

**A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF OUTCOMES  
BASED EDUCATION FROM A DEVELOPMENTAL  
PERSPECTIVE IN SOUTH AFRICA WITH  
PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE EASTERN  
CAPE**

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of**

**MASTERS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE**

**in the**

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**RHODES UNIVERSITY**

**BY**

**KNOWLEDGE MZWANDILE MDIKANE**

**JANUARY 2004**

## **ABSTRACT**

This research study seeks to examine the impact of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) from a developmental perspective in the Eastern Cape. Two schools were selected as research sites, one from a previously advantaged area and the other from a previously disadvantaged area. These schools were evaluated on their understanding of OBE and its relationship to development.

OBE was introduced in South Africa under controversial circumstances because of the legacy of apartheid education from which we are coming. Because of that, schools in South Africa reflect the inequalities that are resulting from apartheid legislation. In 1994 the government introduced the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) to eradicate all the discrepancies resulting from apartheid. On the educational sphere, OBE was the curriculum policy aimed at eradicating the legacy of apartheid education. The then Minister of Education was convinced that OBE or Curriculum 2005 would be a developmental approach to education and would take South Africa into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Ever since its introduction, educators have encountered many problems with the implementation of OBE, especially in the previously disadvantaged areas of the Eastern Cape.

The researcher used semi-structured interviews to collect data from the respondents. However, one set of questionnaires was prepared for the educators, students, parents and education government officials. Because of the qualitative nature of the questionnaire the data collected was also analyzed qualitatively. Each question was analyzed from each of the focus groups and the researcher established findings that were analyzed in relation to the literature review. The researcher then was able to reach his own conclusions on the impact that OBE has on the South African education system and recommendations on what could be done for OBE to be successfully implemented and to be developmentally effective in previously disadvantaged areas of South Africa.

The recommendations propose useful interventions, which could be made by the government to assist all the stakeholders involved in education in both an understanding

and better implementation of OBE in Previously Disadvantaged Areas (PDA's). They include provision of support to stakeholders and that teachers should be taught about the relationship between OBE and reconstruction. The research study focuses mainly on OBE and its relationship to development in urban or Previously Advantaged Areas (PAA's) of two Eastern Cape schools. It will be relevant to the Eastern Cape Education Department in its efforts to implement OBE in schools and it could be a source of knowledge to educators.

The conclusion that has been reached, however, is that there is a lot of ignorance about this new system of education to both educators and parents. There is also evidence of ignorance to matters pertaining to the relationship between OBE and its relationship to the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP). A major recommendation that is made then is that for OBE to be relevant in the South African context, it should help to improve the lives of ordinary people in South Africa, especially in Previously Disadvantaged Areas.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

It has been a pleasure and an incredible experience for me to undertake this research study. It would not have been possible without the assistance of all the contributors who were involved. My sincere gratitude goes then to the following:

- The educators, students and parents of Transkei Primary School (TPS) for having co-operated with me in conducting the research in their school, despite their hectic schedule. In particular, my sincere thanks go to Deputy Principal, Mr. J. Monroe.
- The educators, students and parents of Mpafane Junior Secondary School (JSS) for having co-operated with me in this research study. My sincere thanks also goes to the Principal Mr. M. Mgweba for having allowed me to undertake this study in the school.
- To the District Manager of Umtata, Mr. M. Ngwanya for having allowed me to undertake the study with the Department Officials.
- To all the Department of Education Officials who, despite their busy schedules have given me the opportunity to conduct this research study.
- To my supervisor, Mrs. M. Maistry for her continual encouragement, advice and assistance throughout my undertaking of the study.
- To my mother who has always been next to me and praying for me on my regular journeys from Umtata to East London to meet my supervisor.
- Lastly, to my Lord Jesus Christ, for having given me the inspiration and courage during my undertaking of this study.

## **DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own unaided work, and that the assistance obtained has been acknowledged in the text. I further certify that this thesis has not been submitted for a degree in any other university.

KNOWLEDGE MZWANDILE MDIKANE

JANUARY 2004

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
DECLARATION	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
LIST OF ACRONYMS	VI
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY	2
1.2 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY	7
1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	12
1.4 THEORITICAL POSITION	12
1.5 METHODOLOGY	13
1.5.1 STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN EDUCATION	14
1.5.1.1 Parents	14
1.5.1.2 Educators	15
1.5.1.3 Learners	15
1.5.1.4 The Department of Education	16
1.6 ANTICIPATED VALUE OF THE STUDY	16
1.7 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS	17
1.8 PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED WITH THE STUDY	17
1.9 ORGANIZATION OF THE RESEARCH	18
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1 INTRODUCTION	20
2.2 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS	20
2.2.1 Outcomes-Based Education	20
2.2.2 Curriculum design and development	23
2.2.1 Human resource development	23
2.2.2.2 Curriculum relevance	24

2.2.2.3	Integration	26
2.2.2.4	Differentiation, redress and learner support	27
2.2.2.5	Nation building and non-discrimination	28
2.2.2.6	Critical thinking and critical theory	28
2.2.3	CURRICULUM 2005	29
2.2.3.1	The post-apartheid challenge	29
2.2.3.2	The global competitive challenge	29
2.2.4	DEVELOPMENT	31
2.2.5	EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION	32
2.3	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT: OBE AS THE PRODUCT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (RDP)	35
2.3.1	The Location of OBE within the RDP	35
2.3.2	The location of OBE in the White Paper for Education & Training	39
2.4	THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT	43
2.4.1	Policy making in South Africa as symbolic rather than developmental	47
2.5	PROCESS AND PRODUCT AS DEVELOPMENTAL IN EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION	52
2.6	CONTEXT AS DEVELOPMENTAL IN EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION	55
2.6.1	Behaviorism	55
2.6.2	Social reconstruction	56
2.6.3	Critical theory	57
2.6.4	Pragmatism	58

2.7 A CRITICAL OVERVIEW OF OBE AS A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH TO EDUCATION	60
<b>CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>72</b>
3.1 INTRODUCTION	73
3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN	73
3.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	73
3.3.1 Sampling	74
3.3.1.1 Transkei Primary School (TPS)	75
3.3.1.2 Mpafane Junior Secondary School	75
3.3.1.3 Educational Developmental Officers (EDO's)	75
3.3.1.4 Curriculum Developmental Officers (CDO's)	76
3.3.1.5 OBE Learning Areas Advisors (LAA's)	76
3.3.2 The Research Process	76
3.3.2.1 Data gathering techniques	76
3.3.3 Analysis of data	83
3.3.4 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	84
3.3.4.1 Fairness and informed consent	84
3.3.4.2 Anonymity and confidentiality	84
3.3.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	85
<b>CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS</b>	<b>88</b>
4.1 AN INTRODUCTION	89
4.2 QUALITATIVE DISCUSSION OF THE DATA	89



4.2.1	THEME 1	89
4.2.1.1	Understanding of OBE	89
4.2.1.2	The focus of OBE	91
4.2.1.3	Reasons for the introduction of OBE	92
4.2.1.4	The focus of the old curriculum	93
4.2.1.5	Understanding of educational transformation	95
4.2.1.6	Understanding of the terminology involved in the new curriculum	96
4.2.1.7.	Understanding of the school's main aim in the new curriculum	97
4.2.1.8	Understanding of the change brought by OBE	99
4.3	THEME 2	101
4.3.1	Understanding of development	101
4.3.2	Understanding of the focus of the RDP	102
4.3.3	Understanding of the role of education in the RDP	103
4.3.4	Understanding of OBE's contribution to the RDP	105
4.3.5	Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of children in South Africa	106
4.3.6	Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of Previously Disadvantaged children	108
4.3.7	Understanding of the better implementation of OBE in Previously Disadvantaged Areas	109
4.3.8	Understanding of the enhancement of the developmental needs of children in Previously Disadvantaged Areas	111
4.4	SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS	113
4.4.1	THEME 1	113
4.4.1.1	Understanding of OBE	113
4.4.1.2	The focus of OBE	113
4.4.1.3	The focus of the old curriculum	113
4.4.1.4	Reasons for the introduction of OBE	113
4.4.1.5	Understanding of educational transformation	114
4.4.1.6	Understanding of the terminology involved in the new curriculum	114
4.4.1.7	Understanding of the school's main aim in the new curriculum	114
4.4.1.8	Understanding of the change brought by OBE	115

4.4.2	THEME 2	115
4.4.2.1	Understanding of development	115
4.4.2.2	Understanding the focus of the RDP	115
4.4.2.3	Understanding of the role of education in the RDP	116
4.4.2.4	Understanding OBE's contribution to the RDP	116
4.4.2.5	Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of children in South Africa	117
4.4.2.6	Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of children in Previously Disadvantaged Areas	117
4.4.2.7	Understanding of better implementation of OBE in Previously Disadvantaged Areas (PDA's)	118
4.4.2.8	Understanding of the enhancement of the developmental needs of children in Previously Disadvantaged Areas	119
4.4	FINDINGS IN RESPECT TO THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	119
4.6	OTHER RELEVANT FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH	128
4.6.1	Lack of empowerment in education	128
4.6.2	Stakeholders not involved in curriculum design and development	128
4.6.3	Stakeholders in education not conversant with developmental issues	129
4.6.4	Lack of resources not a reason for non-implementation	130

<b>CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION</b>	<b>131</b>
5.1 INTRODUCTION	132
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	132
5.2.1 Provision of support to stakeholders	132
5.2.2 Solutions that could lead to development in education	133
5.2.3 Development of Previously Disadvantaged Areas	134
5.2.4 Educational development is for the people	135
5.3. RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY IN THE EASTERN CAPE	136
5.4 CONCLUSION	136
6. REFERENCES	138
7. APPENDICES	
7.1 APPENDIX A: SCHOOLS AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS INTERVIEWED	141
7.2 APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE RESPONDENTS	144

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

African National Congress (ANC)  
 Centre for Education Policy & Development (CEPD)  
 Curriculum 2005 (C2005)  
 Curriculum Development Officers (CDO's)  
 Department of Education (DOE)  
 Economics & Management Sciences (EMS)  
 Educational Developmental Officers (EDO's)  
 Education Government Officials (EGO's)  
 Education and Training Qualifications Agency (ETQA)  
 Human & Social Sciences (HSS)  
 Implementation Plan for Education & Training (IPET)  
 Learning Areas Advisors (LAA's)  
 Mathematical Literacy, Mathematics & Mathematical Sciences (MLMMS)  
 Media in Education Trust (MiET)  
 National Curriculum Development Committee (NCDC)  
 National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI)  
 National Qualification Framework (NQF)  
 Outcomes-Based Education (OBE)  
 Reconstruction & Development Programme (RDP)  
 RDP White Paper (RDP/WP)  
 South African Schools Act (SASA)  
 South African Democratic Teacher's Union (SADTU)  
 School Governing Bodies (SGB's)  
 White Paper for Education & Training (WPET)

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter presents the background information and the rationale for the introduction of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) or Curriculum 2005 (C2005) in South Africa. It also aims at giving the context of this research study, the methodology, the stakeholders involved in education and some ethical issues of importance during the collection of data.

### **1.1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE OF THE STUDY**

According to Spady (1999: 1) Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) means “clearly focusing and organizing everything in an educational system around what is essential for all students to successfully complete their learning experience.” OBE was introduced in South Africa and was named Curriculum 2005 because it was anticipated by the then Minister of Education, that it would be fully implemented in all classes by the year 2005. It was introduced as a developmental approach to education and was intended to simultaneously overturn the legacy of apartheid education and catapult South Africa into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, an innovation that was bold and revolutionary in its magnitude of conception (The Review Committee on C2005; South Africa; 2000: 16). The Committee (South Africa; 2000: 49) also states that “the apartheid legacy runs deep and clearly requires a curriculum that deals forcibly and systematically with issues of justice, democracy and respect for diversity and difference.” It believes that “a curriculum should address the means to promote innovation and economic growth as the basis for social development.” OBE was introduced to eradicate this apartheid legacy to meet the aims and objectives of the Reconstruction and Development Programme.

OBE as the product of the RDP has failed to meet its developmental objectives in the previously disadvantaged areas in South Africa. The origins of OBE in South Africa could be attributed to a number of factors. These are:

- (1) The constitution of the Republic of South Africa (RSA) (Act no. 108 of 1996).
- (2) The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP).
- (3) A philosophy of learner-centered education.
- (4) An approach to the integrated and non-disciplinary division of knowledge.

Therefore, the introduction of OBE in South Africa has its origins in the above, which will be briefly defined:

**(1) The constitution of RSA (Act no 108 of 1996)**

Pretorius (1998:2) states that “the provisions for education in South Africa were set out in section 29 of the constitution on the Republic of South Africa, Act no. 108 of 1996.”

He claims that among other provisions section 29 recognizes that:

- Everyone has a basic right to education.
- Everyone has a right to further education, which means that the state has a constitutional duty to develop education so that further education (and not just basic education) increasingly becomes available and accessible to everyone.
- Education should be transformed and democratized which means that school education should be transformed in accordance with democratic values of human dignity, equality and freedom that underpin the constitution (Pretorius; 1998: 2).

**(2) The Reconstruction and development Programme (RDP)**

The RDP is an integrated, coherent socio-economic policy framework that seeks to mobilize all the people and country's resources towards the final eradication of the results of apartheid and the building of a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist future (RDP White Paper: 1994: 5). According to the RDP White Paper (RDP/WP; 1994: 6) “there are six basic principles of the RDP, which ensure a coherent development of South Africa.” Firstly, it states that “we require an integrated and sustainable programme and the legacy of apartheid cannot be overcome with piecemeal and uncoordinated policies.” The RDP brings together strategies to harness all the resources in a coherent and purposeful effort that can be sustained in the future. Secondly, it claims that “this programme should be a people-driven process.” Thirdly, it concedes that “this programme should be closely bound with peace and security for all.” Fourthly, it maintains that “if peace and security are established, then South Africa will embark on nation building.” Lastly, it contends that “these five principles all depend on the

thorough democratization of South Africa.” These principles will be further explained in the literature review of the study.

The (RDP/WP; 1994:8) mentions that “the underlying approach of the RDP programme is that education and training should be available to all.” It claims that “life-long learning is encouraged and that the RDP takes a broad view of education and training, seeing it not only as something that happens in schools and colleges, but in all areas of our society, in homes, workplaces, public works programmes, youth programmes and in rural areas.” It also claims that “a key focus throughout the RDP is to ensure a full and equal role for and recognition of women in every aspect of our economy and society.” It concedes, however that “with this emphasis and with the emphasis on affirmative action throughout the RDP, boundless energies and creativity suppressed by racism and discrimination will be unlocked.” In training, it believes that “particular attention will be paid to the challenges posed by the restructuring of the industries as South Africa re-enter the world economy.”

Thus, OBE was introduced to fulfill these basic principles of the RDP, to become a developmental approach to education and fulfill the ideas of lifelong learning. It was also introduced to eradicate all the legacies of apartheid associated with racism and discrimination in education.

### **(3) Learner-centred education**

Learner-centred education is a system of education that is centred on the child. The Department of Education (2002: 4) believes that “a learner-centred curriculum is curriculum development, which put learners first, recognizing and building on their knowledge and experience, and responding to their needs.”

Gulting, Lubisi, Parker & Wedekind (1998: 4) are in agreement with the DOE that “the curriculum development, especially the development of learning programmes, put learners first, recognizing and building on their knowledge and experience, and responding to their needs.” They claim that “curriculum development processes and



delivery of learning content (knowledge, skills, attitudes and values) should take account of general characteristics, developmental and otherwise, of different groups of learners.” They further contend that “different learning styles and rates of learning need to be acknowledged and accommodated, both in the learning situation and in the attainment of qualifications.” Moreover, they concede that “the ways in which different cultural values and lifestyles affect the construction of knowledge should also be acknowledged, and incorporated into the development and application of learning programmes.”

Gulting et al (1998:4) further suggest that “motivating learners by providing them with positive learning experiences, by affirming their worth and demonstrating respect for their various languages, cultures, and personal circumstances, is a prerequisite for all forms of learning and development.” They maintain that “this should be combined with regular acknowledgement of learner achievement at all levels of education and training and the development of their ability will motivate them to work co-operatively and independently.” They believe that “learners should be encouraged to reflect on their own learning progress, and to develop the skills and strategies needed to study through open learning, distance education and multi-media programmes.”

The Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 40) argues that “the main features of the framework on learner centred education survived intact through successive versions of curriculum policy development.” It claims that “it survived in the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI: 1992), the Implementation Plan for Education and Training (IPET: 1994), the African National Congress (ANC: 1994) and was also central to the Department of Education (DOE: 1997).” In addition, the Committee points out that “another dimension was added through discourses of ‘competency-based’ education and training that were common in South African training circles in the late 1980’s.” The Committee argues that “in the early 1990’s, in the discussions between labour and business, ‘competency’ was transmuted into ‘outcomes’.” It claims that “this led to the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) by the DOE and the National Curriculum Development Committee (NCDC) in 1996.”

Furthermore, the Committee (South Africa; 2000: 40) argues that “during the apartheid years, the principal pedagogical alternative to the education system’s Fundamental Pedagogics was ‘progressive education.’” It states that “this was a form of learner-centred education nurtured in the liberal universities and the English private schools.” Furthermore, it claims that “in the 1980’s the progressive learner-centred approach was linked to an egalitarian transformative project for South African education, and as a result, People’s education was presented as an alternative to apartheid education.” It contends, therefore, that the main features of people’s education that were absorbed into contemporary policy are:

- An egalitarian political mission.
- An anti-rota learning.
- A learner-centred approach to education.
- Teachers as curriculum developers.
- Group work rather than directive teaching
- Community participation. (Review Committee; 2000: 40)

#### **(4) An integrated and non-disciplinary division of knowledge**

The Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 41) believes that “the term ‘integration’ has come into the educational debate in South Africa from three different directions.” However, it claims that “these are related, but not identical.” Firstly, it maintains that “they include the discussions in the early 1990’s around the proper relationship between education and training.” Secondly, it contends that “it is a specifically curricular initiative called ‘integrated studies,’ explored in a few independent schools in the 1980’s.” Lastly, it concedes that “it is the view that schooling is a preparation for life and work.” Therefore, the Committee maintains that “these debates have all had a bearing on the development of learning areas in C2005.”

In addition, the Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 41) maintains that “the definition and selection of the eight learning areas for C2005 grew out of these diverse strands, but also built on the curriculum framework produced in 1994 under the previous regime that proposed a division of fields of study into seven learning areas.”

However, it claims that “C2005 has added Economics and Management Sciences (EMS) to make up the eight learning areas and has added to the basic knowledge fields a set of design features.” Therefore, the Committee believes that “these promote strong integration within and across the learning areas and integration of learning into everyday life.”

## **1.2 THE CONTEXT OF THE STUDY**

The introduction of Bantu Education Act in 1953, by the then minister of Native Affairs, Hendrick Verwoerd, was based on the assumption that Black children required a schooling system that was different from that of White children. The outcome of such a system of education was that the development of Blacks became stunted in every sphere of life, politically, socially and economically.

Nkabinde (1997:5) states that “the introduction of Bantu education in 1954 was aimed at providing separate and unequal education for different races in South Africa.” He maintains that “its motive was to inculcate in Blacks a sense of inferiority.” He claims, however, that Hendrick Verwoerd, then Prime Minister, stated that “Bantu education’s emphasis should be more practical, focusing mainly on technical skills.” Nkabinde (1997:5) is in agreement with Arnold (1981) when he states that “Verwoerd’s message was clear that Black carpenters, laborers, and artisans were to be trained for the White economy, but not as professionals or thinkers who might threaten the status quo.” He further argues that “prior to the introduction and implementation of Bantu education, more than 70 % of African schools were run by missionaries of various denominations and the remainder was controlled by the state or the community.”

However, Nkabinde (1997:5) believes that “the Bantu education Act of 1953 allowed for all African schools to be governed by a separate Department of Native Affairs.” He concedes that “missionaries and the community lost control over African schools so that control of curriculum, teaching methods, and teachers was relinquished in exchange for state financial aid.” He concurs with Evans (1992) when he describes Bantu education “as a deliberately inferior form of education that trained Blacks exclusively for

employment in menial low wage positions in a racially structured economy.” According to Nkabinde, “education for other racial minorities prepared them for leadership positions, whereas Bantu education prepared Blacks for subservient roles.”

In support of this, Nkabinde (1976: 5) contends that “Bantu education had its curriculum geared towards a ‘fit for Blacks’ emphasis, including the production of interpreters, messengers, porters, religious ministers, teachers and nurses.” He maintains, however, that “given the narrow focus of the curriculum its recipients were actually prepared for professions such as mine boys, bank tellers, plantation workers, construction workers, and other low paying jobs.” Therefore, he believes that “the limitations of Bantu education had the potential to make Blacks feel inadequate and incompetent compared to other people.” In addition, he claims that “Bantu education was tailored towards producing certain types of Black intellectuals, that is, intellectuals who were supposed to be passive and never question the status quo.” According to Nkabinde, “such a system of education, then, was intended to silence the voice of government opponents and it was geared to provide certain skills commensurate with the needs of the industry.”

Furthermore, Nkabinde (1997:6) claims that “the government’s interest was to educate more Blacks to suit the needs of the economy.” He contends that “when Bantu education was legally introduced, it was meant to serve definite purposes, one of which was to prevent independence for Blacks, including the freedom of expression.” He believes that “Blacks were prevented from being independent and were consequently controlled by others.” He further concedes that “being controlled by others led Black South Africans to lose their identity and their ability to develop their potential.” Nkabinde (1997: 6) maintains that “their inability to design their own education has done serious education damage as it has debased their self-image, destroyed their confidence, and lowered their motivation.”

Nkabinde (1997:6) believes that Bantu education, as designed by the ruling elite, had the following intentions:

- To provide some basic education for Blacks.

- To provide a system of education that enforced ethnicity.
- To divide permanently the Black population into manageable compartments.
- To provide a form of education that promoted technical training at the expense of critical thinking or education geared towards active participation in shaping one's own life.

Pillay (1990: 30) argues that “the salient features of apartheid education were the differential patterns of educational developments of the different race groups.” On the one hand, he maintains that “Whites received a very high level of education that is comparable with the best in the industrialized world.” On the other hand, he contends that “Black education was characterized largely by an inequitable allocation of resources, overcrowded classrooms, high drop out rates and insufficient poorly qualified teachers.” Pillay (1990: 30) also believes that “this system of education was generally considered by Blacks to be inferior and designed to confine them to lower class occupations.”

However, Samuel (1990: 18) argues that “a crucial facet of Bantu Education was to ensure that in line the apartheid policy, the vast majority of Black children should receive a schooling that did not equip them for anything other than unskilled manual labour” In addition, Samuel (1990: 17) concedes that “Black education was classified into three categories; African education; Coloured education and Indian education.” He claims that “even within this Black education, African education showed the greater degree of underdevelopment.”

Samuel (1990: 17) argues that “the state policy towards Black schooling was possible the single most important factor accounting for the 1976 student revolts.” He believes that “the state's intention to maintain an educational system that ensured that the vast majority of Black pupils had an inferior schooling.” Furthermore, Samuel (1990: 17) maintains that “the state policy on Black schooling from 1963 to 1976 was based on the proposals set out on the Eiselen Commission on ‘Native Education.’”

Samuel (1990:17) contends that “the Commission made numerous recommendations, most of which were implemented in terms of the Bantu Education Act of 1953.” However, he claims that “a crucial premise on which the commission based all its proposals was set out in its terms of reference.” He maintains that “the commission was requested to formulate the principles and aims of education for Natives as an independent race, in which their past and present, their inherent racial qualities are taken into consideration.” Furthermore, he states that “their distinctive characteristics and aptitude, and their needs under the ever changing social conditions should also be considered.” In fact, Samuel (1990: 17) concedes that “the assumption was that Black children required a schooling system that was different from that of White children.” He argues that “the then Minister of Native Affairs, Hendrik Verwoerd, rejected the schooling structure that was set up by the missions on the ground that it produced the “wrong type” of a Black person.” Verwoerd argued:

Racial relations cannot improve if the wrong type of education is given to Natives. They cannot improve if the result of Native Education is the creation of frustrated people who, as a result of the education they received, have expectations in life which circumstances in South Africa do not allow to be fulfilled immediately, when it creates people who are trained for professions not trained to them, when there are people who have received a form of cultural training which strengthens their desire for the White collar occupations to such an extent that there are more such people than openings available... (In Nasson & Samuel 1990:18).

Morrow & King (1998:xii) believe that “the current government in South Africa inherited a situation in which, as a high priority, it has to change public education in some decisive way.” They concede that “by the early 1990’s high hopes had been raised about what changes education could be expected to deliver.” They claim, however that “it was hoped that change would simultaneously benefit the previously disenfranchised and marginalized and improve the quality of life for all.” Furthermore, they believe that “the culture of teaching and learning had broken down in many Black and urban sectors of our society and radical changes to the education system would restore it. They believe that it would “revitalize the whole field after the disaster of apartheid education.” Moreover,

they contend that “it was hoped that the new government would launch an ambitious programme of developing human resource policy at a breakneck point.”

Outcomes-Based Education was introduced in 1997 to enhance the developmental needs of Black people in South Africa. OBE, as a developmental approach to education, is based on outcomes that should be achieved after the completion of the learning experience. It integrates different aspects of learning like understanding knowledge, performing skills, showing values and demonstrating attitudes. Furthermore, Fataar: 1998: 68) believes that “with the introduction of the RDP in 1994, the ANC government produced a White Paper on RDP that laid out the parameters within which reconstruction should occur” According to Fataar (1998: 68) “a policy generated process also occurred around education and a draft White Paper (1998) located itself in the context of the RDP policy.”

However, OBE has not to been a sustainable system of education and did not involve educators and parents in it’s conception. The same educators, without proper training in OBE, were expected to implement it under unequal circumstances. Therefore, the conditions under which educators work seems not to be conducive to the attainability of these competent and complex outcomes. This meant that a shift from apartheid education to OBE needs a careful and monitored approach by the government. The problem with OBE is that it is an educational policy that has been introduced even by other countries and has been adapted to the South African situation. South Africa, as a country of large social and economic inequalities, because of the apartheid legacy, is definitely having a problem with such an approach to education.

The study, therefore, is based on the assumption that OBE does not meet the developmental needs of the children in historically disadvantaged areas. It is also based on the assumption that OBE does not fulfill the basic principles of the RDP. Furthermore, it is also based on the assumption that people should be equipped with skills necessary for their development, as laid out in the National Qualifications Framework

(NQF) that is the pillar of OBE. The introduction of OBE, without addressing the imbalances of apartheid education, is rather problematic.

