

**A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF TEACHER  
EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA IN RELATION  
TO THE NORMS AND STANDARDS FOR  
EDUCATORS**

**Noël DAVID ADAMS**

**Dissertation presented for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**in the Department of Education Policy Studies (Faculty of Education)**



**at**


**Stellenbosch University**

**Promoter: Professor Y. Waghid**

**December 2004**

**DECLARATION:**

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this dissertation is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted at any university for a degree.

Signature: .....  .....

Date: ..... 02.11.2004 .....

**ABSTRACT:**

**A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA IN RELATION TO THE NORMS AND STANDARDS FOR EDUCATORS.**

**NOËL DAVID ADAMS**

**Ph.D DISSERTATION, FACULTY OF EDUCATION, STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY .**

Educators at schools are expected to implement education policy changes promulgated through policy frameworks by the Department of Education in South Africa. However, whether these teachers are equipped to implement education policy or whether they have interacted sufficiently with policy issues remains a contentious issue. My contention is that pre-service and in-service teachers are expected to perform certain roles and demonstrate certain competences, as required or implied by changing education policy frameworks, like the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), but might not necessarily be equipped to do so. This dissertation utilised conceptual analysis and a literature review, as research methods, to explore constitutive meanings of the concept 'education policy' in relation to teacher education transformation in post-apartheid South Africa, with reference to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). Constitutive meanings (Fay, 1975) of post-apartheid teacher education refer to all those shared assumptions, definitions, and conceptions, which structure teacher education transformation and post-apartheid teacher education in certain definite ways. Without these constitutive meanings, according to Fay (1975: 76), social practices, like teacher education, could not exist. By revealing these constitutive meanings, in terms of the interpretive paradigm (Fay, 1975: 78), I have given a possible explanation of post-apartheid teacher education, by articulating the

conceptual scheme that frames post-apartheid teacher education. These constitutive meanings, which were extracted from a literature review, were explored in relation to the main question of this dissertation: Can the new teacher education policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators of 2000, improve teaching and learning in South African schools?

I argue that the latter process will not materialise because of question marks over the transformative potential of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). The mentioned policy framework may be an inappropriate framework to structure and guide the transformation of existing teacher education practices because of certain conceptual gaps. These conceptual gaps are stumbling blocks to transform existing teacher education practice and improve teaching and learning in our schools in the post-apartheid era. I argue that these gaps could be bridged if the Norms and Standards for Educators are reconceptualised along the lines of Benhabib's (1994) deliberative democratic model. Deliberation is necessary because policy alone cannot lead to the transformation of post-apartheid teacher education. Deliberation is also necessary because of the limitations on the state's power to enforce its will through promulgated policy. More engagement, via deliberation, is needed between the government, educational leaders, policy-makers and the other policy actors, like teachers, bureaucrats and teacher education institutions. The arguments of Burbules (1997) and Biesta (2004) seem to substantiate my claim that education policy, alone, cannot lead to the improvement of teaching and learning in our schools. Burbules (1997) posits that teaching is a complex human endeavour that is characterised by predicaments or dilemmas, which cannot be permanently solved. I argue against the integration of the seven roles, as advocated by the Norms and Standards for Educators, because of certain dilemmas. We need the tragic perspective on teaching, of Burbules (1997), to approach teaching differently. Biesta (2004) also urges us to approach teaching differently, by advocating a new language for education.



## OPSOMMING

Daar word van Suid-Afrikaanse opvoeders by skole verwag om opvoedingsbeleid veranderinge, wat via beleidsraamwerke gepromulgeer is deur die Departement van Onderwys, te implementeer. Wat egter 'n kontensieuse kwessie bly is of hierdie opvoeders toegerus is om opvoedingsbeleid te implementeer en of hulle genoegsaam omgeegaan het met beleidskwessies. My argument is dat daar van voor-diens- en in-diens opvoeders verwag word om sekere rolle te speel en sekere kompetensies of bekwaamhede te demonstreer, soos vereis of geimpliseer deur veranderende opvoedingsbeleid raamwerke, soos die Norme en Standaarde vir Opvoeders (Departement van Onderwys, 2000), maar dat hulle nie noodwendig toegerus is om dit te doen nie. Hierdie proefskrif utiliseer konseptuele analise en 'n literatuur oorsig, as navorsingsmetodes, om konstituerende betekenis van die konsep 'opvoedingsbeleid', in verhouding tot onderwyseropvoeding transformasie in post-apartheid Suid-Afrika, met verwysing na die Norme en Standaarde vir Opvoeders (Departement van Onderwys, 2000), te eksploreer. Konstituerende betekenis (Fay, 1975) van post-apartheid onderwyseropvoeding verwys na al daardie gedeelde aannames, definisies, en konsepsies, wat onderwyseropvoeding transformasie en post-apartheid onderwyseropvoeding op sekere definitiewe maniere struktureer. Sosiale praktyke soos onderwyseropvoeding kan volgens Fay (1975: 76) nie sonder hierdie konstituerende betekenis bestaan nie. Ek het hopelik, deur die ontbloting van hierdie konstituerende betekenis, in terme van die interpretatiewe navorsingsparadigma (Fay, 1975: 78), 'n verduideliking gegee van post-apartheid onderwyseropvoeding, deur my artikulering van die konseptuele skema wat die realiteit van onderwyseropvoeding op sekere maniere definiëer. Hierdie konstituerende betekenis, wat onttrek is van 'n literatuur oorsig, was geëksploreer in verhouding tot die hoof vraag van hierdie proefskrif: Kan die nuwe onderwyseropvoeding beleidsraamwerk, soos uitgespel in die Norme en Standaarde vir Opvoeders van 2000, onderrig en leer in Suid-Afrikaanse skole verbeter?

Ek argumenteer dat laasgenoemde proses nie sal materialiseer nie vanweë

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

All thanks to God through Whom all things are possible.

I wish to salute the following persons for their important contributions toward the completion of the dissertation:

(i) Professor Yusef Waghid for his inspirational guidance and support.

(ii) My lovely wife, Joselyn, for her wonderful patience and support.

(iii) My sister, Menisha, for her wonderful support.

## CONTENTS

<b>Declaration .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Opsomming .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>vii</b>

## \*CHAPTER ONE

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

<b>1.1 Problem statement and focus .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 Literature review and scope of study .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.3 Goals and theoretical points of departure .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.3.1 Main and sub-questions .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.3.2 Theoretical framework .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.3.3 Research methods .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.3.3.1 Constitutive meanings of conceptual analysis .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.3.3.2 Conceptual analysis and philosophy of education.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>1.3.3.3 Suggesting an approach to the conceptual analysis of education                 policy.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>1.3.3.4 Rationales behind a conceptual analysis of education policy.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>1.4 Outline of chapters .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>1.5 Summary .....</b>	<b>33</b>

**\*CHAPTER TWO**

**2. CONSTITUTIVE MEANINGS OF EDUCATION POLICY**

**2.1 Introduction .....35**

**2.2 Constitutive meanings of the concept of education policy.....36**

**2.2.1 Education policy structures and guides government actions.....36**

**2.2.2 Education policy represents the temporary settlements of the  
contestation between diverse and competing social forces .....39**

**2.2.3 Education policy is a text that is open to different interpretations.....40**

**2.2.4 Education policy is a discourse .....42**

**2.2.5 Education policy is a continual political process.....44**

**2.2.5.1 Reflecting on the factors impacting on the education policy process.48**

**2.2.5.2 The education policy process: in defence of deliberation.....51**

**2.3 Summary .....57**

**\*CHAPTER THREE**

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA  
FROM THE 1980s TO 2000**

**3.1 Introduction .....58**

**3.2 Motivating the inclusion of the historical context in a conceptual analysis of  
education policy.....58**

**3.3 A brief history of teacher education in South Africa from the 1980s to 2000  
.....60**

**3.4 Summary .....79**

## **\*CHAPTER FOUR**

### **4. CONSTITUTIVE MEANINGS OF TEACHER**

#### **EDUCATION TRANSFORMATION**

<b>4.1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>4.2 Teacher education transformation versus teacher education reform: Clarifying their meanings .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>4.3 Constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>4.3.1 Deliberation can assist teacher education transformation .....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>4.3.2 Local cultures and contexts need to be respected .....</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>4.3.3 It is difficult to change the roles and identities of educators.....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>4.3.4 Teacher education is now largely school-based with extended teaching practice .....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>4.3.5 Teachers should be reflective practitioners.....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>4.3.6 Teacher education is a continual process and involves lifelong learning .....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>4.3.7 Recognition of student voices is important in teacher education transformation .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>4.4 Conceptual gaps within the Norms and Standards for Educators .....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>4.4.1 The Norms and Standards lack detail on how student educators should be trained to be reflective practitioners .....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>4.4.2 The Norms and Standards lack detail on how the recognition of student voices is to be realised at teacher education institutions.....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>4.4.3 All the contexts for Teaching Practice are perceived to be homogenous .....</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>4.4.4 The Norms and Standards assume that educators will change their identities easily.....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>4.5 Reconceptualising Teacher Education:In defence of deliberation .....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>4.6 Summary .....</b>	<b>124</b>

**\*CHAPTER FIVE**

**A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF TEACHER EDUCATION  
IN SOUTH AFRICA IN RELATION TO THE NORMS AND  
STANDARDS FOR EDUCATORS: EXPLORING  
CONSTITUTIVE MEANINGS ASSOCIATED WITH  
TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY**

<b>5.1 Introduction</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>5.2 Constitutive meanings of teacher education: a conceptual analysis</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>5.3 Constitutive meanings of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>5.3.1 The Norms and Standards provide an authoritative standard or model for the development of learning programmes and qualifications for educators for employment purposes</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>5.3.2 The notion of applied competence and its associated assessment criteria forms the cornerstone of assessment in post-apartheid teacher education.....</b>	<b>140</b>
<b>5.3.3 Preset and Inset educators should be reflective practitioners</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>5.3.4 Teacher education institutions must recognise student voices</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>5.3.5 Teaching practice is an essential feature of teacher education</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>5.3.6 Educators should be lifelong learners</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>5.3.7 Local needs, contexts and cultures must be respected</b>	<b>169</b>
<b>5.3.8 Existing teacher education practice must be transformed</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>5.4 Summary</b>	<b>183</b>

**\*CHAPTER SIX**

**THE IMPLICATIONS OF SOUTH AFRICA'S NEW TEACHER  
EDUCATION POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING AND  
LEARNING IN SCHOOLS**

<b>6.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>186</b>
<b>6.2 Implications for teaching and learning in schools.....</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>6.3 Limitations of this study and possibilities for future research .....</b>	<b>213</b>
<b>6.4 Summary .....</b>	<b>214</b>
<b>*REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>216</b>

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY**

#### **1.1 Problem statement and focus**

I want to give a brief description of the context that gives rise to the proposed dissertation. Educators at schools often claim that they are expected to implement education policy changes promulgated through policy frameworks by the Department of Education in South Africa. However, whether these teachers are equipped to implement education policy or whether they have interacted sufficiently with policy issues remains a contentious issue. This dissertation intends to explore constitutive meanings of teacher education in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). My contention is that teachers are expected to *perform* certain *roles* in relation to changing education policy frameworks, but might not necessarily be equipped to do so. The problem arises when policy is promulgated but not sufficient understanding seems to exist regarding its implementation. This dissertation explores some of the meanings associated with teacher education practices in South Africa in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators, in particular its implications for effective teaching and learning in schools.

#### **1.2 Literature review and scope of study**

Commenting on the implementation of new education policies in South Africa, McGrath (1998: 116) suggests that “it is imperative that research should begin to focus on implementation, whilst maintaining a concern with the feedback loop to future policy development.” It is also “necessary to begin critiquing the emergent system and generating detailed alternatives both within and, if necessary outside, the current paradigm” (McGrath, 1998: 118). I accept McGrath’s suggestion and intend to do a conceptual analysis of teacher education in South Africa in relation



to the teacher education policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000).

Why does South Africa need a new policy framework for teacher education? A brief look at the history of teacher education in our country may provide a possible answer to this question. The new teacher education policy framework can be seen as part of a broader reconstruction project of South African society. "South Africa's most urgent and difficult project is to reconstruct all spheres of public life so as to establish enabling conditions for a flourishing and peaceful democracy. A viable education system with committed, competent and confident teachers is a primary condition for accomplishing these ends" (Pendlebury, 1998: 333). The previous statement indicates that teachers are expected to perform certain roles as part of their contribution to the reconstruction project of South African society. These roles are spelt out in detail in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). Educators are supposed, in the *role of scholar, researcher and lifelong learner*, to "achieve ongoing personal, academic, occupational and professional growth through pursuing reflective study and research in their learning area, in broader professional and educational matters, and in other related fields" (Department of Education, 2000: 13). However, whether teachers are actually equipped to do so, is a question for debate.

Pendlebury (1998) has doubts whether many teachers will be able to perform these roles, particularly in the light of the history of South Africa's teacher education. The National Teacher Education Audit (Department of Education, 1995) revealed the negative impact of apartheid on teacher preparation. Apartheid has deeply divided and undermined teacher preparation. The inherited teacher education system was strongly based on racial and ethnic divisions. The audit also showed that the disadvantaged students were mainly concentrated at institutions that were not well equipped to prepare them for their work as teachers, for example, at dysfunctional rural and township colleges and correspondence universities. African students also comprised more than 80% of

teacher education courses at distance universities (like UNISA and Vista) and colleges. Many of these institutions were condemned in the audit for offering ill-conceived courses, inadequate attention to the demands of practice and very little support for disadvantaged learners (Pendlebury, 1998: 337). The history of teacher education from the 1980s to 2000 will be fully explored in this dissertation because of its implications for teaching and learning in our schools, in terms of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000).

How does our new competency-based teacher education framework compare to international trends in teacher education? The criticism of teacher education in South Africa can be compared to recent criticisms of teacher education in the USA. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) identified the following flaws (also evident in South Africa's Teacher Education Audit) in teacher education in the USA: inadequate time, fragmentation, uninspired teaching methods and traditional views of schooling, inadequate induction for beginner teachers, a lack of on-going professional development and few rewards for knowledge and skill (Pendlebury, 1998: 340). The competency-based approach to teacher education and performance assessment was utilised in the USA during the 1970s and early 1980s but is now a largely discredited approach, being criticised as too narrowly behaviouristic. There are some similarities between South Africa's new teacher education framework and the UK's competency-based teacher education framework (Pendlebury, 1998: 341). The most recent critique against the UK's teacher education framework is that it is incoherent and crudely behaviouristic (Pendlebury, 1998: 342). South Africa's new teacher education framework is also being accused of being too behaviouristic. The critique against competency-based teacher education and the responses to it, in South Africa and elsewhere, will be fully explored in this dissertation. This is important in the light of the main question of the dissertation: Can the new competency-based teacher education framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000), improve teaching and learning in South African schools?

### **1.3 Goals and theoretical points of departure**

#### **1.3.1 Main and sub-questions**

The main question that this dissertation will seek to answer is as follow: Can the new teacher education policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators of 2000, improve teaching and learning in South African schools? The sub-questions include the following: What is conceptual analysis? How does one approach the conceptual analysis of education policy? What are the rationales behind the conceptual analysis of education policy? Why is the historical context of education policy formulation important in the conceptual analysis of education policy? What does the concept of 'education policy' entails? What are constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation? What are constitutive meanings of post-apartheid South African teacher education, in relation the Norms and Standards for Educators of 2000?

#### **1.3.2 Theoretical framework**

This dissertation utilises conceptual analysis and a literature review to explore constitutive meanings (Fay, 1975: 76) of teacher education practices in South Africa in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), in particular its implications for effective teaching and learning in schools in the post-apartheid era.

Before outlining my research methodology or theoretical framework, I shall briefly refer to the differences between research methodology and research methods. Some researchers refer to their methodology "as the *conceptual framework* or the *assumptions* that guide their research" (Gough, 2000: 3). Methodology also refers to "a theory of producing knowledge through research and provides a rationale for the way a researcher proceeds" (Gough, 2000: 4). Because research methodologies "constitute practices of educational research, an understanding of research methodology involves thinking about and producing

knowledge and knowledge constructs” (Waghid, 2002: 42-43). Research methods, on the other hand, are modes or ways of conducting research inquiry, for example, interviews, observations and questionnaires (Gough, 2000: 4). In the light of the claim that “particular frameworks of thinking (paradigms) constitute research methodology, one can infer that frameworks of thinking can also frame education policy research (a research methodology for education policy issues)” (Waghid, 2002: 43). Each of the frameworks (like Interpretive inquiry or Critical inquiry) gives different meanings to education policy research.

I intend to utilise the interpretive paradigm (Neuman, 1997) for the dissertation. My research methods or techniques shall include document analysis (literature review) and conceptual analysis. There are certain reasons for my use of the interpretive paradigm. This paradigm is “related to hermeneutics, a theory of meaning that originated in the nineteenth century” (Neuman, 1997: 68). Hermeneutics “emphasises a detailed reading or examination of *text*, which could refer to a conversation, written words, or pictures. A researcher conducts ‘a reading’ to discover meaning embedded within text” (Neuman, 1997:68). The text that will be read in detail and subjected to examination is the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). This will be done to uncover embedded constitutive meanings of teacher education practices in South Africa, and particularly its implications for effective teaching and learning in schools in the post-apartheid era.

Moreover, this dissertation intends to explore constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators of 2000. This can be done in the following manner: “When studying the text, the researcher tries to absorb or get inside the viewpoint it presents as a whole, and then develop a deep understanding of how its parts relate to the whole” (Neuman, 1997: 68). The appropriate meaning of the text is “rarely simple or obvious on the surface; one reaches it only through a detailed study of the text, contemplating its many messages and seeking the connections among its parts” (Neuman, 1997: 68). This last statement by Neuman raises the following

question: How are the major parts of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), like the seven *roles* and the various *competences*, connected to each other and how do these parts relate to the whole? The approach in answering this question, in line with hermeneutics, shall follow the suggestion of Ricoeur (in Odman, 1988: 67) about the interpretation of a *text*. Ricoeur suggests that the interpretation of a text, as a written discourse or a work, must be directed toward the world of the work rather than the mentality of the author. The intentions of the author may give important clues, but they are not the sole criterion in the process of interpretation (Odman, 1988: 67). A text can “also be interpreted with special regard to the world in which it was created and which it is disclosing” (Odman, 1988: 67).

I shall now briefly outline Ricoeur’s (1981) suggested methodology for the interpretation of texts. Ricoeur (1981: 43) defines hermeneutics as “the theory of the operations of understanding in their relation to the interpretation of texts.” A text must be interpreted in relation to the world, which it opens up and discloses. The author is not the focus of the interpretation because “writing renders the text autonomous with respect to the intention of the author. What the text signifies no longer coincides with what the author meant ...” (Ricoeur, 1981: 139). This situation arises when discourse passes from speaking to writing. A text is any discourse fixed by writing. This means that fixation by writing is constitutive of the text itself. The text replaces the relations of dialogue between the writer and the reader (Ricoeur, 1981: 145). Written discourse renders the author’s intentions incompatible with the meaning of the text. This is because written discourse cannot be rescued by all the processes, like intonation, delivery, mimicry and gestures, by which spoken discourse supports itself in order to be understood. Interpretation is the only remedy for the weakness of discourse, which its author can no longer save (Ricoeur, 1981: 201).

Ricoeur (1981) suggests that understanding and explanation can be complementary processes in hermeneutics and also suggests two ways of proceeding in the interpretation of a text. The first way is to proceed from

understanding to explanation. The second way is to proceed from explanation to understanding. The first way of interpreting a text suggests that interpretation is not dependent on the intentions of the author:

If the objective meaning is something other than the subjective intention of the author, it may be construed in various ways. The problem of the right understanding can no longer be solved by a simple return to the alleged intention of the author (Ricoeur, 1981: 210-211).

Why do we need an art of guessing and why do we have to “construe” the meaning? This is necessary because “language is metaphorical and because the double meaning of metaphorical language requires an art of deciphering which tends to unfold the several layers of meaning” (Ricoeur, 1981: 211). A text has to be construed because a text is a whole, a totality. The relation between the whole and the parts requires a specific kind of “judgement” (Ricoeur, 1981: 211). The procedures of validation by which we test our guesses “are closer to a logic of probability than to a logic of empirical verification. To show that an interpretation is more probable in the light of what is known is something other than showing that a conclusion is true” (Ricoeur, 1981: 212). Validation can be compared to the juridical procedures of legal interpretation because it is a logic of uncertainty and of qualitative probability. An interpretation has to be probable and also more probable than another interpretation. Like legal utterances, all interpretations in the field of the social sciences may be challenged. There is no final say in social sciences when it comes to the interpretation of a text because the procedures of validation have a polemical character (Ricoeur, 1981: 213). Since I shall only utilise the first way of interpretation it is only necessary to state that the second way is based on the structural model that is utilised in linguistics and literary criticism. Texts are treated according to the elementary rules which linguistics successfully applied to the elementary systems of signs that underlie the use of language (Ricoeur, 1981: 216).

The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) mainly refer to certain roles or cultural practices which teachers are supposed to perform. These roles, “their associated set of applied competences and the qualifications described here will be used by the Department of Education for purposes of recognition and evaluation of qualifications for employment as an educator” (Department of Education, 2000: 9). One of the roles is that of the educator acting as learning mediator:

The educator will mediate learning in a manner which is sensitive to the diverse needs of learners, including those with barriers to learning; construct learning environments that are appropriately contextualised and inspirational; communicate effectively showing recognition of and respect for the differences of others (Department of Education, 2000: 13).

This extract points to the possibility that this policy expects educators to perform certain educational or cultural practices. This dissertation explores constitutive meanings associated with teacher education practices, such as the one highlighted in the above extract. Will the practice, as set out in the extract, lead to effective teaching and learning in South African schools? How does one do a conceptual analysis of the educational or cultural practices, as set out in the policy text, that educators are supposed to perform and especially its implications for effective learning and teaching in our schools?

I think the ideas of Foucault may help to answer the last question. Foucault has tried to construct a mode of analysis of those cultural practices in our culture, which have been instrumental in forming the modern individual as both object and subject (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982: 120). Foucault’s analysis focuses on those cultural practices in which power and knowledge cross. The other focus is on those cultural practices in which our current understanding of the individual, the society, and the human sciences are themselves fabricated (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982: 120). The latter authors refer to Foucault’s method as interpretive analytics. Interpretive understanding can only be obtained by

someone, who shares the actor's involvement, but distances herself from it (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982: 124). It must be stressed, however, that this will only be a conceptual involvement because of the conceptual nature of this dissertation. The interpreter must undertake the hard historical work of diagnosing and analysing the history and organisation of current cultural practices. The resulting interpretation is a pragmatically guided reading of the coherence of the practices of the society. Foucault is offering us an interpretive analytic of our current situation. Foucault's theory may help us to understand the practices of our culture, practices that are by definition interpretations (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982: 125).

A conceptual analysis of official government policy texts like the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) constitutes an important part of my dissertation. Why is the conceptual analysis of education policy necessary? Premfors (in Rubenson, 1994: 151) provides three reasons for policy analysis. The first reason has to do with an analysis of government actions and their effects in view of some goals or set of goals. The second motivation for policy analysis is to contribute to the solution of public policy problems. Policy analysis, thirdly, addresses particular policy initiatives and analyses the strategy of planned change and the nature and sources of resistance to it. The role of policy research must not be seen as primarily coming up with a solution and/or answer "to a specific issue but rather helps develop a broader understanding of the underlying problem. This involves widening the debate, reformulating the problem, clarifying goals, and analysing eventual conflicts between multiple goals" (Rubenson, 1994: 154).

This dissertation focuses mainly on the first two reasons for education policy analysis, as outlined by Premfors (in Rubenson, 1994: 151) in the foregoing paragraph. I shall attempt to analyse the South African government's actions, as outlined in the current policy framework for teacher education, the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 30), in terms of its goal of transforming existing teacher education practice. I have outlined, earlier on in



this chapter, what the latter policy framework hopes to effect. I argue that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) may be an inappropriate framework, because of possible conceptual gaps, to effect transformation of existing teacher education practice. The dissertation, in view of the second reason for education policy analysis, makes suggestions for an alternative approach to understanding teacher education policy that may improve the transformative potential of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000).

### **1.3.3 Research methods**

Research methods involve techniques of proceeding with gathering evidence (Waghid, 2002: 43). My research methods involve the following categories: discussions with my promoter and other informants, a review of the relevant literature (literature review) and independent reflection related to analysing and exploring concepts and questions of meaning, by means of a conceptual analysis.

My reflection will be of a special kind. Here I am referring to the notion of rational reflection that Waghid (2002: 14-15) tries to propagate as an approach to the analysis of education policy or education policy research. The notion of rational reflection is based on the writings of Peters (in Waghid, 2002: 15) who claims that rational reflection is a “capacity to ask why, to develop grounds for one’s thoughts, and to give reasons which count for or against points of view in a logical and systematic manner”. Rational reflection will ensure that our interpretations and knowledge will be “articulated to others who may be interested in our perceptions and perspectives in a clear, logically consistent and unambiguous manner” (Taylor in Waghid, 2002: 16).

Because we engage rationally in education, “we involve ourselves in dynamic meaning making within which we are agents of change who suggest possibilities for new things” (Waghid, 2002: 17). Rational reflection engenders education as a reflexive activity “specific to the culture, the problems, and dynamics of a

particular context” (Waghid, 2002: 19). We can be more attuned to society and to socially constructed meanings if we utilise rational reflection as an approach to education policy analysis (Taylor in Waghid, 2002: 19). I shall now briefly outline what my research method, conceptual analysis, entails by illuminating constitutive meanings of the concept of “conceptual analysis” in the following section.

### **1.3.3.1 Constitutive meanings of conceptual analysis**

What is conceptual analysis? Understanding the exact meaning of the words that describe a problem is central to comprehending a problem. This means that we must learn the rules for using those terms correctly and precisely. Conceptual analysis, thus, enables us to understand rules (Krathwohl, 1993: 147). The word “conceptual” is derived from the word “concept”. So what is a “concept”? One dictionary holds that a “concept” is “an idea, especially one generalised from various instances ...” (Harber *et al.* 1979: 216). A second dictionary states that a “concept” is an “idea underlying class of objects; general notion ...” (Mackenzie & Augarde, 1981: 62). One can, thus, infer from these two dictionary explanations that a “concept” may refer to “an idea”. Krathwohl (1993: 147), however, posits that concepts “are the terms that we use in our thinking language to refer to the things around us”. A conceptual analysis may assist in defining the essential characteristics of a concept. It also has the potential to help clarify the design of a concept. The process of conceptual analysis is analogous, at a conceptual level, with hypothesis testing with actual data. “But instead of gathering data, we are doing studies mentally to see whether we can think of examples or situations that fit or do not fit the particular check on the term being considered” (Krathwohl, 1993: 148; 154).

Hirst and Peters (1998) also attempt to explain what conceptual analysis entails. The latter authors start their explanation with an effort to elucidate what a “concept” is. Hirst and Peters (1998: 29) use the concept of “punishment” as an example to posit that the meaning of the latter concept can only be understood in

relation to the meaning of other words, like “guilty”. The “ability to relate words to each other would also go along with the ability to recognise cases to which the word applied” (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 29). When we analyse a concept like “punishment” we examine the principle or principles that govern the appropriate use of such a word. If we can make these governing principles explicit we have uncovered a concept. The latter governing principles can also be referred to as logically necessary conditions for the use of the word “punishment”. A logically necessary condition for the use of the latter word is that something, that is not pleasant, should be done to someone. If someone, however, has murdered another person but is being congratulated and praised for the latter deed by the police, then we would refuse to apply the word “punishment”. The action of inflicting something unpleasant, therefore, forms part of our concept of “punishment”. Conceptual analysis, thus, appears to consist in searching for logically necessary conditions for the use of a word (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 30-31). It is also necessary for us to note that the meaning of concepts can only be understood in relation to other concepts (Wittgenstein in Hirst & Peters, 1998: 32). A conceptual analysis of a concept further requires that we must examine the use of words in different types of sentences. To understand the use of these words in sentences, “it is also necessary to understand the different sorts of purposes that lie behind the use of sentences. And this requires reflection on the different purposes, both linguistic and non-linguistic, that human beings share in their social life” (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 33).

Let me extend the foregoing argument about the link between a concept, its use in language and social life. To understand a concept “we have to be in on a certain experience, we have to understand a certain language, not just words, but also a certain language of mutual action and communication” (Taylor, 1985: 24), by which we apply such a concept. Taylor (1985: 34) uses the rules that govern the Queen’s moves in chess to illuminate his argument. If one suspends the latter rules, then this is not chess any longer. Such rules, which make “chess” what it is, are constitutive rules. These constitutive rules govern a certain behaviour in such a way that the mentioned behaviour cannot exist without these constitutive

rules. There are also, in the same way as the latter, “constitutive distinctions, constitutive ranges of language which are similarly inseparable, in that certain practices are not without them” (Taylor, 1985: 34-35). What the latter implies is that “all the institutions and practices by which we live are constituted by certain distinctions and hence a certain language which is thus essential to them” (Taylor, 1985: 35). Using the practices of voting and negotiation as examples, Taylor (1985: 35) posits that the fact that “some practice is voting or negotiation has to do in part with the vocabulary established in a society as appropriate for engaging in or describing it.” Concepts, as part of the vocabulary established in a society, are thus connected to social life and social practices, because these concepts describe the meanings of these social practices. The difference between social practices such as voting and negotiation, thus, lies in their different constitutive rules or meanings (Taylor, 1985: 34 & 137), their different constitutive distinctions and different languages, which is essential to each of the mentioned social practices.

To have an understanding of a concept, “covers both the experience of grasping a principle and the ability to discriminate and use words correctly” (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 30). To grasp a principle, as in the latter case, means to have an understanding of what makes a concept what it is, that is, its constitutive meaning or rule (Taylor, 1985: 137). Waghid (2003: 9) uses the word “dialogue” to illuminate the latter point and posits that the mentioned word is constituted by some “general principle” that it “must be a social activity which is engaged in by people and which is shaped by the material, intellectual and spiritual conditions in which they live”. Seeing people in conversation, which is the general empirical condition, is not enough to constitute “dialogue”. The word “dialogue” is rather constituted by the “general principle” or constitutive rule “which guides and shapes rational social engagement on the part of human beings” (Waghid, 2003: 9).

“Dialogue”, in terms of Waghid’s (2003: 10-11) conceptual analysis of the concept of education, implies action or behaviour that is directed towards a

certain purpose. To uncover the appropriate meaning of the action of “dialogue” or the action of “education” one has to, in the words of Fay (1975: 72), look at the reasons or logically necessary conditions why a particular act is performed. Offering reasons to explain actions, however, requires “a reference to a wider web of general principles which frame actions – what Fay (1975: 74) refers to as practices” (Waghid, 2003: 11-12). This means, then, that an understanding of actions refers to reasons or logically necessary conditions, which in turn refer to general principles or constitutive rules. Fay (1975: 76) implies that there is a relationship between human actions directed towards a certain purpose, the social practices and the concepts that give direction and intention to these practices, in a society: “ ... just as certain action concepts (like voting and teaching) implicitly contain within themselves a reference to an intention, and just as to understand an action one must understand its intention, so also to understand an action one must understand the practice which it embodies.” An important task of conceptual analysis, in terms of the interpretive paradigm, is thus to uncover the set of rules which underlies “a given class of actions, to make these rules explicit, and to relate them to other rules in the society” (Fay, 1975: 76). Fay (1975: 76) refers to such underlying rules as “constitutive meanings”:

For if practices constitute the logical possibility of certain classes of actions, then *constitutive meanings* underlie social practices in the same way that practices underlie actions. By a “constitutive meaning” I mean all those shared assumptions, definitions and conceptions which structure the world in certain definite ways (hence ‘meanings’), and which constitute the logical possibility of the existence of a certain social practice, i.e. without them the practice as defined couldn’t exist (hence “constitutive”).

Conceptual analysis, in terms of the foregoing definition of *constitutive meanings*, would then entail efforts to uncover, or making explicit, the constitutive meanings that underlie social practices like teacher education. By

revealing these constitutive meanings the social scientist, in terms of the interpretive paradigm, “explains a given social order by articulating the conceptual scheme that defines reality in certain ways, and in terms of which the actions he views make sense” (Fay, 1975: 78). The articulation of these conceptual schemes is both a philosophical and a conceptual analysis because it tries to reveal the *a priori* conditions which make social experience in a given society what it is (Fay, 1975: 78). Gyekye (1997: 7), like the latter author, also links conceptual analysis to a reflection on the fundamental ideas that underlie human experience: “The critical and systematic examination of the fundamental ideas underlying human experience, involving the clarification of those ideas, is usually referred to as conceptual analysis.”

Why do we need conceptual analysis? The point of doing conceptual analysis is “to get clearer about the types of distinction that words have been developed to designate. The point is to see *through* the words, to get a better grasp of the similarities and differences that is possible to pick out. And these are important in the context of *other* questions which we cannot answer without such preliminary analysis” (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 33). Conceptual analysis has no point unless it is coupled with making some further philosophical issue more manageable (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 34).

