Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers in Clermont towards Participation in Curriculum Development.

by

Vuyiswa Joyce Hlatshwayo

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education (Curriculum Studies)

in the

Department of Education
University of Natal
Durban

August 1997

Declaration of Originality

I declare that this dissertation is my own work and that all sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

V. J. Hlatshwayo

_____

Durban, August 1997.

Acknowledgements.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the following:

The supervisor of this dissertation, Mr Mike Graham-Jolly, for his assistance, advice and guidance.

The Principals and teachers of Clermont, in particular, for their willingness and co-operation and also for making this study possible.

My family, especially my mother Peggy Hogana, for her support and understanding during the course of the study.

My friend, Sbonelo Mthiyane, for his encouragement and assistance throughout the study.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

ABSTRACT

Recent Policy documents, such as the ANC Draft Framework on Education and Training of 1994, the White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 and the Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education and Training of 1996 have proposed broad participation by major stakeholders, in particular teachers, in the processs of curriculum planning and decision-making. This represents a major shift from past practices which limited teacher decision-making to the classroom. These proposals are made against the background that South African education is undergoing a period of transition from a system which was driven by apartheid policies to a more progressive and democratic system.

This study sought to investigate the responses of teachers in Clermont, a semi-urban black settlement in Durban, to the policy proposals which state that their participation in curriculum planning and development should be extended. It also aimed to explore their thinking concerning the implications such proposals may have for them.
A non-proportional random stratified sample of teachers in promotion and non-promotion posts was drawn to survey teacher responses to these proposals. A mailed "self administered" questionnaire was used as the research instrument for this study.

The major findings which emerged from the survey are:

Teachers in Clermont believe that they have a major role to play and that role should not be limited to the classroom. They regard decisions made about curriculum as directly affecting them. Despite their support for extended participation in curriculum planning and development they feel they are not adequately prepared for that role.
They regard themselves as having inadequate knowledge of the theory and practice of curriculum. In particular, they think they lack skills in designing and planning curricula because they were not adequately prepared during their teacher training, as well as the fact that they were not given such opportunities in the past. Teachers expressed the view that participation in curriculum development could facilitate their professional development. Teachers also acknowledge the importance of the contribution of other stakeholders such as parents and pupils in making curriculum decisions.

In the light of the major findings the study recommends the following:

A holistic approach to teacher development should be adopted which provides teachers with basic skills and concepts in curriculum and curriculum development through seminars and workshops. In the context of the implementation of a new curriculum which is outcomes-based, workshops and seminars could facilitate the process of introducing the new curriculum and also enabling teachers to be critical of their practice. In order to create a favourable climate for teacher development, teacher development must be integrated with whole school development through, for example, in-service training which is school-focused. To facilitate whole school development the creation of forums, such as teacher forums where teachers could discuss current debates, and learning forums involving teachers, pupils and parents where problems facing schools would be explored are recommended.

In the longer term pre-service teacher education should be restructured to include training in curriculum development in order to adequately prepare student teachers in curriculum planning and development. To bridge the gap between schools and colleges of education, universities and the communities, partnerships between schools, universities, colleges of education, and non-governmental organisations, as well as partnerships between schools, communities and the Department of Education at provincial level should be created.

CHAPTER 1

Background to the study.

1.1 Introduction.

King and van den Berg (1991) have argued that the process of curriculum development is inherently political. They state that it involves decision-making on what is to be taught, in what ways, by whom and in which contexts. Decision-making on what is to be taught involves asking a range of questions like, what knowledge is to be taught?, whose knowledge is it? and who shall control the selection and distribution of that knowledge? Decision-making on how that knowledge is to be imparted and by whom relates to questions about the kinds of relationships to be fostered between teachers and learners as well as the quality of teachers needed. Decision-making on these issues has to recognise the varying contexts in which curriculum is experienced. The varying contextual factors such as the infrastructure, geographical location and the existing culture of teaching and learning can determine success or failure of the curriculum. King and van den Berg have also pointed out that the question of context relates to the availability of resources and the ethos of the school and the classroom.

During the apartheid era in South Africa the process of curriculum decision-making lacked transparency. It was highly centralised and largely non-participatory (NEPI, 1992). The Nationalist Party goverment's policy of Apartheid has been the major cause of the lack of broad participation. The policy of Apartheid promoted racial segregation and was intended to ensure the provision and maintenance of privilege for a white minority group. The policy of Apartheid found expression in education through the ideology of Christian National Education (CNE). The CNE policy served to justify a separate and an inferior education system for other racial groups, especially that for black South Africans (Enslin, 1984).

CNE policy stated that education should have a Christian and National character. The education system had to be separated and differentiated in order to reflect the different national groups in South Africa (Ashley, 1989). The ideology of CNE and the doctrine of Fundamental Pedagogics, a body of educational theory which was claimed to be a universal science of education, defined the aims of education, the role of the teacher, the nature of the learner, the role of the parent as well as the content of the syllabi (Ashley, 1989). Enslin (1984) argues that educational institutions which have promoted Fundamental Pedagogics have served to reproduce the ideology of CNE by providing their students with an ideology which helped to prepare them for the role they would play as teachers, bureaucrats and professional ideologists.

Curriculum within this framework of CNE Policy and Fundamental Pedagogics has been narrowly defined as a " plan or teaching-learning programme designed in the light of certain aims" (DEC:House of Assembly, 1988). Consequently, the practice of curriculum development has been mainly concerned with the revision of core syllabuses which has masked the political and ideological dimensions of the curriculum development process (King and van den Berg, 1991). Furthermore, the process of curriculum development was dominated by government bureaucrats and limited the role of other stakeholders such as teachers, parents, learners and the business community (NEPI, 1992).

The role of the teacher has been limited to the implementation of curriculum developed centrally. The process of subject syllabus revision has been done in subject committees within provincial Departments of Education and has had to be approved by curriculum committees at national level (NEPI, 1992). As a result, teachers in South Africa have been operating, at best, as "restricted professionals" (Hoyle, 1974), that is, their role has been limited to teaching duties, knowledge of their subject content and teaching methods.

South African literature on curriculum planning and development has re-inforced this view of a limited decision-making role for teachers which is confined to the classroom by emphasising a narrow definition of curriculum development as consisting of planning, designing, implementation and evaluation with teacher involvement only featuring in the implementation phase (Kruger, 1980; Carl, 1987, 1995). In practice most decision-making in curriculum was made by bureaucrats and government officials.

The dawning of a new political dispensation in South Africa in the early 1990's was accompanied by the emergence of education policy documents, for example, the ANC Draft Framework of 1994 and White Paper of 1995, as well as more progressive literature such as the work of King and van den Berg (1991) and the NEPI report of 1992 which emphasised the need for democratic forms of curriculum development. It was strongly emphasised in the policy documents that teacher participation should be a fundamental principle in the process of curriculum development and that curriculum change was largely dependant on teachers.

1.2 Aim of the study.

The aim of this study is to investigate the responses of secondary school teachers in Clermont towards proposals, in the White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 and the Curriculum Framework of 1996, that teacher participation in curriculum development should be extended and not limited to the classroom. The study will also attempt to ascertain teachers' perceptions of the implications of these proposals.

Clermont teachers were chosen for the study because of the researcher's knowledge of the area and because the existence of only six secondary schools enabled all schools to be included without making the study unmanageable. The greater number of the primary schools precluded their inclusion in the study. The other

in Clermont it would be easier to obtain access to the schools because of her knowledge of some of the Principals. Clermont is a semi-urban settlement in Durban. It is located inland on the outskirts of the Pinetown-New Germany industrial area. Clermont is known to have an active and progressive teacher union and, as a result, teachers are likely to be aware of the fact that there are changes that may be taking place in education policy.

1.3 Motivation for the study.

The proposals on curriculum development in recent policy documents motivated an interest in knowing what the teachers' responses are with regards to these proposals and the implications the proposals may have for them. The White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 commits the government to a full participatory and democratic process of curriculum development whereby teachers will have to work collaboratively with other stakeholders, such as subject advisers, subject specialists, researchers, and teacher educators. The document also suggests the creation of broad curriculum frameworks and core curricula which would allow for greater school-based "micro" adaptations. Not only will the teachers be broadly represented at the national level, they will have a greater role to play at regional and local levels as well.

The Curriculum Framework of 1996 proposes a partnership of teachers and other stakeholders in curriculum and materials development. It also suggests an integrative approach to curriculum development and teacher development. These documents, which are discussed further in Chapter 2, suggest a major shift from past conceptions and practices of curriculum development. Since there has been little involvement of teachers in the past, as well as the fact that very little was done to keep teachers informed of the curriculum development process, it was considered important to establish whether teachers are prepared to take on the role of "extended professionals" (Hoyle, 1974). This concept of " extended professionality" is defined further in Chapter 2 of this study.

1.4 Approach to the study.

Chapter 2 of the study consists of a review of the literature. This section provides a conceptual and a theoretical framework for the study. Different understandings of curriculum and curriculum development are explored from both the international and South African literature. Grundy's (1987) application of Habermas' knowledge constitutive interests to the analysis of different forms of curriculum development and the implications they have for teacher participation are also explored. The concept of the " extended professional" as against the " restricted professional", as defined by Hoyle (1974), are also explained in this chapter. There is also an analysis of past and present policy documents as well as a presentation of arguments in favour of teacher participation.

The last part of the chapter looks at possible alternative forms of curriculum development in relation to what the policy documents are proposing. Chapter 3 of the study provides an account of how the study was designed and conducted. Under "design of the study", the methodology and the research instrument used, as well as the sample, are explained. Under "conduct of the study", the process followed in carrying out the study is explained. The limitations and problems in conducting the study are looked at in this chapter and also at the beginning of chapter 4. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the responses by the teachers. The analysis is descriptive and is presented through tables and brief summaries as well as providing personal interpretations in the context of the literature reviewed. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the findings. Chapter 5 provides conclusions and recommendations drawn from the study.

CHAPTER 2

A Review of Literature.

2.1 Introduction

Curriculum is considered to be a problematic concept, that is, it is understood in various ways by various people. This section looks at various perspectives on curriculum and curriculum development from both the international and local literature. It is hoped that these perspectives on curriculum and curriculum development will help in identifying emerging issues and drawing implications in relation to teacher participation in curriculum development.

2.2 Different Conceptions of Curriculum and Curriculum Development.

Examples from the international literature and South African literature reveal that the word "curriculum" is conceived in many ways with each definition having its own emphasis. In the international literature the following views on curriculum are stated: Barrow (1984, p.5) states that to some curriculum is the "prescribed content" others define it as the "end results" or "educational objectives" or the "principles of procedure". He adds on the definition provided by Hirst (1968) that curriculum is a "programme of activities by teachers and pupils designed so that pupils will attain certain educational and other schooling ends or objectives". Pratt (1980) cited in Barrow (1984, p.5), defines curriculum as an "organised set of education and training intentions".

Stenhouse (1975, p.4) clarifies the different conceptions of curriculum by dividing them into two views. One view is that curriculum is seen as an intention, a plan, an idea about what one would like to happen in schools. The second view is that curriculum is what does in fact happen in schools, the existing state of affairs. He regards earlier conceptions of curriculum and curriculum development as being inadequate. He provides a more liberal definition of curriculum as :

> An attempt to communicate essential principles and features of an educational proposal in an accessible form for public scrutiny and debate (ibid).

This definition represents a shift from the earlier definitions which narrowly focus on one dimension of the curriculum. The conception of curriculum shifts from that of product to process, it becomes a proposal responsive to differing realities.

South African literature also reveals these different conceptions of curriculum and thus different views on what curriculum development is.

Kruger (1980) cited in Mabitsela (1988, p.19) defines curriculum as:

> the selected and ordered teaching content which brings about a programme of teaching ....

Tunmer (1981, p.1) describes the curriculum as the:

> the whole spectrum of compulsory and optional activities which are formally planned for students.