### **1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

There has been much debate from the education profession that OBE was introduced without addressing the effects of apartheid education. Many educators in South Africa are under-qualified and are not skilled in handling OBE since they have not received formal training in it. Moreover, most Black schools, especially African schools in previously disadvantaged areas, are still under-resourced and there are no proper classrooms to accommodate the high enrolment of students. The parents have also not been informed about this new system of education and, therefore, lack its' understanding.

The following is the goal of the research:

- To critically evaluate OBE from the developmental perspective in South Africa.

The objectives of the research are as follows:

- To compare and determine the extent to which educators, students, parents and government education officials understand the implementation and meaning of OBE.
- To critically evaluate whether OBE meets the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas.

### **1.4 THEORETICAL POSITION**

Education is a process whereby a child is assisted to acquire knowledge and skills that would require him/her to become a responsible and self-sufficient adult or citizen. This development from being a child to becoming a responsible adult needs an educational system relevant to the developmental needs of children and which will enable them to use their knowledge in work and in the social world.



This view of learning has also been echoed by many academics, for instance, Spady (1999: 7) believes that “a system of education in a country should encourage life-long learning and should be able to relate meaningfully to the world of work.” This, of course, requires a developmental approach to education and an outcomes-based curriculum to be developed on schools. According to Spady (1999: 9) there are two key purposes of an Outcomes-Based Education curriculum. They are:

- Ensuring that all students are equipped with knowledge, competence and qualities needed to be successful after they exit the educational system.
- Structuring and operating schools so that these outcomes can be achieved and maximized for all students.

The South African government introduced OBE as a developmental approach to education to encourage students to help develop their own communities. Therefore, it is assumed that OBE is a system of education that equips children with knowledge, skills and competencies that are needed for them to live sustainable lives and develop the communities in which they live.

## **1.5. METHODOLOGY**

This research study is based on qualitative data because the researcher was interested in evaluating OBE from a developmental perspective and thus establishes the relationship between education and development. The researcher was also trying to find out whether educators, students, parents and education government officials understand the meaning and implementation of OBE.

The researcher used a combination of questionnaires and interview schedules when collecting data. Two schools were used as research sites, Transkei Primary School (TPS) in Umtata and Mpafane Junior Secondary School (JSS) in the rural outskirts in Umtata. However, 5 educators, 5 students and 5 parents in each school were given questionnaires and interview schedules were conducted with them. Moreover, 3 Education Development Officers (EDO's), 2 Curriculum Development Officers (CDO's) and 1

OBE Learning Areas Advisor (LAA) was also given questionnaires and interview schedules were conducted with them. Questions were arranged according to themes and theme 1 (see Appendix B) the researcher dealt with their understanding and knowledge of OBE while theme 2 dealt with their understanding of the relationship between OBE and development.

### **1.5.1 STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN EDUCATION**

#### **1.5.1.1 Parents**

The parents are the first stakeholders involved in the education of their children because they have to make sure that their children receive quality education. According to the Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD) (2001), “the establishment of School Governing Bodies (SGB’s) represents a significant decentralization of power in the South African school system.” The CEPD contends that “the involvement of parents in the education of their children was established according to the South African Schools Act (SASA).” It claims that the Act allocates considerable powers to Governing Bodies and these include the powers to:

- Adopt a constitution.
- Administer and rent out school premises.
- Recommend appointment of staff to the provincial education department.
- Develop a budget, including provision of school fees for approval by parents.
- Determine admissions policy within certain parameters.
- Raise funds for the school.
- Determine the school’s language policy.
- Supplement the resources supplied by the state in order to improve the quality of education provided to learners. (CEPD: 2001)

The parents, therefore, have to make sure that the type of education their children receive is in accordance with the constitution of South Africa. They have to make sure that their children are learning in conditions that are conducive to quality education.

### **1.5.2 Educators**

According to Van Wyk (1998: 25) “the teacher is the one person at the centre of the education system.” She claims that “teachers have both rights and responsibilities some of which are set out by the South African Council of Educators (SACE).” She maintains that these include:

- Promoting the intellectual and personal development of learners.
- Promoting a culture of teaching and learning.
- Fostering in learners a culture of human rights.
- Acting in a fair and impartial manner in their dealings with learners.
- Taking the appropriate measures to attain and maintain a high level of professionalism (Van Wyk; 1998: 25).

The educators should ensure that all these rights and responsibilities are carried out so that they are able to perform their duties in a professional manner. Their professionalism, should contribute, therefore, to the total development of the child.

### **1.5.1.3 Learners**

Van Wyk (1998: 25) believes that “learners are also at the centre of the education system.” She believes that learners prefer:

- Teachers who are friendly, trustworthy and reliable.
- Teachers who respect their personal feelings, interests, family lives and diverse cultures.
- Safety from embarrassment or being cajoled or threatened into learning.
- Safety from sexual or any other verbal or physical harassment.
- Clear classroom rules and procedures that make behavioral and learning expectations explicit to them.
- Extra assistance from teachers given willingly when needed, including assistance after school hours.
- Fair treatment, recognition and praise for effort and success.
- Teachers with high but accurate expectations of learners.

- Variety in teaching and learning, creative work, positive and challenging school work.
- Teachers who show by example their commitment to teaching (Van Wyk; 1998: 25)

Therefore, learners prefer someone who is friendly, trustworthy and who respect their feelings and interests. They need assistance from teachers, treatment and recognition for their efforts and success. Moreover, they want teachers with accurate expectations for them who show by example their commitment to teaching.

#### **1.5.1.4 The Department of Education**

The Department of Education is also one of the major stakeholders in education. According to Van Wyk (1998:26) “the provincial Departments of Education are responsible for the appointment, promotion and remuneration of educators.” She argues that “there are certain teacher rights that provincial Departments of Education should ensure.” These are:

- It may not unfairly discriminate on the basis of race, age, gender, sex, disability, ethnic or social origin, conscience, belief, culture or language.
- Educators have the right of access to information held by the Department of Education relating to their employment.
- The government should respect the freedom of association of all educators.
- Educators are entitled to be members of political parties, although they are cautioned not to use their position to advance or to attempt to advance the interests of any political party (Van Wyk; 1998: 26).

The Department of Education, therefore, assures that educators and learners are given their rights and that no body is discriminated against on the basis of sex, religion, disability, social origin and belief.

#### **1.6. ANTICIPATED VALUE OF THE STUDY**

This research study would be of great value to the Department of Education, especially in the Eastern Cape, since there are a lot of problems with the implementation of OBE and a

great need of development in education. The Department of Education could, therefore, devise means on how to implement OBE successfully in previously disadvantaged areas with a view to future development of these areas.

Moreover, the study will contribute in bringing knowledge to the development perspective of education to the people of the Eastern Cape. The students, teachers, parents, and Education Department officials will know the relationship between education and development and specifically between OBE and development and what they are supposed to be doing to make OBE pertinent to the developmental needs of their children.

### **1.7. DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS**

There are terms that will be defined in literature review of the study such as Outcomes-Based Education, Curriculum, Curriculum 2005, development and education transformation. (See Chapter 2).

### **1.8 PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED WITH THE STUDY**

The problem that the researcher encountered during this research study was the unwillingness of some of the respondents to participate in the research. Most of them cited their busy schedules when they did not fulfill appointments made with them. Every time someone missed an appointment the researcher had to arrange for another date, which was often not honored. The researcher, for example, made four appointments with one of my respondents from the Department of Education and in each of these instances he failed to arrive claiming to be in a meeting or at work. Because of the significance of his participation in the research, the researcher was determined to elicit a commitment from him, which he did.

Another problem, which the researcher encountered during his undertaking of this study, was the level of his student respondents at Transkei Primary School (TPS). They were young and therefore he had to pitch his first questionnaire at their level. There was also

some difficulty, especially at Mpafane JSS in his interaction with parents when he had to communicate in Xhosa and then to translate it to English. The researcher was careful not to lose the meaning of what they had said in his translation.

## **1.9 ORGANIZATION OF THE RESEARCH**

The research is organized in such a way that Chapter One presents the background and rationale of the study. The context of the study is also briefly explained as well as the objectives of study, the theoretical position, the methodology and some ethical issues that were considered relevant during the research study. Chapter Two attempts to explain the definition of some concepts that are relevant to the study and the important literature that has been used

Chapter Three explains the methodology used in collecting data and ethical issues that were considered relevant to the study. Chapter Four presents the results, analysis and the findings of the research. The summary of the findings, other relevant findings of the research study and the relevance of the findings in respect to the objectives of the study has been briefly explained. Chapter Five is the researcher's conclusion, recommendations and the relevance of the study in the Eastern Cape.

# **CHAPTER TWO**

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

## **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter some of the important literature on Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) and development will be discussed. There will be a definition of the concepts important in the study. The relationship between education and development will be discussed, especially OBE as a product of the RDP, the location of OBE in the White Paper for Education and Training (WPET), the relationship between education transformation and development, process and product as a developmental approach to education. The context as developmental in education and a critical overview of OBE will also be explicated.

## **2.2 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS**

### **2.2.1 OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION**

According to Van Der Horst & MacDonald (1997:7), OBE can be described “as an approach, which requires teachers and learners to focus their attention on two things.” Firstly, they maintain that “the focus is in the end-result of each learning process.” They concede that “these desired end-results be called outcomes of learning and learners need to demonstrate that they have attained them.” Van Der Horst & MacDonald (1997: 7) contend, therefore that “the learner’s progress will be continuously assessed.” Secondly, they claim that “the focus should be on the instructive and learning processes, which will guide the learners to these end-results.” Moreover, they believe that “teachers are required to use the learning outcomes as a focus when they make instructional decisions and plan their lessons.”

Fleisch (2002: 117) claims that “OBE aims to shift the focus of school teaching away from the objectives derived from syllabi content to structuring learning experiences around what students should know by the time they leave the formal school system.” Malan (1997:10) maintains that “education, the process of teaching and learning, is outcomes-based when it accepts as its premise that the definition of outcomes should form the basis of all educational activity. He believes that “these include the description



of qualifications, the development of curricula, the assessment of learners, the developmental of educational structures and institutions.” Therefore, he concedes that even the planning of finances, buildings and other resources are also components of the education process.

Baxen & Souden (1999:133) argue that “OBE has its focus on the country’s pedagogical and ideological legacy, is proposed as the organizing curriculum framework through which the National Qualifications (NQF) will be operationalized.” They believe that “adherents to an Outcomes-Based approach to education in South Africa have suggested that it has the potential to meet the needs of all students regardless of their environment, ethnicity, economic status or disabling conditions.” Baxen & Souden (1999: 133) also claim that “adherents of OBE state that this system enables teachers and educationists to adopt a more explicit, unequivocal curricular focus, to be able to develop better instructional procedures, and assess learner’s achievements with exactitude, clarity and validity.” Moreover, they contend that “the principles that underpin such a system are based on the assumption that all students can learn and succeed, success breeds success and schools control the environment and conditions of success.”

The Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 40) claims that “there are three different kinds of Outcomes-Based Education and they differ as to how outcomes are designed specified and assessed.” In addition, it maintains that “the principal feature common to all outcomes-based education is a distinction between inputs and outputs.” The Review Committee (South Africa; 2000: 41) claims that “outputs (also described as standards) are centrally designed and prescribed, while inputs are discretionary and are generated and managed locally.” The Committee believes that “inputs include that which teachers and learners bring to learning, that is, indigenous particularities and priorities, textbooks, management and support systems.” The Committee is in agreement with Malcolm (2000) that “since these factors vary across learning contexts, the key input of what is taught and how it is taught should be as little prescribed as possible.” In other words, “it believes that quality is defined and assessed solely in terms of standards.”

Furthermore, the Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 41) views OBE “as generally seen to be promoting equity (through the statement of outcomes), but taking account of differences (by maximizing the discretion in the outputs).” However, it believes that “in reality the quality of Outcomes-Based Education depends centrally on the quality of teachers, their content knowledge, their facility with different teaching methods, and their access to learning programmes and textbooks.” The Committee contends that “the language of ‘outcomes’ entered the language of curriculum reform in ANC documents (1994) in a particular form.” It claims, however that “this formulation did not radically separate inputs and outcomes, but still prescribes a ‘core’ curriculum.” It points out that “a fully-fledged model of OBE was set out in ‘CURRICULUM 2005: LIFELONG LEARNING FOR THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY.’” Moreover, it states that “this model specified outputs in the form of outcomes, left inputs largely unspecified and proposed a continuous assessment model in which criterion-referenced assessment underpinned classroom assessment.”

Furthermore, the Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 41) agrees with Malcolm (2000) when he claims that “with the implementation of OBE in various countries across the world, it has become clear that ‘questions of content and conceptual understanding are troublesome in OBE.’” In fact, the Committee contends that “in all OBE systems, questions of conceptual coherence, content, sequence and progression have only recently begun to receive attention.” The Committee maintains that “this has not resulted in a return to a ‘content-driven curriculum’.” It states that “rather it meant recognizing that teachers require as a matter of equity and accountability, greater guidance and support in content specification.” However, the Committee believes that “this can happen in one of two ways, either by stipulating finer and finer levels of outcomes or by ensuring conceptual coherence through guidance on inputs.” The Committee claims that “the successive phases of C2005 development have done mainly the former.”

In conclusion, OBE is an approach to teaching and learning that focuses on end-results of a learning process and are referred to as “outcomes” of learning. OBE also aims at

shifting the focus of teaching and learning away from content syllabi to structured learning experiences around what students should know around what students should know by the time they leave the formal school system. Furthermore, it focuses at organizing everything in an educational system around what is essential for all students to successfully complete their learning experience.

## **2.2.2 CURRICULUM DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT**

According to Gulting, Lubisi, Parker & Wedekind (1998) there are certain principles that should inform curriculum design and development. They claim that these are human resource development, learner-centredness, relevance, integration, differentiation, redress and learner-support, nation building and non-discrimination and critical, creative thinking.

### **2.2.2.1 Human resource development**

Gulting et al (1998: 3) believe that “it is now accepted that successful modern economics and societies require citizens with a strong foundation of general education.” They also argue that “such economies also require people with the desire and ability to continue to learn, to apply and develop new knowledge, skills and techniques.” They concede that it also needs people who “move flexibly between occupations, accept responsibility for personal performance, set and achieve appropriate standards and work co-operatively.” Gulting et al (1998: 3) further claim that “it is the critical role of education and the training process to prepare learners to be such citizens by acknowledging that learners themselves are resources of knowledge.” They point out that “the process of learning, while building on prior learning, should be the process of expanding the boundaries of knowledge and building capacity throughout their lives.” Therefore, they suggest that “the notion of lifelong learning, organized in South Africa in terms of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF), should be a major thrust of a new education and training system.”

Donaldson (2001: 62) believes that “the role of education in support of broader social and economic development was a central theme in the National Education Policy

Investigation (NEPI) research group.” He argues that “according to this group, human resource development is central in meeting the twin challenges of restoring economic growth and improving income distribution in the South African economy.” He maintains that “education and training contribute skills and productivity, and thus underpin long-term economic growth.” Furthermore he states that “education and training facilitate social and economic mobility of the individuals and households, promoting industrial growth, urbanization and coherent rural development programmes.” He believes that “these are valuable social and economic entitlements in themselves, contributing directly to individuals, house hold and community welfare.” Outcomes-Based education, then, was introduced to address the issues of human resource development and to contribute to skills and productivity in South Africa.

#### **2.2.2.2 Curriculum relevance**

Gulting et al (1998:5) argue that “the curricula should be relevant and appropriate to current and anticipated future needs of the individual, society, commerce and industry.” They believe, however, that “ever-increasing evidence suggests that economic growth in a competitive, international, economic system depends fundamentally on a generally well-educated population.” They claim that people should be “equipped with the relevant competencies and skills required in the economy at any point in time, but also with the capacity to continue learning and developing new skills and acquiring competencies.” They further concede that “these imperatives apply not only to the education and training policy but also that learning programmes should enable learners to become technologically literate as well as environmentally aware and responsible.”

Gulting et al (1998:5) maintain that “in the development, design, and delivery of learning programmes, cognizance should be taken of different cultures, languages and religious beliefs.” They claim that “a selection of topics for learning and teaching approaches and methods need to reflect cultural diversity.” They concur that “learners should be able to recognize the uniqueness of our multi-cultural situation and potential for the development of culture as a unique South African commodity, which has immense, positive implications for nation-building and social development.”

Carl (1995: 58) is in agreement with Eisner & Vallance (1975) when they give a description of approaches to curriculum development, called their “conceptual framework.” Firstly, he argues that “the development of cognitive processes stresses ‘how’ the pupils learn, rather than what they learn.” However, Carl believes that “the learning process is most important because the development of thinking skills is strongly accentuated.” Therefore, he contends that “pupils must master and apply skills such as ‘analysis, synthetization and classification.’” Thus, according to him, “the purpose of curriculum development is on the development of cognitive skills of pupils.”

Secondly, Carl (1995: 58) believes that “the curriculum is the process where instructional methods are important.” He claims that “a particular end goal is set and detailed planning takes place to achieve that goal.” However, Carl concedes that “an input is made and it is expected that the pupil will deliver an output in the form of a certain achievement.”

Thirdly, Carl (1995: 58) states that “the self-actualization of the child comprises of the school curriculum offering specific positive learning experiences for the child.” He maintains that “opportunities for self-discovery and development must be created.” Therefore, according to Carl, “curriculum development must be relevant and topical so that this self-actualization can take place and that it does not imply total freedom, but rather disciplined thinking.”

Fourthly, Carl (1995: 58) points out that “social reconstruction requires that pupils should be oriented with regard in inquiry such as, for example, multi-culturalism, unemployment, adaptation to change and pollution.” He maintains that “this approach differ from other approaches in that the needs of the community are strongly accentuated and receive preference.” Therefore, according to Carl (1995) “this approach believes that schools must equip pupils so that they can function in changing communities and, as citizens, critical with regard to social changes.”

Lastly, Carl (1995: 58) is of the view that “in academic rationalism pupils must master selected contents as offered in the traditional subjects.” However, he argues that “stress is also placed on the acquisition of knowledge through research and learning and mastering facts is characteristic of this approach.” Moreover, he believes that “this is more than mere textbook memorization since mastering content stresses development and change in ideas.”

Carl (1995: 58) believes that “for a curriculum to be developmental it should emphasize the development of cognitive skills of the learners.” However, he also maintains that “the process of planning and instructional methods is important where an input is made and pupils are expected to deliver an output.” He contends that “when opportunities have been presented in the curriculum the self-actualization of the child is also developed.” Moreover, he believes that “schools should equip learners with skills relevant to social reconstruction so that they are able to be critical to social changes and maintain themselves as in the changing world.” He also claims that “the curriculum should enable learners to master selected contents and that stress should be placed on acquisition of knowledge through research and not mere textbook memorization.”

#### **2.2.2.3 Integration**

Integration in education entails combining various learning areas into one learning area. It adopts a holistic view of knowledge. Gulting et al (1998:5) believe that “successful modern economies and societies require the elimination of artificial hierarchies in social organization in the appointment and management of work, and in the way in which learning is organized and certified.” They argue that “an integrated approach to education and training implies a view of learning which rejects a rigid division between academic and applied knowledge.” They further state that it implies a division between “theory and practice, between knowledge and skills and between head and hand.” They claim that “such divisions have characterized the organization of curricula and the distribution of educational opportunities in many countries of the world including South Africa.” In fact, they concede that “they have grown out of, and helped to reproduce, very old occupational and social class distinctions.”

Moreover, Gulting et al (1998:5) contend that “adopting an integrated approach to education and training is one way of responding to these changes.” They believe that “it will not, in itself, create a successful economy and society in South Africa, but such an approach is a prerequisite for successful human resource development.” Consequently, they maintain that “an integrated approach would be capable of making a significant contribution to the reconstruction and development of our society and economy.”

#### **2.2.2.4 Differentiation, redress and learner support**

Differentiation means that learners are not the same and had to be treated as individuals. Redress and learner support is the provision of education and support to those previously disadvantaged learners because of their disability or colour. Gulting et al (1998:6) state that “learning programmes should facilitate the creation of opportunities for all learners including those who are disabled in some or other way, enabling them to strive towards the attainment of similar learning outcomes.” They believe that “such an approach does not deny that there are educationally relevant differences among individuals neither does it rule out approaches that would recognize different levels of mastery.” They contend, however, that “implicit in the ideas of national standards, is the belief that differences in learners’ interests and abilities should challenge educators to explore a host of instructional methods and approaches.”

Gulting et al (1998:6) clearly state that “learners should be given the opportunity of coping with demanding performance standards at their own pace rather than at the pace of the majority of learners in class.” In addition, they claim that “learning programmes should, while acknowledging that all learners have special needs, make special provision for accommodating those learners with learning or other disabilities in mainstream education.” They believe that “certain areas of learning and certain aspects of education and training have either not been equally available to all learners in the past or have been grossly neglected.” Therefore, they concede that “learning programmes need to acknowledge this and include special measures for redressing this neglect.”

#### **2.2.2.5 Nation-building and non-discrimination**

Gulting et al (1998:6) point out that “education and training should promote the development of national identity and awareness of South Africa’s role and responsibility with regard to Africa and the rest of the world.” They claim that learning programmes should encourage the development of:

- A mutual respect for diverse religious and value systems, and cultural and language traditions.
- Multi-lingualism and informed choices regarding the languages of learning.
- Co-operation, civic responsibility and the ability to participate in all aspects of society.
- An understanding of natural, provincial, local, and regional and developmental needs (Gulting et al; 1998: 6).

Gulting et al (1998:7) assert, therefore that “learning programmes should protect and advance basic human rights irrespective of gender, race, class, creed or age.” They believe that “learners need to develop a sense of worth and need to experience acceptance, irrespective of the language they speak, the religious convictions they hold and to which gender, class or ethnic group they belong.”

#### **2.2.2.6 Critical theory or creative thinking**

Gulting at al (1998:7) concede that “learning programmes should promote learners’ ability to think logically and analytically as well as holistically and laterally.” They claim, however that “it includes an acknowledgement of the provisional, contested and changing nature of knowledge, and of the need to balance independent, individualized thinking with social responsibility. They also further concede that it includes “the ability to function as part of a group, community or society.” Moreover, they maintain that “the perception of teachers as dispensers of knowledge will also have to change to one where learners are valued as equal and active participants in learning and developmental processes.”



In conclusion, curriculum design and development should allow learners to have a strong foundation of education, to develop new skills and should prepare them for lifelong learning. It should also put learners at the center of the learning process by accommodating their different learning styles, affirming their worth and respecting their diversity. Furthermore, curriculum design and development should be relevant to the needs of the economy enabling learners to develop new skills and competencies. It should encourage an integrated approach to education creating opportunities for disadvantaged groups in the society. Moreover, it should promote nation-building, non-discrimination and enhances the learners' ability to think logically and analytically, encouraging them to participate in their learning and development.

### **2.2.3. CURRICULUM 2005**

According to the Department of Education (DEO) (2002:10), "Curriculum 2005 is regarded as a key project in the transformation of South Africa society." It claims that "C2005 is directed towards achieving a prosperous, truly united, democratic and international competitive country with literate, creative and critical citizens leading productive, self-fulfilled lives in a country free of violence, discrimination and prejudice." They maintain, however that "this vision poses a dual challenge for curriculum designers."

These are:

#### **2.2.3.1 The post-apartheid challenge**

The DOE (2002:10) believes that "the role of the curriculum is to overcome the stultifying legacy of apartheid education by ensuring a deeper knowledge, values and skills base for South Africa's citizens. It believes that "these will in turn provide the conditions for greater social justice, equity and development."

#### **2.2.3.2 The global competitiveness challenge**

The DOE (2002:10) is in agreement with Rensburg (2000) when he claims that "the role of the curriculum is to provide the platform for developing knowledge, skills and

competencies for innovation, social development and economic growth for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.”

Furthermore, the DOE (2002:10) further claims that “the goals to address the above challenges are expressed in the critical outcomes, the curriculum design feature that guides the overall learning purpose of the curriculum.” It contends that “the question is whether the curriculum has been “design down” in such way that all learners have a great chance as possible of attaining the critical outcomes.” The DOE further states that “the description of the learning areas for C2005 emphasizes the role, of each learning area in the reconstruction and transformation of South African society.”

However, the DOE (2002:10) asserts that “some of the learning areas are dedicated to this goal, for example, Life Orientation is described as ‘fundamental in empowering learners to live meaningful lives in a society that demands rapid transformation.’” It contends that “other learning areas are also expected to promote social and developmental values.” The DOE concedes that “the description of Mathematics, Literacy, Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences (MLMMS) indicates to ‘empower people to work towards the reconstruction and development of South African society.’” In the same vein, the DOE believes that “Economics and Management Sciences (EMS) is “fundamental in preparing citizens of South Africa to understand the importance of reconstruction, development and economic growth for a sustainable economic future.”

Moreover, the DOE (2002:11) states that “the apartheid legacy runs deep and clearly requires that the curriculum of post apartheid South Africa deals forcibly and systematically with issues of justice, democracy, and respect for diversity and differences.” It contends that “it should also address the means to promote innovation and economic growth as the basis for social development for all.” In view of this, the DOE maintains that “learners are then enabled to contribute to society when they have been given access to the cognitive tools required by such a society.” Therefore, it concedes that “when seen in this light, the two challenges are indivisible.” The DOE (2002: 11) states that “social transformation can only be successfully pursued through

widespread access to high-level skills and knowledge, and equally, innovation and development should serve the social values of our new democracy.” It claims that C2005 is a high knowledge and skill curriculum, thus becoming the means to promote social justice, growth and development.”

Curriculum 2005 was introduced to overcome the legacy of apartheid education in South Africa as the DOE (2002) have already suggested. In the researcher’s view and experience, Curriculum 2005 has failed to eradicate the discrepancies of apartheid education, especially in the previously disadvantaged areas of the Eastern Cape. Although, Curriculum 2005 was introduced to develop knowledge, skills and competencies for innovation, social development and economic growth, it is unlikely that it could do that in the previously disadvantaged areas of the Eastern Cape. The teachers in these places are faced with problems such as lack of resources and proper training to implement Curriculum 2005. Although, it empowers learners to work towards the reconstruction and development of South African society, it still needs a carefully monitored approach to be better implemented in previously disadvantaged areas.

#### **2.2.4. DEVELOPMENT**

According to Riggs (1981: 46) “‘development’ is a concept with an ‘overloaded meaning’ and an astonishingly large number of concepts such as growth, change, evolution, progress, transformation, improvement, modernization and industrialization.” He argues that “its’ meaning should be deduced from the context within which the word is used.” Torado (1994:21) believes that “there are at least three basic components or core values that should serve as a conceptual basis and practical guidelines for understanding the inner meaning of development.” He points out that these are “life-sustenance, or satisfying the basic needs, self-esteem or being a person and freedom from servitude or human freedom.” He suggests that development in all societies should achieve at least three objectives. These are:

- It should increase the availability and widen the distribution of basic life-sustaining goods.