Carr (1998: 172) holds that “as changes in social life occur so changes in the meaning of concepts will occur as well.” The reason behind this is that “conceptual structures and social structures are neither separable nor distinct. Concepts are socially embedded and a form of social life is partially constituted by concepts” (Carr, 1998: 172). The differences, for example, between ancient Greek society and modern English society mean that one important way of “understanding the concept of ‘practice’ available to any given historical period would be to uncover the rules governing its use in language and social life” (Carr, 1998: 172-173). Carr (1998: 173) equates the process of conceptual analysis with a philosophical analysis, which has a specific intention:

For if a philosophical analysis can succeed in revealing that the way in which a concept is being used is in need of major modification or revision, then it may thereby assist in the process of changing its everyday interpretation and use. Philosophical analysis of what concepts mean and changing social life are thus not necessarily independent tasks.

Carr (1998: 173) then continues to elucidate why the concept of “practice” needs to be analysed in relation to its historical roots, which was the Aristotelian-era. This helps the mentioned author to illuminate and reveal the appropriate meaning of the concept of “practice”. Gyekye (1997: 7) seems to agree with Carr (1998) about the importance of including a historical examination in the process of conceptual analysis. He refers to the concept of “justice” or “liberty”: “Thus, philosophical analysis or conceptual analysis cannot be undertaken in a social or cultural or historical vacuum; it has an experiential background and connections.” Gyekye (1997: 8) rejects the dominant Western notion that regards conceptual analysis or philosophical analysis as a “purely and wholly a priori intellectual activity.” The mentioned author propagates a conception of conceptual analysis that “makes the philosophical enterprise relevant to the concerns and problems of humankind” (Gyekye, 1997: 8).

Why should conceptual analysis or the philosophical enterprise be “relevant to the concerns and problems of humankind”? This is necessary because human beings live in communities and share desires and aspirations. In dealing with the problems of these communities, which are really anchored in human experience, “attention will necessarily have to be paid to experience, if the conclusions of conceptual or philosophical pursuits are to be relevant to the resolution of some of the issues and problems facing human society” (Gyekye, 1997: 8). How does the latter point, which I support, relate to this dissertation? Wolpe (in Badat, 1992: 33) argues that education policy research can investigate the theoretical foundations of education policies with a view to improve it. A conceptual analysis of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) may reveal much about the conceptual foundations of this new teacher

education policy framework. Is this new teacher education policy framework based on sound conceptual foundations? Will it promote the transformation agenda of the education and training of teachers in South Africa? Are there any conceptual shortcomings in the conceptual foundations of the mentioned policy framework? The answers to these questions may help to substantiate the answer to the central question of this dissertation: Can the Norms and Standards for Educators improve learning and teaching in South African schools? I shall now briefly elucidate how conceptual analysis is related to philosophy of education. This clarification is necessary because both Carr (1998) and Gyekye (1997) refer to conceptual analysis as philosophical analysis, and because the main concern of this dissertation is related to an educational issue.

### **1.3.3.2 Conceptual analysis and philosophy of education**

I shall attempt to elucidate what philosophy of education entails and how conceptual analysis is related to the latter. “Philosophy of education ... draws on established branches of philosophy and brings together those segments of them that are relevant to the solution of educational problems” (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 37). Philosophers of education are, generally speaking, “specifically interested in educational matters and philosophise in order to get clearer about how things are and about what should be done in this particular realm” (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 37). I shall now briefly explain how conceptual analysis, as a philosophical activity, is related to philosophy of education.

The nature, content and processes of education were subjected to philosophical examination throughout the history of Western philosophy. It was during the 20<sup>th</sup> century that academics began to regard philosophical issues as central to education theory and practice in sustained systematic tradition. In the United States, Dewey tried to establish philosophy of education as a study, which “involved the development of experimental schooling inspired by epistemological, ethical and political philosophy” (Waghid, 2003: 5). The serious study of education from a philosophical position, however, failed to develop due



to institutional, sociological and political reasons. Wittgenstein published his *Philosophical Investigations* in 1953. The latter publication, via the influence of his Oxford students, led to a major revolution in philosophy “which shifted the impetus to the adoption of analytic methods in philosophy of education” (Waghid, 2003: 6). R.S. Peters, an already distinguished analytical philosopher, led the launch of philosophy of education in the analytic tradition, at the start of the 1960s in the United Kingdom (Waghid, 2003: 5).

Peters (1966) regarded conceptual analysis as a tool of philosophy of education concerned with making pronouncements on a wide range of educational issues. The nature of education, teaching and learning, curriculum content and education policy formed some of the major themes (Waghid, 2003: 6). It was fashionable among philosophers of education, before the rise of analytic philosophy of education in the late 1950s, to make efforts to deduce educational claims from philosophical premises (Evers, 1998: 120). The latter author refers to educational positions such as empiricism and pragmatism. The following is one example of an educational position taken by empiricism, and from which various deductions were made: “All knowledge produced in good schools is to be universally applied.” Proponents of analytic philosophy of education reject such universal truth claims because it seemed too abstract to be utilised in practical issues (Hirst & White in Waghid, 2003: 7).

“Despite the criticism waged against conceptual analysis as the production of a comprehensive set of conceptual truths about education, such an approach to philosophy of education remains an important philosophical activity in order to understand the use of terms and clarifying what these terms stand for” (Waghid, 2003: 7). Waghid’s (2003) use of conceptual analysis is based on the post-1960 ideas of philosophers of education at the University of London Institute of Education. Their area of philosophical study searches for the “general principles, in accordance with which people do in fact think and behave in their everyday life” (Broad, 1958: 67). “It is within such a tradition of conceptual analysis by understanding, in a Wittgensteinian sense (1953), how a term is used and by

locating it within the social context that it acquires meaning for a particular people, at a particular time and place, without looking for essences or atoms of meaning” (Waghid, 2003: 8). I want to extend Waghid’s (2003) latter argument for the social relevance of conceptual analysis by linking it to the call, by Soltis (1998), for the social relevance of contemporary philosophy of education. I shall only refer to one of the three dimensions of philosophy of education that Soltis (1998: 196-199) outlines in his paper, namely the professional dimension of philosophy of education. Soltis (1998: 199) thinks that philosophers of education have a moral obligation to use their special skills in the public sphere:

We need substantive contact with educational researchers, professional educators of educators and practitioners to keep our minds open to potentially relevant philosophical problems, issues, or ideas. In fact, relevance of what we do to education must be the *sine qua non* of our professional commitment. It cannot be otherwise if we are honestly to call ourselves philosophers of education (Soltis, 1998: 200).

Experienced educators can, with the help and mediation of philosophers of education, “look to philosophy for a broader perspective, a richer understanding, and a more critical view of his or her teaching and of education as a basic social institution” (Soltis, 1998: 202). These educators can, thus, use conceptual analysis to interpret and improve their practices.

### **1.3.3.3 Suggesting an approach to the conceptual analysis of education policy**

How does one approach the conceptual analysis of education policy? The complexity and scope of education policy analysis makes it impossible to use successful single theory explanations. We require a toolbox of diverse concepts and theories in education policy analysis. We need an applied sociology rather than a pure one (Ball, 1994: 14). I shall now outline some of the concepts and

theories with which some authors seek to do a conceptual analysis of official government policies, in general, and of education policy, in particular.

Mitchell (1985) identifies two methodological perspectives in literature dealing with American policy research. The first perspective can be referred to as scientific because of efforts to turn practical policy issues into scientific research problems. The second methodological perspective “assumes that social research is an inherently polyphonic enterprise with several essentially different methods for data-collection, analysis, and interpretation” (Mitchell, 1985: 36). The latter strand of literature has identified several key problems associated with the application of scientific methods to policy problems (Mitchell, 1985: 36).

Mitchell (1985: 36) provides two reasons why a scientific or positivistic model may be an inappropriate instrument for education policy analysis. Policy problems are, firstly, often distorted when they are subjected to scientific analysis. Scientists tend to study what they know how to study- not necessarily what policy makers would like them to study. Scientists, secondly, also tend to *reconceptualise* policy problems to fit the conceptual paradigm with which they approach the explanation of social processes and thus fail to examine the problems identified by policy makers.

Bowe *et al.* (1992: 10) bring to our attention the importance of regarding the policy as a text, in the process of policy analysis. Referring to the British Education Reform Act of 1988, Bowe *et al.* (1992: 10) note that the “translation of educational policy into legislation produces a key text (The Act). This, in turn, becomes a ‘working document’ for politicians, teachers, the unions and the bodies charged with responsibility for ‘implementing’ the legislation.” Barthes (in Bowe *et al.* 1992: 10-11) identifies two types of policy texts, namely “readerly” texts and “writerly” texts. In the readerly text there is the minimum of opportunity for creative interpretation by the reader while the writerly text invites the reader to co-operate and co-author. These readerly and writerly texts “are the products of a policy process that ... emerges from and continually interacts with

a variety of interrelated contexts. Consequently texts have clear relationships with the particular contexts in which they are used” (Bowe *et al.* 1992:12). Although many teachers are proactive “writerly” readers of policy texts, their reading and reactions to such texts are not constructed in circumstances of their own making (Ball, 1994: 18).

Referring to the British Education Reform Act of 1988, Bowe *et al.* (1992: 12) note that this policy text is not capable of only one interpretation because it is being constantly rewritten. This happens, because different kinds of “official” texts and utterances are produced by key actors or agencies of governments. This process puts a whole variety and crisscross of meanings and interpretations into circulation. These variety of textual meanings influence and constrain “implementers”, while their own concerns and contextual constraints generate other meanings and interpretations. Another reason for the different interpretations by teachers is that education policies do not normally tell you what to do. Education policies create circumstances in which the range of options “available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed, or particular goals or outcomes are set” (Ball, 1994: 19). Wexler (in Bowe *et al.* 1992: 13) notes that it is crucial that textual analysis of policy is “critically informed by a political and social analysis that seeks to uncover some of the processes whereby such texts are generated.” “Texts carry with them both possibilities and constraints, contradictions and spaces. The reality of policy in practice depends upon the compromises and accommodations to these in particular settings” (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 15). Fataar (1999: 8) seems to agree with Bowe *et al.* (1992) because he claims that education policy is always the subject of negotiation and compromise. It is, thus, crucial to understand the various contexts in which policy is made.

Bowe *et al.* (1992: 21) expand further on how policy, as a text, should be analysed. Policy is not done and finished at the legislative moment because it evolves in and through the texts that represent it. Texts have to be read in relation to the time and the particular site of their production. The policy text and its

related texts have to be read with and against one another because intertextuality is important. Ball (1994) seems to agree with Bowe *et al.*'s (1992) view about the importance of the intertextuality of education policy texts. The analytical focus on one policy or text may make us forget that other policies and texts are in circulation, and that the enactment of one policy may inhibit or contradict or influence the enactment of other policies (Ball, 1994: 19). Another point is that policy texts themselves are the outcome of struggle and compromise. Policy, in the arena of practice, is not simply received and implemented but is rather subjected to interpretation and then recreated (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 21). Policy writers "cannot control the meaning of their texts. Parts of texts will be rejected, selected out, ignored, deliberately misunderstood ... interpretation is a matter of struggle. Different interpretations will be in contest, as they relate to different interests ..." (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 22). Education policy texts can change things significantly. We should, however, not ignore the way that things stay the same because some policies are subject to creative non-implementation. Changes are different in different settings and different from the intentions of the policy authors (Ball, 1994: 20).

Taylor *et al.* (1997: 15) note that we must regard policy more than just a policy document or text. Policies cannot be analysed simply in terms of the words written in formal documents because one can overlook the nuances and subtleties of the context, which give the text meaning and significance. We need to perceive policies as dynamic and interactive because it is not merely a set of instructions or intentions. The other reason is that policies represent political compromises between conflicting images of how educational change should proceed. The words in the policy text were carefully selected and were often revised in the light of the objections of the various interest groups.

Public decisions, like education policy, are made through the political process, where conflicting groups vie for the supremacy of their value orientations (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 405). Taylor *et al.* (1997) also note that *values* are permeating the policy processes and that our own values are inextricably

linked to the way we might approach policy analysis. How, then, should we approach policy analysis? Taylor *et al.* (1997) outline two approaches to policy analysis. The first approach is referred to as the traditional approach to policy analysis, which emerged in the 1960s to assist governments in the task of policy development. “The policy scientist was not only expected to clarify the possible outcomes of certain courses of action, but also to choose the most efficient course of action in terms of available factual data” (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 17). The problem with this approach was that it was based “on an assumption that decisions in the public sphere could somehow be made in a value-neutral manner- effectively in a way which could avoid or simplify the political complexities involved in public policy making” (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 18). This traditional approach, often referred to as positivistic, largely ignored the issues of power and the ways in which the state might exercise it. Also ignored was the issue of contestation in education by various groups with different interests. In conclusion one may say that policy analysis, in terms of the traditional approach, is supposed to be a rational, positivistic and value-free exercise.

Taylor *et al.* (1997) refer to the second approach as critical policy analysis. This approach rejects the positivist assumption that social scientific knowledge can be value free because “observations are inevitably informed by our theories and values in ways which make any absolute distinction between policy analysis and policy advocacy hard to sustain” (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 18). The very emphasis on key notions such as *efficiency*, by the traditional positivistic approach, at the “exclusion of such other virtues as thoroughness, creativity, imagination and so on, indicates that a particular value is already preferred as more worthwhile than others” (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 19). Taylor *et al.* (1997: 19) motivate their preference for the second approach. Critical policy analysis conceptualises education as a moral idea linked to the concerns of social justice. Education has both individual and social purposes because it seeks both to instil those capacities and qualities in students that help them to lead creative and fulfilling lives and to create conditions necessary for the development of a caring and equitable society. These two purposes converge around the idea of active and informed citizenship.

Berkhout and Wielemans (1999: 407) contend that policy analysis must be committed to the critical analysis of values in current education policies as part of the process of clarifying the *values* that an analyst believes should inform both educational and public policy. This makes education policy analysis a normative as well as a conceptual or theoretical activity.

A very important task of critical policy analysis must be to investigate the ways in which key terms are used, and the extent to which particular policies and practices are consistent with our moral vision for education. The previous statement points to the overtly political nature of critical policy analysis because it is anchored in a particular vision of a moral order. The centrality of the values of justice and participation to education, urges critical policy analysis to pay attention to both the content of the policy and also the processes of policy development and implementation. We need to investigate issues of power and the manner in which power is exercised in the making of political choices, in relation to policy making (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 19-20). It seems as if education policy analysts are heeding this call because Berkhout and Wielemans (1999: 403) claim that education policy studies are increasingly focusing on other, more hidden dimensions of power. Critical policy analysis seeks a better understanding of the often invisible ways in which social interaction is structured and how power is wielded. It also seeks a better understanding of how privileged interests are protected in the organisational context. This is necessary because policy processes reveal both overt and covert power structures (Anderson in Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 404).

It is necessary to investigate issues of power in education policy analysis because education policies “typically posit a restructuring, redistribution and disruption of power relations, so that different people can and cannot do different things ... ” (Ball, 1994: 20). Power, in terms of the policy process, is interactive, multiplicitous and complex. Education policy texts *enter* rather than simply change power relations. This leads to the complexity of the relationship between policy intentions, texts, interpretations and reactions (Ball, 1994: 20). We should,

however, not solely analyse the impact of a particular education policy in terms of political power issues. We also need critical reflection on pedagogy and of education's possible and probable role in society. Education policy analysts should not only analyse a particular policy in terms of its educative effect or consequences. They need to become self-reflective by questioning and analysing their own involvement in the process (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 407).

Critical policy analysis can contribute to policy advocacy and also expose the ways in which agendas are set and framed in favour of dominant interests. This type of analysis can identify and overcome obstacles to a democratic planning process. It may also expose the ways in which information provided for consultation might be distorted or false or misleading. Berkhout and Wielemans (1999: 404) assert that education policy and political analysis can be regarded as a source of influence that could be used to shape the political process of which education policy analyses are deemed to be part of. These processes, however, are only possible if the nature of the context in which particular policies are made and implemented are clarified. A lack of an understanding of the context in which a policy emerges will make it impossible to understand the policy or to strategise a response to it. Education policy is constructed within three distinct levels, with each needing its appropriate theoretical strategy. The three levels include the economic level, the political level and the ideological level. We also need to analyse the interaction among these three levels (Ball in Fataar, 1999: 2). Critical policy analysis can either contribute to an understanding of an existing policy or either help create pressures towards a new policy agenda (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 20).

Individuals and groups are constrained by the structures of power and domination despite their efforts to construct their worlds to reflect chosen values and interests (Ranson in Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 415). Berkhout and Wielemans (1999: 416) propose an integrative heuristic model that can be utilised for education policy analysis. This model assumes that the education policy process is dynamic, complex, and interactive. The focus is on comparing



and analysing the process involved in the reshaping of education policy. The model consists of six interactive and interwoven contexts, all contributing to policy development, legislation, implementation, and feedback. Context A, which is central to the policy process, represents the interrelated and diverse nature of learning situations (learner-teacher interaction). Context B represents the institutional patterns in which all learning situations are embedded in a particular community. Context C represents education policy at the regional and or national levels and focuses on both formally constituting political institutions and juridical processes and also on implicit structures and patterns, like interactive networks and contesting discursive practices. Context D represents the numerous other societal subsystems interacting with the education system, like economic changes and labour market conditions. Context E consists of the role and impact of supranational organisations, like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Context F represents the dominant rationality of Western modernism/industrialisation-technocratisation. We must regard the actors or groups of actors at the different levels of the policy process as “filtering or mediating the process interactively in a discursively developed historical context” (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 418).

Education policy processes should not be studied in a fragmented or isolated fashion. We should view education policy analysis interactively in the context of the broader structural processes of social, cultural, and economic production and reproduction. We should not see education policy analysis as the accumulation of neutral facts “but rather as a reflexive process continuously in need of the reassessment of its own constitutive role in the shaping of the educational future and therefore of the values and purposes of this public domain” (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 418-419).

I tend to agree with Ball’s (1994: 14) suggestion that we must not use successful single theory explanations because of the complexity and scope of education policy analysis. We require a toolbox of diverse concepts and theories in education policy analysis. I intend to utilise most of the concepts and theories

that I have outlined in this section to analyse the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) conceptually. The only exception is the traditional or positivistic approach to education policy analysis, as described by Taylor *et al.* (1997: 17-18), because it ignores issues of power, contestation and values. I tend to agree with the critical policy analysis approach that Taylor *et al.* (1997: 18-19) have explained and which I motivated in this section. This approach will help to explain the political and contested nature of education policies. It will also help to shed light on the issue of values in education policies. The heuristic model of Berkhout and Wielemans (1999) might also be useful to effect my conceptual analysis of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000).

#### **1.3.3.4 Rationales behind a conceptual analysis of education policy**

Nisbet (1985: 9) notes that people have different, but also unrealistic expectations of education policy research. Research has to provide answers to the problems of policy makers and teachers. Research can, however, only perform this function where there is consensus on values. Nisbet (1985: 10) tries to provide a rationale for education policy research. There is an interdependent and interactive relationship between research, policy and practice. There is a need for education policy research. We also need critiques and an ordering of concepts which may appear to be academic scholarship but which are essential for the analysis of policy or practice. Policy researchers can influence policy decisions through informing and persuading those with responsibility for action (Nisbet, 1985). Coleman (in Nisbet, 1985: 11) argues that social policy research is most often used by those without direct control over policy, who challenge the policies of those in positions of authority.

Biddle and Anderson (1991: 8) also try to explain the rationale behind education policy research or policy analysis and claim that social research leads to theoretical knowledge. Even though its theoretical insights are never ultimately “proven” the basic purpose for conducting research is to gain those insights.

Because concepts, propositions, and explanations are the building blocks of theory, we can assume that social research generates *theory*. Research generates *theory* because this term reminds us of the tentative nature of social research knowledge. It also helps us to avoid the “fact” assumption of the simple impact model. This approach also suggests that most research impact comes about because users become aware of theories generated through social research (Biddle & Anderson, 1991: 12).

Badat (1992: 37) provides a possible rationale for education policy research in post-Apartheid South Africa. Progressive academics and researchers can contribute to the transformation of the social order by moving into the sphere of policy research. By this they will help to create a new and fundamentally just social order in South Africa. Badat (1992: 29) argues that progressive policy researchers can do much to advance the transformation agenda in South Africa because “some kinds of research, like policy research, are specialist activities and academics and researchers possess particular skills which need to be harnessed in the service of social transformation.” Badat (1992: 33) is also very clear about the political accountability of these progressive policy researchers:

If progressive academics and researchers are not simply to be ideological and political functionaries of the liberation movement they must be given space for critical work. This work may sometimes challenge received positions of the democratic movement. The value of the autonomy of the researchers is precisely their ability to pose questions which the democratic movement itself may, for a number of reasons, be unable to reflect on.

Wolpe (in Badat, 1992) argues that policy research can investigate the theoretical foundations of policies with a view to improve them. In conclusion, then, one might say that the rationale for policy analysis by progressive policy researchers is that they can promote the transformation agenda in post-Apartheid South Africa in a few ways. The first way is to help improve existing policies by

challenging the theoretical foundations of such policies. The second way is by reflecting critically on the political priorities of new policies. The third way is by posing questions for reflection, in terms of research priorities.

#### **1.4 Outline of chapters**

Chapter One introduces the study and also outlines the background to the study. It spells out the problem statement and the focus of the study. The literature review and scope of study provides further background to the reasons for the study. The theoretical framework explains the research methodology that I intend to utilise for the study. The research methods to be utilised for this study are also outlined in Chapter One. I have briefly outlined what my research method, conceptual analysis, entails by looking at constitutive meanings of the concept. I also tried to briefly explain how and why the concept of “conceptual analysis” has developed, and how the latter is connected to philosophy of education. Moreover, as part of this dissertation’s goals and theoretical points of departure, I suggest an approach to the conceptual analysis of education policy, such as the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). I have, lastly, made an effort to provide rationales for the conceptual analysis of education policy in post-apartheid South Africa, particularly in relation to the central concern of this dissertation.

Before starting a conceptual analysis of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators, it is necessary to outline constitutive meanings of the concept of “education policy”. This is necessary because the conceptual analysis of the mentioned policy framework, which is an education policy framework, is the main concern of this dissertation. Chapter Two, thus, attempts to uncover constitutive meanings of the concept “education policy”. A literature review has revealed the following constitutive meanings of the concept of “education policy”: education policy structures and guides government actions; education policy represents the temporary settlements of the contestation between diverse and competing social forces; education policy is a

text that is open to different interpretations; education policy is a discourse; education policy is a continuous political process. The latter constitutive meaning of the concept of “education policy” necessitated a closer look at factors that impact on the policy-making process. This closer examination of impacting factors may enhance our understanding of the concept of “education policy” and, perhaps, help to illuminate a conceptual analysis of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). The political nature of the education policy-making process, as revealed by the last constitutive meaning of the concept of “education policy”, has motivated me to make a case for a deliberative democratic approach, along the lines of Benhabib’s (1994) model of deliberative democracy, to the education policy-making process. Such an approach, I argue, may lead to more inclusivity, in terms of dissenting voices, in education policies and may improve the transformative potential, as intended, of education policies such as the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). Chapter Two will help to set up the theoretical framework that will be utilised for a conceptual analysis of the Norms and Standards for Educators policy and also the answering of the dissertation’s main question: Can the Norms and Standards for Educators improve teaching and learning in South African schools?

Another point is that South Africa’s new competency-based teacher education framework originated within a certain historical context. Why does South Africa need this new teacher education policy framework? Chapter Three tries to answer this question. The historical period under consideration stretches from the 1980s to 2000. Chapter Four seeks to extract constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation from a literature review. This literature review has revealed or uncovered the following constitutive meanings of “teacher education transformation”: deliberation can assist teacher education transformation; local cultures and contexts need to be respected; it is difficult to change the roles and identities of teachers; teacher education has shifted from being university-based to being largely school-based; teachers should be reflective practitioners; teachers should be lifelong learners; student voices should be recognised in

teacher education. The second section of Chapter Four illuminates four possible conceptual gaps within the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), which may impede the transformation of teacher education in South Africa. The first of these conceptual gaps relates to a lack of detail on how student educators should be trained to be reflective practitioners. The second conceptual gap in the mentioned policy framework, relates to the lack of detail on how the recognition of student voices is to be realised at teacher education institutions. Another conceptual gap relates to the possible perception, by the latter policy framework, that all the contexts for teaching practice are homogenous. The fourth conceptual gap relates to the false assumption, by the mentioned policy framework, that educators will be able to change their roles and identities very easily. In the last section of Chapter Four I argue for a reconceptualisation of teacher education. I argue that deliberation, along the lines of Benhabib's (1994) deliberative democratic model, may be helpful in attempts to bridge the conceptual gaps that are alluded to in the previous section. This is argued for in relation to the main question of this dissertation, which is about the potential of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) to improve teaching and learning in South African schools. Bridging these conceptual gaps may improve the potential of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) to transform teacher education and improve teaching and learning in post-apartheid South African schools.

Chapter Five extends the arguments I make in the previous chapters. The first section of this chapter effects a conceptual analysis of the following concepts: "education"; "teacher"; "teaching" and "teacher education". A conceptual analysis of these concepts is necessary because the uncovering of their appropriate meanings may help to illuminate the constitutive meanings, in the following section, of teacher education in South Africa in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). In exploring constitutive meanings associated with teacher education policy, like the mentioned policy framework, the following constitutive meanings of teacher

education in post-apartheid South Africa were extracted from a literature review: the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) provides an authoritative standard or model for the development of learning programmes and qualifications for educators for employment purposes; the notion of applied competence and its associated assessment criteria forms the cornerstone of assessment in post-apartheid teacher education; preset and inset educators should be reflective practitioners; teacher education institutions must recognise student voices; teaching practice is an essential feature of teacher education; educators should be lifelong learners; local needs and cultures and contexts must be respected; existing teacher education practice must be transformed. These constitutive meanings of teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa are explored in relation to the main question of this dissertation, which is concerned about the implications, of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), for teaching and learning in our schools.

I finally argue that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), because of the identified conceptual gaps, may be an inappropriate policy framework to guide the transformation of teacher education in post-apartheid South African society. Policy alone cannot lead to the latter transformation. More engagement about teacher education policy, which is supposed to lead to transformation of teacher education, is needed between the government, educational leaders, policy-makers and the other policy actors, like teachers, bureaucrats and teacher education institutions. This necessary engagement, I argue, can be facilitated by a deliberative democratic approach to the issue of teacher education transformation in post-apartheid South Africa.

The final chapter makes an effort, in the context of the arguments and extracted constitutive meanings of the mentioned concepts discussed in previous chapters, to outline the implications of my research findings for teaching and learning in post-apartheid South African schools. This is done in relation to the central question of the dissertation: Can the new competency-based teacher education

policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators, improve teaching and learning in South African schools? The limitations of this research and the possibilities for further research are also outlined in the final chapter.

### **1.5 Summary**

The problem statement and focus indicated that this dissertation intends to explore constitutive meanings of South African teacher education in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). My contention is that teachers are expected to perform certain roles in relation to changing education policy frameworks, but might not necessarily be equipped to do so.

The literature review revealed that research should begin to focus on the implementation of new education policies and that it may be necessary to generate alternative policies in the new South Africa. The literature review also revealed certain problems with competency-based teacher education policy frameworks that were utilised in the USA and the UK during the 1970s and the early 1980s. This leaves question marks over South Africa's new competency-based teacher education policy framework because of some similarities with the discredited UK framework of the 1970s. There is some skepticism about whether our new teacher education policy framework will improve teaching and learning in South African schools.

A conceptual policy analysis of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) may reveal much about the theoretical foundations of this new teacher education policy framework. Is this new teacher education policy framework based on sound theoretical foundations? Will it promote the transformation agenda of the education and training of teachers in South Africa? Are there any shortcomings in the theoretical foundations of this



new policy framework? The answers to these questions will help to substantiate the answer to the central question of this dissertation:

Can the new teacher education policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators, improve learning and teaching in South African schools?

The ultimate objective of a conceptual analysis of education policies or education policy research, then, is to improve existing policies and also practice, by examining the concepts and conceptual schemes that underpin these policies and which shape these policies.

## CHAPTER TWO

### 2. CONSTITUTIVE MEANINGS OF EDUCATION POLICY

#### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter seeks to uncover constitutive meanings of “education policy”. To do the latter we need to employ conceptual analysis, as outlined in Chapter One of this dissertation. When we analyse a concept like education policy, that is, to uncover constitutive meanings of such a concept, we examine the principle or principles that govern the appropriate use of such a word. If we can make these governing principles explicit we have uncovered a concept. These governing principles can also be referred to as logically necessary conditions (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 30-31) for the use of the word “education policy”.

It is, however, not enough to search for logically necessary conditions so that the appropriate meaning of a concept, like “education policy”, can be uncovered. It is also necessary to uncover constitutive meanings of the mentioned concept, in relation to a social practice, like education (Hirst, 1998: 392), in which these constitutive meanings are embedded. This process is necessary because these constitutive meanings shape and guide the practice in which it is embedded. It is these constitutive meanings, which we must uncover or reveal through conceptual analysis, that make the practice what it is. Without these constitutive meanings the practice, like farming (MacIntyre, 1981: 177) and education (Hirst, 1998: 392), couldn't exist (hence “constitutive”) (Fay, 1975: 76). Constitutive meanings refer to “all those shared assumptions, definitions, and conceptions which structure the world in certain definite ways (hence ‘meanings’), and which constitute the logical possibility of the existence of a certain social practice ...” (Fay, 1975: 76). By revealing these constitutive meanings, in terms of the interpretive paradigm, I shall hopefully explain a given social order by articulating the conceptual scheme that defines reality in certain ways (Fay, 1975: 78).

The following constitutive meanings of the concept of “education policy” were extracted from a literature review: education policy structures and guides government actions; education policy represents the temporary settlements of the contestation between diverse and competing social forces; education policy is a text that is open to different interpretations; education policy is a discourse; education policy is a continual political process. These constitutive meanings will be fully explored in the next section. The term policy, in this chapter, refers to official government policies in general and more specifically to official education policies, as promulgated by government. This is done because education policies are usually part of a government’s public policy frameworks. What does the concept of ‘education policy’ entail? The next section shall address this important question.

## **2.2 Constitutive meanings of the concept of education policy**

What is policy and how does one define this concept? Recent attempts to define the term *policy* range from broad and simple statements like ‘what governments do and say’ to complex lists of characteristics requiring several pages to explain (Mitchell, 1985: 30). Taylor *et al.* (1997) also note that defining policy is not an easy task. Policy analysts, of education policy, more often than not fail to define conceptually what they mean by policy. The meaning of policy is taken for granted (Ball, 1994: 15). For Ball (1994: 15) “much rests on the meaning or possible meanings that we give to policy; it affects how we research and how we interpret what we find.” I shall now briefly discuss constitutive meanings of the concept of “education policy” that I have extracted from a literature review.

### **2.2.1 Education policy structures and guides government actions**

Mitchell (1985:30) claims that approaches to the definition of policy differ along two basic dimensions. Policy definitions, firstly, differ in their assumptions about governmental involvement in social conflict and cooperation. Some approaches

assume that governments are primarily cooperative *social service agencies* (helping to achieve social goals that would be impossible to reach through private actions alone). Some approaches see governments as pre-eminently *conflict management mechanisms* (mediating and controlling social conflicts that would otherwise be overly destructive) (Mitchell, 1985: 30). Policy definitions, secondly, differ with regard to whether governmental actions are thought to support the achievement of social purposes *directly*, or only to fulfill social purposes *indirectly*, by stimulating or restraining the actions of private citizens. The intersection of these two sets of assumptions about the role of government, produces four generic conceptions of governmental action and hence four different definitions of policy (Mitchell, 1985: 30-32).

The first conception of defining policy is referred to as *Structuralist* conceptions. These conceptions define policy as what governments do, why they do it, and what difference it makes (Mitchell, 1985: 30). Structural theories propagate the view that public policies can produce a proper distribution of political power. This will help to eliminate social conflict or lead to a resolution of such conflict. Equity is a primary social value in structural theory. An inequitable distribution of power may result in destructive social conflict. Structural theory, therefore, considers policy “primarily as a vehicle for allocating power to individuals or groups with legitimate right to exercise it and conversely, limiting the power of those whose interests are less legitimate” (Mitchell, 1985: 31). The second way of defining policy, in terms of conceptions of governmental action, is referred to as *Functionalist* conceptions. One exponent of functionalist conceptions, Freidrick (in Mitchell, 1985: 31), defines policy as “a proposed course of action of a person, group, or government within a given environment ... to reach a goal or realise an objective or a purpose.”

Functional theory sees government as doing something about the general welfare, rather than merely protecting the rights of various individuals or groups. *Quality* as a central public value is, therefore, given prominence in functional theory. Functionalists also emphasise rationality in policy analysis. The third way

of defining policy is referred to as *Exchange theory*. Exchange theorists conceptualise policy as a vehicle for indirect influence over conflict by controlling the conditions for citizens's *private choices* and believe that the government that governs best governs least (Mitchell, 1985: 32). *Interactionist theory* is the fourth way of defining policy in terms of conceptions of governmental action. Interactionists see policy as indirect encouragement of *cooperative* action by private citizens. They also believe in the importance of ideological and symbolic leadership by governmental policy makers and assume that policy has its effect by "controlling how individuals and groups *define the problems* they face" (Mitchell, 1985: 32). Typical interactionists define policy as the "conscious attempt of officials, legislators, and interested publics to find constructive responses to the needs and pathologies which they observe in their surrounding culture" (National Academy of Education in Mitchell, 1985: 32). Mitchell (1985: 33) claims that this definition assumes that policy is conscious, and that it is concerned with constructive responses to problems. The result is expected to be voluntary cooperation among citizens.