Kruger (1980) cited in Mabitsela (1988,p.18) building from his notion of curriculum, defines curriculum development as:

> an improved learning programme by means of dissemination and utilisation it is a link between curriculum design and curriculum evaluation.

These definitions can be classified as representing a traditional view of curriculum and curriculum development which results in highly centralised models of curriculum development with planning following a linear hierarchical pattern operating from top to bottom. Kruger's model looks similar to the Havelock's (1971) American Research, Design and Dissemination (R,D&D) model which was strongly criticised for its limited teacher role, involving mainly "experts" and development without reference to context.

Carl (1995, p.38) regards curriculum development as similar to what he calls "curriculation" which he defines as:

> the systematic and effective planning action during which components such as, interalia, objectives, goals, situation analysis, selection and classification of content, selection and classification of teaching experiences, planning of teaching methods and teaching media, planning of the instructional learning situation, implementation and pupil evaluation figure strongly.

King and van den Berg (1991, p.2) provide a broader view of curriculum, which they define as the "totality of experiences people have in schools". In the NEPI Report on Curriculum (1992, p.1) curriculum is defined as:

> the teaching and learning activities and experiences which are provided by schools.

Included in these activities are the aims, objectives, selection of content, ways of teaching and learning, relationships between teachers and learners as well as forms of assessment and evaluation. This view represents a shift from earlier restricted views on curriculum.

The conclusion which can be drawn from these definitions is that earlier conceptions of curriculum and curriculum development were restricted to teaching and learning activities, designed for teachers and pupils. The more progressive definitions are more inclusive in that they include the whole school experience.

2.3 An Application of Habermas' Knowledge Constitutive Interests to An Analysis of Different Conceptions of Curriculum and Curriculum Development as well as their Implications for Teacher Participation.

Grundy (1987) uses Habermas's three knowledge constitutive interests to examine different forms of curriculum development and the level of teacher participation in them.

2.3.1 The "Technical" Knowledge Constitutive Interest.

Grundy states that the "technical interest" arises out of a basic human interest of wanting to control and manage the environment. This interest is based on the "positivist" assumption of knowledge and reality. Knowledge is said to be "out

there" existing independent of the human mind. It is viewed as a commodity to be delivered to others. There is an assumption of the existence of a single reality and a single truth based on scientific evidence. The value perspectives in any given situation are ignored. The technical interest gives rise to instrumental action governed by technical rules based on empirical knowledge. As a result of this interest, there is a belief that a certain structure of rules, if followed, can promote learning and change. The objectives model of curriculum development can be said to be informed by this interest whereby pupils' learning is controlled so that it conforms to original objectives. Curriculum within this interest is defined as a product or a plan with step by step procedures to be followed. Curriculum development is dominated by "experts" and government bureaucracts. It is an in-house process without consideration of various contextual factors because teachers and the public are not part of the process.

For example, Carl (1986), Tanner & Tanner (1980) and Kruger (1980) take the view that curriculum development involves research, design, development, dissemination, implementation, and evaluation following one another sequentially. Teacher participation only features in the stage of implementation, especially in the classroom when teachers decide what to teach and how to teach. Within the framework provided by Grundy such theorists could be said to be oriented towards the "technical" interest.

Implications of this interest for teacher participation are that it allows a very limited role. Little or no participation is allowed at national and provincial levels or even at the local level except in the classroom. Teachers become functionaries or implementors of the official curriculum.

2.3.2 The "Humanist" Knowledge Constitutive Interest.

Grundy (1987) states that the "humanist" interest is also referred to as the "practical" interest. The "practical" interest is based on the relativist view of knowledge and reality. Knowledge is said to be the construction of the human mind and, as a result, subjective, value-laden and provisional.

In this view, there are multiple realities as there are multiple value perspectives. Curriculum is defined as a hypothesis or a proposal to be tested in practice. Teachers, as practitioners, are expected to interpret the broad goals and objectives of the curriculum in their classrooms and decide what is appropriate. The focus is on how practitioners define their given situation and how they are affected by it.

Stenhouse (1975) and Schwab (1983) are amongst those theorists who are orientated towards the practical interest. Schwab (1983) cites teachers, learners and subject-matter as crucial to curriculum deliberation and decision-making. Implications for curriculum development and teacher participation relate to greater professionalism by placing a stronger emphasis on teacher judgement. Curriculum development entails teachers engaging in deliberation guided by personal judgement. Theory does not prescribe action to be taken but gives guidance. The focus of the teacher is not only on achieving goals, but on the meaningfulness of the learning experience for the students.

2.3.3 The "Emancipatory" Knowledge Constitutive Interest.

The " emancipatory " interest is grounded in critical theory. Transformation of one's consciousness, that is, transformation of the way one perceives and acts in the world is the prerequisite in operating within this interest (Grundy,1987).

Critical thought which fosters awareness of false consciousness is central to the emancipatory interest. Knowledge is viewed, as in the humanist interest, as a construction of the human mind and is provisional and contested. People informed by an emancipatory interest in their search for understanding and improvement challenge the very power relationships upon which the system is based.

Within the emancipatory interest, curriculum is a form of praxis, that is, it develops out of the process of participatory action and reflection. Curriculum development means the involvement of practitioners in a reciprocal and integrated process of

planning, acting and evaluating. This form of curriculum development is problematic and risky. It demands collaboration and power sharing between teachers and learners where teachers and learners become equal partners. Teaching and learning becomes a two way process, it involves a dialogue between a teacher and the learners. This interest is aimed at liberating, empowering, and developing an ability to engage in social action informed by critical thought. Implications drawn from this interest are that teachers have got a right and a responsibility to contribute to curriculum development. In Freire's (1972) work, informed by the emancipatory interest, he points out that the roles of the curriculum developer and curriculum implementer merge because the process is driven by practitioners themselves. The relationship of the teacher and learners becomes redefined by a process of curriculum negotiation. Curriculum development and teacher development become integrated.

These three knowledge constitutive interests result in different understandings of curriculum and different practices of curriculum development. The three knowledge constitutive interests are helpful in analysing the different conceptions of curriculum and curriculum development from the international and local literature earlier discussed.

2.4 Legislation, Reports and Statements prior to 1994.

The Policy documents, Reports and Statements discussed in this section provide examples of how curriculum development has been conceived and practised in the past in South Africa.

The National Policy for General Education Affairs Act of 1984 (cited in Ashley, 1989) states that education should be divided into "general affairs" and "own affairs". The Department of National Education (DNE) was a " general affair" responsible for the general policy which was to be applied by all population groups. The Departments of Education and Culture (DEC) for Whites, Coloureds, and Indians were "own affair" structures. Blacks outside the self- governing states were regarded as a "general affair". This reflected the Afrikaner ideology of apartheid, which ensured that

education was used to achieve the goals of the system of Apartheid. The National Education Act of 1967 (later amended to Act, No.102 of 1986) proclaimed that schools controlled by the DEC (House of Assembly) were to have a

> Christian National Character and that White education at provincial level should have wide representation of interested parties including officials of the education departments, parents, the teaching profession, employers and others (Ashley, 1989, p.16).

King and van den Berg (1991) and the NEPI report on Curriculum (1992) argue that curriculum development processes were dominated by white education structures both nationally and provincially. They point out that these structures determined the national core curriculum and other departments had to adapt to curriculum developed by the DEC (House of Assembly). The South African Council of Education (SACE) and the Committee of the Heads of Education (CHED) were the two bodies responsible for formulating curriculum policy with the Minister of Education. The SACE had 20 "experts" and four persons from the organised teaching profession appointed by the Minister.

On the other hand, CHED consisted of the Minister of National Education, the Head of the Department of Education and Training and the Head of one of the white provincial departments (King and van den Berg, 1991). It becomes clear from statements presented by both King and van den Berg (1991) and the NEPI report (1992) that the curriculum development process was carried on outside public debate, it was non-participatory as it did not involve the large population of teachers, pupils, parents, and the business community. It was dominated by government "experts" and bureaucrats.

Curriculum and the process of curriculum development have been narrowly conceived. This conception is revealed when looking at Information Paper No. 21 on Curriculum Development published by the DEC of the House of Assembly (1988, p.3) which has the following definitions on curriculum and curriculum development:

> **Curriculum is a teaching-learning programme or plan, which is designed in the light of certain aims and which contains at least selected and organised content**

and curriculum development is defined as

> **encompassing all the actions related to the scientifically valid planning, designing, testing, refinement, implementation, evaluation and further adaptation of the curriculum.**

These definitions suggest a centralised curriculum development process which has weaknesses because of ignoring many important issues such as the question of the impact of varying contextual factors on curriculum; the issue of teacher development through extended participation in curriculum development as it relates to the question of empowerment (Grundy, 1987) and also as it relates to teachers' professional status (Hoyle, 1974).

South African curriculum theorist Carl (1986) tries to illustrate a view of curriculum development which consists of four phases which follow one another sequentially, that is, the design, dissemination, implementation and evaluation, and that teacher participation strongly features at the third stage of implementation. With reference to setting a hierarchy of seven curriculum areas, he states that in each of these areas there are various bodies and persons to participate. The curriculum areas are as follows:

* **View of life (philosophical aspects) as an influence on curriculum aspects;**
* **Educational legislation;**
* **Planning of school phases and school types;**
* **Syllabus development;**
* **School curriculum development;**
* **Extended or more comprehensive subject curriculum development;**
* **Curriculum development in the classroom (Carl,1987, p.121; Carl 1995, p.267).**

Carl (1987) argues that the role of the teacher becomes less as one moves from the more specific issues of the classroom to broader areas and issues. This view as expressed by Carl has dominated the past South African thinking on curriculum

development, as analysed in the NEPI report on Curriculum and by King and van den Berg (1991).

2.5 Arguments in Favour of Teacher Participation.

Hoyle and Megarry (1980, p. 44) define the term "professionality" as the:

> teachers' attitudes towards their professional practice as well as the degree of knowledge and skills they engage in that practice.

Hoyle (1974) draws a distinction between two forms of professionality, the "restricted" and "extended". His distinction provides a useful framework for analyzing teachers' roles and practices in South Africa.

Hoyle' s (1974) definition of a "restricted" professional refers to a situation whereby teachers' practice is intuitive, classroom-focused, experiential rather than based on theory. Teachers in this context have little to do with the wider issues of policy and decision-making. They value privacy in their classroom and do not compare their activities with that of other teachers.

On the other hand, he defines an "extended " professional as a teacher who locates his/her activities beyond those of the classroom to include the broader issues of policy and decision-making. S/he works with others in the profession, compares and evaluates his/her work with that of others. S/he has an interest in theory and current developments in education. S/he becomes involved in professional activities and in-service work. Given the preceding section on legislation, reports and statements prior to 1994 in South Africa, Hoyle's (1974) conception of "restricted" professional is closely related to the role which has been played by teachers in South Africa, except that in the current absence in some areas of a culture of teaching and learning there are teachers who could not even be regarded as "restricted" professionals.

Carson (1984) and Harlen (1977) argue that teacher participation is crucial because teachers possess the knowledge, experience and closeness in the social circumstances of the learners. Rubin (1987) sees teacher participation as a form of staff

development and states that it becomes personally satisfying to teachers and contributes to the professionalization of teaching.

Lichstenstein, McLaughin and Knudesen (cited in Fullan, 1991) argue that empowered teachers possess three forms of knowledge, that is, knowledge of their professional community, knowledge of education policy and knowledge of their subject area. They argue that teacher participation in curriculum development encourages teachers' professional development. In a study conducted by Punch and Bayona (1990, p.264) in Tanzania overwhelming support by teachers for the need to participate in curriculum decision-making was found. Some of the reasons given by the Tanzanian teachers can be classified as "technical" as they relate to efficiency and effectiveness. These are that participation would enable them to solve problems promptly; participation would enable them to be duty-conscious and committed to the curriculum and its implementation.

Other reasons relate to broader issues of extended teacher roles and empowerment. These are that participation would enable them to be more conversant with policy and intention; participation would encourage and motivate them to innovate and apply their own initiatives in implementing the curriculum; participation would bridge the gap and relieve tension between them and the authorities since major curriculum reforms can be decided co-operatively; it would open the way to searching for and assessing alternative strategies in teaching.