- It should raise the levels of living, in addition to higher incomes, the provision of more jobs, better education, and greater attention to cultural or humanistic issues.
- It should expand the range of social and economic choices available to individuals and nations by freeing them from, amongst others, forces of ignorance and human misery (Torado; 1994: 24).

According to Burkey (1993: 51), “no development activity, whether initiated by outsiders or by the poor themselves, can hope to succeed unless it contains a strong element of human development.” Moreover, he points out that “in simple terms, human development involves the strengthening of the personality and the organization and internalization of knowledge and information.” Brett in Burkey (1993: 34) argues that “development is a change process characterized by increased productivity, equality in the distribution of social products.” He also believes that it is “characterized by the emergence of indigenous institutions whose relationship with the outside world are characterized by equality rather than dependency or subordination.”

In the researcher’s own opinion, development is a concept that entails change whether it is change through growing, progressing in whatever that you have been doing or a change from a state of traditionally to modernity. Development as Riggs (1981: 46) has suggested “should enable people to sustain their lives and also satisfy their basic needs”. It should also contain a strong element of human development and should strengthen people and organizations helping them at internalizing knowledge and information. OBE and Curriculum 2005 should be helping at developing the human resources of South Africa, even in previously disadvantaged areas.

#### **2.2.5. EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION**

Olivier (1998:20) argues that “the re-engineering of the learning system towards the Outcomes-Based approach is a major attempt to build the country into becoming an international role player.” He believes that “the shift to Outcomes-Based learning versus mainly content based learning in the education system and competency-based in training is analogue to the total quality movement in business and in manufacturing.” He

concedes, however that “OBE learning reflects the notion that the best way to get to where you want to be is to first determine what you want to achieve.” He maintains, therefore that “once the end-goal (product or outcome) has been determined, strategies, techniques and other ways and means will be put into place to achieve the goal.”

Furthermore, Olivier (1998: 20) claims that “in terms of Outcomes-Based learning, the learner accomplishes more than remembering or mastering skills and knowledge.” He contends that “learners accomplish more than just producing or delivering outcomes which equals the mastering of knowledge and skills.” He concedes that learners have “the competence to become involved in managing their own learning process, developing preparational steps, or doing interim and final assessments on processes and outcomes.”

In support of this, Olivier (1998: 21) states that “in the content-based approach, students have to master content in one way or another, sourcing the information from teachers, textbooks and notes.” He maintains that “when they are evaluated, they have to mirror these contents to the evaluator for assessment.” He claims that “when evaluators mark the students’ papers, they are to a great extent, marking reflected contents and subtract marks for the degree of distortion that occurs during reflection, in order to obtain a score.” He contends, therefore, that “although this is a blunt outline of the process, it best describes the profitless result of this approach, in the sense that the system does not prepare students for real life and for life long learning.”

Moreover, Olivier (1998: 21) further claims that “content-based learning does not relate to the world of work where people have to produce end-results according to an agreed job-description in either formal employment or any level of the self-employment sector.” He believes that “the purpose of education and training is to prepare learners for life in society and for performing a job.” He suggests that “Outcomes-Based learning intends to focus equally on knowledge, skills, the process of learning and the final outcome, result or product.” He maintains that “in this sense, the process of achieving outcomes during the learning process could be related directly to the way outcomes are achieved in the world of work.” Therefore, according to him “learners exposed to this approach have the

benefits of mastering methods, techniques and procedures which relate to real lifework and which can be repeated in new contexts.”

In view of the above, Olivier (1998: 21) believes that “OBE approach necessitates a paradigm shift towards the curricululating process.” He states that “learning should empower the learner through the achievement of outcomes as well as providing assessment as part of guiding and evaluating the learning processes.” He concedes that “Outcomes-Based learning deviates from the conventional and traditional content-based education and training in the sense that it focuses on the mastering of processes linked to intended outcomes.” He claims that OBE also focuses “on the mastering of knowledge and skills needed to achieve the outcome.” Therefore, according to Olivier (1998: 21), “when learners achieve outcomes, it proves that they did participate in their development and they did not just learn, remember, and recall content in order to achieve a score.” He claims that “it emphasizes learner-centred learning to its full extent with the emphasis on what has been mastered, and that the process to master knowledge, skills, techniques and methods can be repeated in other and new situations.”

In view of the above, Outcomes-Based Education has not yet brought education transformation in South Africa. It has, thus, offered a paradigm shift from a content-based learning to an outcomes-based learning but it does not fulfill its intentions because of the legacy of apartheid education that still prevail in the previously disadvantaged areas. This paradigm shift, therefore, means that mastering knowledge and skills is not enough for learning, but rather, the learners should be able to demonstrate the outcomes they have learnt after their learning experience. Olivier (1998) believes that “such a system of education would prepare them for life long learning.” In the disadvantaged areas of the Eastern Cape it is difficult for educators to achieve such outcomes because of conditions and circumstances under which they teach.

## 2.3 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT: OBE AS THE PRODUCT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (RDP).

When OBE was introduced in 1997 its' intentions was to meet the developmental needs of children in South Africa. However, it was within this context that OBE was in a way fitting in with the principles of the Reconstruction and Development Programme. This was stated in the White Paper for Education and Training (1995) that there should be a clear relationship between education and development.

### 2.3.1 The location of OBE within the RDP

According to the RDP White Paper (South Africa; 1994:5) "RDP is an integrated, coherent socio-economic policy framework." It states that "it seeks to mobilize the country's resources towards the final eradication of the results of apartheid and to a building of a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist future." Moreover, the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 5) states that "the RDP represents a vision for the fundamental transformation of South Africa and also that the integrated process of transformation must ensure that the country." It aims at:

- Developing a strong and stable democratic institutions and practices characterized by representativeness and participation.
- The fully democratization and non-racial South Africa.
- South Africa becoming a prosperous society, having embarked upon a sustainable and environmental friendly growth and development path.
- Addressing the moral and ethical development of society (RDP/WP; 1994: 5).

However, the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994:6) points out that there are six basic principles under which the RDP works. **Firstly, "it is an integrated and sustainable programme."** It claims that "the legacy of apartheid cannot be overcome with piecemeal, uncoordinated policies." Therefore, it contends that "the RDP brings together strategies to harness all the country's resources in a coherent and purposeful effort."

Moreover, it concedes that “these strategies are implemented at national; provincial and local level by the government, parastatals, business and organizations within civil society all working within the framework of the RDP.” In addition, it asserts that “all levels of government must pay attention to affordability given the commitment to fiscal discipline and to achievable goals.”

**Secondly, the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 6) maintains that “the programme must become a people driven process.”** It argues that “the people, with their aspirations and collective determination, are the most important resource.” Therefore, it claims that “it is focused on people’s immediate needs and it relies, in turn, on their energies.” Moreover, it maintains that “irrespective of race or sex, or whether they are rural or urban, rich or poor, the people of South Africa must together shape their own future.” Development, therefore, according to the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 6) “is not about delivery of goods to passive citizenry, but about active involvement and growing empowerment.” Furthermore, the RDP/WP contends that “in taking this approach the government was rebuilding on many forums, such as peace structures and negotiations throughout South Africa.” According to the RDP/WP “the government commits itself to the maximum transparency and inclusivity.”

**Thirdly, the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 6) maintains that “this programme and this people-driven process are closely bound up with peace and security for all.”** It concedes that “promoting peace and security would involve all people and would be developed by expanding the national drive for peace through combating the endemic violence faced by communities in South Africa.” It states that “special attention would be paid to violence against women.” Furthermore, the RDPWP points out that “to begin the process of reconstruction and development, the government should establish security forces who reflect the national and gender character of our country and develop a different, demilitarized ethic.” Moreover, it contends that “the judicial system should reflect society’s racial and gender composition, providing fairness and equality for all before the law.” The RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 6) then, believes that “peace and



stability should be central to the government's efforts in creating an environment conducive to investment."

**Fourthly, the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 6) maintains that "as peace and security are established it would be able to embark on nation building."** Therefore, it believes that "the success of the electoral process and the Government of National Unity (GNU) have set the foundation for nation building." However, it contends that "all parties in the National Assembly are committed to the RDP and the preparedness of those who stayed out of the election process to begin a dialogue." It claims that this will contribute to "the consolidation of peace and security, all contributed to the task of nation building." According to the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 6) "South Africa is a single country, with a single economy, functioning within the constitutional framework that establishes provincial and local powers." The RDP/WP states that "the RDP promotes respect and protection for minorities, and a process to accommodate those wishing to retain their cultural identity." Thus it is on the basis of unity in diversity that we will consolidate our national sovereignty.

**Fifthly, the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 7) concedes that "nation building links reconstruction and development."** According to the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 7) "this notion is based on the idea that reconstruction and development are part of an integrated process." Moreover, the RDP/WP asserts that "the RDP integrates growth, development, reconstruction, redistribution and reconciliation into a unified programme." Therefore, the RDP/WP concedes that "the key to this link is an infrastructural programme that provides access to modern and effective services such as electricity, water, telecommunication, transport, health, education and the training for all people."

Furthermore, the RDPWP (South Africa; 1994: 7) asserts that "the programme would meet both the basic needs as well as open up previously suppressed economic and human potential in urban and rural areas." According to the RDP/WP "rational is that, in turn, this would lead to increased output in all sectors of the economy, and by upgrading the infrastructure and human resource development, would also enhance export capacity."

Therefore, the RDP/WP maintains that “for the process to be effective, attention should be paid to those economic factors inhibiting growth and investment and which place obstacles in the way of private sector expansion.” Moreover, it claims that “success in linking reconstruction, development and growth is essential if we are to achieve peace and security for all.”

**Lastly, the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 7) maintains that “these five principles all depend on a thorough going democratization of South Africa.”** However, it contends that “minority control and privileges in every aspect of our society are the main stumbling block in developing an integrated programme designed to unleash all the resources of our country.” It states that this also prevents a “fundamental change in the way policy is made and how programmes are implemented.” Above all, the RDPWP asserts that “the people affected must participate in decision-making before democratization can transform both the state and civil society.” Furthermore, it concedes that “democracy is not confined to periodic elections, but is rather an active process enabling everyone to contribute to reconstruction and development.” Therefore, the RDP/WP (South Africa; 1994: 7) claims that “the government, with its institutions and activities, has to be reviewed and restructured to fit the priorities of the RDP.”

It is within this context that reconstruction and development should be taking place in South Africa. It should take place in the context of these six principles that have been discussed. In the researcher’s opinion, development whether it is educational or not should be an integrated and sustainable development. It should have to become a people driven process, closely bound with promoting peace and security for all. Moreover, it should be able to embark on nation building and should be able to link reconstruction and development and promoting a thorough going democratization of South Africa.

OBE, then, is supposed to be the reconstruction of a system of education that favored an elite White minority and is therefore now a developmental approach to education that should be taken as fulfilling the principles of the RDP. The principles of the RDP on nation building, for instance, links reconstruction and development and clearly states that

these are parts of an integrated process. It integrates growth, development, reconstruction, redistribution and reconciliation into a unified programme. The relationship to education of these reconstruction and development initiatives was spelt out in the White Paper for Education and Training (WPET).

### **2.3.2 The location of OBE in the White Paper for Education and Training (WPET)**

Christie (1997: 111) states that “the White Paper on Education and Training (WPET) offers the first guidelines on post-apartheid education policy and commits itself to an integrated approach to education and training.” She believes that “an integrated approach according to the WPET implies a view of learning which rejects the established organization of curriculum.” She believes that “its attendant inequalities of occupation and social class are related in South Africa to ethnic divisions.” Christie claims that “an integrated approach to education and training does not only reflect an emerging consensus on human resource development.” She concedes that “it also reflects a major international trend in curriculum development and the reform of qualification structures in South Africa.”

The WPET (South Africa; 1995: 9) concedes that “millions of adult South Africans are fundamentally illiterate and millions of South African children and youth are learning in school conditions that resemble those in the most impoverished states.” Furthermore, the White Paper points out that “in the large, poorly resourced sectors of our society, the majority of students drops out prematurely or fail senior certificate with only a small minority gaining entrance to higher education.” In addition, it claims that “access to technological and professional careers requires a strong base in Mathematics and Science and many are denied access to quality education largely because of the chronic inadequacy of teaching in these subjects.”

The WPET (South Africa; 1995:10) argues that “these gross inequalities in educational attainment, skills, employment opportunities, productivity, and income have been typical

of industrialized economies in the modern era.” It states that “South Africa resembles many other countries grappling with similar needs for social justice, employment creation, housing, primary health care, environmental protection and educational services.” Moreover, the White Paper maintains that “when measured by international indicators of human development and economic competitiveness, South Africa’s overall performance is poor.” It concedes that this is “because the achievements of its well-developed elite sector is overshadowed by inadequate provision for the basic needs, including education and training of the majority of the population.”

The WPET (South Africa; 1995:9) goes on to state that “the distribution of education and training provision in our country follows a pattern of contrasts and paradoxes.” However, it claims that “South Africa has achieved by a large measure, the most developed and well-resourced system of education and training in the African continent, with the highest participation rates at all levels of the system.” Furthermore, the WPET claims that “in the best-resourced, well-staffed highly motivated, elite sector of the school system, almost all students succeed in their senior certificate examinations, and an impressive proportion qualify for submission to higher education.”

Therefore, it is in this historical context that OBE was introduced as a developmental approach to education. It was introduced to cater for the needs of those children who do not have access to well-resourced schools in order to prepare them for lifelong learning, which will be relevant to the needs of the economy of the country. The WPET states clearly that “the Department of Education wants to simultaneously overturn education in South Africa so that students can be internationally competitive and at the same time address other matters of social justice such as the eradication of the legacy of the Bantu Education.”

The WPET (South Africa; 1995:19) also claims that “for the first time in South Africa’s history, a government has the mandate to plan the development of the education and training system for the benefit of the country as a whole and all people.” It argues that “this is a national task, acknowledged by the government as a fundamental priority of the

RDP.” Therefore, according to the WPET “developing the human resources of the country is both a goal of the RDP and a requirement for achieving other RDP goals.” Moreover, the White Paper maintains that “appropriate education and training can empower people to participate effectively in all the processes of a democratic society, economic activity, cultural expression, community life.” It believes that “it can help citizens to build a nation free of race, gender, and any other form of discrimination.”

The WPET (South Africa; 1995:19) goes on to argue that “the government’s RDP is designed to be an integrated and coherent socio-economic policy framework.” Moreover, it claims that “the main theme of the RDP’s human resource development programme is the empowerment of people, through education and training.” It contends that “this includes specific forms of capacity building within organizations and communities, to participate effectively in all the processes of a democratic society.” Furthermore, it states that “all ministries are expected to re-orientate their programmes and budgets in accordance with RDP priorities.” The White Paper claims, therefore that “from one perspective, the entire work of national and provincial Ministries of Education supports the objectives of the RDP, since education and training should be developmental.” It contends that the education and training sector requires transformation like any other institution.” It concedes that this is “because of the structural imbalances in provision, funding, quality and output and the need to deliver education services to neglected adult, youth, and early childhood constituencies.” The White Paper also maintains that “education and training should link schooling and the world of work, restructure governance systems, and upgrade the professional competence of teachers.” It further argues that “it should gear learning outcomes to the country’s reconstruction and development agenda.”

However, the WPET (South Africa; 1995:20) states that “national reconstruction and development demands that the knowledge and skills base of the working and unemployed population are massively upgraded.” It believes that “young people still at school have better opportunities to continue their education and training.” Moreover, it maintains that “our human resource development programme must therefore expand the ways in which

people are able to acquire learning and qualifications of high quality.” Therefore, according to the WPET, “new flexible and appropriate curricula are needed that cut across traditional divisions of skills and knowledge, with standards defined in terms of learning outcomes and appropriate assessment practices.” It concedes that this is done “in order to provide a more meaningful learning experience and prepare them more effectively for life’s opportunities.”

Moreover, the WPET (South Africa; 1995:20) contends that “an integrated approach to education and training will link one level of learning to another.” It believes that this will “enable successful learners to progress to higher levels without restriction from any starting point in the education and training system.” Furthermore, it maintains that “quality assurance will be maintained by duly registered and accredited bodies such as the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) and the National Qualifications Framework (NQF).” The WPET claims that “learning skills by people through experience and on-site training or self-education could be formally assessed and accredited towards certificates, in order to enable them to qualify for entry to additional education and training.”

It was within this context that the relationship between education and development was spelled out in the WPET. OBE, then, was introduced to meet the needs of the human resource development of the country. It was designed to meet the principles of the RDP so that everybody could have access to education, young, old, poor and rich. The NQF was also designed to be a framework in which this new system of education will operate.

Contrary to that, OBE seems not to meet the developmental needs of learners in previously disadvantaged areas of South Africa. It has rather created a historical paradox where the children of the affluent people who study in previously advantaged schools still get the best education and those in previously disadvantaged areas receive poor education because of the conditions under which they learn. This is in agreement to the WPET that states that “the achievements of the well-developed elite sector of our society is being overshadowed by the inadequate provision of the basic needs, including education of the

majority of the population in South Africa.” The provision of education in South Africa still reflect the legacy of apartheid education whereby the students who are successful still come from the best-resourced, well-staffed and highly motivated elite sector of the school system.

OBE as a system of education that was introduced to fulfill the national task of nation building as set out in the principles of the RPD seems unlikely to achieve the RDP goals. The NQF accommodates out of school and adult learning but unless the government addresses the imbalances that exist in the previously disadvantaged and advantaged areas of South Africa the objectives of OBE would be useless. This is directly linked to education transformation and its relationship to development in South Africa.

## **2.4 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION TRANSFORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT.**

Most people from the educational field argue that OBE has offered a paradigm shift for development in education. However, it is significant to note that there are those whose argument is that OBE has not provided any paradigm shift because they claim what OBE is doing is what was always happening in the teaching and learning situation in South Africa. The shift from apartheid education to OBE will be explained and the question as to whether the process and the product argument in education could be considered as developmental in education transformation in South Africa.

However, Naicker (1999: 70) argues against the notion that OBE offers a paradigm shift in the education transformation in South Africa. He believes that “the most South African educators could be located in a functionalist paradigm.” He claims that “in a functionalist paradigm, social scientists believe that they can be objective and understand realities through observation without being participants in the processes.” Naicker (1999: 70) believes that “their stance is neutral and their own interests and positions do not therefore influence their assessment of situations.” He concedes that “the consequence of that is to believe that education is neutral.”

Furthermore, Naicker (1999: 70) concurs with Burrell and Morgan (1979: 358) when they argue that “functionalist theory is characterized by an effort to explain the status quo and is concerned with the effective regulation and control of social affairs.” He also claims that “its fundamental aim is to account for the persistence and survival of existing social forms and therefore it is concerned with evolutionary change as opposed to radical change.” Moreover, Naicker (1999: 70) maintains that “functionalism is fundamentally concerned with prediction and control and cannot contribute to such interrogation as is necessary and sufficient in a fast changing world.”

However, Naicker (1999: 71) raises the question of pedagogics when it comes to education transformation in South Africa. He concurs with Beard et al (1981) when he views “pedagogics as linked and interlinked with functionalism and that a number of Higher Education institutions in South Africa propagate the tenets of pedagogics.” Naicker (1999: 71) argues that “pedagogics or Theory of Education comprises various part-disciplines, for example, Psycho-Pedagogics and Socio-Pedagogics.” Naicker claims that “one of these part-disciplines is Fundamental Pedagogics, sometimes translated as Philosophy of Education, which forms the epistemological grounding for other part-disciplines.” He concurs with McLeod (1995) when he understands Fundamental Pedagogics “as a science that sets out to describe what is universally characteristic of education.” Education, then, according to Naicker, is defined “as a process of the child being accompanied into adulthood by the adult or educator.”

To support this, Naicker (1999: 73) agrees with Beard and Morrow (1981) when they suggest that “the majority of Black teachers in South Africa are influenced by the tenets of pedagogics.” However, Beard and Morrow (1981) consider pedagogics “as a way of theorizing that ‘makes autocratic and monopolistic claims to being the only reliable or ‘authentic’ way of studying education.’” Furthermore, Naicker (1999: 73) suggests that “most writers in the field are arrogantly dismissive of alternatives and this may explain why Fundamental Pedagogics is so popular in most South African higher education institutions.” Based on this discussion Naicker (1999:73) suggests eight perceptions that many South African educationists could have:



- The concept of apartheid and a non-democratic system is acceptable.
- Education is a neutral activity.
- Research in education and the social sciences is objective.
- One can understand realities through observation without being participants in the process.
- Their interests and positions cannot influence Scientists' assessments of education.
- Methods of Natural Sciences can be applied to human affairs.
- The social world is composed of relatively concrete empirical artifacts and relationships that can be identified and measured through approaches derived from the natural sciences.
- The fundamental aim of education research is to account for the persistence and survival of existing social norms. (Naicker; 1999: 73).

However, it's suffice to say that OBE like Fundamental Pedagogics, does not take into consideration how societal factors such as poverty, affect teaching and learning. Naicker (1999: 73) argues that "Fundamental Pedagogics brackets out sociological considerations in explaining teaching and learning." Moreover, he believes that "its' research agenda does not take historical and contextual issues into account." He concurs with Eislen (1981) when he suggests that "research, which might threaten the official ideology, could at best make only a limited contribution to issues of theoretical relevance to education." This, then, led Eislen to conclude that "Fundamental Pedagogics was an ideology rather than a science because the interests it served, determined it."

Naicker (1999: 76) maintains that "transformational OBE is concerned also with sociological considerations and the notion of historical context." He claims that these are important shifts to make from a Fundamental Pedagogics perspective." He further believes that "if this does not happen, many of the learners that experience difficulty as a result of the societal factors, will continue to be part of a large attrition and failure rate of the past." However, he concedes that "as a result of this legacy there has been a radical restructuring of consciousness and structures for change to be effective in South Africa." Moreover, he states that "in order to counter the influences persisting from this legacy,

the Ministry of Education formulated a single education system.” He claims that “it implemented a new curriculum, which amongst other considerations, was concerned with developing critical citizenship.”

However, because of the fact that many educators and academics still believe in Fundamental Pedagogics and to the idea of neutrality in education it would seem that OBE does not seem to offer a paradigm shift that could be considered as developmental in education. Moreover, since Naicker (1999: 70) has explained that Fundamental Pedagogics, as a Theory of Education, does not take into consideration societal issues such as poverty and historical factors, OBE cannot claim to have made a developmental paradigm shift in South African education.

In addition, because many educators in South Africa still belong to the functionalist paradigm and the tenets of Fundamental Pedagogics, they still adopt the same attitude to OBE as they used to do to the previous curriculum. Educators in South Africa still do not believe to be involved in education transformation. OBE was rather imposed to them without questioning it and they were expected to implement it. The educators still believe that the teacher should unilaterally guide the child towards adulthood and tell him/her everything that is required by the curriculum.

It is within this context that OBE cannot be said to be contributing to social development because the legacies of the apartheid education have not been removed. Thus, poverty and the unequal distribution of resources in public schools still persist and Fundamental Pedagogics does not offer a solution to these problems. Thus, OBE cannot not realize the developmental approach to education as it was intended.

### **2.4.1 Policy making in educational transformation as symbolic rather than developmental**

Jansen (2001: 41) believes that “the first ten years of policy making in South Africa, following official moves towards a new democracy (1990) hinged largely on symbolism rather than a substance of change in education.” However, Jansen (2001: 41) argues on “the policy practice problem in South African education and offers a theoretical position to narrate the trajectory of policy development during the ten years period.” He argues that “the making of education policy in South Africa is best described as the struggle for the achievement of a broad political symbolism that would make the shift from apartheid to a post-apartheid society.” He concedes that “we search in vain for logic in policy-making connected to any serious intention to change the practice of education in South Africa.” Therefore, he maintains that “a focus on the details of implementation will not be fruitful since it will miss the broader political intentions that underpin policy making after apartheid.” He claims that “every single case of education policy making demonstrates in different ways the pre-occupation of the state with settling policy struggles in the political domain rather than in the realm on practice.”

Furthermore, Jansen (2001: 41) further argues that “the over-investment in political symbolism at the expense of practical considerations largely explains the lack of change in South African education six years after the demise of apartheid.” He believes that “he makes this argument on the basis of empirical data.”

These include:

- The public claims by politicians and education bureaucrats concerning the primacy of symbolic politics in education policy-making between 1994 and 1999.
- The prominence assigned by politicians to policy production (the making of policy) rather than its implementation.
- The inordinate amount of attention paid to formal participation in policy processes irrespective of their final outcomes.

- The lack of attention to implementation in official policy discourses on educational change.
- The way in which policy makers invoke international precedent in the development of rational educational policies as part of external legitimization of local change processes.
- The way in which international participants (mainly in the form of foreign-paid consultants) are drawn into and influence the development of rational policy-making as the extension of the legitimization role of post-apartheid education policies.
- The way in which national policy positions are validated through claims into South African incorporation within the globalization of modern economies. (Jansen; 2001: 48).

In view of this, Jansen (2001:48) believes that “from a theoretical point of view, a commitment to the practical at the expense of the deeper understanding of policy-making is in itself a preferred theory of change.” He claims that it is “a theory (often implicit) that social problems could be fixed through technical solutions applied in a thoughtful manner.” He states that “such an assumption needs to be treated and not to be taken for granted.” He contends that the argument that “‘if only there were enough resources or if only there was enough capacity, the implementation would have been successful,’ is not at all supported by extensive literature on education policy change in well-resourced contexts.” In other words, concedes Jansen “there is much more going on in policy development and implementation than resources and capacity.”

Jansen (2001: 48) is in agreement with Hess (1997) in his study when he concludes that “the status quo in urban school systems is largely due to political incentives that produce a surfeit of reform and insufficient attention to implementation.” In fact, Hess (1997) believes that “the continuing attention of reform efforts in urban schools is those successive generations of impartially implemented reforms that produce instability and waste resources.”

Jansen (2001: 41) mentions several striking factors about Hess study. These include the fact that:

- The lack of implementation was not due to lack of resources.
- The evidence for non-implementation spread across 57 large schools districts.
- The data was collected on the basis of at least five different kinds of school reform.
- The data was collected through intensive methods, including 342 interviews (Jansen; 2001: 41).

Moreover, Jansen (2001: 48) claims that it is against this background that Hess (1997) believes that “reforms tend to be symbolically attractive but not to impose the cost required by significant change.” He concedes that “the result is that policy-makers have worked more diligently on appearing to improve schooling than on actually doing so.” Jansen (2001: 48) used Hess’s study because “it is one of the very few empirical studies making a similar case to what he presented in a context where resources and capacity are not the prime explanatory variables for non-implementation.” He contends that “unless policy evaluation in South Africa provides greater weight to the symbolic functions of education policy, then there is a real danger of social expectations being frustrated.” He believes that this could lead to “theoretical progress being undermined in explaining education transition after apartheid.”

