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ABSTRACT

It will be generally accepted that teacher education is an important factor underpinning the quality and success of the schooling system in South Africa. Key agenda items in the debate and discourse on the provision of teacher education, in parliamentary and extra-parliamentary circles, include teacher empowerment and professionalization, and teacher education curricula, programmes and policies in the context of an apartheid society in transition to a future democracy.

The present study is a contribution to that debate. It focuses on selected aspects of the pre-service teacher education curriculum at one university Faculty. Data derived from questionnaire surveys and documentary research are analysed and interpreted within the parameters of the critical paradigm of curriculum inquiry as these are given operational definition by the transformative model of teacher education.

The analyses of student and staff perceptions of the curriculum and of curriculum and instructional structures show that the dominant form of teacher education in the Faculty embodies a technocratic rationality that serves to encourage acquiescence and conformity to the status quo in both schooling and society. It is argued that such a curriculum is an anachronism, given the prospect of a "new South Africa" that has become apparent since February 1990. In that context, the dissertation makes an attempt to offer a conceptual basis for an alternative framework in the reconceptualization of teacher education.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

There can be little doubt that one of the major challenges facing South Africa today is the provision of an adequate number of qualified teachers to enhance the quality of education in the country as a whole (HSRC, 1981; Gaydon, 1984). Such provision has to be seen in the larger context of educational reform that continues to dominate the national education agenda both in official and extra-parliamentary circles (1). Key agenda items include teacher empowerment and professionalization (not necessarily commensurate terms), and teacher education curricula, programmes and policies as important issues underpinning the quality and success of the schooling system.

Debate and discourse of a similar nature are currently engaging the attention of several academics in the Faculty of Education at the University of Durban-Westville (UDW). The proposed dissertation is a modest contribution to that debate. It is motivated by the conviction that teacher education needs to be placed urgently on a footing which will enable teachers to understand the changing South African contexts in which they will function and to respond critically to the conflicts and contradictions of a society in transition to a post-apartheid era.

1.1 THE STUDY AND ITS CONTEXT

This dissertation is a case study in teacher education focused on a Faculty of Education at just one of the many universities in South Africa which offer pre-service courses. The Faculty at UDW was established in the 1960s as part of the apartheid system of separate university education for the government-designated race groups. Thus for the major part of the three decades it has been in existence, the Faculty has been largely concerned with the preparation of Indian (2) teachers for Indian schools.
The Faculty, together with the University, is now entering a new phase in its development. Since 1983 when the Government removed restrictions on whom universities could admit, there has been an increasing intake of African students resulting in a substantial change in the racial composition of its student body. The transformation since the days of apartheid separatism is reflected in the racial mix of students in the Faculty where today out of a total student population of 866 students, 55.6 per cent are African, 43.2 per cent are Indian and 1.2 per cent Coloured. In the final year there are 223 students, of whom 56 per cent are Indian, 41.3 per cent African and 2.7 per cent Coloured (3). If the trend continues, it is likely that in a few years' time an even more significant proportion of its students will be Africans.

Future strategies for curriculum development will, therefore, have to take into account the impending diversification in the cultural and social characteristics of the enlarged constituency the Faculty will serve. In some areas of the curriculum there might be a building on existing foundations; in other areas more fundamental changes will probably be needed. Irrespective of the "racial" composition of students, all of these envisaged curricular changes are predicated on the assumption that the central focus of the Faculty will be on the "education of teachers who will practise within a non-racial, non-sexist, democratic, unified system of education that redresses class-inequalities in South Africa." (4)

This is not to suggest, however, that the Faculty has not addressed curricular issues in the past. On the contrary, there have been continual changes in its teacher education programmes. While these changes, no doubt, made ongoing practices more efficient, they were essentially piecemeal in nature and rarely, if ever, evaluated in the total context of the teacher education curriculum of the Faculty.
The present dissertation attempts to make some contribution towards redressing the situation. It is a case study with particular reference to the pre-service teacher education curriculum it offers to final-year students. In doing so, it follows on two other research projects which were also conducted in the context of the Faculty (du Plessis, 1985; McCarthy 1990) but which dealt with specific components of the curriculum. The present dissertation, on the other hand, focuses on the teacher education curriculum as a whole. Given the fact that the Faculty is on the threshold of a new era, it is opportune to undertake such a holistic evaluation of its present curriculum.

Obvious difficulties associated with any attempt to treat comprehensively the diverse manifestations of several teacher education programmes (5) that the Faculty has offered during the past thirty years demand that a focus be fixed on a particular programme. In this dissertation the theme of curriculum theory and teacher education is presented in the context of the one-year post-graduate Higher Diploma in Education (Secondary School Direction). It is one of the very first courses that was offered by the Faculty and as such has historical continuity.

The choice of this particular course, however, should not be misinterpreted to imply a narrow preoccupation with the HDE curriculum per se. Rather, the insights derived from the analysis of that particular curriculum are of value only insofar as they enable one to obtain some understanding of the state of teacher education in the Faculty. Thus it is hoped that the theoretical insights and conceptual understanding derived from the analysis and interpretation of data will not only help to strengthen the information base of decision making in the Faculty, but will also make a contribution to policy debates on teacher education in the context of a society in transition to a future democracy.
1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The dissertation has three major objectives. These are:

1. To undertake analyses and interpretations of empirical data focusing on selected aspects of the teacher education curriculum as perceived by students and lecturers in the Faculty.

2. To consider the socio-political context within which the Faculty has evolved; and the related historical and structural factors that have influenced the form and content of its curriculum.

3. To identify curriculum problems and issues and to generate theoretical propositions that might underpin the formulation of development objectives and strategies for reconceptualizing the teacher education curriculum.

1.3 STUDY METHODS (6)

The information upon which the first two chapters of the dissertation is based was derived from an extensive library research programme.

Data for Chapters Three and Four, which form the main body of the dissertation, have been drawn primarily from (a) questionnaire surveys and (b) documentary research.

(a) Questionnaires (consisting of fixed response and open-ended questions) were administered to two groups:

1. To final-year students: the questionnaire focused on the relevance of the curriculum to their professional development. Eighty-six of the one hundred HDE students responded to the questionnaire.
2. To lecturers in the Faculty: the questionnaire dealt with the aims of teacher education and related matters, and the major curriculum problems that Faculty will have to address in the future. The survey was well received by all thirty-six lecturers in the Faculty, resulting in a hundred percent response.

(b) **Documentary sources** included observation forms completed by lecturers during teaching practice sessions, calendars of the University, final-year examination question papers of the Faculty, and minutes of Faculty Board meetings.

Data was also obtained from informal interviews and discussions with lecturers and final-year students in the Faculty, and with teachers at schools where final-year students are stationed during teaching practice. Most of these teachers consulted were perforce products of UDW, which added credence to their responses during my conversations with them. All of these discussions, integrated with one's experiential knowledge of the situation (as a Faculty member since 1970), proved very helpful and added substantial depth of understanding to the problems being investigated.

1.4 **DISSERTATION OUTLINE**

There are three parts to this dissertation.

1.4.1 **Part One : Background to the Study : The Conceptual Framework**

This consists of the present introductory chapter and Chapter Two which comprises the conceptual framework within which the study is set. Three paradigms of curriculum inquiry are discussed - the empirical-analytical, the hermeneutic and the critical - with particular reference to the respective modes of rationality, their relevance for curriculum theory and practice and the
teacher education models that correspond to each mode of rationality respectively: the applied-science model, the interpretive model and the transformative model.

Bearing in mind that the paradigm of critical inquiry is the only approach that fosters a problematic attitude towards the question of teacher education, and given the context of an apartheid society in transition to a future democracy, it was decided that the parameters of that paradigm as they find expression in the transformative model of teacher education would provide the essential conceptual framework for the study. Thus the analysis and interpretation of data in Part Two of the dissertation are undertaken from the perspective of that model.

1.4.2 Part Two: Major Characteristics of the Teacher Education Curriculum in the Faculty

In Part Two, comprising Chapters Three and Four which form the main body of the thesis, the emphasis is on the analysis of data obtained through questionnaire surveys and documentary research. Two interrelated issues are discussed, each forming the subject of a separate chapter.

Chapter Three focuses on the perceptions of students and staff on selected aspects of the curriculum that the Faculty teaches. Students' views pertaining to the relevance of the curriculum to their professional development, the qualities that characterize a good teacher, their self-ratings as teachers and ways of improving the curriculum are some of the major issues covered. Insofar as the lecturers are concerned, their views were canvassed on the aims of teacher education, the qualities of a good teacher, and the major curriculum problems that the Faculty will have to address in the future. The analysis reveals that the majority of students and lecturers in the Faculty subscribe to an applied-science model of teacher education. There are, however, a small group of lecturers who acknowledge that the teacher education curriculum has to transcend this technical-instrumental orientation.
Chapter Four traces the origin of UDW in the context of the apartheid policy of "separate development". The analysis focuses on how the structural constraints that are manifest in a policy of racial domination had a negative impact on the teacher education curriculum in the Faculty. Against this background the form and content of the curriculum as it finds expression in the HDE course are examined. The analysis reveals further examples of the way in which the technocratic rationality is represented in the curriculum and instructional structures of teacher education in the Faculty.

1.4.3 Part Three: Conclusion: Implications for Curriculum Development

The body of the thesis contained in Chapters Three and Four provides sufficient evidence for a better understanding of the major characteristics of the teacher education curriculum of the Faculty. On the basis of that evidence it is postulated that the question pertaining to the reconceptualization of the curriculum should be urgently addressed.

Thus, in the concluding chapter consideration is given to the identification of factors that might underpin the formulation of curriculum development objectives and strategies for change. These factors are presented in terms of a number of theoretical propositions which, it is hoped, will constitute key agenda items in the debate and discourse on the teacher education curriculum, not only at this University, but also at other tertiary institutions in South Africa where teacher education forms a part of the total curriculum.

1.5 CURRICULUM THEORY, TEACHER EDUCATION AND RELATED PROBLEMS

This dissertation on curriculum theory and teacher education, in which the analysis is undertaken from the perspective of a transformative model of teacher education, inevitably raises questions of impartiality, objectivity and value-free
interpretations in educational research. The problems associated with that set of circumstances are not only unavoidable but also of a sensitive nature, given the context of this dissertation.

The analysis and interpretation have highlighted certain limitations in the way in which lecturers in the Faculty conceptualize teacher education. In that regard the single greatest difficulty has been to avoid any suggestion of disparaging the work of one's colleagues. It needs to be categorically stated that no such disparagement is intended or implied. If there are any limitations in the approach of some of the lecturers to teacher education, it is because of the limitations embedded in the paradigm they endorse, a paradigm that offers little or no scope for treating the various dimensions of the teacher education curriculum as problematic. This does not mean, however, that the lecturers concerned have to accept existing arrangements complacently because they appear to be "successful". Indeed, they have a moral responsibility to consider alternative frameworks critically in an effort to ensure that the programmes they offer are sensitive to changing contexts.

The problem is further compounded by the fact that the situation being researched is one in which the researcher has been closely involved, having been on the lecturing staff for the past twenty years. One is thus being critical of the very system that one was a part of. This makes the issues raised in this dissertation more personally difficult to deal with insofar as critiquing the situation is concerned. Yet at the same time that very fact of involvement serves to make such critique all the more pertinent and morally obligatory. If the historical and structural constraints imposed on Black (i.e. Indian, African and Coloured) academics by the apartheid society are taken into account, there may indeed be valid reasons for working within the education system. But this does not necessarily mean that all those who work within the system accept or support it, or that working within the system precludes them from being critical of it.
Teaching, whether at the primary, secondary or tertiary level can be a subversive activity even in the context of apartheid!

To elaborate on the question of objectivity in educational research, a point raised in the opening paragraph of this section, it is now widely accepted that, as in social science generally, there is no such thing as value-free education either in concept or content. As Crittenden (1973 : 1) has observed:

"All teacher education is a form of ideology... There is no such thing as value free teacher education, just as there is no such thing as value free education for children."

While it is acknowledged that it is not possible to be neutral about education, it must nevertheless be realized that social scientists have an obligation to recognize and attempt to identify their value premises and concomitant biases. Thus the present dissertation is predicated implicitly on a set of beliefs about education and society: that no society is perfect and the purpose of education is to improve it. More explicitly, the dissertation is embedded in a context that conceptualizes teacher education as a process that is political and ideological in nature. Accordingly, an attempt has been made to analyze and interpret data from the perspective of a transformative model of teacher education in the belief that by treating the various dimensions of the pre-service programme as problematic, teacher education may become a significant force in promoting the vision of a new social order. Lather (1986 : 67) captures the essence of this argument when he writes:

"Once we recognise that just as there is no neutral education there is no neutral research, we no longer need apologise for unabashedly ideological research and its open commitment to using research to criticize and change the status quo."
NOTES

1. For example, the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) launched in November 1990, under the aegis of the National Education Coordinating Committee (NECC) has set up a number of Research Groups to investigate education policy options for a new South Africa. One such group is the Teacher Education Research Group (TERG).

2. The very nature of South Africa's apartheid system requires the application of racial nomenclature. Officially there are four groups, the Africans, the Whites, the Coloureds and the Indians. It must be pointed out that the use of such terminology in this dissertation should not be taken to imply the legitimation of the government-designated race groups.

3. Source: Student Affairs, UDW.


5. For details, see Chapter 4.

6. The study method is described in greater detail in Appendix A.
2.1 INTRODUCTION

It will be recalled that the present dissertation is specifically concerned, on the one hand, with identifying staff and student views on selected aspects of the curriculum while, on the other, it focuses attention on the major curriculum problems facing the Faculty with a view to considering ways and means by which such problems may be addressed. To achieve these goals it is necessary to construct a conceptual framework within which analyses and interpretations of empirical data may be undertaken and within which problems of curriculum development may be identified and solutions considered.

Given the fact that the University of Durban-Westville is undergoing a fundamental transformation at present, a transformation that has parallels in the present climate of political change in South Africa, the foregoing issues no doubt constitute one of the most compelling set of challenges the Faculty will have to address in the decade of the 1990s and beyond. Indeed, they involve fundamental questions of reconceptualization at the paradigmatic level. The nature of paradigms, therefore, provides the essential theoretical rationale for the study and a conceptual framework within which analyses and interpretations will be undertaken.

2.2 CURRICULUM PARADIGMS

The term "paradigm", in the educational research context, originates from Kuhn (1962, 1970), who drew upon data from philosophy, history, psychology as well as from the natural sciences to argue that the history of science reveals that the conduct of scientific inquiry in any era takes place within a paradigm.
A paradigm may be operationally defined as a framework of epistemological assumptions and methodological procedures that governs the conduct of inquiry and the interpretation of data. Thus any theoretical knowledge that is generated will be consistent with the view of "reality" that the paradigm endorses. The production of theories from within a paradigm is what Kuhn refers to as "normal science", which he argues usually takes the form of "puzzle solving" in terms of the dominant paradigm. Puzzles which persistently defy solution within the terms of the paradigm become "anomalies". A state of "crisis" then develops and the pressure is temporarily accommodated by "extraordinary research" which, if successful, produces a "revolution"; that is, a "paradigm shift" or reconceptualization which inaugurates the emergence of a new paradigm. Referring to the implications of such a revolution, Carr and Kemiss (1986:72) note that they entail:

"... changes in the conduct of research that are so fundamental that the nature and scope of the whole enterprise are perceived in an entirely different way. Not only does 'normal science' and its 'puzzles' change; so also does the way in which (a) research community interprets 'reality' and defines such notions as 'knowledge', 'theory', and 'truth'."

Illustrations include a shift of scientific paradigms from Einstein's clockwork physics to the relativity theories of Newton and the quantum theory of Max Planck, the shift from the Ptolemaic or geocentric universe to the heliocentric universe of Copernicus in astronomy, the transition from pre- to post-germ theory promoted by the works of Lister, Pasteur and others in medical science, and the move from Euclidean to non-Euclidean geometry in mathematics (Schubert, 1986:170).
This is not to suggest that the concept of paradigms has not been without criticism (e.g., Lakatos and Musgrave, 1970). Nevertheless, the term itself is firmly entrenched in the linguistic register of the various disciplines where it continues to serve as a convenient methodological/empirical shorthand for a particular universe of discourse. Thus a positive outgrowth has been an increasing recognition of the possibility of conducting educational inquiry through different paradigms, particularly since the early 1970s. The publications of several scholars, referred to as reconceptualists, have ensured that debate in the curriculum field will continue to centre on paradigms of inquiry. A common feature characterizing these publications is their origin in non-mainstream sources located to the left of centre in the political spectrum (e.g., Apple, 1979, 1982; Giroux, Penna and Pinar, 1981; Giroux, 1981, 1983; Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985; Giroux and McLaren, 1987; Grundy, 1987; Popkewitz, 1987; Zeichner and Liston, 1987; Cornbleth, 1990). These works have undoubtedly widened the scope of curriculum studies. The need for such wide-angled vision is all the more necessary "in a country as isolated as South Africa where educational theory (especially) in Afrikaans universities has undergone an indigenous development of a particularly restricting kind" (Millar, 1983 : 7) and where major areas of educational study, like curriculum theory, for example, have been underdeveloped.

The influence of the aforementioned works is discernible in the discourse among those engaged in the reform of the teacher education curriculum, both here and abroad. The nature of the discourse is revealed in writings that range from those dealing with the curriculum at a general theoretical/conceptual level (e.g., Buchman and Schwille, 1983; Zeichner, 1983; Giroux and McLaren, 1986; Shulman, 1987) to those that address specific components of the curriculum (e.g., Adler and Goodman, 1986; Thembela, 1986; Zeichner and Liston, 1987; Randall, 1990). Locally, a number of organisations and tertiary institutions
have held conferences, seminars and workshops on both the theory and practice of teacher education; a specific example of work in this category is that of the NEPI Teacher Education Research Group, under the aegis of NECC (1). Although not in this genre, but of some relevance to the present dissertation, is the "Education Renewal Strategy", a discussion document produced by the Department of National Education in June 1991, which makes reference to fourteen recommendations (2) designed to reform teacher education in South Africa.

Despite the variation in the scope of the above-mentioned deliberations and despite the political and concomitant ideological positions of those researching teacher education, the basic curriculum question of what is most worthwhile for teachers to know must be addressed. This question is of particular relevance to the present study, dealing as it does with the curriculum of teacher education. It, in turn, raises other related questions pertaining to the concept of good teaching, the teacher's role in the context of a society in transition, the opportunities teachers have in the education of an informed, critical citizenry and, as a corollary to this, whether there is a need for teachers to reconceptualize their roles as professionals.

Responses developed within curriculum theory to such questions vary a great deal, though it is possible to detect at least "three paradigms (that) have emerged to give definition and structure to the practice of research" (Popkewitz, 1984 : 35): the empirical-analytical, the hermeneutic and the critical.

Before elaborating on each of these three paradigms of curriculum inquiry, it is necessary to make reference to certain key ideas that give definition to the Kuhnian concept of "paradigm" as used in this dissertation. The purpose of the task is to provide some background material for the sections that follow. Accordingly, anything more than a brief summary will be outside the scope of the present research.
Drawing on the works of Schubert (1986) and Carr and Kemiss (1986) — who in turn base their interpretations on the works of Hultgren (1982), Giroux (1980), Bernstein (1976; 1979) and, more particularly, Habermas (1970; 1971; 1972; 1973) — it may be stated that each of the paradigms is characterized by a particular mode of rationality. The different modes of rationality represent different processes of inquiry and are determined by specific knowledge-constitutive interests. Different kinds of knowledge are constituted by the particular human interests they serve. According to Habermas knowledge is always constituted on the basis of interests that have grown out of the natural needs and desires of the human species in specific historical and social contexts.

Knowledge, then, is the result of human activity that arises out of natural needs and interests. These are referred to as "knowledge-constitutive interests" because they are interests that shape and determine what constitutes knowledge (in different human activities) and the categories in terms of which such knowledge is organized. It is possible to identify three basic knowledge-constitutive interests: technical, practical and emancipatory, each of which may be linked respectively to the paradigms referred to above.

Thus, the empirical-analytical paradigm incorporates a technical interest with its emphasis on control over the environment; the mode of social organization used is that of the workplace with its hierarchical structure. In contrast, the hermeneutic paradigm serves a practical interest with the focus on intersubjective understanding in situationally specific contexts; in doing so it uses the social organisation of interaction. The critical paradigm incorporates an emancipatory interest that is concerned with empowerment of people; this requires modes of social organization that emphasize power.
It is with a consideration of the three paradigms of curriculum inquiry that the rest of the chapter will be concerned. Three aspects in particular will be discussed:

1. The mode of rationality that characterizes each paradigm.
2. The implications that each mode of rationality has for curriculum theory and practice at the school level.
3. The models of teacher education that correspond to each mode of rationality.

A brief explanation concerning the second aspect listed above is necessary. The focus on curriculum theory and practice at the school level is deemed to be a pre-requisite to any discussion on the teacher education curriculum. Teacher education is historically related to the institutional development of schooling. Every plan for teacher education is necessarily bounded by existing or proposed patterns of schooling. Thus, the question of how teachers should be educated cannot be adequately addressed without reference to curriculum theory and practice as this finds expression in the context of the school.

2.3 THE EMPIRICAL-ANALYTICAL PARADIGM OF CURRICULUM INQUIRY

2.3.1 Mode of Rationality

The empirical-analytical paradigm of inquiry is characterised by a technical mode of rationality which holds faith in the certainty of knowledge generated by methods of positivistic science; that is, such knowledge is produced through experimentation grounded in experience and observation of overt behaviour or appearance of nature, which is taken for granted as the basis for truth. It assumes a rather ordered, predictable universe; one in which objectivity, replicability, validity, reliability, causal explanation, prediction and, most importantly, control are possible and desirable.
In other words, the knowledge-constitutive interest of technical rationality lies in controlling the objectified world. It uses the natural sciences as its model of theoretical development and consequently rests on a number of assumptions pertaining to knowledge, social reality and the nature of inquiry.

2.3.2 Implications for Curriculum Theory and Practice

The technical mode of rationality has a number of implications for educational theory and practice.