I want to end this section with a closer look at what education policy, in the light of the previous discussion of official government policy definitions, entails. The political nature of official governmental policies, because of the latter's aim to structure and guide government actions, are also found in the following definition of education policy by McLaughlin (in Waghid, 2002: 1): "Education policy can be considered a set of political decisions which have been taken by those who exercise power ... through a prescription of actions aimed at changing educational institutions or practices." Waghid (2002: 1-2) claims that this explanation of education policy accentuates at least three main aspects. The first aspect is that education policy is formulated by those who exercise power. The second aspect is that education policy is a set of justifiable prescribed actions. Education policy is, thirdly, a coherent framework for implementation in education systems aimed at bringing about change (preservation or adjustment).

### **2.2.2 Education policy represents the temporary settlements of the contestation between diverse and competing social forces**

There are also other perspectives on how to define policy. Harman (in Taylor *et al.* 1997: 24) defines policy as:

the implicit or explicit specification of courses of purposive action being followed or to be followed in dealing with a recognised problem or matter of concern, and directed towards the accomplishment of some intended or desired set of goals. Policy also can be thought of as a position or stance developed in response to a problem or issue of conflict, and directed towards a particular objective.

Taylor *et al.* (1997: 24) criticise Harman's definition of policy. They believe that Harman's definition appears to give the impression that there is general agreement when policies are generated. The other apparent impression is that policies are implemented in a straightforward and unproblematic way. This leads to an oversimplified way of viewing policy. The definition creates the impression that society is underpinned by a value consensus. Another impression is that the various institutions in society contribute to the ongoing stability of the whole. Taylor *et al.* (1997: 24) propagate a view of policy that differs from Harman's view. They claim that society consists of competing groups who have different values and different access to power. This last factor necessitates a definition of policy, which reflects the political nature of policy as a compromise, which is struggled over at all stages by competing interest groups.

Another point of critique is that Harman's definition is imbued with functionalist ideas and also reflects a positivistic approach to solving policy problems. Policy problems are too complex to be solved in simple technicist ways (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 24). The third point of critique is against the courses of action outlined in Harman's definition. These courses of action do not sit in a simple linear relationship with each other. Knowledge from practice may be used to make

ongoing changes to the policy text. Policy processes are often complicated by the reality that they are occurring at a number of levels and within a number of arenas (Fulcher in Taylor *et al.* 1997: 24). Berkhout and Wielemans (1999) also believe that the policy process is ongoing and more contradictory. The following definition by Kenway (in Taylor *et al.* 1997: 32) of policy is, in my view, more in line with the political nature of policy: “Policy represents the temporary settlements between diverse, competing, and unequal forces within civil society, within the state itself and between associated discursive regimes”.

### **2.2.3 Education policy is a text that is open to different interpretations**

Policies are contested in and between the arenas of formation and implementation. Different parties and processes are involved in the construction of the policy text and its implementation. The opportunity, however, for reforming and re-interpreting the text mean policy formation does not end with the legislation of the policy because a plurality of readers necessarily produces a plurality of readings of any text (Codd in Ball, 1994: 16). Generation and implementation are continuous features of the policy process, with generation of policy still taking place after the legislation has been effected. These different contexts of policy recreation are connected directly by their varying capacities to effect the work of each other (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 14). Referring to the British Education Reform Act of 1988, Bowe *et al.* (1992: 19) note the following:

Consequently, even with a highly detailed piece of legislation on the statute books, educational policy is still being *generated and implemented both within and around the educational system* in ways that have intended and unintended consequences for both education and its surrounding social milieu.

The “intended and unintended consequences” that Bowe *et al.* (1992) refer to can be linked to Ricoeur’s (1981) conception of hermeneutical interpretation of texts. Ricoeur (1981: 139) claims that “writing renders the text autonomous with

respect to the intention of the author. What the text signifies no longer coincides with what the author meant; henceforth, textual meaning and psychological meaning have different destinies.” This situation arises when discourse passes from speaking to writing. The “intended and unintended consequences” of the British Education Reform Act of 1988 has led to a situation, as Bowe *et al.* (1992) put it, in which teachers, Local Education Authorities (LEAs) and parents are interpreting, re-interpreting and recontextualising policy and applying it to their particular contexts. Ball (1994: 16) is also of the opinion that authors of education policy cannot control the meaning of their texts. This happens because the policies themselves, the texts, are not necessarily clear or closed or complete and because the policy texts are the end-product of compromises at various stages. We cannot predict or assume how policy texts will be acted on in every case in every setting, or what their immediate effect will be (Ball, 1994: 18).

Policy implementation does not happen automatically. This happens because bureaucrats give their own meanings and interpretations to the intended policies. They can change or subvert the policy maker’s original intentions (Fataar, 1999: 6). Berkhout and Wielemans (1999: 412) claim that one of the “original assumptions of policy studies, namely, that legislation would ensure enactment or implementation according to the intentions espoused by the policy, has increasingly become questioned.” The translation of policy into practice operates on the assumption that administrators at various levels have to interpret the wishes of the policy makers by generating rules and regulations. The implementation process is further complicated by contradictions caused by competing bureaucratic factions within governmental education departments. It is the teachers, however, who have to eventually translate the rules and regulations into actual classroom practice on a day-to-day basis (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 412). Educational bureaucrats and teachers act as filters for the policy that is being transformed into programmes and practice. These people contest the policy from a variety of historical developments and contexts. Policy as text contains divergent meanings, contradictions, and structured omissions, so



that it produces different effects (Raab in Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 413). Different readers will decode the policy text in different ways. In the end these readers will construct different meanings of the policy text, depending on the contexts in which they read the policy text (Codd in Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 413). The micropolitical processes of schools provide the milieu for this recontextualisation of education policy (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 413) and possibly the construction of the “unintended consequences for both education and its surrounding social milieu”, which Bowe *et al.* (1992: 19) refer to. The previous statements possibly points to the limited power of the state to linearly effect change through official education policy because the power of the state is “circumscribed by the contextual features of institutions and the struggle for meaning” (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 413).

#### **2.2.4 Education policy is a discourse**

The policy process, in terms of the notion of a continuous policy cycle and the notion of policy recontextualisation, consists of three interrelated contexts (Bowe *et al.* 1992). The *context of influence* is the first context. This is where public policy is normally initiated and also where policy discourses are constructed. It is in this domain that interested parties struggle to influence the definition and social purposes of education. Policy concepts are established within this context and it is also where these concepts acquire currency and credence. It is these concepts that provide a discourse and lexicon for policy initiation. I shall now briefly discuss the construction of “policy discourses”. The construction or production of these policy discourses is closely related to issues of power. Policy ensembles or collections of related policies exercise power through a *production* of “truth” and “knowledge”, as discourses (Ball, 1994: 21). Foucault (in Ball, 1994: 21) claims that discourses are practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak. Discourses do not identify objects, but rather constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention.

Discourses are “about what can be said, and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority. Discourses embody the meaning and use of propositions and words” (Foucault in Ball, 1994: 21). Discourses, thus, enable the construction of certain possibilities for thought and the ordering and combination of words in particular ways. Other combinations are displaced or excluded at the same time by these discourses (Ball, 1994: 21-22). The powerful effect of these discourses is that it makes us take up the positions that are constructed for us within education policies. We can think of education policy ensembles, in Foucault’s terms, as “regimes of truth” through which people govern themselves and others (Ball, 1994: 22). “Each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true ... ” (Foucault, 1980: 131). There are manifold relations of power, which permeate, characterise and constitute the social body. These relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation, and functioning of a discourse. Power cannot be exercised without a certain economy of discourses of truth, which operates through and on the basis of this association. “We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth” (Foucault, 1980: 93).

Education policy, as discourse, changes the possibilities we have for thinking otherwise. It also limits our responses to change, and enables our misunderstanding of what education policy really is because we misunderstand what it does. Policy discourses can lead to the redistribution of voice so that only certain voices can be heard as meaningful or authoritative (Ball, 1994: 23). This last statement links up with Bowe *et al.*’s (1992) claim about the establishment of education policy concepts within the *context of influence*. It is these education policy concepts that provide a discourse and lexicon for education policy initiation.

### **2.2.5 Education policy is a continual political process**

Badat (1992) also refers to the political nature of defining policy. Prunty (in Badat, 1992: 18) contends we must see policies as the authoritative allocation of values. This allocation highlights the centrality of power and control in the formulation of official government policy. We also need, in the light of the previous view, “to consider not only whose values have become institutionalised, but also how these values have become institutionalised” (Badat, 1992: 19). This is necessary because Prunty (in Badat, 1992: 19) claims that “policy is the legitimation of values”. Education policy, according to critical policy sociologists, represents a political commitment to a set of social ideals that are constructed in deeply contested ideological and political processes. This view regards education policy as the authoritative allocation of values and as the operational statements of values (Kogan in Fataar, 1999: 3). The previous definition of education policy points to the possibility that any government chooses to favour the institutionalisation of certain values over others. This choice over values leads to questions about whose values are embodied in policy and how it has become dominant (Fataar, 1999: 3).

How does the policy-making process work? Kruss (1998) draws a distinction between two common conceptual models of the education policy process. Kruss (1998: 97) refers to the first one as a “rationalist” model of policy-making. This model assumes that policy-making is essentially a rational process, which operates through classic steps, from formulation through implementation. The educational problem is seen as one, which requires technical solutions. Policies are seen as blueprints which exist prior to action, and which are implemented on the external world through a controlled process. It is assumed that this process is based on consensus (Kruss, 1998: 97-98). The second one is regarded as a “political” model of policy-making because this model assumes that policy is the authoritative allocation of values and that policy-making is thus essentially a political activity (Kruss, 1998). “In this model, understanding power relations,

conflict and contestation is crucial to understanding the nature of policy” (Kruss, 1998: 98).

I believe that the policy-making process proceeds more in line with the political model. I say this in the light of the previous section that highlighted the political and contested nature of education policy. Fataar (1999) also refers to the rationalist and the political models of policy-making, and also to the centrality of power relations, conflict and contestation in shaping education policy. The discussion that follows now will lend some weight to my view that the political model provides a better explanation of the policy-making process.

Policy analysts, according to Mitchell (1985: 33), distinguish between four stages in the policy-making process. The first stage entails the initial articulation of policy interests or demands. The next stage involves deliberation, modification and aggregation of support for various proposals. Priority setting and allocation of resources to particular policies occur during the third stage. The last stage entails follow-up oversight of policy implementation. These four stages point to the possibility that the policy-making process is more complex, interactive and multi-layered. Taylor *et al.* (1997: 24-25) claim that policy is much more than a specific policy document or text. Policy must be regarded both as process and as product. Policy, in such a conceptualisation, may include the following processes: (1) the production of the text itself; (2) ongoing modification to the text, and (3) processes of implementation into practice.

In emphasising policy as process in addition to policy as text, Taylor *et al.* (1997: 25) have highlighted the political character of both the process and the text. Their position differs substantially from those who prescribe a rational approach to policy making. Rational approaches usually require a set of chronological steps in policy development. Most policy in reality, however, is developed in a more disjointed, less rational and more political fashion. Rein's (in Taylor *et al.* 1997: 26) three-stage conceptualisation of the policy process also seems to highlight the political nature of the latter. Problem setting occurs in the first stage. The

mobilisation of the fine structure of government action happens during the second stage, while the final stage entails the achievement of settlements in the face of dilemmas and trade-offs among values. These “trade-offs” are manifested in the actual policy text. Policy-processes are, thus, inherently political in character and involves compromises, trade-offs and settlements. Policy is more than the policy text because policy also involves processes prior to the articulation of the text and the processes, which continue after the text has been produced (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 28). The policy text that the agencies of the state issue becomes the vehicle of communication between the agents within the process and can be interpreted as expressions of political intention (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 410).

Bowe *et al.* (1992: 7) try to shed some light on the policy-making process in Britain and note that policy generation is detached from implementation. Policy studies have generally encouraged a “linear” conception of policy. This, I believe, is more in line with the “rationalist” model of policy-making. The following discussion will lend some substance to Bowe *et al.*’s (1992) view and my inference about the policy-making process in Britain. The policy-making process in Britain during the 1980s was fragmented (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 7). The old partnership between the Department of Education and Science (DES), the local education authorities (LEAs) and the teachers pulled apart and was substituted by a fragmented policy process in which the new policy makers appeared remote from the educational scene. This separation of the policy generation process from the implementation process culminated in the Education Reform Act of 1988. This act gave the DES and the Secretary of State extensive new powers to direct the work of LEAs and schools (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 7). British teachers, thus, have been excluded from the production of the Education Reform Act of 1988. Bowe *et al.* (1992:10) claim that such a state control model, which is top-down and linear, distorts the policy-making process and serves the “powerful ideological purpose of reinforcing a linear conception of policy in which theory and practice are separate and the former is privileged”.

The third context is the *context of practice*, the arena of practice to which policy refers. Policy is not simply received and implemented within this arena but is rather subjected to interpretation and then recreated (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 19-21). Referring to their analysis of the Victoria Participation and Equity Programme in Australia, Rizvi and Kemmis (in Bowe *et al.* 1992: 22) note that “all aspects of a program may be *contested* by those involved in a program, moreover a program is formed and reformed throughout its life through a process of contestation.” Critical policy sociologists seems to agree with the latter view about the contestatory nature of the policy process because they view policy as being constantly formulated and reformulated subject to interaction at various stages by key policy participants and stakeholders. We can think of education policy as fundamentally a socio-political practice over which different interest groups struggle and attempt to give it meaning (Fataar, 1999: 7).

This contestation is the result of practitioners coming to the practice with their own histories, with experience, with values and purposes of their own. They have, thus, vested interests in the meaning of policy. The different histories, experiences, values, purposes and interests which make up any arena will lead to different interpretations of policies (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 22). We are confronted both with different interpretations of policy and interpretations of interpretations at all stages in the policy process. These reinterpretations of interpretations spread confusion and “allow for play in and playing off of meanings” (Ball, 1994: 17). This results in the opening and re-opening up of gaps and spaces for action and response. The text that arrives at the school eventually, thus, has an interpretational and representational history (Ball, 1994: 17). Badat (1992) seems to agree with Bowe *et al.*'s (1992) notion about the continuous nature of the policy-making process. The policy-making process can be conceptualised as a circular process. Social forces start the process by setting agendas for policy-making. Agenda setting leads to policy formulation and then to policy adoption. Policy is implemented during the next stage. “The *evaluation* of implemented policies leads to *new agendas being set*, and the cycle begins again” (Badat, 1992: 21). The conclusion, then, is that the policy process is one of complexity

and one of policy-making and remaking. It is often difficult and impossible to control or predict the effects of policy. To understand why the education policy-making process is so complex and why it is difficult and impossible to control or predict the effects of education policy, it may be necessary to briefly reflect on the factors that impact on the education policy process. The following section shall deal with this effort to illuminate the complexity of the education policy process. This may help to reveal the appropriate meaning of the concept of “education policy”.

### **2.2.5.1 Reflecting on the factors impacting on the education policy process**

What are the factors that impact on the education policy process? Biddle and Anderson (1991: 3) note that modern educational systems are subjected to repeated calls for change or reform and that the interests of specific groups are reflected in most of these calls. Most calls involve assumptions about the potential effects of innovations. In most cases those assumptions are not backed by research. Biddle and Anderson’s (1991) view may indicate that policies are supposed to serve the interests of certain groups in society. Policy processes are inherently political in character and involve compromises, trade-offs and settlements. There are competing interests in the policy process and policies represent compromises over struggles (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 26). Another point is that policies are never value free. Power and control are central in policy processes. There will always be political struggles over whose voices will be heard and whose values will be reflected in policies (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 27). Ball (in Taylor *et al.* 1997: 27) seems to echo the latter view because he notes that policies “embody claims to speak with authority, they legitimate and initiate practices in the world and they privilege certain visions and interests.”

I want to shed some light on the nature of the “political struggles” or contestation in the policy process. Contestation is involved right from the moment of appearance of an issue on the policy agenda, through the invitation of action to the inevitable trade-offs involved in formulation and implementation.

Contestation is also played out in regard to whose voices are heard and whose values are recognised or authoritatively allocated in the policy and which groups ultimately benefit as a result of the policy (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 28-29). Only certain influences and agendas that are regarded as legitimate will benefit from this authoritative allocation. The policy will then only voice these certain influences and agendas (Ball, 1994: 16).

What is the impact of the state on the policy process? Offe (in Taylor *et al.* 1997: 30) claims that the state plays a special role in capitalist societies in the policy process. The state has to balance irresolvable tensions between the need to ensure, on the one hand, that the economy continues to function in a satisfactory fashion so that state revenues can be generated, and the need for the state, on the other hand, to respond to political and democratic demands upon it for coverage. The state can never solve this delicate problem. The state simply comes to settlements, which seek to manage the tensions between the *accumulation* and *legitimation* functions of the state. The state structures “mediate the policy process, ‘determining’ to some extent what issues get on the policy agenda and how, the policy options available and policy outcomes” (Offe in Taylor *et al.* 1997: 30). The state is, thus, important in theorising policy. The latter is an ongoing process because policies have their own momentum inside the state. This happens because purposes and intentions are reworked and reoriented over time. The problems faced by state change over time. Different actors and different interest groups represent policies differently (Ball, 1994: 17). The state’s power to enforce its will through promulgated education policy is, however, increasingly regarded as strongly circumscribed by contextual forces, more covert manifestations of power and dominant discursive patterns (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 408).

Governments have had to construct policies, which attempt to respond effectively to the demands of a more complex society and interest groups who have become more assertive. Governments have utilised education policy as a bureaucratic instrument to administer the expectations that the public has of



education (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 3). The political work of organised social movements over the past thirty years have lead to significant changes in educational policies. Another factor impacting on the policy process is the change in the economic structure of most Western countries since the 1980s (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 3). During the 1960s and early 1970s welfare state education policies focused on the provision of greater equality of educational provision. However, the economic difficulties that most Western countries experienced since the mid-1970s have led to calls for alternative ways of funding and organising education. The 1980s saw the rise of the current neo-liberal economic system in most Western countries, with its emphasis on educational reforms and cutbacks in state expenditure. What is the impact of the new neo-liberal economic system on education policy? Global economic restructuring has led to calls for the creation of an educational system more responsive to the changing labour market needs of nations (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 4).

Donn (1998) takes the last point further and notes that the latter quarter of the twentieth century has seen the development of an international policy-making climate, which is characterised by market rules of engagement. The qualifications frameworks of New Zealand, Scotland and South Africa, which are seen by policy-makers as solutions to economic and educational problems, are firmly located within global economic and political contexts, within an international policy climate characterised by “market rules of engagement” (Kruss, 1998: 67). The rise of the neo-liberal global economic system has, thus, led to the current changes in the international discourse on education. Kallaway (1998: 20) tries to explain the impact of the changes in the international discourse on education in the more developed countries of the North (e.g. the USA and Britain) on education policy formulation in the less developed countries of the South (e.g. South Africa and Zimbabwe). The South’s educational objectives are being defined in terms of the neo-liberal global discourse of the North because of the re-ordering of the international discourse on education in the 1990s. These educational policy discourses of the North appears to have been effective in subordinating many countries of the South to a new

domination of educational codes and assumptions imported from the industrialised North. “The globalisation of the language and practices of the qualifications frameworks, learning profiles and outcomes-based education (OBE) ... now constitute a new international and almost hegemonic set of policies and practices” (Kallaway, 1998: 20). I think Kallaway refers to the almost overpowering effect of policy discourses (see remarks by Ball in the previous section) on alternative policy views because it displaces and excludes other voices and visions that differ.

Berkhout and Wielemans (1999: 406) also refer to the impact of global economic restructuring on education policy during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Values relating to economic development have been brought to the forefront of the education policy discourse. There are other factors, besides global economic restructuring, that are responsible for a changed policy climate in education. A second factor is technological changes. Changes in social attitudes towards authority have, thirdly, created new pressures on education. The last factor concerns the development of powerful social movements that have developed over the past few decades and their demand for democratic engagement in policy processes (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 4). The next section shall reveal how this demand for democratic engagement in education policy processes could possibly be realised. I shall also try to motivate why this engagement may be necessary in the education policy process.

#### **2.2.5.2 The education policy process: in defence of deliberation**

I now turn my attention to the demand by powerful social movements for “democratic engagement in policy processes” which have developed over the past few decades. How should this “democratic engagement in policy processes” proceed? I shall mainly refer to the proposals of Benhabib (1994) and her deliberative democracy model. The idea of decision making by discussion among free and equal citizens, or deliberative democracy, is having a revival (Elster, 1998: 1). Benhabib (1994) argues that modern and complex democratic societies

have to secure three public goods. The first public good is legitimacy. Economic welfare is the second public good, while a viable sense of collective identity is the last public good in today's complex democratic societies has to attain. Not attaining one or a collection of these public goods would cause a crisis in societies. Critics of current democratic institutions provide some reasons for their assessment that current arrangements are undermining the most important principles of democracy. The first reason is that contemporary political practices are based on a politics of self-interest that produces social fragmentation and permit an unequal distribution of social and economic power that persistently disadvantages the poor and the powerless. Contemporary political practices, secondly, presuppose institutions that depend almost entirely upon merely aggregative, episodic, and inflexible forms of decision-making and that leave deep structural problems of social and economic renewal unresolved. "Out of all these diagnoses comes the same remedy: public deliberation" (Bohman, 1996: 1).

Benhabib's (1994) paper is concerned with the attainment of the public good of legitimacy in modern democratic societies. Legitimacy in complex and modern democratic societies can result from the free and unconstrained public deliberation of all about matters of common concern. The previous statement may point to the possibility that a public sphere of deliberation about matters of mutual concern is imperative for the legitimacy of democratic institutions (Benhabib, 1994). The arguments advanced by Habermas and Rawls seem to have a common core: "political choice, to be legitimate, must be the outcome of *deliberation about ends among free, equal, and rational agents*" (Elster, 1998: 5). Before going further I would like to offer an account of deliberation:

... the notion includes collective decision making with the participation of all who will be affected by the decision or their representatives: this is the democratic part. Also ... it includes decision making by means of arguments offered *by and to* participants who are committed to the values of

rationality and impartiality: this is the deliberation part  
(Elster, 1998: 8).

Benhabib (1994) proposes a solution to the problems or dilemmas that Rosseau (in Benhabib, 1994) raises in his theory of democracy. Rosseau (in Benhabib, 1994) raises the paradox of democratic decision-making. How do we handle factional self-interest versus the common good? In the best interest of who or in the common good of whom will democratic decisions be made? For Rosseau (in Benhabib, 1994:29) there is no answer to this paradox:

If the will of the people is the source of all legitimacy, then it can also fail in rationality, for the judgement which guides the people is not always right, nor do the people always know what is in their own interest.

Rousseau's (in Benhabib, 1994: 30) theory about democratic legitimacy shows a disjunction between rationality and legitimacy and also between the articulation of the common good and people's sovereignty. The challenge is how to reconceptualise the hiatus between rationality and legitimacy that is articulated by Rousseau's theory. A deliberative model of democracy is a possible solution to the legitimacy-rationality dilemma of Rousseau's theory because the procedures of deliberation "generate legitimacy as well as assuring some degree of practical rationality" (Benhabib, 1994: 32). Bohman (1996: 2) seems to agree with the previous view because he claims that more deliberation may be an effective response to the demand for a more rational political order in which decision-making at least involves the public use of reason by free and equal citizens. The latter process can enhance the legitimacy of decisions because citizens (and their representatives) will be encouraged to test their interests and reasons in a public forum before they decide. The deliberative process can enhance the legitimacy of decisions by forcing citizens to justify their decisions and opinions by appealing to common interests or by encouraging participants to argue in terms of reasons that might be acceptable to all (Bohman, 1996: 5).

The discourse theory of democracy of Habermas explains the rationality of deliberation in terms of ideal reason-giving procedures because the exchange of reasons takes place in a *discourse* in which “participants strive to reach agreement solely on the basis of the better argument, free of coercion and open to all competent speakers” (Bohman, 1996: 7). This means that deliberation is not limited to a community of like-minded citizens. It is a “public” rather than a “collective” or a group-specific activity (Bohman, 1996: 8).

There are three reasons for the essentiality of deliberative processes to the rationality of collective decision-making processes. The first reason is that new information is imparted. Deliberative processes, secondly, lead to critical self-reflection on already held views and opinions. Deliberative processes can also lead to changes in opinions/ views/ preferences and considering the common good (Benhabib, 1994: 32). The latter process can occur because deliberation draws citizens out of their parochial interests and instills community-mindedness. Deliberation also increases the amount and variety of data that inform collective decisions (Stokes, 1998: 136). Deliberation can take place in various public spheres, including political parties, social movements and voluntary associations. A crucial aspect of the deliberative model of democracy is the idea of “a ‘public sphere’ of opinion-formation, debate, deliberation and contestation among citizens, groups, movements and organisations in a polity” (Benhabib, 1994: 39). Warren (2002: 174) seems to agree with Benhabib’s (1994: 39) idea of “a public sphere of opinion-formation, debate, deliberation and contestation among citizens” because he propagates the idea that deliberation about matters of common concern “should not be restricted to political representatives, judges, media pundits, technocrats and other elites, but should infuse a society so structured that it underwrites ongoing processes of public opinion-formation and judgement.” Proponents of deliberative democracy emphasise the interaction between institutionalised processes of deliberation and those that occur within society. Democracy can be revived and expanded in a piecemeal way by utilising many of the political forms that already exist. Constitutional procedures,

associations, social movements, decentred party structures and public spheres can also be utilised to revive democracy. It is necessary to focus on non-state forms and venues of democracy because state-centred democratisation is running up against limits imposed by market capitalism, scale and increasing complexity (Warren 2002: 174-176).

Benhabib's (1994) paper outlines a deliberative model of democracy, which incorporates features of practical rationality. Practical rationality makes free public deliberation about matters of mutual concern to all possible. Deliberative democracy is rational because of five reasons. It, firstly, imparts information. Deliberative democracy also leads to changes in opinions and revision of preferences. The latter two processes can occur because deliberation induces individuals to give due consideration to their judgements. This will enable them to know what they want, but also to understand what others want. The deliberative process will also enable them to justify their judgements to others as well as to themselves (Warren, 2002: 173). The deliberative process, thirdly, leads to the formulation of conclusions, which can be challenged publicly for good reasons. Discourse, according to Habermas (in Bohman, 1996: 40), becomes the medium of public deliberation. Discourse, in Habermasian terms, refers to second-order communication about communication. This reflective level of communication makes it possible for a speaker to clarify his claims or to provide reasons for his views, in response to a hearer's request for this. Citizens coordinate their everyday activities via the mechanisms of communication, by rejecting or accepting claims or offers made in speech. "Discourse is thus a social mechanism for coordinating action ... " (Bohman, 1996: 41). The fourth reason is that it allows self-referential critique of their own uses and abuses. Deliberative democracy, lastly, takes place within a multiple, anonymous, heterogenous network of many publics and public conversations (Benhabib, 1994: 44).

The practical aim of deliberative democracy is a more extensive form of democracy because it creates a greater scope for public decision-making and

self-rule. This can only be achieved if some social conditions are corrected because large social inequalities are irreconcilable with public forms of deliberation in egalitarian institutions. Pluralism and complexity may also be possible impediments to the ideal of deliberative democracy. The latter idea must, however, be rejected because pluralism and complexity may promote free, equal, and rational deliberation in vibrant and cosmopolitan public spheres (Bohman, 1996: 21). Deliberative democracy can succeed if collective judgements can be shifted from the forces of power and money in modern societies, in Habermasian terms, to the forces of talk, discussion and persuasion or the force of deliberation. Deliberative democracy can help to repair torn social fabrics and to create new social relations where the old ones have failed. In this way deliberative democracy can generate its own kind of social adhesive. Habermas refers to the latter as “communicative power” (Warren, 2002: 178 & 180). Deliberative democracy can help to structure political conflict so that it might be settled “through the force of communicative influence rather than through the forces of money or coercive power” (Warren, 2002: 181). The outcomes of such a process should be more “legitimate, more rational and more ethical than any other possible political arrangement” (Warren, 2002: 189).

The deliberative democracy model may be, in the light of the political and contestatory nature of the education policy making process, an appropriate mechanism for the construction of education policy that will be eventually “more acceptable” and “more legitimate” to most of the actors that are involved in the education policy process. A deliberative democracy approach may lead to a discourse that enable more inclusivity and less to the exclusion of dissenting voices. It may also mediate the contestation that is involved in the policy process so that the end-result may be education policies which give voice to the values and interests of the majority, if not all, citizens. This may lead to the implementation of education policies as the policy authors intended to and to less recontextualisation and to less creative non-implementation of education policies.

### **2.3 Summary**

This chapter has extracted the following constitutive meanings of the concept of “education policy” from a literature review: education policy structures and guides government actions; education policy represents the temporary settlements of the contestation between diverse and competing social forces; education policy is a text that is open to different interpretations; education policy is a discourse; education policy is a continual political process. To illuminate the latter constitutive meaning I have briefly outlined the factors that may impact on the education policy-making process. I have also made a case for the utilisation of deliberation, as a means to structure the education policy process so that dissenting and different voices and values may also be included in promulgated education policies, and so that education policies can achieve their intended objectives.



## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **A BRIEF HISTORY OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA FROM THE 1980s TO 2000**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter tries to provide a brief history of teacher education in South Africa from the 1980s to 2000. How was teacher education conducted in South Africa in the 1980s and 1990s? The answer to this question may reveal the motivation behind South Africa's latest teacher education policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). Before proceeding with this process I shall attempt to motivate the inclusion of the historical context in education policy analysis or education policy research. Here I shall rely on the ideas of Kallaway (2002). Kallaway (2002) posits that a history of education may help us to understand and critique educational policy. Historical research can, at best, reveal the complex, contradictory reality that policy-makers have to somehow accommodate and transform. A historical perspective may help to suggest which education policy frameworks have a chance of succeeding and which are completely inappropriate (Kallaway, 2002). I shall attempt to provide a brief history of the development of teacher education policy frameworks in South Africa. I start with a closer look at the Education and Training Act of 1980 and conclude with the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000).

#### **3.2 Motivating the inclusion of the historical context in a conceptual analysis of education policy**

Kallaway (2002), in his introduction to a new publication about the history of South African education under apartheid from 1948 to 1994, attempts to provide a case for the inclusion of a history of education in education policy analysis or education policy research. A knowledge of apartheid education may be central to

the understanding of the overall apartheid project. Our grasp of apartheid education, however, remains limited and fragmentary. We must review the nature of history of education as part of the wider enterprise of educational research (Kallaway, 2002: 3).

It was through a study of the works of Malherbe, Pells and also Horell that Kallaway (2002: 3) tentatively began to grasp the significance and fascination of the history of education under apartheid and its potential importance for the understanding and critique of educational policy. Historical research can, at best, reveal the complex, contradictory reality that policy-makers have to somehow accommodate and transform. A historical perspective may help to suggest which education policy frameworks have a chance of succeeding and which are completely inappropriate. A history of education should enable us to answer key questions about the nature of apartheid education and the opposition to it over time (Kallaway, 2002: 6). Scholars, elsewhere, have shown “the potential of historical analysis in demonstrating the implications of particular political settlements for education and in making important linkages between policy in the past and present” (Kallaway, 2002: 6). These writers “have managed to stimulate debate and clarify questions relating to the success and failures of past policies in promoting democracy and equity” (Kallaway, 2002: 7).

A history of South African apartheid teacher education may reveal how apartheid education policies were adjusted over time to accommodate critiques both from inside and from outside the ruling National Party. It may also reveal the extent of the continuity and innovation of these policies represented at various times and in different contexts. “If ‘the limits and the possibilities of the transformation’ to a new democratic order are to be properly understood, ‘it is essential that we understand the political and educational ... routes travelled and the vehicles used’ to arrive at the present situation. In reforming apartheid education it is vital to understand where we have come from and what it is that requires change” (Kallaway, 2002: 10). A history of education may help us to critically assess the nature of contemporary changes in education policy and to understand our

practices in historical and comparative perspective. Fataar (1999: 8) seems to agree with Kallaway (2002) because he claims that education policy is always the subject of negotiation and compromise. It is, thus, crucial to understand the various contexts in which education policy is made. Education policy texts can be better understood when it is read in relation to the time and the particular site of their production (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 21).

### **3.3 A brief history of teacher education in South Africa from the 1980s to 2000**

A new statute, the Education and Training Act, replaced the Bantu Education Act of 1953 and the Bantu Special Education Act of 1964 on 1 January 1980. The Act tried to do away with some of the worst aspects of previous legislation. The new act dropped the designation Bantu and replaced it with black. School boards were relieved of the duty of hiring and dismissing black teachers. The latter processes became the domain of the new Department of Education and Training (Samuel, 1990: 23). The 1980s started with student unrest in African and coloured schools (Gaydon, 1987). In April 1980 coloured students in schools in Cape Town protested against the inferior quality of education and its generally inadequate provision. The protest spread to the rest of the country and also to the universities. "The events of 1980 exposed the depth and extent of the educational crisis in South Africa. It also underlined the failure of the educational system to realise its political objectives" (Samuel, 1990: 24-25). This widespread student unrest prompted an educational policy shift from the ruling National Party in 1980. In 1980 the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) was requested by the cabinet to investigate education at all levels and to recommend a programme to make education of equal quality available to all races. Professor J.P. de Lange headed the investigation committee (Gaydon, 1987). Samuel (1990: 25) seems to agree with Gaydon (1987) because he also claims that the requested HSRC investigation was a direct response, from the state, to the events of 1980.