A number of constraints are reflected in the literature both locally and internationally (Carson, 1984; Harlen, 1977; Fullan ,1993 and Punch and Bayona, 1990). These constraints can be classified as relating to initial teacher education which does not equip teachers for continuous development, inadequate in-service training, teaching responsibilities which put limitations on teachers' time and the bureaucratic nature of the system of education.

Nicholls (1983) points out that extended teacher participation brings in additional work to normal teaching duties and may be rejected if teachers are not allowed time to manage this extra workload. Duke and Showers (1980, pp.93-106) found that

reasons for not wishing to participate in decision-making relate to loss of autonomy. Teachers think they would be compromising their traditional authority over what happens in their classrooms if they engaged in a process of shared decision-making with colleagues as well as non-teachers. They further state that teachers fear that once they become party to decisions made this could undermine the collective bargaining power of teacher unions.

In an investigation into "Constraints on the further professional development of teachers at Indian secondary schools in Greater Durban" Maharaj (1991) cites the following reasons: lack of consultation, centralised control or prescriptive policies of the Department; the management style of principals, that is Principals not heeding suggestions of teachers; hostile relationship between teachers in non-promotion posts and the management staff at schools, and lack of opportunities for teachers to get involved. These reasons can be said to relate to the issue already raised, that of the organisation of the management structure in the system of education and in schools. Other reasons relate to the issues of teacher attitude and the level of expertise teachers have in curriculum planning and decision-making. These are; professional jealousy; lack of confidence or experience; fear of victimisation or voicing opinions.

2.6. Recent Policy Proposals in South Africa on Curriculum Development.

The Policy documents considered in this section are the African National Congress (ANC) Draft Policy Framework for Education and Training of 1994, the White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 and the Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education and Training of 1996.

The ANC draft policy document (ANC, 1994, p. 67) in its introductory paragraph on curriculum acknowledges that:

> the lack of relevance of the curriculum has been exacerbated by the narrow base of participation in the process of curriculum development. In the main, parents, teachers, students, workers and private sector have not been involved.

As part of its wider policy of human resources development, the document puts important emphasis on teacher preparation and professional development through pre-service and in- service education. The document also suggests new forms of teaching which will be less authoritarian, promote learner-centredness, stimulate critical thinking and problematise knowledge as provisional and contested (p. 70). On the whole, it is very general about the involvement it proposes for teachers in curriculum development. The present government's White Paper on Education and Training(DNE, 1995, p.27) states that:

> **the Ministry is committed to a fully participatory process of curriculum development and trialling in which the teaching profession, teacher educators, subject advisers and other learning practitioners play a leading role along with academic subject specialists and researchers.**

The document goes further in stipulating that there will be national frameworks and a core curriculum from which provincial education departments would define learning programmes. These learning programmes would express distinct provincial interests and priorities. The document also suggests curriculum development at a micro level (DNE, 1995, p.27). Both the ANC's draft policy of 1994 and the White Paper of 1995 embrace reconstruction and development as one of the aims of education.

The Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education (DNE, 1996, p.6) sets out participation and ownership as one of its guiding principles in curriculum development. The framework document states:

> **A healthy partnership between state authorities and parents is absolutely essential for the establishment of a culture of lifelong learning. At the same time, teachers should be equal partners in curriculum and materials development while employers and other stakeholders have a major responsibility in helping to determine how learners should be prepared for adult life, including the world of work.**

The document further states that:

> **Capacity building, as an integrative process of lifelong learning and development, requires furthermore, that curriculum development,**

> teacher development (in-service and pre-service) and community development go hand in hand (p.7).

2.7 Forms of Curriculum Development and Teacher Participation.

This section looks at practical possibilities in curriculum development identified from the literature (Skilbeck, 1984; Grundy,1987) and also implicitly stated in some policy documents like the White Paper of 1995, through which broad participation of teachers, learners and parents is envisaged. These are School-Based Curriculum Development (Skilbeck,1984; Punch and Bayona, 1990 and Garrett,1990) and Action Research (Grundy,1987).

2.7.1 School - Based Curriculum Development (SBCD).

School-Based Curriculum Development (SBCD) is defined as:

> the planning, designing, implementation and evaluation of a programme of students' learning by the educational institution of which those students are members (Skilbeck, 1984, p. 2).

Teachers participate in every stage with other important role players be they parents, learners or educational institutions. This form of curriculum development is based on the assumption that teachers have a major role to play but that role is not exclusive to teachers. Teachers work as partners with other role players. This form of curriculum development seems to be informed by the "practical" interest because it enhances teacher professionalism and it provides opportunities for recognising differing educational contexts. SBCD ties teacher development with school development.

SBCD arose out of the need for some measure of autonomy and the inadequacy of highly centralised systems of curriculum development. Campbell (1985), Garrett (1990), Skilbeck (1984) and Eggleston (1980) argue that this form of development is not antithetical with central government initiatives but these should serve as a framework within which development can take place. This form of curriculum development is implicitly indicated in the White Paper of 1995 and the Curriculum

Framework of 1996. Difficulties associated with SBCD identified in the literature (Marsh et al 1990; Skilbeck,1984) relate to the skills and expertise of teachers and teachers' attitudes towards accepting the responsibility of being major role players; the level of teacher motivation and the extent to which they value participatory and collaborative forms of development. Other problems relate to the management structures in schools which do not encourage initiatives; the availability of support structures such as teachers' resource centres and the creation of too many sites of curriculum development which creates a problem of maintaining acceptable standards in educational provision.

The White Paper of 1995 states that:

> The formulation of national norms and standards necessarily involves the development of curriculum frameworks and core curricula. Within these national parameters, provincial Departments of Education have significant scope for defining learning programmes which express distinct provincial interests and priorities, should they wish to do so... School-based " micro" adaptations can be important means of professional development and INSET, as well as expressing particular interests of the school and its community (DNE, 1995, p. 27).

Garrett (1990) has suggested a useful model relevant to the proposals made by the White Paper on Education and Training of 1995. In his model of SBCD within a centralised system, he suggests that 90% of curriculum development could be centralised and the remaining 10% left for curriculum development at a school level. Teachers would spend "nine-tenths of the year" on centralised curriculum. In the remaining "one-tenth of the year" teachers will be expected to design and write their own material and courses. Subject advisors and Inspectors will serve to support teachers in their school context. Garrett further suggests that, for teachers to take the responsibility for SBCD seriously, promotions and salary increases will have to be made on the basis of the work produced by teachers.

2.7.2 Action Research

Action research is a democratic form of research in which teachers investigate their own practice as well as the wider social context within which that practice is undertaken (Grundy, 1987). The kind of action research discussed in this section is informed by the "emancipatory interest". It is concerned with not only making teachers more effective and efficient but in developing critical thinking which will allow them to gain a deeper understanding of their practice as well as how that practice may be constrained by the social and material context in which they exist.

Problems to be investigated are identified by teachers, they control the process of improving curricula and the context within which they operate. Teachers engage in a reciprocal and cyclical process of planning, acting, observing and reflection. The role of expert knowledge is to assist teachers in the process of reflection as they reconstruct, recollect, analyse and judge their activities as well as planning for future activities. The knowledge which counts as legitimate is that generated by teachers.

This form of curriculum development would suggest a radical shift from past practices in curriculum development in South Africa. This form of participation has the potential both to liberate and empower teachers not only to understand and improve their practice but to transform the processes of curriculum development.

2.8 Conclusion.

The review of literature shows that the definition of curriculum has evolved from a traditional restricted view to a more democratic view over the period of time. Since this development did not occur in a linear way these views may still be found to exist parallel to each other. In a more democratic way, curriculum has become viewed in its socio-political context, recognising that there are social groups with interest in curriculum. The more democratic ways of decision-making in the process of curriculum development have become emphasised in recent policy documents. One is able to draw from the analysis of Grundy (1987) that curriculum development takes various forms which either enhance or limit opportunities for the participation

of teachers. The description in King and van den Berg (1991) and the NEPI's report (1992) on the curriculum development process in the past illustrates the point that it was a technical exercise.

The ANC draft policy document of 1994, the White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 and the Curriculum Framework of 1996 show a shift in thinking in favour of broad participation in the process of curriculum decision-making. Given this shift in thinking it is important to identify attitudes of teachers towards possible ways in which teachers' participation can be effected in practice. From the literature reviewed, teacher participation can exist in centralised systems through School-Based Curriculum Development (Garrett, 1990) and also through Action-Research (Grundy, 1987).

If South African teachers are expected to participate in these forms of curriculum development, the following questions raised by Skilbeck (1984) are to be asked: Do the teachers accept the responsibility of being major role-players? Do they have the skills and expertise of engaging meaningfully in these forms of curriculum development? Do they value participatory and collaborative forms of curriculum development? Do schools have the management structures to encourage such initiatives? Does the Education system have enough support structures such as teachers' resource centres to promote such teacher activity? If teachers are not confident to take on an extended role, what do they think can best assist them to build their confidence and develop in themselves the necessary skills in order to be able to take extended roles in curriculum planning and development.

CHAPTER 3

The Research Methodology .

3.1 Introduction.

This chapter provides an account of how the study was designed and conducted. In describing the research design, emphasis will be given to the method of investigation which includes, the research instruments to be used and reasons for choosing them, the size of the sample, the sampling procedure, method of data collection and data analysis. Under conduct of the study, the procedure followed in carrying out the study will be described. The aim of the study will be re-emphasised in order to give a coherent description of the methodology in relation to the purpose of the study.

3.2 Aim of the study.

The aim of the study was to find out how secondary school teachers in Clermont perceive recommendations in policy documents, such as the ANC Draft Policy Framework for Education and Training of 1994; the White Paper of 1995 and Curriculum Framework of 1996, that their role should be extended in curriculum development and what implications this might have for them. The focus of inquiry will be on teachers' understanding of what curriculum and curriculum development are, the nature of their present involvement in curriculum decision-making, whether or not they envisage changes and if so, what kind of change they envisage. The teachers' views will be analysed in relation to issues which have emerged from the literature as well as from the above recent policy documents in South Africa.

3.3 The Design of the Research.

3.3.1 The methodology to be used.

Judd, Smith and Elliot (1991) state that survey research is appropriate in situations where the researcher is not interested in causal relationships but in knowing what people think about an issue. Cohen and Manion (1994) also point out that surveys are useful for gathering data aimed at describing the nature of existing conditions.

Survey research was considered appropriate, therefore, for obtaining teachers' perceptions of participation in curriculum planning and development.

3.3.2 The research instrument to be used.

Cohen and Manion (1994) state that whether the survey is large-scale or small-scale it involves one or more of the following data-collection techniques: structured or semi-structured interviews, self completion or postal questionnaires, standardised tests and attitude scales. Simon (1990) proposes a " generative strategy" by which, the researcher through the use of informal data collection techniques such as open-ended interviews, content analysis and participant observation, allows the target population to generate research issues. In the case of this study, it was assumed that due to a lack of transparency and a lack of broad involvement in processes of curriculum development in the past (ANC, 1994 ; NEPI, 1992) teachers would not be in a position to engage in in-depth open-ended interviews on curriculum development which could be used to generate research themes. Secondary considerations were time and the cost involved in undertaking such interviews. Therefore, a more traditional approach was adopted whereby concepts to be tested and explored were predetermined by the researcher from personal knowledge of the context and a study of relevant literature.