However, Jansen (2001: 52) states that “in education the instrument of choice policy-making is the so-called policy review.” He describes “the policy review as a selective process intended to address those areas of government policy in which there is a perceived crisis of delivery.” He points out that “a careful reading of the Call to Action (Department of Education: 1999), a document that outlined the Minister’s delivery plan, made it very clear that C2005 was one of the likely candidates for policy review.” Jansen (2001: 52) believes that “to call for a policy review merely concedes that there is a possibility of failure.” In fact, he maintains that “a review by its very nature carries a threat of exposure.” He believes that “in the case of a weak state, that is, a state with limited bureaucratic and political capacity to change the practice of education on the ground, reviews are particularly dangerous.” He claims that “the policy review could be described as having these three functions.” These are:

- To refine policy, making finer adjustments to an otherwise effective and valued policy.
- To activate existing policy, providing implementation impetus to an accepted policy through, for example, new resource commitments.
- To establish new policy, creating substantially new frames for educational practice that go beyond the scope of existing policy (Jansen: 2001: 52).

In support of the above, Jansen (2001: 53) argues that “during the months leading up to the review of C2005, the Minister of Education repeatedly pointed to the arcane language of OBE, its complex formulation.” He claims that the Minister mentioned “the inaccessibility of this new curriculum innovation to practitioners.” He believes that “the appointment of a high-powered review team with a mandate to make specific recommendations for the improvement of the curriculum was inevitable.” Jansen (2001: 53) states that “the Report of the Review Committee was comprehensive, detailed and meticulous in its analysis of the problems of C2005 and how it could be improved.” He concedes, however, that “the proposals created an unprecedented crisis both within ANC political cycles and inside the education bureaucracy.” He further contends that “the reason for that was the sheer scope of the proposals for change which were seen as displacing the flagship of the previous Minister’s period, C2005 for something the committee unintentionally tagged as Curriculum 21.”

Jansen (2001: 53) believes that “Curriculum 21 was a strategic error, which the media interpreted as referring to a curriculum for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, a displacement of C2005, and thus all attempts to retrieve the meaning were lost on the public.” More seriously, he maintains that “many politicians and bureaucrats considered the scope and symbolism of the proposed changes as a fundamental shift from C2005.” He states that “the scope of the changes were certainly sweeping, removing much of the architectural edifice of the existing curriculum in favour of streamlined, simpler and more accessible curriculum.” He claims that “the symbolism of the changes was not only reflected in the change of name, but in what departmental officials read as a “back to basics” approach stripped of the ideological assertion of learner-centredness and programme-based curricula.” In

short, he asserts that “the proposed recommendations were read, rightly or wrong, as the establishment of significantly new elements of policy.” He contends, therefore, that “the Review Committee on C2005 constituted the establishment of new policy rather than the implementation of existing policy.”

Furthermore, Jansen (2001: 53) maintains that “in South Africa politicians are pre-occupied with policy symbolism rather than the substance-change in education.” This leads to OBE’s non-implementation and not being developmental as it was intended in South African education. He argues against the idea of well resourcefulness and capacity as reasons for implementation of policy, citing Hess study (1997) where education policy in well-resourced contexts was non-implementable. He concedes, however, that even in the case of the implementation and review of C2005 in South Africa, the politicians were pre-occupied with symbolism than with practical change at grassroots level. He believes that the new proposed National Revised Curriculum Statement (NRCS) is a result of such symbolism by politicians.

In concurrence with Jansen it is notable that South African education policy makers are encouraged by symbolism rather than real practice in their formulation of education policies. Outcomes-Based Education then is a product of such political symbolism in education policy making. Political symbolism, therefore, according to Jansen, means that there is more to resources and capacity in the implementation of OBE in the disadvantaged areas. Ever since OBE was introduced in South Africa, the policy makers never bothered themselves to look at its implementation, especially in the previously disadvantaged areas. The Review Committee that was established to review C2005, instead of coming with solutions leading to its’ implementation they recommended its replacement. This policy symbolism, therefore, does not contribute to social development but rather in the change from one policy to another.

## **2.5 PROCESS AND PRODUCT AS DEVELOPMENTAL IN EDUCATIONAL TRANSFORMATION.**

There has been a lot of debate in education circles that for education to be developmental there should be a clear relationship between the process of education activity and the product of that educational activity. As a result, many conflicting arguments have emerged concerning these two paradigms in South African education.

Critics of this new Outcomes-Based paradigm believe that there is no difference between the process of and the product of education in the old and new education paradigms. Geyser (2000:3) believes that “the introduction of curriculum 2005 (and OBE) has invited conflicting responses.” However, he claims that “there are those who see OBE as a complex and far-reaching initiative to transform completely the South African education system within the parameters of the proposed NQF.” Therefore, he argues that “people see OBE, as a comprehensive change to the entire hierarchical structure of schooling, with implications for what is taught, how it is taught, and how learning is assessed.” Moreover, Geyser (2000: 3) contends “it is hoped that this new curriculum will trigger economic development in South Africa and it will promote equity for all learners and contribute towards building a new nation.”

Furthermore, Geyser (2000: 3) concedes that “others see little or no change, and insists that “this is what we have been teaching all along.” He also points out that “the changes brought about by curriculum 2005 do not have a depth and magnitude to be considered a paradigm shift.” However, Geyser contends that “these differing responses are based on how OBE is perceived in essence, and on the kinds of changes (if any) that are proposed by this curriculum.” In addition, Geyser believes that “the fact that OBE does not imply a paradigm shift in South African education is based on the argument that a dominant paradigm focuses on the objective model.” Moreover, Geyser maintains that “although there is a difference between outcomes and objectives, the term ‘outcome’ is very similar to the term ‘objective’ because it finds its natural home in the product model.” He argues



that “both objectives and outcomes deal with what the learners should be able to do as a result of the learning opportunities presented by the teacher.”

Geyser (2000: 3) contends that “behavioral objectives are short-term objectives, while outcomes refer to what the learner should be able to do at the end of the series of lessons, or at the end of the module or a course.” Outcomes, therefore, according to Geyser, “occupy an intermediate position between short-term behavioral objectives and long-term aims.” Moreover, he claims that “a further difference is acknowledged, namely, that objectives are related to a specific subject-area, whereas outcomes are general in nature because they transcend subject boundaries.” In addition, he claims that “the new outcomes-based curriculum has been designed by identifying outcomes first, before ‘content’ is selected.” He concurs with Arjun (1998: 23) when he acknowledges that “this paradigm has been subject to strong competition from the alternative critical paradigm, and adds that a curriculum based on a critical pedagogy makes greater use of logic than the means-ends rationale.” He states that “although educational science is in a state of paradigmatic crisis, curriculum planners are still opting for a paradigm that is based on means and ends.”

Furthermore, Geyser (2000:3) asserts that “product and process are complimentary concepts in the new curriculum.” He contends that “the new curriculum focuses more on process than on product, is often held as not new in education, and it has been debated for some time now.” He maintains that “these two concepts are complimentary, and that one assumes the other, for without processes one cannot achieve the product, and to achieve the product, some or other process is necessary.” Geyser (2000: 3) claims that “where the old curriculum emphasized knowledge as the product, “it remains to be seen whether the new curriculum will focus on greater manifestation of processes related to constructivism.” Therefore, Geyser believes “the proposed shift from the product to process is not seen as indicative of a paradigm shift.”

Therefore, Geyser (2000: 4), argues that “it seems self evident from the above that before undertaking any aspect of curriculum work, the teacher or curriculum developer must

first attempt to determine and understand the basic assumptions of his/her own philosophy.” He argues he/she should “compare these with alternatives proposed at other times and in other places.” In other words, he believes that “people, preparing teachers and other curriculum developers are urged to identify and critically discuss their own philosophical assumptions about teaching and learning.” Geyser believes that “practising or preparing teachers should be aware of the philosophical underpinnings of the curriculum they are implementing because every educational model has a theoretical basis.” However, he concedes that “many education models are based on more than one underlying philosophy and curriculum 2005 is no exception to the rule.”

What Geyser (2000: 3) argues is evident in the implementation of Outcomes in OBE learning and the behavioral objectives of the previous content-based curriculum. Many teachers argue that there is no difference between the objectives of the previous curriculum and the outcomes of OBE. Geyser (2000: 3) therefore “refutes that OBE has brought a change in the education system.” He believes that “this is more common in the former Model C schools because they claim that this is what they have been doing all along and there nothing new that has been brought by OBE.” He contends that “as far as the process and product of education objectives and outcomes are concerned, OBE has not provided any paradigm shift in South African education.”

According to the researcher’s view OBE has not in anyway contributed to the development of education transformation in South Africa. It has, indeed, brought a paradigm shift in education but it has not in any way contributed to development, especially taking into cognizance the complex nature of OBE and its implementation to under-resourced schools in the Eastern Cape. The process and product debate in education transformation is complex in that there are those who propagate the view that for education to be developmental there should be an end product or an outcome. Geyser (2000: 3) believes that OBE has not offered any paradigm shift in South African education because what the teachers are doing is what they have been doing all along. He contends that there is no difference between the behavioral objectives of the old curriculum and the outcomes of this Outcomes-Based curriculum.

## 2.6 CONTEXT AS DEVELOPMENTAL IN EDUCATION TRANSFORMATION

Many academics have argued that OBE has provided a developmental paradigm context in South Africa. However, they believe that for education to be developmental and provide a paradigm shift it must satisfy certain philosophical underpinnings. Geyser (2000:24) “presents a critical analysis of the underlying philosophical underpinnings of outcomes-based education as a developmental approach to education.” These philosophical foundations are:

- Behaviorism
- Social reconstruction
- Critical theory
- Pragmatism

### 2.6.1 Behaviorism

Geyser (2000: 25) concedes that “the philosophy of behaviorism has a strong philosophical bias, focusing on external human behavior, which can be observed.” He claims that there are two basic behaviorist principles:

- Observable behaviors that are important and human behavior is overt, observable and measurable. According to Geyser, the formulation of specific objectives (or outcomes that describes the ideal behavior) is an integral feature of behaviorism.
- The environment is important because observable, measurable behavior is dependant on stimuli from the environment (Geyser; 2000: 25)

Geyser (2000:25) justifies his behaviorist philosophy by arguing that “OBE’s strong behaviorist assumption can be seen in the way Spady (1999: 2) defines outcomes, and also in South African policy documents.” However, Geyser argues that Spady (1999:2) defines outcomes as “clear learning results that we want students to demonstrate at the end of significant learning.” He goes on to say that outcomes “are what learners can actually do with what they know and have learned.” Furthermore, Geyser also claims that “the South African Qualifications Authority’s (SAQA) formulation of critical and

developmental outcomes for education and training in South Africa are interpreted as specific outcomes for the eight learning areas.”

Moreover, Geyser (2000: 25) maintains that “SAQA further provides guidelines for the organization of education and training and, in so doing, formulates standards that include assessment criteria.” He believes that “the use of active verbs when formulating an outcome is stressed and these active verbs relate to facets of observable behavior such as to collect, identify, analyze and demonstrate.” Furthermore, Geyser contends that “an outcome is an achievement within a specific context.” Therefore, maintains Geyser “in curriculum 2005, a set of range statements describing the context or situation of a specific outcome, should be demonstrated.” He goes on to argue that “range statements are defined as indicators of the scope, depth, level of complexity, and also the critical areas of content, processes and acceptable level of achievement.” Therefore, Geyser believes that “OBE, with visible, measurable and specifically formulated outcomes, has strong roots in behaviorism.”

### **2.6.2 Social reconstruction**

Geyser (2000:33) argues that “social reconstruction is a philosophy strongly oriented towards social transformation.” Geyser maintains that “what is needed, according to this theory, is more emphasis on society-centered education that takes into consideration the needs of the society and all the classes, not only the middle class.” Therefore, Geyser believes that “schools should take an active role in determining the new social order and that issues such as empowerment, transformation and emancipation of the suppressed and denationalized communities should be stressed.” Reconstructionists, therefore, according to Geyser, “see the primary struggle in society today between those who wish to preserve society as it is, or with little change, and those who believe that great change is needed to make society more responsive to the needs of the individual.” He further claims that “reconstructionism is seen as crisis philosophy, appropriate for a society in crisis, which is the essence of international society today.”

In education, Geyser (2000: 33) asserts that “the idea of learning as a constructive process is widely accepted and learners do not passively receive information, but instead actively construct knowledge as they strive to make sense of their worlds.” Therefore, according to Geyser, “the learning theories of social reconstructionists emphasize aspects such as supporting the role of the teacher.” However, Geyser contends that “knowledge is seen as a social product, not the construct of research by elite theorists and the learner should construct his/her body of knowledge with the teacher as a facilitator.” Likewise, argues Geyser “values are not regarded as being universal and final because moral relativism is a constructivist view that allows for the plurality of moral facts and truths.”

Furthermore, Geyser (2000: 34) maintains that “in the official documents on outcomes-based education, the outcomes of social transformation are mentioned repeatedly.” He claims that “the outcomes are perceived to ‘articulate active and energize rigorously, the South African perspective of transformation’.” However, he argues that “knew knowledge is in large constructed by the learners and teachers are perceived as facilitators, and not as authoritarian sources of knowledge and power.” Moreover, Geyser believes “social transformation is the basis for the formulation of the rationale for the learning outcomes. He claims for example, “in MLMMS the learning outcome ‘take transformative action, thereby empowering people to work towards the reconstruction and development of the South African society,’ has the basis for social transformation.” Similarly he claims that “in LLC the learning outcome which says ‘language learning empowers people to make meaningful statements’ has got that base for social transformation.” Therefore, according to Geyser, “these examples are convincing in the argument that OBE in South Africa, is among other things based upon social reconstruction principles.”

### **2.6.3 Critical theory**

When it comes to the critical theory, Geyser (2000: 34) believes that the key focus areas in the philosophy of critical theory are the change and emancipation of societies and individuals from being regulated and indoctrinated towards being critical and

questioning. In addition, maintains Geyser, “a critical social and educational science is a mode of collective social action profoundly connected to emancipatory ideals of rationality, justice and freedom.” Furthermore, he concedes that “truths are not only accessible to the privileged elite and he believes that the reason for such contention is that since there is no such thing as ‘pure theory,’ there is no privileged access to ‘truth.’”

Geyser (2000:34) maintains that “the discussion documents on OBE in South Africa stress the critical attitudes and skills to be acquired by learners.” He mentions that “in the introduction to the discussion of the proposed new curriculum, the emphasis falls strongly on a new curriculum for a new democratic society, and the following vision for South Africa is given.” These are:

- A prosperous, truly united, democratically and internationally competitive country with literate, creative, and critical citizens leading productive, self-fulfilled lives in a country free of violence, discrimination and prejudice.
- Learning progress should promote the learners ability to think critically, and, one of the nationally critical outcomes as formulated by SAQA says “collect, analyze, organize and critically evaluate information.”
- In the rationale for the learning area, Economics and Management Sciences (EMS), reconstruction, development and economic growth, is specifically mentioned (Geyser; 2000: 34)

Subsequently, Geyser (2000: 34) contends that “the emphasis on reconstruction and on critical questioning attitudes in the new curriculum reflects key aspects of the critical theory philosophy.”

#### **2.6.4 Pragmatism**

According to Geyser (2000: 34) pragmatism “is a philosophy that emphasizes usefulness.” Therefore, he concedes that according to this theory “whatever works in practice or what is useful, is of the utmost importance.” He maintains that “this is constantly changing, and the ideal teaching method is not concerned with teaching the

learner what to think so much as to teach him/her to think critically.” Taking a pragmatic view, Geyser claims that “the curriculum is based on the learner’s experiences and interests and prepares him for life’s affairs and the future.” Therefore, Geyser argues that “the subject matter is interdisciplinary and the emphasis is on problem solving (not on mastering organized subject matter).” However, he points out that “learning takes place in an active way as learners either individually or in groups solve problems and will vary in response to a changing world.” The pragmatics, according to Geyser, “consider teaching as a process of reconstructing experience according to the scientific method and the learner has to acquire the method or process of solving problems in an intelligent manner.”

Geyser (2000: 34) believes that “pragmatism features very strongly in the new curriculum.” He believes that it can be seen in the following:

- The first critical outcomes that refer to the learner’s ability to “identify and solve problems and make decisions using critical and creative thinking.”
- The learning area, Technology, has its first specific outcome as stating that learners will be able to “understand and apply the technological process required to solve problems.”
- The learning area, Natural Science, has its fifth specific outcome in that learners need “to use scientific knowledge and skills to support responsible decision-making” (Geyser; 2000: 34).

Therefore, according to Geyser (2000: 34) “the OBE model for South Africa has very strong roots in the philosophy of pragmatism hence in official documents; the pragmatic usefulness of education is also acknowledged.”

In conclusion Geyser (2000: 34) concedes “that OBE is deeply rooted in behavioral foundations in that even Spady defined outcomes as learning results that students should demonstrate at the end of significant learning.” He acknowledges that “the NQF further provides guidelines for such organization.” These behavioral foundations, which Geyser insists on, might be demonstrated to each and every learner. For instance, learners in the

previously disadvantaged areas do not always demonstrate the intended outcomes. The reason could be the environmental conditions the child learns may not be conducive to learning because of lack of resources and the capability of educators to handle OBE.

Furthermore, Geyser also believes that any curriculum should lead to the social reconstruction of the country. He claims that it should empower people; contribute to the emancipation of the suppressed communities and therefore leads to social reconstruction. In the researcher's knowledge and experience OBE has not yet contributed to the social reconstruction of the country as yet. OBE was introduced to meet the developmental needs of the previously disadvantaged groups and to reconstruction the South African society but it has not been able to do that.

Moreover, Geyser claims that it stimulates critical thinking and teaches students not to be passive receivers of knowledge. This is what OBE has successfully done because children are able to participate in their learning and can contribute in their own development. They can solve their problems and make their own decisions. However, all this could be made by the government making useful interventions in the implementation of OBE in previously disadvantaged areas. Geyser also believes that OBE is based on the learners' experiences and interests and prepares them for life roles in the future. However, although the paradigm contexts, especially of social reconstruction in which Geyser puts OBE is developmental, it leaves many questions of how can it be the same in social contexts and situations that are not the same.

## **2.7 A CRITICAL OVERVIEW OF OBE AS A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH TO EDUCATION.**

Jansen (1999: 3) argues that "OBE fails to do what it was intended to do." However, Jansen is of the view that "OBE cannot offer the same development that it offers to both urban and rural contexts." Jansen discovers many deficiencies that hinder the implementation of OBE in previously disadvantaged areas, which include the teacher's lack of understanding of OBE, the level of their qualifications; the unequal situations and



environments in which OBE is implemented. He also claims that the complexity of the terminology involved in OBE and the political and epistemological context under which it was formulated put more emphasis on curriculum content when at the same time claiming to be moving away from content coverage.

Jansen (1999: 3) offers us what he considers as reasons why OBE will fail in South African schools and why it cannot lead to the development of children in disadvantaged areas. He also explains why many teachers are so frustrated with this new curriculum development. However, he argues that “what is clear is that since the mid-1990’s OBE has triggered the single most important curriculum controversy in the history of South African education.” He contends that “the most important part of this curriculum policy system is that the core curricula were regularly devised for all schools based on a ‘schools subject’ approach.” He believes that “these curricula were introduced into schools with vastly different resource environments and, accordingly, produced vastly different consequences in these different race-based resourced contexts.” In the researcher’s school, for instance, they do not have proper classrooms and some classes are taught in rondavels. We do not have proper chalkboards and there is no adequate furniture to accommodate all children in the classrooms. In such a situation how could it be expected that OBE can develop children into their full potentials. It is these different resource contexts, as Jansen contends, that makes OBE a symbol rather than an education policy that is practical to all South Africans.

Furthermore, Jansen (1999: 3) asserts that “in 1996, without warning, a key document emerged spelling out the proposal of OBE.” He mentions that these proposals have striking characteristics:

- The sudden emergence of the proposal, bringing ordinary teachers into contact with a curriculum discourse completely foreign to their understanding and practice.
- The lack of conceptual connection between the proposal for OBE and the early integrated and competency debates.

- The development of an OBE for schools, which appeared distinct from discussions of OBE in the workplace or, as, became clearer later, from OBE in higher education contexts.
- The heavy reliance on Spadyean OBE as the justificatory framework.
- The shift in language from ‘competencies’ to ‘outcomes’ a move widely interpreted as an attempt to escape the more obvious behaviorism implied in ‘competencies’ in favor of the more educationally acceptable ‘outcomes’ language.
- The introduction of a new, complex and voluminous terminology to describe OBE.
- The introduction of curriculum 2005 that was weakly coupled to OBE in official documents and discourses (Jansen; 1999: 7-10).

Jansen (1999: 146) outlines ten principal criticisms as to why OBE will impact negatively on South African schools. Firstly, argues Jansen “the language and innovation associated with OBE is too complex, confusing and at times contradictory.” Consequently, he believes that “a teacher attempting to make sense of OBE will not only have to come to terms with more than fifty different concepts and labels, but also keep track of the changes in meaning and priorities affordable to these different concepts over time.” For example, contends Jansen, “to understand the concept of ‘outcomes’ requires understanding of competencies.” He concedes that these competencies are “unit standards, learning programs, curriculum assessment criteria, range statements, equivalence, articulation, bands, levels, phases, curriculum frameworks.” He claims that “this is done in accordance to their relationship to SAQA.” He also states that “it also requires understanding of the NQF, the ETQA and the reconstruction of the twelve SAQA fields of learning areas with eight phases as well as the fields of study.”

According to Jansen (1999: 146) “the sudden shift from ‘competencies’ to ‘outcomes’ in the official discourse on OBE lies behind the change and how the two terms now relate within the new policy.” In fact, Jansen claims “the only certainty about OBE and its predecessor language is that it has constantly changed meaning.” He believes that “this language is quite inaccessible, for example, essential outcomes are distinguished in most policy papers from specific outcomes only to see the former displaced recently with

critical ‘outcomes.’” For this reason alone, Jansen asserts, “the language of OBE and its associate structures is complex and inaccessible for most teachers to use them meaningfully in classroom practice.”

In the researcher’s school, for example, teachers find it very difficult to use the policy documents because they do not understand most of the terminology. Although they have gone to workshops on OBE it is still difficult to conceptualize all the terminology. This inevitably hampers successful implementation because of lack of understanding of the terminology by the teachers.

Secondly, Jansen (1999: 146) maintains that “OBE as a curriculum policy is lodged in problematic claims and assumptions about the relationship between curriculum and society.” However, he points out that “advocates of OBE in South Africa are associated with or are stated as prerequisite for, or sometimes are offered as solutions to economic growth.” Moreover, Jansen argues, “there is not a shred of evidence in almost many years of curriculum change and literature to suggest that altering the curriculum of schools leads to, or is associated with changes in national economies.” In fact, he claims that “even the most optimistic of studies conducted in Tanzania and Columbia by the World Bank, suggest that there is simple no evidence from experimental research that curriculum diversification.” He concedes that there is no evidence that “an attempt to make curriculum responsive to economic conditions has ‘significant’ social or private benefits.”

Jansen (1999:148) believes that “it is particularly the case in developing countries where economic problems have little to do with what happens inside schools.” He states that they have “much more to do with the economics and politics of a Third World state, for example, sustained high unemployment.” However, he suggests that “what official documents therefore claim is at best misleading.” He believes that “they offer an economic development panacea to benefit those alienated from education and training under apartheid in the name of a complex curriculum reform policy.” Furthermore, he contends that “to make such connections between curriculum and society has

understandable political goals, but they have no foundation, given accumulated research on curriculum change.”

Thirdly, Jansen (1999: 148) maintains that “OBE is destined to fail in the South African education system because it is based on flawed assumptions about what happened inside schools, how classrooms are organized and what kind of teachers exist within the system.” In addition, he points out that “the claim that ‘transformational OBE is a collaborative, flexible, trans-disciplinary, outcomes-based, open-system, empowered-oriented approach to learning’ suggests that highly qualified teachers exist to make sense of such a challenge existing practice.” Therefore, contends Jansen, “the policy requires not merely the application of a skill, but understanding its theoretical underpinnings and demonstrating the capacity to transfer such application and understanding across different contexts.” He claims that “anyone who seriously believes that such an innovation will be implemented with these original insights in mind has not spent enough time with the previously disadvantaged schools.”

Consequently, because of the legacy of apartheid most schools in South Africa are under-resourced and many teachers in are under-qualified and they are expected to implement such a complex curriculum innovation. The principal of the school where the researcher teaches for instance, does not have matriculation and she is expected to monitor and manage OBE, which she does not understand. By contrast, most former Model C schools do not have any problem in the implementation of OBE because the educators are highly qualified and their schools are well resourced.

Fourthly, Jansen maintains, “there are strong philosophical rationales for questioning the desirability of OBE in democratic school systems.” He believes that “one need not take the radical but enticing position that specifying outcomes in advance might be anti-democratic.” However, Jansen believes, “it is sufficient to argue that this policy offers an instrumentalist view of knowledge, ‘a means-ends OBE stance that violates the epistemology of the structure of certain subjects and disciplines.’” He mentions that “developing technical writing skills or the mechanical repair of a bicycle tube lends itself

to specifying instrumental outcomes, developing appreciation for a complex reading in English literature or poetry does not.” He is in agreement with Richard Peters when quoting McKernan (1942: 2) as saying

Worthwhile activities have their own built-in standards of excellence, and therefore they can be evaluated according to the standards inherent in them rather than according to some end or outcome.

Therefore, according to Jansen, “there is a fundamental contradiction in insisting that students use knowledge creatively only to inform them that the desired learning outcomes are already specified.”

Fifthly, Jansen (1999: 150) asserts that “there are important political and epistemological objections to OBE as a curriculum policy.” He claims that “the question must be asked again of the ANC and its democratically aligned partners, how is it that a movement which predicated its politics on the notion of process organizes its policies on a platform of outcomes.” He believes that “much of the educational and political struggle of the 1980’s valued the processes of learning and teaching as ends in themselves.” Furthermore, Jansen maintains that “this problem extends to the manner in which teachers, as constituents have been limited in their participation around this important policy.”

Moreover, Jansen (1999: 150) claims that “a small elite group of teachers often expert and White, have driven the Learning Area Committee (LAC) and other structures in which OBE have been developed.” However, argues Jansen, “the sad reality is that the overwhelming majority of teachers do not have access to OBE, or understand OBE in instances where such information may be available.” In other words, contends Jansen, “there is no process, systematic and ongoing, in which teachers are allowed to conceptualize and make sense of OBE as curriculum policy.” Ironically, claims Jansen, “teachers continued to be defined as implementers of this policy.”