The De Lange Report that was released in 1981 stressed the need for a body of well-trained teachers and urged the government to focus on training African teachers (Gaydon, 1987: 6). The report stated that a corps of well-trained and talented teachers, provided with education of equal quality, are needed to realise the potential of the country's inhabitants, to promote economic growth, and to improve the quality of life of all inhabitants (Pillay, 1990: 37). The report recommended that matriculation or an equivalent qualification be the minimum entrance requirement for teacher training and that the minimum period of training be three years. These recommendations were endorsed by the government's White Paper on the report. The government accepted the proposal that the qualifications of all teachers should be uniform and promised to do everything in its power to increase African teacher training. "Since then it has made progress in reducing the African teacher backlog, but these efforts are unlikely to achieve racial parity in both teacher-pupil ratios and teacher qualifications in 10 years" (Gaydon, 1987: 6-7). The latter efforts of the National Party government can be seen as part of a new educational agenda in South Africa at the start of the 1980s. The De Lange Report can be regarded as the basis of the construction of this new educational agenda and also as "an attempt to patch together some form of acceptable consensus on educational reform and development" (Nasson, 1990: 50). The De Lange Report appears to be an attempt to define what arguments, ideas, and strategies should be regarded as legitimate, and normal and acceptable part of a reformist educational discourse. The report favoured a vision of incremental educational reform and has, thus, set the parameters within which authorised solutions to problems are allowed to emerge (Nasson, 1990: 50).

The number of African teachers has increased dramatically between 1980 and 1984, from 95 501 to 137 522 (44%). There was, however, still a severe African teacher shortage. The African teacher-pupil ratio (1 to 41,2) was still double of that in White schools (1 to 18,6) in 1985 (Gaydon, 1987: 7). By 1985 most of the African teacher training colleges were situated in the non-independent homelands (28 to the 9 in white designated areas). The government has, since its

1980 commitment to equal education, reduced the backlog in the supply of African teachers significantly. The shortage dropped from 73 143 in 1980 to 55 668 in 1984. This represents a decrease of more than 17 000 (Gaydon, 1987: 8). The shortage of African teachers is one obstacle in the way of parity. The huge number of underqualified African teachers is the other obstacle. Many educationists contend that the quality of teachers produced by the African colleges is well below that of White teachers. The poor quality of the African teaching force is a greater obstacle to equality than the backlog in teacher numbers (Gaydon, 1987: 11-12). Pillay (1990: 37) also refers to the poor quality of the African teaching force and its impact on the quest for equality and claims that the “pattern is a vicious circle of poorly qualified teachers, producing poorly qualified pupils who in turn go on to become poorly qualified teachers.” The problem of the poor qualifications of the majority of teachers is a more critical problem than the numerical shortage of African teachers. South Africa was, thus, confronted with a teacher crisis in Black education both in terms of numbers and in terms of quality of teachers, in the 1980s (Pillay, 1990: 39-40).

In 1981 the minimum basic qualification for both primary and secondary school teachers of all races was changed to matriculation plus three years of professional training (M+3). Before 1981 African training colleges accepted students with less than a matriculation certificate and offered a two-year as well as a three-year training course (Gaydon, 1987: 12). The minimum requirement for the first teacher certificate for Black primary school teachers were two years of teacher training, for candidates with a Standard Six Certificate (Nkabinde, 1997: 35). The latter situation continued until 1983. The increase in standards was welcomed, but few African teachers, however, possessed M+3. Statistics from the Department of Education and Training (DET) estimated that some 70,2 % of teachers in its system were underqualified in 1985 (Gaydon, 1987: 12). A DET official confirmed, during a private interview, that about 4000 teachers who were qualified to teach in primary schools only were teaching in secondary schools during 1985. This DET official added that his department was making every effort to improve their qualifications (Gaydon, 1987: 13).

Educationists doubt whether qualifications gained within the segregated African training system are equal to those in the White system. Their opinion is based on the belief that the African colleges produce teachers, particularly primary school teachers, of a lower quality than those for other races. The other reason has to do with the poor quality of the training staff at these colleges. Many aspirant African teachers are products of an inferior education system and are thus unlikely to be as competent as their white counterparts. The inferiority of segregated African education is likely to be perpetuated unless “trainee teachers are offered a training which enables them to overcome the disadvantages of their schooling- a training which, it appears, is not offered in the segregated African colleges” (Gaydon, 1987: 13-14). Nkabinde (1997: 35) also agrees with the perception that the training of Black teachers is inferior to that of other racial groups. The DET has increased the amount budgeted for teacher training dramatically from R 14,5 million in 1981/82 to an expected R 46,3 million in 1986/87. This R 32 million increase has, however, achieved only limited progress towards parity. The African teacher training system was still characterised by a shortage of qualified teachers and training facilities in the 1980s, despite much-increased government spending. At the same time, white teacher colleges became increasingly underutilised because of declining demand for teachers in white schools (Gaydon, 1987: 15-16).

Nkabinde (1997) also tries to shed some light on the progress towards the improvement of the poor qualifications of many Black teachers in South African towards the end of the 1980s. According to Baine and Mwamwenda’s (in Nkabinde, 1997: 34) report of the situation in 1988, 17 percent of South African primary school teachers in Black schools outside the homelands and 28 percent in the nonindependent homelands were not qualified. The report also observed that approximately 51 percent of the teachers in the senior secondary schools and 63 percent of the teachers in the junior secondary schools, in the then homeland of Transkei, were given roles beyond their qualifications, even though a majority had been qualified to teach at lower levels (Nkabinde, 1997: 34). Thus, at the end

of the 1980s, we had many Black teachers teaching at secondary level despite their lack of qualifications for that level. They were also not qualified to teach specialised subjects such as mathematics and science. Nkabinde (1997: 34) regards well-trained teachers as a central component in the educational process and argues that all proposals for improving education must go hand-in-hand with high-quality teacher development in order to enhance that process.

The 1990s started off with the release of Nelson Mandela from prison and the unbanning of the African National Congress (ANC). The National Education Coordinating Committee (NECC) conducted a research project, the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), between December 1990 and August 1992. The main objective of this research project was to interrogate policy options in all areas of education “within a value framework derived from the broad democratic movement” (NECC, 1992: vi). Teacher education in South Africa was one of the areas that were thoroughly investigated by one of the research groups. This report, which was released in 1992, provide some insight into the state of teacher education in South Africa, in the 1980s, and also proposes some policy options for teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa.

The NEPI Teacher Education Report (NECC, 1992: 1) claims that apartheid teacher education has limited the capacities of South Africa’s teaching corps. “Teachers are primary agents in education. A teaching corps of quality and substance is thus a necessary condition for educational transformation. This makes teacher education and development the pivot of a coherent and viable national policy” (NECC, 1992: 1). The report, in the light of the previous considerations, recommends that the “overarching aim for teacher education policy should be to improve the quality of the teaching corps in South Africa” (NECC, 1992: 1). This improvement is necessary because the report revealed that teacher education was characterised by fragmentation, difference, and discrimination, and no coherent teacher education policy or plan for national development. The teacher education system was organised broadly along ethnic

lines, and controlled by fifteen different ministries in terms of different acts, during the 1980s and the early 1990s (NECC, 1992: 4-5).

The National Party government has also, during the early 1990s, attempted to reconstruct the education and training agenda in South Africa. The state's policy directions for education and training were outlined in state documents published during 1991: *Educational Renewal Strategy (ERS)*, *Educational Realities in South Africa* and *A Curriculum Model for Education in South Africa (CMSA)*. The framework of the ERS guiding principles for a new education model contained the state's proposals for teacher education. Several of these principles coincide with the NEPI guiding principles, superficially. No consideration is, however, given to the principles of non-sexism and redress. Centralisation and rationalisation are two dominant policy principles in the ERS recommendations for planning and provision of teacher education (NECC, 1992: 34-35). The ERS proposes the establishment of distance teacher education on a national basis as a strategy for retraining. "Although the ERS acknowledges that South Africa's teacher training programmes will require fundamental review, its recommendations are timid, vague, and very general" (NECC, 1992: 36). The ERS also does not appear to have a policy position on the professional development of teachers (NECC, 1992: 37).

The NEPI Teacher Education Report claims that the proposals from the state, private sector, and the World Bank have a major weakness. This major weakness has to do with their failure to take cognisance of the political context of education policy and practice. This has resulted in the conception, of both the shortcomings in teacher education and their possible solutions, as largely technical matters. Although equity concerns are central throughout, state proposals marginalise the need for redress (NECC, 1992: 55-56). The report also highlighted the deep disparities in the duration and quality of pre-service South African teacher education and in teacher supply on a regional basis, at different levels, and for different subject areas. According to the report, some 30 000 teachers are unqualified, while another 45 000 have less than matric. Women



predominate in both groups, which are concentrated in the rural areas. The bulk of rural colleges and many urban ones are ill-equipped to respond to the demands of transforming the country's teacher education system. Another problem is the breakdown of learning in many schools. This has debilitated the limited efforts of colleges to provide student teachers with adequate practical experience (NECC, 1992: 66).

The NEPI Report regards future educational policy in South Africa as part of a broader policy framework for social, political, and economic reconstruction. The repeal of all legislation currently impeding the development of a coherent national policy for the provision of teacher education must be regarded as an urgent matter, particularly in the light of the NEPI principles of non-racism, equality, and national unity (NECC, 1992: 68 & 70). The report also, like the ERS, proposes a national system of distance teacher education as a strategy to address the serious problem of mainly black unqualified and underqualified teachers (NECC, 1992: 73-75).

The contribution of the NEPI reports to meaningful education debate, policy research and analysis, and also the experience gained during the NEPI process were enhanced with further work on education policy research through the establishment of the Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD). The CEPD, after a period of consultation and discussion, published the African National Congress's (ANC) *A Policy Framework for Education and Training* (ANC, 1994), prior to the elections in January 1994. The latter policy framework informed the newly elected ANC-government's education and training discussion document, which was published at the end of 1994 (Sedibe, 1998: 271-272). In 1994 a Committee on Teacher Education Policy (COTEP) was appointed to advise the Council of Education Ministers and the Heads of Education Departments Committee (HEDCOM) on teacher education policy (Sedibe, 1998: 271). The Department of Education (1995) gazetted the Education White Paper 1 on Education and Training in February 1995. This was the official government framework for the restructuring of the education system in line with

the Constitution (Sedibe, 1998: 272). Post-apartheid South Africa has been bombarded with new education and training policy frameworks. The White Paper on Education and Training (Department of Education, 1995), which Gultig (1999: 56) regards as the cornerstone policy document of the new education and training dispensation, describes the “paramount” post-apartheid educational task as building:

... a just and equitable system which provides good quality education and training to learners young and old throughout the country ... Appropriate education and training can empower people to participate effectively in all the processes of a democratic society, economic activity, cultural expression, and community life, and can help citizens build a nation free of race, gender and every other form of discrimination.

This “paramount” task reveals a certain educational policy tension in The White Paper on Education and Training (Department of Education, 1995): “balancing the *political* imperative to transform the philosophy and ideology which underpins South African education while at the same time fulfilling an *economic* imperative, namely developing and managing a system that will educate/train more competent workers” (Gultig, 1999: 56). South Africa’s educational transformation is, thus, driven by internal socio-political *transformation* imperatives (redressing apartheid inequalities in education, work opportunities and political power), on the one hand, and by external economic *efficiency* imperatives (meeting the challenge of rejoining a globalised world economy that requires a skilled and productive workforce that can compete globally), on the other hand (Gultig, 1999: 57). Morrow and King (1998: xiv) also refer to these two imperatives, which seem to be in tension with each other, that are driving the educational transformation in South Africa. Two significant shifts away from this “holism” had, however, already begun by 1995. The White Paper, firstly, “cements the shift – that had begun with the National Education Policy Investigation (1993) – away from a strongly transformative, interventionist, and socialist “people’s education” to an essentially humanist, liberal and non-

interventionist understanding of education and of education's role in society" (Gultig, 1999: 57). The second shift refers to the White Paper's failure, in the light of its rhetoric for the integration of education and training, to operationalise this integration in a combined Department of Education and Labour (Mahomed in Gultig, 1999: 57). This lack of systemic integration is likely to perpetuate the current understandings of education as "theoretical knowing" and training as "practical skilling". Teaching and teacher education are being constructed within this discursive environment (Gultig, 1999: 57-58).

One of the key recommendations of the Education White Paper 1 on Education and Training (Department of Education, 1995) was the need for a teacher education audit (Sedibe, 1998: 272). The national Department of Education officially initiated the teacher education policy process in 1994. The CEPD coordinated this process, in 1994, in the form of a National Audit on Teacher Education (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996). The audit consisted of the following six components: distance education institutions, colleges of education, universities and technikons, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), departmental in-service teacher education and teacher supply, demand and costs. The audit was driven by two objectives. The first objective was to develop an analysis of teacher demand, supply and utilisation. The second objective was to evaluate institutions that offer teacher education, the profile of their staff, governance structures and the quality of teacher education programmes, both pre-service education and training (PRESET) and in-service education and training (INSET) (Sedibe, 1998: 273-274).

The old education departments had operated INSET and PRESET separately without an up-to-date database. The development of teachers was also undertaken without any knowledge of teacher demand, supply and utilisation. The audit can be regarded as the first comprehensive review of teacher education institutions and programmes. It was also the first piece of work undertaken by government to review the development, supply and utilisation of teachers in a continuum of relations. The audit has made the Department of Education aware

of the quality of teacher education programmes, the classroom backlog, the shortage and turnover of teachers in scarce subjects (Sedibe, 1998: 274). The audit revealed how deeply apartheid had divided and undermined teacher preparation. The inherited system is characterised by racial and ethnic divisions (Pendlebury, 1998: 334).

The apartheid education system dispersed the responsibility for teacher education over a large number of education authorities. The system also differentiated along racial and ethnic lines. Colleges of teacher education were not classified as part of higher education with universities and technikons, but rather as part of the school-college sector. This, in many respects, meant that state control and provision of teacher education paralleled state control and provision of primary and secondary education. Apartheid and the urban-rural divide created huge disparities across institutions and sectors in almost every aspect of teacher education. The system as a whole paid little heed to concerns of quality, efficiency and cost-effectiveness (Pendlebury, 1998: 335).

The Audit Reports looked back at past practices and forward to emerging ones. The audit revealed a sharp divide between pre-service teacher education (PRESET) and in-service teacher education (INSET). Another audit revelation is the concentration of disadvantaged student teachers at institutions least well equipped to prepare them for their work as teachers, for example, at dysfunctional rural and “township” colleges and “correspondence” universities (Pendlebury, 1998: 335). The audit statistics shows that 89% of the registrants at state colleges of education, during 1994, were African students. Many of these students had no long-term commitment to teaching and had entered a college as their only affordable route into higher education. More than 80% of registrants in teacher education courses at distance universities and colleges, were Africans. The audit condemned many of these latter institutions for ill-conceived courses, inadequate attention to the demands of practice and little or no academic support for disadvantaged learners (Pendlebury, 1998: 335).

By 1994 private agencies and NGOs had broken the state monopoly on teacher education and development. Colleges of education and universities formed partnerships. These partnerships represented a significant re-configuration of institutional and political space. Such partnerships altered patterns of decision-making because colleges were required to establish college councils and senates with representation from a range of stakeholders. In this way significant areas of control were moved away from provincial departments of education. As a result of these developments university-associated colleges were able to enjoy a fair degree of autonomy, with opportunities for teacher educators to become agents of change through curriculum innovation and a wider choice of assessment procedures (Pendlebury, 1998: 335). This was not the case for the majority of colleges. The DET exercised control over virtually every aspect of college life and work at Black colleges. DET colleges had to follow a curriculum set and examined by the DET. In the DET colleges especially, but also in others, the structure, content and timing of the pre-service curriculum served to harden the boundary between school and college (Pendlebury, 1998: 336).

The Committee on Teacher Education Policy (COTEP) was charged with three tasks. The first task was to conduct a situational analysis of all South African teacher education institutions. The second task was to develop a national qualification framework for teachers. The third task of COTEP was to propose national governance structures for teacher education. The first task resulted in the National Teacher Education Audit. In an unprecedented move, COTEP commissioned a consortium of independent researchers to conduct the Audit (Pendlebury, 1998: 336). The National Teacher Education Audit (NTEA) (Department of Education, 1996) contained the first officially expressed criticism of South Africa's allegedly over-theoretical teacher education. The authors of the *Synthesis Report* of the NTEA, Hofmeyr and Hall, claims that practice will improve if teachers are exposed to more practice and less theory (Gultig, 1999: 60).

An appendix to the *Synthesis Report* of the NTEA, *Criteria for Analysis of Teacher Education in South Africa*, proposes that teacher education should increasingly occur as INSET (Hofmeyr & Hall in Gultig, 1999: 60). *International Best Practice: Research Evidence on Effective PRESET and INSET*, which is another appendix to the *Synthesis Report* of the NTEA (Hofmeyr & Hall in Gultig, 1999: 60), recommends a relatively brief period of PRESET, with the systematic provision of INSET, as the most cost-effective way to improve the quality of education in the developing world. As a solution to the poor quality of teaching in South Africa an “alternative” model, consisting of a mix of shorter initial teacher education and a distance education year incorporating the best international practices of open learning, should be developed (Hofmeyr & Hall in Gultig, 1999: 60). The NTEA’s *Colleges of Education Sector Report* (Department of Education, 1996) claims that college curricula are too theoretical and underpinned by an inappropriate pedagogy. The curriculum should be more practice-based and more responsive to actual experiences in the classroom.

COTEP also organised a series of local and international conferences for stakeholders to deliberate on the Audit’s findings and make recommendations for a White Paper on Teacher Education. Apartheid jeopardised possibilities for negotiating collective identities and futures across differences. Stakeholder forums on the Audit, as well as forums on new norms and standards for teacher education and development have opened space for this kind of negotiation. These forums have stimulated genuine public debate and have also enabled a common sense of purpose and principled consensus on broad policy goals (Pendlebury, 1998: 337).

The second task of COTEP resulted in the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, gazetted as national policy in September 1995. After further stakeholder forums COTEP released the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education in 1996. In this new teacher education document apartheid’s discourse of duty and obedience to authority has been displaced by a discourse of rights

and professional autonomy (Pendlebury, 1998: 338). Teacher education should enhance the capabilities of prospective teachers to deal with human rights issues and to become “autonomous, flexible, creative and responsible agents for change in response to the educational challenges of the day” (COTEP, 1996: 10). Teachers are seen as makers of democratic citizens, and not so much as purveyors of knowledge (Pendlebury, 1998: 338).

COTEP (1996) present the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education as a radical paradigm shift from the old criteria for the Evaluation of South African Qualifications for Employment in Education. This new teacher education policy framework moves away from an over-regulated structure and content for teacher education curricula. The first version of this new policy, however, prescribed six fields of study and practice: education, professional studies, major subjects, communication, religious education and teaching practice (Pendlebury, 1998: 339). The Department of Education released a discussion document, Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Training and Development, in 1997. This latter policy document replaces the term “outcomes” with the term “competences”. This is done to bring the curriculum framework for teacher education in line with the rest of the system of outcomes-based education. This development, which constitutes a new evaluative space, means that teachers qualify for employment if they demonstrate the required competences or outcomes (Pendlebury, 1998: 338).

The draft revised Norms and Standards for Teacher Education was subsequently published by the Department of Education in 1998. This latter policy framework emphasised the ends of the new proposed South African teacher education system. The new policy framework also granted considerable more discretion to institutions to decide on how best to accomplish these ends (Pendlebury, 1998: 339). Teacher education programmes, according to the draft revised Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998), will be evaluated primarily on whether they can be shown to prepare teachers for their envisaged roles. Teachers and prospective teachers will likewise be evaluated on

whether or not they are competent to fulfil their envisaged roles. This new policy document proposes the following seven roles: (i) teacher as mediator of learning; (ii) teacher as curriculum and materials designer; (iii) teacher as leader and manager; (iv) teacher as scholar, researcher and lifelong learner; (v) teacher as pastor and care giver; (vi) teacher as learning area specialist; (vii) teacher as citizen and community developer (Department of Education, 1998).

“Teachers, although recognised as crucial to transformation, have also been identified as ill-equipped to meet its challenges” (Gultig, 1999: 58). To improve the latter situation, new teacher education policy such as the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998) has set itself the task of developing a teacher education able to meet the broad education policy outcomes suggested by the White Paper and SAQA: namely, a competent teacher who can think, solve problems, and practice effectively (Gultig, 1999: 58). The aim of teacher education, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998), is to educate teachers to teach effectively within the complexity of the South African context that is undergoing transformation. Teachers must become empowered to become change agents in their schools and communities. “Within this context, efforts to produce effective teachers for our schools involve not only systemic reforms, but institutional and personal change as well. This suggests a transformative role of education and especially of teacher education in society” (Moletsane, 2002: 69-70). Morrow (1996: 152) seems to echo the latter view because he firmly believes that reconstruction “of our country depends on a reconstruction of the education system, and professional teachers are the main agents in this task.”

Gultig (1999: 63-64) claims that the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998) reflects a shift from a deeply humanist and transformative people’s education, as articulated in the NEPI proposals (NECC, 1992) for teacher education in a post-apartheid South Africa, to a rather narrow and instrumentalist notion of learning and teaching, in South Africa. Why has this shift occurred? Globalisation seems to be a major factor in this shift in the



discourse on South African teacher education. The globalisation of economic activity has forced governments to review the future role of the nation state and how it can secure economic growth and shared prosperity (Brown & Lauder in Donn, 1998: 70). Harley and Parker (1999: 181) posit that the “development of an outcomes-based national qualifications framework in South Africa provides an interesting case study of globalisation at work.” The Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998) rest, like the South African Qualifications Act and Curriculum 2005, on two pillars: a national qualifications framework (NQF) and outcomes-based approaches to learning. These approaches to education and training, which have been strongly influenced by similar movements in England, Australia, New Zealand and the USA, “attempts to introduce new forms of economic and social relations that have arisen in advanced industrialized countries. In South Africa, these approaches have been both imported and indigenised in recent education policy discourses” (Harley & Parker, 1999: 181). I shall now briefly outline the reasons behind the changing discourses on teacher education in the international arena. Here I shall specifically refer to the situation in the UK, the USA and Australia, because it is the developments in these countries that have impacted on the conceptualisation of teacher education, in the form of teacher education policy documents like the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998), in post-apartheid South Africa during the latter half of the 1990s.

Near the end of the 1990s teacher education seemed to be more in a state of turmoil than in a state of continuous improvement. In many countries teacher education is under attack (Wideen & Grimmer, 1995: vii). I shall attempt to reveal the rationale behind the changing discourses on teacher education. What are the reasons behind the reforms in teacher education? The reforms of both initial and in-service teacher education in England came about in large measure due to the radical realignment of the partnership among central government, local government agencies, tertiary institutions and teachers in schools themselves. The authority and power for teacher education, in particular, is moving rapidly from higher education institutions to schools as a result of central government

mandate in the form of the Education Reform Act of 1988 (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 47).

One of the major reasons behind the changing discourse on teacher education can be traced to globalisation. Government education documents and reports are now full of the language of the market economy, of choice and competition; and of consumers of education (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 48). The globalisation of economic activity has forced governments to review the future role of the nation state and how it can secure economic growth and shared prosperity (Brown & Lauder in Donn, 1998: 70). “Similar pressures and ensuing discourses are currently developing in education, especially in the global interface of training with education policy” (Donn, 1998: 70). It has been suggested that the most successful economies of the twenty-first century will be in countries that have transformed themselves into learning societies (Donn, 1998: 70-71). The conventional understandings of public education, in many OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) countries, were being challenged by a groundswell of disillusionment with the mass systems of education and training that had been developed earlier in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This intensifying dissatisfaction with established education and training systems was accompanied by a deepening penetration of market mechanisms for the distribution of education. The latter process was reinforced by “an instrumental conception of the goals of education and a sense that unified systems of education and training were appropriate to the work of the new knowledge society” (Morrow & King, 1998: xiii). The changes in England’s education in the 1980s resulted, partly, from a global neo-liberal approach to educational planning and management with a strong emphasis on accountability and standardisation. This approach was often propagated in the rhetoric of the market, which redefined pupils and parents as consumers who could make informed choices (Hedges, 1999: 115).

The second reason relates to a far more powerful and centralised government presence in education. The government has “taken more and more powers for itself in many spheres and changed the role of local authority institutions to one

of being at best merely an arm and agent of central government policy” (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 50). Pimm and Selinger (1995: 50) refer to the latter situation in England as a massive process of nationalisation. In Australia, where each of the eight states and territories have the responsibility to provide teacher education, the federal government has, over the last three decades, demonstrated an increased interest in all phases of education and has influenced state education. The federal government’s huge annual contribution of \$420 million towards teacher education through its operating grants to universities makes it impossible for state organisations to ignore pronouncements on teacher education. One of the federal government’s discussion documents, that illustrate its desire to influence teacher education, encourages teacher educators, other academics, teacher employers and the state governments to reassess the relevance of pre-service and professional development programs to ensure a more rapid response to the changes occurring in the contexts in which teachers work (Tisher, 1995: 35-36).

A third possible reason for the changing discourse on teacher education has to do with changes in society in the 1990s which has created a new context within which teacher education has to be delivered. Radical reform is needed in teacher education because the problems in teacher education have changed little over the last forty years. We have seen substantive and far-reaching changes occurring in society in the 1990s. Despite the gradual building up of these changes “they have coalesced in a way that sets a very different context for schools and for the faculties of education that prepare for those schools. It is difficult to imagine how the old ways of doing business in faculties of education- critiqued so thoroughly and found so wanting- can possibly survive in this new context. Teacher education may have reached a turning point in its history” (Wideen, 1995: 2). Hargreaves (in Wideen, 1995: 3) claims that schools and teachers need to respond to the demands of an increasingly complex and fast-paced postmodern world. The pace of change in society has increased as communication improves, thereby changing the definition of knowledge and also its value in solving problems within an increasingly competitive marketplace. “The uncertainty of

such rapid change, coupled with the sense of competitiveness that comes from the global marketplace invites more players into the decision-making arena. Education has apparently become too important to be left to educators” (Wideen, 1995: 3).

The public criticism of preservice teacher education, in Australia, has “intensified in recent years with calls at both state and national levels, from business, academic and political groups, for a review and a recasting of pre-service preparation programs” (Tisher, 1995: 34). The education employing authorities, politicians and business groups claims that Australian teacher education, like its American counterpart, has a weak and questionable knowledge base, a fragmented and shallow curriculum which provides little intellectual challenge. Many critics regard the changes to Australian teacher education as minimal. These changes do not constitute major changes to pre-service teacher education. The formulation of national school curricula, national standards and procedures for school assessment and basic national qualifications for teachers came about because of concerted national pressures for changes to teaching and teacher education, in Australia, from the federal government, professional associations, and nationwide business and industry groups (Tisher, 1995: 34-35).

A new political ideology, in some countries, has overall, “melded a concern for teacher competence into a powerful new discourse about excellence in education, managerialism, surveillance and new professionalism. ‘Quality control’ is the key ideological concept here- along with the equation of educational excellence with ‘standards and assessment’” (Cowen, 2002: 10). This powerful new discourse has led to the separation of teacher training from universities and the establishment of a state monopoly for the definition and delivery of teacher training on a school-dominated model in England. This historical shift and the current sociological and political processes have resulted from a combination of the “state power with an ideology of managerialism, competence and efficiency movements, and anticipatory socialisation for teachers into school cultures that are themselves dominated by such credos” (Cowen, 2002: 10-11). The new

discourse has already deeply affected the pedagogies and daily practices of schools of education in England (Cowen, 1995: 11).

The National Qualifications Framework (NQF) appears to bridge the “oppositional chasms of the past between apartheid education and people’s education, and between academic education and vocational training. An NQF offers the possibility of extending educational opportunities to the whole population in a way that redress the ravages of apartheid and addresses the social, political and economic future of the country” (Harley & Parker, 1999: 182). Kruss (1998: 96) appears to agree with the latter view because she posits that a central tenet of emerging education policy is that the integration of education and training is desirable, and also necessary, to further the dual goals of equity and redress, on the one hand, and economic growth and development, on the other hand.

Near the end of 1998 the National Department of Education established two technical committees. One of these committees had to revise the Norms and Standards for Educators (Pendlebury, 1998: 336). The work of this committee resulted in the Norms and Standards for Educators, which was gazetted as national government policy in February 2000, by the National Department of Education. “This policy statement derives from the final report produced by the Technical Committee on the Revision of Norms and Standards for Educators, Department of Education, September 1998” (Department of Education, 2000: 9). The latter policy document is the culmination of the work of the Technical Committee over a period of nine months. Their activities included literature and policy review and also intensive consultation with a range of stakeholders. The Committee also drew heavily on the work of others, including the regulations and discussion documents of the South African Qualifications Authorities (SAQA) and the reports of the Education, Training and Development Practices Project (Department of Education, 2000: 9-10).

A central feature of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) is the seven roles that educators are supposed to perform and also the competences that educators have to display, for assessment and qualification purposes. The following seven roles are nearly similar to those in the draft revised version of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 1998): (1) Learning mediator; (2) Interpreter and designer of learning programmes and materials; (3) Leader, administrator and manager; (4) Scholar, researcher and lifelong learner; (5) Community, citizenship and pastoral role; (6) Assessor; and (7) Learning area/subject/discipline/phase specialist. Educators are expected to perform these roles as part of their contribution to the reconstruction project of South African society (Pendlebury, 1998: 33). Each of the seven roles is constituted by the following three competences: Practical Competence; Foundational Competence; and Reflexive Competence. “The seven roles and associated competences for educators for schooling provide the *exit level outcomes*. They are in effect the norms for educator development and therefore the central feature of all initial educator qualifications and learning programmes” (Department of Education, 2000: 12). An educator is supposed, in the role of *Interpreter and designer of learning programmes and materials*, to “understand and interpret provided learning programmes, design original learning programmes, identify the requirements for a specific context of learning and select and prepare suitable textual and visual resources for learning” (Department of Education, 2000, 13). However, whether teachers are actually equipped to do so, is a question for debate.

### 3.4 Summary

This chapter has, in a way, revealed both the nature of teacher education in South Africa and also how teacher education policy frameworks developed, from the Education and Training Act of 1980 through to the latest policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education) of 2000. The brief history of teacher education in South Africa has, somehow, revealed the complex and contradictory reality that the policy-makers of the

Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) have to somehow accommodate and transform.

The Norms and Standards policy framework of 2000 is supposed to be instrumental in transforming various aspects of South African teacher education. The new policy framework has to address, for example, the huge problem of, mainly African, unqualified and underqualified teachers. Tackling the problem of the poor quality of teacher training may be crucial to the effective implementation of the new policy framework. I make the latter point in the light of the expected competences that teachers have to display and also the roles they are expected to perform, for qualification purposes. The new policy framework is also supposed to be instrumental in transforming certain classroom practices. Here I refer to the expected role of the teacher as curriculum and materials designer (Department of Education, 2000: 13). Under the previous dispensation, curriculum and subject specialists in governmental education departments usually performed this role. It remains to be seen whether teachers, who have previously received designed curricula and designed materials, will be able to perform this role. I say this in the light of the huge numbers of unqualified and underqualified South African teachers.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **CONSTITUTIVE MEANINGS OF TEACHER EDUCATION TRANSFORMATION**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

In this chapter I explore constitutive meanings (Fay, 1975: 76) of teacher education transformation. These extracted constitutive meanings, from a literature review, are then used to help me examine, by means of a conceptual analysis, the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) in relation to the main question of this dissertation. Constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation refer to all those shared assumptions, definitions, and conceptions which structure teacher education transformation in certain definite ways (hence “meanings”). Without these constitutive meanings, according to Fay (1975: 76), a concept, like “teacher education transformation”, could not exist (hence “constitutive”). By revealing or uncovering these constitutive meanings, in terms of the interpretive paradigm (Fay, 1975: 78), I may provide an explanation of teacher education transformation, by articulating the conceptual scheme that seems to frame the reality of teacher education transformation in post-apartheid South Africa.

My argument is that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) contain several conceptual gaps that could restrict transformation of teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa. These gaps relate to a lack of detail on how student educators and educators should be trained to be reflective practitioners; the lack of detail on how the recognition of student voices is to be realised at teacher education institutions; all the contexts for teaching practice are perceived to be homogenous; a seemingly false assumption by the mentioned policy framework that educators will change their roles and identities easily.



I argue that these conceptual gaps could possibly be overcome if constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation are used to effect change. In this regard, I specifically make an argument for deliberation to be used to bring about meaningful change. I shall firstly discuss constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation before identifying possible conceptual gaps within current teacher education policy. A literature review has revealed the following constitutive meanings of the concept of “teacher education transformation”: deliberation can assist teacher education transformation; local cultures and contexts need to be respected; it is difficult to change the roles and identities of educators; teacher education is now largely school-based with extended teaching practice; teachers should be reflective practitioners; teacher education is a continual process and involves lifelong learning; a recognition of student voices is important in teacher education transformation. Finally, I shall make a case for deliberation as an enabling condition to effect teacher education transformation in post-apartheid South Africa. Before exploring constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation I shall briefly try to clarify meanings of teacher education transformation and teacher education reform, and how these concepts are utilised in this chapter and the rest of the dissertation.