The research themes in this study were generated from an analysis of policy documents, such as the ANC's Draft Policy Framework for Education and Training of 1994, the White Paper of 1995 and the Curriculum Framework of 1996. Themes which emerged from these documents included, the limited participation of teachers and other stakeholders in the practices of curriculum development in the past and the need for broad participation in the future; the establishment of an equal partnership of teachers, parents, private sector and the state; an integrative approach to curriculum development and teacher development; an emphasis on teacher preparation and professional development on an on-going basis (see Chapter 2, pp.16-17). Reference was also made to relevant literature on curriculum planning

and development (King and van den Berg, 1991; NEPI, 1992; and Grundy, 1987). This led to the emergence of the following themes:

* Curriculum to be understood as a broad concept which includes not only aims, objectives and subject-matter but also attitudes, relationships between learners and teachers, ways of teaching and forms of evaluation;
* Curriculum development also to be understood as a broad concept which includes issues of policy and decision-making;
* Collaborative forms of curriculum development where teachers engage in planning, acting and evaluating with other stakeholders as leading to greater teacher development and professionality (see Chapter 2, pp.8-10).

These themes which emerged from the literature were used to generate a questionnaire. Cohen and Manion (1994) and Judd, Smith and Elliot (1991) point out that each form of data collection technique has advantages and disadvantages and that the researcher needs to consider these factors in relation to the suitability of each technique to the research question, the specific population targeted for research as well as relative costs. Fink and Kosecoff (1985) ; Judd, Smith and Elliot (1991) and Simon (1986) state that a postal questionnaire is less costly, puts less pressure for an immediate response and give respondents a greater feeling of anonymity. They also point out that the disadvantages of using postal questionnaires are: the respondents are unable to ask for explanations of questions they do not understand, the difficulty for the researcher in probing responses and seeking for explanations and the inability of the researcher to control the context of question answering as well as the possible low motivation of respondents.

Despite these disadvantages a "self administered" postal questionnaire was considered more appropriate on the grounds that it is less costly than interviews and would be convenient to teachers when looking at the time factor. The "self administered" questionnaire would allow teachers to respond in their own time and it also guaranteed anonymity which is essential for encouraging teachers to respond freely to sensitive questions. Hoinville and Jowell (cited in Cohen and Manion, 1994)

suggest a number of ways which can be used to secure a good response rate in postal questionnaires, such as, the appearance of the questionnaire with reference to clarity of wording and simplicity, pre-testing of the questionnaire, enclosed stamped envelopes for the respondents' replies, inclusion of a covering letter to convey the importance of respondents' replies and assuring confidentiality, the use of follow-up letters and the provision of incentives if possible. Other research theorists (Bell, 1993; Fink and Kosecoff, 1985) also consider piloting of a questionnaire as crucial in determining whether respondents will understand directions provided and also in determining the amount of time it takes to fill a questionnaire. The questionnaire for this study was piloted in order to meet some of the problems mentioned in using a "self-administered" postal questionnaire. The questionnaire (Appendix A) contained both closed and open-ended questions in order to cross check responses and also to allow respondents to provide explanations for their responses. The questionnaire focused on the following issues:

* Teachers' own understanding of curriculum and curriculum development.
* Teachers' views on who should take decisions on issues pertaining to curriculum planning and development.
* Teachers present involvement in their schools.
* What teachers consider to have been the limitations to their greater involvement if they felt, they have been constrained.
* Teachers' views with regards to their preparation for more extended roles in curriculum development.
* Teachers' views on the means by which they might obtain the necessary skills.

Teachers' responses to these issues were to be analysed by coding the closed questions in order to record responses as percentages. Responses to open-ended questions were to be analysed through identifying compatible responses and grouping them into emerging themes.

3.3.3 The Sample and the Sampling Design.

The focus of the study is on the perceptions, beliefs and attitudes of secondary school teachers in Clermont towards participation in curriculum development. The reasons for choosing Clermont have been elaborated in chapter 1 of the study. The focus was limited to teachers in the six Clermont secondary schools rather than the primary schools with the intention of keeping the study manageable. Each of the six secondary schools consists of about 37 teachers. In this study it was considered that teachers who form a heterogeneous group in terms of their positions or post levels in schools, might as a result perceive their roles differently with regards to present and future involvement in curriculum development. This was based on the assumption that decision-making has been traditionally linked to post-levels. Therefore a random stratified sample was drawn which was to be representative of the total population. In a stratified sample the population is divided into two or more strata based on a single criterion or more than one criteria (Judd, Smith and Elliot,1991).

The random stratified sample was to be drawn from three strata. These strata were determined according to teacher post-levels and were as a result non-proportional since the number of teachers in post-levels was too diverse. The six Principals and their Deputy Principals were combined into a single strata of 12 respondents. The Heads of Departments, six from each school were also to form the second stratum of 36 respondents. The last stratum was to be the teachers in non-promotion posts who made the total population of 174 teachers. Out of the total population of Principals and their Deputy Principals 6 respondents (50%), either Principal or the Deputy Principal were sampled, in the second stratum of the Heads of Department 18 respondents (50%) were sampled out of the total of 36. In the third stratum of teachers in non-promotion posts 36 respondents (20,6%) were sampled out of the total of 174 teachers. Six teachers in non-promotion posts from each school were to receive a questionnaire, these were to be three senior teachers (having more than five years teaching experience) and three junior teachers (having less than five years teaching experience) on the assumption that the variable of experience might influence teachers' perceptions.

This non- proportional stratified sample is summarised as follows:

	Total Population (N)	Sample Size(n)	%
Principals and Deputy Principals (Post Levels 4 & 2)	12	6	(50%)
Heads of Department (Post Level 3)	36	18	(50%)
Teachers in non-promotion posts (Post Level 1)	174	36	(20,6%)

3.4 The Conduct of the Research.

3.4.1 Procedure used in administering the questionnaire.

Informing Clermont Secondary School Principals about the research and conducting the research was derailed by a long process of trying to obtain permission from the Department of Education. It took six months to obtain permission to undertake research in Clermont schools. The reasons being that the Department of Education was undergoing the process of restructuring and there was lack of clarity as to who was responsible for dealing with issues pertaining to the granting of permission to do research in schools.

The Area Manager of Clermont schools advised that an application for permission be directed to the Acting Superintendent-General at Ulundi. The first application letter was sent in March 1996. The response which stated that the matter had been referred to a Research Committee was received after three months. After this letter, there was a long period of quietness about the matter. Several attempts were made to find out about the matter from the Department officials concerned, some of whom stated not to have come across such an application. A second application had to be faxed after having finally ascertained who was responsible for granting permission to undertake research in schools. It was only in August 1996 that a letter which stated that the Research Committee had granted permission to undertake research in Clermont schools was received from the Acting Director-General.

The questionnaire was first piloted with six teachers who were randomly selected and who were not part of the sample. This was done in order to find out which questions

they found difficult or ambiguous. Only a few questions had to be rephrased after this stage because they proved difficult to understand. The next stage was to telephone Principals individually in order to make appointments at which permission was to be requested to administer questionnaires through them in their schools. In the case of schools where there were no telephones the researcher had to pay surprise visits which meant, in some cases, waiting until the Principal arrived. Each school Principal was visited and given a copy of the letter from the Acting Director-General (see Appendix D) which granted permission to undertake research in the respective schools, as well as a letter requesting their help and co-operation (see Appendix C).Each Principal was given ten questionnaires nine of which were to be given to teachers. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a covering letter to the respondents requesting their help in completing the questionnaire and assuring anonymity and confidentiality of their responses (see Appendix A). Stamped addressed envelopes were also included for the return of questionnaires. The University address was used in order to give credibility to the study as well as in consideration of the general slow postal services .

3.4.2 Response.

By the end of the second week 14 questionnaires were received. The number of questionnaire returns began to slow down by the third week. Principals were telephoned and thanked for their courtesy and co-operation in distributing the questionnaire and were further requested to remind those members of staff who might not have had the opportunity to complete and return the questionnaires to do so as soon as possible.

Some Principals indicated that they had been busy with September trials and had misplaced some of the questionnaires. Additional copies of the questionnaire had to be sent in this case. Others indicated that they had completed and posted back the questionnaires and that they might have been delayed by the postal service. In some schools where there were no telephones and thus difficult to secure appointments for second visits teachers known to be working in those schools were given second

questionnaires to give to their colleagues in case they had lost the initial ones. These attempts could only raise the response rate by six more questionnaires to a total of 27. The overall response rate was 45%. Since the respondents were promised anonymity and that the researcher was not dealing with them directly there was no way of determining who had replied and who had not replied. Possible reasons for this response rate will be further discussed in Chapter 4 on data analysis and findings.

From the writer's experience there are problems in conducting survey research in contexts such as Clermont. In such contexts the conduct and the importance of educational research is relatively known by teachers. Teachers have low motivation for teaching due to dissatisfaction with their jobs which arises from the salaries they get, working in overcrowded classroom and unstable environments. Added to these, most teachers come from a history where entering other careers was restricted and teaching the only route to obtaining a professional job. Under these conditions there is often reluctance and disinterest towards contributing to educational research.

CHAPTER 4

Data Analysis and Findings.

4.1 Introduction.

This section provides data analysis of the responses of the 27 Secondary School Clermont teachers. The responses make 45% of the total sample of teachers drawn upon for the study. This represents a low return rate despite attempts by the researcher to remind Principals through phone calls and the sending of additional questionnaires in case some teachers had misplaced the initial ones. The low response rate could be attributed to, amongst other things, the low motivation associated with the mailed questionnaire as well as the circumstances of teachers at the time the questionnaire was administered. The questionnaire was administered in mid-September at a time when teachers were back from a strike action which had taken more than a week. Teachers were busy trying to make up for the lost time. In some schools they were already busy with September trials and tests. As a result, it seems, filling in a questionnaires was low on the list of teachers' priorities.

The Principals were to give the questionnaires to their staff members because they knew in their schools who were junior teachers and senior teachers, as well as who were in promotion posts and who were in non-promotion posts. This in itself presented a problem in that the researcher could not deal directly with the teachers and had to depend on the Principals and give constant reminders to Principals. These factors presented limitations for this study. As a result, only very tentative generalisations can be made from the teachers' responses to be analyzed below.

4.2 The Respondents.

The analysis will be in the form of describing and interpreting the teachers'

responses. These descriptions will be presented in the form of frequency tables where necessary, as well as giving brief summaries and personal interpretation drawing from literature reviewed on curriculum.

Table 1 and 2 provide personal information and qualifications of the respondents. These characteristics will help in the analysis and in determining whether teachers in different post levels perceive their roles differently with regards to curriculum development.

It is important to re-iterate that initially a stratified sample was drawn consisting of, six Principals or their Deputy Principals; eighteen Heads of Department, three from each school and thirty six teachers, six from each school. Because of the low-return rate the first two strata were banded together into a single category of teachers in promotion posts (Level 2-4). The questionnaire returns of 18 teachers in non-promotion posts (Level 1) amounted to half of the sample of 36 teachers.

Table 1 shows that most of the teachers in this sample are males, 17 males (63,0%) and 10 females (37,0%). Out of the total population of teachers most of them are in post-level 1. Most of the teachers in post-level 1 are younger teachers below 35 years with less than five years teaching experience. Most teachers in promotion posts are male and senior teachers with more than six years teaching experience.

Table 2 shows that most of the teachers in this study have an academic University qualification as well as a teaching Diploma. Some teachers have post-graduate qualifications and most of them are occupying promotion posts. This is not surprising since promotion and salary increases have been based on having higher qualifications and also consideration of teaching experience

TABLE1:PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS.