Sixthly, when put more directly, Jansen (1999: 151) goes on to argue, OBE enables policy makers to avoid dealing with the central question in the South African transition, namely, what is education for? For example, he claims, “there is little evidence in the report of the LAC for HSS that this problem has been directly addressed.” However, “he believes that one would expect in this committee that core values and commitments would be more readily evident than, for example, in the Natural Sciences.” But as Jansen (1999: 151) contends, “there is not a single commitment to combating racism and sexism in society, or developing the Pan-African citizen, or the role of dissent in a democracy.” He maintains that, “of the seventeen learning area outcomes identified, the closest approximation of a value statement is the phrase, ‘participate actively in promoting a sustainable, just and equitable society.’” He believes that “this settlement is so broad as to become meaningless, especially when this unpacked in specific objectives such as ‘display constructive attitudes’ or ‘participate in debate or decision-making.’”

Consequently, Jansen (1999: 151) believes that “the above statements could have been written for Hawaii, Buenos Aires or Western Nigeria because they are bland, decontextualized, global statements which will make very little difference in a society emerging from apartheid and colonialism.” Furthermore, contends Jansen, “OBE outcomes do not define content or what policy bureaucrats call the actual learning programmes.” As a result, Jansen claims that “the same set of learning outcomes could be exposed to a wide range of interpretations.” For example, he concedes that “outcomes with good citizenship goals could mean one thing in a conservative school setting and another in a school with a broad democratic ethos.” As a result, he believes that “there is nothing within the OBE framework to prevent such latitude of interpretation, which subsequently would mute, even a modest direction signaled in an outcome.”

The seventh criticism of OBE, according to Jansen (1999: 151) is that “its management will multiply the administrative burden placed on teachers.” In this regard, he cites “a useful example of such trends found in a research on how teachers understand and implement continuous assessment.” He states that “this policy instructive was issued to all schools in the wake of the syllabus reform process spearheaded by the National

Education and Training Forum in 1995/1996.” Moreover, contends Jansen, “rather than encourage a more progressive, holistic assessment of students as the policy stipulated, continuous assessment in practice meant little more than assessing continuously in most schools.” Furthermore, he believes that “the range of assessment tasks remained more or less constant and the number of tasks multiplied significantly.” Moreover, Jansen claims that “the same is likely to happen with OBE because to manage this innovation, teachers will be required to re-organize curriculum, increase the amount of time allocated to monitor individual student progress against outcomes.” He argues that they will be required “to administer appropriate forms of assessment and maintain comprehensive records.” Therefore, Jansen asserts that “as experienced elsewhere, OBE will fail in the absence of this careful management by teachers.”

The eighth criticism, according to Jansen (1999: 152), is that “OBE emphasizes curriculum content even if it claims to be moving away from the content coverage that besets the current education.” However, Jansen highlights the fact that “children do not learn outcomes in a vacuum.” He claims that “curriculum content is a vehicle for giving meaning to a particular set of outcomes.” Furthermore, Jansen claims that “an outcome regarded as ‘appreciating the richness of national and cultural heritages could be based on content which glorifies a narrow Afrikaner nationalism.” He believes that it could “also validate in another context, some form of militant ethnicity.” Therefore, to Jansen, “a fixation with outcomes could easily lead to serious matters with respect to building a multi-cultural curriculum which both moves beyond ethnicity while simultaneously engaging with historicity of such concepts in the context of South Africa.”

Jansen (1999: 152) goes on to argue that “selecting curriculum content applies choice and this is where the politics of curriculum reform coincides with the broader politics of transition.” He questions “who makes these choices, where and under what conditions”? Therefore, according to Jansen, “it is crucial that OBE evangelicals not renege on a commitment to make strategic curriculum choices, which would form the basis for the critical outcomes of the new curriculum.” He also maintains that “OBE trivializes curriculum content in another way by threatening to atomize and fragment curriculum

knowledge.” He claims that “by organizing knowledge around discrete competencies OBE overlooks important cross-curricular and inter-disciplinary demands encountered in becoming a complex task.” Moreover, he contends that “OBE further assumes that knowledge acquisition proceeds in a linear way such that one outcome is linked in a step-wise direction to another.” Jansen believes that “this is one of the most common criticisms against OBE and yet it is being monitored towards implementation.”

The ninth criticism, argues Jansen (1999: 152), is that “for OBE to succeed even in moderate terms requires a number of interdependent innovations to strike the new educational system simultaneously.” According to Jansen (1999: 152) these innovations would have been to:

- Trained and retrained teachers, radically new forms of assessment (such as performance assessment or competency-based assessment).
- Additional teachers for managing this complex process.
- Retrained education managers or principals to secure the implementation as required.
- Parental support and involvement.
- New forms of learning resources (textbooks and other sides), which are consistent with an outcomes-based orientation (Jansen; 1999: 152).

In other words, claims Jansen, “an entire re-engineering of the education system is needed to support this innovation.” Therefore, according to him, “a fiscal base is needed or the political will to intervene in the education system at this level of intensity.”

Lastly, Jansen asks, “how does one explain these dilemmas of OBE as outlined in the policy criticism that has been offered”? He then proposes two levels of analysis, technical and political, but at the same time equally valid. From a technical perspective, Jansen explains, “it could be argued that the prerequisites for fundamentally changing the apartheid curriculum are not in place.” In fact, he maintains that “OBE as a curriculum innovation has not taken adequate account of the resource status of schools and classrooms in South Africa.” Furthermore, contends Jansen, “as a policy OBE is not



grounded in the curriculum change experiences of other countries with similar initiatives.” Jansen concedes that “OBE will further undermine the already weak culture of teaching and learning in South African schools by escalating the administrative burden of change at the very time that rationalization further limits the human resource capacity for managing such change.”

However, Jansen believes that “the long-term effects of OBE are unavoidable, namely that the more schools are loaded with unworkable innovations, the less likely they are to adopt such changes in the future.” Similarly, he maintains that “the weak reception of continuous assessment (1995/96) in schools and the complete ineffectiveness of the syllabus revision process (1994/95) in changing curriculum practice explain why teachers have received OBE in such an unenthusiastic manner.”

Furthermore, Jansen is of the view that “OBE is primarily an attempt to push forward something innovative into the schools at all costs.” He claims that this done “in order to reclaim political credibility for a Ministry of Education that is still charged, within and outside the government, with having delivered little concrete evidence of the transformation in schools.” He mentions that “not a single official interviewed in the national Department of Education believed that OBE should be introduced so soon, yet they all worked feverishly towards implementing it at all costs in 1998.” He contends that “there is no other way of understanding such behavior outside of a political analysis of the state and curriculum in the South African education transition.”

The Review committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 50), discussing the design features of OBE, argues that “according to the documents that have been reviewed, interviewed and submitted, all indicate some or other breakdown in the translation of C2005.” The Committee asserts that “policy and guideline documents are translated into learning programmes, learner support material, assessment tasks and lesson plans.” The Committee believes that “these evaluation documents and commentaries on C2005 suggest that this is happening for two reasons.” Firstly, it claims that “there is incoherence, incompatibility, and flaws in the design of the curriculum structure of

C2005.” Secondly, it maintains that “there is poor implementation, planning and execution of the new curriculum.”

Moreover, the Review committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 50) concedes that “by taking a simple model of curriculum structure allows us to establish the key nodes and processes of any curriculum structure.” However, it believes that “such a curriculum model then allows us to see what version of curriculum structure we have in curriculum 2005, and then to establish what such a version can and cannot do under specified conditions.” Furthermore, the Review committee contends that “every curriculum includes a demarcation of knowledge and this demarcation is of two types, lateral demarcation and vertical demarcation.”

Firstly, the Review committee (South Africa; 2000: 51) maintains that “lateral demarcation indicates how knowledge units and clusters are to be demarcated from each other: do they belong in the curriculum.” It argues that it shows “how parameters should be used to demarcate one from another and how should they be demarcated from non-curricula everyday knowledge.” Thus, the Review committee believe that “the particular challenge posed here for curriculum design is that of connective coherence or integration.” It claims that “there is no coherent linkage between knowledge units and clusters, as well as connections within them and between them.”

Secondly, the Review committee (South Africa; 2000: 51) goes on to argue that “vertical demarcation establishes which knowledge, within each demarcated knowledge cluster, must be taught and learnt in which sequence, and at which level of competency.” It concedes that “this involves the notion of sequence, pace, progression and what competencies should precede others in the learning process.” Therefore, the Review committee contends that “traditionally, vertical dimension has been determined within disciplines and that the particular challenge that has been posed here is of conceptual coherence or progression.” It claims that this is “to ensure coherent linkage conceptually within each knowledge unit.”

Moreover, the Review committee (South Africa; 2000: 51) claims that “different learning areas have different requirements in terms of integration and progression.” It maintains, however, “that some knowledge areas such as arts and culture and technology require relatively little in the way of design to encourage learners to explore the connective relations into the field at their own time and space.” Therefore, according to the Review committee, “the steps of progression are largely implicit.” Furthermore, it asserts that “other learning areas presuppose an overt stepwise ladder of concepts and skills that must be organized in a more sequential and phased way to facilitate cognitive access.” It points out that these are learning areas “such as mathematics, natural sciences, languages and social sciences.”

It is however, noteworthy to say that in the context of all these criticisms that have been analyzed by Jansen and the Review committee on C2005, it is difficult or it is unlikely to believe that OBE does contribute to the developmental needs of all children in South Africa. It seems as if there are many issues that still need to be resolved before we can imagine OBE playing a meaningful role in the reconstruction and development of South Africa. It needs a concerted effort by the government to address the inequalities, which exist between previously advantaged and disadvantaged schools. Furthermore, there is a need for teachers to be involved in any curriculum development and the level of their qualifications should be improved. They have to be trained properly in the implementation of OBE, in the terminology involved in the new curriculum and in all the pedagogic implications of OBE. It is in this context that we could say that OBE has really contributed to the reconstruction and development of human resources in South Africa.

# **CHAPTER THREE**

## **RESEARCH DESIGN &**

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter offers an overview of the methods used in the study of the relationship between Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) and development. It also offers the techniques used in investigating this relationship. This chapter discusses the ways in which data has been obtained in studying the relationship between OBE and development. The research method and process, techniques, ethics and limitations of the study and its anticipated value have been fully explained and it informs the researcher of the advantages and disadvantages of using such research methods.

### **3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN**

This research study was based on qualitative data and was exploratory in nature because the researcher was investigating the experiences and feelings of educators, parents, students and education government officials on their understanding and knowledge of the relationship between OBE and development.

Creswell (1998:14) concurs with Denzin and Lincoln (1994) when they define qualitative research “as a multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive naturalistic approach to its subject matter.” Denzin and Lincoln (1994) believe that qualitative research is conducted in a natural setting, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. They claim that qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials. They state that this “includes case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interaction and visual texts that describe routine and problematic moments and meaning in individual lives.”

### **3.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

When the researcher pursued the research study he had clear objectives in mind. As an educator, dealing with OBE on a day to day basis he could not allow subjectivity to influence this study while he conducted interview schedules with the respondents.

### 3.3.1 Sampling

Rubin and Babie (1993:243) argue that “stratified sampling is a method for obtaining a greater degree of representativeness and of decreasing the probability of a sampling error.” They recall that “sampling error is reduced by two factors in the sample design.” Firstly, they maintain that “a large sample produces a smaller sampling error than a small sample.” Secondly, they suggest that a “homogeneous population produces samples with smaller sampling errors than does a heterogeneous population.” Furthermore, they contend that “if 99 percent of the population agrees with a certain statement, it is extremely unlikely that any probability sample will greatly misrepresent the extent of the agreement.” Therefore, they concede that “if the population is split 50-50 on the statement then the sampling error will be much greater.”

Rubin and Babie (1993:243) believe that “stratified sampling is based on this second factor in sampling theory.” However, they maintain that “by selecting your sample from the total population at large, you ensure that appropriate numbers of elements are drawn from homogeneous subsets of that population.”

The researcher selected a sample from educators, students, parents and education department officials. Educators were grouped according to the learning areas in which they were teaching, for instance, two educators from the Human and Social Sciences (HSS), Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC), Life Orientation (LO), Mathematical Literacy, Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences (MLMS), Technology, Natural Sciences (NS), Economics and Management Sciences (EMS), Arts and Culture (AC).

Two schools were involved in the research study. One school is Transkei Primary School (TPS), which is a former Model C school based in Umtata and Mpafane Junior Secondary School (JSS), which is a previously disadvantaged school and situated in the rural outskirts of Umtata. In these two schools the researcher gave questionnaires to five teachers, five parents in Mpafane JSS and three in TPS and five students in both schools.

The researcher also had interview schedules with the respondents. Here is some relevant information about the schools and Government Officials interviewed.

### **3.3.1.1 Transkei Primary School**

Transkei Primary School is situated in Umtata. It is a former Model C school and its principal teacher is Mr. Shank. It consists of about 500 students who come mainly from the surrounding suburbs of Umtata. The school starts from Grade 1 to Grade 7 and is a feeder for Umtata High School. It is also very determined to produce students of high quality for the Umtata community.

### **3.3.1.2 Mpafane Junior Secondary School**

Mpafane J.S.S. is situated about 40 kilometers outside Umtata. It is a previously disadvantaged school. It does not have proper classrooms and resources or proper sanitation. It has about 250 children, some of whom travel about a kilometer to school. The Principal teacher is Mr. Mgweba. All the teachers live in town and travel everyday to school.

There were also officials from the Department of Education that were involved in the research study. The researcher gave questionnaires to three Education Development Officers (EDO's) and had interview schedules with them as well as with two Curriculum Development Officers (CDO's) and one OBE Learning Areas Advisor (LAA).

### **3.3.1.3 Educational Development Officers**

The Educational Development Officers are responsible for the development of the schools. Their main responsibility is to ensure that the educators are doing their jobs as expected by the Department of Education. They also make sure that the curriculum is properly implemented and are responsible for the whole development of the school.

### **3.3.1.4 Curriculum Development Officers**

The Curriculum Development Officers are responsible for the development and design of the schools curriculum. They ensure that the curriculum is properly implemented and that it is in line with the rules and laws of the Department of Education. They also look at the assessment of students and the examinations.

### **3.3.1.5 OBE Learning Areas Advisors**

The OBE Learning Areas Advisors are responsible for the training of educators in Outcomes-Based Education. They are also responsible for conducting workshops to train educators about new developments in OBE, how to assess students and are responsible for the Continuous Assessment System (CAS) conducted with Grade 9 students

## **3.3.2 The Research Process**

### **3.3.2.1 Data gathering techniques**

The researcher gave the educators questionnaires which they discussed among themselves and arrived on a consensual answer. He then took about five to ten minutes interviewing each educator, probing for further clarification.

However, in-depth interviews were conducted with Government officials, that is, Curriculum Development Officers (CDO's), Education Development Officers (EDO's) and Learning Area Advisors (LAA's). The researcher asked for special leave to interview Government Officials as they stated clearly that their schedules were too busy to accommodate group discussions. Five parents and five students from the two schools were also grouped together. The researcher grouped the parents and students in order to discuss the questions with his assistance so that a consensus could be reached in each of the questions. The researcher used Xhosa with the parents and students of the rural school, as they did not understand English well. The researcher had no problem with the urban parents and students who communicated well in English.



These interview schedules were dependent on the schedule of the particular school. At TPS, the researcher was given five minutes to interview each teacher and this could only be done during flexi periods. They cited the busy schedule of the school timetable as the reason for such an arrangement. The researcher was then given the permission to interview parents in their respective homes because he was told it would be unlikely that he would reach them at school since the parent's meetings were not often held. Through the help of his colleagues, the researcher was able to contact three of them. He gave them questionnaires and interviewed them in their homes.

At Mpafane J.S.S., the researcher was given 10 minutes to interview teachers, students and parents and the principal provided school time within which to conduct the interviews. The researcher had to take special leaves to interview government officials because of their busy work schedule and the researcher spent ten minutes to interviewing each one. The research was done over a period of four weeks. During the first two weeks, the researcher was involved with schools and in the last two weeks, with the education government officials. The researcher wrote letters to the principals of the two schools asking for permission to conduct the study. In all these places the researcher was granted permission to do research, but with some difficulty, especially with some education department officials who showed a lack of interest in participating in the research.

The researcher also used semi-structured interviews to obtain more data from the respondents. Marlow (1998: 159) argues that "in a semi-structured interview the interviewer has a basic set of questions but he is free to ask additional questions or to improve as needed." He also contends that "in a semi-structured interview, the interviewer can improvise with questions and 'has more freedom to pursue hunches'." Welman & Kruger (1999: 161) point out that we can use semi-structured interviews with all age groups and with young workers who participate in Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET) and who are still unable to read, as well as elderly people with poor eye sights. Coughlan (2000: 38) believes that there are six advantages of a research interview. These are:

- Naturalness and spontaneity.
- High respond rate.
- Flexibility.
- Access to serendipitous information.
- Non-verbal behavior.
- Observation and control of the environment.

The researcher had a varied approach to his respondents when collecting data. For instance, he allowed the teachers five minutes to discuss the questions with his assistance and then another five minutes for in-depth interviews. He conducted in-depth interview schedules with the Government Officials because they had no time for group discussions. The interview schedule had two themes that were the same for all respondents. The rationale for choosing the two themes was to meet the objectives of the study.

- To critically evaluate OBE from a developmental perspective.
- To compare and determine the extent to which educators, students, parents and government education officials understand the implementation of OBE.

The questions focused on the following themes:

- Understanding of OBE.
- The focus of OBE.
- Reasons for the introduction of OBE in South Africa.
- The focus of the old curriculum.
- Understanding of education transformation in South Africa.
- Understanding of the terminology involved in the OBE curriculum.
- Understanding of the aim of the school in the new curriculum.
- Understanding of the change that has been brought by OBE in South Africa.

Theme 2 focused on the following questions:

- Understanding of “development.”

- Reasons for the introduction of OBE in South Africa.
- Understanding of the role of education in the RDP.
- Understanding of the contribution of OBE in the RDP.
- Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of children in South Africa.
- Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas or not.
- Understanding of better implementation of OBE in previously disadvantaged areas.
- Understanding of the enhancement of the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas.

Murphy & Dillon (1998: 55) suggest that “interviews are a specific form of conversation and like all conversations they are mutual in that both parties have a stake in the outcome of the conversation.” Indeed, they argue that the dictionary defines the interview “as including a ‘sight shared by two people,’ and a ‘mutual view’.” However, they maintain that “there are many layers of meaning and influence in interviews, with only some of them apparent to participant observers.” Therefore, they believe that “individuals speak, listen and make meaning from their own unique perspective and that two people may share the same experience and yet each perceive it uniquely.” Moreover, they contend that “such things as age, class, gender, ethnicity, and individual and societal ideologies mediate individual experience and meaning.” There was a mutual understanding between the researcher and the respondents because they spoke freely with him and shared their experiences of OBE.

Murphy & Dillon (1998: 111) offered general principles regarding the use of each questions. They believe that “**questions should be intentional.**” The researcher was very careful to ask questions that he considered relevant to the research study. Sometimes the respondents would ask the researcher why he was asking a certain question. Murphy & Dillon (1998:111) contend, however that “clinicians should know why they are asking the questions they ask.” Therefore, they claim that “clinical questions always have to have purpose, and the clinician should always be aware of the possible effects that each question might have on the client.”

Moreover, Murphy & Dillon (1998:111) assert that **“clinicians need to be sensitive to cultural attitudes towards questioning.”** My study had no cultural issues because it was educational and concentrated more on education and development. Nevertheless the researcher was sensitive when he dealt with issues of class and financial status. Murphy & Dillon (1998: 111)) believe that “every culture and in most families, inculcate norms regarding who can ask what, of whom, in what order, and which questions should be asked only in private or with certain members present.” Therefore, they acknowledge that “it is imperative that clinicians develop a cultural sensitivity and competence in asking questions regarding subjects such as class, sex, money, serious illness, addictions and family violence.”

Murphy & Dillon (1998: 112) maintain that **“questions should be well timed.”** They contend that clinicians “should know why they are asking now at this particular time in the interview.” Moreover, they claim that “clinicians should devise other means of eliciting the same information without disrupting the client’s flow.” Furthermore, they argue that **“too much questioning makes the clinician the director.”** They believe that “gentle guidance and data gathering questions are inevitable in emergencies and in initial sessions with clients not used to clinical work.” In addition, they concur that “the clinician wants to motivate dialogue with the client through maximum encouragement, participation, expression and initiation of topic or focus.”

Murphy & Dillon (1998:112) argue that **“questions can interrupt concentration.”** They claim, however, that “while questions are often necessary and helpful, it is important to that every question, no matter how well intended does not interrupt the natural flow of the client’s narrative.” Moreover, they believe that “flexibility in data gathering is essential. They point out that clinicians could alter planned agenda if the client exhibits an unusual behavior.” They further claim that “clients are more likely to broaden or deepen their stories when they feel calm, safe and understood.”

Murphy & Dillon (1998: 112) state that **“good questions can be supportive and therapeutic as well as useful for gathering data.”** They claim that “questions could serve many purposes, for instance, to help the client expand his/her story or to gain new perspective, to provide more information or to help clarify ambiguity.” Moreover, they contend that **“difficult questions should be introduced carefully.”** They agree with Kidushin (1997) when he suggests that “the impact of difficult questions could be mitigated by the use of prefaces or lead-ins that help clients save face, that “universalize problems” or that “raises the client’s self esteem in preparation for dealing with a question which is apt to be self-deflating.”

Murphy & Dillon (1998:113) believe that **“too little questioning could make for drift or leave the client at a loss for direction.”** However, they believe that “although it is possible to conduct an interview in which the clinician do not ask a single question, the clinician sometimes needs to help the new, unfocused client by asking gentle questions.” They argue that this should be done “in plain language designed to make things on track when the client start to wander.” Moreover, they claim that “too little questioning could occur when the interviewer thinks personal questions are becoming too intrusive or does not want the client to feel pushed into revealing difficult personally sensitive material.”

Furthermore, Murphy & Dillon (1998: 113) concede that **“follow up questions are often necessary.”** They believe, however, that “clinicians need to stay with a line of inquiry long enough to mine it sufficiently for details about content, meaning or feelings.” In addition, they maintain that “the clinician might ask follow up questions regarding something the client has said, but which the clinician does not ask from them and that sometimes the interviewers are embarrassed to ask the client what they mean for fear of appearing ignorant.”

Murphy & Dillon (1998: 114) believe that **“answers to questions can be both verbal and non-verbal.”** They suggest that “clinicians need to listen to both the verbal and non-verbal answers that clients give.” They also assert that “the clinician’s questions can also be both verbal and non-verbal.” Therefore they claim “that raising an eyebrow or

cocking one's head and responding wide-eyed to statements and all these other lighthearted responses of the clinician could act as questions to which the client can respond immediately with goodwill." Consequently, they concede that "clinician responses would represent a warmer, less formal style of probing and they are the best used within the context of a solidly established working relationship."

Lastly, Murphy & Dillon (1998: 114) maintain that "**clinicians need to be aware of what they are not asking.**" They argue that "the clients often notice clinician patterns the same way clinicians notice client patterns." Moreover, they claim that "clients often note, sometimes subliminally, which topics clinicians avoid." They maintain that "it is not unusual for the client to protect himself/herself by not bringing up subjects around whom the clinicians have shown uneasiness or embarrassment." Furthermore, they claim that "**questions can be used as defenses or weapons, by both clinician and client.**" They believe also that "questions could be used to try to diminish or shame the other so that the questioner feels more powerful once again."

The researcher used mainly open-ended questions. Rubin and Babbie (1993:184) believe that "we may ask open-ended questions, in which case the respondent is asked to provide his/her own answer to the question." They also argue that "open-ended questions can also be used in interview-schedules, as well as in self-administered questionnaires." However, they maintain that "in an interview schedule, the interviewer may be instructed to probe for more information as needed." Furthermore, they conceded that "because of the opportunity to probe for more information, open-ended questions are used more frequently on interview schedules than on self-administered questionnaires although they commonly appear in both formats."

To summarize the use of questions in research, clinicians should ask intentional questions and they need to be sensitive to cultural and other sensitive issues. Questions should also be well timed and clinicians should avoid posing too many questions to the clients. However, clinicians should be aware that questions could interrupt the client's concentration. Moreover, they should be aware that good questions could be supportive

and useful for gathering data. Difficult questions, however, should be introduced carefully using prefaces or lead-ins that would help clients to answer questions. The interviewer should also be aware of inclusive questions that might invade the privacy of the client as well as making of non-verbal language. Furthermore, clinicians need to be aware of what they are not asking and also that questions can be used as defenses or weapons by both the clinician and the client. The researcher always took into cognizance such use of questions during his interview schedules with the respondents.

### **3.3.3 Analysis of the data**

This research study, as the researcher has already mentioned was based on qualitative data. Schofield (2000: 2) points out “that qualitative data is often valued for its intrinsic interest, for achieving a variety and possible range of human behavior.” Silverman (2000: 11) asserts that “the methods used by qualitative researchers exemplify a common belief that they can provide a deeper understanding of social phenomenon than would be obtained from purely quantitative data.”

Kavle (1996:64) discusses qualitative research in accordance with its objectivity. He argues that “it has often been claimed that the qualitative research interview lacks objectivity, due in particular to human interaction inherent to the interview situation.” However, he argues that “according to a definition of objectivity as inter-subjective agreement, the lack of inter-subjective consensus testifies to objectivity being a rather subjective notion.” Furthermore, he claims that “the objectivity of the knowledge produced by the interview inter-action must be discussed with specific respect to the different conceptions of objectivity.”

The researcher analyzed the responses of each focus group and then collected their responses. The researcher then took his findings from that collation. The data was only qualitative in the research because the researcher was investigating their understanding of OBE and the relationship between OBE and development.

### **3.3.4 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

When the researcher conducted this research study there were many ethical issues to consider during his interaction with the respondents.

These include:

#### **3.3.4.1 Fairness and informed consent**

The respondents were not forced to participate in the research study. This was based on the principle of fairness as the researcher was given permission to do the study. The respondents agreed to participate in the research study and the researcher explained the aims and objectives of the study before he began. Marlow (1998: 189)) argues that “it is always important that researchers should always obtain informed consent from the participants and that they must always be told about the purpose and goals of the research.” He also claims that “they must give voluntary, informed consent before the research continues.”