#### **4.2 Teacher education transformation versus teacher education reform: Clarifying their meanings**

This section attempts to clarify what educational transformation, with specific references to teacher education, entails. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 30) states how the transformation of existing teacher education practices could possibly be accomplished:

It is necessary to establish key strategic objectives for the design and delivery of educator development programmes and qualifications, which will provide guidance for the transformation of existing practice. The objectives are stated as standards for design and delivery and provide a

basis for quality assurance of programmes by Education and Training Quality Assurance bodies.

The latter statement gives rise to the following question: What is teacher education transformation and what does the “transformation of existing practice” in teacher education mean? An appropriate meaning of the text (the quote above is part of an official policy text) is, according to hermeneutics, “rarely simple or obvious on the surface; one reaches it only through a detailed study of the text, contemplating its many messages and seeking the connections among its parts” (Neuman, 1997: 68). I shall try to spell out a possible message or messages that the latter part (the above quote) of the mentioned policy text is attempting to send out to its readers. Before answering this important question it may be proper to spell out what is meant by transformation. I shall use Waghid’s (2003) conception of conceptual analysis as a theoretical tool to clarify the meaning of “transformation” as a concept. A concept can be analysed “in terms of searching for logically necessary conditions which guide its general principle or constitutive rule. The general principle (that which makes a concept what it is) ... enables new actions which can be used to explain and reconstitute practices” (Waghid, 2003: 14). Understanding why a concept is used as it is used, also requires knowledge about the historical context, which has shaped the general principle of a concept and its relational practices. Another aspect of Waghid’s (2003: 15) conception of conceptual analysis is the claim that “concepts can only be understood in relation to other concepts.” The main aim of this brief conceptual analysis of the concept of “transformation” is to clarify what is meant by “teacher education transformation” in the South African context.

One dictionary refers to “transformation” as an action that aims to change the shape, appearance, quality or nature of something (Hornby, 1978: 703). Another dictionary refers to “transformation” as an action that intends to effect a change in form, nature or character (Harber *et al.* 1979: 1170). The word “character”, as used in the previous quote, means, according to an Oxford dictionary, “... all those qualities that make a thing ... what it is and different from others ...”

(Hornby, 1978: 97). A Heinemann dictionary refers to “character” as “... the combination of qualities which distinguishes an individual, thing or group ...” (Harber *et al.* 1979: 174). From these dictionary explanations one can infer that “transformation” may refer to an action that intends to change the constitutive qualities or features of something, because it is these constitutive qualities that make this “something” what it is. The meaning of the word “character”, in terms of the dictionary, seems to have brought us closer to a possible meaning of the word “transformation”. This seems to lend some substance to Taylor’s (1985: 22) view that meanings “cannot be identified except in relation to others, and in this way resemble words.” It also lends some substance to Waghid’s (2003: 15) contention that “concepts can only be understood in relation to other concepts.” What, then, in the light of the latter interpretation, does teacher education transformation refer to? I argue that teacher education transformation refers to an action or actions that intend to change the constitutive qualities or features of teacher education. What are the constitutive features of teacher education? I shall attempt to answer this question via Bernstein’s (1975: 85) notion on the classification and framing of educational knowledge:

Formal educational knowledge, can be considered, to be realised through three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what as a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realisation of this knowledge on the part of the taught.

Thus, pedagogy, curriculum and assessment can be regarded as important constitutive features of teacher education, in the light of Bernstein’s (1975: 85) notion on the classification and framing of educational knowledge. This view seems to be supported by the NECC (1992), Moletsane (2002) and Pendlebury (1998) who refer to these aspects of South African teacher education transformation. To transform teacher education in South Africa, thus, refers to actions that intend to change the constitutive features of the country’s teacher education system, of which pedagogy, curriculum and assessment are the most

important. The National Teacher Education Audit (NTEA) (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996: 138) states categorically what the constitutive features of a transformed South African teacher education system should be:

System reconstruction is essential. This must include a new conceptual framework and values, new governance and financing arrangements, new curricula focusing on teacher competences, institutional reform, capacity-building and quality assurance mechanisms.

I shall argue that the transformation of South Africa's teacher education system can be described as "deep" if it displays most of the constitutive features that the NTEA (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996: 138) refers to. If the new teacher education system displays very little of the latter constitutive features, its transformation can be regarded as "thin". It must be noted, however, that two of the authors that I shall refer to in this section refer to efforts to effect major educational changes in certain countries, as reforms. Wideen *et al.* (2002) refer to efforts to change teacher education in Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago as educational reforms. Hedges (1999) refers to efforts in England and Wales (part of the UK) to change the curriculum for schools, as reforms.

Talking about the orientation of South Africa's post-apartheid (after 1994) education and training policies, Fataar (2000: 20) claims that the negotiated political settlement of 1994 "facilitated the displacement of radical transformation objectives by a narrow reform orientation." The latter claim implies that the concepts, "transformation" and "reform", have different meanings for Fataar (2000). What is meant by the word, "reform"? One dictionary refers to the word "reform" as an action that intends "to improve by changing, as by giving up a bad habit ..." (Harber *et al.* 1979: 909). A second dictionary gives the following meaning for the word "reform": "make or become better ... amendment; improvement" (Mackenzie & Augarde, 1981: 246). Educational reforms, in the light of meanings extracted from the two dictionaries, may refer to actions that intend to improve or amend educational practices. I

have stated previously, in this introduction, that the word “transformation” refers to an action or actions that intend to change the constitutive qualities or features of something, because it is these constitutive qualities that make this “something” what it is. “Reform” and “transformation” are, thus, two different actions because the intentions of each of these actions differ.

Teacher education reform, thus, refers to actions that intend to improve or amend the existing teacher education framework, while teacher education transformation may involve actions that intend to change the constitutive features of the existing teacher education framework with the intention to create a new and totally different teacher education framework. The latter is new because its constitutive features or qualities differ from the previous teacher education framework. These constitutive features of the practice of teacher education, curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation (assessment), are underpinned by constitutive meanings of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. The latter implies that the transformation of the practice of teacher education, in post-apartheid South Africa, must involve the changing of the constitutive features and their coupled meanings of the mentioned practice. I tend to, in the light of the latter conceptual analysis, agree with Fataar (2000: 20) that “reform” and “transformation” should be seen as different concepts, coupled to different educational objectives in the efforts to change South Africa’s current teacher education framework. I, thus, argue for the transformation of existing teacher education practice, and not for the reform thereof. I shall now turn to a brief discussion of constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation that were extracted from a literature review.

### **4.3 Constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation**

#### **4.3.1 Deliberation can assist teacher education transformation**

The first constitutive feature is that deliberation can assist teacher education transformation. A starting point, to substantiate my latter argument, is a paper by

Hedges (1999) that deals with experiences of some British teachers of major educational reforms that started in the late 1980s. The introduction of a National Curriculum, in 1988, in England and Wales was a key reform initiative of the British government. The way in which the National Curriculum was introduced led to widespread dissatisfaction among British teachers. Much of the teachers' anger was directed at "the process of change, particularly their exclusion from initial decisions about it" (Hedges, 1999: 112). Many British teachers felt vindicated when some flaws in the proposed changes were exposed and they saw this as the only "possible outcome of a reform process which had deliberately not been based on consultations with them" (Hedges, 1999: 113). Why should the policy-makers of the National Curriculum have consulted the British teachers? Reformers should try to have the majority of teachers on their side. These teachers need to see innovation as a longer-term process. One of the aims of any education reform is to ensure that new ideas have currency among teachers. The latter process can only be achieved through dialogue and negotiation. Without this, "as happened in the initial stages of the English reforms, teachers' feelings of a lack of ownership or investment in the substance of the reforms, while being expected to work hard at implementing them, led to them being undermined" (Hedges, 1999: 115).

I shall now briefly explore the view of Hedges (1999: 115) about the importance of dialogue and negotiation with teachers in any education reform. The latter author claims that dialogue and negotiation can be utilised as a tool to ensure that new ideas have currency among teachers. I tend to agree with Hedges (1999) because I believe that a deliberative democratic approach, especially from the side of government, can only support education reform efforts. The past few decades have seen the development of powerful social movements demanding more democratic engagement in education policy processes (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 4). How should governments respond to this demand? I argue that a deliberative democratic approach to educational reform can be an appropriate response to this demand. I argue this in the light of one of the reasons that critics of current democratic institutions provide for their assessment that current arrangements are

undermining the most important principles of democracy. These critics posit that contemporary political practices are based on a politics of self-interest that produces social fragmentation and permit an unequal distribution of social and economic power that persistently disadvantages the poor and the powerless. Public deliberation, according to Bohman (1996: 1), may be a possible remedy for the latter situation.

Deliberation includes “collective decision making with the participation of all who will be affected by the decision or their representatives: This is the democratic part. Also ... it includes decision making by means of arguments offered *by* and *to* participants who are committed to the values of rationality and impartiality: this is the deliberation part” (Elster, 1998: 8). More deliberation may be an effective response to the demand for a more rational political order in which decision-making at least involves the public use of reason by free and equal citizens. The deliberative process can, according to Bohman (1996: 5), enhance the legitimacy of decisions by forcing citizens to justify their decisions and opinions by appealing to common interests or by encouraging participants to argue in terms of reasons that might be acceptable to all. Hedges’ (1999: 115) argument, in the light of the deliberative democratic approach that I have outlined here, implies that the British government and its education policy-makers together with the teachers or their representatives, must engage in the education reform policy process as free and equal citizens. Such a process may ensure that the new ideas of the education reform have currency among teachers.

There are three reasons why deliberative processes are crucial to the rationality of collective decision-making processes. The first reason is that new information is imparted (Benhabib, 1994: 32). Education policy makers, in my view, may use the deliberative platform to clarify the intentions of their policies, while teachers may offer some critique or suggestions on how these policies can be improved. Deliberative processes can, secondly, lead to critical self-reflection on already held views and opinions. Deliberative processes can also lead to changes in opinions or views or preferences and considering the common good (Benhabib,

1994: 32). These processes, according to Stokes (1998: 136) can occur because deliberation draws citizens out of their parochial interests and instills community-mindedness, and also because deliberation increases the amount and variety of data that inform collective decisions. I shall extend my argument for a deliberative approach to education reform, in relation to the South African context, later on in this chapter.

What happens when major educational reforms, like the introduction in 1988 of a new curriculum for schools (The National Curriculum) in England and Wales, proceed without prior negotiation and deliberation with the teachers who were supposed to implement these reforms? Before the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1988, British teachers were responsible for the curriculum in their schools. The new dispensation changed the roles of British teachers, after 1988, from designers of curriculum for their schools to that of implementers of the new curriculum. They were excluded from the design of the new curriculum (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 51). This exclusion of British teachers from negotiations and deliberations about the new curriculum angered them. They felt that the new dispensation had cost them their pedagogical authority. This led to resistance from these teachers against the loss of their pedagogical authority and the National Curriculum, in the early 1990s. The British government then commissioned the Dearing Commission to investigate the latter matter. The subsequent Dearing Report of 1994 recommended the recognition of teachers' pedagogical authority, and also suggested certain reforms to the National Curriculum. The Dearing Report resulted from negotiations and deliberations with teachers and teacher unions. The teachers called off their resistance in the light of the recommendations of the Dearing Report and the suggested reforms to the National Curriculum (Hedges, 1999: 116-119). The UK teachers, thus, showed agency when they contested the National Curriculum. They launched this action because they wanted the British government to respect their pedagogical authority. The contestation of the UK teachers against one of the education reform policies, the National Curriculum, seems to lend some substance to Taylor *et al.*'s (1997: 28) argument about the political nature of



education policies and that the latter are not implemented in a linear and unproblematic manner.

Education policies are contested in and between the arenas of formation and implementation. Different parties and processes are involved in the construction of the policy text and its implementation. The opportunity, however, for reforming and re-interpreting the text means policy formation does not end with the legislation of the policy because a plurality of readers necessarily produces a plurality of readings of any text (Ball, 1994: 16). Generation and implementation are continuous features of the policy process, with generation of policy still taking place after the legislation has been effected (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 14). Education policy, according to critical policy sociologists, is fundamentally a socio-political practice over which different interest groups struggle and attempt to give it meaning. This is why education policy is constantly being formulated and reformulated subject to interaction at various stages by key policy participants and stakeholders (Fataar, 1999: 7).

This contestation is the result of practitioners coming to the practice with their own histories, with experience, with values and purposes of their own. They have, thus, vested interests in the meaning of policy. The different histories, experiences, values, purposes and interests which make up any arena will lead to different interpretations of policies (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 22). We are confronted both with different interpretations of policy and interpretations of interpretations at all stages in the policy process. These reinterpretations of interpretations spread confusion and facilitate the play in and playing off of meanings. This results in the opening and re-opening up of gaps and spaces for action and response (Ball, 1994: 17). I contend that the latter processes had created the space for the UK teachers to contest one of the education reform policies, the National Curriculum, during the 1990s.

### 4.3.2 Local cultures and contexts need to be respected

A second constitutive meaning of teacher education transformation is that local cultures and contexts need to be respected if the latter process were to succeed. The restructuring of teacher education, like the economic trend toward globalisation, seems to have an irrepressible momentum (Wideen *et al.* 2002: 111). How can we manage teacher education transformation? Wideen *et al.* (2002) worked as consultants, during the 1990s, for the governments of Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, in the field of teacher education reform. They believe that the lessons learnt from this experience can illuminate the problematic features of teacher education in a variety of settings (Wideen *et al.* 2002: 111).

Changes in the school curriculum in Jamaica, in the middle 1990s, led to efforts to transform teacher education of primary school teachers. Jamaican curriculum planners realised that teachers, at both pre-service and in-service levels, had to be retrained if the new curriculum, based on the notion of child-centred learning, was to be implemented effectively (Wideen *et al.* 2002: 112). A paradigm shift in thinking among most of the primary school teachers in Jamaica was needed to meet the challenge of the new integrated curriculum and the notion of child-centred learning. Because Jamaican education reformers assumed that qualitative change will primarily come from better qualified teachers, reform revolved around both initial teacher preparation and the ongoing professional development of teachers. The intention of education reform in Trinidad and Tobago would shift teaching from a didactic approach to instruction, to a learner-centred approach to teaching. This reform, like in the case of Jamaica, provided a major challenge for teacher education at all levels. Both Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago faced a number of issues in implementing their reforms. A central issue was to change the way both teachers and the general population think about teaching and learning. Another issue was the strengths of the colonial system that would now be a limiting factor to change and innovation. Education reformers, in both the mentioned countries, regarded teacher education, at both the pre-service

and in-service levels, as central in effecting this change (Wideen *et al.* 2002: 112).

I shall now briefly turn to a brief discussion of one of the issues that Wideen *et al.* (2002: 112) refer to, namely the issue about changing the way both teachers and the general population think about teaching and learning, via education reforms, in the mentioned Caribbean countries. I argue that the changes in thinking that these reforms hope to effect will not come about very easily. Society, according to critical policy analysis, consists of competing groups who have different values and different access to power (Taylor *et al.* 1997). The latter statement reflects the political nature of education policy as a compromise, which is struggled over at all stages by competing interest groups. The latter struggle means that education policies will not be implemented in a straightforward and unproblematic way, because society is not underpinned by a value consensus (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 24). Education policy, thus, represents the “temporary settlements between diverse, competing and unequal forces within civil society, within the state itself and between associated discursive regimes” (Kenway in Taylor *et al.* 1997: 32).

Prunty (in Badat, 1992: 19) claims that policy is the legitimization of values. Critical policy sociologists contend that education policy represents a political commitment to a set of social ideals that are constructed in deeply contested ideological and political processes. This view regards education policy as the authoritative allocation of values and as the operational statements of values (Kogan in Fataar, 1999: 3). Any government, thus, chooses to favour the institutionalisation of certain values over others. The latter process implies the exclusion of the values of certain interest groups in society. Because these different values drive the thinking of these different and competing groups, I contend that the education reform policies of Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago will not easily change the thinking of both teachers and the general population about teaching and learning. The lack of a value consensus and policy contestation means that education reform policies will not be implemented in a

straightforward and unproblematic manner. A possible solution to the issue, which Wideen *et al.* (2002) have highlighted, is that of deliberative democratic approach to educational reforms in the mentioned Caribbean countries. I shall, however explore this argument, later on in this chapter, in relation to educational reform efforts in the UK (see the previous section) and also in relation to the South African context.

How can the prospects for teacher education reforms be improved? Wideen *et al.* (2002: 119) have identified certain principles, from their work as consultants in Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, which could improve the prospects for teacher education reforms. One of these principles, namely the avoidance of templates, is relevant for this chapter. A country has its own unique problems requiring unique solutions. Local conditions and culture must be respected and solutions must be developed that will work locally (Wideen *et al.* 2002: 120). I shall examine the latter issue in relation to South Africa's latest teacher education policy framework, the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). Is the latter policy framework sensitive to local conditions and can it work locally? I shall attempt to answer this question later on in this chapter.

#### **4.3.3 It is difficult to change the roles and identities of educators**

A third constitutive feature of teacher education transformation is that it is difficult to change the roles and identities of teachers. The other possible reason, besides the perceived lost of their pedagogical authority, for the teachers from England and Wales, to resist and contest the curriculum reform was the effect of the latter reform on the identities of these teachers (Hedges, 1999: 114). A major proportion "of teacher knowledge is ritualised and based on internalised routines. This accumulated, even habitual, wisdom forms a crucial foundation of a successful teacher's identity, but it is exactly the area that is often undermined by major reform, leaving even the most experienced and confident teachers feeling uncertain of their abilities" (Hedges, 1999: 114). This uncertainty about the teachers' futures in the profession was exacerbated by five years, from 1988

onwards, of constant change due to government mistakes and the volume of paperwork. A possible solution to this problem is an evolutionary approach to any major educational reform. Policy-makers are, however, not in favour of slow reforms. The pressure to find quick fix solutions tends to discourage lengthy processes of gradual and negotiated change.

Major educational reforms that move too fast can become counter-productive because people take time to adjust and learn to do new things. It also takes longer for any kind of change to take root (Hedges, 1999: 114- 115). Avalos (1999: 48) seems to echo the latter view because she posits that one has to remind those concerned with a teacher training system or an institution and stimulating the development of a different outlook by its members, is a complex process that takes time. The argument about the possible impact of major educational reform on the identities of teachers will be pursued in relation to the efforts to transform South Africa's teacher education system, later on in this chapter.

#### **4.3.4 Teacher education is now largely school-based with extended teaching practice**

An important shift in the discourse on teacher education involves the issue of the location of teacher education. What is the best site for teachers to learn how to teach? The answer to this question has led the United Kingdom to restructure their systems in terms of the location of their teacher education programmes. In the UK much of the teacher training is transferred to schools. Schools, in most cases, take charge of two-thirds of the training time and share with universities the assessment of student teachers. Several forms of teacher education programmes that were influenced by individual experiments and recommendations from reports produced in the eighties and nineties are in operation in the United States. The main aim is to bring teacher education closer to schools (Avalos, 1999: 43-44). There are, however, some educationists like Martin (in Avalos, 1999: 44) who still believe that teacher education should be located at universities because of the comparative advantage of universities over

other institutional environments in terms of the subject matter area and the critical approach inherent in university based training. Myers and Saul (in Wideen, 1995: 7) seem to support Martin's idea (in Avalos, 1999: 44) that universities are the best sites for teacher education because they claim that universities provide a setting "and an atmosphere in which fundamental issues can be examined critically, fresh alternatives can be explored, and promising, imaginative programs can be developed."

There is, however, some critique against university-based teacher education. Some critics suggest that university faculties of education have been slow in developing new initiatives, with the intention to improve initial teacher training. Another point of critique concerns the dissatisfaction of student teachers with their teaching preparation in universities. One possible reason for the latter situation is that university faculties of education are more concerned with publication than teaching. A third point of critique is that faculties of education find themselves in a weak position in relation to other university faculties. The struggle of teacher educators to gain status with their counterparts in other faculties, together with their distancing of themselves from the schools for whom they prepare teachers have contributed to the marginalization of faculties of education, "both within the university in which they are housed and in the schools for which they prepare teachers" (Wideen, 1995: 8).

What has been the effect of this marginalization? Gideonse (in Wideen, 1995: 9) and a group of caseworkers, in their analysis of teacher education policy in the United States, find that faculties of education are holding very weak positions in the teacher education policy arena. The negative feedback from teachers about their preparation had opened the door for policymakers to move in with simple solutions to very complex problems and exert more external control over teacher education. "Consequently, teacher education was seen as overgrown, lacking in quality, and not providing an adequate response to the needs of the school and the larger society" (Wideen, 1995: 9). A further problem that may weaken the case for university-based teacher education is the "strong and compelling

argument that the perceived failure of the schools rests upon the shoulders of those who prepared teachers for those schools- the teacher educators within faculties of education” (Wideen, 1995: 9). Today faculties of education are facing strong calls for reform, especially from government. Those heading the reform agenda for the schools in the United States have virtually by-passed teacher education as a player in that reform. Teacher education, in England, for the most part has been relegated to the schools or conducted through distance education (Wideen, 1995: 9).

The current situation in England provides a good example of the movement of teacher education from universities to schools. The British Education Reform Act of 1988 had a major impact on teacher education in England. The authority and power for teacher education is moving rapidly from higher education institutions to schools as a result of the Education Reform Act of 1988 (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 47). The Education Reform Act of 1988 was instrumental in effecting a dramatic transformation and shift in the locus of control of teacher education in England from 1990 onwards. The British government exerted more centralised control over teacher education in the 1990s (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 48).

Local management of schools has suddenly, as with the health service, become a major issue and has displaced teaching and learning as the primary focus. It is now the responsibility of individual schools to hire and fire their teachers, and to facilitate the professional development of their teachers (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 50). The role of the head teacher, or principal, in the professional development of his or her school’s staff, is to ensure that an appropriate designated member of staff takes responsibility for “each new appointee; that the programme of monitoring, support and assessment is in place; and that the assessment of performance is rigorous, fair and conducted according to established procedures” (Tickle, 2000: 704).

The proposals to restructure teacher education in England intend to give schools a strong role in initial training and the funding to support their increased responsibility. Schools can use their knowledge of the demands placed on new teachers to become active partners in designing and running teacher training courses (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 51). Another intention of the restructuring of initial teacher training, by moving it from universities to the schools, is to give students more time in schools. Observing and working with teachers, as well as discussing classroom practice with teachers, tutors and other students, is the best way to learn classroom skills needed for effective teaching. The third intention of the restructuring proposals is to require courses to equip students with essential competencies that will ease the transition from initial training to induction. These proposals point to a substantially decreased involvement of higher education in initial teacher education and it seems “their role is intended to become more one of accrediting and evaluating school-based schemes in which secondary student teachers spend far more of their time in school (originally proposed as 80 per cent, currently some two-thirds of a 36-week course)” (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 52). Circular 4.98 of 1998 emphasised the standards all trainees had to achieve, and also the practicalities of teaching. In the Postgraduate Certificate of Education, of one year, over 66% of the trainees’ time was to be spent in school. The apprenticeship model, which is the model of training, entails the training of trainees to deliver the National Curriculum through the acquisition of a number of specific skills and careful observation of those already experienced in the profession (Halstead, 2003: 70).

The chair of the then Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) in England, William Taylor (in Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 52), declared that school-based teacher training is much more than extended teaching practice. This is because school-based training involves a fundamental change to the organisation, design and management of initial teacher training. This new arrangement requires a much more substantial and continuous contribution from teachers. The second of the proposals, to restructure teacher education in England, demonstrate the government’s belief in an apprenticeship model of



learning (Gilroy in Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 52). The proposals imply that teachers will have to perform two roles: teaching their learners and training novice teachers. Many of the teachers do not wish to do all the training themselves because “they are concerned that students’ experience will be limited by the localized experience they receive from working closely with only one teacher” (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 53). There is also little evidence of a great enthusiasm among head teachers and teachers for school-based teacher training because of the increased workload which this imposes on the school, the shortage of resources and the perceived lack of expertise within schools (Hoyle & John, 1998: 79).

The new arrangements have changed the role of higher education considerably because tutors are now required to coordinate student placements, and prepare teachers for their new role as mentors of student teachers. Another considerable change is a “considerable direct transfer of resources from the colleges to the schools which have grave implications for those involved in teacher education in higher education institutions” (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 53). Many university departments of education want to move out of initial teacher training because individual schools are seeking strong partnerships with only one institution for reasons of time and practicalities and also because of increased competition for school placements and reduced financial inducements. The government had also hoped for a rapid shift to school-based teacher training in which schools take on the full role of training teachers with or without accreditation from higher education institutions (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 53).

The new arrangement of school-based teacher training in England is not without problems. Most of the teachers are not satisfied with the new role that the government requires from them, particularly in the area of subject methods which are legislated (in circular 9/92) to be taught in the school (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 54). “School mentors do not see themselves as experts in teacher education, as they do in teaching, and are actively seeking guidance and reassurance” (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 56). A second problem has to do with the

considerable variation of the models of supervision for school placement under the new arrangements. Devolved funding has made it impossible for many higher education institutions to send tutors to visit students in school on a regular basis. Some of these institutions have revised their arrangements and only see students when they are requested by the school. The assessment of teaching competence is made by the mentor and the training manager in the school. This new arrangement “obviously represents a coming loss of jobs in higher education” (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 54). Schools are now, under the new arrangement, regarded as “*the place of learning- for higher education staff for teacher-mentors, for newly-qualified teachers and for teachers-in-training, as well as for pupils!*” (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 60). Pre-service and in-service teacher education has, thus, been devolved onto schools and teachers in England. This is additional pressure on schools and teachers who are already under the pressures and public demands of national curriculum and assessment. Schools “should be predominantly about pupils learning and teachers teaching, and not about management or assessment, and not primarily training teachers” (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 63-64).

The weakening of university influence on teacher education has also occurred in Australia and New Zealand. The basic pattern is that the state itself does not agree with the traditional assumptions about the creation of a “profession”. The state disputes that the universities can be trusted to deliver a cadre of “reflective professionals”. Teacher education has changed to teacher training. The latter is increasingly school-based so that “teacher training approximates more and more to immersion in daily school practice (which has pedagogic actors and pedagogic actions that are also increasingly under state surveillance)” (Cowen, 2002: 10).

#### **4.3.5 Teachers should be reflective practitioners**

A fifth constitutive feature of teacher education transformation is that teachers should become reflective practitioners if teacher education transformation is to be effected. I want to link the capacity of educators to evaluate and modify their

thinking and practices, and also to imagine other possibilities to Carson's (1995) notion of a reflective practice. Meanings of reflective practice will continue to unfold through teacher educators' own thoughtful work as educators. To promote reflection in the education of teachers, teacher educators must become more reflective themselves (Carson, 1995: 151). Reflective practice is not an alternative paradigm of teacher education, because it consists of clearing spaces and opening up places for thinking. Reflective practice allows that "which turns away from us to show itself. It means trying to lay aside preconceptions about teaching and teacher preparation in order to listen more attentively to how we live together pedagogically in teacher education classrooms and in the schools we serve" (Carson, 1995: 153). To "listen more attentively", in my view, possibly points to deliberation, discussion and dialogue among student teachers and between teacher educator and student teacher, with the intention of evaluating and modifying their thinking and practices. The latter process can lead to imagining alternative possibilities so that teachers can "rationally re-educate themselves" (Waghid, 2003: 27), to become reflective practitioners.

Carson's (1995: 153) views result from an action research project that was conducted at the University of Alberta, Canada, during 1989. One of the main objectives of this research project was to implement the process of reflective practice in their teaching. The research project involved two teacher educators, two faculty consultants, two doctoral students and four different classes of secondary education social studies student teachers that were taught over a two-year period. The views of Carson (1995) result from reflections among teacher educators and students. The journal entries of their experiences during the research period, of both educators and students, formed the basis of these reflections. Carson (1995: 159), one of the teacher educators, posits that the opening of the teacher educators to the students' voices enabled the students to speak of the difficult processes of forming their identities as teachers:

By attentively listening to what student teachers and we as teacher educators are saying about critical reflection and how it relates to learning

to teach, we better understand teaching and teacher education. This saying speaks of learning to teach as a process of constitution and reconstitution of identity (Carson, 1995: 159).

The recognition of his students' voices enabled Carson (1995) to distance himself from his teaching practice. I want to link this process with Bengtsson's (1995: 31) notion of reflection because he posits that self-reflection enables the practitioner to distance him/herself from his/her practice. The latter process enables the practitioner to get self-knowledge of her/himself and her/his practice so that alternative possibilities could be imagined, after evaluation and modification of their thinking and practices:

This kind of self-knowledge has at least three different kinds of pedagogical value: (1) With the help of self-reflection the teacher can learn about his or her own teaching practice. (2) Self-knowledge makes it possible for the teacher to take a position on his or her own practice. (3) Self-knowledge makes it also possible for the teacher to teach about his or her own teaching (Bengtsson, 1995: 31).

A closer examination of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), however, points to several conceptual gaps within this policy framework that are likely to impede teacher education transformation in South Africa.

#### **4.3.6 Teacher education is a continual process and involves lifelong learning**

Another constitutive meaning of teacher education transformation is that teacher education is a continual process and involves lifelong learning. One of the important shifts in the discourse on teacher education, as revealed by some international literature, involves the replacement of the distinction between initial teacher training and in-service training with the concept of continuous teacher education. "There is less and less belief in a comprehensive purpose of initial

teacher education that prepares for all eventualities in the school, classroom and professional life as a whole” (Avalos, 1999: 38). Initial teacher education can be regarded as the first part of continuous, expected professional development through the induction year and into service. There must be a continuity of experience rather than strong boundaries between pre-service and in-service teacher education (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 60).

Another shift in the discourse on teacher education, which is closely linked to the previous shift, involves the processes a student teacher needs to undergo in order to teach effectively. The literature on teacher education reveals dissatisfaction with the traditional forms of understanding the “pedagogy” component of teacher education and its relationship to learning how to become an effective teacher. At issue here is how the pedagogical knowledge is transformed into teachable knowledge (Avalos, 1999: 41). This latter re-orientation is leading to what might be called a revision of the linear concept of teacher education where content knowledge and theoretical pedagogy come first and are followed by technique learning and practical implementation. The emerging view sees teacher education as a continual learning process that involves initial training (PRESET), in-service training (INSET), reflective practice and experiential checking of practices and understandings (Avalos, 1999: 42). The continual nature of the teacher education learning process, in terms of the latter view, happens because teachers reorganise the knowledge they gained before and during their training to “serve the purposes of teaching and of stimulating learning processes in diverse pupil groups” (Avalos, 1999: 48).

#### **4.3.7 Recognition of student voices is important in teacher education transformation**

Another constitutive meaning of teacher education transformation relates to the importance of recognising student voices in teacher education. The latter shift in the discourse on teacher education involves the knowledge that student teachers bring to the teaching situation. Teacher training theory now recognises that there

are prior beliefs, attitudes and experiences that student teachers bring to the training situation that are not easily changed. There is a greater awareness of the need to understand how people modify beliefs, or how it is possible to build on pre-existing concepts and structures (Avalos, 1999: 39-40). Feiman-Nemser and Remillard (in Avalos, 1999: 50) argue that the following conditions have to be met if one wants to detect and change student teachers' prior beliefs and attitudes:

Provision of opportunity for student teachers to consider why the new practices and their associated values and beliefs are better than the conventional ones they may hold;

Examples of the new practices in realistic conditions, and preferably to have experienced them themselves as learners; and

Provision of ongoing support and guidance in the process of reconstructing their views and practices.

Moletsane (2002: 76-77) has examined problems associated with the incorporation of previously disadvantaged Black students into previously White higher education institutions and also the issue of how effective transformation of teacher education should be effected at these institutions. One of the problems at these previously White teacher education institutions is that the Black students' backgrounds "and prior learning are often seen as a barrier to effective learning in an environment that imposes different expectations to those they normally experience" (Moletsane, 2002: 76-77). The negative views of teacher educators about the "diverse students' academic and social backgrounds may mean that they also are not convinced of the possible success of truly transformative programmes" (Moletsane, 2002: 77). How, then, do we effect effective transformation of teacher education in South Africa? Dzvimbo and Van der Westhuizen (in Moletsane, 2002: 76) suggest a "paradigm shift from restructuring to purposeful reconceptualisation of teacher education programmes. In purposeful reconceptualisation, civil society, ideology, histories and voices of previously excluded groups form the focus of transformation of teacher

education programmes. This leads to the uncovering of new languages that help teachers and teacher educators to acknowledge the multiple experiences and perspectives students and others bring to the teaching and learning situation because of their location in different social, cultural and economic backgrounds.” The shift from the exclusion of student voices to the recognition of student voices, beliefs, histories and experiences will be examined in relation to the South African context, later on in this chapter. I now turn to an explanation of conceptual gaps within the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000).