SEX		PROMOTION POSTS LEVEL 2-4	NON-PROMOTION POSTS LEVEL 1	TOTAL	%
FEMALE	10	4	6	10	37,0%
MALE	17	5	12	17	63,0%
AGE YOUNGER	(20-35)	4	15	19	70,4%
OLDER	(36-55)	5	3	8	29,6%
TEACHING EXPERIENCE	01-05	-	11	11	41,0%
	06-10	2	4	6	22,0%
	11-15	7	3	10	37,0%

TABLE 2: QUALIFICATIONS

QUALIFICATIONS	POST LEVEL/RANK N=27 PROMOTION POSTS LEVEL 2-4	NON-PROMOTION POSTS LEVEL 1	TOTAL%
PROFESSIONALLY QUALIFIED ONLY.	1	5	6 (22,2%)
UNIVERSITY GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONALLY QUALIFIED.	3	12	15 (55,6%)
POST-GRADUATE & PROFESSIONALLY QUALIFIED.	5	1	6 (22,2%)
TOTAL	9 (33,3%)	18 (66,7%)	27 (100%)

4.3 Perceptions of Curriculum and Curriculum development.

TABLE 3: DEFINITIONS OF CURRICULUM (ITEM 1 OF SECTION B)

RESPONSE	POST LEVEL/RANK N=27		
	LEVEL 2-4	LEVEL 1	TOTAL %
1. Curriculum as the body of knowledge as well as methods to transmit that body of knowledge	-	1	1 (3,7%)
2. Curriculum as a plan or teaching programme of the school that includes, aims, objectives as well as the syllabi of the school.	3	3	6 (22,2%)
3. Curriculum refers to all the learning and teaching opportunities provided by the school. It includes the values and attitude transmitted through teaching methods, aims, objectives, methods of evaluation, organisational structures as well as decision-making processes of the school.	6	14	20 (74,1%)
TOTAL	9 (33,3%)	18 (66,7%)	27 (100%)

Table 3 shows that when presented with three definitions of curriculum, 20 teachers indicated that the third definition was the closest to their understanding of curriculum. Six teachers indicated the second definition as closest to their understanding. Only one teacher indicated the first definition as closest to his understanding of curriculum. This means that most of the respondents in both

promotion posts and non-promotion posts seem to have a very broad understanding of what curriculum is.

TABLE 4: DEFINITIONS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (ITEM 2 IN SECTION B).

RESPONSE	POST LEVEL/RANK		N=27
	LEVEL 2-4	LEVEL 1	TOTAL %
1. The process of deciding what schools teach and how they teach it guided by particular beliefs and value system as well as principles.	6	7	13 (48,1%)
2. The process of selection of the learning and teaching materials e.g. selection of textbook, development of teaching aids, lesson planning and setting of tests.	3	11	14 (51,9%)
TOTAL	9 (33,3%)	18 (66,7%)	27 (100%)

Table 4 shows that 13 teachers indicated that the first definition of curriculum development, as the process of deciding what schools teach and how they teach it, was closer to their understanding of what curriculum development is. The other 14 teachers indicated their understanding of curriculum development to be closer to the second definition of curriculum development as the process of selection of learning and teaching materials. This shows that teachers are divided in their understanding of what curriculum development is. The first definition is broader than the second one in the sense that curriculum development is understood to be the process which has political, ideological, social and cultural dimensions. It goes beyond syllabus revision and materials development to

include issues of policy and decision-making. The process of curriculum development is seen to be influenced by the values, beliefs and aspirations of the society, in other words, it is not a neutral process it is influenced by various contextual factors. Although some teachers have a broad understanding of curriculum they have not built on that understanding and linked it with curriculum development. This is said against the background that some teachers who indicated a broad understanding of curriculum match it with a narrow conception of curriculum development.

TABLE 5: PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS ON WHO SHOULD UNDERTAKE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (ITEM 3 OF SECTION B).

RESPONSE	POST LEVEL/RANK		
	LEVEL 2-4	LEVEL 1	TOTAL %
1. TEACHERS	1	12	13 (48,1%)
2. THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.	-	1	1 (3,7%)
3. PRINCIPAL AND HEADS OF DEPARTMENT.	1	-	1 (3,7%)
4. SUBJECT SPECIALISTS	4	3	7 (25,9%)
5. CURRICULUM EXPERTS.	4	5	9 (29,6%)
6. PARENTS.	3	3	6 (22,2%)

Table 5 shows that teachers indicated more than one response to item 3 and each of the responses was given an equal value. Teachers' responses resulted in 13 teachers indicating a preference for teachers to undertake curriculum development. Nine teachers indicated a preference for curriculum experts. Seven teachers indicated a preference for subject specialists. Six teachers indicated a preference for parents. Only one teacher indicated a preference for the

Principals and Heads of Department and one teacher indicated a preference for the Department of education.

4.4 Perceptions of participation in Curriculum development.

Reasons supplied (item 4 of Section B) by teachers who indicated a preference for teachers to undertake curriculum development are summarised as follows:

* Teachers are closer to pupils, they constantly interact with pupils.
* Teachers are implementors of the curriculum, they have a better understanding of the school environment.
* Teachers have to be empowered to select what is relevant at all levels, local, provincial and national.

Teachers choice of curriculum experts and subject specialists is supported on the grounds that they are perceived to have more skills and expertise than teachers, parents, and principals. Curriculum experts were considered to have a broad knowledge of curriculum issues. Parents were chosen for reasons that they carried the responsibility for their children's education, they had a better understanding of the needs of the communities to which they belonged. It seems from the reasons provided by teachers that they feel they should play a major role in curriculum development since they are implementors and always in close contact with realities of the school. Teachers also expressed the feeling that they do not have adequate skills and knowledge to participate fully in curriculum development and therefore need to participate with others. Few teachers in this sample expressed the view that the Department of Education should develop curricula. This could imply that teachers no longer want top-down approaches to the development of curricula.

Similar to Table 5, teachers indicated more than one response to the question of who they think should decide on the method of curriculum planning to be used

(Item 5 of Section B) which resulted in 17 teachers, most of whom are in non-promotion posts, expressing the view that teachers should decide on the method of curriculum planning to be used. Fourteen teachers expressed the view that curriculum experts should decide on the method of curriculum planning to be used. Six teachers expressed a preference for subject specialists, four teachers expressed a preference for Principals and Heads of Department, three teachers expressed a preference for parents and only one expressed a preference for the Department. The reasons supplied by teachers for expressing their preference for teachers are consistent with those offered in response to Item 4. Teachers believe that as implementors of the curriculum they should be part of the curriculum decision- making process and the method to be used. They consider themselves to be better informed of the needs of the pupils because of their constant interaction with them. They also regard themselves as important stakeholders since decisions on curriculum affect them. Again, little support was shown for the Department.

Reasons for the preference of curriculum experts supplied by teachers are also consistent with those given in response to item 4. They consider curriculum experts as having knowledge of various methods of curriculum planning. Teachers also think curriculum experts are better able to facilitate the process of curriculum development.

Teachers' responses on whether or not they consider themselves to be involved in curriculum planning and development (Item 7 of Section B) resulted in 14 teachers indicating that they were involved in curriculum planning and development while 13 teachers indicated that they were not involved. Teachers who indicated that they were involved gave the following reasons as examples of their involvement (Item 8 of Section B).

* **Participation in the decision-making concerning subjects to be offered to students.**
* **Transmission of knowledge to the pupils.**

* Teaching what is on the syllabi in the manner suited to the particular needs and abilities of pupils.

The reasons supplied by teachers who expressed the view that they were involved in curriculum planning and development were consistent with a limited view of curriculum development as the process of selecting teaching and learning material. It is also interesting to note that 13 of the teachers who indicated broad understanding of curriculum development expressed the view that they were not involved in curriculum planning and development.

Teachers' responses on whether or not their involvement in curriculum development should be limited to the classroom (Item 9 of Section B) resulted in all 27 teachers indicating that teacher involvement should not be limited to the classroom.

Reasons given by the teachers' were:

* As professionals they should be given a wider scope beyond the classroom.
* They are parents as well as members of the community in which they serve.
* Involvement beyond the classroom will allow them to have access to knowledge on curriculum issues, this would help them in making informed decisions and make curriculum their own.
* The curriculum should not be imposed on them, they should take part in policy-making, selection of textbooks and content to be taught.
* Involvement in planning of curriculum will serve as a form of motivation for teachers.
* Involvement of teachers will help in bringing about curriculum change.
* Curriculum development goes beyond the classroom it includes the values of society at large.

The reasons provided by teachers are very important in that they offer supporting arguments for the need of greater teacher participation and the extension of the role of teachers to that of " extended professionals" as defined by Hoyle (1974). Teachers feel that as professional people they should be given much more autonomy which goes beyond the classroom in order to gain more understanding of curriculum development. Teachers seem to share the view that curriculum development is influenced by much wider issues of society and should not be limited to the classroom.

Teachers' responses to whether or not they were adequately prepared during their teacher training for the role of curriculum developer and decision-maker (Item 11 of Section B) resulted in 19 teachers in both promotion and non-promotion posts indicating that they were not adequately prepared for the role of curriculum developer and decision-maker. Eight teachers also in both promotion and non-promotion posts indicated that they were adequately prepared for these roles.

Reasons supplied by teachers who felt they were adequately prepared for the role of curriculum developer and decision-maker during their teacher training were:

* **Curriculum studies and didactics were essential components of their teacher training course.**
* **They were exposed to pupils during their training.**
* **They were exposed to curriculum issues in various places during their training.**
* **They were using the subject knowledge and teaching methods they were taught during teacher training.**

These reasons show a limited understanding of what curriculum and curriculum development is. For these teachers it seems curriculum is understood to be a

body of knowledge as well as methods to transmit that body of knowledge. They confuse curriculum planning and development with taking curriculum decisions in the classroom. Teachers who believe they were not adequately trained gave the following reasons:

* **The teacher training institutions were part of Bantu Education structures and provided inadequate training to allow teachers to develop curriculum.**
* **It was believed teachers would play no role in curriculum development and decision-making, teachers were trained to be implementors and take orders from superiors.**
* **There was inadequate theory and practice on curriculum development.**
* **Teacher training was more of " a fantasy than a reality ", it was more ideal.**
* **There was no practical aspect of curriculum development.**
* **There was an over-emphasis on content, methods of delivering content, marking of registers at the expense of other wider issues involved in curriculum.**
* **There was no curriculum development course.**

These reasons confirm earlier indications that most of the teachers surveyed teachers do not consider themselves to have the necessary skills to engage in meaningful curriculum planning and development. They feel that the inadequate knowledge they have is due largely to government policy at the time, the top-down approach to the curriculum planning and development process as well as the nature of teacher training itself. On the question of what needs to be done to provide teachers with the necessary skills to engage in curriculum development (Item 13 of Section B), most teachers suggested:

* **Workshops, seminars, symposiums organised by either teachers or the**

Department of Education on different approaches to curriculum development.

* In-service courses which would provide broad theory on curriculum to be presented to teachers by curriculum experts.
* Teachers to be exposed to and be involved in the curriculum development process.
* Teacher training institutions to expose teachers to the theory and practice of curriculum development during their initial training.

These suggestions indicate that teachers are prepared to enhance and broaden their knowledge and that opportunities should be created for them through either formal or informal courses as well as through allowing them to be part of curriculum development processes. The teachers also express the view that they want to be involved in organising such courses. The Department of Education would have to facilitate provision of such formal and informal courses.

TABLE 6: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS ON WHETHER TEACHER DEVELOPMENT AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE SEEN AS SEPARATE PROCESSES (ITEM 14 OF SECTION B).

RESPONSE	POST LEVEL/RANK		N=27
	LEVEL 2 - 4	LEVEL 1	TOTAL %
YES	2	2	4 (14,8%)
NO	7	16	23 (85,2%)

23 teachers indicated that teacher development should not be separated from curriculum development. The other four teachers felt that teacher development and curriculum development should be seen as separate processes.

Teachers who felt that the two should not be separated supplied the following reasons:

* Curriculum development leads to teacher development, the two are inseparable.
* Teachers are professionals and are entitled to be knowledgeable about the curriculum.
* Teachers are curriculum planners and developers both on moral grounds and for practical reasons.

These reasons reflect that most of the teachers think that their role should be extended. Teachers who felt that teacher development should be separated from curriculum development supplied these reasons:

* A teachers' task is that of giving instruction in class.
* Curriculum development will demand a lot of the teachers' time.

The fact that these two processes should be separated is consistent with the teachers' limited view of curriculum development as the selection of teaching and learning material. It is also a reflection of a view of teachers as restricted professionals similar to that defined by Hoyle (1974). On the question of what teachers think are the reasons for the limited role they have played in curriculum development (Item 16 of Section B), respondents cited the following as the most important reasons:

* Exclusion from curriculum decision-making bodies.
* Lack of transparency of the process of curriculum development.
* Lack of consultation, teachers not being part of the curriculum development structures.
* Repressive system of the Department of Education towards teachers and teacher organisations.