First, knowledge is regarded as value-neutral. A major assumption here is that knowledge can be operationalized and defined in such a way that there is an invariant definition which can be used to test and compare data. The search for such formalized knowledge relies heavily on quantitative techniques and formal logic. Enquiry becomes embedded in a framework of objectivity in the search for knowledge that can be universalized. Only facts generated by this procedure are utilized in explanation and discovery, while other forms of knowledge, such as those derived intersubjectively, are marginalized on the grounds that they cannot be empirically verified. The implication of this assumption to educational theory is clear when concepts such as school readiness, intelligence and scholastic achievement are interpreted solely in terms of the results obtained from performing certain operations. The influence of the methodology of natural sciences is clearly discernible here. To cite a specific example: concepts about good teaching are operationalized into discrete variables that have an invariant meaning and can be measured concretely, such as what types of questions are asked during a lesson; the number of student-initiated responses which occur and the time taken up by "teacher talk" in a lesson and so on.

Second, educational theories associated with the technical mode of rationality "comprise hypothetico-deductive connections of propositions, which permit the deduction of law-like
hypotheses with empirical content" (Habermas, 1972: 308). That is, empirical-analytical inquiry is concerned with identifying the regularities that exist in the environment in an effort to formulate rules for action based upon these regularities. A major assumption here is that the technical interest is fundamentally focused on controlling the environment through rule-following action based on empirically grounded laws. An illustration of the relevance of this assumption to educational theory can be found, for example, in the quest for laws of learning which can provide a set of specific rules that would, if followed, promote learning. Implicit in this prescriptive approach to the curriculum is the idea that both the learner and the learning environment may be manipulated to ensure that the desired learning occurs. This is the technical approach, par excellence.

Third, the relationship between cause and effect in this approach is a linear process that is susceptible to prediction. In other words, since knowledge is objective, and consists of isolated and analytically separable parts that interact in terms of law-like regularities, it follows that the relationship among these variables can be empirically verified. The relevance of this assumption for educational theory and practice is well stated by Popkewitz (1984: 37) with reference to teaching:

"Teaching is ... reduced to specific variables that can be measured independently of other elements in the system. Teacher praise, for example, is separated out from a myriad of other factors in classroom or teaching practices and compared to achievement in order to understand whether praise influences this school outcome. It is believed that by identifying and interrelating variables, the specific cause of behaviour within the system can be known."
Implicit in the above three assumptions is a fourth: that education is a politically neutral activity. The technical rationality endorses a reproductive view of the curriculum. It implies that the status quo is good enough; that is, cultural and social improvements are not needed. This notion of the reproductive function of schooling has gained currency in educational theory in recent years and has implications that run much deeper than simply providing analyses and interpretations of teachers' work. The role of schools as agents of social and cultural reproduction has become an important issue in educational discourse and debate (e.g., Bowles and Gintis 1976; Apple 1979).

The relevance of the above ideas to teacher education will now be considered.

2.3.3 Technical Rationality and Teacher Education

The tradition in teacher education that is identified with the basic assumptions of technocratic rationality may be referred to as the applied-science model. Arising out of the discussion in the preceding section, the nucleus of ideas that give definition to this model may be summarised as follows:

1. It is based on positivist epistemology; knowledge is regarded as neutral, objective and beyond critical analysis.

2. Teaching is approached as a management problem, involving the drawing up of lesson plans, constructing materials and evaluating according to pre-determined objectives derived from behaviourist psychology. It is an approach largely identified with the Tyler Rationale (Tyler, 1949).

3. The teacher's role is reduced to that of a technician whose task is to transmit knowledge formulated by "experts". To enhance the technicist role, emphasis is placed on the acquisition of discrete skills on the assumption that each skill is related cumulatively to the concept of teaching.
4. The transmission mode of teaching finds expression in the passive model of human behaviour in classroom social relationships.

5. Teaching competence is commensurate with the mastery of teaching skills and content knowledge, with success being measured in terms of explicit criteria.

The aforementioned characteristics will find expression in a teacher-education curriculum where method courses offer prospective teachers "an increasing supply of research instruments, models, styles of teaching and data on effective teaching" (Densmore 1987: 131), all of which are designed to "train" better teachers. Teaching methods are reduced to skills and techniques. Such a narrow characterisation means that teaching methods are denuded of social, human and historical elements. In that context, knowledge is reified: content and methods of teaching are seen as external to human agency, and the dynamics of teaching are reduced to problems of management and technical control.

Congruent with the above-mentioned orientation to a scientific pedagogy, the "Education" and "Method" components of the curriculum will be presented discretely and not contextually. Thus the various sub-disciplines of Education and the Method subjects will be taught as separate entities with little or no conscious effort to correlate and synthesize the content in a manner that will have some relevance and application to the prospective teachers' personal and professional lives.

The prospective teacher is regarded as a passive recipient of this professional knowledge, with virtually no voice in the purpose, content and direction of his/her curriculum. This is a prime example of the teacher-training approach that sees teacher preparation as a form of applied science.

Insofar as the teacher education curriculum is constructed in an educational and social context that is taken for granted, the
applied-sciences model lends ideological support to a notion of value consensus and role socialisation in terms of Parsonian functionalism. Underlying the harmony and consensus implicit in the applied-science model of teacher education is a perception of the roles of students and teachers as relatively fixed and permanent in terms of a hierarchial social order operating in the context of the school and classroom. The conceptualization of the educational process within such narrow boundaries results in the marginalizing of the political, social, and economic forces that have a bearing on the theory and practice of teacher education.

2.4 THE HERMENEUTIC PARADIGM OF CURRICULUM INQUIRY

2.4.1 Mode of Rationality

The hermeneutic mode of rationality attempts to enhance the understanding of social life through symbolic patterns of interaction. Its knowledge-constitutive interest shifts attention from the certainty of knowledge characteristic of empirical-analytical inquiry, and focuses on understanding how the ideas, concepts and languages of interaction communicate meaning that makes it possible for us to relate to each other and the world around us.

Meanings, in the hermeneutic mode of rationality, are constructed by actors in the process of interaction rather than being imposed by an external social system. Human beings are not passive recipients of information. In their interaction with others, individuals interpret, negotiate and identify situations and produce meanings in terms of which they define the possibilities and limitations of human existence and so construct their own social world. It, therefore, follows, for instance, that an understanding of the actions of individuals requires an interpretation of the meanings which actors give to their behaviour.
Since meanings in this sense are socially constructed, they can be deconstructed and reconstructed. Social reality, therefore, is the result of ongoing negotiations between mutually involved sets of actors who are always engaged in interpreting, evaluating and defining the constitutive rules that shape their interactions. Thus, the hermeneutic mode of rationality has a deep-seated interest in meaning and understanding based on intersubjective consensus that occurs through social interaction.

2.4.2 Implications for Curriculum Theory and Practice

This mode of rationality has important implications for educational theory and practice.

In contrast to the technical view, the hermeneutic paradigm holds that knowledge is socially constructed; that is, knowledge is subjective, not objective. From this it follows that pedagogy cannot be pursued by service delivery systems as is the case with the technical approach where the teacher's role is to master techniques of transmitting pre-packaged knowledge prepared and presented by "experts". The hermeneutic paradigm, on the other hand, regards teaching as a process of interaction between teachers and learners in a situation where all participants are regarded as subjects, not objects. It is a process that recognizes the relevance of personal knowledge of learners and their lived experiences. Teaching is not a means-end activity by which an educational outcome is obtained through the action of a teacher upon a group of objectified pupils. Rather it is regarded as a process through which teachers and pupils interact in order to make meaning of the world. It entails interpretation and understanding of knowledge with emphasis on cognitive and personal development. This means that learning, not teaching, will become the central concern of teachers.
It follows from the above view of the pedagogic process that curriculum proposals informed by the hermeneutic rationality will not eschew subjectivity, but rather acknowledge the importance of judgement. As Stenhouse (1975: 96) has observed, a "process view of the model (of curriculum development) rests on teacher judgment rather than teacher direction." Such a view implies that teachers have the professional right to make their own meaning of any curriculum prescribed for implementation and would consequently deny or, at least, seriously question the authority of such a document to determine teachers' work.

Teachers will thus be obliged to evaluate and interpret the purposes of the prescribed content. Interpretation is not done with a view to understanding the purposes of the curriculum and then devising techniques to implement these as competently as possible because, as Grundy (1987: 69) observes:

"... it is not sufficient that the teacher is able to interpret the curriculum texts to come to an understanding of what the document prescribes. For instance, it is not sufficient that a teacher understands that what is intended is for students to undertake learning experiences which will enable them to complete sets of mathematical computations. A teacher whose work is informed by a practical interest will reject mathematics curriculum proposals which encourage the achievement of correct answers as a consequence of the application of appropriate algorithms but fail to make provision for the student actively to engage in making meaning of mathematical problems and their possible solutions."
So there is an obligation on the part of teachers to question prescribed content that militates against "meaning-making". Teachers operating within the hermeneutic paradigm will also question whether a fragmented and subject-specific content is the best way of organising knowledge to enhance the process of making meaning and thereby encourage interpretation and understanding rather than the rote memorisation of pre-packaged curriculum material. Such teachers will recognize the need "to draw upon an eclectic awareness of the disciplines of knowledge (and) relate existing knowledge to fundamental needs and interests of students" (Schubert, 1986: 216).

Implicit in the argument presented in the preceding paragraphs of this section is the notion that education, curriculum and teaching may be considered as practical. In terms of the practical view the relationship between theory and practice is not a one-way linear process involving the implementation of ideas into action; of deriving practice from theoretical principles. The process is two-way: pedagogy is informed not only by theory but also by the practical exigencies of specific situations; it always requires critical appraisal and mediation by the practical judgement of the teacher.

How do the aforementioned elements of curriculum theory and practice contribute to the teacher education programme? This question will be considered in the section that follows.

2.4.3 Hermeneutic Rationality and Teacher Education

The second model of teacher education, one that is identified with hermeneutic rationality, is the interpretive model. Drawing on the discussion in the preceding section and on the works of Schwab (1969, 1970), it is possible to identify four central assumptions that characterize the model:

1. The source of educational problems is located in specific situations.
2. The method of inquiry is interaction in situationally-specific contexts.

3. The nature of knowledge sought is increased understanding of socially-constructed meaning.

4. The purpose of such enlightenment is increased capacity to take effective action in particular curriculum situations.

If these assumptions are adhered to, it follows that the teacher education curriculum will be based on the self-perceived needs and concerns of prospective teachers. The phenomenological route to knowledge is personal and in terms of this epistemological perspective the individual must find the meaning of his own existence. Translated into an education programme, it means that prospective teachers must be permitted to work on problems and tasks that are of interest to them. The curriculum must provide opportunities for them to explore possibilities, and provide time for private introspection. Unlike the case with programmes formulated in terms of the applied-science model, the content knowledge and pedagogic skills that teachers are to master will rarely be documented in advance. This is not to suggest that students take priority over subject matter because the two are linked; but rather that disciplines of knowledge are important to the extent that they contribute to the meaningful pursuit of student-teachers' interests and to their own personal maturity and development. As students become involved in the search for knowledge that is of practical benefit to them, they realize that there is a need to interpret, select, order and synthesize such knowledge to suit their own needs, interests and problems. The specification of a particular set of behaviours for all teachers to master will, therefore, be viewed as counter-productive to the development of effective teachers.

Rather than the mastery of a pre-determined set of skills and behaviours, a central concern within the interpretive model is
to encourage students to develop their own theories of teaching. An illustration of this point would be when:

"... students in teacher education ... pose problems related to their interest in becoming a teacher. Preparatory to observing teaching practice, they might be exposed to a succession of theorists and be asked to interpret and assess what they observe through the lenses of, say, Dewey, then Freud, then Plato, then Froebel, and so on. As theory upon theory accumulates, they would be asked to sort through the layers in an effort to match theories to situations, adapt and combine theories to give situations greater meaning, and finally to invent interpretations of events that theoretical literature seems not to address" (Schubert, 1986: 298).

As stated earlier, the relationship between theory and practice is, thus, not a linear process, where theory determines practice. On the contrary, teachers would be required to tailor, adapt, combine and even invent theories to suit specific situations, as suggested above. The ability to do so is important, because, in terms of the model, many pedagogic perspectives would be needed in a class to suit different circumstances. The experience that prospective teachers gain as they develop their own responses to situations would contribute to their own evolving theory of teaching. The particular nature of the relationship between theory and practice captures the essence of the interpretive model of teacher education.

A shortcoming of the interpretive model is that it regards the educational and social contexts within which prospective teachers are to work as unproblematic. Evaluation of the curriculum is made primarily in terms of its effects on individual students in teacher education and not in terms of its
effects upon the prevailing social order. This is congruent with the tenets of the interpretive perspective, with its focus upon activities that occur within schools and classrooms.

But the lives of students and teachers, the social and cultural aspects of classroom life and the selection of knowledge to be taught transcend the relatively narrow boundaries of the school. By celebrating personal development and self-fulfilment the model, in effect, endorses the liberal view that education operates on meritocratic principles; it thereby perpetuates the myth that education can create a more equal and just society.

2.5 THE CRITICAL PARADIGM OF CURRICULUM INQUIRY

2.5.1 Mode of Rationality

The critical paradigm of curriculum inquiry is informed by an emancipatory mode of rationality linked to principles of critique and action. Its knowledge-constitutive interest lies in the "emancipation and empowerment (of people) to engage in autonomous action arising out of ... critical insights into the social construction of human society" (Grundy, 1987: 19).

Proponents of the critical paradigm claim that the search for consensual meaning and understanding, the central concern of hermeneutic rationality, would be impossible if it were not located in a social order that empowers human beings to transcend constraints imposed by race, gender and socio-economic class. They thus deem it necessary to go beyond the hermeneutic by focusing on emancipatory interest. It must be emphasized that emancipatory rationality does not renounce the primacy of consensual meaning; instead it tries to contextualize such meaning in a wider societal setting in order to explore how the latter might impose limitations and constraints upon ideas and action. This is a necessary corrective because the relatively narrow focus of the hermeneutic rationality on
subjective meanings of action creates the impressions that social reality is shaped by individual consciousness alone. But social reality is also structured and shaped by political, economic, sociological and historical factors; all of these factors affect the perceptions and ideas of individuals so that "reality" may be distorted by the operation of ideological processes. It is, therefore, necessary to uncover these processes and explain how they can result in a "false consciousness" that conditions and constrains interpretations of reality. Thus the emancipatory interest requires going beyond any narrow concerns with subjective meanings in order to acquire an emancipatory knowledge that will promote critique by treating both theory and practice as jointly problematic, as open to dialectical reconstruction through reflection and action. Such a combination, in which thought and action are dialectically related, is labelled critical praxis.

2.5.2 Implications for Curriculum Theory and Practice

Emancipatory rationality generates a number of concerns for educational theory and practice.

A curriculum that is informed by an emancipatory interest will be characterized by a dialectical relationship between theory and practice; in other words, curriculum is not a product per se but is essentially a form of praxis that develops through a reflexive relationship between action and reflection.

Arising out of the above general principle are a number of specific, interrelated principles. The implications of these, for curriculum theory and practice, may be spelt out as follows.

An emancipatory curriculum operates in the context of interaction, which implies that the learning process requires the creation of a dynamic social environment. Such an environment will contribute to the promotion of teaching and learning as a dialogical relationship between teacher and learner. This transactional view means that teaching and
learning are two sides of the same pedagogic "coin". Through such emancipatory pedagogy, students become actively involved in the construction of their own knowledge so that learning becomes meaningful. Meaningfulness in the context of emancipatory education is a matter of negotiation between teacher and learner from the outset of the learning experience. Meaning-making is thus recognized as a social construction.

Since meaning-making also involves conflicting meanings, a critical orientation to all knowledge is essential. What this suggests is that the curriculum process is inevitably political in nature. This is in contrast with the technical orientation that endorses a reproductive view of the curriculum, which implies that education is a neutral, apolitical activity. The critical paradigm, on the other hand, seeks emancipation from ideological domination through hegemonic meaning structures which mask asymmetrical distribution of power in society. It must be acknowledged that those who "control" in society also have the power to ensure that their meaning-structures are accepted as unproblematic. When teachers and students challenge such domination by subjecting curriculum knowledge to ideological critique, the process of curriculum construction as meaning-making becomes a political act.

Various questions can be formulated to give operational content to the aforementioned ideological critique. Schubert (1986: 315) provides a useful list that contains some of the more important questions that critical theorists ask:

1. How is knowledge reproduced by schools?
2. What are the sources of knowledge that students acquire in schools?
3. How do students and teachers resist or contest that which is conveyed through lived experience in schools?
4. What do students and teachers realize from their school experiences? In other words, what impact does school have on their outlooks?
5. Whose interests are served by outlooks and skills fostered by schooling?

6. When served, do these interests move in the direction of emancipation, equity, and social justice, or do they move in the opposite direction?

7. How can students be empowered to attain greater liberation, equity, and social justice through schooling?

The general aim of questions of this kind is to draw attention to the dialectical relatedness of knowledge, the learner, society and schooling and, consequently, the contribution that emancipatory education can make to the reconstruction of society. To emphasize a point alluded to in previous paragraphs, a more specific aim of the above questions is to enable teachers to critique their pedagogic actions in relation to the political, social and cultural contexts in which their teaching is actually embedded.

An emancipatory curriculum thus makes it obligatory to treat teaching as problematic. Problematizing teaching means not only questioning the nature of knowledge and its ideological underpinnings, as indicated above, but also questioning the unexamined assumptions upon which teaching is based. Tom (1985: 40) sums up the problematizing of teaching in the following way:

"To make teaching problematic is to raise doubts about what, under ordinary circumstances, appears to be effective or wise practice. The object of our doubts might be accepted principles of good pedagogy, typical ways teachers respond to classroom management issues, customary beliefs about the relationships between schooling and society, or ordinary definitions of teacher authority - both in the classroom and in the broader school context."
The aforementioned elements of curriculum theory and practice have a significant impact on the teacher education programme, as will be indicated in the next section.

2.5.3 Emancipatory Rationality and Teacher Education

The model of teacher education that corresponds to the emancipatory mode of rationality may be referred to as the transformative model. It builds on the assumptions on which the interpretive model is based and addresses curriculum issues within the broader societal framework.

Drawing on the discussion in the preceding section and on the work of Whitty, Barton and Pollard (1987), it is possible to infer that the transformative model of teacher education is characterized by at least four important features.

First, the model will emphasize educational aims and the concomitant content and pedagogic knowledge and technical skills. The assumption here is that teachers will regard it as their responsibility to consider ethical and axiological issues involved in educational aims and to contribute to the formulation of policy at the school, local and national levels. The development of technical skills in teaching and the mastery of content are always addressed within the framework of critical inquiry and are, accordingly, viewed not as ends in themselves but as means of contributing towards emancipatory ends.

Second, teaching is regarded as a dialogical process in which classroom inquiry and practical action are monitored and evaluated reflexively. Normative questions, such as the list of seven questions cited in the previous section, assume primacy of importance and the process of critical inquiry complements the ability to carry out the tasks themselves. Thus the curriculum requires prospective teachers to render as problematic that which is taken as given about issues such as the role and tasks
of the teacher, the role of the pupil, the nature of knowledge, and current institutional arrangements for the conduct of schooling.

Third, the model attempts to relate educational disciplines to the teachers' own theorizing about pedagogical matters. Thus educational disciplines and method courses are not studied discretely, but instead used to complement, extend and refine the teachers' practical theorizing; theory and practice are treated as open to dialectical reconstruction through reflection and action. It follows from this that the knowledge and skills to be taught cannot be fully specified in advance. Students play an active role in determining the content of the curriculum insofar as their self-perceived needs are given due recognition.

The model thus rests on a constructivist epistemology in terms of which knowledge is seen as developing by a process of construction and reconstruction of theory and practice.

Finally, the transformative model defines the teacher education curriculum within an educational and societal context that is regarded as problematic; within the framework of critical inquiry this implies a commitment to the quality of the teaching-learning process and the pursuance of social justice and equity.

The basic tenets of the emancipatory approach to the teacher education curriculum are summarized nicely by Zeichner (1981-82: 6-7):

"Because of the intimate relationship between the school and the social, political and economic contexts in which it exists, any consideration of the consequences to which classroom action leads must inevitably take one beyond the boundaries of the classroom and even of the school itself and beyond the consideration of educational principles alone ... An exclusive focus of the level of the classroom and on educational principles alone does not enable the
student teacher to contemplate the kind of basic structural changes that may be necessary for his or her responsibility to be fully exercised. The attention of student teachers remains focused on the amelioration of surface symptoms in individuals and not on an analysis of the social conditions that stand behind, and at least partially explain the existence of those symptoms" (emphasis added).

Insofar as the transformative model of teacher education is conceptualized within an educational and societal context that is regarded as problematic, it provides ideological support for a conflict view of society that advocates fundamental changes in the structure of society as a prerequisite for the establishment of a social order characterized by justice and equity for all its citizens. As such it offers a radical alternative to the conservative bias implicit in the applied-science model of teacher education, and the liberal stance of the interpretive model. While it is realized that education alone cannot change the social order, it is equally true that no strategy for the fundamental reform of society can afford to ignore the contribution that education and schooling can make towards the achievement of such an objective. This potential to contribute to change should, therefore, be nurtured and developed. The relative merits of the different models in this regard are succinctly stated by Giroux and McLaren (1987: 267-70) when they write:

"What is missing from (the applied-science and interpretive models of teacher education) is the image of the teacher as a transformative intellectual who defines schooling as fundamentally an ethical and empowering enterprise dedicated to the fostering of democracy, to the exercise of greater social justice, and to the building of a more equitable social order."
2.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter has revealed something of the diversity of paradigms of curriculum inquiry. It is important to emphasize, however, that the three paradigms discussed are not diametrically opposed to one another insofar as there are parallels in some of the major curricular phenomena they address. Be that as it may, it is equally important to emphasize that the way we think about or conceptualize these curricular phenomena depends on the types of questions it is possible to raise within the framework of the respective modes of rationality characterizing each paradigm; the nature of the interrogation has considerable impact on what those phenomena become. Therefore, it makes a significant difference whether the paradigm within which one operates tends to be more of the empirical-analytical, hermeneutic or critical variety.