#### **4.4 Conceptual gaps within the Norms and Standards for Educators**

I argue that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) contain certain gaps that are unlikely to better the prospects of the latter policy framework to transform South African teacher education. Because of the latter problem, the prospects of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) to improve learning and teaching, in South African schools, look dim. The first gap relates to the lack of detail in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) on “how” teacher education institutions are supposed to prepare or educate student teachers and teachers to become reflective practitioners. The second gap in the latter policy text relates to the problem of the non-recognition of student voices, beliefs, experiences and histories by teacher education institutions and the possible role the latter process can play in effecting deep transformation at these institutions.

The third gap in the latter policy text involves the “effective” implementation of teaching practice, as part of the preparation process of student teachers, in South African schools. I shall try to examine this possible gap in relation to one of the shifts in international teacher education that was revealed in the previous section of this chapter. Here, I refer to the shift in university-based teacher education to school-based teacher education in the UK (Pimm & Selinger, 1995), the USA (Grimmett, 1995) and Australia (Tisher, 1995). Teacher education in these

countries, have shifted to a mentorship approach whereby student teachers, unlike the traditional approach of limited teaching practice, have an extended teaching practice at the schools. Experienced teachers mentor these student teachers during the extended teaching practice at the schools.

Because of the limited scope of this chapter I shall only examine the mentorship approach to teacher education in the UK. Thereafter I shall consider the prospects of implementing the latter approach in South African teaching practice. Can the mentorship approach of school-based teacher education of the UK be implemented in South Africa? I shall argue that the prospects for the latter process look dim because of the lack of enabling conditions at many South African schools to implement teaching practice “effectively”. The findings of one empirical study by the University of the Western Cape, of an action research project, into how a mentorship approach can facilitate the training of pre-service teachers by in-service teachers (Robinson, 2001) will possibly lend some substance to my latter argument. A closer examination of the prospects and dilemmas of the UK’s mentorship approach to teaching practice may help to substantiate my latter argument. A conceptual analysis of the breakdown of a culture of learning and teaching at many South African schools, and the possible “solutions” to this problem by Christie (1998), shall also be utilised to lend some substance to my argument that there may be some problems with the utilisation of a mentorship approach to teaching practice in our schools.

The fourth gap in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) relates to the seven roles that educators are supposed to perform and the associated competences that they are supposed to demonstrate, for purposes of qualifications and accreditation by the Department of Education. The latter policy text implies that student teachers and teachers have to adopt new roles. These new roles imply that teachers have to assume or adopt new identities and also learn new competences. Will the latter process happen automatically? I argue that the process of teachers adopting new identities, new roles and new competences will not happen automatically. The starting point of



my argument shall be an analysis of the latter process by Harley and Parker (1999: 182). My argument also applies to teacher educators. The arguments of Carson (1995) about the constitution and reconstitution of teacher identity, because of reflective practice, shall hopefully substantiate my argument that the adoption of the new roles, new identities and new competences by teachers, and also teacher educators, will not happen automatically and that some sort of intervention may be necessary.

#### **4.4.1 The Norms and Standards for Educators lack detail on how student educators and educators should be trained to be reflective practitioners**

The first conceptual gap within the mentioned policy text relates to the lack of detail on how, in terms of procedure or means, both student teachers and teachers should be trained by teacher education institutions, to become reflective practitioners. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 10) expect teachers to be reflective practitioners. Will teachers who have been taught within the Fundamental Pedagogics framework, that has and still dominates most South African teacher education institutions, be able to demonstrate the “flexibility of mind” to be used to think in a number of different contexts and act as reflective practitioners? My contention is that this will not be the case because the “pretensions to scientific objectivity of Fundamental Pedagogics, together with the way in which it is taught, prevent teachers from developing an understanding of the relationship between education and the context in which knowledge and understanding are created and shared. Fundamental Pedagogics is intellectually harmful in that it neutralises and depoliticises educational discourse, and does not provide students and teachers with the concepts necessary to access critically its (or any other) claims about education” (NECC, 1992: 17).

My argument must also be seen against the background of some of the findings of the National Teacher Education Audit (Department of Education, 1995). The Audit revealed that students in DET colleges, and also other colleges, were

subjected to a pedagogy, curriculum and assessment procedures that seem incompatible to reflective practice. “A standard format for examination question papers in many subjects fostered the habits of ‘teaching to the exam’ and rote learning of textbook summaries, lecture notes and model answers” (Pendlebury, 1998: 337). The Norms and Standards for Educators is silent on how the competences and the “flexibility of mind”, to apply these competences, should be developed in student teachers and in-service teachers. The latter policy document only states that all “the competences must be developed in all initial educator qualifications ... They may be developed in different ways, with different emphases and at different depths. Providers have the responsibility to decide how this should be achieved ...” (Department of Education, 2000: 11). This lack of clear guidelines may help to perpetuate the status quo and hinder the transformation of South African teacher education. Clear guidelines are necessary because many South African teachers were subjected to, in the Apartheid era, and perhaps still, to rote learning of teaching methods in DET and other colleges (Pendlebury, 1998: 344). These colleges stressed subject facts at the expense of “principled knowledge and the development of critical discernment and independent judgement” (Pendlebury, 1998: 337). These educators need to be “re-educated”, by evaluating and modifying their thinking and practices themselves, to become reflective practitioners because this change will not happen automatically. I will take the latter point further later on in the next section of this chapter.

#### **4.4.2 The Norms and Standards for Educators lack detail on how the recognition of student voices is to be realised at teacher education institutions**

A second conceptual gap in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) relates to the lack of detail, in terms of procedures or means, on how the recognition of student voices is to be realised at teacher education institutions. This major conceptual gap in the latter policy text can possibly impede the transformation of teacher education in South Africa. The ends of the

new teacher education policy framework are strongly emphasised in the draft revised Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1997a & 1998). The latter policy grants considerably more discretion to institutions to decide on how best to accomplish these ends (Pendlebury, 1998: 340). The focus on ends to the exclusion of means is also evident in an earlier version of the Norms and Standards that was drafted by the Committee on Teacher Education Policy (COTEP) in 1996 (Pendlebury, 1998). I contend that this trend, the focus on ends to the exclusion of means, is also perpetuated in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). The latter policy text is dominated by a detailed description of the seven roles that teachers are supposed to perform and the various competences that they must demonstrate for qualifications and accreditation purposes. The policy text lacks detail on pedagogy and curriculum and only states that: "These norms and standards provide a basis for providers to develop programmes and qualifications that will be recognised by the Department of Education for purposes of employment" (Department of Education, 2000: 9).

Teacher education institutions must develop all the competences in all educator qualifications:

Providers have the responsibility to decide how this should be achieved, and before designing a learning programme it will be necessary to establish the particular nature of the clients and which qualification the learners are to be prepared for (Department of Education, 2000: 11).

Here again the latter policy text lacks detail on "how" all the competences should be developed in all initial educator qualifications, and again emphasises ends to the exclusion of means. I agree with Pendlebury (1998: 340) that this focus on ends to the exclusion of means can be a possible impediment to the transformation of teacher education in South Africa. Changes in teaching practices cannot be guaranteed by changes in policy. Educators may, wittingly or not, undermine new policy by continuing to practice in "old ways or in ways that

reinterpret policy in the light of habitual understanding” (Pendlebury, 1998: 342). Much more than policy is needed to effect deep transformation of South Africa’s teacher education dispensation. This is especially the case where the policy focuses on ends to the exclusion of means and gives little guidance on what a transformative curriculum would look like in practice (Pendlebury, 1998: 342). The very openness of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) is both its strength and its weakness. The latter policy’s strength, in my opinion, is the space it creates for teacher education institutions to use their professional discretion to develop teacher education programmes, according to the prescriptions of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). It is a weakness because the latter policy text also creates space, because of a lack of detail on pedagogy and curriculum, for the perpetuation of Apartheid-era teacher education practices.

Moreover, the huge “disparities across institutions and sectors as a result of apartheid and the urban/rural divide” (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996: 138) make it risky to focus on ends without paying proper attention to means. The latter factor may, thus, help to retard deep transformation of teaching and learning at South African teacher education institutions. These institutions must produce teachers that are supposed to act as transformative agents (COTEP, 1996: 10) to help in the reconstruction of South African society. Before designing a learning programme, it is necessary for teacher education institutions to “establish the particular nature of the clients and which qualification the learners are to be prepared for” (Department of Education, 2000: 11). How are teacher education institutions supposed to “establish the particular nature of the clients”? My argument is that the establishment of the “particular nature of the clients” implies that teacher education institutions must “consult” their students. Teacher education institutions must, then, use the information, originating from these “consultations”, to assist them in designing their learning programmes. I shall extend the latter argument in the next section of this chapter.

#### **4.4.3 All the contexts for Teaching Practice are perceived to be homogenous**

A third conceptual gap in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) concerns the assumption of the latter policy text that all contexts in which teaching practice ought to happen are perceived to be homogenous. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 12) asserts the following about the importance of teaching practice in teacher education programmes in South Africa:

Teaching practice is seen as a mode of delivering through which all the different roles of educators should be developed and assessed. Time spent in the workplace is considered to be very important and should provide the authentic context within which student educators experience and demonstrate the integration of the competences developed in the entire curriculum.

What is the meaning of the latter policy text extract and what does it try to say to teacher education institutions? A text, such as the extract above, must according to hermeneutics be interpreted in relation to the world, which it opens up and discloses. The author is not the focus of the interpretation because “writing renders the text autonomous with respect to the intention of the author. What the text signifies no longer coincides with what the author meant ...” (Ricoeur, 1981: 139). This situation arises when discourse passes from speaking to writing. A text is any discourse fixed by writing. This means that fixation by writing is constitutive of the text itself. The text replaces the relations of dialogue between the writer and reader (Ricoeur, 1981: 145). Written discourse renders the author’s intentions incompatible to the meaning of the text. This is because written discourse cannot be rescued by all the processes, like intonation, delivery, mimicry and gestures, by which spoken discourse supports itself in order to be understood. Interpretation is the only remedy for the weakness of discourse which its author can no longer save (Ricoeur, 1981: 201). A successful

interpretation, according to Taylor (1985: 17), is “one which makes clear the meaning originally present in a confused, fragmentary, cloudy form”. I hope my interpretation of the policy text extract of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 12) will outline its appropriate meaning and intentions.

The latter text extract implies that schools are supposed to provide a stable workplace and an authentic context within which teaching practice can take place. The National Teacher Education Audit (NTEA) (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996: 137) also refers to this requirement, stating that the typical profile of a successful teacher education institution was “one in which there is strong leadership, a positive institutional ethos, democratic governance structures, learner-centred approaches, extensive curriculum reform and substantial teaching experience for students”. My concern is with the aspect of “substantial teaching experience for students”. I argue that the shift to the mentorship approach to teacher education in the UK (Pimm & Selinger, 1995) reflects, in a way, this notion of “substantial teaching experience for students” (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996: 137), because of the huge amount of time that UK student teachers now spent at schools. I shall attempt to answer the following question: Can the mentorship approach of school-based teacher education of the UK, with its extended teaching practice, be implemented in South Africa? I argue that the prospects for the latter process look dim because of the lack of enabling conditions at many South African schools to implement extended teaching practice “effectively”. The findings of one empirical study by the University of the Western Cape (UWC) of an action research project into how a mentorship approach can facilitate the training of pre-service teachers by in-service teachers (Robinson, 2001) will hopefully lend some substance to my latter argument. The aim of the mentorship programme of the UWC Education Faculty was to develop the capacity of teachers to act as guides to the student teachers doing teaching practice at their schools. The students involved in this mentorship programme were doing a one-year pre-service course, the Post-Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE). The mentorship programme, which ran for three years, “also saw mentors as potential

change agents, who could contribute to building their schools as good learning environments for teachers and student teachers” (Robinson, 2001: 99).

The possibility of this mentorship approach, and thus teaching practice, to facilitate conversations among teachers about teaching will, however, be difficult to facilitate because of disabling conditions at many South African schools. Many of our schools do not provide enabling conditions for the implementation of a mentorship approach to teaching practice. I make the latter point in the light of arguments in a paper by Christie (1998) about the breakdown of a culture of learning and teaching in many South African schools. The latter process, which is one of the legacies of apartheid education, refers to:

... the poor functioning of a large number of previously black schools in South Africa. These schools, generally secondary schools located in the poor and disrupted communities spawned by apartheid, share a number of common features. These include: disputed and disrupted authority relations between principals, teachers and students; sporadic and broken attendance by students and often teachers; general demotivation and low morale of students and teachers ... (Christie, 1998: 283).

The latter conditions, as revealed by the quote, may not be enabling conditions for the implementation of a mentorship approach to teaching practice, because the practice of teacher education (the teacher mentor mentoring the student teacher) can only flourish, according to Christie (1998: 292), within an educational environment that is characterised by rhythmical, disciplined teaching and learning and that is also formally structured in time and space. Robinson (2001: 105) uses the research results from a case study, which was conducted at five secondary schools on the Cape Flats during 1995 and 1996, to also refer to the ongoing disruption of the school programme at certain schools.

Robinson (2001: 106) briefly refers to two major factors that are likely to impede opportunities for teacher involvement in mentoring student teachers, namely

school culture and school policies on mentoring. Her case study revealed that four of the five schools lacked a vibrant sense of teachers engaging regularly in reflection on classroom or school practices. Because the schools were busy with crisis management all the time, there was little time at the school for reflection and planning. Four of the five schools also displayed little evidence of a policy on the mentoring of student teachers. The mentor teachers also complained that their teaching and administration duties left them little time to mentor the student teachers. Mentoring the student teachers, thus, meant extra work for the already over-occupied mentor teachers (Robinson, 2001: 107-109). How, then, can we create enabling institutional conditions, at the school level, to facilitate the mentorship approach to teaching practice at South African schools? The ideas of Darling-Hammond (in Robinson, 2001) may be relevant to the latter question because she proposes that schools should structure themselves so that they can facilitate collegial sharing and decision-making about classroom practices. Such a process can overcome teacher isolation by creating frequent and regular opportunities for teachers to discuss problems of practice and to observe one another's teaching. This means that schools have to organise themselves to make or create time for such an exercise (Darling-Hammond in Robinson, 2001: 111).

#### **4.4.4 The Norms and Standards for Educators assume that educators will change their roles and identities easily**

The fourth conceptual gap in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), concerns the seven roles that educators are supposed to perform and the associated competences that they are supposed to demonstrate, for purposes of qualifications and accreditation by the Department of Education. The latter policy text implies that student teachers and teachers have to adopt new roles. These new roles imply that teachers have to assume or adopt new identities and also learn new competences. Will this process happen automatically? I argue that the process of teachers adopting new identities, new roles and new competences will not happen automatically. The views of Harley and Parker (1999) shall hopefully lend some support to my latter argument.



One aspect of South Africa's difficulties in implementing the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998) lies in the attempt to graft a legalistic social framework of organic solidarity onto a corps of teachers whose identities and roles were forged during the apartheid-era, and which was based on mechanical solidarity. The mentioned policy text also assumes as already existing what it is intended to produce and attempts to produce the kinds of consciousness and identity, in teachers, on which its operationalisation, workability and success really depend (Harley & Parker, 1999: 193). Can the identities of teachers be easily changed? The answer is no. "Teacher identities are constituted and reinforced over a long period of time. The shift to a new pedagogy and thus teacher identity has to be conceptualised and supported over a long period" (Fataar, 2000: 28). A recent empirical case study, by Jessop (1997), reveals the impact of teachers' life histories on their pedagogical beliefs, skills and practices. Jessop's (1997) study revealed that "pedagogical conservatism is a biographical safety net for teachers who feel insecure with new ideas and practices" (Harley & Parker, 1999: 194). Jessop (1997) concludes that attempts to change the identities of teachers must start from where teachers are at and then build on their own experience and strengths. This approach may likely be more effective than sweeping change. Hedges (1999: 114-115) calls for a slow pace to educational reforms because major educational reforms that move too fast can become counter-productive because people take time to adjust and learn to do new things. It also takes longer for any kind of change to take root. Teacher development must focus on the way in which educators conceptualise and construct their professional identities because more than training is necessary to change the identities of teachers. The latter process is necessary because teachers' roles "as citizens and as educators are formed within markedly differing contexts, making it difficult to talk about a South African teacher in universal terms" (Harley & Parker, 1999: 195).

The importation of OBE and the NQF, the two pillars on which the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998), may have

falsely understood the nature of the relationship between schools and South African society, especially in relation to teachers' personal and professional identities. As a pre-requisite to the implementation of OBE and the NQF, teachers may first need "to shift their own identities, their understanding of who they are and how they relate to others. This requires a high degree of interpersonal skills, self-reflection and adaptation. These are the very skills that the mechanical mills of apartheid failed to forge" (Harley & Parker, 1999: 197-198). Avalos (1999: 48) posits that the development of a different outlook by teachers, by teacher education institutions or government education departments, is a complex process that takes time. The task of transforming the identities and roles of South African teachers, by the policy-makers and teacher educators, seems to be daunting. This task is being complicated by the underlying weaknesses that emerge from adopting an imported model which emerged in very different societies, like the UK and Australia, with organic solidarities binding together a highly advanced division of labour into a South African context still dominated by mechanical solidarities (Harley & Parker, 1999: 198).

How, then, do we bridge the mentioned conceptual gaps in the Norms and Standards for Educators so that the transformation of teacher education in South Africa could be advanced? In the next section I argue that these conceptual gaps could possibly be bridged if the constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation are used to effect change. In this regard, I specifically make an argument for deliberation to be used to bring about meaningful change.

#### **4.5 Reconceptualising Teacher Education: In defence of deliberation**

Grimmett (1995) attempts to explain why teacher education currently appears to be more in a state of turmoil than in a state of continuous improvement. We need to examine the issues confronting teacher education in some Western countries in which restructuring efforts are taking place. It is also necessary to identify some policy directions for changing how we prepare teachers. Restructuring teacher

education without a thorough reconceptualisation of the latter will not lead to genuine change in teacher education (Grimmett, 1995: 202).

A radical reconceptualisation of teacher education will involve partnerships within and without the university. These partnerships will lead to interdisciplinary study and field-based teacher research in pre-service teacher education (Grimmett, 1995: 203). There are, however, “persistent threats to teacher education based in higher education”, in the United States (Imig in Grimmett, 1995: 203). School-based professional development programs are also strongly supported in the USA. These developments place the future of university-based teacher education in the balance. Teacher education is being restructured around the world at both the level of policy and at the ground level of action. Genuine change can only occur where policy and action are working in tandem. In many countries, however, “these initiatives occur only at the policy level and represent *restructuring without purposeful reconceptualisation*. When policy is used solely to coerce people at the ground level into working in ostensibly different ways, much resistance and little purposeful reconceptualisation of teacher education takes place” (Grimmett, 1995: 204). It is only in a few places that policy and action are so closely aligned “that policy initiatives represent a *restructuring arising out of reconceptualisation* that has already been articulated at the ground level of action. Changes seem to have occurred, that have effectively addressed the criticisms plaguing teacher education for so long, where policy has ably reflected or successfully enabled reconceptualisation at the action level (Grimmett, 1995: 204).

The changes in teacher education in England illustrate what happens when radical restructuring is not accompanied by purposeful reconceptualisation (Grimmett, 1995: 206). Government restructuring has commodified schooling and teacher education in England, while the national government has declared that the education system is in crisis and that it can only be saved by market forces. “Any attempt by teachers and teacher educators to counter these assertions is treated with contempt. Schools, not universities, are seen as *the*

place of learning to teach. Consequently, schools are given a dominant role to play in teacher preparation. The apprenticeship model is very much back in vogue. Universities become ‘service providers’ in the market place of education” (Grimmett, 1995: 206). Less government in the form of privatisation, heightened competition and reduced funding levels actually produces more government in the sense of increased regulation and intrusion, in the form of form-filling bureaucracy, extensive examination regimes and heavy monitoring of schools, into the practice and autonomy of professionals (Pimm & Selinger, 1995: 50).

There is, however, some hope to help bridge the gap in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) on how student teachers and teachers should be trained to become reflective practitioners. Here, I am referring to the instance of non-traditional pedagogical practice, as described by Waghid (2003: 20). My contention is that practical reasoning might help to develop in teachers the flexibility of mind that will enable them to think in a number of different contexts. Caring, as a constitutive element of practical reasoning, can help teachers to improve their practices because it encourages others to develop the capacities to evaluate and modify their thinking and practices, and also to imagine alternative possibilities “so as to be able to rationally re-educate themselves, to become practical reasoners” (Waghid, 2003: 27).

I want to link the capacity of educators to evaluate and modify their thinking and practices, and also to imagine other possibilities to Carson’s (1995) notion of a reflective practice. The meaning of reflective practice will continue to unfold through teacher educators’ own thoughtful work as educators. To promote reflection in the education of teachers, teacher educators must become more reflective themselves (Carson, 1995: 151). Reflective practice is not an alternative paradigm of teacher education, because it consists of clearing spaces and opening up places for thinking. Reflective practice allows that “which turns away from us to show itself. It means trying to lay aside preconceptions about teaching and teacher preparation in order to listen more attentively to how we live together pedagogically in teacher education classrooms and in the schools

we serve” (Carson, 1995: 153). To “listen more attentively”, in my view, possibly point to deliberation, discussion and dialogue among student teachers and between teacher educator and student teacher, with the intention of evaluating and modifying their thinking and practices. The latter process can lead to imagining alternative possibilities so that they can “rationally re-educate themselves”, to become reflective practitioners (Waghid, 2003: 27).

I shall now turn to a brief description of an instance of non-traditional pedagogical practice at a South African university. This one example of non-traditional pedagogical practice might be used at teacher education institutions to transform classroom practices and teach student teachers how to access theoretical discourses, and also how to use theory as an analytic tool to analyse and improve teaching practices. The instance of non-traditional pedagogical practice involves one of the pedagogical practices of Waghid (2003) in his classroom at the University of Stellenbosch. Waghid (2003: 20) uses a combination of his own narratives and those of his learners to construct a notion of university teaching based on practical reasoning in an attempt to move beyond the dominant “transmission mode” of teaching which had been and in many cases remains prevalent in South African university classrooms. Practical reasoning, in the university classroom, can enhance joint educational activity among learners and educators “by their acting together and trying to convince one another (through deliberation) to co-ordinate their classroom and pedagogical activities in particular ways” (Waghid, 2003: 20). I think Waghid (2003), as an teacher educator, is making an attempt to involve his university students in decisions about his classroom pedagogy. This attempt is, more or less, in line with one of the evaluative criteria that was utilised in the analysis of South African teacher education in the National Teacher Education Audit (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996) of 1995. These evaluative criteria state that: “Teacher Education should be underpinned by a learner-centred philosophy of education and aim at improving practice and thinking about practice” (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996: 137).

I contend that Waghid's (2003: 20) attempt of a non-traditional (the traditional pedagogical practice is the transmission mode) pedagogical practice, in the form of practical reasoning, is an attempt to recognise the voices, beliefs, histories and experiences of his teacher education students. This latter attempt has resonates with one of the shifts in the international discourse on teacher education (Avalos, 1999: 39-40), namely the shift from the exclusion of student voices to the recognition of student voices, beliefs, histories and experiences in teacher education. Moletsane (2002: 78) also makes a plea for the recognition of previously excluded student voices, beliefs, histories and experiences by South African teacher education institutions so that these could be utilised to inform curriculum transformation in teacher education and the transformation of teacher education programmes. To Moletsane (2002: 77 & 78) the latter efforts would constitute purposeful reconceptualisation of teacher education programmes, and not adaptation or restructuring thereof. I contend that Waghid's (2003) attempt at a non-traditional pedagogical practice, through practical reasoning, constitutes an instance of purposeful reconceptualisation of teacher education, and also an instance of transformed teacher education pedagogy.

I want to link my argument to Moletsane's (2002: 78) plea for the recognition of previously excluded students' voices, beliefs, histories and experiences in the development of teacher education programmes that will aid the transformation of teacher education in South Africa. My argument is also linked to my previous discussion of how Waghid (2003: 20) employed a non-traditional pedagogical practice, practical reasoning, to consult his teacher education students on an "appropriate pedagogy" for their classroom practice. Carson (1995: 159) used reflective practice to consult his student teachers on an "appropriate pedagogy" for their classroom practice. How, then, should the "consultation" process with student teachers occur? Practical reasoning and reflective practice should be complemented by Benhabib's (1994) model of deliberative democracy, because the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) creates space for deliberation. I think, deliberative democracy can help student teachers to engage in the processes of making meaningful contributions to non-traditional

pedagogy, curriculum and assessment procedures at South African teacher education institutions.

Why do we need deliberative democracy to effect the latter process? Critics of current democratic institutions provide some reasons for their assessment that current arrangements are undermining the most important principles of democracy. The first reason is that contemporary political practices are based on a politics of self-interest that produces social fragmentation and permit an unequal distribution of social and economic power that persistently disadvantages the poor and the powerless. Contemporary political practices, secondly, presuppose institutions that depend almost entirely upon merely aggregative, episodic, and inflexible forms of decision-making and that leave deep structural problems of social and economic renewal unresolved. "Out of all these diagnoses comes the same remedy: public deliberation" (Bohman, 1996: 1). The deliberative process can enhance the legitimacy of decisions by forcing deliberators to justify their decisions and opinions by appealing to common interests or by encouraging participants to argue in terms of reasons that might be acceptable to all (Bohman, 1996: 5).

There are three reasons for the essentiality of deliberative processes to the rationality of collective decision-making processes. The first reason is that new information is imparted. Deliberative processes, secondly, lead to critical self-reflection on already held views and opinions. Deliberative processes can also lead to changes in opinions/ views/ preferences and considering the common good (Benhabib, 1994: 32). The latter process can occur because deliberation draws deliberators out of their parochial interests and instills community-mindedness. Deliberation also increases the amount and variety of data that inform collective decisions (Stokes, 1998: 136).

Benhabib's (1994) paper outlines a deliberative model of democracy, which incorporates features of practical rationality. Practical rationality makes free public deliberation about matters of mutual concern to all possible. Deliberative

democracy is rational because of five reasons. It, firstly, imparts information. Deliberative democracy also leads to changes in opinions and revision of preferences. The latter two processes can occur because deliberation induces individuals to give due consideration to their judgements. This will enable them to know what they want, but also to understand what others want. The deliberative process will also enable them to justify their judgements to others as well as to themselves (Warren, 2002: 173). The deliberative process, thirdly, leads to the formulation of conclusions, which can be challenged publicly for good reasons. Discourse, according to Habermas (in Bohman, 1996: 40), becomes the medium of public deliberation. Discourse, in Habermasian terms, refers to second-order communication about communication. This reflective level of communication makes it possible for a speaker to clarify his claims or to provide reasons for his views, in response to a hearer's request for this. Citizens coordinate their everyday activities via the mechanisms of communication, by rejecting or accepting claims or offers made in speech. "Discourse is thus a social mechanism for coordinating action ... " (Bohman, 1996: 41). The fourth reason is that it allows self-referential critique of their own uses and abuses. Deliberative democracy, lastly, takes place within a multiple, anonymous, heterogenous network of many publics and public conversations (Benhabib, 1994: 44).

The aim of the mentorship programme of the UWC Education Faculty was to develop the capacity of teachers to act as guides to the student teachers doing teaching practice at their schools. The students involved in this mentorship programme were doing a one-year pre-service course, the Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE). The mentorship programme, which ran for three years, "also saw mentors as potential change agents, who could contribute to building their schools as good learning environments for teachers and student teachers" (Robinson, 2001: 99). The rationale behind the mentorship approach to teaching practice, of the UWC action research project (Robinson, 2001) is as follows:



When mentors act as agents of cultural change, they seek to break down the traditional isolation among teachers by fostering norms of collaboration and shared inquiry. They build networks with novices and their colleagues ... They facilitate conversations among teachers about teaching (Feiman-Nemser & Parker in Robinson, 2001: 100).

The possibility of this mentorship approach to “facilitate conversations among teachers about teaching” has an important bearing on this dissertation. I have argued, earlier in this chapter, for a deliberative democratic approach to educational transformation. I argue that the mentorship approach to teacher education has the potential to promote a deliberative democratic approach to the transformation of teacher education in South Africa. The UWC mentorship programme (Robinson, 2001) could possibly be an instance of reconceptualised teacher education (Grimmett, 1995) because its intentions and duration of teaching practice differs, in my view, conceptually from the traditional approach (Robinson & Vergnani, 2001: 70) to teaching practice at UWC. Teacher training, during the 1970s at UWC, was dominated by Fundamental Pedagogics. The latter emphasised student teachers’ classroom performance, in teaching practice, rather than to develop their ability to reflect on or discuss school life beyond the classroom (Jantjes *et al* in Robinson & Vergnani, 2001: 70). Teaching practice, within Fundamental Pedagogics, thus emphasised the teacher as an individual who has to perform in his classroom.

One of the intentions of the UWC mentorship programme, stressing teacher collaboration and collaborative reflection about educational purposes and practices (Robinson, 2001: 101), is to bring together different teachers to share experiences and to encourage cooperation and debate among teachers within a particular school. The mentorship approach would enable teachers to become more critically aware of their classroom practices, through consistent and purposeful dialogue with one another (Robinson, 2001: 101). The latter arguments resonate with my arguments, in the previous section, about how practical reasoning (Waghid, 2003), reflective practice (Carson, 1995) and

deliberative democracy (Benhabib, 1994; Warren, 2002) could possibly help to transform teacher education practices in South Africa. If the mentorship approach to teaching practice is, however, to realise its objectives, then it must first try to address two major obstacles. These obstacles relate to school culture and school policies on mentoring (Robinson, 2001: 106). I have already illuminated these obstacles to mentoring earlier on in this chapter.

Schools can, thus, become one of the various spheres, besides political parties, social movements and voluntary associations, within which deliberation can take place about common concerns like educational practices. A crucial aspect of the deliberative model of democracy is the idea of a “public sphere” of opinion-formation, debate, deliberation and contestation among citizens, groups, movements and organisations in a polity (Benhabib, 1994: 39). Warren (2002: 174) seems to agree with the latter view because he propagates the idea that deliberation about matters of common concern “should not be restricted to political representatives, judges, media pundits, technocrats and other elites, but should infuse a society so structured that it underwrites ongoing processes of public opinion-formation and judgement.” It is necessary to focus on non-state forms and venues of democracy because state-centred democratisation is running up against limits imposed by market capitalism, scale and increasing complexity (Warren, 2002: 174). These deliberations in the staff-rooms of schools can help teachers to understand and improve their practices because deliberation imparts new information and because deliberation can lead to critical self-reflection on already held views and opinions.

A deliberative democratic approach to educational transformation, at the institutional level, can create conditions that may be favourable to change, because it can facilitate discussions about change, the sharing of experiences and reflective enquiry. The latter processes can help participants to develop “both a disposition for change and create a shared understanding of what is involved in the various roles” (Avalos, 1999: 47). A deliberative democratic approach to educational transformation can also help to ease the impact of the latter process

on the changing of the identities of teachers, because it may help them to understand what is expected from them in the transformation process. A deliberative democratic approach may lead to a discourse that can enable more inclusivity and less to the exclusion of dissenting voices. This approach may enable South African teacher education institutions to recognise and also utilise the voices of their student teachers in the design of teacher education programmes so that purposeful reconceptualisation of teacher education can be effected.

#### **4.6 Summary**

This chapter made an effort to uncover constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation. The following constitutive meanings of the concept of teacher education transformation were extracted from a literature review: deliberation can assist teacher education transformation; local cultures and contexts need to be respected; it is difficult to change the roles and identities of teachers; teacher education has shifted from being university-based to being largely school-based; teachers should be reflective practitioners; educators should be lifelong learners; student voices should be recognised in teacher education.

In the second section of this chapter I applied the listed constitutive meanings of the concept of teacher education transformation to post-apartheid South Africa's current teacher education policy framework, the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). I have identified conceptual gaps within the mentioned policy framework that may impede the transformation of teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa. These conceptual gaps relate to a lack of detail on how student educators and educators should be trained to be reflective practitioners; a lack of detail on how the recognition of student voices is to be realised at teacher education institutions; all the contexts for teaching practice are perceived to be homogenous; the false assumption by the mentioned policy framework that educators will change their roles and identities easily. I

argue, in the final section of the chapter, for the reconceptualisation of teacher education so that the transformation of the latter can be advanced in post-apartheid South Africa. I make a case for the utilisation of deliberation, as a means, to assist this reconceptualisation I am referring to.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA IN RELATION TO THE NORMS AND STANDARDS FOR EDUCATORS: EXPLORING CONSTITUTIVE MEANINGS ASSOCIATED WITH TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter attempts to do a conceptual analysis of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). Constitutive meanings (Fay, 1975: 76) associated with teacher education policy, like the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), are also explored. The first section of this chapter explores, by means of a conceptual analysis, constitutive meanings of the concept of teacher education. An attempt is made to uncover the logically necessary conditions or governing principles (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 30-31) for the use of the word “teacher education”. Making these logically necessary conditions explicit may hopefully reveal the appropriate meaning of the concept of “teacher education”.