* Discrimination and lack of creative education.
* Teachers not given a chance to contribute by the Department.
* Teachers have been only regarded as transmitters of subject-matter.
* Education has been in the hands of the politicians not educators.

The reasons above confirm the view expressed by King and van den Berg (1991) that curriculum development in South Africa has been an "in-house" process driven by government bureaucrats with no teacher involvement. As reasons of least importance for the limited role they have played, teachers pointed to the following:

* Reluctance or lack of interest on the side of teachers to get involved.
* Teacher training which did not equip teachers for such roles.
* Lack of financial resources to develop their own curricula.
* Teachers do not see themselves as having a role to play since they were excluded in the first place.
* Teachers not happy with their conditions of work to bother about anything.
* Laziness, lack of a sense of responsibility, and incompetence of teachers which cause them to allow superiors to decide for them.
* No provision has been made to draw upon their experience and initiatives.

Although these reasons are regarded as being of less importance by teachers, they have significant implications with regards to building capacity and providing a support system for teachers. These reasons relate to teachers lack of confidence and low motivation which could negatively affect any attempts to extend the role of teachers in curriculum development.

These reasons also reaffirm the view expressed earlier by teachers that initial teacher training was inadequate and this suggests a strong need for restructuring of this sector. Teachers' responses on who takes decisions in the schools in which they work on issues such as school policy, duty allocation, subjects to be offered (Item 17 of Section B) resulted in 23 teachers indicating that, teachers, Heads of Department and the Principals took decisions on school policy, duty allocation and subjects to be offered. This figure represents all teachers in promotion posts and most of the teachers in non-promotion posts as having expressed this view. The surprisingly democratic nature of decision-making reflects a shift from earlier forms of governance where the Principal would decide without consultation of staff members how the school has to be governed. This form of participative governance, which might be the product of socio-political changes, is compatible with practices advocated in policy documents. The democratic decision-making in curriculum development at school level may also mean the need and willingness of teachers to participate in democratic forms of decision-making.

Only four teachers in non-promotion posts indicated that Principals and Heads of Department took decisions on such issues. The fact that most of the teachers indicated that they take part in decision-making on school policy, duty allocation and subjects to be offered at school level suggests that teacher autonomy and involvement is stronger at school level and classroom level than at Provincial and National level. This could be a reflection of the way teacher's role in curriculum development has been conceived in South Africa. The outline given by Carl (1995) on the hierarchy of curriculum areas and his assertion that the teacher's role in curriculum development is more active in the classroom and the school than at higher levels of policy and decision-making, is also a reflection of the pattern of teacher participation which dominated thinking in the past.

Teachers' responses on the role they play in curriculum decision-making at school level (Item 18 of Section B) resulted in 15 teachers indicating involvement in the formation of the school policy. Eleven teachers indicated involvement in duty allocation. Ten teachers indicated involvement in the selection of topics or themes to be covered in their subject area, subjects to be offered by the school and drawing up of the time-table.

Seven teachers indicated involvement in decision-making on the number of periods per week each teacher should have. Only four teachers indicated that they were not involved in any of the examples provided of curriculum decision-making at the school level. The fact that 23 out of 27 teachers state that they have some measure of involvement in curriculum decision-making at school level may be regarded as an important development. It is important because it suggests a move towards greater democratization and it also reflects a willingness on teachers to be part of decision-making in curriculum development.

TABLE 7: RANKING OF THE CURRICULUM DECISIONS IN WHICH TEACHERS THINK THEY SHOULD BE INVOLVED (ITEM 19 OF SECTION B)

TEACHER'S RANKING OF THE RESPONSES	1	2	3	4	5	6
SELECTION OF TEXTBOOKS	6	2	6	1	-	1
CONTENT OF THE SYLLABUSES	3	7	4	2	-	-
TEACHING GUIDELINES OF THE SUBJECT	1	3	1	8	2	1
SCHEMES OF WORK FOR THE YEAR	1	1	5	4	3	2
METHODS OF EVALUATION	-	3	-	2	7	4
PROVINCIAL AND NATIONAL POLICY - MAKING BODIES	5	-	-	-	4	7

Table 7 shows that six teachers ranked selection of textbooks as their number one desired involvement. Five teachers ranked as their number one involvement the provincial and national policy-making bodies. Three teacher respondents ranked as their number one involvement the content of the syllabuses. One teacher ranked as number one involvement the teaching guidelines of the subject as well as schemes of work for the year.

This table shows that teachers views are not united with regards to their priorities for involvement in various forms of curriculum decision-making. There are clearly teachers who are of the view that more involvement should be in selection of learning material and content to be taught. There are teachers who view involvement in policy-making at provincial and national level as important but on this issue as well, there are teachers with contrary views who regard this involvement as of least importance compared to other curriculum decisions.

TABLE 8: TEACHERS' PERPECTIVES ON THE DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT PUPILS SHOULD BE GIVEN IN CURRICULUM PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (ITEM 21 OF SECTION B).

RESPONSE	POST LEVEL/RANK N=27		
	LEVEL 2 - 4	LEVEL 1	TOTAL %
MAXIMUM INVOLVEMENT	2	8	10 (37%)
MINIMUM INVOLVEMENT	5	4	9 (33%)
NO INVOLVEMENT	1	3	4 (15%)
NOT SURE	1	3	4 (15%)

Table 8 shows that ten teachers indicated that pupils should be given maximum involvement. Nine other teachers indicated that pupils should be given minimum involvement. Four teachers indicated that pupils should not be involved, the other four teachers indicated that they were not sure whether pupils should be involved. Reasons supplied by teachers who indicated that pupils should be given maximum involvement were:

* Pupils should be part of the decision-making process on things that affect them.
* Pupils should be allowed to express their aspirations, be given a chance in deciding how they wish to be taught and tested.
* Pupils' involvement will help curriculum developers to design what is relevant to pupils.
* Pupils' involvement can also serve as a form of motivation.

The majority of teachers who felt that pupils must be involved but that involvement must be minimal stated that pupils lacked knowledge and understanding required for curriculum planning and development.

4.10 Summary of findings.

The focus of this study has been to find out the perceptions of Secondary School teachers in Clermont on participation in curriculum development. From the analysis of teacher responses the following points emerge:

Teachers' understanding of curriculum development is not the same, some teachers have a broad understanding while others reflect a limited understanding. Those who show a limited understanding also view curriculum development in a limited way as a selection of teaching and learning material.

Despite their different understanding of what curriculum development is all the teachers in this study feel that they have a major role to play in curriculum

development and that their role should not be limited to the classroom. They feel that this role has to be extended since the decisions taken directly affect them as well as the fact that they constantly interact with the pupils and understand the school realities better than other stakeholders.

Thirteen teachers feel that they are not involved in curriculum development. The teachers who believe they are not involved indicated their understanding of curriculum to be the process of deciding what schools teach and how they teach it, guided by particular beliefs and value system as well as principles.

The fourteen teachers who say they are involved point to various examples relating to decision-making with regards to their subject areas as well as imparting knowledge in the classroom. These examples presented by teachers who believe they are involved in curriculum development indicate a limited understanding of curriculum development. Most teachers feel that although they would like extended participation they are not adequately prepared for that role. The inadequacy they refer to is their limited knowledge of curriculum development. They attribute their limited knowledge to their initial teacher training and the top-down approach to curriculum development by the former government which has hindered any form of teacher participation.

Teachers feel that extending their participation could facilitate their professional development , 23 teachers indicated that teacher development should not be treated as a separate process from curriculum development. Teachers feel that their knowledge could be enhanced through being exposed and allowed participation in curriculum development processes and also through workshops, seminars, in-service courses where they would interact with curriculum experts and subject specialists.

Teachers seem to acknowledge the importance of participatory and democratic forms of decision-making, most of them indicated that some measure of

involvement has to be given to pupils while others feel that the contribution of parents is important in taking curriculum decisions. At school level most teachers claim to have some measure of involvement especially in issues of school policy. Teachers in promotion posts and teachers in non-promotion posts do not show any differences with regards to their views on participation in curriculum development.

Teachers in this study, although they show varying degrees of understanding about curriculum and curriculum development, do seem to understand the importance of the fact that any form of curriculum development is dependant on their meaningful participation.

Views expressed by teachers in this study seem to be compatible with the proposals from the recent policy documents reviewed in the preceeding chapter. The ANC Draft Framework of 1994 has advocated the restructuring of teacher preparation and professional development. The White Paper of 1995 has proposed participatory forms of curriculum development where teachers will work in collaboration with other stakeholders, amongst them, subject specialists, subject advisers and researchers. The Curriculum Framework of 1996 has also recommended such broad participation in its proposal for teachers to be equal partners in curriculum development with other stakeholders such as parents, employers and the state.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions and Recommendations.

5.1. Introduction.

The conclusions and recommendations of this study need to be understood in the context of wider developments at the national level in South African education as well as in the context of Clermont secondary schools which formed the focus of the study. Taking into consideration the context of the Clermont secondary schools involves taking note of the historical legacy of these schools, for example, the shortage of resources in schools and the fact that the schools are situated in an environment where there is very little to draw from. Some of the secondary schools are situated near slums. The community consists mainly of working class people most of whom are tenants. There are no teacher centres or resource centres since teachers were confined to teaching in the classroom and not provided with the opportunity to participate in curriculum development.

On the other hand, the wider context involves taking into consideration the developments in curriculum policy at the national level. The White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 led to the development of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). Within this framework the development of curricula will be outcomes-based. Outcomes are differentiated into "critical" outcomes and "specific" outcomes which contribute to learning area outcomes. The "critical" outcomes represent the long term goals of education and training. "Specific" outcomes are knowledge, skills and values which have to be demonstrated in particular contexts (National Department of Education, 1996). In an outcomes-based system of education teachers will be expected to design and develop curriculum around intended outcomes. The Department of National Education has proposed to phase in the new curriculum framework consisting of eight learning areas as from January 1998. The implementation of a new curriculum will be a

staged process of firstly, piloting the new curriculum from July to December 1997; secondly, retraining of educators; thirdly, the creation of effective institutions of learning to handle outcomes-based education (Department of Education and Culture, Kwazulu-Natal, 1997).

The current developments at national level are aimed at moving away from the apartheid driven policies of the past. The processes of curriculum development of the past have been reviewed in this study, and it is clear that the lack of broad participation by teachers in curriculum development during the apartheid era was not accidental. It was orchestrated by the National Party government in order to ensure centralised control over education and, in particular, curriculum. It has been pointed out in chapter 1 of the study that the principles of Christian National Education formed the basis for the provision of education in South Africa. The National Education Policy Act of 1967, later amended in 1986, which determined the curriculum provided at a pre-tertiary level, was based on CNE principles and was intended to perpetuate the perspectives of Afrikaner nationalism within the education system. The ideology of CNE did not only determine curriculum provision at pre-tertiary level but also permeated teacher education institutions (NEPI, 1992). The process of curriculum planning and development was designed to be driven by two organisations at national level, the South African Council of Education (SACE) and the Commitee of the Heads of Education (CHED), which consisted of government bureaucrats (King and van den Berg, 1991; NEPI, 1992). In terms of Grundy's (1987) analysis of Habermas's knowledge constitutive interest the process of curriculum development, as it has been practised in South Africa, could be regarded as "technical". As a " technical" exercise the process of curriculum development seeks to control and manage the status quo. The focus is on developing curricula with a structure of rules or procedures to be followed. This approach to curriculum development ignores the fundamental issues of who has the power and control of decision-making in the process of curriculum development. It also ignores the question of the varying contexts in which curriculum is experienced. Teacher

involvement is limited to teaching duties in the classroom. Evidence of a narrow and technicist conception of curriculum development may be found in both publications of the Nationalist Party government (DEC: House of Assembly, 1988) and the work of some South African theorists on curriculum (Carl, 1987, 1995; Kruger, 1980). In theory, curriculum development has been thought to be a scientific and rational exercise consisting of planning, designing, implementation and evaluation. In practice, however, a top-down approach was followed in the planning and designing stage which mainly involved "experts" and government officials with teachers only participating in the implementation stage. Assessment as a form of evaluation was centrally and provincially determined and teachers have not been part of the process of setting the standards and norms of examinations. Assessment has been one way of ensuring that teachers conformed to prescribed syllabuses.