The various themes discussed within the framework of these paradigms embrace some of the diversities alluded to. Perhaps these can be most easily adumbrated with reference to the relationship between theory and practice. The empirical-analytical paradigm regards theory as a set of disinterested principles that can be applied in practice; the hermeneutic paradigm regards practice as being informed not only by theory but also by the practical exigencies of specific situations, requiring mediation by the professional judgement of the teacher; and the critical paradigm regards theory and practice as being dialectically related, with both theory and practice being treated as problematic, as open to reconstruction through reflection and action.

Each of these alternate views on theory and practice reflects differences in views regarding the other major themes addressed in the chapter; namely, the nature of knowledge, the teaching-learning process, the mastery of content knowledge and
technical skills in teaching, and the relationship between education, schooling and society. It is clear that each paradigm seeks to give emphasis and coherence to these themes in different ways.

The diversity of paradigmatic orientations offers interesting options insofar as deciding on the conceptual framework for the present study is concerned. Bearing in mind that the study focuses on teacher education curriculum issues in the context of a university that is undergoing a fundamental transformation, a transformation which has parallels in the present climate of impending change, it is evident that the critical paradigm is the only approach that fosters a problematic attitude towards the question of teacher education. The parameters of the paradigm of critical inquiry as these find expression in the transformative model of teacher education will, accordingly, provide the essential conceptual framework for this study.
NOTES

1. See Footnote 1, Chapter 1.

2. It is interesting to note that only one recommendation refers, albeit obliquely, to the curriculum of teacher education. Thus Recommendation 7.4 (on page 42 of the Document) recommends that the South African Council for Education "advise on the ... type and duration of teacher training programmes."
3.1 INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this chapter is to identify the perceptions that students and staff in the Faculty have of the teacher education curriculum. The identification of perceptions has important implications both for the evaluation of the present curriculum and for the development of future strategy.

Accordingly, staff and student perceptions of the curriculum are examined so as:

(1) to extend the understanding of the role and relevance of the professional, educational and practical components of the curriculum;
(2) to afford insights into the ways in which teacher education is conceptualized;
(3) to provide indicators that might form the basis upon which consideration might be given to factors that are likely to underpin the formulation of curriculum development objectives and strategies for the future.

The questionnaire survey undertaken to meet the analytical requirements of the three objectives listed above included the following elements:

(1) ranking of the importance of the method subjects (the professional component) in terms of the contribution each has made to the teaching of the discipline concerned;
(2) ranking of the importance of the other subjects (the educational and practical components) in terms of the contribution each has made to the students' professional growth as teachers;
(3) ways in which the present curriculum could be improved;
(4) qualities that characterize a "good teacher";
(5) students' self-ratings as teachers;
(6) aims of a teacher education programme;
(7) curriculum problems that the Faculty will have to address in the decade of the nineties and beyond.

The statistical analyses presented in the sections that follow are based on the results derived from a questionnaire survey conducted in the Faculty. Details of the study methods are contained in Appendix A.

3.2 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE CURRICULUM

In spite of rhetoric to the contrary, university curricula are by and large still formulated without any significant input from the student constituency. The Faculty of Education is no exception to this shortcoming. This survey is a modest attempt at redressing the imbalance.

To debate whether student perceptions are "right" or "wrong" is to miss the point, which is that perceptions help in formulating criteria in terms of which students evaluate the curriculum on offer and, concomitantly, their response to it at the level of the classroom, the context where much of the teacher's professional life is spent.

It must be stressed at the outset that the analyses of data can only yield conclusions that are tentative and speculative; they are indicators of what students in the Faculty think of the curriculum and what factors inform that thinking. In spite of such limitations it cannot be gainsaid that the exercise is a useful one.

3.2.1 Professional Subjects in the Curriculum

In rating the Professional (Method) Subjects over 75 per cent of the "votes" cast were in the "Very Important" and "Important" categories (Table 3.1). This suggests that the Method Subjects are making an important contribution to the teaching of the respective disciplines.
It is apparent that practical considerations are an important criterion in rating Method Subjects (Table 3.2). The extent to which these subjects help in devising teaching strategies were cited by nearly 50 per cent of the respondents. Other criteria in the practical category included the relevance of method subjects in the planning, preparation and presentation of lessons and the related aspect of the importance of teacher-pupil interaction in the teaching/learning process.

Of the remaining criteria all, except one - the attitude of lecturers - are self-explanatory. It is interesting to note that this criterion was cited by over 10 per cent of the sample, a fact which suggests that the attitude of a lecturer to his discipline and more particularly to his students should not be underestimated in the learning process even at the tertiary level.

**TABLE 3.1**

**RATING OF PROFESSIONAL (METHOD) SUBJECTS : PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN EACH CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING SCALE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 : Very Important</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 : Important</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 : Fairly Important</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 : Not very Important</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 : Unimportant</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.2

CRITERIA FOR RATING PROFESSIONAL (METHOD) SUBJECTS: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS MENTIONING EACH CRITERION. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Importance of Discipline in School Curriculum</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Insight into Discipline</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Planning, Preparation and Presentation of Lessons</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pupil-teacher Interaction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Innovation and Creativity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attitude of Lecturer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Theory-Practice Relationship N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Only criteria mentioned by at least 10 per cent of the sample are listed here.

3.2.2 Educational and Practical Subjects in the Curriculum

At least four subjects (Educational Management, Philosophy of Education, History of Education and Speech) do not appear to have made a significant contribution to the students' professional growth as teachers (Table 3.3). If one considers the criteria used in rating these subjects (Table 3.4), it can be seen that although relevance for classroom practice is a prime consideration, a significant number of students have cited other criteria like the relevance of a particular subject in terms of the contribution it makes to the teacher education curriculum, the insights it affords them in locating their work in the wider societal context, and the extent to which it provides them with a theoretical framework within which they can evaluate teaching and learning.
It may be argued that of those subjects which are rated favourably (using the mean rating of 3 as the cut-off point) all, except Sociology of Education, have a bias towards the classroom: given the utilitarian tendency of students when assessing subjects, it is to be expected that subjects like Teaching Practice, Curriculum Studies and Psychology of Education will enjoy a relatively high rating.

TABLE 3.3

MEAN RATING OF IMPORTANCE OF SUBJEC TS (1) IN THE CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>MEAN RATING OF IMPORTANCE (1-5)(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. School-based Teaching Practice</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum Studies (Didactics)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychology of Education</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. English Usage</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Campus-based Teaching Practice</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sociology of Education</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Educational Management (Admin. of Educ)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. History of Education</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Speech</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Method Subjects are not listed here.

(2) "Mean Rating of Importance" as used here and in other Tables in this chapter should be interpreted on a continuum, with 1 being "Most Important" and 5 "Least Important".
TABLE 3.4

CRITERIA USED IN RATING OF IMPORTANCE OF SUBJECTS (EXCLUDING METHOD SUBJECTS) : PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS MENTIONING EACH CRITERION. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance for Classroom Practice</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relevance in Teacher-Education Curriculum</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relevance for Teachers' Role in the wider context of Society</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Theoretical background to Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Relevance for Classroom Management N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Only criteria mentioned by at least 10 per cent of the sample are listed here.

But, as already observed, students did cite criteria other than those of a practical nature. There is little doubt that these criteria (see Table 3.4) will be readily accepted by the lecturers concerned as characterising their respective subjects. The survey results suggest that a significant number of students appear to have valid reasons for their decisions pertaining to the relevance of the subjects under question and it is an issue that has to be addressed by the Faculty.

If, on the other hand, the empirical evidence (as contained in Tables 3.2 - 3.4) is interpreted in terms of majority opinion, then it would appear that practical considerations are the most important factor informing student evaluation. This suggests that students conceptualize teacher education largely in terms of a technocratic rationality.
Against this background, it is perhaps not surprising that the four subjects that were regarded as having made the least contributions to professional growth were also the same subjects nominated for exclusion from the curriculum (Table 3.5). Nevertheless, that a large number of students in the Faculty do not appear to see the relevance of most of the Education sub-disciplines in the curriculum is a matter that has to be urgently addressed. In this regard, it is particularly disquieting that Philosophy of Education, which is logically necessary to sound theorising about education, is among the subjects nominated for exclusion. (This issue will be addressed in Chapter Four when the "Education" component of the syllabus is discussed).

**Table 3.5**

**Subjects nominated for exclusion from the curriculum: Percentage of sample mentioning each subject.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>MEAN RANKING OF IMPORTANCE (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Speech</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. History of Education</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Educational Management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the moment, it is necessary to focus on "Speech" and examine the available evidence to arrive at some understanding as to why nearly ninety per cent of the students perceive this subject in such a poor light.

"Speech" is a relatively small component of English Usage. As a practical aspect of English Usage, it involves the presentation of playlets written, produced and directed by groups of students.
Although Speech is officially allocated one period per week on the time table, this conveys an erroneous picture of the demand it makes on students' time. Student opinion canvassed suggests that many hours outside the official time table are needed in order to put the plays together for presentation before an audience comprising staff and students from the Faculty. Given the relatively minor part it occupies in the total curriculum it consumes a disproportionate amount of the students' study time.

The following remarks give some indication of student thinking on the matter:

"I am very frustrated with Speech. It is a big waste of time."

"Speech - I cannot understand its ... contribution to education."

"Speech is an absolute waste of time. I cannot see the relevance of it."

"Speech is there to make our lives difficult."

While a persuasive case can no doubt be made for the inclusion of Speech in the present curriculum, particularly if the subject is viewed in isolation, a more worthwhile exercise would be to assess the contribution it makes to the total teacher education programme. It is suggested that such an exercise will lead one seriously to question the relevance of the subject in its present form.

3.2.3 Ways of Improving the Curriculum

Student opinion canvassed on ways of improving the curriculum focused primarily on form and content (Table 3.6). One which did not fall into this category but which was cited most often by students had to do with factors pertaining to the improvement in the quality of lectures and lecturing. While it
is readily acknowledged that the concept "quality" does not admit of a universally acceptable definition because of the large number of situationally specific variables involved, this response from the students nevertheless points to the need for evaluation by lecturers of both their lecturing styles and the teacher education programmes they offer. Such an exercise constitutes an integral part of academic and staff development. Students' views have a bearing on these two curriculum matters.

The following responses give some indication of student thinking:

"Lecturers should include relevant issues in their lectures. I think some of the things we learn are utter nonsense."

"... I feel the quality of lectures ought to improve for it is hypocritical to expect us to be 'new wave' teachers while bombarding us with the relics of the 'apartheid' system of schooling."

"Some Faculty members are still living in the past. It is time they changed or got fired. What they are teaching us is a load of rubbish which cannot be used in schools."

"I believe that lecturers need to focus on themselves ... Some of them are very authoritarian in their approaches. Changing the curriculum and having these same lecturers can be disastrous."

"We are advised to break away from 'traditional teaching', but most lecturers are guilty of this; they have to change first before expecting us to change the system."
TABLE 3.6
WAYS OF IMPROVING THE CURRICULUM: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS MENTIONING EACH CATEGORY. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve Quality of Lecturing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Longer School-based Teaching Practice Sessions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish Linkages between Subjects in the Curriculum</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shorten Curriculum; allow more time for independent study</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improve Content of Campus-based Teaching Practice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 86

(1) Only categories mentioned by at least 10 per cent of the respondents are listed here.

The responses suggest that students' dissatisfaction with the quality of lectures and lecturing runs deep. The necessity for staff to problematize this aspect of the teacher education programme is apparent. Once the need for such evaluation is accepted, then the other ways of improving the curriculum (see Table 3.6) can be meaningfully addressed.

Students appear to favour the inclusion of content of a more practical nature (e.g., micro teaching) as part of the campus-based teaching practice programme and a longer school-based teaching practice session. A typical response
regarding the latter issue is as follows:

"I think we should spend more time on practical work than on theory. We could become better teachers if we spent more time in classrooms than lecture rooms."

On the other hand, students seem to favour a shorter academic curriculum and more time for independent study; this would appear to be related to a relatively crowded timetable, comprising twenty forty-five minute contact periods per week. The perceived need to establish linkages between subjects in the curriculum would appear to hint at the present fragmented nature of the curriculum, with the various subjects being taught as discrete entities. Such linkages will no doubt give greater structural coherence to the curriculum. (The matter will be discussed in later sections of the dissertation.)

3.2.4 Qualities of a Good Teacher

The perceptions about teaching and learning held by student teachers are of vital concern to teacher educators; if students' ideas and beliefs about what it takes to be a successful teacher do not coincide with those of teacher educators, there is likely to be a discontinuity between lecture-room theory and classroom practice.

Students' responses to the question pertaining to the qualities of a good teacher are presented in Table 3.7. The evidence suggests that except for an emphasis on subject-matter knowledge, students tended to refer most often to social and affective variables such as the ability to relate to pupils, commitment to teaching, caring and concern for pupils' needs, sense of humour, industriousness and patience, while minimising the relative importance of pedagogic skills. The latter category included criteria such as the ability to encourage critical thinking, to teach stimulating lessons and to use creative methods.
Social and affective variables are obviously desirable traits in a teacher, but conceptions of teaching that undervalue cognitive or academic dimensions are incomplete and tend to diminish the importance of subject matter and pedagogical knowledge. The data point to the need for teacher educators to think about ways of redressing this shortcoming.

**TABLE 3.7**

QUALITIES OF A GOOD TEACHER: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS (STUDENTS) MENTIONING EACH CATEGORY. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ability to relate to/communicate with pupils</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment to Teaching</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowledge of Subject Matter</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sense of Humour</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Honest and Hardworking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sensitive to Pupils' Needs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personality</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Encourages Critical Thinking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stimulating Lessons</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Creative Methods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gives pupils freedom to question and criticize one's teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Patience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Only categories mentioned by at least 10 per cent of sample are listed here.
### 3.2.5 Self-Ratings

Students' responses to the question asking for their self-ratings as teachers (Table 3.8) reveal a high level of optimism. Only a little over two per cent of the students rated themselves as "slightly below average". Nearly 60 per cent of the students rated themselves in the above-average categories.

#### Table 3.8

**Self-Ratings as Teachers: Percentage of Respondents Mentioning Each Category.** (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATINGS</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Above Average</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Slightly above Average</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Slightly below Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Below Average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>82 (1)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Four respondents did not answer this question.

The criteria used in the self-rating exercise were generated from the students' perceptions of their strengths and weaknesses as teachers (Table 3.9). Except for reference to the importance of good teaching techniques, the remaining criteria cited do not adequately distinguish the work of a teacher; their connection with education is only contingent since they could be effective in most positions requiring some form of managerial responsibility.
TABLE 3.9

CRITERIA FOR SELF-RATINGS AS TEACHERS: PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLE MENTIONING EACH CRITERION. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Good Teaching Techniques</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to relate to Children</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Problems in Classroom Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to Communicate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of Experience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Only criteria mentioned by at least 10 percent of the sample are listed here.

Students' high self-ratings as teachers, when viewed against their categorisation of their strengths and weaknesses and conceptions of successful teaching, suggest that their optimistic biases may be due to the relatively limited frame of reference within which they appear to be operating. While a high level of confidence that students have in their own ability as teachers may be good for their self-image and well-being, it may nonetheless be true that the concomitant unrealistic expectations that they hold about their own success may lead them to devalue the need for professional preparation. Without in any way impairing the positive self-image of students, teacher educators need to reflect upon ways in which this optimism should be tempered with realistic expectations.

Having analysed the responses of students in an effort to arrive at some understanding of how they perceive the curriculum and their role as teachers, the focus now shifts to teacher educators, the people who play a significant part in contributing to these perceptions.
The next section, accordingly, analyses selected viewpoints of all thirty-six full-time teacher educators in the Faculty, ranging in rank from junior lecturer to professor.

3.3 STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE CURRICULUM

It would probably be generally accepted that the perceptions of teacher educators regarding the teacher education curriculum are important determinants in shaping the development and implementation of that curriculum.

A questionnaire survey was conducted among all full-time members in the Faculty, focusing on three related areas:

(1) the aims of a teacher education programme,
(2) the qualities of a good teacher, and
(3) the major curriculum problems facing the Faculty in the foreseeable future.

3.3.1 Aims of a Teacher Education Programme

Lecturers were asked to list three of the more important aims which in their opinion, should characterize a teacher education programme and the extent to which these aims apply to the present curriculum. The responses are presented in Table 3.10 in which categories are arranged in descending order of frequencies. It is interesting to note (using 3.0 as a cut-off point) that six of the eleven aims are regarded by lecturers who cited them as not being particularly applicable to the Faculty's programme.

Lecturers cited most often the importance of teaching skills, with emphasis on the application of techniques in the classroom to enhance pupil learning. The second most frequent response focused on subject matter knowledge. The following responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>MRA(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching Skills: Application of Techniques</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subject Matter Knowledge</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inter-personal Relationships: tolerance, understanding, ability to communicate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development of Personality to enhance Teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers as Facilitators of Learning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationship between Theory and Practice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Self-evaluation, critical/creative thinking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education for Democracy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Understanding the Societal Context of Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Knowledge of how children learn and develop intellectually, socially and emotionally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Formulating aims, objectives and evaluation techniques</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) MRA: "Mean Rating of Applicability" of the particular category to the teacher education curriculum in the Faculty; (Range: from 1 - "Most Applicable" to 5 - "Least Applicable".)
give some indication of Faculty thinking:

"I would like to presume that students would come to us with a good background knowledge of the subjects they have chosen to teach, and it would be up to the teacher educationists in these areas to attempt to get them to continue with their subject interests, get them to read, debate and... in this way encourage a critical stance towards the content matter which makes up the subject or discipline they are going to teach."

Another lecturer stated that an important aim is "to ensure that the individual is au fait with his/her specialist area of knowledge", while a third was of the opinion that the curriculum should comprise "an academic component which comprises theoretical studies in subject sciences and the disciplines of Education".

The third and fourth most frequent responses dealt with social variables. Typical responses cited the importance of inter-personal relationships (focused on factors like tolerance, understanding and the ability to communicate) and the development of personality to enhance teaching by providing opportunities for each student-teacher to grow according to his/her abilities and interests.

Other responses that could be categorised as pedagogic knowledge, but of a less technical nature than the application of teaching techniques, dealt with the role of teachers as facilitators of learning and the importance of creating a stimulating classroom ambience that will enhance the teaching/learning process. Insofar as the relationship between theory and practice is concerned, responses included reference to aims like bridging "the gap between theories of education and their application in the classroom", and the "integration of educational theory and practice as a basis for critical thinking". More specific reference to educational theory
included aims dealing with knowledge pertaining to child development and the formulation of instructional objectives.

Two categories cited by a relatively small percentage of Faculty members included aims that dealt with schooling, education and society in a context that transcended the narrow confines of the classroom. It is interesting to note that this aim was cited as being least applicable to the teacher education curriculum of the Faculty. Typical aims included the following: "to understand the political, social and economic contexts in which we teach"; "to provide teachers with meaningful links between schooling and the political, social and economic systems"; "to motivate students to serve their community in as many fields as possible apart from teaching"; "to prepare students for the practical realities of a new South Africa".

Despite the intentions of those (few) lecturers who want to set teacher education within a radical discourse that takes cognizance of the wider societal framework, a closer examination of the aims suggests that the dominant form of teacher education in the Faculty embodies a type of rationality that is apolitical and technical in orientation.

Specifically, the technological orientation is manifest insofar as most of the aims reflect a pre-occupation with pedagogical concerns with emphasis on learning outcomes. The emphasis on learning outcomes leaves unexamined questions like what is the nature of knowledge, what knowledge is of most worth, why is it of most worth, how is such knowledge produced, whose interest does this knowledge serve, how are social and political contradictions mediated through acceptable forms of classroom knowledge. Such epistemological and ideological questions are often not considered; in their place one finds an emphasis on skills in the application of techniques and concerns related to efficiency in the classroom situation. Such a perspective views the purpose of schools as socially and politically neutral.
In the final analysis the technological rationality serves to encourage conformity to the status quo in both schooling and society. The relevance and appropriateness of such a conservative perspective can be seriously questioned particularly in view of the powerful role that schooling now appears to play in the reproduction and legitimation of a social order stratified in terms of class, gender and race (e.g., Greene 1979, Giroux 1980, Popkewitz 1985).

3.3.2 Qualities of a Good Teacher

It is interesting to note that as with students (see Table 3.7) lecturers have also cited social variables as being the most important criterion (Table 3.11). Thus commitment to teaching and the importance of character and personality were the two responses most frequently cited. The third most frequent categories included two responses which had to do with knowledge of subject matter and a critical awareness of the wider context of the teaching/learning process. The remaining six responses focused specifically on classroom teaching (see Table 3.11), dealing with aspects such as the importance of seeing the integrated nature of purposes, teaching and evaluation, the role of inter-personal relationships, and the ability to use knowledge and other resources creatively in order to enhance pupil learning and understanding.

For the most part lecturers have conceptualized a "good" teacher in the relatively narrow didactic sense. As with aims of teacher education, the focus is on matters of direct classroom practice. This serves to underscore the technological orientation that seems to inform the teacher education programme in the Faculty. While skills in immediate classroom concerns are no doubt important and desirable qualities, one problematic consequence with such a characterisation of a "good" teacher is that it eclipses other qualities that cast the teacher's role in a broader context which transcend the daily press of
It is argued that good teachers should also possess other qualities like the ability to reflect critically about themselves, their children and the relationship between school and society; they should also bring to bear a questioning attitude towards teaching, the learning process, the nature of school knowledge and the curriculum. Such reflective and analytic abilities would obviate their "unthinking submergence in the social reality that prevails" (Greene, 1973: 269) and thereby enable them to undertake "the important task of helping students rethink both the democratic possibilities within schools and the wider society of which they are a part" (Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985: 141).