The second section of the chapter explores, by means of a conceptual analysis, constitutive meanings (Fay, 1975: 76) of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). Constitutive meanings of teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa refer to all those shared assumptions, definitions, and conceptions which structure post-apartheid South African teacher education in certain definite ways (hence “meanings”). Without these constitutive meanings, according to Fay (1975: 76), social practices (Hirst, 1998: 392), like teacher education, could not exist. By revealing these constitutive meanings, in terms of the interpretive paradigm (Fay, 1975: 78), I shall hopefully give an explanation of post-apartheid teacher education, by articulating the conceptual scheme that defines the reality

of post-apartheid South African teacher education in certain ways. A close examination of the latter policy framework, in relation to other teacher education policy documents like the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (COTEP, 1996) and the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Training and Development (Department of Education, 1997a) have revealed the following constitutive meanings of teacher education: The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) provide an authoritative standard or model for the development of learning programmes and qualifications for educators for employment purposes; the notion of applied competence and its associated assessment criteria forms the cornerstone of assessment in post-apartheid teacher education; pre-service (preset) and in-service educators (inset) should be reflective practitioners; teacher education institutions must recognise student voices; teaching practice is an essential feature of teacher education; educators should be lifelong learners; local needs, contexts and cultures must be respected; and existing teacher education practice must be transformed. These listed constitutive meanings seem to reflect, to a great extent, the teacher education outcomes or conceptual orientations of the constitutive meanings of teacher education transformation that my conceptual analysis has revealed in Chapter Four.

Constitutive meanings of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), are examined in relation to the central question of this dissertation: Can the new education policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), improve learning and teaching in South African schools? I argue that the transformation of teacher education will not be an easy process. The prospects of the mentioned policy framework for improving learning and teaching in South African schools look dim, because of the latter problem. Based mainly on Jansen's (2001: 272) notion of education policy as "political symbolism", I argue that the mentioned policy framework shows signs of "political symbolism" and that the latter policy framework may not lead to deep transformation of teacher education in South Africa. Jansen (2001: 272)

claims that the making of education policy in South Africa can best be described as a “struggle for the achievement of a broad political symbolism to mark the shift from apartheid to post-apartheid society.” Jansen (2001: 272) posits further that every “single case of education policy-making demonstrates, in different ways, the preoccupation of the state with settling policy struggles in the political domain rather than in the realm of practice.” I argue that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) demonstrate this “preoccupation” because it lacks detail (Christie, 1999; Fataar, 2000) on practical implementation. This may impede deep transformation of teacher education in South Africa. Education policy, alone, cannot lead to educational transformation (Christie, 1999) because of the limitations of the state’s power to enforce its will through promulgated education policy (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999). The state and its education policy-makers need more “engagement” with other policy actors, like educators and bureaucrats, if it is to succeed in its aim to transform education in South Africa (Christie, 1999). In the absence of any concrete suggestions, by Christie (1999), on how this engagement should be effected I have suggested that a deliberative democratic approach may frame and facilitate this engagement so that the transformation agenda of teacher education in South Africa could be advanced.

## **5.2 Constitutive meanings of teacher education: a conceptual analysis**

Before turning to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), it may be necessary to briefly explore constitutive meanings of “teacher education”. I shall firstly explore constitutive meanings of “education” and then “teacher” to uncover constitutive meanings of “teacher education”.

What does the concept of ‘education’ entail? When we analyse a concept like education we examine the principle or principles that govern the appropriate use of such a word. If we can make these governing principles explicit we have uncovered a concept. The latter governing principles can also be referred to as logically necessary conditions for the use of the word education. Conceptual

analysis, thus, appears to consist in searching for logically necessary conditions for the use of a word (Hirst & Peters, 1998: 30-31). I shall, thus, attempt to search for the logically necessary conditions for the use of the word education.

Hirst (1998: 384) sees education as a social practice. This is because “education can no longer be rationalistically planned. As a social practice itself, it can only be rationally developed in practice and that in relation to other social practices with which it is tightly interlocked” (Hirst, 1998: 392). One of the logically necessary conditions for the use of the word “education” is articulated by Oakeshott (1998: 284): “Education in its most general significance may be recognised as a specific transaction which may go on between the generations of human beings in which newcomers to the scene are initiated into the world they are to inhabit”. Education can, thus, be regarded as a human engagement of a certain kind “and as transaction upon which a recognisably human life depends for its continuance” (Oakeshott, 1998: 284). There are, however, some obstacles that may retard and even frustrate this transaction. One obstacle has to do with the way human beings understand themselves. Human beings are “composed entirely of beliefs about themselves and about the world they inhabit. They inhabit a world of intelligibles; that is, a world composed, not of physical objects, but of occurrences which have meanings and are recognised in manners to which there are alternatives” (Oakeshott, 1998: 285). The transaction between the generations can be regarded as a transaction “between human beings and postulants to a human condition in which new-comers are initiated into an inheritance of human achievements of understanding and belief” (Oakeshott, 1998: 286-287). This inheritance is composed of “human activities, aspirations, sentiments, images, opinions, beliefs, modes of understanding, customs and practices: in short, states of mind which may be entered into only in a procedure of learning” (Oakeshott, 1998: 287). In this transaction the new-comer, thus, learns to perform humanly. Education is, thus, not “acquiring a stock of ready-made ideas, images, sentiments, beliefs etc.; it is learning to look, to listen, to think, to feel, to imagine, to believe, to understand, to choose and to wish”



(Oakeshott, 1998: 287). Education is, thus, not an uncomplicated process because it requires engagement in which the new-comer learns to understand this inheritance of human understandings and modes of thinking. Oakeshott (1998: 308) concludes his efforts to elucidate the meaning of the concept of “education” with the following:

Education ... is the transaction between the generations in which new-comers to the scene are initiated into the world which they are to inhabit. This is a world of understandings, imaginings, meanings, moral and religious beliefs, relationships, practices – states of mind in which the human condition is to be discerned as recognitions of and responses to the ordeal of consciousness. These states of mind can be entered into only by being themselves understood, and they can be understood only by doing so. To be initiated into this world is learning to become human; and to move within it freely is being human, which is an historic, not a natural condition.

I shall now briefly extend the Oakeshott’s (1998) elucidation of the concept of “education” by focussing on the initiation of new-comers into practices. The practices are part of the world into which new-comers are initiated into. MacIntyre (1981: 175) regards human well-being partly as embracing the pursuit of what he calls “practices”:

By a “practice” I am going to mean any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through goods internal to that form of activity are realised in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended ... Brick-laying is not a practice; architecture is. Planting turnips is not a practice; farming is.

Practices, thus, contains internal, shared goods. These consist of the excellence of what is produced and also the virtues “necessary to sustain a practice – the courage and honesty, for instance, found in the willingness of a novice to subordinate herself to the best standards available within the practice, or the cooperativeness necessary for working on a common task” (White & White, 1998: 352). To be initiated into ‘practices thus “requires engagement in them in order to possess the goods, including the virtues, which they embody” (White & White, 1998: 357). Pendlebury (1998a: 182) also links education to “practices”:

Education ... is centrally a matter of getting people to care about practices that might otherwise have meant nothing to them ... It is partly a matter of socialising them into traditions and practices so that they might, in time, use the language of those practices to criticise, advance and perhaps overturn them ...

I shall now briefly extend Pendlebury’s (1998a: 182) conception of education as partly a matter of socialising people into traditions and practices. This act of socialising implies that certain people must be responsible for the latter act to occur. In the sphere of education teachers would be the responsible for socialising people into the traditions and practices of humankind. What constitutes the notion of teacher? A “teacher”, in terms of Pendlebury’s (1998a) conception of “education”, is a person who socialises people into the traditions and practices of humankind. A “teacher”, in terms of Oakeshott’s (1998: 308) conception of “education”, is a mediator in the transaction between the generations whereby the teacher initiates new-comers into the world which they are to inhabit. This world or states of mind is constituted by understandings, imaginings, meanings, moral and religious beliefs, relationships and practices. “These states of mind can be entered into only by being themselves understood, and they can be understood only by learning to do so. To be initiated into this world is learning to become human ...” (Oakeshott, 1998: 308). So a teacher, in terms of the latter, is therefore a person who must learn new-comers to become

human by helping them to understand the understandings, imaginings, meanings, moral and religious beliefs and practices of the world they are to inhabit. A teacher, to put it another way and in terms of Oakeshott's (1998: 287) notion of education as a transaction whereby new-comers are initiated into an inheritance of human achievements of understanding and belief, is a person who must help new-comers to understand the human activities, aspirations, sentiments, images, opinions, beliefs, modes of understanding, customs and practices of the world they are to inhabit, via a procedure of learning.

The role of the teacher in the latter initiation process implies that the teacher is someone in whom some part or aspect or passage of this inheritance is alive. The teacher possesses something of which he is a master to impart "and he has deliberated its worth and the manner in which he is to impart it to a learner who he knows. He is himself the custodian of that practice in which an inheritance of human understanding survives and is perpetually renewed in being imparted to new-comers" (Oakeshott, 1998: 290). This brings me to the next question: What constitutes "teaching"? Revealing logically necessary conditions for the use of word "teaching" may reveal appropriate meanings of the concept of "teaching"? Oakeshott (1998: 290) offers the following meaning of "teaching":

To teach is to bring it about that, somehow, something of worth intended by a teacher is learned, understood and remembered by a learner. Thus, teaching is a variegated activity which may include hinting, suggesting, urging, coaxing, encouraging, guiding, pointing out, conversing, instructing, informing, narrating, lecturing, demonstrating, exercising, testing, examining, criticising, correcting, tutoring, drilling ... everything, indeed, which does not belie the engagement to impart an understanding.

Bengtsson (2001: 144) also makes an effort to reveal what the concept entails: "Teaching is, on the one hand, acting and, on the other, intersubjective relations between at least two persons" (Bengtsson, 2001: 144). Teaching is acting because to teach is "necessarily to do something: to tell, to demonstrate, to ask

questions, to supervise, to organise group work, role play, excursions, project work, etc.” (Bengtsson, 2001: 144). Intersubjectivity is also a necessary quality (or a logically necessary condition) of teaching because teaching cannot be performed alone. If the world had only one inhabitant this person could “certainly still learn very much, but it would not be possible to be taught by someone or to teach someone. Intersubjectivity is, therefore, an integral and inseparable part of teaching. Teaching can, therefore, be said to be a practical intersubjectivity ...” (Bengtsson, 1998: 144).

A third characterising quality (or a logically necessary condition) is that “teaching can be defined as practical intersubjectivity that intends that someone learns a certain content of knowledge” (Bengtsson, 2001: 145). The latter characterising quality is necessary because there is nothing that necessarily entails that teaching also results in learning. People can learn from teaching, but need not do it. “On the other hand, learning is quite possible independently of teaching. People are learning all their lives and not only in teaching situations” (Bengtsson, 2001: 145). A fourth necessary characterising quality of teaching is that all teaching occurs in concrete and timely contexts. It is these concrete contexts that give life and meaning to teaching (Bengtsson, 2001: 146).

What, then, are logically necessary conditions or governing principles (Hirst & Peters, 1998) for the use of the “teacher education”? The foregoing conceptual analysis of the words, “education”, “teacher” and “teaching”, revealed the following possible logically necessary conditions or constitutive meanings (Fay, 1975: 76), in order for us to refer to “teacher education”. These constitutive meanings may reveal what the concept of “teacher education” entails:

1. Teacher education is a social practice which can only be rationally developed in practice.
2. Teacher education entails a transaction between human generations in which student teachers are initiated into an inheritance of human

achievements of understanding and belief, in relation to the practices of teaching and learning.

3. The inheritance of human achievements of understanding and belief, or the world into which student teachers must be initiated via teacher education, is composed of human activities, aspirations, sentiments, images, opinions, beliefs, modes of understanding, customs and practices, and can only be entered into in a procedure of learning.
4. Teacher education is not an uncomplicated process because it requires engagement in which the student teacher learns to understand the inheritance of human understandings and modes of thinking.
5. The initiation into the practices of teaching and learning, via teacher education, requires engagement in these practices in order to possess the goods, including the virtues, which they embody.
6. Teacher education is partly a matter of socialising student teachers into the traditions and practices of teaching and learning.
7. Because the world, into which student teachers have to be initiated into, can only be entered into in a procedure of learning, this initiation necessitates the mediation of a teacher educator who must, via teacher education, help them to understand the inheritance of traditions and practices of teaching and learning.

I shall now move to a closer examination of constitutive meanings of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). A close examination of the latter policy framework, in relation to other South African teacher education policy documents like the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (COTEP, 1996) and the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education,

1998) revealed certain constitutive meanings of teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa.

### **5.3 Constitutive meanings of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators**

#### **5.3.1 The Norms and Standards provide an authoritative standard or model for the development of learning programmes and qualifications for educators for employment purposes**

One of the constitutive meanings of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), is that the latter policy provides a basis for teacher education institutions (providers) to develop programmes and qualifications that will be recognised by the Department of Education for purposes of employment. The seven roles, their associated set of applied competences (norms), and the qualifications (standards) described in the mentioned policy will be used by the Department of Education for purposes of recognition and evaluation of qualifications for employment as an educator (Department of Education, 2000: 9). Qualifications must be designed around the seventh role, that of a subject or learning area specialist, because the latter encapsulates the purpose of the qualification and shapes the way the “other six roles and their applied competences are integrated into the qualification” (Department of Education, 2000: 12).

Teacher education institutions must ensure, in order for qualifications and their associated learning programmes to be recognised for employment in education, that “the roles and applied competence specified in the exit level outcomes of the qualification meet the requirement of learners to demonstrate their ability to integrate theory and practice” (Department of Education, 2000: 32). The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) outline the outcomes that teacher education, in post-apartheid South Africa, should be

directed towards. The seven roles and their associated set of applied competences are the norms for post-apartheid teacher education.

When we analyse a concept like “norms” we examine the principle or principles that govern the appropriate use of such a word. If we can make these governing principles explicit we have uncovered a concept. A conceptual analysis, in terms of the conception of Hirst and Peters (1998: 30-31), of the word “norms” involves a search for logically necessary conditions for the use of the word. Du Plooy and Killian (1981: 107) explains ‘norm’ as follows:

Norm is derived from the Latin: *norma* meaning a carpenter’s square for measuring right angle; also a rule, a concept, a model, a pattern or an authoritative standard. Norms are standards to ascertain whether something is correct, accurate, precise as it *should* be.

Norms can also be used as “*directives* or *guides* (directing principles) to determine *beforehand* what is good or bad, ... true or false in our activities. Secondly, they can be used as standards by means of which we can pass judgement afterwards ...” (Du Plooy & Killian, 1981: 108-109). The foregoing explanations imply that the following may be logically necessary conditions or governing principles for the use of the concept ‘norms’, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000):

1. The norms of the mentioned policy framework, the seven roles and their associated set of applied competences, should be used to measure how learning programmes and qualifications of teacher education institutions conform to the prescriptions of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000).
2. The mentioned policy framework provides an authoritative standard or model with which the latter measurement should be effected, in relation

to the design and delivery of learning programmes and qualifications for educators for purposes of employment by the Department of Education.

3. The norms of the mentioned policy framework are supposed to be rules or directives that teacher education institutions should follow when they design and deliver their learning programmes and qualifications.
4. The norms of the mentioned policy framework can be used as standards to pass judgement on the learning programmes and qualifications of teacher education institutions.

From the foregoing explicit logically necessary conditions for the use of the concept of 'norms', one can infer that the latter policy framework provides the *outcomes* or *ends* that teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa should be directed towards. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) provide the *ends* to which the learning programmes and qualifications of teacher education institutions should be directed towards. The latter situation gives rise to the question: What about the *means* to arrive at these *ends*? *Means*, in terms of Bernstein's (1975: 85) notion on the classification and framing of educational knowledge, would be constituted by curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation:

Formal educational knowledge can be considered to be realised through three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realisation of this knowledge on the part of the taught.

Curriculum, pedagogy and assessment (evaluation) can, thus, be regarded as important constitutive elements or parts of teacher education. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) only refer to the



assessment of student educators, and how this should be done. I shall elaborate on the latter point in the following section. About the *means* of teacher education, curriculum and pedagogy, the mentioned policy framework has very little to say. The ends of the new teacher education policy framework is strongly emphasised in the draft revised Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1997 & 1998). The latter policy grants “considerably more discretion to institutions to decide on how best to accomplish these ends” (Pendlebury, 1998: 340). The focus on ends to the exclusion of means is also evident in an earlier version of the Norms and Standards that was drafted by the Committee on Teacher education policy (COTEP) in 1996 (Pendlebury, 1998). This trend, the focus on ends to the exclusion of means, is also perpetuated in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). The latter policy text is dominated by a detailed description of the seven roles that teachers are supposed to perform and the various competences that they must demonstrate, for qualifications and accreditation purposes. The policy text lacks detail on pedagogy, curriculum and assessment procedures and only states that: “These norms and standards provide a basis for providers to develop programmes and qualifications that will be recognised by the Department of Education for purposes of employment” (Department of Education, 2000: 9). Teacher education institutions must develop all the competences in all educator qualifications:

Providers have the responsibility to decide how this should be achieved, and before designing a learning programme it will be necessary to establish the particular nature of the clients and which qualification the learners are to be prepared for (Department of Education, 2000: 11).

Here again the latter policy text lacks detail on “how” all the competences should be developed in all initial educator qualifications, and again emphasises ends to the exclusion of means. I agree with Pendlebury (1998: 340) that this focus on ends to the exclusion of means can be a possible impediment to the transformation of teacher education in South Africa. Changes in teaching

practices cannot be guaranteed by changes in policy. Educators may, wittingly or not, undermine new policy by continuing to practice in “old ways or in ways that reinterpret policy in the light of habitual understanding” (Pendlebury, 1998: 342). Much more than policy is needed to effect deep transformation of South Africa’s teacher education dispensation. This is especially the case where the policy focuses on ends to the exclusion of means and gives little guidance on what a transformative curriculum would look like in practice (Pendlebury, 1998: 342). The very openness of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) is both its strength and its weakness. The latter policy’s strength, in my opinion, is the space it creates for teacher education institutions to use their professional discretion to develop teacher education programmes, according to the prescriptions of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). It is a weakness because the latter policy text also creates space, because of a lack of detail on pedagogy and curriculum, for the perpetuation of Apartheid-era (see NECC, 1992 & Pendlebury, 1998) teacher education practices.

Moreover, the huge “disparities across institutions and sectors as a result of apartheid and the urban/rural divide” (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1996: 138) make it risky to focus on ends without paying proper attention to means. The latter factor may, thus, help to retard deep transformation of teaching and learning at South African teacher education institutions. It is these institutions that must produce teachers that are supposed to act as transformative agents (COTEP, 1996: 10) to help in the reconstruction of South African society. Detail is necessary because the ends of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) cannot be realised by using the means (pedagogy and curriculum) of the apartheid teacher education dispensation. This is because the conceptual foundations of the pedagogy and curriculum of the latter dispensation seem to be incompatible with the conceptual foundations of the ends of the post-apartheid teacher education framework. It seems as if implementers, teacher education institutions and teacher educators, have to infer from the mentioned policy framework that they must adapt or change their pedagogy and curriculum to

realise the ends of the mentioned policy framework. Detail on implementation, pedagogy and curriculum and assessment, is necessary because any policy text is not capable of only one interpretation. This is because different kinds of official texts and utterances are produced by key actors or agencies of government. The foregoing process puts a whole variety and crisscross of meanings and interpretations into circulation. This variety of textual meanings influences and constrains implementers, while their own concerns and contextual constraints generate other meanings and interpretations (Bowe *et al.* 1992: 12). I argue that the lack of detail on pedagogy and curriculum by the mentioned policy framework may put a whole variety and crisscross of meanings and interpretations about the transformation of South African teacher education into circulation, which could create space for the perpetuation of apartheid-era teacher education. I shall extend these arguments later on in the section that deals with the transformation of existing teacher education practice in South Africa.

### **5.3.2 The notion of applied competence and its associated assessment criteria forms the cornerstone of assessment in post-apartheid teacher education**

The notion of *applied competence* and its associated *assessment criteria* is the cornerstone of the Norms and Standards policy of 2000. Three interconnected kinds of competence, *practical competence*, *foundational competence* and *reflexive competence*, are the constitutive features of this *applied competence*. *Practical competence* refers to the demonstrated ability of the student teacher “to consider a range of possibilities for action, make considered decisions about which possibility to follow, and to perform the chosen action” (Department of Education, 2000: 10) in an authentic context. This *practical competence* is grounded in *foundational competence* “where the learner demonstrates an understanding of the knowledge and thinking that underpins the action taken ...” (Department of Education, 2000: 10). *Practical competence* and *foundational competence* are “integrated through *reflexive competence* in which the learner demonstrates ability to integrate or connect performances and decision-making with understanding and with an ability to adapt to change and unforeseen

circumstances and to explain the reasons behind these adaptations” (Department of Education, 2000: 10). The latter policy framework’s conceptualisation of *applied competence* improves on the version of applied competence in an earlier version of the Norms and Standards, Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Training and Development (Department of Education, 1997a). The latter was a discussion document. The earlier version (Department of Education, 1997a: 58) of the mentioned policy framework refers to *practical competence* as our demonstrated ability to perform a set of tasks. The Norms and Standards for Educators (2000: 10) have extended this conception by stating that the performance should be in an authentic context.

Before performing a set of tasks the student educator should demonstrate the ability to consider a range of possibilities for action and make considered decisions about which possibility to follow. The earlier version of the Norms and Standards (Department of Education, 1997a: 58) refers to *foundational competence* as our demonstrated understanding of what we and others are doing and why. The later version of the Norms and Standards (Department of Education, 2000: 10) extends the latter conception by stating that “practical competence” is grounded in *foundational competence* where the student educator demonstrates an understanding of the knowledge and thinking that underpin the action taken. *Reflexive competence*, in the earlier version of the Norms and Standards (Department of Education, 1997a: 58), seems, unlike the conception in the later version (Department of Education, 2000: 10), to be disconnected from *practical competence* and *foundational competence*. The earlier version of the Norms and Standards (Department of Education, 1997a: 58) states that *reflexive competence* “is our demonstrated ability to integrate or connect our performances with our understanding so that we learn from our actions and are able to adapt to changes and unforeseen circumstances.” The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 10) extend the latter conception by stating that *practical competence* is grounded in *foundational competence* and that these two competences are integrated through *reflexive competence*. The latter policy framework also, unlike the mentioned earlier version, require from student

educators to explain the reasons behind their adaptations to change and unforeseen circumstances.

*Applied competence* also requires from student teachers the ability to integrate the discrete competences, which constitute each of the seven educator roles. This is important so that competence is assessed, rather than simply explained as the ability to perform a discrete competence. In turn, the seven roles should also be assessed in an integrated and applied manner (Department of Education, 2000: 10). The *exit level outcomes* for educator development are constituted by the seven roles and associated competences for educators for schooling. These exit level outcomes are “in effect the *norms* for educator development and therefore the central feature of all initial educator qualifications and learning programmes” (Department of Education, 2000: 12). The seventh role, that of a subject or learning area specialist, is the “over-arching role into which the other roles are integrated, and in which competence is ultimately assessed” (Department of Education, 2000: 12).

Evidence, for the purpose of assessing student educators and in-service educators, “can be demonstrated through a variety of options: case studies; problem-solving assignments; teaching practice in simulated and in situ contexts; portfolios of learning materials; projects; written and oral examinations” (Department of Education, 2000: 31). The ultimate objective of the assessment strategy seems to be to assess the extent to which student educators have the ability to teach in authentic and changing South African contexts (Department of Education, 2000: 31).

Student educators were assessed differently during the apartheid-era. Assessment was referred to as evaluation. The latter was an important constitutive part of Fundamental Pedagogics. The latter was an authoritarian educational philosophy that has historically shaped and dominated the teacher education programmes at teacher education institutions in South Africa. Institutions subscribing to this philosophy taught one-theory explanations of learning, curriculum and society in

a didactic, racist and exclusionary manner (Gultig, 1999: 61). The education faculties of Unisa, most of the Afrikaans universities, most of the universities in the homelands and the TBVC states, and all of the colleges of education under or affiliated to the DET and the House of Representatives kept Fundamental Pedagogics in place during the apartheid years (NECC, 1992: 17).

DET colleges had to follow a curriculum set and examined by the DET. “A standard format for examination question papers in many subjects fostered the habits of ‘teaching to the exam’ and rote learning of textbook summaries, lecture notes and model answers” (Pendlebury, 1998: 337). The curriculum at the DET colleges, and also at other colleges, focussed too much on content and stressed rote learning of teaching ‘methods’ and subject ‘facts’ at the “expense of principled knowledge and the development of critical discernment and independent judgement” (Pendlebury, 1998: 337). There is little evidence, at this stage, which suggests that the latter situation has changed because many colleges and universities still continue to follow old patterns (Moletsane, 2002). The foregoing brief description has illuminated the difference between apartheid-era assessment and post-apartheid assessment of student educators, in terms of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). Apartheid-era student educators were mainly assessed via written examinations which emphasised rote learning, while post-apartheid student educators should be assessed via demonstrated competences, in the form of case studies; problem-solving assignments; teaching practice in simulated and in situ contexts; portfolios of learning materials; projects; written and oral examinations.

The latter gives rise to the following question: What does the concept of “competence” entail? To answer this question it is necessary to look at logically necessary conditions that guide the use of the latter word. The word “competence” means to being competent or the ability to do something. To be “competent”, in turn, refers to persons “having ability, power, authority, skill, knowledge, etc. (to do what is needed) ...” (Hornby, 1978: 119). Another dictionary refers to “competent” as “having the ability, power or qualifications

to do something ...” (Harber *et al.* 1979: 212). Houston (1987: 88) gives the following meanings to the concept of “competence”:

Competence ordinarily is defined as adequate for the purpose; suitable, sufficient, or as legally qualified, admissible, or as capable. In a sense it refers to adequate preparation to begin a professional career, and has a direct linkage to certification requirements.

“Competence” has different meanings for different people. Competency-based teacher education, regarded as narrowly behaviouristic and utilised in the USA during the 1970 and 1980s, is now a largely discredited approach to teacher education and performance assessment. The so-called competence-based education movement in the UK has, in the recent past, been criticised for being crudely behaviouristic and incoherent (Pendlebury, 1998: 340). “Competence” is a promiscuous term, both in South Africa and the UK, because it embraces an embarrassing variety of conceptions, each with a different relationship between knowledge, understanding and performance. COTEP documents also do not contain any clear conception of “competence”. The authors of the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (COTEP, 1996) reject charges of being crudely behaviouristic, and insist that competences are equivalent to but not the same as behavioural objectives (Pendlebury, 1998: 340). COTEP (1996: 14) claims that competences give “expression to the aims of teacher education in the form of discrete units. Competences are equivalent to behavioural objects, but are broader and therefore not as easily measured. Competences are more narrowly defined than aims, but broader than behavioural objectives.”

The foregoing definition implies that competences are a “mid-range evaluative unit falling somewhere between aims and objectives. Three features are supposed to distinguish them from objectives: they are broader, not as easily measured and cannot be evaluated without interpretation” (Pendlebury, 1998: 340). COTEP reject behaviourist charges, against their conception of competence, because the assessment of competences do not entail behavioural outcomes that are linked to

long checklists of evidenced behaviour, as was typical of competency-based teacher education and performance assessment in the USA. The behaviourist charges must be rejected because, according to COTEP (1996), the specified competences imply agency, intentionality and intelligent action in response to various teaching contexts (Pendlebury, 1998: 341). COTEP's specification of competences, despite conceptual fuzziness, can be regarded as an inadequate attempt to define features of good teaching practice, in a post-apartheid South African society undergoing radical social change (Pendlebury, 1998: 341).

Competences, according to Morrow (1995), can only be understood in relation to practices. The disconnection of practices from competences may lead to the reification of competences and thus depriving them of their sense and significance. "Three related features of Morrow's account are pertinent to the question of how a competence-defined evaluative space might enable the transformation of teacher education. The account rests on a constitutive conception of practice, which Morrow develops from the work of ... MacIntyre ... it stresses professional discretion, judgement and principled knowledge; it builds an ethical dimension- the ideal of service- into the notion of professional competence" (Pendlebury, 1998: 341). Apartheid education policy has severely curtailed the scope, among educators, for nurturing and exercising professional judgement. Apartheid education policy also eroded the ideal of service among educators (Pendlebury, 1998: 341). The notion of "competence", in post-apartheid teacher education policy may hopefully widen the scope, among educators, for nurturing and exercising professional judgement and advance the ideal of service among educators, so that the transformation of South African teacher education can be advanced. I shall now, in the light of the foregoing conceptual analysis, list logically necessary conditions for the use of the concept of competence, in relation to post-apartheid South African teacher education policy:

1. Competence refers to the ability to do something.



2. Competence refers to the possession of ability, power, authority, skill, knowledge and qualifications to do what is needed.
3. Competence refers to adequate preparation (capability) to begin a professional career, and has a direct linkage to certification requirements.
4. Competence involves the demonstration of abilities, by a student educator, in an authentic context (the classroom at school?) for assessment and qualification purposes.
5. Competence refers to the demonstrated abilities of a student educator to consider a range of possibilities for action, to make considered decisions about which possibility to follow, and then to perform the chosen action in an authentic context for assessment and qualification purposes.
6. Competence refers to the ability of a student educator to demonstrate an understanding of the knowledge and thinking that underpins the action that the latter has taken.
7. Competence refers to a student educator's demonstrated ability to be a reflective practitioner who can integrate or connect performances and decision-making with understanding and with an ability to adapt to change and unforeseen circumstances and to explain the reasons behind these adaptations.
8. Competence also refers to the demonstrated ability of a student educator to integrate the discrete competences, which constitute each of the seven roles.
9. The competences, which are coupled to each of the seven roles, constitute the *norms* and also the *exit level outcomes* for educator development and

therefore the central feature of all initial educator qualifications and learning programmes.

10. Competence, for qualification purposes, is ultimately assessed in the seventh role, that of a subject or learning area specialist, in which the student educator demonstrates the ability to integrate all the other roles and their associated competences.
11. Competence, or the ability to teach in authentic and changing South African contexts, can be demonstrated, for assessment purposes, through a variety of options: case studies; problem-solving assignments; teaching practice in simulated and in situ contexts; portfolios of learning materials; projects; written and oral examinations.
12. Competences are equivalent to behavioural objects, but are broader and therefore not as easily measured.
13. Competences differ from objectives on three accounts: they are broader, not as easily measured and cannot be evaluated without interpretation.
14. The assessment of competences does not entail behavioural outcomes that are linked to long checklists of evidenced behaviour.
15. Behaviourist charges must be rejected because the specified *competences* imply agency, intentionality and intelligent action, on the part of the student educator, in response to various teaching contexts.
16. Competences can only be understood, and only have sense and significance, in relation to practices, which are constituted by professional discretion, judgement and principled knowledge and a built-in ethical dimension (the ideal of service).

17. The notion of competence can widen the scope for nurturing and exercising professional judgement and advance the ideal of service among educators so that the transformation of South African teacher education can be advanced.

This brings us to the next question: What is wrong with competency-based teacher education, as espoused by the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000)? I shall refer to the arguments of Houston (1987) to illuminate some points of critique against competency-based teacher education (CBTE). A first point of critique against competency-based teacher education, in the United States of America during the 1980s, concerns the attack of humanistic educators against CBTE for its pre-specified objectives. Their argument centred round the following question: Does the learner control his or her own learning or does some external system control his or her learning? The view of these humanistic educators, of education, as developing free, self-determining, self-renewing, self-actualised persons was antithetical to the basic CBTE conceptualisation (Houston, 1987: 90). This emphasis on pre-specified objectives, in the form of roles that student teachers and in-service teachers have to perform and competences that they must demonstrate for assessment and qualifications purposes, is clearly evident in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 12). A second point of critique against competency-based teacher education is that the latter is being anti-intellectual, because of its emphasis on performance of competences by teachers. A naïve actor could fulfil the requirements of the pre-specified competences without the undergirding knowledge base. Critics distinguished the performer from the professional who performs, noting that a good actor could receive passing marks simply by mimicking the actions of an effective teacher (Houston, 1987: 90).

A third point of critique against competency-based teacher education relates to the specification of competences, because such lists atomised the teaching process. Teaching cannot be atomised because teachers use a number of skills

and knowledge in an integrated fashion, depending on the context of teaching. Critics questioned the value of dissecting general competence into a number of specific and autonomous objectives. A fourth point of critique concerns CBTE's limitation of objectives to those leading to observable action or results. Such a limitation may stifle the development of teachers whose personal characteristics might lead to a wide range of successful teaching practices. A fifth point of critique relates to problems around the measurement of each single competency, because the use of a single variable procedure was considered inadequate. These critics opted for multivariate measures of the total integrated teaching process of a teacher (Houston, 1987: 90).

It seems as if the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 10 & 12) is aware of the foregoing points of critique against competency-based teacher education, because the latter policy framework states that the seven roles, and each of its associated competences, should be assessed in an integrated and applied manner. The seventh role, that of a subject or learning area specialist, is the "overarching role into which the other roles are integrated, and in which competence is ultimately assessed" (Department of Education, 2000: 12). Is the integration of competences, however, enough to silence critique against competency-based teacher education? I argue that this is not the case because the Norms and Standards need to be reconceptualised in terms of the arguments that I will outline in Chapter Six of this dissertation. I shall argue that the seven roles and its associated competences for assessment purposes should not be integrated, as advocated by the Norms and Standards for Educators, and that teaching should be approached differently, by referring to the use of the tragic perspective on teaching (Burbules, 1997: 65) and Biesta's (2004: 77) arguments about the centrality of risk in the teaching situation. Biesta (2004: 77) argues against the pre-specification of objectives in teaching. I shall illuminate the latter arguments in Chapter Six to show that competency-based teacher education with its pre-specified objectives in the form of listed and atomised competences, as espoused in the mentioned policy framework, may be inappropriate in post-apartheid South Africa to improve teaching and learning in schools.