Reference in chapter 2 to Grundy's (1987) work has illustrated that the process of curriculum development takes various forms which could either foster or hinder teacher participation. According to Grundy both the "practical" and "emancipatory" interests have implications for participation in curriculum development. For example, Hoyle's (1974) concept of the "extended professional" could be considered comparable to the role of the teacher within curriculum development informed by the "practical interest". The study has drawn attention to various possible forms of curriculum development which can enhance teacher participation two of which involve School-Based Curriculum Development (Skilbeck, 1984) and Action Research (Grundy, 1987). Garrett (1990) has shown that school-based curriculum development can exist within centralised systems, and has illustrated this by proposing a 10% model of school-based curriculum development with the remaining 90% of the school work centrally determined. An alternative form of curriculum development has been suggested in the White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 through a proposal that there should be micro curriculum development within broad frameworks determined at national level.

However, it is also apparent that SBCD and Action Research as alternative forms of curriculum development have problems and limitations.

These problems and limitations drawn from Skilbeck (1984) are found in chapter 2 of this study. The following questions raised by Skilbeck were useful in anticipating what may be regarded as concerns by teachers surveyed in this study: Do teachers accept the responsibility of being major role-players? ; Do they have the skills and expertise of engaging meaningfully in curriculum planning and development? ; Do they value participatory and collaborative forms of curriculum development? ; Do schools have the management structures to encourage teacher initiatives? ; Does the system have enough support structures such as teacher's resource centres to promote teacher activity? ; If teachers lack confidence what can be done to build their confidence?

5.2 Conclusions.

The teachers in this survey have confirmed the view that their role in curriculum development has been minimal. They have attributed the limited role they have played to the lack of transparency and consultation due to a top-down approach to curriculum development by the former Department of Education and Training and the fact that the status of teachers as major role players in curriculum planning and development was not recognised, except as transmitters of knowledge. They have also pointed to the fact that the process of curriculum development has been driven by politicians and not educators and that teacher training institutions were part of the Bantu Education structure and as a result, teachers were only prepared for a role as implementers of curriculum through focusing on content and methods of teaching. Teachers surveyed in this study accept the responsibility of becoming role-players in curriculum development, they have shown support for the argument that their participation in curriculum development should not be limited to the classroom. They think that their greater closeness to pupils than most of the other stakeholders justifies the fact that their role should be extended and not limited

to teaching duties. Teachers also think that extended participation is important for their professional development and also for increasing their motivational level. Although teachers have shown support for broad participation at national, provincial, and local levels they feel they have limitations in making a significant contribution to the process of curriculum development. They recognise that they have insufficient knowledge of curriculum issues and lack exposure to the broad theory and practice of curriculum as well as skills in designing and developing curricula. Consequently, teachers have shown support for collaborative forms of curriculum development where they will work with other stakeholders especially those who possess knowledge and skills which they think they do not have, such as curriculum "experts" and subject specialists.

Teachers have shown an understanding of curriculum "experts" as people who will facilitate the process of curriculum development, which differs from the way "experts" have been traditionally conceived of as excluding other stakeholders. The responses of some teachers in the study indicate that they limit the concept of "curriculum development" to materials development or the transmission of knowledge. There is also a strong perception amongst teachers in this study that participation in curriculum development ought to focus at a local level on involvement in the selection of textbooks or content and methods to be used and, to a lesser, extent with involvement in policy-making bodies at national and provincial levels. This is not surprising if one refers to Enslin's (1984) argument cited in chapter 1 of the study that teacher education institutions have served to reproduce the ideology of the CNE and the doctrine of Fundamental Pedagogics which fostered the perception that a teachers' role is limited to the classroom. Teachers have expressed the view that in-service training courses, workshops and symposiums which teachers would participate in organising could be a means of developing their knowledge and skills. However, in-service training has been criticised for failing to bring about teacher development. Fullan (1991) states that in-service education has been unsuccessful in bringing about

the professional development of teachers. He gives as reasons, amongst others, the lack of follow-up support for ideas and practices introduced in in-service programs and that topics for discussion are mostly not selected by teachers. As a result in-service programs fail to address the needs and concerns of individuals as well as to recognise the contexts to which they will return.

The Synthesis Report on the National Teacher Education Audit of 1995 also confirmed these weaknesses of in-service courses in stating that the impact of the South African in-service programmes is questionable because they consist of short courses or workshops without any follow-up for the teachers. The Synthesis Report suggested a school-focused approach to in-service training which would be holistic and aimed at solving the particular needs of teachers and schools.

Teachers have indicated that they already have considerable say in curriculum decision-making at school level in matters of school policy, in subjects to be offered by the school and in themes to be covered in their subject, although this is limited to the confines of the prescribed syllabus. This development could be regarded as a fertile ground on which to build the collaborative forms of decision-making proposed in policy documents such as the White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 and Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education of 1996.

Despite the fact that teachers in this study consider pupils and parents to have inadequate knowledge and understanding of curriculum matters, they regard the contribution of parents and pupils as important in taking curriculum decisions. Teachers surveyed in this study have shown support for proposals in policy documents for extended teacher participation in curriculum planning and decision-making. Teachers are also aware of the implications of such extended roles as they are able to identify the fact that they have limited knowledge and skills and will need the assistance of other stakeholders. Teachers recognise the fact that

involvement in curriculum development would ensure their continued professional development.

5.3. Recommendations.

In the light of the key issues from the literature, the wider education context, the context of Clermont schools and the conclusions drawn from the teacher's responses above, the following recommendations are made:

- Teachers should be provided with basic skills and concepts of curriculum development through workshops and seminars. This needs to take place in a more holistic approach to teacher development following the argument advanced by Fullan (1991) that the professional development of teachers must go hand in hand with whole school development. Within this holistic view the professional development of teachers is seen as a "change in learning materials, in skills, practices, in thinking and understandings" (p.326).

- On the basis of what teachers have said the workshops and seminars could be facilitated by teacher educators, subject advisors and researchers.This recommendation is made against the background that it has emerged from the findings of the study that teachers have inadequate conceptual knowledge of curriculum and curriculum development. In the context of the implementation of a new curriculum which is outcomes based, such workshops and seminars would help to empower teachers so that they would able to reflect critically on the process of achieving outcomes. Considering the cost and time constraints, a cascade approach could be followed in which teachers involved in seminars and workshops at a provincial level would help in the development of other teachers at regional and local level.

- Teachers' capacity should be built through school-based in-service courses where teachers would be expected to develop their own learning programmes.

This would be part of an on-going and staged process of developing teachers and, at the same time, contributing to the development of schools. In the context of an outcomes based curriculum teachers would be helped in writing and developing their own materials and also in reflecting critically on the "specific outcomes". This could be one way of developing teachers' skills in curriculum development in their workplaces and at the same time trying to be sensitive to criticism against in-service courses, that they fail to consider varying contexts in which teachers work (Fullan, 1991; Hofmeyr and Hall, 1995). Contextual factors, such as the management structure of the school, the ethos of the school and availability of resources, have an impact on any curriculum innovation. School-based in-service training could be part of a holistic approach to teacher development which is sensitive to these contextual factors. Extended participation in curriculum development would put extra demand on teachers, thus a gradual process of development which would begin by raising the level of teachers' awareness with regards to the value of their experiences would be more acceptable. Sabar and Shafriri (1981), writing on involving teachers in developing their own curriculum, argue that it begins from taking teachers from the conscious phase to one of greater autonomy and internalisation in a supportive environment.

- From the literature we learn that teachers' level of motivation is important for the success of any curriculum innovation. It is thus recommended that teachers' morale needs to be boosted through addressing their needs and concerns. For the recommendations thus made to succeed, the working conditions of teachers need to be taken into account. The Synthesis Report on the Teacher Education Audit of 1995 has raised critical contextual issues which could be the cause of the absence of a culture of teaching and learning in schools and the low morale of teachers. These issues are that teacher education has often been seen as a "back door" route to obtaining a tertiary qualification for people with no desire to teach; poor working conditions for teachers; educational reforms which put

extra demands on teachers and also make their jobs more complex; high absenteeism and attrition; poor quality and relevance of teacher education which make teachers feel incompetent or lack confidence in the classroom and low teachers' salaries. To ignore these issues, and the fact that there is an absence of a culture of teaching and learning would make it difficult to effect any changes in the curriculum. Teachers need encouragement through either cash bonuses or more favourable conditions of service to reward good performance. This is significant because it has been acknowledged in the literature on curriculum planning and development that extended teacher participation is extra work to normal teaching duties. (Skilbeck, 1984; Nicholls, 1983 and Punch and Bayona, 1990)

- Teacher participation in a whole school approach to development may also be facilitated by teacher organisations through the creation of teacher forums in schools where current debates on curriculum could be discussed. This is put forward with the recognition that it would be difficult for every teacher to participate at national and provincial levels and as such, this could be one mechanism of ensuring broad participation of teachers at grassroots level.

- In order to create a climate favourable for teacher development and whole school development, it is recommended that learning forums should be created at school level which would include teachers, pupils and parents. This is recommended as it has emerged from the findings of the study that teachers acknowledge the importance of the contribution of other stakeholders such as parents and pupils. Such forums would explore the importance of co-operation, participation and collaboration in curriculum decision-making. Such forums would also explore real problems facing schools, for example, the break-down of the culture of teaching and learning in schools. Development of such forums would be an attempt to transform schools into collaborative workplaces.

- **Pre-service teacher education would need to be restructured to include training in curriculum development. Teacher education, it has emerged from the findings of this study, has inadequately prepared teachers for the role of curriculum developers. It has also been indicated in the Synthesis Report on the Teacher Education Audit of 1995 that pre-service teacher education needs restructuring. Teachers surveyed for the study have strongly suggested that teacher training institutions need to offer courses in curriculum development where students would be exposed to the broad theory and practice of curriculum policy and practice in South Africa, as well as to current debates on whether teachers should participate in curriculum development.**

- **Partnerships should be built between schools, non-governmental organisations and colleges of education or universities in order for teachers to be kept informed of developments in curriculum as well as for colleges and universities not to lose touch with school realities. Teachers in this study have indicated that teacher training was removed from the realities of schools. This kind of partnership is important for promoting on-going teacher development where teachers would work together with teacher educators in writing and developing material and in experimenting with new approaches.**

- **Partnerships should be built between schools, communities, non-governmental organisations and the Department of Education at provincial level and regional level. The Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education of 1996 has referred to such potential partnerships between state, parents and teachers. This recommendation is also made against the background that the Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education of 1996 also proposes an integrative approach which does not divorce curriculum development from other forms of development such as teacher development and community development.**

References.

African National Congress (1994) *A Policy Framework for Education and Training: Discussion Document.* Braamfontein, Education Department, ANC.

Ashley, M. (1989) *Ideologies and Schooling in South Africa.* S.A.T.A. , Rondebosch.

Barrow, R. (1984) *Giving Teaching Back to Teachers . A Critical Introduction to Curriculum Theory.* Ontario, Wheatsheaf Books.

Bell, J. (1993) *Doing Your Research Project : A Guide for First Time Researchers in Education and Social Science.* Buckingham, Open University Press.

Campbell, R.M. (1985) *Developing the Primary School Curriculum.* London, Holt.

Carl, A.E. (1986) *Teacher Involvement in Curriculum Development in Secondary Schools in the Republic of South Africa.* D.Ed. Thesis, University of Stellenbosch.

Carl, A.E. (1987) "Teacher Involvement in Curriculum Development - a myth or reality " *South African Journal of Education,* Vol.7, No.2.