TABLE 3.11

QUALITIES OF A GOOD TEACHER: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS (STAFF) MENTIONING EACH CATEGORY. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment to Teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Character and Personality</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Knowledge of Subject Matter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Critical awareness of wider context of Teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integrity of Purpose, Classroom Teaching and Evaluation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teacher-pupil Relationship</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communication Skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Creative use of Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ability to reconstruct/integrate Knowledge into coherent structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Only categories mentioned by at least ten per cent of the sample are listed here.
3.3.3 Major Curriculum Problems

Table 3.12 presents the responses given by lecturers to the question asking them to give three of the major curriculum problems that the Faculty of Education will have to address in the decade of the nineties and beyond. As can be seen, eight categories were generated from the responses of thirty six lecturers.

Not unexpectedly, the development of a curriculum to cater for a post-apartheid/multi-cultural South Africa was cited most often by lecturers. One lecturer characterized this particular aspect of the problem in terms of "making the curriculum relevant to the needs of a society in crisis and in transition." He was of the opinion that:

"...the needs and views of the student-community constituencies must feature prominently in the construction of the curriculum. This is almost totally ignored at present. The curriculum is determined largely by 'professional' and 'institutional' requirements."

Another lecturer acknowledged the "diversity of background (and) diversity of knowledge base of incoming students" and questioned the wisdom of having "one course to prepare teachers to meet such varying needs in respective communities" (emphasis in original).

Along similar lines, a third respondent cautioned that:

"Curricula must take into account seriously the current understanding of students and avoid mystifying them with issues and materials to which they cannot reasonably be expected to have some intellectual access."
TABLE 3.12

MAJOR CURRICULUM PROBLEMS FACING THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION:
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS MENTIONING EACH CATEGORY. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Curriculum for a post-apartheid/multicultural South Africa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum Content: What should be taught?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Re-organization of the Curriculum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty Relationships: Staff, Students and Community</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fragmentation of Curriculum: Need for Integration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Irrelevancy in the Curriculum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communication/Language Problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reconceptualization of the Curriculum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Only categories mentioned by at least ten per cent of the sample are listed here.

Other responses included the following:

"Discovering and then deciding what is relevant and of worth and value to most of the people in the country; and then building a curriculum which will reflect that."

"Finding ways to democratize and humanize the curriculum so that the ideal of a non-racial democratic South Africa/Azania may be realized."

"One of our main problems will be to offer a programme with relevance in a fast-changing society and actively contributing to these changes."
The question of relevance is also implicit when one considers the second most frequently cited category that deals with curriculum content globally. Respondents suggested that the Faculty should seriously address what subjects should be included in the curriculum and the justification for their inclusion.

Closely related to the above was the question of re-organizing the present curriculum without necessarily making any fundamental changes to its knowledge content. The following responses may help to give some insight into Faculty thinking about this particular curriculum problem:

"I would like to see more time given to courses with inbuilt reading, critical analyses, group discussions, actual teaching of reading and writing skills, group dynamics and so on. I think, given the constraints, (those) involved in (Campus-based Teaching Practice) are doing a good job, but this segment of the total course needs to be broadened, expanded and made more rigorous for both staff and students."

"The Faculty should devise a curriculum with more 'common ground' and from this the other, more specialised courses could be taken further."

"I would like to see a system of thematic teaching implemented. Each discipline could address a number of common educational themes from its own angle."

"We should design a curriculum that will call for more independent work on the part of our students."

One lecturer's views are worth citing in some detail not only because of the explicit manner in which she addresses the problem but also because of the controversial nature of her solutions.
She is of the opinion that "we are confusing the students with too many different theories." To obviate this the Faculty has to "accept as policy" a particular philosophy of teaching. As she put it:

"We should work together as a team, creating a meaningful teacher-education course ... in which we propagate a particular philosophy ... The easiest way of reaching such an agreement is to decide on a particular school of thought (e.g., Bruner or Stenhouse or Freire or Skinner, etc) because it is too time-consuming to develop our own school of thought...Our present practice in which each lecturer forces his/her own theory down students' throats is exceedingly harmful to the reputation of this Faculty."

Faculty relationships, involving staff, students and the wider community, was the fourth major problem cited by lecturers. At least fifty per cent of the lecturers regarded this factor as having an important bearing on the curriculum. Reference to what lecturers had to say regarding this matter will provide some insight into the diverse nature of the problem.

The lack of communication among lecturers was regarded as "a grave problem" : it was felt that "workshops or talk sessions should be arranged" during which "aims should be discovered and shared. From these sessions problems can be identified and worked on. There is little cohesion or communication in our Faculty at present."

Presumably through lack of such communication "we rarely know what our colleagues are doing, not only with regard to the teacher education programme but also in relation to each other's work" One way to obviate this was to work co-operatively in "professional development, curriculum development and research."
At the moment "we have not really decided what we want our student teachers to learn and how we can make it happen through a combined effort."

One respondent felt that communication resulting in the "exchange of views, values and ideas" will make lecturers "aware of various perspectives ensuring that they do not become smug in their (particular) perspective." She cautioned, however, that while there "should be greater communication between academics", we should "not allow dominant personalities or articulate language to influence our thinking but to look beyond these facades at the substance" (emphasis in original).

Such exchange of ideas will probably make a significant contribution to improving the quality of curriculum: one lecturer pointedly remarked that "Philosophical underpinnings are not thoroughly examined or understood by those involved with curriculum planning."

The value of communication between lecturers and the beneficial way this will impact on the curriculum are implicit from the foregoing. There would appear to be a need for formal structures that will facilitate such co-operative endeavours. As one lecturer put it:

"Time needs to be made available for more co-operation between lecturers. This should be recognized as a legitimate part of the workload of Education lecturers, as an alternative to the demands for published papers and individual research for the sake of research."

The importance of staff-student relationships as a factor in curriculum planning was mentioned by several lecturers. The responses suggest that there is considerable room for improvement in this particular aspect of Faculty life. One lecturer characterized the problem as being one of "an alienated
teaching force within the Faculty divorced from the practical realities of our students." Another felt that "our lack of knowledge of the background and life of our students will hamper us in our attempts at designing a curriculum which they will consider relevant and inspiring." In a similar vein, a third lecturer stated that the "curriculum has been imposed by the academic staff on the students. Student opinion, in the past had never been canvassed. Students' views should inform any thought on curriculum planning." Another viewpoint was that the curriculum "should not be treated as a 'pre-given' phenomenon to be imposed on clients. It should be constantly negotiated with professional bodies, students, community agencies and other interested parties."

The nature of staff involvement in community agencies was specifically spelt out by some lecturers. The following are some of the responses obtained:

"The Faculty needs to become accessible to teachers and the community; for example, by setting up a resource network at the University where people can work on and share ideas."

"Expose the lecturing staff to the ideas of others through organised visits to institutions."

"Student involvement in community-based education projects should be encouraged."

"Lecturing staff should have greater involvement in professional work with teachers and schools."

"Staff should be given the opportunity to go back to teach in schools, more particularly Black schools, to keep in touch with realities."
The lack of meaningful communication is probably a contributory factor to two other problems: fragmentation of the curriculum and irrelevancy in the curriculum.

The fragmentation of the curriculum was characterized by one lecturer as a problem involving:

"... diverse and contradictory elements. Students often find great difficulty in seeing the rationale behind such a 'broken' curriculum - made even more difficult by conflicting and contradictory 'lecturing' practices."

In the opinion of another lecturer, since the "different disciplines do inter-relate, the integration needs to be made explicit in the curriculum"; while a third suggested that "one way of unifying our programme was perhaps to find some common thread that ties up what each person is doing."

Such a "common thread" was made explicit by another lecturer when he observed:

"We need to take a fresh look at subject methods, curriculum studies, and teaching practice and see whether there is any way in which these can be married in a sensible and productive manner. I would like to see these handled on a team-teaching basis, and perhaps spend more time on general methodology, allied to actual practice in either peer group or 'imported' class situations."

A number of lecturers expressed themselves sharply on the question of irrelevancy in the curriculum. One felt that the curriculum was "irrelevant to the real problems in education today," while another suggested that "archaic, inherited aspects of the curriculum should be reviewed and rejected." A third was particularly trenchant in his criticism and expressed a point of
view that will, arguably, be endorsed by the majority of the lecturing staff:

"The greatest problem we face at the moment, and one which will increase in complexity unless we are ready to face it, is the problem of irrelevancy. Much that we teach under the guise of Education courses is so much eyewash, and of no real value to the students; this is becoming even more apparent, both to the thinking lecturer and the students, so we need to do something about this, and in conjunction with the clientele. The so-called Educational disciplines which masquerade as being academic or scientific are discardable or, at very least, replaceable. So Education courses must be revamped somehow."

The lecturers who cited communication skills via the medium of English as a curriculum problem had in mind the African student in particular. One lecturer saw this as "the biggest problem" that the Faculty will have to address in the future. Another stated that "many of our African students are experiencing problems in expressing themselves." The same lecturer suggested two solutions: "A reading laboratory to solve the language gap," and "Introducing an African language as a medium of instruction." Along similar lines a third lecturer stated that "Staff will have to learn Zulu even if the medium of instruction is English." She further suggested that "special attention needs to be paid to English as a second language."

Only a relatively small percentage of the lecturing staff assessed the curriculum within a radical framework: less than twenty per cent saw the problem as one of re-conceptualizing the curriculum with a view to making fundamental changes. The following responses give some idea of how lecturers feel about this matter.
One lecturer referred to learning:

"There is not enough transformative learning in which theory and practice are dynamically linked and students changed."

Another focused on values:

"The curriculum is still too Anglo-Euro-centred and rests heavily on liberal progressive values at the expense of social-democratic values."

A third set the problem in a relatively wider context. With reference:

"...to things such as the dominance of transmission teaching, arbitrary methods of evaluating learning and assessing students, and the technicist ethos that characterizes our Faculty,"

he implied that all members of staff do not fully understand:

"...the educational, political, social and ideological implications and consequences of the current teacher education programme being offered and taught ... and being learned by the students who will be teaching for the next thirty years or so of their professional life."

To summarise, the survey suggests that in the opinion of the lecturers concerned major curriculum problems that the Faculty will have to address in the decade of the nineties and beyond may be classified into eight categories (see Table 3.12), focused primarily, though not exclusively, on academic matters. Socio-political variables dealing with Faculty relationships and the question of communication through the medium of English are other matters that have to be taken into account.
It would probably be generally accepted that the first three curriculum problems concerned with the form and content of a teacher education programme in a post-apartheid/multi-cultural South Africa (as reflected in table 3.12) will be among the more important issues that will feature in any discourse on curriculum development. Presumably, lecturers in the Faculty would be key participants in such deliberations; herein lies a problem.

A closer reading of the comments cited suggests that there is need for greater conceptual clarity on the part of some of the lecturers in the Faculty if any discourse on curriculum issues is to be profitable. For instance, it will be recalled that one lecturer observed that the curriculum should be "relevant to the needs of a society" (emphasis added). The question of needs - used in the generic sense as it is in the statement - and the problems associated with identifying and prioritizing them for purposes of the curriculum is fraught with many difficulties. Thus as Barrow (1984 : 46) has observed "the idea that curriculum design should start with needs assessment ... is one particular general rule that should be rejected. This is not the way to start planning a curriculum"(1). Deciding what subjects should be included in the curriculum is also not the way to go about planning a curriculum because it begs the larger question of how teacher education should be conceptualized in the first place.

Equally questionable is the call for separate curricula to cater for the "diversity of background of incoming students in order to prepare them to meet varying needs in respective communities"; it is a paternalistic approach and, contrary to current thinking among progressive educationists, will have the effect of "racialising" the curriculum.

Also to be categorically rejected is the view that the teacher education curriculum should be planned from the perspective of a philosophy enunciated by a single person. Such a view will result in a static, moribund curriculum because it treats the
education process as established, not emergent. In short, it indicates a fundamental misunderstanding of the curriculum field and of teacher education.

One should also guard against making elaborate and far-fetched claims such as "finding ways to democratize the curriculum so that a non-racial South Africa may be realised." To make such claims is to misunderstand the role of educational institutions in bringing about change in a society. Educational reform cannot serve as a substitute for more fundamental social change; on the other hand, no viable strategy for social equality can afford to ignore what goes on in educational institutions.

Another problem cited was the lack of communication among lecturers in matters pertaining to their academic work. It is a situation that has contributed to the fragmentation of the curriculum with the resultant lack of a cohesive intellectual orientation. This problem was also referred to by the students (see Table 3.6). Part of the problem may be a function of certain structural constraints, more particularly the organisation of the Faculty into separate departments, each responsible for a particular sub-discipline of Education. Over the years these structures have become so entrenched that subjects continue to be offered discretely, as they are in other Faculties of the University where the various syllabuses are independently controlled by subject departments with little or no correlation between the several subjects of a course. Burgess (1971: 157), for instance, has observed that the "pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is not a good basis for professional education: at this level it is a recipe for triviality and irrelevance." Within the framework of a professional education course a subject gains its meaning and significance from its structural relationships with other subjects; on its own a subject has little or no significance or meaning, for significance or meaning can only arise from the context in which it is embedded. Problems related to education
seldom, if ever, appear in a way that the insights derived from any one discipline will be sufficient to reach a satisfactory solution.

This suggests the need for specialists to collaborate in their work. Accordingly, compliance with the tradition of equating university education with the completion of a certain number of isolated courses would appear to be one characteristic within University culture that the Faculty should eschew since it inhibits substantive reform of the pre-service teacher education curriculum.

The problems associated with a fragmented curriculum and the way it impacts negatively on Faculty work by precluding any intellectual coherence that ties professional education together are issues that need to be urgently addressed and resolved.

3.4 CONCLUSION

In the previous chapter three models of teacher education were identified: the applied-science, the interpretive and the transformative.

Survey findings suggest that teacher preparation in the Faculty, with its proclivity towards a technocratic rationality and pedagogic instrumentality, approximates to the applied-science model of teacher education. If cognizance is taken of the transformation that the University of Durban-Westville is undergoing at present, the relevance of that model of teacher education to the wider constituency that the Faculty now serves is open to serious question.

Arising out of the above problem, other major curriculum issues the Faculty will have to question include the relevance of the course content to the educational needs of prospective teachers,
the fragmentation of the curriculum resulting in a lack of intellectual coherence and the way these factors impact on students' perceptions of the curriculum.

All of these issues in turn point to the need for the creation of structures that will enable the Faculty to set its educational discourse in a context that involves staff and students. There is also the perceived need expressed by several members of the lecturing staff for structures that will initiate and maintain contact with the wider community. It would appear that "the meaningful pursuit of education-related studies (will have to move) dramatically from the seclusion of academia into the sound and fury of the community-at-large ..." (Steinberg, 1987: 57).

Such a situation will ensure that the teacher preparation programme will resonate with the lecturers' oft-declared laudatory objective of devising curricula for professional practitioners who can understand the demands of schooling and education in the context of a society in transition to a post-apartheid South Africa. These initiatives must, logically, be preceded by the formulation of some axiological framework within which the aims of teacher education in the Faculty can be clearly articulated.

A careful consideration of the analysis undertaken in this chapter, provides adequate evidence to postulate tentatively that a fundamental reconceptualization of the teacher education curriculum of the Faculty has become apparent. In order to substantiate this observation it is necessary to consider further evidence. Accordingly, the next chapter will examine the structure and content of the curriculum offered by the Faculty.
NOTES

1. For a reasoned critique of this view see Barrow (1984: 41-46; 79-82).
4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter dealing with student and staff perceptions of the curriculum it was found that teacher preparation in the Faculty tended to endorse a techcratically rationality and a concomitant pedagogic instrumentality that was largely congruent with the applied-science model of teacher education. Further, it was tentatively postulated in that chapter that given the transformation that the University of Durban-Westville is undergoing at the moment, a reconceptualization of teacher education has become necessary.

In order to establish whether the survey findings and inferences drawn therefrom are justified, it is necessary to examine other available evidence. This chapter, accordingly, reviews the course content and structure of the curriculum of the Faculty; it examines, in particular, three major components of the curriculum, namely: Educational Subjects, Professional (Method) Subjects, and Teaching Practice.

Before examining the course content and structure of the curriculum it is necessary to make reference to the apartheid policy of "separate development" in terms of which UDW was established. Against this background the structural and organisational aspects of the University are briefly examined, with particular reference to the Faculty of Education. It is necessary to see the structural and socio-political contexts of the present curriculum in historical perspective in order to make meaningful proposals for change; after all, curriculum and context are mutually determining.
4.2 THE POLICY OF APARTHEID

Apartheid both as ideological doctrine and practice is one of the most controversial racial policies in the world. Politically and socially, the ultimate goal of apartheid, as envisaged by the White South African government of the Nationalist Party after its election victory in 1948, was the total segregation and "separate development" of the statutorily defined racial groups in their own territories; economically, the rationale was to maximise "development both for the sake of white prosperity and for the material protection of White supremacy" (Johnston, 1979: 358).

It needs to be pointed out that the apartheid system was not a set of ideas and practices that emerged suddenly after 1948 with the victory of the Afrikaner Nationalists at the all-White general election. On the contrary, it grew organically in the changing context of South Africa: it built upon the segregation order which had developed concomitantly with the rapid industrialisation of the country consequent upon the discovery of gold and diamonds in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The social system during the industrial period was strongly influenced by nascent forms of White domination and privilege that were discernible in pre-industrial South Africa.

Prior to 1948, although the segregation referred to above was decidedly racial in character, it lacked an overall conceptual and legal framework of functional and geographic separation. It was permissive in practice, with pragmatic adaptations and exemptions. Since 1948, with the adoption of formal apartheid ideology, the racialisation of society was endorsed in a complex and elaborate legal order "affecting practically every facet of political, social and economic life in the country" (Fair and Davies, 1976: 165). It needs to be emphasized, however, that a sharp distinction should not be made between the two periods under consideration; the controls (some of which have recently been removed) (1) governing South African society are essentially an outgrowth of the controls that were put in force prior to 1948. When the Afrikaner National Party came to power on
the platform of apartheid, previous trends in White thought and policy were made more explicit. Nationalist rule in the period since 1948 carried to its logical conclusion a basic programme for the geographic segregation of races that had already been initiated by previous White regimes. In Natal, for example, English segregationist practice which preceded apartheid were identical (2) "in all but its codified and legalistic features" (Adam and Giliomee, 1979: 24). The Nationalists merely closed the remaining loopholes in the system and vastly enlarged the bureaucracy used to administer the programme. Concomitantly, a more elaborate and consistent ideology was promulgated in order to justify racial discrimination. Thus from a history of pragmatic racial segregation grew a policy of apartheid that attempted to create vertically separate ethnic societies in which horizontal contact would (in theory) be reduced to a minimum and each society identified within its own territory. This was classic apartheid, combining as it did two ideological themes of White supremacy:

"The main thrust was 'segregation as domination', which insisted on White domination and the exclusion of Blacks. The second theme was 'segregation as trusteeship', which purported to reject the oppression and exploitation of Blacks since they would supposedly be given the opportunity to express themselves within their own areas and communities. Although the policy of apartheid was based on both these themes, it was also different. Drawing on the Afrikaners' own ethnic mobilisation, apartheid ideologues projected on the other groups similar ethnic and nationalist aspirations. Helping others to realize these aspirations was a justification for depriving them of political rights in the white political system" (Giliomee and Schlemmer, 1989: 35).
Translated into practice the classic apartheid system comprised three main elements (Giliomee and Schlemmer, 1989: 64). Briefly, these were:

1. **Political control and privilege**: an all-White parliament, quasi-independent so-called homelands for Africans, and racially discriminatory spending on social welfare.

2. **Labour legislation**: influx control and other forms of regulating African labour.

3. **Communal apartheid**: statutory race classification, group areas (separate residential and business areas for the exclusive ownership and occupation of each racial group), separate amenities, and separate education at primary, secondary and tertiary levels.

Of particular relevance to this study is the policy of communal apartheid, providing as it did the basis of segregated education. The underlying philosophy of communal apartheid was that White domination had to be statutorily safeguarded, promoted and maintained to ensure the survival of Whites and of Afrikaners in particular; hence the need for statutory race classification which had to be further reinforced by segregated residential areas and by an education system which would make the various Blacks identify with their own communities. Such a communal basis was regarded as a prerequisite for eliminating competition and conflict between Blacks and Whites in a common system.

Over the years, the implementation of communal apartheid measures led to South Africa's increasing international isolation. The outside world looked upon apartheid as an egregious violation of basic human rights. Foreign pressure came from many sides and assumed many different forms. It began in the fields of international sport and diplomatic relations in the 1960s and eventually led to the introduction of economic sanctions by the West. Such deterioration in international relationships presaged a shift away from classic apartheid.
Internally, the elements that gave impetus to this process included the fiscal crisis of the State, the White demographic decline and rising Black militancy. Thus, inexorable pressures from home and abroad pointed to the necessity for changes in communal apartheid. Steps were consequently taken to introduce reform measures aimed at curbing but, significantly, not eliminating, White exclusivity and privilege.

This ushered in a period of what has been called reform-apartheid (Giliomee and Schlemmer, 1989) during the 1970s and 1980s. Briefly, some of the reform-apartheid measures include the removal of segregated entrances, lifts, toilets and waiting-rooms; the desegregation of some parks, beaches, libraries, theatres, buses and trains. Over the years, the government tolerated the emergence of mixed residential areas in some of the major cities, and in 1988 approved the principle of free settlement areas. This was followed in 1991 by the abolition of the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act. Of particular relevance to this study is the reform-apartheid measure permitting desegregation in university education; it restored to universities the right to admit students on a non-racial basis.

In spite of the aforementioned reform-apartheid measures, it would be wrong to conclude that South Africa has entered the post-apartheid era. At least twenty-two racial laws and hundreds of by-laws and provincial ordinances must be amended or scrapped before apartheid is removed from the statute books (Weekly Mail, August 23-29, 1991: 13). In view of this, any notion of a swift transformation of society to a non-racial democracy is over-ambitious and somewhat simplistic.