#### **3.3.4.2 Anonymity and confidentiality**

During the research study the researcher made sure all responses were given to him in a spirit of confidentiality and therefore, the researcher did not disclose the identities of the respondents in the study. Marlow (1998: 189) believes that “anonymity and confidentiality require that the identities of individuals be separated from the responses they are giving.” In other words, according to Marlow (1998: 189), “the researcher cannot identify a given response with a given respondent and confidentiality means that the researcher knows the identity of the participants and their responses, but ensures not to disclose that information.” There was no information disclosed by the researcher as to its origin and everyone’s views were considered important by the researcher. Grinnell (1998:74) states clearly that “protection of privacy is a basic right guaranteed to all social work practice clients and research subjects.” He believes that “the protection of privacy is not a privilege but it is a right.” The researcher made sure that everyone participated in the research and he avoided asking questions, which would embarrass the respondents or expose their ignorance. Strydom in De Vos (1998: 27) gives us three reasons why



respondents usually deceive during the research interview. Firstly, he argues that “it is to hide the real goal of the study. Secondly, he claims that “it is to hide the real function of the action of the subjects. Lastly, he believes that it is to disguise the experiences they (the respondents) will go through.”

This study was based on the principle of fairness and informed consent because no respondent was forced to participate in the research and the opinions of all people were respected. The respondents were told about the aims and objectives of the research in time and confidentiality of the respondents was maintained. The researcher did not in any way influence the respondents to respond in a particular way, but rather assisted them, in a relevant way, to answer the questions.

### **3.3.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The research study, however, had enough respondents, but as the researcher has already stated it is difficult to argue that it represent the general population. The researcher also guarded against subjectivity and he always made sure that he was objective when undertaking the study. The researcher had to guard against any personal bias and influence from his own knowledge. Kvale (1996: 64), for instance, suggests “three conceptions of objectivity in qualitative interview.” These are freedom from bias, inter-subjective knowledge and reflecting the nature of the object.

Firstly, contends Kvale (1996: 64), “objectivity as freedom from bias refers to reliable knowledge, checked and controlled, undisturbed by personal bias and prejudice.” He maintains, however, that “such a common sense conception of objectivity as being free from bias implies doing good, solid, crafts manlike research, producing knowledge that has been systematically cross-checked and verified.” In principle, he concedes that “the interview can be an objective research method in the sense of being unbiased.”

Secondly, Kvale (1996:64) believes that “a conception of objectivity as meaning inter-subjective knowledge has been common in the social sciences.” Furthermore, in

explaining the difference between arithmetic and dialogical inter-subjectivity he claims that, “in principle, qualitative interviews can approach objectivity in an arithmetic sense of inter-subjectivity.” He maintains that “although a single interview can hardly be replicated, different interviews may, when following similar procedures in a common interview come up with reliable data from the subjects.” In addition, he contends that “with a dialogical conception of inter-subjectivity, the interview attains a privileged position because it involves conversation between the interviewer and his/her subjects.”

Lastly, Kvale (1996: 65) claims that “objectivity in a qualitative interview may also mean reflecting the nature of the object researched, letting the object speak, being adequate to the object investigated, and expressing the real nature of the object being studied.” However, he claims that “the objectivity of the method then depends on its relation to the nature of the object studied, and it involves theoretical understanding of the content matter investigated.” Furthermore, he believes that “with the object of the interview understood as existing in linguistically constituted and interpersonally negotiated social world, the qualitative research interview becomes a more objective method.” He argues that it becomes more objective “in the social sciences than in natural sciences, which were developed for a non-human object domain.” Therefore, concludes Kvale, “from this perspective, the qualitative research interview obtains a privileged position concerning objective knowledge of the social world.” He concedes that “the interview schedule is sensitive to reflect the nature of the object investigated, and in the interview conversation it speaks.”

The researcher also made sure that the atmosphere during his interviews was a friendly one and the discussions allowed for free uninhibited expression by the respondents. Singh (1994:20), for instance claims that “the respondents should not feel threatened and that the interviewer should establish relatively formal and superficial contact with the respondents.” In fact, Singh maintains that “the interviewer should take a neutral stand on what the interviewee has to offer.” Furthermore, he concedes that “he/she should show a mildly, friendly interest in what the respondent has to say, without directly agreeing or disagreeing with him or her.” Moreover, he contends that “all respondents

are asked the same questions in the same sequence, and in a similar situation.” At the same time, Singh believes that “a change midway in the wording or sequence of questions is not permissible and spontaneous explanations and examples by the interviewer are not allowed.”

Thus, it is within this research context that the study was conducted. Qualitative research methods were used such as questionnaires, interviews and sampling as the technique used to probe for more information on the relationship between OBE and the development of teachers, parents, students and government officials. The researcher took note of ethical considerations in order to elicit more information from the respondents. Thus, the qualitative nature of the data enabled the researcher to determine his findings from the research study.

Although the study involved many respondents, it would be difficult to argue that they represented the general population. The findings were authentic because they came from senior people from the Department of Education, educators, parents and students. The researcher was sensitive to probe and ask complicated questions that would, in any manner, expose the ignorance of the respondents, although the questions were straightforward. As an educator, the researcher was aware that he needed to remain objective when dealing with his respondents.

# **CHAPTER FOUR**

## **RESULTS & ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS**

## **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter aims at discussing and analyzing the research findings obtained from educators, learners, parents and government officials. It also aims to reach conclusions about the findings themselves and their relation to the goals and objectives of the study. As the researcher has already stated, the data was mainly qualitative, which was collected from the respondents on each of the questions discussed in the interview schedule.

## **4.2 QUALITATIVE DISCUSSION OF THE DATA**

### **4.2.1 THEME 1 (SEE APPENDIX B)**

#### **4.2.1.1 Understanding of OBE**

##### **Transkei Primary school (TPS)**

At TPS, the researcher interviewed five teachers and five students and three parents. In the discussion with educators they reported that OBE is about cultivating the idea of life-long learning in the learners. They believed that it is a system of education where students are expected to have the necessary knowledge, skills and correct attitudes. The students believed that OBE included subjects like economics and that students were put into different classes according to their academic performance. Some of them did not understand the question. The parents claimed that OBE is a new approach to education and some did not know exactly what it is.

##### **Mpafane Junior Secondary School (JSS)**

At Mpafane JSS, the researcher gave questionnaires and had interview schedules with five educators, five students and five parents. The educators reported that OBE was a type of education that is child-centred. The students argued that OBE is a type of education that provides clear knowledge to students in South Africa. The parents were unable to define exactly what OBE is but they claimed that ever since OBE was introduced in South Africa there been a change between what the students are learning in OBE and what they learnt before OBE was introduced.

### **Education Department Officials**

The researcher gave questionnaires and had interview schedules with three Education Development Officers (EDO's), one OBE Learning Areas Advisor (LAA) and two Curriculum Development Officers (CDO's). The Education Development Officers argued that OBE is a new method of teaching that has been introduced by the new government in schools. The OBE Learning Areas Advisor claimed that OBE is a system of education that is based on outcomes which children should demonstrate at the end of their learning experience. The CDO's reported that OBE is an approach to the provision of education and shifts the emphasis from what learners should know and remember to what they can do with knowledge acquired after the learning experience. They believed that it places an emphasis on the development of learners.

### **Findings**

The findings demonstrated that only the Education Government Officials except the EDO's knew exactly what OBE was and the others had no understanding. The parents and the students had no understanding at all. The respondents claimed that OBE is a system of education that is based on outcomes achieved and demonstrated by the children after the completion of their learning. According to Spady (1999) Outcomes-Based Education means "clearly focusing and organizing everything in an educational system around what is essential for all students to successfully complete their learning experiences." According to Van Der Horst & MacDonald (1997: 7), "OBE can be described as an approach, which requires teachers and learners to focus their attention on two things." They argue that "these are end results of each learning process and should focus on the instructive and learning processes that will guide the learners to these end-results." Lubisi (1997) also believes that "OBE is a system of education that is based on outcomes that should be achieved after the completion of a learning experience." He mentions that "it integrates different aspects of learning, like understanding, knowledge, performing skills, showing values and demonstrating attitudes."

#### **4.2.1.2 The focus of OBE**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators argued that the focus of OBE is towards the education of the learner in his/her totality. They claimed therefore, that if children are educated in all aspects of life this would inevitably contribute to their development. The students believed that the focus of OBE is to gain knowledge at their level so that they can understand their work better. Furthermore, they believed that the focus of OBE is that they should become successful in life and do anything with their knowledge. The parents claimed that the focus of OBE is the transformation of education in South Africa. They also believed that the government wants to eliminate content-based education in schools.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators argued that the focus of OBE is to develop learners' skills, knowledge, values and attitudes. The students claimed that the focus of OBE is to inculcate in the students the ability to do things for themselves. The parents conceded that the focus of OBE is to develop the skills of their children.

##### **Education Department Officials**

The Education Development Officers reported that the focus of OBE is a change in teaching such that learners take an active role in their learning and the Learning Areas Advisor claimed that the focus of OBE is child-centred and that the child is the main participant in the learning process. The CDO's believed that the OBE's focus is on learner development, that is, what learners are able to do and how they behave after having acquired outcomes or knowledge.

##### **Findings**

It was found out that Government Officials had a clear understanding of the focus of OBE, while the educators and the parents did not. The students had no idea whatsoever about the focus of OBE. The respondents believe that the focus of OBE is on the needs of the child so that children will take an active role in their learning and development. This is in agreement with Gulting, Lubisi, Parker & Wedekind (1998: 4) when they argue

that “one of the principles of curriculum design and development is human resource development.” They claim that “motivating learners by providing them with positive learning experiences and by affirming their worth is what the curriculum should aim at.” The respondents, thus, agreed that this was, indeed the focus of OBE, to provide learners with positive learning experiences.

#### **4.2.3. Reasons for the introduction of OBE in South Africa**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators believed that because the old system had racially divided departments, OBE was introduced to merge all these departments. They claimed that it was introduced to eradicate all the discrepancies of the old system. They also maintained that OBE is a system of education that benefits all kinds of learners, those who are academically strong and those who weak. In accordance with this view, the students believed that OBE was introduced to help and improve the marks of all South African students. They also stated that it was introduced to improve the pass rate and the skills of South African students so that they would understand basic knowledge in an easier way. The parents argued that OBE was introduced to change the old curriculum to the new OBE approach curriculum. They also believed that it was introduced because there was a need for a change in education.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators reported that OBE was introduced so that learners would become responsible citizens. The students did not know why OBE was introduced in South Africa, but claimed that it was introduced to develop education. The parents believed, however, that the government introduced OBE so that South Africa would be raised to the same educational level as other counties.

##### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's believed that OBE was introduced in South Africa to develop marketable adults who would have both knowledge and skills, with which to solve their problems. The LAA claimed that OBE was introduced because there was a feeling that children



were unemployable because of the system of education that was in place. Therefore, she maintained that OBE was introduced to develop skills so as to meet the needs of the economy. The CDO's conceded that OBE was introduced because it emphasized non-discrimination, learner-centered education and common-citizenship.

### **Findings**

Government Officials, educators and parents at TPS had an understanding of why OBE was introduced in South Africa. The educators at Mpafane JSS, the students and the parents did not have a clear knowledge as to why OBE was introduced in South Africa. The respondents claimed that OBE was introduced to benefit all kinds of learners, those who are academically strong and those who are weak. Gulting et al (1998: 6) state that "the curriculum should address issues of differentiation, redress and learner support." They maintain that "learning programmes should facilitate the creation of opportunities for all learners, including those who are disabled in some or other way." They conceded that "such an approach does not deny that there are educationally relevant differences among individuals, neither does it rule out approaches that would recognize different levels of mastery." The respondents also believed that OBE was introduced as a paradigm shift in education transformation. They claimed that it was introduced to move away from content-based education to outcomes based education. Olivier (1998: 21) claims that "the shift to Outcomes-Based Education from content-based education reflects the notion that the best way to get where you want to be, is to first determine what you want to achieve." He concedes that "Outcomes-Based learning means that the learner accomplished more than just producing or delivering outcomes with equal mastering of knowledge and skills."

#### **4.2.1.4 The focus of the old curriculum**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators contended that the focus of the old curriculum was based on the fact that there were 19 education departments, which were divided according to race and culture. They further claimed that OBE was introduced in order to merge all these departments. They further conceded that the old curriculum was content-based and focused only on

knowledge. However, the students believed that the focus of the old curriculum was on becoming successful in life, but it was different from OBE because they were expected to work in a different and difficult way. Some did not understand the focus of the old curriculum whatsoever. The parents claimed that the focus of the old curriculum was teacher-based and the child was a passive listener who was expected to be told everything by the teacher.

### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators concurred that the focus of the old curriculum was teacher-based and not child-centred. They argued that the old curriculum did not provide learners the opportunity to find information, interpret and analyze it. The students believed that the focus of the old curriculum was to increase the student's knowledge. The parents claimed that the old curriculum was content-based and focused on knowledge.

### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's maintained that the old curriculum was based on knowledge that was not applicable to everyday life experiences. The LAA claimed that the focus of the old curriculum was based on knowledge no matter how irrelevant it was. The CDO's reported that the focus of the old curriculum was based on inappropriate learning without knowledge change in values, skills and attitudes.

### **Findings**

The respondents, in one way or another had an understanding of the focus of the old curriculum although the students did not have a clear understanding. They conceded that the old curriculum was content-based and was not focused on the development of the child. Olivier (1998: 21) argues that "in a content-based approach, students have to master knowledge in one way or the other, sourcing the information from teachers, trainers, textbooks and notes." He contends that "when they are evaluated they have to mirror these contents to the evaluator for assessment." He further believed that "when evaluators mark the papers, they are to a great extent, mark reflected contents and that marks are subtracted for the degree of distortion that occurs during reflection, in order to

obtain a score.” He asserts that “such an approach to education is profitless in the sense that it does not prepare students for life and lifelong learning.” The respondents, therefore, believed that the old curriculum emphasized a profitless approach to education.

#### **4.2.1.5 Understanding of educational transformation**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators argued that for educational transformation to take place in South Africa a paradigm shift must take place in the education process. They believed that education should be transformed from being a content-based education to an outcomes-based education. The students claimed that education transformation aims to make them business people so that they can understand the things of the world. The parents maintained that educational transformation in South Africa is difficult due to the scarcity of resources in previously disadvantaged schools. They believed that if these problems could be addressed then there could be educational transformation in South Africa.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators did not have an understanding of educational transformation, but what they did say was that in the old curriculum teachers told learners everything and later asked questions on what they had been taught. The students also did not understand anything about educational transformation, but felt that it would broaden their knowledge. The parents reported that the government should transform education so that it would more skills oriented.

##### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO’s maintained that education in South Africa should be transformed to produce marketable people who have both skills and knowledge, which they will use throughout their lives. The LAA believed that education should be transformed in South Africa in such a way that we move away from an education system producing passive learners to one that has active, creative and participating learners who at the end of their learning would be able to make decisions for themselves and become responsible citizens. The CDO’s pointed out that education transformation in South Africa should be a process of

change with sweeping and wide-spread changes involving not only the essential remodeling of an outdated system, but a paradigm shift in the attitude adopted to the entire educational process.

### **Findings**

It was the Government Officials and the educators of TPS who had an understanding of educational transformation in South Africa. The educators, parents and students at Mpafane JSS did not have an understanding of transformation. Most respondents argued that education should be transformed in such a way that it produces learners who are active, creative and who participate in their learning. They also believed that it should produce people who will be employable and who are needed by the economy of the country. Gulting, Lubisi, Parker & Wedekind (1998:4) are in agreement with this when they claim that “the curriculum should be relevant and appropriate to current and anticipated future needs of the individual, society or industry.” They claim that “ever-increasing evidence suggest that economic growth in a competitive international economic system depends fundamentally on a general well-educated population.” They further state people should be “equipped with the relevant competencies required in the economy, at any point in time, and with the capacity to continue learning and developing new skills and acquiring new competencies.” Gulting et al (1998: 4) concede that “the transformation of education and training should be linked to economic policy and strategy, and also that learning programmes should enable learners to become technologically literate and should reflect cultural sensitivity.” This is what most respondents conceded, that education transformation should produce people who are marketable and who are going to be needed by the economy.

#### **4.2.1.6 Understanding of the terminology involved in the new curriculum**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators argue that that they understood all the terminology involved in the new curriculum while students were totally ignorant. The parents, however, reported that they did not know anything about the terminology involved in the new curriculum.

### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators pointed out that they understood some of the terminology involved in the new curriculum, but not all of it. The students and the parents knew nothing of the terminology involved in the new curriculum.

### **Education Government Officials**

The EDO's claimed to understand some of the terms involved in the new curriculum. The LAA believed that she understood all of the terminology involved in this new curriculum. The CDO's reported that they understood some of the terms, but not all of them.

### **Findings**

It was the EDO's, the educators at TPS and the LAA who knew all the terminology of the new curriculum, while the rest either understood some or none at all. The Review Committee on C2005 (2000) also disclosed that the complex language and terminology used on C2005 documents was confusing. It points to three particular problems regarding this language, the use of meaningless jargon, vague and ambitious language, the unnecessary use of unfamiliar terms to replace familiar ones and the lack of common understanding in use of C2005 terminology.

#### **4.2.1.7 Understanding of the school's main aim in the new curriculum**

### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators claimed that the school's main aim in this new curriculum is to prepare students for life-long learning so that they become responsible and productive adults. The students reported that the school's main aim is to prepare and develop them for the future and also to prepare them to pass the exams. The parents understood that the school's aim in this new curriculum is to involve learners in their education, to develop their skills and to produce fruitful learners.

### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators reported that the school's aim in this new curriculum is to improve the skills, values, knowledge and attitudes of learners. The students were ignorant of the aim of the school in this new curriculum. The parents believed that the main aim of the school in this new curriculum is to give their children certificates of proof that they have attained skills.

### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's conceded that the school's main aim in this new curriculum is that it should be a steering wheel towards attaining the type of learners we envisage, that is, learners who are marketable and who are needed by the country's economy. The LAA stated that the school's main aim is to mould children to become creative thinkers and responsible citizens. The CDO's concurred that the school's main aim in this new curriculum is to adopt consultative, management styles and participatory management to meet its objectives.

### **Findings**

The educators and parents at TPS had an understanding of the school's aim in this new curriculum, but the students did not. The educators at Mpafane JSS also had an understanding of the school's aim while the parents and the students did not. The respondents believed that the school's main aim is to mould children into becoming marketable responsible adults who will be useful to the country and its economy. There are also those who claim that in order for the school to achieve those objectives it should adopt participatory styles of management. Gulting, Lubisi, Parker & Wedekind (1998: 4) believe that "the main function of a school is to develop a curriculum which will lead to human resource development." They also mention that "it should put the interests of learners first and should build on their knowledge and experience." However, they concede that "the school should be relevant to the economic needs of the country and that the school should address issues of differences among students and should strive towards nation building and a country with no discrimination." All these things, they maintain "should be included in the school curriculum."

#### **4.2.1.8 Understanding of the change brought about by OBE**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators believed that OBE has brought a change in the education system because there is now scope for those learners who are not academically strong and that in this new curriculum they can show their understanding in a variety of ways. The students believed that OBE has brought a change in education because it has widened their knowledge on some aspects and that now they know things that they never knew before. The parents claimed that OBE has not brought any change in the education system at the moment since they have not yet established whether it will be successful or not. They argued that their children still do not work after matriculation and even after they have finished their teacher's diplomas, they end up on the streets.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators reported that OBE has brought a change in the education system because learners now are able to do things for themselves. For instance, they claimed that students are able to collect data and interpret it. The students also believed that OBE has brought a change in the education system because they can do things for themselves. The parents also concede that OBE has brought a change in education because it is providing their children with skills which they are going to use after they have left school.

##### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's claimed that OBE has brought a change in the education system because students can now talk without fear and are able to express their views to their educators. The LAA described the change that OBE has brought as two fold. Firstly, she claimed that it helps children to become independent, creative thinkers who will be problem-solvers. Secondly, she maintained that if OBE is not well implemented and understood correctly, pupils will become confused and there will be no change between the new and the old curriculum. However, she also mentioned that OBE does not yet have a product

in South Africa since, it has not yet been implemented in Secondary Schools. The CDO's claim that OBE has not yet brought a change to the education system in South Africa. They believe that although OBE results have not yet been released, the approach of those learners already involved in OBE is beginning to demonstrate that there is change in education. In fact they conceded that most learners, especially those in Further Education & Training (FET) are not yet involved in OBE.

### **Findings**

The respondents had an understanding of the change that has been brought about by OBE in South Africa. The educators believed that OBE has brought change because there is now a chance for those who are not academically strong to show their ability in a variety of ways. The students maintained that now they can do things for themselves. It is the parents of TPS who seemed to dispute the fact that OBE has brought a change in education in South Africa. The Government Officials claimed that OBE has brought a change because it produces independent creative people but that if it is not well implemented it can cause confusion to the learners and educators. They also conceded that since it has no product yet it would be difficult to argue that the changes have been effective. Geyser (2000: 3) concurs with this when he believes that "the introduction of OBE has invited conflicting responses and that there are those who see OBE as a complex and far reaching initiative to transform completely the South African education system." He maintains, however, that OBE is seen, "as a comprehensive change to the entire hierarchical structure of schooling, with implications for what is taught, how is it taught, and how learning is assessed." He further contends that "this new curriculum will trigger economic development in South Africa and will promote equity for all learners and contributes towards building a new nation."



### **4.3 THEME 2 (See appendix B)**

#### **4.3.1 Understanding of development**

##### **Transkei Primary school.**

The educators reported that the word “development” means to show growth, change and improvement in the right direction. The students believed that it means to do better and improve from the past. The parents asserted that “development” means to improve.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators reported that “development” is a process of changing where you improve and become better. The students argue that it means to grow, to go forward and expand. The parents claimed that development meant to grow or develop.

##### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO’s reported that “development” meant to mature or to grow. The LAA stated that it means growth and progression. The CDO’s claimed that the word “development” means to progress.

##### **Findings**

The respondents knew what the word “development” meant. They believed that “development” is to grow, to expand or to move in the desired direction. According to Riggs (1981: 46) “development is concept with ‘an overloaded’ meaning and an astonishingly large number of concepts such as growth, change, evolution, progress, transformation, improvement, modernization and industrialization could be called development.” He claims that “it’s meaning should be deduced from the context within which the word is used.” Burkey (1993: 51) asserts that “no development activity, whether initiated by outsiders or by the poor themselves, can hope to succeed unless it contains a strong element of human development.”

Brett in Burkey (1993: 34) sees “development as a change process characterized by increased productivity, equality in the distribution of social products, and the emergence of indigenous institutions.” He argues that these institutions should have “relations with

the outside world that is characterized by equality rather than dependency or subordination.” The respondents, then, were unable to explain the word from a human developmental approach but rather they explained development in terms of growth and expanding. Torado (1998: 21) mentions “three basic components or core values that should serve as a conceptual basis and practical guidelines for understanding the inner meaning of development.” He named them as “life-sustenance or satisfying the basic needs, self-esteem or being a person and freedom from servitude or human freedom.”

#### **4.3.2 Understanding of the focus of the RDP**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators claimed that the focus of the RDP is to eradicate apartheid and to cultivate “ubuntu.” Moreover, they asserted that the RDP focuses on uplifting the previously disadvantaged sections of our society by a shift in emphasis, especially towards entrepreneurship. The students did not know the focus of the RDP. The parents argued that the focus of the RDP is to inculcate in the people the ability to do things for themselves.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators believed that the focus of the RDP is to give better life to the people. The students claim that the focus of the RDP is to develop education. The parents suggested that the focus of the RDP is to provide electricity, roads and water for the people

##### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO’s contended that the focus of the RDP is to address the imbalance of the past, for example, by providing the people with low-cost house. The LAA stated that the focus of the RDP is to inculcate skills in the people so that they will be able to live sustainable lives. The CDO’s believed that the focus of the RDP is to build a new South Africa and to promote progress.

### **Findings**

The Government Officials, educators and parents had an understanding of the focus of the RDP. The students had no idea whatsoever about the focus of the RDP except to say that it is concerned with the development of education. The respondents believed that the focus of the RDP is to address the legacies of apartheid and to develop the previously disadvantaged areas. They also stated that it is to inculcate skills to the people so they are able to sustain themselves. According to the RDPWP (South Africa; 1994: 6) “there are six principles that are a focus of the RDP.” Firstly it argues that “it focuses on an integrated and sustainable programme.” Secondly, “it is a people driven process and, therefore, focuses on people.” Thirdly it claims that “this people driven-process should be closely bound with peace and security for all.” Fourthly it states that “as peace and security for all are established then it would embark on nation building.” Fifthly, it concedes that “nation building links reconstruction and development.” Lastly, it maintains that “all these principles depend on the thorough democratization of South Africa.” The respondents were unable to explain the principles of the RDP. The idea of addressing the legacies of apartheid and uplifting the previously disadvantaged communities seems to concur with the principles of embarking on nation building and linking reconstruction to development.

#### **4.3.3 Understanding of the role of education in the RDP**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators believed that the role of education in the RDP is to cultivate entrepreneurship in the people so that they become self-starters. The students claimed that the role of education in the RDP is to reconstruct and develop the people’s knowledge. The parents claimed that the role of education is to develop skills in their children.

##### **Mpafane J.S.S.**

The educators argued that education has played a role in the RDP because those same learners being taught now use the skills learnt in OBE for the construction of roads and

the installation of electricity in the RDP projects. The students have no understanding of the role of education in the RDP. The parents claimed that the role of education is to provide their children with skills, which they will use in the RDP projects.

### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's maintained that the role of education in the RDP is to inculcate in the children values of fair and equal distribution of resources to be used in the RDP. The LAA claimed that the role of education in the RDP is the development of skills in children to be used in future projects. The CDO's believed that the role of education in the RDP is two fold. Firstly, they contended that it manages the process of RDP. Secondly, they argued that it gives direction to the process of reconstruction and development.

### **Findings**

The Government Officials, educators and parents had an understanding of the role of education in the RDP. The students have no understanding whatsoever. The respondents believe that education helps to equip students with skills, which they, in turn, will use in their projects. There was also a view that education manages the process of the RDP and gives direction to it. According to the RDPWP (South Africa; 1994: 6) "the role of education is the development of the human resources of the country." It believes that "education should be designed in such a way that people are involved in the decision-making process." It also contends that they should be involved in "the implementation, new job opportunities requiring new skills, gaining rewards for existing skills previously unrecognized and in managing and governing the society." This is the role then that education should have in the reconstruction and development of the country. This supports what the respondents believed, that education should help equip students with skills, which relate to RDP projects.