Carl, A.E. (1995) *Teacher Empowerment through Curriculum Development : Theory into Practice.* Kenwyn, Juta.

Carson, A.S. (1984) "Control of the Curriculum: A case for teachers". *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* Vol. 9, No.1.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994) *Research Methods in Education (Fourth Edition).* London, Routledge.

Department of Education and Culture, Administration: House of Assembly (1988) Information Guide. No.21, *Curriculum Development in Practice,* Transvaal Education Department.

Duke, D.L. and Showers, D.K. (1980) "Teachers and Shared Decision-Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement". *Educational Administration Quartely,* Vol.16, No.1.

Eggleston, J. (1980) *School-Based Curriculum Development in Britain : A Collection of Case Studies.* London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Enslin, P. (1984) "The Role of Fundamental Pedagogics in the formulation of Educational Policy in South Africa". In P. Kallaway (ed) *Apartheid and Education.* Johannesburg, Ravan Press.

Fink, A. and Kosecoff, J. (1985) *How to Conduct Surveys.* California, Sage.

Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York, Herder and Herder.

Fullan, M. (1993) *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform.* London, Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (1991) *The New Meaning of Educational Change.* Ontorio, Oise Press.

Garrett, R.M. (1990) "The Introduction of School-Based Curriculum Development in a Centralised Education System: A Possible Tactic". *International Journal of Educational Development,* Vol.10, No.4.

Grundy, S. (1987) *Curriculum: Product or Praxis?* London, Falmer Press.

Harlen, W. (1977) "A Stronger Teacher Role in Curriculum Development". *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* Vol. 9, No.1.

Hofmeyr, J. and Hall, G. (1995) *The National Teacher Education Audit* (Synthesis Report)

Hoyle, E. (1974) "Professionality, Professionalism and Control in Teaching". *London Educational Review,* Vol. 3, No.2.

Hoyle, E. and and Megarry, T.(eds.) (1980) "Professionalization and Deprofessionalisation in Education". *World Yearbook of Education: Professional Development of Teachers.* London, Kogan Page.

Judd, Smith and Elliot (1991) *Research Methods in Social Relations.* Fort Worth, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

King, M. and Van den berg, O. (1991) *The Politics of Curriculum: Structures and Processes* Pietermaritzburg, Centaur Publications.

Kruger, R. A. (1980) *Beginsels en Kriteria vir Kurrikulumontwerp.* Pretoria, H.A.U.M.

Mabitsela, L.M. (1988) "Involvement of Black Teachers in Curriculum Development". M. Ed. Dissertation, Rand Afrikaans University.

Maharaj, G.H. (1991) "An Investigation of Constraints on the Further Professional Development of Teachers as Curriculum Decision-Making at Indian Secondary Schools in the Greater Durban Area". M.Ed. Dissertation, University of Natal.

Marsh, C. and Day,C; Hannay, L. (1990) McCutcheon, G. *Reconceptualising School- Based Curriculum Development.* London, Falmer Press.

National Department of Education (1996) *Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education and Training:Draft Document.* Pretoria.

National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) (1992) *Report on Curriculum.* Cape Town, OUP.

Nicholls, A. (1983) *Managing Educational Innovations.* London, George Allen & Unwin.

Punch, K.F. and Bayona, E. (1990) "Teacher Participation in Curriculum Development: A Model and Field Study in Tanzania". *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 10, No. 4.

Republic of South Africa (1995) *White Paper on Education and Training.* Government Gazette, Notice No.196 of 1995, Cape Town.

Rubin, L. (1987) "Curriculum and Staff Development" In *Staff Development for School Improvement.* Falmer Press, New York.

Sabar, N. and Shafriri, N. (1981) "The Need for Teacher Training in Curriculum Development". *British Journal of In-service Education,* Vol.8, No.1.

Schwab, J.J. (1983) "The Practical 4: Something for Curriculum Professors to do". *Curriculum Inquiry,* Vol.13, No. 3.

Simon, A. M. (1990) "Generative Strategy for Data Production". In P. Hugo (ed) *Truth be in the Field.* Pretoria, Unisa.

Simon, A.M. (1986) ***Field Research Procedures and Techniques for the Social Sciences and Education.*** **Johannesburg, Faculty of Education, University of Witwatersrand.**

Skilbeck, M. (1984) ***School-Based Curriculum Development*** **. London, Harper and Row.**

Stenhouse, L. (1975) ***An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development.*** **London, Heinemann.**

Tanner, D. and Tanner, N. (1980) ***Curriculum Development : Theory and Practice*** **New York, Macmillan.**

Tunmer, R. (1981) "The Curriculum in the decade of the eighties". ***South African Journal of Education,*** **Vol. 1, No.2.**

Appendix A

University of Natal

c/o Department of Education

P/Bag x10

Dalbridge 4014

19 August 1996

Dear Colleague

am a member of Ziphathele Secondary School and I am conducting a survey on the Perceptions of Teachers on participation in Curriculum Development". This survey is being conducted through the enclosed questionnaires.

would be very grateful if you would please assist me by completing the questionnaire and eturn it through the accompanying stamped self-addressed envelope.

assure complete anonymity and confidentiality of your responses.

Yours sincerely

Vuyiswa Hlatshwayo (Miss).

CONFIDENTIAL

Perceptions of Teachers in Clermont Area towards Participation in Curriculum Development.

I would appreciate your help and co-operation in completing the following questionnaire. The personal information required is meant to assist in determining the extent to which teachers in different post levels perceive their roles or potential involvement in curriculum development.

SECTION A

Please tick ( ) or enter your responses in the appropriate space provided.

Please indicate your:

1. Sex

Female	
Male	

2. Age

20-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56+

3. Teaching Experience in Years:

4. Qualifications:

Highest Academic	
Highest Professional	

5. In which Post Level are you?

1	
2	
3	
4	

6. Are there any other additional responsibilities that you have ? (eg. H O D, Sports Manager etc.)

Yes	
No	

7. If Yes, Please state them.

_____

_____

_____

SECTION B

Please respond by ticking ( ) in the appropriate box

1. Which one of the following definitions is closest to your understanding of curriculum?

	Curriculum refers to the body of knowledge as well as methods to transmit that body of knowledge.
	Curriculum is a plan or teaching programme of the school that includes aims, objectives as well as the syllabi of the school.
	Curriculum refers to all the learning and teaching opportunities provided by the school. It includes the values and attitudes transmitted through teaching methods, aims, objectives, methods of evaluation, organisational structure as well as decision-making processes of the school.

2. From your understanding of curriculum which of the following descriptions is closest to your understanding of curriculum development ?

	The process of deciding what schools teach and how they teach it guided by particular beliefs and value system as well as principles.
	The process of selection of the learning and teaching materials e.g. selection of textbooks, development of teaching aids, lesson planning and setting of tests.

3. Who do you think should undertake curriculum development ?

1. Teachers.	
2. The Department of Education	
3. Principals and Heads of Dept.	
4. Subject specialists.	
5. Curriculum experts.	
6. Parents.	

4. Please give a reason/s for your choice

5. Who should decide on the method of curriculum planning to be used.

1. Teachers	
2. The department of Education.	
3. Principals and Heads of Dept.	
4. Subject specialist.	
5. Curriculum experts.	
6. Parents.	

6. Please give a reason/s for your choice

7. Do you consider yourself to be involved in curriculum planning and development?

Yes	
No	

8. Describe the nature of your involvement in curriculum planning and development in your school.

9. Do you consider that teacher involvement in curriculum development should be limited to the classroom?

Yes	
No	

10. Please give a reason/s for your answer.

_____
_____
_____

11. Do you think you were adequately prepared during your teacher training for the role of curriculum developer and decision-maker?

Yes	
No	

12. Please give a reason/s for your answer.

_____
_____
_____

13. What do you think needs to be done to provide teachers with the necessary skills to engage in curriculum development if they do not have them?

_____
_____
_____

14. Do you agree that teacher development and curriculum development should be seen to be separate processes?

Yes	
No	

15. Please give reason/s for your response.

_____
_____
_____

16. What do you think are the reasons for the limited role teachers have played in curriculum development? Please list your reason/s by stating the most important first and the least important last.

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. In your school are decisions on issues such as school policy, duty allocation, subjects to be offered decided by:

	The Department of Education
	The Principal and H O Ds in schools
	Teachers, H O D 's and Principal

18. In which of the following curriculum decision-making do you play a role?

	Formation of the school policy.
	Duty allocation.
	Subjects to be offered.
	Drawing up of the time-table.
	Decision-making on the number of periods per week.
	Selection of topics/themes to be covered in your subject area.
	None of the above.

19. In which of the following types of curriculum decision-making do you think teachers should be involved? Please indicate by ranking those listed below.

Selection of textbooks.	
Content of the syllabuses.	
Teaching guidelines of the subject.	
Schemes of work for the year.	
Methods of evaluation.	
Provincial and National Policy-making bodies.	

20. If there are any other types of curriculum decision-making, please state below and include them in the ranking.

_____ ☐

_____ ☐

_____ ☐

21. What degree of involvement should pupils be given in curriculum planning and development?

Maximum Involvement	Minimum Involvement	No Involvement	Not Sure

22. Please elaborate on your response.

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. If there is any suggestion or comment you wish to make, Please use the space provided below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

!! THANK YOU !!

For Your Precious Time

****

University of Natal
c/o Department of Education
Private Bag X10
Dalbridge
4014

15 August 1996

Dear Sir / Madam

Teachers in your school have been selected for the study titled "Perceptions of teachers in the Clermont Area towards participation in Curriculum Development" undertaken through the University of Natal.

A humble request is put forward to you the Principal to please fill-in one of the questionnaires or please give one to your Deputy - Principal. A further request is made to the Principal to give the remaining questionnaires; 3 of the questionnaires to any of the Heads of Department, 3 to the senior teachers (teachers with more than five years experience) and the remaining 3 to junior teachers (teachers with less than five years experience).

A special appeal is made to the Principal with regards to his time and co-operation. A letter from the Acting Superintendent General, Mr Pearce, which grants permission to undertake the research study is enclosed.

Yours faithfully

Vuyiswa Hlatshwayo (Miss).

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE
UMNYANGO WEMFUNDO NAMASIKO
DEPARTEMENT VAN ONDERWYS & KULTUUR

Province of KwaZulu-Natal / Isifundazwe saKwaZulu-Natal / Provinsie KwaZulu-Natal

Street Address/Ikheli ohlala kulo/Straatadres:
228 Pietermaritz Street, Pietermaritzburg

Postal Address/Ikheli lokuposa/Posadres:
Private Bag 9044, Pietermaritzburg 3200

Telephone/Ucingo/Telefoon: (0331) 552111

Fax/Isikhahlamezi/Faks: (0331) 943808

ENQUIRIES/IMIBUZO/NAVRAE: Mr R G Pearce
REFERENCE: 2/1/2/13

6 August 1996

Miss V J Hlatshwayo
C\O Mr M Graham-Jollyet
Department Of Education
University Of Natal
Private Bag X 10
DALBRIDGE 4014
3201

Dear Miss Hlatshwayo

PERMISSION TO UNDERTAKE A RESEARCH STUDY

After careful consideration by the Committee for Research Proposals we have pleasure in granting you permission to undertake your study, titled " Perceptions of teachers in the Clermont Area towards participation in Curriculum Development."

You have requested that the schools you wish to use as part of your study are : Ilanga Secondary, Umqhele Secondary, Sithengile Secondary, Sithokozile Secondary, KwaDabeka Number 7 Secondary, Ziphathele Secondary. Please make the relevant arrangements with the respective Principals. Should you have any problems please request the principals to contact Mr Pearce at the above number.

Yours sincerely

Pearce.

ACTING SUPERINTENDENT GENERAL p.p.

The Addresses that you are missing are:

Sithengile Secondary
Box 419 Clennaville
Tel no 031- 7075166

KwaDabeka Number 7 Senior Secondary
Box 1696 New Germany
Tel No 031 - 7074523