The foregoing has dealt with selected aspects of the policy of apartheid; reference was made, in particular, to communal apartheid because of the relevance of this element to the present study. The necessarily brief analysis was intended to provide a framework within which the origin of UDW and its
development during the periods of classic apartheid and reform apartheid may be analysed and assessed. Although this study is focused on the Faculty of Education, it is nevertheless necessary to see the work of the Faculty in the historical context of segregated University education. It is with a consideration of this aspect that the next section will be concerned.

4.3 THE UNIVERSITY OF DURBAN-WESTVILLE AND SEPARATE EDUCATION

4.3.1 The Establishment of UDW

The University College, Durban (later the University of Durban-Westville) was established in the era of classic apartheid in November 1960 by the Minister of Education, Arts and Science under the ironically titled Extension of the University Act (Act No. 45 of 1959) "for the purpose of providing University training for Indian students" (Prospectus, 1961: 4). Thus UDW as an integral part of a separate educational system fitted neatly into the apartheid model of society.

Segregated education provided the ideological justification for communal apartheid. When introducing the "Separate Universities" Bill in 1959, the Minister of Education articulated the underlying philosophy as follows:

"The Government's policy of separate development requires that non-Whites should be given every opportunity to develop as individuals and for development as separate communities. If it is to be a balanced development, separate development demands that every individual national unit should produce from its own ranks, the necessary leaders, thinkers, educationists, professional and technical people... Every national group...should have its own schools and its own university or universities... that not only
serve as the focal point of its pride and self-esteem, but as a means to educate the community in the true meaning and value of university training as such" (3).

What is clear from the above statement is the conviction that the preservation of ethnic identity – a fundamental feature of communal apartheid – is one of the main functions of education. Therefore, Oosthuizen (1981: 17) seems to miss a basic point when he writes that "it is unfortunate that ethnicity played such a predominant role when Black universities were established."

In fact, ethnicity has always played a predominant role in the provision of university education for Blacks even in the era of pragmatic segregation. Prior to 1959, the so-called "open" Universities of Cape Town and Witwatersrand admitted Blacks on a limited scale. The University of Fort Hare (which was established in 1916 as the South African Native College) was allowed to admit, as a matter of government policy, not more than fifteen per cent from groups other than African. At the University of Natal part-time classes were started in 1936 on a racially segregated basis. The Universities of Cape Town, Witwatersrand and Rhodes "did not include any reference to admission of students on the grounds of race or colour in their charter, but various subterfuges were used to exclude people of colour in the period prior to 1959" (Behr, 1988: 185). These English-language universities very much reflected the prejudices of the society to which they belonged. Brookes (1966: 77), for instance, in referring to the blatantly racial admission policies of the University of Natal apologetically observes that it "was regrettable that what was given to the non-European was given sometimes with hesitation and reservation" and vindicated the University on the grounds that "European students in Durban have ... sometimes not welcomed full integration in practice, and the Council had to bear European public opinion in mind, so that integration has not always been easy."
Against this background, it would not be unfair to characterize the strong reaction of the English-medium universities to the "Separate Universities" Act (4) as mere tokenism, bordering on hypocrisy. Far from being actuated by altruistic motives it was merely a sop to international opinion that was condemnatory of the Act as utterly contradictory to the concept of a university and a violation of those principles laid down in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The so-called protest by the English-medium universities was little more than an expedient public relations exercise. They could then go on record as defenders of human rights and academic freedom without having to translate such ideals into practice.

The purpose of the above observation is to point out that as in other spheres of life the Blacks were always discriminated against when it came to the provision of university education. It made little difference whether racial discrimination stemmed from the policy of "pragmatic" segregation prior to 1948 or classic apartheid (under Afrikaner Nationalist rule): university education was offered in a context which most Blacks, in principle, rejected.

Not surprisingly, UDW had inauspicious beginnings. When the intention to establish the University was announced by the government, a large section of the Indian leadership and the wider community representing over fifty political, educational, social, cultural and religious organisations convened a meeting in December 1960, rejecting the idea of a "tribal" university which was seen as a product of the policy and ideology of apartheid.

The establishment of UDW, and other ethnic Universities (5), introduced two new principles into existing university practice:

(1) It created State-controlled universities alongside existing State-aided universities.
(2) It deprived universities of the right to accept or reject students for admission. Thus South Africa became the first and only country in the world to statutorily prohibit the admission of students to universities on the grounds of race.

But contrary to the expectations of the authorities, the Black campuses over the years became significant terrains of struggle between the dominant and dominated groups in South African society. This point will be illustrated with reference to UDW.

4.3.2 UDW: From state control to autonomy

A useful framework within which the dynamics of the nature and function of universities, more particularly ethnic universities, can be analysed has been provided by de Clercq (1991). According to de Clercq, "universities mediate and operate in a web of complex and contradictory social relations that belong to different terrains of struggle" (Ibid: 51). She identifies two levels of struggle: the external and the internal. The external terrain refers to the wider social, political, and economic context out of which universities evolve; within this context there are different social forces that vie for power and influence. The internal terrain refers to the institutional forces inside the universities, whose agents are students, lecturers and administration officials. It is the dialectical relationship between the external social forces and the internal institutional forces that has a significant influence on the character and functioning of universities. The nature and dynamics of the struggle can be seen in the context of UDW.

As a State-controlled institution, UDW began under the tutelage of UNISA in a context in which the influence of Afrikaner academics was predominant. In this regard Behr (1988: 194) observes that the decision of the English-medium universities to dissociate themselves from ethnic universities "gave Afrikaner academics free rein to take up teaching posts in these institutions and to imbue students there with insular Christian
National philosophy" (6), and thereby "deprived non-White students at the time of insights into the great liberal tradition of the non-Afrikaner academe."

There may, indeed, be some validity to this viewpoint but it is doubtful whether English academics of liberal persuasion would have been appointed at UDW in the early years anyway. It is generally acknowledged that the establishment of ethnic universities had a double agenda. The overt intention was to provide the statutorily defined race groups with "separate but equal" opportunities, consistent with the policy of communal apartheid. Its hidden agenda was one of constructing and disseminating a set of beliefs and values through its curriculum and teaching that would enhance the process of reproducing the intellectual cadres of apartheid. It is appropriate at this stage to refer to the crucial role played by the Afrikaner Broederbond in the pursuit of that objective.

 Started in 1918, the Broederbond, a secret Afrikaner organisation comprising clergymen, academics, farmers, professionals and politicians, dedicated itself to the cause of Afrikaner domination. By the late 1970s its members occupied virtually all top positions in the political, civil service and educational hierarchies. At one stage, it was observed that the "South African Government ... is the Broederbond and the Broederbond is the Government" (Wilkins and Strydom, 1978: 1).

The Broederbond had a vested interest in the control of education as part of its broader political agenda. Insofar as Indian education was concerned the aim of the organisation was:

"... the implementation of State policy through the medium of education. For this it is indispensable that the top structure of Indian education remains for considerable time in the hands of right-minded Whites" (Wilkins and Strydom, 1978: 160).
It is thus no coincidence that the first Rector and the Registrar of UDW were both members of the Broederbond, the former having served on its Executive Council. Not surprisingly, they imposed rigid controls in the administration of the institution right from its inception. Under "Regulations for Students" (Prospectus, 1962: 30 - 31) one notes the following:

"No student shall become a member of any students' organisation within or outside the University College which has not been approved by the Council, and no society or association shall be established at the University College without the approval of the Council.

Approved students' committees may meet in terms of the constitution of the body concerned and no other meeting of students shall be held in the precincts of the University College without the approval of the Rector.

No periodical, publication or pamphlet for which students are wholly or partly responsible and no notice or placard may be distributed or displayed without the approval of the Rector.

No press statement may be issued by or on behalf of or at the request of the students without the permission of the Rector."

Official attitude towards student dress was also extremely rigid. The Rector required staff members "to warn students that ... he would enter lecture rooms and request students who looked untidy to leave ... He threatened to send administrative staff to lectures to take the names of untidily dressed students while lecturers, who were responsible for such matters, would have to explain their failure to exclude such students from classes" (7).
Rigid controls also applied to members of the academic staff. In spite of many requests for the relaxation of strict dress codes, they were not permitted to wear safari suits. Staff members were also subject to the same restrictions as students in the matter of press statements. In 1971, for instance, the question of racially discriminatory salaries was given much prominence by a Sunday newspaper. The Rector immediately convened a meeting of all Indian members of staff, at which they were individually required to admit or deny responsibility for the article in question. It is significant that he at no time addressed the issue that prompted the article in the first place; to have done so would have been tantamount to giving symbolic and practical expression to equality between the "races", which would be counter to the tenets of classic apartheid. In this regard the Rector appeared to have the support of the White staff. When the question of salaries was discussed at a university staff meeting in 1971, most of the Whites voted against the principle of equality of salaries. It was evident that at the time most of the White academics were employed, at least in part, for their political loyalty.

It was partly because of this support that top administration was able to adopt a form of authoritarian and centralised rule. A more important factor, however, was the degree of accountability that these officials had in relation to the dominant and dominated groups of the wider society. It was clear that the balance of external social forces within which UDW was located at the time was overwhelmingly in favour of the dominant interest groups. In this context, of the three main agents that constituted the internal institutional forces - students, lecturers, and administration officials - the latter were accordingly able to dictate their decisions to university members. Thus university structures while giving the appearance of being open were in fact operating in a very closed and autocratic manner. The Council, the highest governing body of the University, had a succession of Chairmen who were Broederbonders. Although all academics from about 1970 onwards were employed by and answerable to Council, the fact that the
Council was under the control of agents of apartheid meant that, in effect, staff members were controlled in much the same way as civil servants. In 1972, for instance, a professor of law was dismissed because the authorities considered him to be too radical.

In terms of reaction to controls imposed by authorities, it was implied in a previous paragraph that the attitude of most White academics was largely pro-establishment. Insofar as Indian academics are concerned it is necessary to mention that most of them initially boycotted the university. As stated earlier, the University was seen as an extension of the ideological state apparatus to promote the policy of apartheid and "separate development". Over the years this attitude was seen as being somewhat reductionist in nature and the boycott tactic was gradually abandoned; the University was seen as an important terrain for educational and political intervention. These progressive academics, however, were not always successful in exploiting the educational and political spaces existing in UDW. The attitudes of some Indian academics did not help either; there were some who willingly complied and appeared to have no reservations about their allegiance. In this category may be included one senior Indian academic who, on the occasion of the official opening of the new UDW campus in 1972, sycophantically remarked:

"The Japanese have their own university and the Chinese have theirs. So I don't see why the Indians can't have their own university."

He was probably one whom the Broederbond might have referred to as a "right-minded" person.

Another factor that hampered the work of progressive academics was the internal institutional constraints which together with the external social forces existing around UDW at that time militated against the struggle for a democratic, non-racial education in South Africa.
But the control and hegemony exercised by the dominant interest groups in society are seldom total and absolute (e.g., Giroux, 1983; Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985). The attempts of the dominant groups to prescribe the various functions and goals of UDW met with resistance from the student body. Students bore the full brunt of the government's security apparatus: helicopter surveillance of campus, armoured vehicles, truncheon attacks, tear-gassing, arrests and detentions were the order of the day. For their part, the authorities responded by expelling alleged ringleaders, closing down the University or suspending classes. These happenings characterized campus life for most of its early history.

Given the balance of social forces referred to above, the boycotts did not change the character and direction of the University in any significant way; that was to come later. Nevertheless, student boycotts played an important part in shaping popular democratic struggles to liberate education from the shackles of hegemonic control. In that context UDW became an important site of struggle and contestation within the parameters of the extra-parliamentary liberation movement.

In subsequent years, reform-apartheid measures introduced in the 1970s led inexorably to incipient change in the balance of external social forces following various political reforms which were ushered in after 2 February 1990. These reform measures impacted significantly on the nature of UDW. In addition to the appointment of a progressive academic as Rector, a number of other recent developments are worthy of mention:

"An independent SRC was recognised in 1979; the University was granted autonomy in 1983; and gradually more liberal and younger members of staff of all racial groups were appointed. In 1986, the Council recognised the Combined Staff Association (COMSA). In 1988, a new chancellor, ... a highly respected judge with a visible human rights profile, and a relatively more liberal and
progressive Council, were appointed. Dramatic shifts also occurred in student enrolment patterns, throwing into sharp focus the contradictory idea of a university primarily for Indians. African student numbers rose from zero in 1977 to 436 in 1986 and to nearly 3000 this year. Today 34 per cent of our student population is African, 59 per cent Indian, 5 per cent White and 2 per cent Coloured. UDW is one of the most racially-integrated campuses in this country and is likely to become one of the first South African universities to approximate South Africa's demographic profile"(8).

The foregoing account, focusing on selected aspects pertaining to the nature and functioning of UDW in an apartheid society, sets the backdrop for an examination of the form and structure of the curriculum offered by the Faculty of Education.

4.4 THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION: CURRICULUM ISSUES IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Before discussing the curriculum the Faculty teaches, it will be necessary, as a point of departure, to refer to certain historical and structural factors that have had a bearing on the context within which the Faculty now functions.

4.4.1 Historical Perspective

The Faculty began in 1962 as a small Department within the Faculty of Arts, with a staff of five, under the auspices of UNISA. It had to prepare students for education diplomas of that University. Accordingly, UNISA determined syllabi, set examinations and maintained standards, establishing norms from which there could be no deviation.

In addition a number of initial teacher education courses, different from those of UNISA, were offered to students who had obtained a senior certificate without matriculation exemption.
The introduction of these courses was significant insofar as it helped to boost student numbers and thereby ensure the survival of the Department. Lecturing responsibility pertaining to both in-house and UNISA courses was quite arbitrarily shared irrespective of the academic qualifications of the lecturers concerned. (This element of arbitrariness has been a feature of Faculty life during much of its existence.)

When the Department of Education acquired Faculty status in 1966, its academic staff had increased almost six-fold to twenty-nine members, comprising twenty-three Whites (at least one of whom was a prominent Broederbonder) and six Indians; academically, fifteen of the Whites had a UNISA background. A number of the lecturers were poorly qualified for work at the tertiary level. They included retired inspectors of education and several wives of professors in other departments of the University. By the end of the first decade a second professor was appointed; he was a Broederbonder, formerly on the staff of UNISA. It needs to be mentioned that while the first professor in the Faculty (appointed in 1964) was not a member of the Broederbond, he was nevertheless an ambivalent figure.

The above observations are made to highlight two points: the preponderance of Whites in a government-created Indian university and their biased academic background. If these two points are seen together with the UNISA tutelage, referred to earlier, then it is not unreasonable to conclude that the intellectual environment of UNISA, with its Christian National Philosophy and concomitant Fundamental Pedagogics, was reproduced in the Faculty. As such it was Afrikaner-controlled in terms of educational content and reproduction of dominant ideology. The Faculty was thus nothing more than a glorified training college in which students were exposed to a one-dimensional view of teacher education. Much of the content of the pre-service curriculum was dominated by the writings of one professor in the Faculty, who produced books and monographs on a variety of subjects including history of education, psychology of education, and teaching method, all of
which were autocratically prescribed. So complete was his control that on one occasion he threatened to dismiss a staff member who had the temerity to prescribe other works to his students. It is necessary to mention that the research of the professor in question was dominated by an empirical-analytical enquiry orientation. If to this context we add other prescribed books (on philosophy and moral and civic education) written by "Broederbond" professors in the Faculty - books that were straight out of the Fundamental Pedagogics stable - it will be appreciated that the supreme model of teacher education in the Faculty was the applied-science model with heavy emphasis on training in basic skills. As the analysis in Chapter Two clearly emphasized it is a teacher education model supportive of the status quo. This helped to consolidate the hegemonic control of apartheid ideologues.

In order to maintain control, the appointment of "right-minded" White staff was crucial. For several years, the issue of appointment and promotion of academics was much debated, especially among Indian members. This is not to suggest that Indian members were endorsing racism in reverse. In this regard it is interesting to note that the principle of separate development required that the control of ethnic universities would eventually be transferred to the communities they served. It was explicitly stated that where possible academics belonging to a particular ethnic group should be employed. This principle was honoured more in breach than in observance. It was evident that the apartheid ideologues used a number of subterfuges to maintain control over the direction of the University. What the Indian academics objected to was the nepotism and the racism that manifested themselves as an inevitable consequence of such "job reservation". In this context, Oosthuizen's (1981 : 63)
apologia is quite surprising:

"Although the policy makers placed strong emphasis on Indian self-development at the University, many in the community expressed fears of discrimination, especially in staff affairs. As far as appointments were concerned, such fears were unjustified (emphasis added).

Table 4.1 shows that such an observation is demonstrably untrue. It can be seen that Whites appear to have received favoured treatment both in terms of appointment and promotion. Anomalies in promotion have been a contentious issue for a number of years since Indian academics had been given few promotional opportunities. Thus after two decades nearly seventy five percent of Faculty staff were White and the heads of all five departments were White professors.

This situation underwent change in subsequent years as an increasing number of Indian academics were appointed. At the time of writing the ratio in respect of White : Indian staff is almost the exact opposite of the situation in 1966 having changed in percentage terms from 67:33 to 39:61. It needs to be emphasized that in recent years appointments have been made on a non-racial basis, although affirmative action might have played a part in some instances.

Thus far only passing reference has been made to the existence of departments in the Faculty. It is necessary to elaborate on this particular aspect especially in view of the negative way it appears to have affected curriculum development.

4.4.2 Departments in the Faculty

In 1971 four departments, based on the UNISA model, were established within the Faculty (see Table 4.2). The thirty-eight staff members were quite arbitrarily assigned to the various departments. For instance, lecturers specialising
## Table 4.1

**Faculty of Education Staff Composition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROF.</th>
<th>ASSOC. PROF.</th>
<th>SENIOR LECT.</th>
<th>LECT.</th>
<th>JUNIOR LECT.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;RACE&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>W *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* W = WHITE

** I = INDIAN  

Source: UDW Calendars.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Philosophy of Education</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Sociology of Educ.</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Physical &amp; Aesthetic Education</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Becomes a Dept. in Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Method Subjects, who should have been located in the Department of Didactics (as it was then called) were spread throughout the four departments so as to give these departments a semblance of viability in terms of staff numbers: lecturers specialising in Mathematics, Physical Science, Commerce and Biology were located in the Department of Empirical Education; those specialising in History, Geography and Latin in the Department of History of Education; those specialising in English and Afrikaans were in the Department of Didactics; while lecturers in Physical Education were in the Department of Philosophy. Some might find this arbitrary distribution of staff ridiculous, but seemingly not the heads of the respective departments. In fact, this ridiculousness was further emphasized when, in 1975, the head of the Department of History of Education, Comparative Education and Education Administration quite arbitrarily swapped chairs with the head of the Department of Philosophy and Sociology of Education; the lecturers concerned were obliged to follow their respective leaders.

The continual re-allocation of lecturers and the continual and inconsequential name-changes to departments (see Table 4.2) reached embarrassing proportions in 1983 with a skewed distribution of staff. Of the five departments (the fifth department — Physical and Aesthetic Education — was created in 1975), four had between them fifteen lecturers. Of this number two academics (both of them with the rank of lecturer) comprised the sum total of the staff of the Department of History, Comparative Education and Administration of Education. On the other hand, the Department of Didactics found itself with no fewer than twenty lecturers. Thus nearly two decades after its establishment, the Faculty had still not found a sense of direction.

In 1984 there were certain developments in the Faculty that had implications for its departmental structure. Briefly, it was a case of campus politics involving two heads of department, the one White the other Indian, and their respective access to
institutional sources of power. The dispute was finally resolved with the amalgamation of two departments—the Department of History of Education, Comparative Education and Administration of Education and the Department of Philosophy and Sociology of Education—into a single department renamed the Department of Foundations of Education. The Indian academic lost the headship of his department as a result of this restructuring and subsequently resigned. The new department, with its vast range of sub-disciplines, is probably the only one of its kind in any university in the world. Not surprisingly, it has to date not been possible to find an academic possessed of such omniscience to occupy the chair!

As a result of the amalgamation of the aforementioned two departments into one, it became possible to split the Department of Didactics into two—General Didactics and Applied Didactics. Officially, the decision was taken on the grounds of administrative convenience, in view of the fact that the Department contained twenty of the thirty-five members who constituted the Faculty. But some lecturers in the Faculty had serious reservations, arguing that this decision had not been based on sound educational principles.

There were further changes in 1990. The Department of Physical Education moved to the Faculty of Arts for purposes of administrative efficiency since most of its work involved students in that Faculty. It still offers physical education courses to prospective teachers. In the same year, the name, "Didactics", was shed by the two departments, which are now called the Department of Curriculum Studies and the Department of Applied Curriculum Studies. It was argued that "Didactics" as used in South Africa, more particularly in Afrikaans-medium universities, was firmly linked with major philosophical trends embodied in Fundamental Pedagogics. As such it was rather limited in breadth and depth of application, being concerned primarily with didactic practices at schools. It was further argued that the approach adopted in the Faculty is different insofar as the interpretation and analysis of teaching is set in
a wider context which includes various ideological points of view. An in-depth study of teaching, therefore, requires an understanding of the nature of knowledge, of the learner and of society. Whether this argument is mere rhetoric or whether it reflects the nature of work in the Faculty is a question that has to be addressed. Based on the evidence examined thus far it would appear that it is a declaration of intent rather than a description of actual practice. The final answer must await further evidence which will be provided by an examination of the form and content of the curriculum the Faculty teaches; this task will be undertaken in the next section. Before doing so, some comment on the courses that the Faculty has offered over the years is necessary since it is an important structural factor in the context in which the Faculty functions.

4.4.3 Courses offered by the Faculty

During the first decade the Faculty was under the tutelage of UNISA, as mentioned earlier. It prepared students (who had Matriculation with exemption) for UNISA diplomas. In addition it offered a number of initial courses of its own for students with Senior Certificates without Matriculation exemption. There were at least six such courses, varying in duration from one to three years, leading up to Certificates or Diplomas suitable for teaching at the Senior Primary (Stds 2-4) or Junior Secondary (Stds 5-7) levels.

It may be argued that the proliferation of these courses was necessitated by developments in Indian education at the time. In 1966, Indian schools were removed from provincial control and placed under an "own affairs" Department of "Indian" Education. With this development arose the need for more teachers. In that context the Faculty played an important role in meeting the increasing demand for teachers.