#### **4.3.4 Understanding of OBE's contribution to the RDP**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators believed that the contribution of OBE to the RDP is that children will learn to become entrepreneurs so that they will be able to start their own businesses. The students did not have an understanding of OBE's contribution to the RDP except to say that it helps them to understand in an easier way, which then they can pass on to others. The parents claimed that it does contribute to the RDP because it develops skills in their children and it cultivates in them the ability to live sustainable lives.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators stated that the OBE approach provides the learners with skills, which they will in turn use in RDP projects. The students were unaware that OBE contributes to the RDP. The parents believed that OBE contributes in one way or the other to the RDP because their children will learn skills, which will be of use in the RDP.

##### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's conceded that OBE contributes to the RDP because it encourages people to share their resources. They further claimed that this is seen in the equal distribution of projects in the RDP. The LAA claimed that OBE contributes to the RDP in that it produces creative, independent thinkers who are able to solve problems for themselves. She further maintained that responsible citizens will be able to sustain their projects and that this is rooted in the OBE curriculum. The CDO's believed that for proper reconstruction and development to occur people should have knowledge, skills, values and correct attitudes. They argued that traditional education does not address those needs, while OBE does. They contended, therefore, that OBE does not only contribute to RDP, but is part of the RDP.

##### **Findings**

The respondents understood OBE's contribution to the RDP with the exception of the students. Most of the respondents believed that OBE contributes to the RDP in the sense

that it produces creative, responsible people who are going to use their skills in the RDP projects. They further claimed that it encourages the spirit of sharing to the learners. Moreover, they asserted that OBE does not only contribute to the RDP but is part of the RDP. Geyser (2000: 34) argues that “there are learning areas with outcomes, which emphasize reconstruction and development. For instance, he argues that “in MLMMS there is a learning outcome that states, ‘take transformative action, thereby empowering people to work towards the reconstruction and development of South African society.’” Geyser (2000:34) argues that “in many OBE documents, the outcomes of social transformation and development are repeatedly mentioned.” This supports the idea that OBE does contribute to the Reconstruction and Development Programme.

#### **4.3.5 Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of children in South Africa**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators believe that OBE does not meet the developmental needs of children in South Africa. They argued that the fundamental design is in place so that OBE will eventually meet the needs of all learners. However, they claimed that at this stage, it is not very useful. The students maintained that OBE does meet the developmental needs of children because they are free to do anything and they are in a position to teach it to other people. The parents conceded that OBE does not meet the developmental needs of children in South Africa because there are schools where OBE is hindered by a lack of resources, unqualified teachers and a lack of proper classrooms.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators claimed that OBE does not meet the developmental needs of children in South Africa because they point out that there are schools that do not have adequate resources and facilities. The students believed that OBE does meet their developmental needs because there are learning areas such as Technology in which they are taught to do things for themselves. The parents believed that OBE does not meet the developmental needs of children in South Africa because there are many schools that are under-

resourced, especially those in previously disadvantaged areas. However, they mentioned that their children do acquire skills such as electricity installation in this OBE approach.

### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's claimed that OBE does meet the developmental needs of all children in South Africa because children of the same age are in the same class. The LAA suggested that OBE does meet the developmental needs of children in South Africa as long as it is correctly implemented. She believed that if it is not correctly implemented it is unlikely to meet the student's developmental needs. The CDO's maintained that their perception of this was two-fold. Firstly, they stated that for those schools with better access to resources and facilities OBE meets their developmental needs. Secondly, they argued that in places where there are no trained teachers, no facilities and equipment, OBE does not meet the developmental needs of students

### **Findings**

The respondents seemed to give me adequate answers as to whether OBE does meet the developmental needs of children in South Africa. They claimed that in places, which were previously advantaged, OBE does meet their developmental needs but in places where there are no facilities and the teachers are poorly trained it is unlikely to meet the developmental needs. Jansen (1999: 3) offers valid reasons as to why OBE will fail in South Africa. He argues that "this curriculum system was devised for all schools based on a 'schools subject' approach." He claims that "these curricula were introduced into schools with vastly different resource environments and, accordingly, produced vastly different consequences in these different resourced contexts." He states that "the sudden emergence of the proposal, bringing ordinary teachers into contact with a curriculum discourse completely foreign to their understanding and practice, is one of the factors that hinder the implementation of OBE."

#### **4.3.6 Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of Previously Disadvantaged children**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators argued that OBE does meet the developmental needs of children in these Previously Disadvantaged Areas (PDA's) to a certain extent. However, they claimed that lack of skilled educators in these areas hampers the success of OBE. The students believed that OBE does not meet the developmental needs of children in PDA's because the children in these areas are not allowed to do certain things. The parents believed that OBE could meet the developmental needs of children in PDA's if classrooms could be built, if resources were made available to these schools and if teachers could be properly trained in OBE.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators contended that due to the lack of facilities and resources in rural schools, it is highly unlikely that OBE will meet their development needs. The students claimed that their schools do not have facilities such as laboratories, libraries and computers which means that OBE will not meet their development needs. The parents believed that although their children learn skills from OBE, the fact that their school is under-resourced means it is not on a par with other schools and that this hinders the development of their children.

##### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's believed that the problem of the infrastructure should be addressed in schools before OBE should be considered as a means of meeting the developmental needs of children in these areas. The LAA argued that if OBE is correctly implemented then it will meet the developmental needs of children in these PDA's. However, she contended that if it is not implemented correctly it will not meet their developmental needs, but would cause confusion for teachers and students. The CDO's conceded that OBE does meet the developmental needs of children in PDA's, but is dependent on a variety of factors. They claimed that all Blacks were discriminated against but the circumstances



were not the same. Moreover, they maintain that the success of OBE depends on whether urban and rural schools have well-trained teachers who are committed to their work.

### **Findings**

The respondents were clear that for OBE to meet the developmental needs of children in PDA's the problem of facilities and infrastructure should be addressed in these areas. They also asserted that teachers should be trained in OBE and it should be correctly implemented so as not to cause confusion. In one of his principal criticisms of OBE, Jansen (1999: 3) argues that "OBE is destined to fail in South African education system because it is based on flawed assumptions about what happens inside schools, how classrooms are organized and what type of teachers exist within the system." He claims that "the complexity of OBE suggests that highly qualified teachers are needed to make sense of such a challenge to existing practice." He maintains, therefore, "that the policy requires not merely the application of a skill but an understanding of its theoretical underpinnings and a demonstrating capacity to transfer such application and understanding across different contexts." However, he concedes that "the sad reality is that the overwhelming majorities of teachers do not have access to OBE, or understand OBE even in instances where such information may be available." In other words, he asserts that "there is no process, systematic and ongoing, in which teachers are allowed to conceptualize and make sense of OBE as curriculum policy."

#### **4.3.7 Understanding of the better implementation of OBE in Previously Disadvantaged Areas**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators believed that to implement OBE successfully in these PDA's there is a need for educators to be retrained and for properly structured courses to be made. They contended that there should be motivated teachers and more opportunity for feedback. The students did not have a clear understanding of what should be done to implement OBE in these areas except to say that there should be equal opportunity for the people of

South Africa. The parents believed that if facilities could be provided in these PDA's and teachers could be trained in OBE, then OBE could be better implemented in these areas.

### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators claimed that to implement OBE successfully in these PDA's the government should provide them with facilities and resources, which to date are not available to them. The students also echoed the same views regarding resources such as laboratories, libraries and computers and better classrooms. The parents also claimed that the schools in these PDA's should be provided with resources to enable the better implementation of OBE.

### **Education Department Officials**

The EDO's believed that for OBE to be implemented successfully in PDA's there should be a fair distribution of resources between rural schools and urban schools. The LAA claimed that for OBE to be implemented successfully in these PDA's, educators need to be trained properly in OBE and their qualifications have to be upgraded. The CDO's pointed out that for the successful implementation of OBE in PDA's, properly trained and committed educators should manage OBE. They also asserted that facilities and equipment should be made available to these PDA's to meet the needs of children and educators.

### **Findings**

The respondents believe that for OBE to be implemented successfully in PDA's the government should intervene and provide these schools with facilities and classrooms, which would make the school environment a more conducive place of learning. They also cite the fact that teachers also need to be retrained in OBE and their qualifications need to be improved. In addition, they state that past-discrimination is not the only reason for poor implementation of OBE in schools, but also the level of commitment of the teachers. Jansen (1999) believes that "for OBE to succeed it requires a number of interdependent innovations to strike the new educational system simultaneously." He claims that "teachers need radical training in new forms of assessment, such as

performance assessment and performance-based assessment.” He also concedes that “education managers or principals should be retrained to secure the implementation of OBE, as required and additional teachers for managing this complex process should be employed.” He maintains that “parental involvement and support is needed for OBE to succeed and opportunities for teacher dialogue and exchange is needed as they co-learn in the process of implementing it.” He states that “new forms of learning resources (textbooks and other sides) that are consonant with an outcomes-based orientation, are needed.”

#### **4.3.8 Understanding of the enhancement of the developmental needs of children from Previously Disadvantaged Areas**

##### **Transkei Primary School**

The educators stated that enhanced infrastructure and technology is needed in these disadvantaged areas to enhance the developmental needs of these children. The students did not have an appropriate answer but felt that children should be taught the same curriculum despite a lack of resources. The parents maintained that to enhance the developmental needs of children in PDA’s, better classrooms should be built and resources should be made available to the teachers and students. They also believed that teachers working in these areas should be better qualified in dealing with OBE.

##### **Mpafane JSS**

The educators maintained that to enhance the developmental needs of children in these PDA’s the government should provide resources and build better and well-ventilated classrooms. The students also contended the fact to enhance their development needs the government should provide them with all the resources now lacking so that they are on par with other students in the former Model C schools. The parents also believed that the facilities and resources should be made available in these schools in PDA’s. They also argued that teachers in these areas should be dedicated in their work.

### **Education Development Officers**

The EDO's claimed that to enhance the developmental needs of children in PDA's the government should address the question of infrastructure and it should adhere to the prescribed developmental ages. The LAA believed that the enhancement of the developmental needs of children in PDA's depends on their exposure to media and the availability of resources such as libraries, computers and laboratories. The CDO's concurred that "to enhance the developmental needs of children in PDA's a better process for the training of educators should be put in place." They also conceded that educators should have enough skills and knowledge of OBE and their attitudes and values towards their work should change.

### **Findings**

The respondents claimed that for the enhancement of the developmental needs of children in PDA's, children should be exposed to the media and their schools should be well resourced. They also maintained that there is a great need for the teachers to be properly trained in OBE. They pointed out those facilities such as computers, laboratories and libraries are also needed. Torado (1994: 21) believes that "development in all societies should achieve at least three objectives." He claims that "they should increase the availability and widen the distribution of basic life-sustaining goods." He also contends that "development should raise the levels of living, in addition to higher incomes, the provision of more jobs, better education and greater attention to cultural and humanistic values." He argues that "development should expand the range of social and economic choices available to individuals and nations by freeing them from, amongst others, forces of ignorance and human misery." This is what should be done to develop or to enhance the developmental needs of children in PDA's. They should be provided with life-sustaining goods and their basic needs should be met. Their levels of living, better education and other cultural issues should be raised. The implementation of OBE, without addressing these social issues, will be useless.

## **4.4 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS**

### **4.4.1 THEME 1**

#### **4.4.1.1 Understanding of OBE.**

Throughout the research study the researcher discovered that most of the respondents do not understand exactly what OBE is. The only people who could provide a clear definition of what OBE is were the Government Officials.

#### **4.4.1.2 The focus of OBE**

Most of the respondents had a thorough knowledge and understanding of the focus of the new curriculum except the students. The educators had some knowledge while the parents had a skills approach in understanding the focus of OBE. The students had a little, but unclear understanding of the focus of OBE. The Education Government Officials (EGO's) had a good understanding of the focus of OBE.

#### **4.4.1.3 The focus of the old curriculum**

The respondents had a good understanding and knowledge of the focus of the old curriculum. They were able to distinguish it from the new curriculum in that they stated explicitly that it focused on racial divisions and was content based. They, however, claimed that learning was inappropriate because it placed too much emphasis on knowledge no matter how irrelevant it was.

#### **4.4.1.4 Reasons for the introduction of OBE in South Africa**

Most of the respondents knew why OBE was introduced in South Africa except the students who had a vague understanding. The educators had a good understanding, although there were some who were unclear as to how learners from different academic and intellectual backgrounds could be accommodated in this OBE curriculum. The parents had a skills approach to the reason why OBE was introduced. The EGO's understood that it was introduced in order to produce marketable, self-sufficient, responsible and skillful citizens. They also claimed that the constitution encapsulates a non-discriminatory, integrated and learner-centred education.

#### **4.4.1.5 Understanding of educational transformation**

The educators had a good understanding of education transformation because they believed it aimed at a paradigm shift in the education system of South Africa. They claimed that this paradigm shift is shifting away from a content-based education to an outcomes based education, which focuses on the skills and knowledge that students would be able to use throughout their lives. The students believed that education transformation would make them business people. The parents had a skills approach to education transformation. The EGO's had a clear understanding of education transformation in that they believed that it should aim at producing creative, participative and responsible citizens who would be independent decision-makers.

#### **4.4.1.6 Understanding of the terminology involved in the new curriculum**

The educators in the previously advantaged school claimed that they understood all of the terminology in the new curriculum, whereas those from the previously disadvantaged school were familiar with only some of the terminology. The students and the parents were unaware of the terminology involved in the new curriculum. Some EGO's said they knew all of the terminology whereas others knew some.

#### **4.4.1.7 Understanding of the school's main aim in the new curriculum**

The educators have a good understanding of the school's aim within this new curriculum and believed it will prepare students for life-long learning and enable them to become responsible and productive citizens. They also believed that it would develop learners' skills, attitudes, knowledge and values. The students, on the other hand, had a limited understanding of the aim of the school with regard to this new curriculum. Similarly, the parents in the previously disadvantaged school had a vague view of the aim of the school in the new curriculum because they believed its' aim is to provide their children an exam certificate. Others, on the other hand, thought its' aim is to produce fruitful learners. The EGO's had an informed understanding in that they claimed it aimed at moulding children

to become creative thinkers and be responsible citizens. Others believed that it is a steering wheel towards attaining the type of learners we want.

#### **4.4.1.8 Understanding of the change brought about by OBE**

The educators believed that OBE has brought a change in the education system in that it has given scope to those learners who come from different academic and intellectual backgrounds. They also believed that in this new curriculum children could solve problems themselves. The students also believed that OBE has brought a change because that they have acquired knowledge of things they did not know in the past. The parents have a skills approach in that they claim it has provided their children with skills. The EGO's also believed that OBE has brought a change because within this OBE curriculum the children express themselves freely and can participate fully in activities, which will ultimately develop their skills. They also believed that if it is well implemented OBE will bring a change, but if not, it could cause confusion for students and teachers.

### **4.4.2 THEME 2**

#### **4.4.2.1 Understanding of development**

Almost all the respondents understood what development was. The educators stated that it means to show growth, change and improvement in the desired direction. The students, however, claimed that it is a process of change in which you improve, expand and become better. The parents also believed that development means to grow, develop and improve. The EGO's believed that it means to mature, to grow and progress.

#### **4.4.2.2 Understanding the focus of the RDP**

The educators understand the focus of the RDP although their understanding varies considerably. They believe that it means to cultivate "ubuntu" to the people and to uplift the previously disadvantaged sections of our society by inculcating the spirit of entrepreneurship. The students were unaware of the focus of the RDP except some who said it is about developing education. The parents maintained that it focuses on bringing services to the people such as electricity, roads, water etc. The EGO's believed that it aimed at addressing the imbalances of the past so that people could live sustainable lives

through the provision of low-cost houses in an effort to build a new South Africa and this would constitute progress.

#### **4.4.2.3 Understanding the role of education to the RDP**

The educators had a good understanding of the role of education in the RDP. They claimed that it is to cultivate entrepreneurship in children so that they become self-starters. Furthermore, they believed that it is a tool which can be used to ensure co-operation and understanding among the people in South Africa. Other teachers in the previously disadvantaged school had little understanding of the RDP. Many students in the previously disadvantaged school were also unaware of the role of education in the RDP, but some said it was about the reconstruction and development of education. The parents had a skills approach to the role of education in the RDP in that it must provide their children with skills to be used in their projects. The EGO's, however, maintained that the RDP ensures that there be fair distribution of resources amongst all South Africans and to develop the skills and knowledge of children to be used in the RDP projects. They also claimed that proper reconstruction and development takes place if people are properly educated.

#### **4.4.2.4 Understanding of OBE's contribution to the RDP**

The educators stated that the contribution of OBE to the RDP is similar to the role of education to the RDP. The students, however, had an unclear understanding of that contribution. They claimed that OBE would enable them to learn in an easier way. Others from the previously disadvantaged school were ignorant of OBE's contribution to the RDP. Parents adopted a skills approach and argued that it would contribute to the development of their children's skills. The EGO's, however, believed that it had contributed by encouraging fair distribution of resources amongst the people and by stimulating children to become creative, independent thinkers capable of solving problems for themselves. They contend that for proper reconstruction to occur people should have knowledge.



#### **4.4.2.5 Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of children in South Africa**

The educators believed that the basic design of OBE is in place and therefore will eventually meet the developmental needs of all children in South Africa. However, those in the previously disadvantaged school believe that because of a lack of resources and facilities in these schools, OBE does not meet their developmental needs. The students in the previously disadvantaged school claimed that it does not meet their developmental needs because their schools do not have the resources and facilities that other schools have. However, they also conceded that there are learning areas in which they are learning to do things for themselves. Those in the previously advantaged school maintained that they have every opportunity to achieve and can teach OBE to other people. The parents have a skills approach because they believe that OBE will provide their children with skills and therefore it meets all developmental needs. In contrast, those in the previously disadvantaged school claimed that OBE does not meet the developmental needs because many schools do not have resources to implement OBE successfully. The EGO's claimed that if it is well implemented OBE it will meet the developmental needs of all children, but if not, is unlikely to meet all their of their developmental needs.

#### **4.4.2.6 Understanding of OBE meeting the developmental needs of children in Previously Disadvantaged Areas (PDA's)**

The educators believed that OBE in these areas is hampered by a lack of unskilled educators. They also believed that because of a lack of resources in these schools it is unlikely that OBE will meet their developmental needs. The students from the advantaged school have an unclear understanding as to whether OBE does meet the developmental needs of children in these previously disadvantaged areas. They believed that people in some areas are denied educational facilities. Similarly, those in the previously disadvantaged school believed that their schools do not have enough resources

and facilities. Therefore, according to the children from PDA's, OBE does not meet their developmental needs.

The parents maintain that for OBE to meet the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas, well-resourced schools should be built and teachers should be properly trained. The EGO's contend that if OBE is well implemented it could meet the developmental needs of these children but if not it could cause confusion in teachers and students. Furthermore, others believe that the success of OBE depends on a variety of factors because although Blacks were discriminated against, the circumstances were not the same and success depends more on whether the previously advantaged or disadvantaged school have well trained committed educators or not.

#### **4.4.27 Understanding of better implementation of OBE in Previously Disadvantaged Areas (PDA's)**

The educators in the previously advantaged school believed that educators in these previously disadvantaged areas have to be retrained and that there is a need for courses or learning areas to be properly structured. They further claimed that teachers should be motivated and there should be more opportunities for feedback. The educators in the previously disadvantaged school maintained that the government should install facilities and resources and should build better classrooms in these schools.

The students would like to see greater equality of living conditions among South Africans so that OBE could be better implemented in these disadvantaged areas. Those in the previously disadvantaged school claim that the government should provide their schools with resources so that they are on par with the previously advantaged schools. Parents also believed that to implement OBE successfully in these areas they should be provided with resources. They argued that schools should be well built and teachers should be properly trained in OBE. The EGO's, also conceded that educators should be properly trained in OBE and their qualifications should be upgraded. They maintained that these schools should be provided with resources so that they are on an equal level with schools

previously advantaged. Moreover, they claimed that there should be fair distribution of resources and the problem of infrastructure should be addressed because OBE needs more space.

#### **4.4.2.8 Understanding of the enhancement of the developmental needs of children in Previously Disadvantaged Areas (PDA's)**

The educators believed that enhanced infrastructure and technology is needed to improve the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas. However, educators in previously disadvantaged schools conceded that the government should provide these schools with facilities and build more classrooms. The students in the previously advantaged school have an unclear understanding because they believed that previously disadvantaged children are different from them in ability. The children from the previously disadvantaged school claim that the government should provide their schools with facilities so that they are on an equal level with other schools.

The parents believed that these schools should be properly resourced and that teachers should become qualified in handling OBE. The EGO's claimed that these children should be exposed to media and that the use of computers, libraries and laboratories should be made available to them. However, others suggested that a better process of educator training should be put in place and that teachers' attitudes towards teaching should change.

### **4.5 FINDINGS IN RESPECT OF THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH**

#### **(I) To critically evaluate OBE from a developmental perspective.**

The respondents stated clearly that OBE does not meet the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas. However, they claimed that OBE is hindered

by many factors such as the unavailability of resources and facilities. Therefore, according to most of the respondents, in order for OBE to be a developmental approach to education, the government should address the imbalances which exist between the previously advantaged schools and the previously disadvantaged schools. Moreover, they understood well the concept of development. They argued that development is about moving forward and making progress. This is what OBE should be doing for the people, it should be providing them with the opportunity to grow and develop.

OBE was introduced as a developmental approach to education to meet the RDP's principles of nation building and linking reconstruction and development. However, many factors are hampering the successful implementation of OBE, to fulfill its developmental objectives. Therefore, according to most of the respondents OBE has not become a developmental approach to education yet. According to the RDP White Paper (1994:8) "in developing human resources the people should be involved in the decision-making process, implementation, new job opportunities that require new skills, gaining rewards for existing skills previously unrecognized and the managing and governing of the society." The RDP claims "to empower people, but that claim can only succeed if there is an appropriate education and training programme in place."

Therefore, OBE does not meet the developmental needs of South African people especially those who have been previously disadvantaged. This is in contradiction to the basic principles of the RDP, which aim at addressing the developmental needs of previously disadvantaged people.

**(II) To critically evaluate whether OBE does meet the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas or not.**

Most of the respondents feel that OBE does not meet the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas. They stated clearly that there could be no proper implementation of OBE in unequal conditions. They believe that the government should provide schools with resources and facilities, should train educators properly in handling

OBE, educator's qualifications should be improved and all classrooms problems should be addressed.

The Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 37) maintains that “the successful implementation of the structure and design of the curriculum, orientation and training, learning support materials.” It believes that “the support of teachers was all constrained by the inadequate financial and human resources.” However, it contends that “although the very emergence of the new curriculum to replace that of apartheid education was an achievement.” It concedes that “its structure and design was compromised by the availability of human and financial resources to construct it.” Furthermore, it contends “that teacher orientation, the quantity and quality of training and trainers, both of which are financial and human resources limited training and development.” Therefore, it maintains that “the scarce financial and human resources undermine the quality, availability and use of learning support materials.”

Most of the schools in the previously disadvantaged have problems with financial and human resources. These schools are mostly managed by School Governing Bodies who do not have financial resources. They depend solely on student's fees to manage their day-to-day activities. It becomes difficult in the implementation of OBE because the curriculum needs Learner Support Material, which teachers cannot use because of its complexity. A concerted effort by the government is needed to address these issues.

The Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 37) points out that “each aspect of the implementation of OBE has been affected by the time frames.” However, it believes that “too-tight frames were unrealistic at a time when newly constituted departments, not yet operating to full capacity and without adequate budgets, were expected to simultaneously formulate and implement policies and programmes across every area of education.” Moreover, it also highlights a lack of leadership and management during this time, as many schools had no principals because of policies such as the redeployment of teachers, which also had the effect of creating an extremely turbulent context in provinces and schools.

These are some of the factors that still contribute to the failure of OBE in the PDA's. The government had unrealistic time frames where it expected educators to implement policies foreign to their understanding. It failed to understand the legacy of apartheid education that had to be eradicated before a total transformation of education in South Africa can take place. This is what Jansen (1999: 149) believes that "OBE will fail in South Africa because what happens outside in the economic and political sphere has little or no bearing to what happens inside the classrooms." He claims that this is because South Africa is still a developing country.

Furthermore, the Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 38) maintains that "the implementation of C2005 was accompanied by a number of assessments and evaluations concerned with teacher orientation and training, learner support materials and provincial capacity." Therefore, it claims that "without such a process of regular monitoring and review, curriculum renewal cannot occur." Moreover, it concedes that "ongoing research on curriculum change, supported at all levels, is critical for both its constant improvement." It also concedes that it is critical "for generating the debate and discussion that is central to informed citizenry within a democratic South Africa." It believes, however, that "monitoring and review on their own cannot change; they need to be supplemented by wise judgement and decisive action in key areas."

The Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000) contends that "efforts to implement without adequate resources meant that the processes of implementation are sometimes counter-productive to the broader aims of educational transformation". It claims, however, that "if the principal goal of implementing C2005 was to overturn the legacy of apartheid education by enabling teachers to change their understandings of what is possible and thereby transform classroom practice, then the results have not been encouraging." It maintains that "former Model C schools have been able to implement C2005 with greater ease than the majority of schools, largely because of being better resourced." In addition, it contends that "the will to introduce C2005 has been strong in the majority of Black schools because of the link between the curriculum and the goals of

educational transformation.” However, it concedes that “this commitment has been inhibited by poverty of resources manifested at different levels in these Black schools.”

Therefore, it seems as if there are many factors hampering the successful implementation of OBE or C2005 so as to meet the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas. These obvious consequences require attention in the implementation process. Teachers need to be encouraged to work in groups and adequate human and financial resources should be put in place for teacher training and support and for learning support materials. Provincial education departments, however, should be given enough finances to carry out this task and the government should make sure that there is proper management and leadership in school to advance the goals of OBE or C2005.

Furthermore, the government should make sure there is continuous monitoring and evaluation in previously disadvantaged schools to ensure that OBE does meet its developmental objectives. It should make sure that previously disadvantaged schools are on an equal level in terms of resources and infrastructure.

Luckett (2001:58) argues that “if a diverse curriculum is to be adopted and implemented in the South African context, there should be numerous consequences and in no doubt many unintended ones.” However, he outlines “more obvious consequences that would require attention in the implementation process.” He claims that “such a modular curriculum structure and a uniform system enables different types of learning in different contexts to be treated comparatively in the new system.” Moreover, he concedes that “this would require teachers to work in co-operatively in teams, which many are not accustomed to.” Therefore, he believes that “institutional structures and processes would need to change to encourage group as opposed to individual creativity.”

**(III) To compare and determine the extent to which educators, students and parents both in previously advantaged and disadvantaged areas understand the implementation and meaning of OBE.**

The educators have a good understanding and knowledge of OBE except some who did not understand OBE terminology and the relationship between education and development. The students, however, did not have an understanding of OBE, its terminology and the relationship between education and development.