Nevertheless, it is equally true that the survival of the Faculty was a strong motivating factor and in the pursuit of this objective the Faculty became a training college in the
pejorative sense of the term. Course content was offered discretely and not contextually, and lecturers generally worked in isolation with little meaningful communication in matters pertaining to the curriculum. Perhaps because of their relatively poor academic background the lecturers found such an arrangement convenient and non-threatening. This pattern became consolidated over the years with the result that even to this day lecturers in the Faculty work in isolation. Another factor that impacted negatively on the Faculty needs to be mentioned. The nature of the work done in the early days together with the quality of some of the academics appointed contributed in no small measure to the poor image of the Faculty in the context of the University.

The nature of curriculum development in the Faculty in the following decade did little to improve that image. It was in 1971 that the University College received academic autonomy and became UDW. Guidance and assistance was then given indirectly by UNISA and the Faculty was free to design its own courses. During this period the Faculty registered tremendous growth in quantitative terms. Four departments were established in 1971 (as indicated earlier), the staff had increased almost five-fold from eleven in 1966 to about fifty in 1980, all one-year and two-year initial teacher education courses were phased out (as a result of the introduction of a three-year minimum qualification requirement by the Department of "Indian" Education) and a number of undergraduate courses catering both for matriculants and senior certificate holders were introduced in their place. Much time and energy was expended in planning and teaching these courses, all of which, strictly speaking, belonged in a college of education. Eventually, these courses were rationalised and consolidated into two diplomas for teachers at the senior-primary and junior-secondary levels respectively. During the same period the Bachelor of Paedagogics degree was added to these two new undergraduate diplomas and the existing post-graduate diploma. Further, seven diplomas were introduced
on the basis of part-time study for qualified teachers wishing to specialize in the following areas: school counselling, hearing impairment, remedial education, special education, physiotherapy, resource centre management, and home economics. Thus by the end of the second decade the Faculty was offering no fewer than eleven diplomas (four initial and seven specialized) which at the time was probably a record for any university in the country.

A number of these diplomas, more particularly the specialized diplomas, were poorly conceptualized with much emphasis on structure and relatively little on course content. Neither was much attention given to the availability of suitably qualified academic staff. Characteristically, lecturing responsibilities were arbitrarily allocated and some staff members carried untenable loads.

Not surprisingly, in the decade of the eighties most of these courses were discontinued. Today the Faculty offers four diplomas: three specialized diplomas (in special education, remedial education and resource centre management) on a two-year, part-time basis for qualified teachers, and one postgraduate diploma for pre-service teachers - the Higher Diploma in Education (HDE). It is with an examination of this diploma that the next section will be concerned. As stated in an earlier chapter, the HDE course per se is not the concern of this research; rather the course is of relevance only insofar as an analysis of its structure and content can afford insights into the nature of the pre-service teacher programme that the Faculty offers.

4.5 FORM AND CONTENT OF THE PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM

The HDE course comprises three basic components: Education Subjects, Professional (Method) Subjects and Teaching Practice; there are two ancillary subjects: English Usage and Afrikaans Usage (which is optional).
The number of students doing Afrikaans Usage has dwindled progressively over the years and the subject is likely to be phased out in the next few years. In effect, the structure of the Diploma is as follows:

1. **Principles of Education**, comprising six sub-disciplines, combined, for purposes of the final examination, into three papers, each of three-hours' duration:
   
   (1) Philosophy and Sociology of Education
   (2) Empirical Education and Curriculum Studies
   (3) History of Education and Educational Management.

2. **Professional Subjects**, comprising two areas of specialization and a final examination of two papers, each of three hours' duration: e.g.,
   
   (1) Special Method: History
   (2) Special Method: English


4. **Teaching Practice**, comprising two components:
   
   (1) Campus-based Teaching Practice
   (2) School-based Teaching Practice.

Thus, the HDE student in the Faculty has to pass a final examination of six three-hour written papers comprising: three in the sub-disciplines of Education, two in areas of teaching specialities, and a paper in English Usage; Teaching Practice, comprising two components, evaluated on a continuous basis.

English Usage, which includes a "Speech" component (referred to in Chapter Three) has evolved from Speech Training and has survived as part of the curriculum for thirty years. The relevance of the subject to the changing constituency the Faculty now serves needs to be re-assessed.
TABLE 4.3
STRUCTURE OF HDE COURSE, 1966

Principal Subjects

1. Philosophy of Education.
2. Empirical Education.
3. History of Education.
4. Method and Administration of Education.
6. and 8. Practical Teaching Tests in each of the two principal teaching subjects.

Ancillary Subjects

10. Blackboard work.
11. School Librarianship.
12. First Aid and School Hygiene.

Official Languages

13. and 14. A written oral and practical test in each of the two official languages. However, students who have not studied both English and Afrikaans at school, may offer only one language for examination purposes.

Source: University College Durban, Calendar, 1966: 43
It is interesting to note that after almost three decades the HDE course is still based on the UNISA model in terms of its structure (9). An examination of the course offered by the Faculty in 1966 confirms this observation (see Table 4.3). Over the years there were a few minor changes but the basic structure is similar. For instance, Method and Administration of Education was split into two sub-disciplines, with each arbitrarily absorbing the ancillary subjects. Thus Method of Education included Audio-visual techniques (which had evolved from Blackboard Work), while Administration of Education included School Librarianship; Speech Training became part of Language Studies. In the early 1970s one new subject – Moral and Civic Education – was added to the curriculum while First Aid and School Hygiene was given respectability under the new name of Physical, Health and Recreational Education. All the additions, deletions, combinations and sub-divisions amounted to nothing more than cosmetic change. A perusal of Table 4.4 lends support to this observation. Thus, in spite of all the largely in-house seminars, workshops and conferences held in order to examine the relevance of courses offered, the basic structure of the present HDE course remains hardly altered.

The HDE course is presented over thirty weeks, which comprises one academic year. Of this period twenty-four weeks (80 per cent) are devoted to lectures on campus and six weeks (20 per cent) to school-based teaching practice. The average number of lectures allocated to the various subjects in the curriculum is shown in Table 4.5. For a clearer understanding of the data it needs to be pointed out that one lecture per week over twenty-four weeks averages 0.8 lectures per week over a thirty-week academic year.

Details pertaining to time-table and other issues will be analysed by considering each of the three major components of the course respectively. Data for the analysis will be obtained from the faculty syllabuses and the final examination question papers in the various subjects that comprise the HDE course.
TABLE 4.4

STRUCTURE OF HDE COURSE, 1974

Curriculum:

The following subjects are prescribed for the University Higher Diploma in Education:

1. Administration of Education (which includes School Librarianship)
2. Empirical Education
3. History of Education
4. Method of Education (which includes Audio-visual techniques)
5. Philosophy of Education
6. and 7. Special Method of teaching two principal subjects in the Secondary School
8. Practice Teaching
9. Afrikaans
10. English
11. Health, Physical and Recreational Education
12. Moral and Civic Education

Note:

Students who have passed Education II will take Education III, Educational Technology and School Librarianship instead of subjects 1-5 listed above.

Students other than those taking Education III are not permitted to attend courses for a degree and for the University Higher Diploma in Education concurrently.

(a) The pass mark for the award of a diploma is 50 per cent per course.
(b) A student who does not pass all the courses prescribed for the final year at the final examination or a supplementary examination allowed in terms of General Rules G8 and G9 must repeat the whole of that year.
(c) A diploma may be awarded with distinction if the candidate obtains an average mark of 70 per cent in the examination as a whole, and a pass with distinction in practice teaching, provided that the candidate has taken the examination at one sitting.

Source: UDW Calendar, 1974: 192
### TABLE 4.5

**HDE PROGRAMME: LECTURES PER WEEK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>LECTURES PER WEEK</th>
<th>AVERAGE: LECT. PER WEEK</th>
<th>THREE-HOUR EXAM PAPERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Educ.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Educ.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical Educ.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Studies</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Educ.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Management</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. PROFESSIONAL SUBJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Method 1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Method 2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. ANCILLARY SUBJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Usage</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. TEACHING PRACTICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-based TP</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based TP</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Converted for purposes of comparison.

School-based TP (of 6 weeks duration: 30 school days).

At University: 1 practical is of 3 hours duration and 1 lecture is 45 minutes; organisationally, 1 practical equals 1 lecture. During TP, 60 practicals (30 x 2) are deemed to have been conducted, averaging 2 practicals or 2 lectures over a 30-week academic year.
4.5.1 Principles of Education

It can be seen that there is an unevenness in the distribution of lectures between the sub-disciplines of Education, on the one hand, and Professional subjects on the other (Table 4.5). As a corollary to this there appears to be a discrepancy in examination requirements in respect of these subjects. To cite one example: History of Education and Educational Management (combined as Paper 3 for purposes of the examination) average 0.8 lectures per week, while a method subject averages 3.2 lectures, which gives a ratio of 1:4. Yet at the end of the year a student has to sit for a three-hour examination in each of these subjects. Although the other sub-disciplines of Education (which include the so-called foundation disciplines) receive a relatively more favourable weighting, the situation is not very much improved. For instance, Philosophy/Sociology of Education (Paper 1) averages 1.6 lectures per week for a three-hour paper in the final examination.

While acknowledging that, generally speaking, there cannot be a one-to-one correspondence between the number of lectures and the quality of work, it is nevertheless reasonable to infer that a three-hour paper on the basis of the barest minimum of lectures (in a context where there are no tutorials) will invariably result in a compromise in quality. Interviews with lecturers concerned indicate that all of them are under tremendous pressure to cover a certain volume of work to justify a three-hour paper. In these circumstances it is virtually impossible in each of the sub-disciplines to set more than one assignment and/or test which, incidentally, forms the basis for the calculation of year marks. One lecturer, for instance, admitted that he can do no more than give his students a "bare outline" of the subject matter in the time available; there is "no real depth" and the result is a "superficial approach" to the sub-discipline concerned. To redress the situation students are expected to complete a programme of readings, but the
efficacy of the exercise is somewhat nullified in the absence of tutorials. Thus, organisationally, there are a number of shortcomings which impact negatively on the quality of work.

Another negative structural factor is the existence of departments in a context where the sub-disciplines are taught in isolation, a point that was raised in the previous chapter and which is repeated here from a different perspective. In Education, as in other academic fields of discourse, the politics of academia manifests itself in a fight for survival and status among the various disciplines. Lecturers have a vested interest in professionalizing their respective disciplines in an effort to justify their inclusion in the curriculum. So it is at UDW. In deference to the alleged relevance of each sub-discipline, a relevance that appears to be based on unexamined assumptions, there is, as far as is practicable, an equitable distribution of lecturing time so as to obviate any suggestion of the existence of a differential status among the sub-disciplines. If the student does emerge out of such a fragmented programme with any cohesive understanding of educational theory, such enlightenment, it is submitted, will not be the result of any conscious planning. On the contrary, a context in which each lecturer presents his sub-discipline in isolation cannot be anything but inimical to the development of educational theory. Thus it transpires that the teacher education programme in the Faculty has to fit into institutional structures that appear to have become reified with the passage of time. Such a Procrustean approach mutilates educational theory to the detriment of curriculum development.

This state of affairs does not reflect creditably on the way in which the Faculty conceptualizes teacher education. Credence is given to this stricture if we examine the HDE Principles of Education syllabus (Appendix D) in conjunction with the relevant set of examination papers (Appendix E). It will be readily accepted that the inclusion of the various sub-disciplines in a teacher education programme can only be justified if they are
taught as part of educational theory and not as discrete disciplines. This is not to suggest that they cannot be taught as discrete disciplines, but their inclusion as such in an integrated teacher education programme would suggest conceptual confusion. The result is a motley assemblage of syllabuses without a unifying focus.

Not only is there no coherence to the structure of the syllabus, but there does not appear to be any direction to the teaching of that syllabus, in the collective sense. "Philosophy of Education", in the Faculty, has moved away from Fundamental Pedagogics and its positivist epistemology. The questions (see Appendix E) suggest that the approach is primarily, though not exclusively, within the hermeneutic paradigm. "Sociology of Education" is, generally, radical in approach, with questions requiring both interactionist and neo-Marxist approaches.

"Empirical Education", on the other hand, shows an unmistakable bias towards behavioural and cognitive psychology and the approach adopted is located firmly in the empirical-analytic paradigm with its technical mode of rationality that endorses a positivistic epistemology. Practically all the questions (see Appendix E) imply that Empirical Education comprises a fixed body of knowledge that can be operationalized in such a way that the various psychological constructs have an invariant definition. On the basis of this evidence, it may be tentatively concluded that Empirical Education as part of the Faculty's pre-service teacher education programme has been somewhat static for the past twenty years (see UDW Calendar, 1971: 202-203).

"Curriculum Studies", like Philosophy and Sociology of Education, has also eschewed the positivistic stance and a relatively narrow pre-occupation with teaching techniques and classroom strategies. There is an identifiable preference for
the hermeneutic paradigm, although students also appear to have been exposed to the critical mode of rationality and reconstructivist epistemology.

The "History of Education" syllabus covers an extremely wide field ranging from education in ancient civilizations to twentieth century child-centred movements; no fewer than eleven such topics appear under "General History of Education". The syllabus also includes a section on "South African education".

The approach to the subject is firmly embedded in the positivistic paradigm and if the question paper is any criterion, there is a heavy emphasis on the recall of knowledge. Insofar as its link with teacher education is only tenuous at best and insofar as its relevance to educational theory is difficult to discern, "History of Education", as it is conceptualized and taught in the Faculty, would appear to be an irrelevance. The subject has become enshrined in a syllabus that has remained static for the last two decades (see UDW Calendar, 1971: 203).

The inclusion of "Educational Management" in a pre-service teacher education curriculum constitutes, from the perspective of this dissertation, a time-consuming irrelevance comprising much non-essential detail. A study of the syllabus and the question paper suggests that its contribution to educational theory is at best minimal, if educational theory is defined as being concerned with determining rationally defensible principles for educational practice.

It is clear from the above that the lecturers involved in the respective sub-disciplines of Education adopt different approaches, in the paradigmatic sense, and present their sub-disciplines as separate entities with little or no conscious effort to correlate and synthesize the subject matter content in a manner that will enhance the prospective teachers' professional lives. The presentation of the sub-disciplines in this manner only serves to accentuate their radically different
characters and the limited significance of any one or even all of these domains in the formulation of principles of educational theory. "Principles of Education" in this formulation is an integration of composite areas, with its unity being the unity of a consistent set of principles of practice and not simply the aggregation of contributory disciplines.

4.5.2 Professional (Method) Subjects

The Faculty offers Professional (Method) subjects in a wide range of disciplines ranging from Accounting, Biblical Studies and Computer Science to Music, Physical Education and Zulu.

According to the syllabus (see Appendix D), the Method Subjects "have been designed to provide activities (emphasis added) that will enable students in the respective school subjects" to attain a number of ends most of which are focused on techniques involving instructional objectives, subject syllabuses, schemes of work, teaching/learning strategies, and tests and examinations. Insofar as these issues emphasize a relatively narrow concern with classroom application, the syllabus, it is argued, appears to be based on a partially formulated version of curriculum theory. Further available evidence has to be considered to ascertain whether such an observation is warranted.

To this end, twenty three Method subject papers set for the 1990 Final Examination in the Faculty for HDE students were scrutinized. The categories used for the purpose of analysis were derived from the question papers themselves. It was found that three broad themes were being emphasized and the questions were grouped accordingly:

(1) Techniques: questions in this category focused on strategies for classroom instruction; or on information pertaining to classroom instruction.
(2) Lesson Plans: questions required either the drawing up of lesson notes on selected topics according to a specific format, or an evaluation of lesson transcripts.

(3) Methods: questions in this category focused on teaching strategies globally.

It was further found that the questions required either a descriptive knowledge or a theoretical understanding of the issues involved. All questions were weighted proportionately, in terms of percentages, on the basis of the mark allocation. The resultant system is presented in Table 4.6.

If it is accepted that a question paper reveals the type of work done, then there appears to be an uneven quality in the teaching of the respective method subjects in the Faculty in terms of academic requirements. According to Table 4.6 in at least eleven (nearly fifty per cent) of the method subjects the emphasis in all three categories of questions is on descriptive knowledge. It is acknowledged that it is necessary for a teacher to possess a wide repertoire of techniques and know how to utilize them in the preparation of lessons and that these curricular concerns constitute a necessary part of methodology. Nevertheless, it is debatable whether these issues should be tested at the intellectually undemanding level of recall, more particularly in a post-graduate examination.

A sample of the questions referred to is included in Appendix F. For purposes of comparison it would be interesting to consider questions from "Principles of Education". Thus, in Philosophy/Sociology of Education, for instance, students have to grapple with such questions as the "existentialists' concept of freedom and choice" and "assumptions underlying Marxist theory and its relevance for understanding certain problems in schools" (see Appendix E).

Questions like the above, which require a certain level of theoretical sophistication, are in stark contrast to some of the questions that appear in the Method papers (see Appendix F),
TABLE 4.6

PROFESSIONAL (METHOD) SUBJECTS: CATEGORIES OF QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>A. DESCRIPTIVE KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>B. THEORETICAL UNDERSTANDING</th>
<th>RATIO - A : B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TECHNIQUES</td>
<td>LESSON PLANS</td>
<td>METHODS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Accounting</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arabic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Biblical Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Biological Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Economics</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Geography</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. History</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. History of Art</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. History of Music</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mathematics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Music</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Physical Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Physical Science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Speech &amp; Drama</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tamil</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Urdu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Zulu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Figures rounded to add up to 100 in each case.
where students are required to deal with the importance of good penmanship (Accounting), lesson plans drawn up in terms of behavioural objectives (Biblical Studies), case endings and their effects on pronouns (Hindi), the selection, use and display of pictures (History), the relative merits of a wooden and a plastic recorder (Music), the organisation of a swimming gala (Physical Education), and the importance of a library in promoting reading (Tamil). No doubt these are relevant issues if that is what one wants to include in one's lectures to pre-service teachers preparing for a post-graduate diploma, but the question as to whether they should be tested on it as well requires to be addressed seriously, as suggested earlier.

It needs to be emphasized that not all questions in the Method papers are at this simplistic level. There are a number of Method subjects that require theoretical understanding in all categories of questions, as indicated in Table 4.6, and substantiated by a sample of question in Appendix G. Method questions in this genre include a wide range of issues such as the constructivist view of knowledge (Biological Science), the relative merits of learning theories (General Science), reconceptualizing the curriculum within the framework of a socially critical paradigm (Geography), opportunities for cross-curricular teaching (Physical Science), the relevance of the acculturation model to second language acquisition (Urdu) and the theoretical underpinnings of Communicative Language Teaching (Zulu). These questions besides helping to improve the academic quality of the Professional (Method) Subjects also suggest that not all lecturers in the Faculty endorse a "teacher-training" model with its taken-for-granted views on classroom techniques; there are some who endorse other models.

Nevertheless, a careful analysis of the questions suggests that while a number of these lecturers require their students to develop theoretical understanding of various educational issues, it is, at best, theoretical understanding in terms of neo-positivism (science with a human face). Only in a few cases
are philosophical alternatives to positivism considered. This would appear to substantiate an observation made earlier that curriculum theory in the Faculty is only partially developed. It is evident that significant dimensions of curriculum theory like the learner, school and society, the nature of knowledge (out of which are created subject-matter divisions for teaching and learning) are not all given explicit reference and treated as problematic.

4.5.3 Teaching Practice

The Teaching Practice (TP) component of the HDE course is divided into two sub-components: Campus-based and School-based. For purposes of evaluation each sub-component receives equal weighting.

4.5.3.1 Campus-based Teaching Practice

The Campus-based programme comprises four units:
(1) Media Education
(2) Computer Literacy
(3) Sport Organisation
(4) Teaching/Learning/Communication (TLC), focusing on selected issues in pedagogy and education.

The first three categories deal essentially with the acquisition of skills. The TLC unit is academically orientated and is designed to exist at the interface between "Principles of Education" and "Professional Subjects". Its purpose is to provide the pre-service teacher with a forum for discourse and debate on a variety of issues. The synthesis in the TLC unit aimed for at the level of organisation is not always successfully realised at the level of practice because the fragmented nature of the HDE course, referred to earlier, militates against a holistic approach to teacher education. Furthermore, the campus-based programme, more particularly the TLC unit is not well received by lecturers. It needs to be pointed out that the campus-based sub-component as an integral
part of Teaching Practice was an addition to the curriculum precipitated by the administrative imperative of finding enough work for lecturers in terms of SAPSE norms. With the passage of years the innovation has become institutionalized as a permanent part of the curriculum with its original reason all but forgotten. Because of its status as a "filler course", the TLC unit, in particular, has not been enthusiastically received by some lecturers, with the result that its full value has not been sufficiently exploited.

4.5.3.2 School-based Teaching Practice

The students' introduction to school-based TP begins with a two-week "Observation Period" at schools, prior to the commencement of the academic year. By way of preparation the students attend a one-day orientation programme that is designed to help the prospective teacher "learn how to survive in the structure of the school" (10). As part of the learning programme student teachers are expected to observe lessons and to teach ten lessons under the guidance of a supervising teacher whose role, incidentally, is not defined; four of these lessons have to be formally written up for purposes of assessment. In addition to the notes of lessons, the student teacher has to complete a twenty-two page observation schedule with details—most of which are mere reportage—pertaining to items such as class registers, the control of school stock, the allocation of extra-curricular duties to teachers, the distribution of resources for teaching, and the administering of tests and examinations. While a knowledge of matters relevant to administration is no doubt an essential part of a teacher's professional repertoire, it is difficult to justify their inclusion at the very beginning of a pre-service programme.

A more serious shortcoming, from the perspective of the transformative model of teacher education, is the questionable conceptualization of the programme. The idea that teacher education should start with practice is like dumping prospective teachers into schools at the deep end and letting them fight for
survival. Symbolically, the orientation programme that students attend in preparation for this baptism is referred to as the "UDW Initial-Teaching Survival Kit". It is an unfortunate introduction to teacher education insofar as it reinforces the very stereotypes and prejudices that constitute a technicist mindset which limits the student teachers' receptivity to, and future use of, abstract theory. It is precisely because of this unintended conservative outcome that the place of the "Observation Period" in the teacher education programme needs to be seriously questioned.

It would be interesting to see whether this conservative orientation is evident on the part of Faculty members who supervise school-based TP. Before doing so it is necessary to refer to certain matters of administrative detail to set the background against which the analysis could be undertaken. The Faculty has adopted the internship model of block sessions for organising its teaching practice programme. In terms of this model student teachers are attached to particular schools on a full-time basis for a period of three weeks in each of the two semesters that comprise the academic year. During this period they are expected to teach at least two lessons per day in each of their two specialities and, as bona-fide members of the staff, to take part in the other activities of the school. Teaching is done under the supervision of class teachers and university lecturers. Details pertaining to supervision by lecturers have to be recorded in at least four forms all of which have to be filed. One form is used by lecturers to record comments of lessons taught during their visit (the so-called "crit. lessons"); another is used for purposes of overall assessment of the student's teaching performance and conduct over each block session; a third is a cumulative record card in which are entered dates of visits by lecturers, marks/symbols awarded for lessons observed, and the overall percentage awarded for each subject speciality; and a fourth form is designed to yield a cumulative record of the total number of supervisory visits made by each lecturer.
The purpose of much of this bureaucratic paper work is not clear when in the final analysis all that seems to matter is a percentage mark; only in a relatively few cases, when students fail to make the grade, are the files scrutinized. Another administrative function that the files appear to serve is one of control where the number of supervisory visits made is quantified and errant lecturers reminded that they have not satisfied the norm in respect of each student teacher. Of all these forms only one would seem to serve a really useful purpose – the form in which lecturers record their observations on lessons taught during their supervisory visits. It is these forms that will be analysed presently in order to obtain another dimension of Faculty thinking on teacher education.

Over four hundred observation forms completed by thirty one lecturers during the second TP session in 1990 were scrutinized. The categories used for purposes of analysis were generated from the observation forms themselves. Accordingly, two broad models of supervision were identified. It was found that nineteen lecturers (about 61 per cent) used a mode of supervision that could be characterized as lesson-specific critique, while the remaining twelve (about 39 per cent) favoured a global critique. While all were identified as basically utilizing one of these approaches, some lecturers in the first category employed aspects of the global critique. It will be necessary to elaborate on these two modes of supervision.

Lecturers using the mode of supervision labelled "lesson-specific critique" tended to focus narrowly on individual lessons taught during their visits. Their critiques were, primarily, observations on specific topics taught and were based on criteria that had reference to the skills and techniques of teaching such as the particular approach used, the formulation of questions, class control and management, budgeting of teaching time, sequencing of lessons and pupil participation. An overall assessment of the lesson was made, usually with reference to objectives, and, where necessary,
suggestions for improvement were given, at times in great detail including the type of questions that should be asked in teaching the particular topic under consideration.

Some lecturers included subjective and idiosyncratic remarks in their critiques:

"I like the way you teach (name of subject)"

"Be bold; control the class with your voice. You are in charge."

One, in particular, made large conclusions on relatively slender evidence, and ended every critique with the following observation:

"You should make a good teacher."

Others, at times wrote at length on relatively minor, peripheral issues, thereby trivializing their critiques.

Generally, lecturers whose critique is characterized as "lesson-specific" appeared to endorse a scientific approach to teaching. The following sample of observations made by the lecturers concerned captures something of this technical-instrumental view:

"I am extremely happy with your lesson preparation. Your objectives are simple and clear and it (sic) certainly gives your lesson direction."

"Your lesson did not achieve the aims."

"There still remains a question mark at the end of the period: How much did each child learn? Can they pass a test on this material? I'll be sceptical until I can see the results of a test marked by you."
"Your lesson preps. show that you use role play frequently. I am glad you have discovered how useful this technique can be in all teaching..."

"Do some teaching and then question the pupils, otherwise where are they going to get the answers from?"

"More aids will result in better lessons."

"Prepare well and you will have good lessons."

"While your presentation was integrated and successful, it did not quite tally with your lesson notes."

"I can see you are a hard worker and I am sure you will make a good teacher - just work on it."

"There have been no serious violations of teaching techniques."

"Keep up your level of enthusiasm and you should have no problem in having a highly successful teaching career."

If only life were so simple! What emerges from the above sample of observations is a clear indication that the lecturers concerned conceptualize teaching in terms of a set of values informed by a technocratic rationality. The mode of supervision assesses the value of teaching techniques (theory) insofar as they have been useful in the teaching of individual lessons (practice). It implies a one-way, linear relationship between theory and practice and, typically, ignores the dialectical relationships. Moreover, it contributes to a view of teaching that involves the technical application of educational knowledge for the purpose of attaining a given set of objectives on the basis of efficiency and parsimony. It is an approach that does not encourage the development of a critical, reflective spirit.
in teacher education aimed at open inquiry and investigation. Within this perspective teaching often becomes an end in itself rather than a means towards some larger educational purpose that transcends the narrow instrumental concerns of a technological rationality.

The conceptualization of teaching within the parameters of a larger educational purpose is evident, at least implicitly, in the mode of supervision that has been characterized as "global critique". Essentially, the approach used in this mode of critique entails evaluating lessons, not as lessons per se, but for identifying what the lessons reveal about how student teachers conceptualize teaching generally, with the lesson itself serving as a source of specific examples that are used to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses in such conceptualization.

Lecturers using the mode of global critique also make reference to those teaching skills and strategies referred to earlier, but, as a means to an end and not as an end in itself. In addition, their critiques include observations on aspects such as contextualizing lessons, creating meaningful learning opportunities, and teaching for critical understanding. A few also make reference to the relevance of curriculum paradigms in selecting, interpreting, reconstructing and critiquing knowledge. What emerges is an evaluation of teaching in terms of selected dimensions of curriculum theory. As such, it does not seek to inculcate the development of specific teaching skills or teaching strategies apart from situational factors that contribute to the curriculum context within which the skills and techniques are to be used or the ends towards which they are to be directed.

If indeed the characterization of the modes of supervision into two basic categories is acceptable, then it would appear that there exists a significant qualitative difference between the lesson-specific critique on the one hand, and the global
critique on the other. More importantly, the perceived dichotomy in supervisory styles suggests ideological differences in the way in which teaching is conceptualized in the Faculty. The majority of lecturers endorse an empirical-analytical orientation and look upon teaching as a practical, routine activity that is pragmatic, atheoretical, apolitical, and ideologically free in nature. Another group of lecturers acknowledge that teaching is a practical activity but also give due recognition to the fact that it is also a complex activity that encompasses moral as well as intellectual dimensions, psychological as well as logical elements. Thus in spite of rhetoric to the contrary, there is a strong conservative element in the Faculty that wittingly or unwittingly endorses an applied-science view of teacher education.

4.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter has tried to show how the structural constraints inherent in the policy of apartheid shaped the nature of the terrain within which UDW has operated and in some respects continues to operate. In that context, and bearing in mind the objectives of this dissertation, specific reference was made to the programmes, policies and practices in the Faculty.

It is hoped that the evidence presented in this chapter has demonstrated adequately that historically and contemporarily a number of contextual factors have played a significant role in influencing the nature of teacher education in the Faculty. The lack of attention to the shared enterprise of teacher education across disciplinary boundaries is a major issue that has to be urgently addressed. This has as its corollary a fragmented and segmented curriculum, a state of affairs exacerbated by a lack of communication among staff at academic level and the absence of meaningful discourse and debate; all of these factors collectively contribute to the underdevelopment of educational theory and curriculum theory.
Given these circumstances, it is not surprising that teacher education in the Faculty embodies a technological rationality which appears to be reflected in the curriculum that the majority of its members teach and practice. Thus, notwithstanding the presence of a progressive element, an apolitical and technical orientation appears to dominate teacher education in the Faculty.
NOTES


2. During the second reading of the Group Areas Bill, a Member of the Opposition declared: "Apartheid measures have been in force in Natal in most cases for years and years. The position is we have not called it apartheid. We have called it common sense. In Natal we have applied the principle as and when we could ..." (Hansard, House of Assembly Debates, 30 May 1950, Col. F 594).


4. "The Afrikaans-medium universities (like the English-medium universities) had in terms of their charters (prior to 1959) the right to determine who should be admitted, the power resting with the council of each university. The former (Orange Free State, Potchefstroom, Pretoria, Stellenbosch) in terms of their right did not accept non-Whites (Behr, 1988: 191).

5. These are:

   The University of Zululand, at Ngoye in Natal for the Zulus.
   The University of the North, at Turfloop near Pietersburg in the Transvaal for Sotho-, Tsonga-, and Venda-speaking groups of the Black population.
   The University of Western Cape, at Belville near Cape Town for members of the Cape Coloured, Malay, Griqua or other Coloured group.

6. "Christian National Education started from the premise that God decreed separate ethnic groups and that the prime objective of the school system should be to maintain these separate ethnic groups" (Giliomee and Schlemmer, 1989: 95).


9. The minimum requirements for the HDE course for the secondary school is laid down in "Criteria for the Evaluation of South African Qualifications for Employment in Education", 1986: 36 - 38. However, the specific details pertaining to the form and structure of the course and evaluation procedures are the prerogative of the educational institution concerned. It is interesting to note the "minimum requirements" cited above apply only to so-called White universities. But the Faculty programme, even after autonomy, was organised in terms of these minimum requirements in order to be on a par with that of its White counterparts.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation was to investigate selected aspects of the teacher education curriculum of the Faculty of Education. In specific terms the study has thus far focused on two of its major objectives.

These are:

(1) An analysis of the structural constraints manifest in the policy of apartheid and their impact on the way UDW and the Faculty has evolved over the last three decades: concern focused on the hegemonic control that the rectorate was able to impose on the various constituencies of the university by virtue of the fact that the balance of external social forces in the early days of the University was in favour of the dominant White ruling-class interests. The analysis has served to emphasize how the structural factors embedded in such domination collectively impacted negatively on the provision of teacher education in the Faculty.

(2) An examination of the curriculum that characterizes the work of the Faculty: this has been analysed, on the one hand, in terms of the teaching, supervision and evaluation process and, on the other, in terms of student and staff perceptions of those processes. The analyses suggest that the dominant form of teacher education in the Faculty approximates to the applied-science model.

The body of the thesis has provided evidence which enables the major characteristics of the nature of the teacher education curriculum to be understood. The evidence has been summarized at the conclusion of each chapter and it is not intended to repeat that material here. Certain significant aspects of the evidence, however, provide the basis upon which consideration might be
given to the third major objective of the work which is to identify curriculum problems and issues and to consider factors that might underpin the formulation of development objectives and strategies for change and improvement.

5.2 TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE FACULTY: ISSUES IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

An attempt was made in the previous two chapters to describe, characterize, analyze and understand teacher education in the Faculty within the framework of the critical paradigm of curriculum inquiry, as this is given operational definition by the transformative model of teacher education.

If the analyses presented in those two chapters are accepted, then it would appear that a number of historical and structural factors have impacted negatively on the provision of teacher education and, as a corollary, on the development of curriculum theory in the Faculty and in many ways on the development of Faculty staff. In order to substantiate this observation it would be useful to attempt a synthesis of relevant aspects of supportive evidence analyzed in Chapters Three and Four.

5.2.1 Students' Perceptions of the Teacher Education Curriculum

A technocratic rationality is clearly evident in the way students in the Faculty perceive teacher education. It will be recalled that over 75 per cent of the students rated Method subjects as having made an important contribution to the teaching of their specialities. Of particular significance was the relevance of these subjects in devising teaching strategies and in planning and preparation of lessons. Complementing this was School-based Teaching Practice which was rated as one of the most important components in the curriculum, particularly because of its relevance for classroom practice. In that context the three sub-disciplines of Education (History, Philosophy and Educational Management) were regarded as having made the least contribution to professional growth and were nominated for exclusion
from the curriculum. The instrumental approach would appear to be an influential factor in accounting for over 60 per cent of the students rating themselves in the above-average category as teachers. Such a high level of optimism should be assessed against the way in which students conceptualize teaching. Except for an emphasis on subject matter knowledge students tended to refer most often to social and affective variables. Even the criteria used in self-ratings did not adequately distinguish the work of a teacher; their connection with education was only peripheral and could apply to most positions requiring some form of managerial responsibility. What emerges clearly is that the students' conception of teaching tends to undervalue cognitive or academic dimensions and accordingly diminishes the relative importance of subject matter and pedagogical knowledge and the wider context of educational practice. In this view it is not surprising that a longer School-based Teaching Practice was cited as one important way in which the teacher education curriculum could be improved.

5.2.2 Staff Perceptions of the Teacher Education Curriculum

A technocratic rationality is also evident in the way the majority of lecturers perceive the teacher education curriculum. Thus over 60 per cent of the lecturers regarded the acquisition of techniques and skills as the most important aim of teacher education. Most of the other aims cited reflect a pre-occupation with pedagogical concerns focused on learning outcomes. As with aims of teacher education, lecturers for the most part conceptualized a "good teacher" in a relatively narrow didactic sense, with the emphasis on classroom practice. Such a view resonates with the manner in which nearly 50 per cent of the Method subjects are taught and examined - at the relatively undemanding level of descriptive knowledge. Complementing this is the lesson-specific mode of critique used by the majority (over 60 per cent) of the lecturers during teaching practice supervision; it endorses the view that teaching is little more than an isolated set of technical procedures, an ensemble of skills to be mastered to facilitate the transmission of
pre-packaged, teacher-proof knowledge for the attainment of pre-determined ends. In brief, teaching is conceptualized as applied science. Thus, when over 50 per cent of the lecturers cite the form and content of the curriculum in the context of a post-apartheid South Africa as the most important problem that the Faculty would have to face in the foreseeable future, it is likely, given their technical-instrumental orientation, that such seemingly radical rhetoric translates somewhat disappointingly into programmes for curriculum reform rather than curriculum reconceptualization.

There are indications, however, that the catalyst for such a reconceptualization of the curriculum resides in a relatively small, but significant, group of lecturers who may be characterized as progressive educationists. In support of this viewpoint reference may be made to research evidence. Thus, in citing the aims of teacher education this group of lecturers included two categories that dealt with schooling, education and society in a context that transcends the narrow confines of the classroom. This tendency to set the teacher education programme in the context of some larger educational purpose is also evident in other instances, some of which include: the criteria they use to characterize a "good teacher" (e.g. the ability to reconstruct knowledge); the way they teach and examine Method subjects where students are expected to display some theoretical understanding; the global mode of critique they employ in the supervision of teaching practice, an approach that moves beyond the immediate considerations of a particular lesson to the pedagogical principles, both general and subject-specific, that should underpin teaching.

It is clear from the above that one characteristic which is common to all progressive lecturers is the recognition that the teacher education curriculum has to transcend the purely instrumental concerns of a technological rationality. This recognition, however, is given practical expression in different ways, which suggests that those lecturers referred to as progressives do not form a monolithic group in the Faculty. The
differences may be encapsulated in the way teaching is conceptualized: a careful analysis of the evidence suggests that most of the progressives regard teaching as reflective practice, while a minority among them believe teaching to be critically reflective practice, as critical praxis. More fundamentally, it is a difference over particular value commitments and, relatedly, the worth of competing educational goals. A number of progressives appear to be ideologically located within the empirical-analytical paradigm of curriculum inquiry, believing that it is possible to transcend the instrumental concerns of a technical mode of rationality by subscribing to a neo-positivist philosophy; put differently, it is a belief that inspires the notion that the worth of competing educational goals can be decided on the basis of educational principles alone.

There are others among the progressive group of lecturers who believe that the debate over the relative merits of competing educational goals should incorporate, in addition, considerations of moral and ethical criteria such as justice, equality and emancipation. In other words, educational discourse conducted within the paradigm of critical inquiry — as this is operationally defined in terms of the transformative model of teacher education — would enable prospective teachers to identify connections between curriculum and instruction at the level of the classroom, on the one hand, and the wider educational goals and the political, social and economic conditions that shape the terrain of classroom practice, on the other. Within such a view the process of teaching and the context in which it is embedded are regarded as problematic.

5.2.3 The Case for Reconceptualization of the Curriculum

Despite the presence of progressive academics in the Faculty, a careful consideration of the evidence analysed in preceding chapters lends support to the view that the dominant form of teacher education has a discernible empirical-analytical orientation. The characteristics of a teacher education model
embedded in such a paradigm have been analysed at a theoretical level in Chapter Two. Subsequent chapters have revealed examples of the way in which the technocratic rationality is represented in the perception of staff and students and in the curriculum and instructional structures of teacher education in the Faculty. It was also shown that, historically, the model can be traced back to its apartheid origins three decades ago, with its ideological basis in Christian National Education and Fundamental Pedagogics. Over the years it became institutionalized in the context of UDW so that a distinct sub-culture of teaching as applied science came to characterize teacher education in the Faculty.

Thus, to a significant degree, problems in teacher education lie in the institutional context in which the Faculty was created and exists today. This is not to deny, however, that part of the problem resides in those lecturers who endorse the applied-science model of teacher education. While some of these conservative academics may indeed be unaware of the political and ideological commitments embedded in such a perspective, it is nevertheless true that teacher education in the Faculty, either by acts of omission or commission, has become a significant agency for the perpetuation and legitimation of an educational status quo and, by implication, an inequitable apartheid social order.

This situation would appear to be an anachronism given the prospect of a "new South Africa" that has become apparent since February 1990, and the reality of a changing student constituency that the Faculty now serves. It, therefore, becomes vitally important that the initiatives forthcoming from progressive academics are given explicit structural recognition and incorporated as an integral part of Faculty policy on teacher education in the context of an impending new social order. What is called for is discourse and debate that have a liberating potential and, concomitantly, implications for progressive, fundamental change.
The next section of this chapter will, accordingly, focus on some of the major factors that will merit consideration for inclusion on the agenda for reconceptualization.

5.3 TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM: DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

The analysis undertaken in Chapters Three and Four dealt explicitly with selected curricular issues and, as a necessary concomitant, with structural contexts. Data for the identification of factors that might underpin the formulation of objectives and strategies for the reconceptualization of the teacher education curriculum will be derived and, where necessary, extrapolated from that analysis. The formulation of development objectives and strategies will be framed within the transformative model of teacher education. The merits of this model relative to two other models have been discussed in an earlier chapter and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that it is only one among the three models that fosters a problematic attitude towards questions pertaining to changes in curricular policies, programmes and practices on the one hand, and structural contexts on the other.

The ensuing identification of factors that will feature on the agenda for reconceptualizing the curriculum will, accordingly, take into consideration two areas of change: curricular and structural. It is submitted that a focus on curricular issues on their own will have relatively little impact on the extent to which programmes and practices can be changed and improved if that focus is not widened to include fundamental structural changes.

In that context, it is submitted, that any debate and discourse on reconceptualizing the curriculum will have to consider a number of factors as constituting key agenda items. These can be
paraphrased to include the following theoretical propositions:

1. **Teacher education should be explicitly recognized as a political and ideological activity.**

The dominant technocratic rationality of the Faculty that sees pre-service preparation programmes and practices in apolitical, value-neutral and procedural terms is conceptually mistaken, more particularly in the context of a changing South Africa in which discrimination on the grounds of race, class and sex will be redressed.

In that regard, there is need for the formulation of an axiological framework within which the aims of teacher education can be clearly articulated.

2. **Concepts of schooling must take into account differing contexts and particularities.**

Current Faculty programmes imply that school is a monolithic concept; but, if cognizance is taken of the enlarged constituency the Faculty now serves, there is not one common school but different types of schooling that respond to the socio-economic conditions and cultural affiliations of the children.

In that regard, more particularly in the African context, it has to be recognized that school life is a cultural arena characterized by contestation, struggle and resistance, where hegemonic and township cultures collide and where there has been an erosion of the culture of learning.

In the light of the aforementioned diversity, it is pertinent to ask how the different components of the Faculty programme - Education subjects, Method subjects and Teaching Practice - give definition and direction to our reasoning about diversity?
3. **The experiences and perceptions of student teachers need to be incorporated as a dynamic element in the curriculum.**

Students bring to their professional education varied preconceptions about teaching, varied definitions of a "good teacher" and expectations for success. The experiences and perceptions have to be interrogated and reinterpreted (where necessary) in a manner which provides students with a more complete appreciation of the professional significance and relevance of educational theory and curriculum theory. Programmes developed in this way would help to foster in students the commitment to becoming active, informed critics of their own experiences rather than merely passive respondents to their professional and occupational situations.

4. **All academic study in a teacher education programme should have professional significance in a context where the various components of the programme - Education subjects, Method Subjects and Teaching Practice - influence and interrelate with one another in a dialectical manner.**

In terms of that criterion a number of the sub-disciplines of Education can be faulted on the grounds of triviality and/or irrelevance, while the fragmentation of the curriculum and the resultant organisation of content into discrete subject areas exacerbates the problem.

Thus the importance of a substantive focus - one that incorporates the dialectical relatedness of knowledge, the learner, society and schooling - to give coherence to the teaching of the sub-disciplines of Education as part of educational theory, and not as separate, isolated subject areas, needs to be urgently addressed.

Also to be questioned is the strong utilitarian focus of a number of Method subjects, which serves to entrench the technocratic approach to teacher education. The emphasis on
techniques and skills as ends in themselves trivializes a fundamental professional component of the course, that should, ideally, be organized within the framework of curriculum theory derived from educational theory.

To resonate with the foregoing, the removal of the utilitarian approach to teaching and its replacement by a more progressive, emancipatory pedagogy needs to be explored.

An emancipatory pedagogy emphasizes a tentativeness to knowledge and a concept of teaching as a dialogical process in which theory and practice are treated as open to dialectical reconstruction through critical reflection and action. Such an approach will make a significant contribution towards countermanding the retrograde practice of defining teachers primarily as technicians.

Relatively, in the organisation of teaching practice, a clear definition and understanding of the role of the school and the co-operating teacher in supervising the work of the student teacher is required. The educative potential of Teaching Practice does not appear to be fully realized in view of the marginal status of teacher education in the school's agenda.