The parents were also unfamiliar with its terminology. The Education Government Officials (EGOs) knew some of the terms involved in the new curriculum and others did not. The Review Committee on C2005 (2000: 38) points out that “the lack of orientation, training and a support process hampers the successful implementation of C2005.” It claims that “it took place in a unique context of rapid social change.” Moreover, it maintains that “it posed a major challenge that had the effect of disarming regular institutions and as such it was a challenge that was not properly seized.” The Department of Education (1997) in the Review Committee (2000: 38) approved a “‘broad strategy’ for the implementation of OBE.” However, it asserts that “this strategy included a national pilot project and a national in-service programme for teachers.” This in-service programme for teachers included:

- An advocacy phase directed at approximately 300 000 teachers in the education system to prepare for implementing OBE.
- A national mechanism for training Foundation Phase and Intermediate Phase teachers.
- Distribution of policy documents illustrative learning programmes and learner support materials to teachers as part of the training.
- An evaluation and monitoring mechanism (Review Committee; 2000: 38).

The Review Committee on C2005 (South Africa; 2000: 38)) maintains that “the Department of Education initially commissioned MiET, a Non-Government



Organization, to provide a core of 20 officials from each province with a basic understanding of C2005.” It suggests, however, that “these ‘master trainers’ cascade their knowledge and understanding that they have gained to the district officials.” Furthermore, it claims that “these district officials should cascade this information to classroom practitioners and other educators in their respective districts.” Therefore, according to the Review Committee (South Africa; 2000: 38) “this training model that was commonly referred to, as the ‘Cascade model’ became the primary means of preparing the majority of teachers for C2005 implementation.” Moreover, it believes that “it is still the dominant training model, and it has been adopted quite substantially.”

Consequently, the majority of teachers in previously disadvantaged areas do not have an understanding of OBE. This is because the people designated as sources of knowledge about OBE were not fully informed themselves. Therefore, it shows the failure of the Cascade model to distribute knowledge to the people about OBE. The Review Committee (South Africa; 2000: 38) maintains that “the capacity of the provinces to provide teacher training was found wanting.” However, it argues that “it was supplemented by external support of national and international development agencies.” It claims that “provincial finances could not fully cover operational activities directly related to C2005.” Moreover, it contends that “teacher training was done at three levels, the training of EDO’s, the training of lead teachers from schools or clusters of schools and in-school training of peer teachers.” Furthermore, it concedes that “the Department insisted that schools form clusters to continue dialogue on C2005 and develop learning activities and support materials to enhance this training.” It believes, however, that “the teachers felt that the minimal time set aside for training and classroom support was not sufficient.”

This has been evident in the research that most EDO’s do not have an understanding of OBE. This supports the earlier statement that people who are expected to be delineators of OBE may be ignorant of the work they do. The Review Committee on C2005 (2000: 38) claims that “teacher training was a challenge considering the number of teachers, about 58 000, as against the number of available trainer facilitators”. It maintains,

however, that “teacher support was minimal and not regular and the lack of a paradigm shift by education managers at all levels of the system impacted negatively on teacher training.”

According to the CEPD in the Review Committee (South Africa; 2000: 64) the “weakness of the Cascade approach could be aptly encapsulated in the proverb, ‘the blind leading the blind’.” The CEPD argues that “the Cascade approach should have been strengthened with adequate follow-up support measures.” However, it claims that “a submission was made by University of Cape Town (UCT) to the Department of Education that there should be fewer levels in the Cascade model to limit dilution of the training.”

The CEPD in the Review Committee (South Africa; 2000: 64) “indicates that the quality of orientation was weak and often what was called training was often orientation.” In fact, “it claims that the results were that observations were made that in most cases the training had played an advocacy rather than a skills development role.” However, the Khulisa Trust (1999) in the Review Committee (South Africa; 2000: 64), observes that “a further index of the quality of training provided was that the level of engagement, understanding and involvement with the processes of curriculum development diminishes further down the hierarchy of the education system as one goes.”

The Review Committee (South Africa; 2000: 64) concedes that “the main problem experienced by teachers revolved around the training being too abstract and insufficiently focused on what the theory meant in practice.” Jansen (1999:208) also believes that “teachers uniformly felt that their preparation for curriculum 2005 was inadequate and incomplete.” However, the Review Committee (South Africa; 2000: 64) further states that “an additional weakness of the training was the perception that was created that in C2005 ‘anything goes.’” Therefore, it claims that “many teachers left the training workshops not knowing what it is they ought to teach.” Moreover, the Committee claims that “a survey conducted by the SADTU graphically points out that with the introduction of the OBE curriculum to the South African education system, teachers are desperate for

support.” It concedes teachers need support “both in understanding and accepting the changes required of them and in implementing these changes in their classrooms.”

The Review Committee(South Africa; 2000: 64) goes on to argue that “one of the main problems with the training of teachers on C2005 was that it focused on teaching the terminology rather than engaging with the substance underlying the terminology.” However, it maintains that “the complexity of the terminology has not allowed teachers to come to grips with the basic implications of OBE for classroom practice.” Moreover, it concedes that “the teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the ‘glut of OBE literature’ which they describe as intimidating, user-unfriendly and of poor quality.” It further contends that “all the phase documents tend to alienate classroom practitioners because they are “peppered with unnecessary terminology” and contain very little practical guidance.”

Therefore, these factors pointed out by the Review Committee (South Africa; 2000) are the main reason why many teachers have problems in implementing OBE properly in their schools, particularly in the previously disadvantaged schools. It suggests that “the Cascade model was a failure because the ‘master trainers’ were pre-occupied with terminology rather than with what was happening in the classroom practice.” Moreover, the Committee claims that “the teachers complained that the training was too abstract and was not focused on applied theory.” It believes that “teachers were expected to implement a new curriculum on the basis of inadequate and incomplete training.” It concedes that “the training was weak and therefore played a role of advocacy rather than the skills development role.” This is what hinders OBE or C2005 from becoming a developmental approach to education. It does not fulfill the role that the principles of the RDP are aiming to develop in South Africa. Ever since its introduction, OBE has encountered many problems because even those who are training teachers are ignorant of it and subsequently the CEPD concluded it was a case of the blind leading the blind.”

## **4.6 OTHER RELEVANT FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH**

### **4.6.1 Lack of educator empowerment in education**

Throughout the research study, the researcher has found that most teachers lack empowerment and training in OBE or C2005. He discovered that most educators did not understand what OBE was and its terminology. Most educators, especially in previously disadvantaged schools are not empowered in issues of education transformation or its implications in the education system of the country. According to the Centre for Education Policy & Development (CEPD; 2001), “the Eastern Cape ranks in the first two provinces, which has the highest unqualified educators in South Africa.”

According to CEPD (2001: 69) “it was found out that many educators did not understand what they had to teach in different grades, how to teach it under the new system and were unable to develop their own material.” It states that “there is evidence that many educators do not possess adequate conceptual foundations needed to use textbooks.” The CEPD states that specific targets for educator development include:

- The upgrading of under-qualified teachers.
- A re-orientation of all educators towards a new context (democratic principles and disciplinary forms.
- A re-skilling of all educators for new and more classroom contexts.
- The development of educators in accordance with policy developments such as Outcomes-Based Education (CEPD; 2001: 69).

There is a great need to empower educators to understand the context in which they work, especially with regards to OBE and education in general.

### **4.6.2 Stakeholders not involved in curriculum design and development**

During the research study there was evidence to show that the government in South Africa was making unilateral decisions when it came to policy making especially curriculum development. Jansen (1999: 150) believes that “a small elite of teachers often experts and White had driven the Learning Areas Committee (LAC) and other structures

in which OBE had been developed.” Jansen (2001: 48) further states that “that the process of policy review whose implementation logic is driven centrally and personalized with relish in the public domain, has unleashed a series of political problems.” Carl (1995: 16) concedes that “the teacher must not be a mere implementer, but a development agent who is able to develop and apply the relevant curriculum dynamically and creatively,”

All the stakeholders that are involved in education need to be involved in policy making and curriculum development. Therefore, there would not be the level of ignorance in issues of education transformation about OBE among educators.

#### **4.6.3 Stakeholders in education not conversant with development issues**

During the researcher’s interviews with parents, students and educators, he discovered that they did not understand the concept “development” in its relationship to education. Although OBE was introduced as a developmental approach to education, the stakeholders in education did not understand education from a developmental perspective. This is contrary to the RDPWP (1994:8), which states that “the aim of education is human resource development and the empowerment of people through education and training.” It states that “these include specific forms of capacity building within organizations and communities and to participate effectively in all processes of a democratic society.” The WPET (1995: 19) concedes that “national reconstruction and development demands that the knowledge and skills base of the working and unemployed are massively upgraded.” It points out that “young people at school should have better opportunities to continue education and training.”

The stakeholders, therefore, need to be informed about the relationship between education and development, especially on the focus of the RDP and the role of education, more especially of OBE to the RDP.

#### **4.6.4 Lack of resources not a reason for non-implementation**

The study also discovered that in the disadvantaged school it is not only the unavailability of resources, which prevent educators from implementing OBE but rather lack of a conceptual understanding of the terminology involved in the new curriculum and unclear textbooks. Jansen (1999: 150) argues that “there is no ongoing process that is systematic that would help teachers to conceptualize and make sense of OBE as curriculum policy.”

The educators, however, also cited the unavailability of Learner Support Material (LSM) as one of the reasons that makes OBE difficult to implement. They claim that textbooks arrive late in the year. When they did arrive, they were not the ones ordered from the Department of Education and then it became difficult to teach. Educators believe that the Education Department is applying cost pressure and as a result, they have to accept the wrong material.

In conclusion, the Education Government Officials have a good understanding of OBE and its’ relationship to development. The educators in the previously advantaged school also showed a good understanding of the relationship between OBE and development. The educators in the previously disadvantaged school, the parents and the students showed little understanding of OBE and its relationship to development. Other relevant findings of the research include the fact that educators are not empowered when it comes to educational matters. Parents and students do not have enough conceptual understanding of the terminology involved in OBE is because they are not being included in policy making and therefore they are not conversant with educational matters. This might be the reason, therefore, why educators in PDA’s are facing problems with the implementation of OBE and not the lack of resources as previously expressed.

# **CHAPTER FIVE**

# **RECOMMENDATIONS &**

# **CONCLUSION**

## **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter aims at providing recommendations from the research study. The researcher will also provide his own conclusions as to the relevance of the research study. Relevant suggestions will be made on how OBE in South Africa could meet the developmental needs of all people in order for it to play a reconstructive and developmental role.

## **5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **5.2.1 Provision of support to stakeholders**

The government should reconsider the use of complex curriculum terms, which are abstract and vague. It should rather employ people who are going to assist teachers practically in their daily application of OBE in the classroom situation. In addition, educators should be trained properly in OBE because from the research findings many of them did not understand OBE. Therefore, teachers have to be taught why OBE was introduced and its focus of direction.

Furthermore, teachers should attend workshops on matters affecting education transformation. These include the consequences of education transformation as a paradigm shift because many educators in the previously disadvantaged areas showed a lack of knowledge in these fundamental education transformational issues. Most importantly, educators in previously disadvantaged areas should be taught the impact that globalization has on education. Kraak (1998: 6) argues that “a further feature of the changes brought by globalization is the rapid diffusion of learning activities outside specialist learning organizations such as schools, colleges and universities.” He points out that “learning in the information age is now taking place in many organizations such as enterprise-based learning and also in communities where educated citizens continuously generate and interpret knowledge and information in pursuit of a better quality of life.”

Therefore, the government could include courses on the relationship between education and development in the National Professional Diploma in Education (NPDE) and the Further Diploma in Education (FDE) introduced to upgrade teacher’s qualifications.



Moreover, even the Educational Development Officers (EDO's) could be included in these upgrading modules as they have displayed a lack of understanding of OBE and its relationship to education transformation. The parents, however, could also be taught as they have also shown ignorance of OBE and its relation to educational transformation. Therefore, the educators have a role to play in the education of parents in previously disadvantaged areas. The EDO's could even organize an information day to update the relevant people about education transformation. They could teach them the terminology of the new curriculum because even the newly introduced Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) has terminology that could be difficult to understand. Unfortunately, the Government Officials who are supposed to be training educators in educational transformation seem to be the most ignorant of OBE. It is recommended that they should be included in these workshops and training sessions.

### **5.2.2 Solutions that could lead to development in educational transformation**

The educators, especially in previously disadvantaged schools were not aware of the relationship between OBE and development. They did not even know the basic principles of the RDP and where OBE fits in to these principles. In addition, it was also surprising to find that they did not even understand that OBE was introduced to eradicate the legacy of Bantu Education and to be a developmental approach to education. These teachers, therefore, need to be trained in the understanding of the relationship between OBE and the RDP.

According to the ANC Policy Framework for Education and Training (1994: 33) "the education and training policy in South Africa is an integral part of the RDP." It claims that "it provides opportunities for people to enhance the quality of their own lives and the standard of living of their communities is the central objective of the RDP." Therefore, if educators could be taught that in introducing OBE, the government was fulfilling its mandate of nation building as well as reconstructing the legacy of apartheid education, which did not contribute to the development of Black students. Similarly, the teachers should take the responsibility of educating parents about the relationship between OBE and development. Therefore, it is recommended that this should be included in the

school curriculum and learning areas, such as Human and Social Sciences (HSS) where children would learn about the focus of the RDP. They could also learn why it is important for them to know how to manage their own projects and they could be given assignments to study local projects. It is also recommended that the curriculum should embrace all these efforts that could make OBE a developmental approach to education.

### **5.2.3 Development of previously disadvantaged areas**

Another crucial factor hampering the successful implementation of OBE is the lack of resources in previously disadvantaged schools. The government should draw up a special budget to improve the conditions of these schools if it is serious about the development of the children in particular, and the people in general, who live in these areas. If such a situation is allowed to persist it will then result in two education systems in one country, the one from previously advantaged areas producing well-developed students and the other from underdeveloped areas producing ineffective children, underdeveloped and unable to do things for themselves. Therefore, if this were not done, OBE will have no impact on the lives of ordinary poor South African children. For reconstruction and development to occur, people must be well equipped with skills and knowledge that they will use in their RDP projects. It is recommended that for this to happen, a combined effort from the Department of Education, the educators, the students and the parents is needed to achieve the goals of the RDP.

Underdevelopment in most areas of South Africa, especially those designated as homelands by the previous government still manifests itself. The education provided in these areas still reflects the legacy of the previous system of underdevelopment. The government, therefore, should make a concerted effort to develop these previously disadvantaged areas. Taylor (1998: 294) argues that “the most fundamental challenge facing the development practitioner is to understand the development process into which he/she is intervening.” He further claims that he/she should “know where the individual, the organization or the community is located on its own path of development and to

understand where it has come from, how it has changed along the way and what its next development challenge is likely to be.”

It is recommended therefore, that the government should develop these previously disadvantaged areas by improving their infrastructure. Furthermore, schools in most disadvantaged areas need development practitioners who will know how to handle such historical discrepancies. Educators, therefore, should play the role of practitioners in their areas of development in order to implement OBE effectively.

#### **5.2.4 Educational development is for the people**

The fact that the government unilaterally develops policies affecting people, especially in education, means that it has not involved those people in their own development. Burkey (1993: 50) suggest that “people must feel and believe that it is their own efforts that are driving the development process.” He argues that “they must feel that they themselves are contributing the maximum of their of their own human, financial and material resources, and that assistance from outside is not what they cannot manage themselves.”

The problems encountered by the educators in the implementation of OBE are indicative of major stakeholders not being involved in the drafting and the making of the curriculum policy. According to Kaplan (1994) “development is for the civil society.” He maintains that “civil society is a society whose institutions belong to the people.” He contends, however, that “ordinary people need to gain mastery over these institutions.” Kaplan also mentions that “they need to wrest control from the hands of the elites and particular groupings or hierarchies.” He believes that “they also need to integrate the institutions in their daily lives and need to ensure that they are served by these institutions rather than only serve them.”

It is recommended that the government, therefore, should make sure than any development brought to the people should involve the people in its’ formulation and its’

inception. It should not be a top-bottom approach to development, but should rather include all the stakeholders involved in education.

### **5.3 RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY IN THE EASTERN CAPE**

The study could be relevant in the Eastern Cape because there have been problems, mainly in the implementation of OBE in previously disadvantaged areas. The Eastern Cape has inequalities within its educational services and OBE, and although the new system was introduced to eradicate the legacy of apartheid education, it has been unsuccessful in addressing these inequalities.

This study, therefore, could be useful to the Department of Education in Bisho or to the National Department in its' efforts to tackle the problems of OBE and in policy making in general. However, this research could also be useful to educators in their individual development. Educators should know that they are not just vehicles to drive the imposed education policies of the government, but should be active participants in those policy developments.

The research could also be a useful resource to teacher organizations such as the South African Democratic Teacher's Union (SADTU), National Professional Teacher's Organization of South Africa (NAPTOSA) and other teacher unions present in the Eastern Cape in their teacher development programmes. All the stakeholders involved in education, particularly in the Eastern Cape, as well as in South Africa in general, could benefit from this study in their educational development.

### **5.4 CONCLUSION**

The government, have much to do in order to achieve the goals of the RDP through the introduction of OBE. There is still a lot of ignorance about this new system of education such that many educators resort to old methods of teaching because of a lack of guidance in their implementation of OBE. There is very little knowledge of OBE, especially amongst students and parents. Moreover, the students and some parents showed

ignorance pertaining to matters of the RDP and its relationship to OBE. Of course, they knew well what is needed for OBE to be developmental, but they could not make a clear connection between OBE and RDP

OBE, as the product of the RDP, should help to uplift the lives of the people in PDA's. This is emphasized in the six basic principles of the RDP, that development should be linked to reconstruction. However, as the WPET states that "education has to be developmental by its nature." There have been many criticisms leveled against OBE as a developmental approach to education. Such a complex system of education needs to be given a careful and monitored approach in its implementation in the PDA's of the Eastern Cape.

## REFERENCES

## BOOKS

African National Congress. 1994. **A Policy framework for education and training**. Manzini: MacMillan.

Baxen, J. & Soudien, C. 1999. "Outcomes-based education: Teacher identity and politics of participation." In J. Jansen & P. Christie (eds) **Changing curriculum: Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa**. Kenwyn: Juta.

Burkey, S. 1993. **People first: A guide to self-reliant participatory rural development**. London: Zeds books.

Carl, A.E. 1995. **Teacher empowerment through curriculum development: Theory into practice**. Kenwyn: Juta.

Centre for Education Policy Development. 2001. **Transformation of the South African schooling system: A report from the second year of education 2000 plus: A longitudinal study to monitor education policy implementation and change**. Pretoria: CEPD.

Cresswell, J.W. 1998. **Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions**. Thousand Oaks; London: Sage Publishers.

Christie, P. 1998. "Globalization and the curriculum: Proposals for the integration of education and training." In P. Kallaway, G Kruss, A. Fataar, & G.Donn (eds) **Education after apartheid: South African education in transition**. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Department of Education. 2002. Curriculum 2005: "Lifelong learning for the twenty-first century, and South Africa's new curriculum framework." In J. Gulting, U. Hoardley, & J.D. Jansen (eds) **Curriculum: From plans to practices**. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

De Vos, A.S. 1998. **Research at grass roots**. Cape Town: Van Schaick.

Donaldson, A. 2001. "Reconstructing education: Reflections on post-apartheid planning, systems and structure." In Y. Sayed & J.D. Jansen (eds) **Implementing education policies**. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Fleish, B.D. 2002. **Managing educational change: The state and school reform in South Africa**. Cape Town: Hiennemenn.

- Geyser, H. 2000. "OBE: A critical perspective." In T.V. Mda & S. Mothata. **Critical issues in South African education**. Cape Town: Juta
- Grinnel, R.M. 1988. (3<sup>RD</sup> ed.) **Social work research and evaluation**. Illinois: Peacock Publishers.
- Gulting, J. Lubisi, C., Parker, B. & Wedekind, V. (eds) 1998. **Understanding Outcomes-Based Education: teaching and assessment in South Africa**. Cape Town: Oxford University.
- Jansen, J.D. 1999. "Why OBE will fail: An elaboration." In J.D. Jansen, & P. Christie, (eds) **Changing curriculum: Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa**. Cape Town: Kenwyn.
- Jansen, J.D. 2001. "Rethinking policy making in South Africa: Symbols of change, signals of conflict." In J.D. Kraak, & M. Young (eds). **Education in retrospect: Policy and implementation since 1990**. Johannesburg: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Kraak, A. 1998. **Competing education and training policies, a "systematic" versus "unit standards" approach: Occasional papers**. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Kvale, S. 1996. **Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing**. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishers.
- Lubisi, C. 1997. **Understanding outcomes-based education: Knowledge, curriculum and assessment in South Africa**. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal.
- Marlow, C. 1998. **Research methods for generalist social work**. Pacific Grove: Books Cole.
- Morrow, W. & King, W. 1998. **Vision and reality: Changing education and training in South Africa**. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Murphy, B.C. & Dillon, C. 1998. **Interviewing in action: Process and practice**. Pacific Grove: Brooks Cole.
- Nkabinde, Z.P. 1997. **An analysis of educational challenges in the new South Africa**. Lanham, Md: University Press of America.
- Olivier, C. 1998. **How to educate and train outcomes-based**. Pretoria: J.L. Van Schaik.



- Pillay, P.N. 1990. "The development and underdevelopment of education in South Africa." In B. Nassom, & J. Samuel, (eds) **Education: From poverty to liberty**. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Pretorius, F. 1998. **Outcomes-based education in South Africa**. Johannesburg: Hodder & Stroughton
- Riggs, F. 1981. **Social science concepts: A systematic analysis**. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Rubin, A. & Babie, E. 1997. **Research methods for social work**. Pacific Grove: Brookes/Cole
- Samuel, J. 1990. "The state of education in South Africa." In B. Nassom, & J. Samuel, (eds) **Education: From poverty to liberty**. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Schofield, J.W. 2000. Increasing the generalizability of qualitative data. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley, & P. Foster(eds). **Case study method**. London: Sage Publishers.
- Spady, W. 1995. **Outcomes-based education: Critical issues**. American Association of School Administrators, USA: Breakthrough Systems.
- Singh, B.R. 1994. **Improving gender and ethnic relations: Strategies for schools and gender education**. London: Cassel
- Silverman, D. 2000. **Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook**. London: Sage Publishers
- Torodo, M.P. 1994. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. **Economic development**. New York: Longman
- Van Der Horst, H. & MacDonald, R. (eds.) 1997. **OBE: outcomes-based education: A teacher's manual**. Cape Town: Kagiso.
- Van Wyk, N. 1998. "The teacher and major stakeholders in education." In F. Pretorius, & E. Lemmer (eds). **South African education and training: Transition in a democratic era**. Johannesburg: Hodder & Stroughton.
- Welman, J.C. & Kruger, S.J. (eds) 1999. **Research methodology for the business and administrative sciences**. London: International Thomson Publishers.

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS & REPORTS

South Africa. Government of National Unity. 1994. **Reconstruction and Development Programme White Paper: Discussion Document**. Pretoria: Government Printers.

South Africa. Department of Education. 1995. **White Paper on Education and Training**. Pretoria: Government Printers.

South Africa. Department of Education. 2000 **A South African Curriculum for the The Department of Education Twenty First Century Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005**. Pretoria: Government Printers.

## JOURNALS

Coughlan, F. 2000. **Worksheets prepared for research methodology for social work students at Rhodes University**; East London.

Kaplan, 1994. **NGO's, civil society and capacity building: Towards a developmental strategy**. <http://www.cdra.org.za>. 12/07/2003

Luckett, K. 2001. A proposal for an epistemically diverse curriculum for South African Higher Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. **South African Journal for Higher Education**, 15 (2): 58.

Taylor, J. 1998. Transformation and development: A South African perspective. **Oxford University Press and Community Developmental Journal**, 33 (4): 294.

# APPENDIX A

**TRANSKEI PRIMARY SCHOOL**

EDUCATORS	STUDENTS	PARENTS
5	5	3

Transkei Primary School is situated in Umtata. It is a former model C school and its Principal teacher is Mr. Shank. It consists of about 500 students who come mainly from the surrounding suburbs of Umtata. The school starts from grade 1 to grade 7 and is a feeder school for Umtata High School. It is also very determined to produce students of high quality for the Umtata community.

**MPAFANE JUNIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL**

EDUCATORS	STUDENTS	PARENTS
5	5	5

Mpafane JSS is situated in about 40 km outside Umtata. It is a previously disadvantaged school and does not have proper classrooms and resources as well as proper sanitation. It has about 250 children some of whom travel about a kilometer to school. The Principal teacher is Mr. Mgweba. All the teachers live in town and travel every day to school.

**GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS**

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS	CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS
3	2
OBE LEARNING AREAS ADVISORS	
1	

**EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS (EDOs')**

The Educational Development Officers are responsible for the development of the schools. Their main responsibility is to ensure that the educators are doing their jobs as

expected by the Department of Education. They also make sure that the curriculum is properly implemented and are also responsible for the whole development of the school

### **CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS (CDOs')**

The Curriculum Development Officers are responsible for the development and design of the schools curriculum. They see to it that the curriculum is properly implemented in schools and that it is in line with the rules and laws of the Department of Education. They also look at the assessment of students and the examinations.

### **OBE LEARNING AREAS ADVISORS (LAAs')**

The learning Areas Advisors are responsible for the training of educators in Outcomes-Based Education. They are also responsible for conducting workshops to train educators on new developments in OBE, how to assess students and are responsible for the Continuous Assessment System (CAS) that is conducted with Grade 9 students.

## **APPENDIX B**

**THEME 1****UNDERSTANDING OF OBE**

1. What is Outcomes-Based Education (OBE)?
2. What do you think is the focus of OBE?
3. Why do you think OBE was introduced in South Africa?
4. What was the focus of the old curriculum?
5. What do you understand by the transformation of education in South Africa?
6. Do you understand the meaning of the terminology involved in the new curriculum, for instance, range statements, performance indicators, learning programme, assessment criteria, South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) and National Qualifications Framework (NQF)? Yes or No.
7. What do you think is the school's main aim in the new curriculum?
8. Do you think OBE has brought a change in education in South Africa? Please explain.

**THEME 2****THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OBE AND DEVELOPMENT**

1. What does the word "development" mean?
2. What is the focus of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) in South Africa?
3. What is the role of education in the RDP?
4. Does OBE contribute to the RDP? Please explain.

5. Does OBE meet the developmental needs of all children in South Africa? Please explain.
6. Does OBE meet the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas? Please explain.
7. What should be done to implement OBE successfully in previously disadvantage areas?
8. What should be done so that the developmental needs of children in previously disadvantaged areas could be enhanced?