Experience suggests that a number of schools adopt the apprenticeship approach to Teaching Practice. In this context there is an emphasis on the children's learning and a relative lack of attention to the student teachers' learning. There is a need, therefore, to promote the collaborative and mutual exploration of Teaching Practice in terms of which it is understood that the purpose of Teaching Practice is to go beyond the requirement of having student teachers merely modelling the conventional activities of teaching.
Ideally, the Teaching Practice curriculum in that formulation would foster in students a critically reflective attitude which will enable them to evaluate the changing conception of teaching in the context of a society in transition from a reform-apartheid era to a post-apartheid era.

5. The dialectical relationship between curriculum development and staff development needs to be recognized.

Fundamental change in the curriculum cannot be achieved without some concomitant change in the lecturer. The lecturers' professional perspectives of teacher education have powerful implications for the process of curriculum change and for the ways in which curriculum policy is translated into curriculum practice.

In that respect, it would be necessary to remove the structural conditions and concomitant institutional support, tacit or otherwise, that make it possible for lecturers, under the guise of autonomy, to avoid collaboration with their colleagues and, as a consequence of this, to continue to endorse a type of paradigmatic allegiance that runs counter to the progressive route taken by the Rectorate, the official staff association and the general student body at UDW.

It, therefore, needs to be strongly emphasized that there are close relationships between autonomy and the idea of a profession on the one hand, and accountability to the constituencies that the Faculty serves on the other.
6. **Pre-service teacher education should also have a normative function to perform.**

Support must be given to the view that one of the purposes of teacher education is to change the practice of schools, and that to an extent the teacher education programme of the Faculty would be inappropriate for schools as they exist.

The normative character of the curriculum must be understood in that context. The penchant for "pragmatism" in teacher education programmes should not commit teacher educators to sanction everything that appears to produce the desired results. Even successful programmes and practices with long histories need to evaluated periodically. Hence teacher education must have a critical and normative function. Unless the curriculum is to languish and ossify and thereby remain insensitive to changing contexts, we must guard against any tendency to complacently accept existing structures as satisfactory or practically unalterable.

5.4 **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that the theoretical propositions enumerated above constitute some of the key agenda items for the consideration of the Faculty and, indeed, of other tertiary institutions in South Africa that offer teacher education programmes. All of the items raised will, no doubt, contribute to a broader, more encompassing perspective from which to evaluate the significance and relevance of teacher education policies, programmes and practices.

Debate and discourse along the lines envisaged will not only resonate with the concept of a University undergoing transformation but will also make a useful contribution to the vision of a new social order characterized by justice, equality...
and non-exploitative economic relations. If that sounds somewhat utopian, with Maxine Greene (1978: 71) I would like to argue that:

"The concern of teacher educators must remain normative, critical, and even political. Neither the (Faculties of Education) nor the schools can change the social order. Neither (Faculties) nor schools can legislate democracy. But something can be done to empower teachers to reflect upon their own life situations, to speak out in their own ways about the lacks that must be repaired; the possibilities to be acted upon in the name of what they deem decent, humane, and just."
APPENDIX A

STUDY METHODS

While the information upon which the first two chapters of this dissertation is based was derived from an extensive library research programme, data for Chapters Three and Four were obtained from questionnaire surveys and documentary research.

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEYS

1. Students

A pilot survey was conducted before the questionnaire was finalised. This helped in removing certain ambiguities in the wording of some questions and, most importantly, in deciding upon the length of the questionnaire. It was also found that students preferred complete anonymity in answering questions. Thus details pertaining to name, race, and gender were excluded from the questionnaire which in its final form consisted of open-ended and fixed response questions (see Appendix B).

The questionnaire was administered to HDE students registered in the Faculty in 1990. Eighty-six of the one hundred students canvassed submitted returns. The survey was conducted towards the end of the academic year at a time when students, by virtue of having completed both the teaching practice sessions in schools and most of the academic components of the syllabus, would have acquired a reasonable overall view of the course.

2. Staff

Before the questionnaire was finalised, a draft copy was scrutinized by a representative cross-section of the Faculty. In its final form it comprised one fixed-response and three open-ended questions (see Appendix C).
The questionnaire was well received by all thirty-six members of the Faculty and resulted in a hundred per cent response.

3. Presentation of Data

The open-ended nature of most of the questions used in the survey of staff and student opinions, necessitated the coding of responses. The categories used to analyse lecturers' and students' responses were generated from the data themselves. For each open-ended question, the responses were listed, examined and grouped according to similar themes. Only categories listed by at least ten per cent of the respondents were included in the final tabulation. Data presentation was mainly in the form of frequency tabulations and, where appropriate, the frequencies were ranked in terms of a five-point scale.
DOCUMENTARY RESEARCH

Documentary sources consulted in the process of gathering data for the dissertation included the following:

1. Examination Question Papers

Final-year papers pertaining to the 1990 HDE Examination in the academic components of the course were read and scrutinised. This exercise comprised three three-hour papers in Education subjects and twenty-three three-hour papers in Method subjects.

The papers were analysed to ascertain what they revealed about how the lecturers concerned conceptualize teacher education. (For details, see Chapter 4).

2. Teaching Practice Observation Forms

Over four hundred forms completed by lecturers during their observation of lessons taught by students during their second teaching practice session in schools were read and scrutinised. The analysis was undertaken to afford insights into how the lecturers in the Faculty approach teaching practice and, relatedly, what that approach reveals about how they view teacher education.

3. University Calendars and Minutes of Meetings

The calendars were used as sources of information pertaining to departmental structure of the Faculty, staff composition, and the form and content of the various syllabuses.

Personal copies of the Minutes of meetings of the Faculty Board of Education were used to corroborate one's experiential knowledge of the teacher education process acquired over a period of two decades.
Owing to bureaucratic red tape permission to use the Board Minutes (and Senate Minutes) was not readily forthcoming; several attempts to redress the situation proved unsuccessful. Thus, it was not possible to make direct reference to the Minutes in the dissertation.
APPENDIX B
UNIVERSITY OF DURBAN—WESTVILLE
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE: HDE STUDENTS: 1990

******************************************************************************

1. METHOD SUBJECTS

A. (i) List the method subjects you are doing.
(ii) Indicate the importance of each of these method subjects in terms of the contribution it has made to your teaching of the discipline concerned.

Choose one of the following responses.

1. Very Important
2. Important
3. Fairly Important
4. Not very important
5. Unimportant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Subjects</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. What factors did you take into account when deciding on the levels of importance for the above group of method subjects?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
2. OTHER SUBJECTS IN THE CURRICULUM

A. Below is a list of other subjects in the Curriculum. Indicate the importance of each subject in terms of the contribution it has made to your professional growth as a teacher.

Choose one of the following responses:

1. Very important
2. Important
3. Fairly important
4. Not very important
5. Unimportant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Management (Educ. Admin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Studies (Didactics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Usage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-based TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. What factors did you take into account when deciding on the levels of importance for the above group of subjects?

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
3. IMPROVING THE CURRICULUM

A. In your opinion which of the subjects listed in Questions 1 and 2 above can be excluded without making much difference to the course?

B. In what ways do you think the present curriculum could be improved?

4. "A GOOD TEACHER".

Of the several qualities that may characterize "a good teacher" list THREE which you think are most important.

5. SELF-RATING

How do you rate yourself as a teacher?

Indicate by means of a cross (x) in one of the boxes below:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Above average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Slightly above average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Slightly below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **WHAT STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES DID YOU CONSIDER WHEN ANSWERING QUESTION 5 ABOVE?**

**Strengths**

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

**Weaknesses**

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

7. **ARE THERE OTHER MATTERS WHICH YOU WOULD LIKE TO BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE FACULTY WITH A VIEW TO IMPROVING THE CURRICULUM?**

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX C
UNIVERSITY OF DURBAN–WESTVILLE
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
QUESTIONNAIRE: STAFF MEMBERS

NAME OF LECTURER: ..............................................

******************************************************************************

1. AIMS

A. Of the several aims that may characterize a teacher-education programme, which THREE in your opinion are the most important?

1. ........................................................................................................................................................................

2. ........................................................................................................................................................................

3. ........................................................................................................................................................................

B. To what extent are the AIMS listed above applicable to the teacher-education programme currently offered by our Faculty?

Use the following five-point rating scale:

1 ......... 2 ...... 3 ...... 4 .......... 5
(Most applicable) ------------------>(Least applicable).

AIMS | RATING
---|---
AIM 1 |
AIM 2 |
AIM 3 |
2. "A GOOD TEACHER"

Of the several qualities that may characterize "a good teacher", which THREE in your opinion are the most important?

3. CURRICULUM PROBLEMS

What in your opinion are THREE of the major curriculum problems facing teacher education in our Faculty in the decade of the nineties and beyond?

4. ARE THERE OTHER MATTERS WHICH YOU WOULD LIKE TO BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE FACULTY WITH A VIEW TO IMPROVING THE CURRICULUM?
A. PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION

Paper 1

Section 1: Philosophy of Education

(1) Philosophy of education within the educational framework
(2) Aims and field of study
(3) Moral education
(4) Modern trends in educational theory-forming

Section 2: Sociology of Education

(1) Field of study, scope and limits
(2) Sociological concepts with regard to education (including civic education)
(3) Basic trends in sociological perspectives within educational context

Paper 2

Section 1: Empirical Education

(1) Empirical education as a science
(2) The learner: psychological aspects
(3) Processes that affect learning
(4) Intelligence and personality
(5) The exceptional learner
(6) Types of learning
Section 2: Didactics

(1) The nature of didactics
(2) Educational technology
(3) Teaching strategies
(4) Classroom management
(5) Planning an evaluation in the didactic situation
(6) Curriculum

Paper 3

Section 1: History of Education

(1) General history of education
   (a) the place and scope of history of education: a broad view
   (b) education in ancient civilization
   (c) ancient education in the Near and Far East
   (d) Greek education
   (e) Roman education
   (f) Medieval education
   (g) the Renaissance or Reformation or Counter-Reformation
   (h) realism
   (i) naturalism
   (j) the psychological movement
   (k) the 20th century child-centred education.

(2) South African education: broad trends in education in South Africa during the 20th century with specific reference to the establishment of the Division of Education (Department of Indian Affairs).

Section 2: Administration of Education

(1) Theory of the administration of education as a discipline
(2) A survey of the South African system of education, with emphasis on Indian education
(3) Indian Education Act, No. 61 of 1965 (and amendments)
(4) Duties and responsibilities: principal, deputy-principal and head of department
(5) Teaching as a profession
(6) Differentiated education
(7) Community-cum-school activities
(8) Organization and administration of physical education and recreational pursuits
(9) A student survey of aspects of organization of particular schools.

B. PROFESSIONAL COURSES

Special Method Courses

These courses have been designed to provide activities that will enable students in the respective school subjects to -

(1) Formulate and use instructional objectives
(2) Evaluate the relevant subject syllabuses
(3) Prepare schemes of work
(4) Select and use a variety of teaching/learning strategies
(5) Select or develop, and use, appropriate teaching/learning materials
(6) Study and apply theories relevant to the teaching/learning process
(7) Prepare and present appropriate learning experiences in the practice teaching situation
(8) Construct, evaluate and use tests and examinations
(9) Identify areas of difficulty and devise learning opportunities to resolve them
(10) Form concepts of the relationship between the components of teaching/learning programme in terms of -
    (a) aims and objectives
    (b) selection of content
    (c) methodology
    (d) assessment

Throughout each course emphasis will be placed on the need for flexibility, and also the regular updating to teaching/learning strategies.
C. TEACHING PRACTICE COURSES

Each of the following courses is designed to integrate theory and practice and to focus on the professional and personal development of the student. The details for the various courses in Teaching Practice are contained in the Guide to Teaching Practice and the respective manuals. All courses are continuously assessed.

School-Based Activities

(1) Observation of and reporting on classroom management, practice and school organisation
(2) Preparation, presentation and evaluation of lessons under the guidance and supervision of qualified practising teachers and university lecturers/tutors.

Campus-Based Activities

(1) Teaching, learning and communication
(2) Micro-teaching
(3) Micro-computers: awareness, literacy and elementary programming of lessons
(4) Extra-classroom activities e.g. sports organization
(5) Audio-visual education

D. ENGLISH USAGE

Aim The aim of the course is to equip the student with an adequate command of language to enable him to teach general subjects through the medium of English.
Section A

As the student is required to express himself, both orally and in writing, logically, coherently, concisely and in a grammatically correct form, selected works embracing Poetry, Prose and Drama are prescribed. The prime purposes of the study of these works of literary merit are for -

(a) Language enrichment
(b) An understanding of Western values and thinking
(c) Idiomatic expressions pertaining to everyday speech

Section B

Special consideration is given to -

(a) Comprehension
(b) Speech - clarity, projection, pronunciation and speech rhythms
(c) The art of appreciation through listening (recorded speeches, play and prose extracts).

Source: UDW Calendar: 1990.
APPENDIX E

UNIVERSITY OF DURBAN-WESTVILLE
HDE EXAMINATIONS: OCTOBER/NOVEMBER 1990
PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION

PAPER 1: PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Time: 3 hours
Marks: 100

Answer three questions. Choose one from each section. All sections are of equal value.

SECTION A

QUESTION 1

"The point is that philosophy is an activity; it is something you do rather than a body of subject matter you study."

(R. BARROW)

What implications does the above statement have for your role as a future teacher?

QUESTION 2

How would you use a sociological approach to explain the existence of inequalities in education in South Africa? Illustrate your answer by referring to some current issues which have been highlighted in the debate on inequality.

SECTION B

QUESTION 3

"In itself freedom is neither a goal nor an ideal. It is the potential for action."
What are the educational implications of this statement? Discuss this with reference to the existentialist's concepts of freedom and choice.

QUESTION 4

(a) You are being interviewed for a post of lecturer in education at the University of Durban-Westville. One of the questions put to you is to express your views on academic freedom. Give an account of your answer.

OR

(b) State the main characteristics of the Moral Development Model as expounded by Kohlberg. Evaluate its application for classroom practice.

SECTION C

QUESTION 5

(a) The different perspectives that are used by sociologists of education give rise to very different viewpoints on education and society. Select two contrasting perspectives and explain how each has influenced our views about schools and society.

OR

(b) Examine critically some of the assumptions underlying Marxist theory, and consider the relevance of this theory for understanding certain problems evident in schools today.

QUESTION 6

(a) How would you use the cultural approach to identify some important social and educational aspects of schooling? Discuss the value of adopting this approach to a study of the schools as a social institution.
OR

(b) "Bias is a characteristic of the curriculum, including the way in which it is taught." Discuss critically.

PAPER 2: EMPIRICAL EDUCATION AND CURRICULUM STUDIES (DIDACTICS)

Time: 3 hours

Marks: 100

ANSWER FOUR QUESTIONS: TWO FROM SECTION A AND TWO FROM SECTION B

SECTION A: EMPIRICAL EDUCATION

QUESTION 1: 25 MARKS

(a) According to D. Felker (1974) the self-concept serves three functions: it maintains inner consistency, it determines the interpretation of experiences, and it provides expectation. Discuss these functions.

(b) (i) What does specific learning disability mean?

(ii) What are some of the characteristics of learning-disabled pupils?

(c) Discuss some of the important considerations in the teaching of principles.

QUESTION 2: 25 MARKS

(a) Write explanatory notes on ONE of the following:

(i) The inductive and deductive approaches to teaching concepts

(ii) The psychoeducational features of Mild and Moderate Mental Retardation
(b) There are characteristic differences among people in the ways they prefer to organize and process information. Discuss how these differences, called cognitive styles, affect children's performance in schools.

QUESTION 3 : 25 MARKS

Although much is made of the "controversy" between Bruner and Ausubel over reception versus discovery learning, a closer look reveals that the two are far more alike than different. Discuss the overall message of both views and then highlight the similarities in the two viewpoints.

SECTION B : CURRICULUM STUDIES (DIDACTICS)

QUESTION 4 : 25 MARKS

"Reality is not static, it is a process undergoing constant transformation." Paulo Freire.

Critically discuss the consequences of the above statement for teaching.

QUESTION 5 : 25 MARKS

"Sometimes I get so bored at school when our teacher keeps on explaining, like with maths problems. I already understand it and then I just have to keep quiet and listen again and again." Shireen, 13 years old.

Discuss this quote with reference to both:

1) your findings from the interview you conducted with a child during Teaching Practice

and

2) "differentiated education".
QUESTION 6 : 25 MARKS

Explain the differences between a subject-centred curriculum and a student-centred curriculum. What do you consider the best option for teaching and why?

PAPER 3 : HISTORY OF EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT
(ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION)

Time : 3 hours
Marks : 100

ANSWER FOUR QUESTIONS - TWO FROM EACH SECTION.
ALL QUESTIONS ARE OF EQUAL VALUE

SECTION A

1. (a) Describe the contrasting features of old Spartan and Athenian systems of education in respect of the following aspects:
   (i) Aim of Education
   (ii) Educative Agencies
   (iii) Role and Status of Education
   (iv) Content of Education

   (b) If you had the choice of attending a Spartan or Athenian school, which would you choose? Support your answer with ONE critically argued valid reason.

2. Consider critically the extent to which Vittorino de Feltre can be regarded as the first modern educator.

3. Evaluate critically Monastic education in terms of its contribution to the individual and to community life.
SECTION B

4. Over the last eighty years, the science of administration has evolved in three phases: (1) classical organisational thought (1900), (2) human relations approach (1930), and (3) behavioural science approach (1950).

Evaluate critically developments in each of these phases and comment on their significance for educational administration.

5. Examine the concept "People's Education" with specific reference to:

(i) its origins
(ii) definitional issues
(iii) its process and
(iv) its role in the future

6. The position of the Head of Department of a school has evolved from a purely administrative one to a professionally energising function. Discuss your perceptions of this important management position. Include in your discussions personal observations made during teaching practice.
APPENDIX F

UNIVERSITY OF DURBAN–WESTVILLE
HDE EXAMINATIONS: OCTOBER/NOVEMBER 1990
METHOD SUBJECTS

SAMPLE OF QUESTIONS (FIRST SET)

ACCOUNTING:

Discuss the importance of good penmanship in Accounting and indicate how you would deal with untidy and illegible written work by your pupils.

ARABIC:

Describe in detail how you would teach a lesson on the prescribed Quranic Surahs to a Standard 8 class.
Enumerate the different teaching aids you would use.

BIBLICAL STUDIES:

Plan the teaching of a 35/50 min. lesson in one of the topics suggested below. Your plan should show clearly that you have taken into account:

(i) The Objectives
(ii) Opportunities for pupil involvement
(iii) Resources you would use

Topics:

(i) The Temptations of Jesus (Matt 4:1-10)
(ii) "The Lord's Prayer (Luke 11:1-4)
(iii) Jesus' First Miracle (John 2:1-11)
ECONOMICS:

Write an account on tests in Economics under the following headings:

Compilation of the test paper;
Marking memorandum;
Analysis of the results;
Remedial measures.

Illustrate your answer with suitable examples.

HISTORY:

Pictures are the most obvious form of visual aid to learning history and also the most easily obtained. In spite of this there are schools where hardly a picture can be found, while in others which do keep collections of pictures they are not well used. It is one thing to collect pictures; it is quite another thing to turn them to account in the work of school and classroom. This requires an understanding of their use. Discuss the points to be borne in mind by a history teacher when:

(a) selecting pictures
(b) using pictures
(c) displaying pictures

MUSIC:

Would you advise your student to buy a wooden or plastic recorder? Give reasons for your answer.
PHYSICAL EDUCATION :

Discuss the different processes of administration and relate them to the organization of a swimming gala.

TAMIL :

Write an essay on the advantages of a library.
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE:

On the international front, science educators are beginning to realize the importance of constructivism in teaching and learning science.

What is the constructivist view of learning science and especially Biology?

Describe the constructivist model for learning which has been developed and proposed by the Childrens' Learning in Science (CLIS) Project. What are some of the problems associated with the implication of this model?

How does the Osborne Generative Model differ from the CLIS model?

ENGLISH:

Two poetry lesson transcripts are given. They were prepared at different times by different persons. Read them carefully and then:

1. Evaluate each lesson
   (a) as if you were the teacher concerned, and
   (b) as if you were a visiting lecturer.

2. Give a rational explanation for your approaches in
   (a) and (b) above.

3. State, with reasons, which you consider to be the better lesson preparation.
GENERAL SCIENCE:

Learning in school is often treated as "the transmission of verbalisations" or "being the same as the changing of behaviour". These views are rejected by others who claim that "pupils construct their own meaning".

Briefly describe the main implications of each of these three views for the learning and teaching of General Science. Then present a case for what you think is the best approach of the three or the best synthesis of approaches for science teaching.

GEOGRAPHY:

A socially critical paradigm enables us to reconceptualize the nature of geography teaching.

Examine the validity of this viewpoint.

MATHEMATICS:

Curriculum development in mathematics is initiated following certain pressures for change (Howson, Keitel and Kilpatrick, 1981).

(a) Describe a curriculum development project which you have studied, indicating clearly the problem which initiated the development. To what extent was the project successful in meeting the need and solving the problem?

(b) Choose a second mathematics curriculum development project in a different country. Compare and contrast this project with the one you have described in (a), mentioning pressures, barriers and the degree of success of this project.
PHYSICAL SCIENCE:

The natural environment can provide an appropriate venue and opportunity for cross-curricular teaching. How can physical science be brought into such cross-curricular teaching? Justify your answer using appropriate examples.

SPEECH AND DRAMA:

Design a movement syllabus for a standard eight class which takes into consideration pupils in a post-apartheid society.

URDU:

The central premise of the Acculturation Model is:

...second language acquisition is just one aspect of acculturation and the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language (Schumann 1978: 34).

To what extent does this Model apply to the Urdu situation in South Africa?

ZULU:

Write an essay on the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Approach in which you discuss:

(a) The circumstances which led to its development.
(b) The theoretical underpinnings.
(c) The advantages and disadvantages of the approach.
(d) The teaching techniques and methods consistent with CLT.
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