### 5.3.3 Preset and Inset educators should be reflective practitioners

The practical competence and foundational competence of the student educator should be integrated through *reflexive competence*. The student educator must, for assessment purposes, demonstrate the abilities and skills of a reflexive practitioner. These abilities and skills entail the demonstrated ability “to integrate or connect performances and decision-making with understanding and with an ability to adapt to change and unforeseen circumstances and to explain the reasons behind these adaptations” (Department of Education, 2000: 10). Programmes for in- service (Inset) educators should prioritise the promotion of critical engagement, reasoning and reflective thinking (Department of Education, 2000: 33).

If we combine all the roles and its associated competences it seems as if the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) require from educators to be reflective practitioners. The latter role is unfamiliar to many educators, especially for in-service educators who have been trained during the apartheid-era. Here I refer to the mentioned educators’ training in Fundamental Pedagogics. Education is a practical matter and pedagogics is the scientific study of this practice. Pedagogics seeks to “determine the *nature* of educational reality and why it is what it is, and also *tries to furnish guide-lines for the improvement of educational practice*” (Gunter, 1974: 23). Fundamental Pedagogics, also called Philosophy of Education, deals especially with the *essential nature and purpose* of education. Fundamental Pedagogics is, thus, essentially a study of the essence and aims of education (Gunter, 1974: 24).

The essential nature of a teacher’s professional task, in terms of Fundamental Pedagogics, requires that a good and successful teacher should, among others, possess the following qualities in a high degree:

1. A teacher should possess knowledge about the subject that he teaches and the child whom he educates.
2. A teacher must love his work, the subject that he teaches and his learner (the child).
3. A teacher must place herself in the shoes of her learners.
4. A teacher must exercise authority.
5. Leadership implies that the child that is being led is capable of following and profiting by the leadership of the teacher.
6. The leadership duties of a teacher imply that she must know the goals (adulthood) of her teaching.
7. A teacher must be a role model for his learners, in relation to cultural values, norms and ideals.
8. A true teacher is a friend of children, with the vocation to serve, inspired by hope, faith and love.
9. In order to satisfy the above eight requirements to an appreciable extent, it is necessary for the teacher-educator *to be an adult person himself* (Gunter, 1974: 123-130).

What the foregoing, when compared to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), clearly indicates is that the qualities now required from educators, in the post-apartheid era differ substantially from qualities required during the apartheid-era. Nowhere does the apartheid-era teacher education include the teacher qualities of lifelong learner and reflective practitioner. This brings us to the following question: What does student educators require to be reflective practitioners? To be a reflective practitioner means that the educator is able to do the following:

*Where the learner demonstrates the ability to integrate or connect performances and decision making with understanding and with the ability to adapt to change and unforeseen circumstances and explain the reasons behind these actions* (Department of Education, 2000: 16).

We can infer from the latter quote that the student educator must be able to make choices before performing certain actions. To make these choices the student educator needs to understand these choices. Another constitutive element of being a reflective practitioner is that the student educator can demonstrate that she is able to adapt to change and unforeseen circumstances. A third constitutive element of being a reflective practitioner is that the student educator is able to explain the reasons behind the actions she has taken. The ability to make choices before performing certain actions implies that the reflective practitioner may require certain enabling knowledge or certain enabling skills. What type of knowledge or skills does a reflective practitioner needs to have to reflect on the following:

Reflecting on how race, class, gender, language, geographical and other differences impact on learning, and making appropriate adaptations to teaching strategies (Department of Education, 2000: 16).

To reflect on the latter issues the reflective practitioner, the student educator, in the teaching situation (the practice) must at least have knowledge about the history of education (during the apartheid-era) and how the latter impacted upon schools in the racially divided communities of South Africa. The student educator should have been sensitised about gender issues and how to address stereotyping in the teaching situation (the classroom). The student educator should also have been sensitised about language differences and how to possibly handle learners from different language and cultural backgrounds (a multi-cultural scenario) in her classroom. But is knowledge about the mentioned issues enough to motivate the student educator, during teaching practice, and the in-service educator to reflect on these important issues in the teaching situation in the classroom? I shall argue that knowledge about the mentioned issues may not be enough to motivate the student educator and in-service educator to reflect on these issues, in relation to their impact on learning in the classroom. I argue that educators may need a special type of wisdom to deal with the latter issue. Here I am referring to Aristotle's (Hughes, 2001) notion of practical wisdom. Practical

wisdom consists of two interrelated virtues, namely moral virtue and intellectual virtue (Hughes, 2001). A person who employs practical wisdom does the right thing at the right time (MacIntyre, 1981: 141).

An educator in the post-apartheid South African context, in terms of Aristotle's (Hughes, 2001) views on practical wisdom in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, thus requires both moral virtue and intellectual virtue to reflect on "race, class, gender, language, geographical and other differences impact on learning, and ... (to make) ... appropriate adaptations to teaching strategies" (Department of Education, 2000: 16). But how does an educator reflect and act on the latter issues if confronted by them in the teaching situation in the classroom, like in the following scenario:

Educator X has, near the end of the first quarter of the school-year, discovered that two of his pupils, in grade eight, are not progressing as well as the rest of the class. On further investigation and after interviewing the two pupils, educator X discovers that they have a problem with the medium of instruction. They can express themselves verbally in the medium of instruction, Afrikaans, but they seem to have a problem, because of their Xhosa background, to express themselves correctly or adequately in the written language like their so-called Coloured fellow classmates.

How does educator X reflect and act on the foregoing problem-scenario? Aristotle (1962: 329 & 331) seems to imply that a person must first deliberate on her available choices before deciding which action to take:

Now the cause of action ... is choice, and the cause of choice is desire and reasoning directed to some end. Hence choice necessarily involves both intellect or thought and a certain disposition of character ... Thought by itself however moves nothing, but only thought directed to an end, and dealing with action. This indeed is the moving cause of productive



activity also, since he who makes something always has some further end in view: the act of making is not an end in itself, it is only a means, and belongs to something else. Whereas a thing done is an end in itself: since doing well (welfare) is the End, and it is at this that desire aims. Hence Choice may be called either thought related to desire or desire related to thought; and man, as an originator of action, is a union of desire and intellect.

Deliberation on the various options available can, thus, be regarded as a prerequisite for choosing an action and exercising practical wisdom, because “good deliberation means coming to the right conclusion as to what is expedient or ought to be done, and coming to it in the right manner and at the right time” (Aristotle, 1901: 197). This act of deliberation is necessary because educator X must make certain choices before acting in the classroom. Educator X can choose to ignore the problem in her classroom or she can choose to do something about it. Deliberation with his principal or his colleagues may help educator X to clarify his choice of action. To make such choices, as in the case of educator X, requires practical wisdom, which can only be acquired in the practice of teaching. Student educators will not fully learn this practical wisdom during their teaching practice periods, but may develop it in the working situation, the classroom. The latter is the authentic context and also the site of practice where practical wisdom needs to be exercised. I shall now attempt to lend some substance to my latter claims by highlighting some of the other competences, from the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), that may require from student educators a demonstration of one of the constitutive virtues of practical wisdom, namely moral virtue or the desire to do good (the other constitutive virtue is intellectual virtue or thought according to Aristotle, 1962: 329 & 331) so that they can make the right choices at the right times in the right way in the right situations (Aristotle, 1901: 197) when deciding on actions to be taken in the classroom:

1. Employing appropriate strategies for working with learner needs and disabilities, including sign language where appropriate.
2. Adjusting teaching strategies to: match the developmental stages of learners ... cater for cultural, gender, ethnic, language and other differences among learners.
3. Adjusting teaching strategies to cater for different learning styles and preferences and to mainstream learners with barriers to learning.
4. Creating a learning environment in which: critical and creative thinking is encouraged; learners challenge stereotypes about language, race, gender, ethnicity, geographic location and culture.
5. Reflecting on how teaching in different contexts in South Africa affects teaching strategies and proposing adaptations.
6. Reflecting on the extent to which the objectives of the learning experience have been achieved and deciding on adaptations where required.
7. Critically reflecting on the ways barriers to learning can be overcome.
8. Critically reflecting on the degree to which issues around HIV/AIDS have been integrated into learning (the foregoing competences are some of the constitutive competences of the student educator performing the role of 'Learning mediator').
9. Showing an appreciation of, and respect for, people of different values, beliefs, practices and cultures.
10. Being able to respond to current social and educational problems with particular emphasis on the issues of violence, drug abuse, poverty, child and women abuse.
11. Reflecting on ethical issues in religion, politics, human rights and the environment.
12. Reflecting on ways of developing and maintaining environmentally responsible approaches to the community and local development.
13. Adapting learning programmes and other activities to promote an awareness of citizenship, human rights and the principles and values of the constitution.

14. Critically analysing the degree to which the school curriculum addresses barriers to learning, environmental and human rights issues (the foregoing competences are some of the constitutive competences of the student educator performing his 'Community, citizenship and pastoral role' for assessment purposes) (Department of Education, 2000: 15-16;18-20).

The demonstration of the listed competences implies that a student educator has to be a virtuous person who should possess certain moral virtues and whose intentions is to do good in her/his classroom and the South African society. One can infer that such a person should at least demonstrate the following moral virtues: compassion, sincerity, tolerance, fairness, non-discrimination, non-sexism, non-racialism, courage and justice in her classroom. Can student educators acquire these moral virtues during their teacher education programme? I argue that this may not be the case in the light of the following claim by Aristotle (1901: 34): "Excellence, then, being one of these two kinds, intellectual and moral, intellectual excellence owes its birth and growth mainly to instruction, and so requires time and experience, while moral excellence (moral virtue) is the result of habit or custom ...". We acquire virtues such as compassion and tolerance by doing the latter acts or by practising them, because by "doing just acts we become just, and by doing acts of temperance and courage we become temperate and courageous" (Aristotle, 1901: 35). Nature gives us the capacity to receive moral or ethical virtues, and this "capacity is brought to maturity by habit" (Aristotle, 1962: 71). The listed moral virtues can, thus, only be acquired in the authentic context of the practice of teaching and as part of habitual actions. Student educators may be ready to receive the moral virtues, as listed, but this capacity is brought to maturity by the habit of doing or practising these virtues in the authentic context of the practice of teaching in the classroom. I am, thus, implying that teaching practice, as part of the teacher education programme of a teacher education institution, may not provide ample space for the maturation of moral virtues, as implied in the Norms and Standards for

of Education, 2000), because teaching practice is not the authentic context of the practice of teaching.

I make the latter claim against the background of MacIntyre's claim that a practice is directed towards the achievement of a particular goal or good internal to it "and common to its practitioners. In pursuing this internal good, practitioners are able to achieve excellence of character, or virtue" (Knight, 1998: 10). MacIntyre (Knight, 1998: 10) also posits that practices are the schools of virtues:

Justice, courage and truthfulness are cultivated through participation in practices, as practitioners come to find in a practice something beyond themselves that may be valued for its own sake rather than as a mere means to satisfy their more immediate and selfish desires. Practitioners recognise that they can only achieve such an internal good by doing what is required to emulate the standards of excellence already established within the practice.

The moral virtues that student educators need to make choices about certain actions in the classroom, as required by the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), can thus only be acquired by participating in a particular practice and by emulating the highest standards within the latter practice. It is by doing this that a student educator can "learn, as an apprentice learns, how to exercise sound judgement with regard to what is best or a most perfected example of a good yet achieved (MacIntyre in Knight, 1998: 12).

Being a reflective practitioner, thus, involves making choices about action to be taken in the classroom, acting and to reflect on the effectiveness of these actions. Doing the latter can only be learnt in the authentic context, which is the practice of teaching. The actions of a reflective practitioner must be modelled and demonstrated to student educators. I make the latter point in the light of the research findings of Ensor (2000) on how student educators learn. Teacher

educators and also the in-service educators to whom student educators have been allocated for the period of teaching practice, must themselves be reflective practitioners if they intend to teach the student educators how to be reflective practitioners.

Reflection does not happen in a vacuum, but in a certain context. The exercise of the practice of reflection thus requires knowledge about the context and also certain tools. I want to suggest that a study of Philosophy of Education may help enable student educators to grasp the philosophical issues in education. This knowledge may help them to understand the choices they have to make in the classroom. I make the latter point in the light of the arguments of Carr (2004: 62) who posits that teachers can utilise “practical philosophy” to be reflective practitioners and to improve or change their practices. A study of the History of Education may help student educators to understand their teaching contexts and also why social transformation is necessary in South Africa. Ethics education may enable student educators to make the right ethical choices in the classroom. Pedagogical considerations are also necessary at teacher education institutions, because teacher educators who persist only with the transmission mode of teaching may not enable themselves to teach student educators how to be reflective practitioners. Student educators must pursue the virtues that are internal to the new practice of teaching that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) require. The pursuit of these virtues may help them to be reflective practitioners. These interventions are needed if the latter policy framework is to lead the transformation of teacher education in South Africa, and also the improvement of teaching and learning in South African schools.

#### **5.3.4 Teacher education institutions must recognise student voices**

Another constitutive meaning of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), is that teacher education institutions must recognise the voices of their students, in

relation to the design of programmes and assessment criteria. Teacher education institutions or providers have the responsibility to decide how the competences should be achieved. Before designing a learning programme it will be necessary, for teacher education institutions, to “establish the particular nature of the clients and which qualification the learners are to be prepared for” (Department of Education, 2000: 11). Teacher education institutions have, before they decide on the design of a learning programme, to take certain factors into consideration. A first factor is the type of learners in the programme, especially their levels of maturity and experience. A second factor to consider is whether the context is rural, urban or peri-urban. A third factor relates to the phase or phases to be catered for. The language experience of the student educators or in-service educators is also an important factor. The last factor that should be considered by teacher education institutions, before they design their learning programmes, is whether the courses are to be offered through contact or distance education (Department of Education, 2000: 11).

A second aspect of the call for the recognition of student voices relates to the assessment of student educators and in-service educators: “Accountability and transparency are necessary features of all assessment practices and learners should be informed of the assessment criteria and strategies before the learning begins” (Department of Education, 2000: 31). A third aspect of the call for the recognition of student voices relates to the importance of regularly reviewing programmes in the light of new developments in the field as well as on the basis of feedback from, among others, student educators and in-service educators, and assessment processes (Department of Education, 2000: 33). I have already examined the importance of recognising student voices, by teacher education institutions, in Chapter Four. I have explained why student voices should be recognised by teacher education institutions and how the use of deliberation can facilitate the process and advance the transformation agenda of teacher education in South Africa.

### 5.3.5 Teaching practice is an essential feature of teacher education

Another constitutive meaning of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), is that teaching practice is an essential feature of teacher education, particularly in relation to student educators' ability to integrate theory and practice in authentic contexts. Time spent in the workplace, the school, is very crucial and "should provide the authentic context within which student educators experience and demonstrate the integration of the competences developed in the entire curriculum" (Department of Education, 2000: 12). School experience is not a separate ad-on, but an integral part of the programme. School experience should be a structured teaching and learning experience with some form of observational assessment. Teaching Practice should be contextually sensitive so that close links can develop between the workplace, the schools, and the teacher education institutions (Department of Education, 2000: 32).

The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) prescribe the ends or exit level outcomes that the practice of teaching in post-apartheid South Africa must be directed towards. These ends, in the form of seven roles and its associated competences, prescribe the *norms* on how the practice of teaching should be conducted in post-apartheid South African schools. It is the duty of teacher education institutions to train student educators to be competent in conducting this new practice of teaching. Student educators must, thus, learn this new practice of teaching. What is a practice?

By a 'practice' I am going to mean any coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realised in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended. Tic-tac-toe is not an

example of a practice in this sense, nor is throwing a football with skill; but the game of football is, and so is chess ... Planting turnips is not a practice; farming is (MacIntyre, 1981: 177).

Teaching, in terms of MacIntyre's (1981) explanation, is a practice because teaching is a coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity. I make the latter point in the light of Bengtsson's (2001) conceptual analysis of what the concept of teaching entails. Bengtsson (2001) argues that that the concept of "teaching" is constituted by four necessary qualities. I have outlined these four necessary characterising qualities in the first section of this chapter. I also refer to the constitutive meanings of the concept of "teacher education" that I have extracted from a literature review and that I have listed in the first section of this chapter. Practices have traditions and histories (MacIntyre in Knight, 1998: 92-93). Teacher education, in terms of Oakeshott's (1998) definition of education, would then entail the initiation of student educators into a certain practice, the new practice of teaching as prescribed by the Norms and Standards for Educators (2000). Teaching practice is, thus, an exercise that prepares student educators to enter the practice of teaching. This entering process involves cooperative human activity, that was socially established, because to "enter into a practice is to enter into a relationship not only with its contemporary practitioners, but also with those who have preceded us in the practice ... " (MacIntyre in Knight, 1998: 87).

The new practice of teaching, as prescribed by the mentioned policy framework must, however, if compared to the traditional practice of teaching that was guided by Fundamental Pedagogics of the apartheid-era (NECC, 1992) still develop a substantive tradition and history. It must be kept in mind that practices are based on the subjective, inter-subjective and common understandings of social actors who are involved in these practices (Taylor, 1985: 36-39). Have the social actors (student educators, in-service educators and teacher educators), involved in teacher education in South Africa a clear common understanding of this new practice of teaching, in the few years since its promulgation in the



Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education) in February 2000? The answer to this question is important because student educators must be initiated (Oakeshott, 1998) or socialised (Pendlebury, 1998a) into this common understanding about this new practice of teaching by in-service educators during the teaching practice of student educators. Have these in-service educators developed a clear common understanding of this new practice of teaching? This question is important because it is these in-service educators that are supposed to initiate or socialise the student educators, during teaching practice, into this new practice of teaching. To effect this initiation or socialisation in-service educators must themselves be knowledgeable about this new practice, but they must also practice it themselves.

In-service educators, and also teacher educators, must unlearn the traditional practice of teaching in which they have been trained during the apartheid-era, via Fundamental Pedagogics. Part of this new practice of teaching is that the educator must be a reflective practitioner and lifelong learner. These latter two roles were not constitutive parts of the traditional practice of teaching. In-service educators, especially those to whom student educators have been allocated for teaching practice, and teacher educators must, thus, be reflective practitioners and lifelong learners themselves because they have to initiate and socialise student educators into this new practice of teaching. Being reflective practitioners and lifelong learners are important constitutive parts of this new practice of teaching.

### **5.3.6 Educators should be lifelong learners**

A sixth constitutive meaning of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 32), is that educators should be lifelong learners:

The worth and value of qualifications and learning programmes are determined by the learners' ability to demonstrate applied and integrated

competence in the satisfying of academic, professional and occupational requirements. Such an integrated approach to learning places great emphasis on the lifelong professional development of educators.

There is also a call on teacher education institutions to provide enabling conditions for educators to pursue lifelong learning. One way to do the latter is for teacher education institutions to increasingly offer programmes in modes that will allow practising educators to attend. Another way of enabling practising educators to pursue lifelong learning is for teacher education institutions to develop learning programmes that can be used to create spatial flexibility in courses: “learners can learn at a variety of sites and do not necessarily have to have face-to-face contact with their educators” (Department of Education, 2000: 33). Assignments which aim to encourage problem-solving within authentic contexts should be designed. Programmes should prioritise the promotion of critical engagement, reasoning and reflective thinking. Teacher education institutions should also demonstrate an “understanding of educator development as an activity that goes wider than formal schooling” (Department of Education, 2000: 33). What does the concept of “lifelong learning” mean? The next section shall attempt to address this question.

To uncover the appropriate meaning of the concept of lifelong learning in post-apartheid South Africa one needs to make the logically necessary conditions that guide the use of the words “lifelong learning” explicit. Larsson (1997:251) ascribes the following meaning to lifelong learning in South Africa:

Currently, lifelong learning is a concept with many meanings used by a variety of actors. It is used as the key concept by new government in liberated South Africa ... this variety of meanings can be looked upon as a problem: life-long learning risks losing its richness and precision as a concept. It becomes too useful for too many purposes. The meaning of the term is often either obscure or meagre.

Larsson's (1997) statement urges us to consider the many meanings or interpretations of lifelong learning in South Africa. Soobrayan (1997) seems to agree with Larsson's (1997) viewpoint because he claims that lifelong learning, currently, assumes multiple meanings and interpretations in the way it is applied and articulated in policy discourses on education transformation. "At one extreme, it is employed as a coherent conceptual framework which presents a comprehensive and particular understanding of education priorities, the strategies required to address these and a fundamental assertion of a radically different and distinct pedagogy. At another level it emphasises the expansion of present education provision to more throughout the lifecycle. In the latter form the major questions posed relate to access and provision, rooted in a discourse of equity" (Soobrayan, 1997: 251).

In the early 1990s the anti-Apartheid movement in South Africa under the banner of the mass democratic movement, which included COSATU, the United Democratic Front (UDF) activists and academics, investigated policy options for an alternative education and training system for a post-Apartheid society. This investigation by the National Education Co-ordinating Committee (NECC) was called the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) and was divided into different research groups. Two examples are the Curriculum and the Adult Basic Education Research Groups. The Adult Basic Education (ABE) Research Group of the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) investigated policy options in the area of ABE "within a value framework derived from the ideals of the broad democratic movement" (NECC, 1992a:v). The final report of the adult education research group defined lifelong education as follows:

Although apparently similar to continuing education, lifelong education is a more comprehensive and visionary concept which includes formal, non-formal, and informal learning extended throughout the lifespan of an individual to attain the fullest possible development in its totality, and includes learning that occurs in the home, school, community, and work-

place, and through the mass media and other situations and structures for acquiring and enhancing enlightenment (NECC, 1993:9).

The NEPI definition tries to present lifelong education as a vision of how education in a post-Apartheid South Africa should be. This vision of lifelong learning must also serve as a conceptual framework within which a new education system has to be constructed. Of central importance in this conceptual framework is the "...fullest possible development in personal, social, and professional life..." of the individual. The emphasis on the development of the individual may point to the possibility that NEPI's definition was strongly influenced by the humanistic school of lifelong learning. Lifelong learning can mean different things to different people. There are at least two different and important theoretical and ideological strands in lifelong learning. The first one is the human capital school with its legacy for neo-liberal ideology. Education in terms of the market and investment in human capital are chief characteristics of the human capital school. The human capital school reduces education to the needs of the economy. Lifelong learning has historically been more closely associated with the humanistic school, which considers education from the perspective of the individual and the democratic citizen (Walters, 1999a: 579). The humanistic tradition considers all human beings to be capable of learning and developing their potential abilities (Gustavsson, 1997) and also seeks to advance a social agenda (Korsgaard, 1997). The development, in my view, of the potential abilities of all humans, in terms of a social agenda, may include voter education, aids education and literacy education for adults. "Within the debates about lifelong learning both strands exist, but the drive to marketisation of education and training within a human capital perspective holds sway both globally and, increasingly, in South Africa" (Walters, 1999a: 579).

The African National Congress (ANC) document of 1994, *Policy Framework for Education and Training*, gave the following meaning to lifelong learning: "Lifelong learning is an essential structural objective for our system of education if the objectives of a democratic society are to be met" (ANC, 1994:73). In the

ANC's definition lifelong learning is regarded as an instrument that can be helpful in the establishment of a democratic South African society. So lifelong learning is not simply an educational concept. It also has to serve political purposes in our new society.

The National Institute for Lifelong Learning Development (NILLD) (1997:9), that was established within the Department of Education to do research on lifelong learning and to drive the national lifelong learning project, defines lifelong learning as the "development of human potential in all roles, circumstances and environments, through a continuously supportive process which stimulates and empowers individuals to acquire and apply all the knowledge, values, skills and critical understanding required to confidently and creatively attain their goals, from cradle to grave." The NILLD definition seems to indicate that lifelong learning is supposed to perform various functions. Lifelong learning has to develop human potential in all roles, circumstances and environments. It is not clear what these roles, circumstances and environments are. Lifelong learning is also supposed to stimulate and empower individuals to acquire and apply certain knowledge, values, skills and critical understanding required to attain their goals. It is not clear what these goals are. In this definition the emphasis is on the fulfilment of human potential from cradle to grave.

The definition of the *Policy document on adult basic education and training* (Department of Education, 1997a: 16) shows certain similarities to the NILLD (1997) definition: "Lifelong learning is a continuous process which stimulates and empowers individuals to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills and attitudes required to realize their full potential". In this definition lifelong learning is also supposed to ensure the fullest development of the human potential of individuals. Key words are "stimulates" and "empowers". It is not clear how individuals should be stimulated and empowered. The ABET definition is also vague about the kind of knowledge, skills and attitudes that are required to realise the full potential of individuals. In essence this definition provides a very broad conceptual framework in terms of what lifelong learning

should achieve in South Africa: Lifelong learning must ensure the fullest development of human potential of all individuals. All the definitions, thus far, seem to have been influenced by the humanistic school (Gustavsson, 1997: 240) of lifelong learning. The definitions, up to this point, reflect some of the major shifts in the international discourse on lifelong learning (OECD, 1996: 88). The definitions reflect the shift to the individualisation of lifelong learning with the emphasis on individual and not groups of learners. There is no reference to the role of the state in the provision of lifelong learning. The last point contradicts the government's stated commitment to lifelong learning, in terms of the redress agenda (Department of Education, 1997b:viii).

Walters (1999b: 7) also makes an effort to interpret what lifelong learning means in the post-apartheid South African context. She states that lifelong learning "itself is still to be given substantive content and at present signals the need for individuals who have been disadvantaged by apartheid to have opportunities for second chance learning and for the workforce to be enskilled to compete globally." In this interpretation lifelong learning is supposed to perform certain political and economic functions. The mentioned interpretation, is different from the emphasis on the individual, in nearly apolitical terms, in the NEPI, NILLD and ABET definitions of lifelong learning. According to the Walters (1999b: 7) interpretation lifelong learning is supposed to provide opportunities for learning to those South Africans who have been disadvantaged by apartheid. On another level lifelong learning is also supposed to assist with the enskillment of the country's workforce. This enskillment of the country's workforce is necessary if South Africa wants to compete effectively in the global economy. The necessity of lifelong learning in terms of competitiveness in the global economy points to the influence of the human capital school on the meaning of lifelong learning in South Africa. In the Walters (1999b) interpretation the influence of both the humanistic school (the provision of more opportunities for learning to more South Africans) and the human capital school (lifelong learning for economic purposes) is noticeable.

All the meanings of lifelong learning that I have uncovered in this section, point to the fact that this concept assumes multiple meanings and interpretations in South Africa. The following, extracted from the foregoing literature review, are constitutive meanings of the concept of “lifelong learning” in South Africa: The lifelong learning concept is employed as a conceptual framework which presents a particular strategy to achieve education and training transformation in South Africa; the lifelong learning concept advocates a new way of thinking that can increase learning opportunities for more of the disadvantaged South Africans from the apartheid-era, to advance the equity and redress agenda; lifelong learning risks losing its richness and precision as a concept because of its variety of meanings; lifelong learning is employed as a coherent conceptual framework which presents a comprehensive and particular understanding of education priorities, the strategies required to address these and a fundamental assertion of a radically different and distinct pedagogy; lifelong learning aims for the fullest possible development of the individual in his personal, social and professional life; lifelong learning can be regarded as an instrument that can be helpful in the establishment of a democratic South African society; lifelong learning aims at the fulfilment of human potential from cradle to grave; lifelong learning is a continuous process which stimulates and empowers individuals to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills and attitudes required to realise their full potential; lifelong learning is supposed to assist with the enskillment of the country’s workforce so that South Africa can compete in the global economy.

The use of the concept of “lifelong learning” in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) creates the impression that the latter concept has only one meaning which is very clear to educators and teacher education institutions. Which of the foregoing constitutive meanings guide the use of the concept of “lifelong learning” in the mentioned policy framework? I argue that the constitutive meaning that refers to lifelong learning as a concept that advocates a new way of thinking that can increase learning opportunities for the disadvantaged South Africans from the apartheid-era, to advance the equity and redress agenda, may guide the use of the concept of “lifelong learning”. The

mentioned policy framework does not refer explicitly to the issue of redress, but only call on teacher education institutions to be flexible so that educators can improve their professional development (Department of Education, 2000: 32 & 33) via alternative modes of delivery: “learners can learn at a variety of sites and do not necessarily have to have face-to-face contact with their educators.” I made the point of redress in the light of the huge numbers of unqualified and under-qualified South African teachers (mainly African) that I have alluded to in Chapter Three.

### **5.3.7 Local needs, contexts and cultures must be respected**

The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 30) clearly state that the purpose of qualifications, to be delivered by teacher education institutions, should be in “line with national and/or local needs.” Teacher education institutions should also promote access to it and provide learner support. Learning programmes, in relation to teaching practice, should be contextually sensitive. Programmes should ground teaching in a wider social, economic and political understanding and awareness. The teacher education programme of teacher education institutions should be “designed on the basis of research, with national/local needs and standards as well as the needs of target learners and employers in mind” (Department of Education, 2000: 31-33). The latter assumption of the mentioned policy framework about the importance of national/local needs and standards seems to be contradictory in the light of the following paragraphs that describe how international developments in education and training have impacted on and helped to shape South Africa’s Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000).

Teacher education developments in the United Kingdom (UK), the United States of America (USA) and Australia have impacted on South Africa’s latest teacher education policy framework, the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). The latter policy framework rests on two pillars: a national qualifications framework and outcomes-based approaches to



learning. These approaches to education and training, which have been strongly influenced by similar movements in England, Australia, New Zealand and the USA, make an effort to introduce new forms of economic and social relations that have manifested in advanced industrialised countries. South Africa has imported and indigenised these approaches in recent education policy discourses (Harley & Parker, 1999: 181).

A global educational discourse, on education and training, is emerging which impacts heavily on practice in various countries. Qualifications and curricular innovations, in this global context, are being significantly shaped by the ideology of the market. Current South African education policy is very much part of the global discourses involving the rationales for and developments in particular forms, structures, procedures and procedures of education and training (Kruss, 1998: 66). South Africa's education policy-makers were strongly influenced by the Australian and Scottish (part of the UK) models of learning through competence and the qualifications structures to assess these competencies (Kruss, 1998: 67). Competency-based teacher education was used in the USA during the 1970s and early 1980s. This approach is now, however, largely discredited in the USA (Pendlebury, 1998: 340). Groener (1998: 86-95) explains in her paper, Political roots of the debate about the integration of education and training, how COSATU was influenced by the Australian model of integrated education and training, and how their contributions helped to shape South Africa's current education and training policy frameworks.

South Africa's Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (Department of Education, 1998) show some similarities with various official circulars on competence-based teacher education in the UK (Pendlebury, 1998: 339). The reason, then, for referring to the UK, the USA and Australia is that developments in teacher education policy frameworks in these countries may shed some light on South Africa's latest teacher education policy framework. A closer examination of the teacher education of the mentioned countries may help with the analysis of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of

Education, 2000) and to assess its potential for transforming teaching and learning in South African schools.

I have already, in Chapter Four, explained why local needs, contexts and cultures need to be respected to advance the transformation agenda of teacher education in South Africa.

### **5.3.8 Existing teacher education practice must be transformed**

Another constitutive meaning of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 30), is that it is “necessary to establish key strategic objectives for the design and delivery of educator development programmes and qualifications which will provide guidance for the transformation of existing practice.” The latter gives rise to the following question: Can the promulgation of education policy alone, like the Norms and Standards for Educators of 2000, lead to the transformation of existing teacher education practice in South Africa? The following section attempts to answer this important question.

Education policy process, according to the integrative heuristic model of Berkhout and Wielemans (1999: 416), should not be studied in a fragmented or isolated fashion. We should view education policy analysis interactively in the context of the broader structural processes of social, cultural, and economic production and reproduction. My argument relates to the possible “political symbolism” of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), as a policy framework. Using Jansen’s (2001: 272) notion of education policy as “political symbolism” as a point of departure, I argue that the mentioned policy framework shows signs of “political symbolism” and that this policy framework may not lead to deep transformation of teacher education in South Africa. The prospects of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), for improving teaching and learning in South African schools, look bleak because the latter policy framework may not lead to

deep transformation of our teacher education dispensation. Jansen (2001: 272) argues that the making of education policy in South Africa can best be described as “a struggle for the achievement of a broad political symbolism to mark the shift from apartheid to post-apartheid society.” The preoccupation of the state with settling policy struggles in the political domain rather than in the realm of practice, is demonstrated by every single case of education policy-making, in different ways (Jansen, 2001: 272). I argue that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) demonstrate this “preoccupation” because it lacks detail on practical implementation. This gap in the mentioned policy text may impede deep transformation of teacher education in South Africa. I have explained, earlier on in this chapter, why we need more detail from the mentioned policy framework on practical implementation. I argue that any policy text is not capable of only one interpretation. The lack of detail on pedagogy and curriculum may put a whole variety and crisscross of meanings and interpretations about transformation of South African teacher education into circulation, which could create space for the perpetuation of apartheid-era teacher education.

How can the state influence the policy process? The state, according to Offe (in Taylor *et al*, 1997: 30), plays a special role in capitalist societies in the policy process. The state has to balance irresolvable tensions between the need to ensure, on the one hand, that the economy continues to function in a satisfactory fashion so that state revenues can be generated, and the need for the state, on the other hand, to respond to political and democratic demands upon it for coverage. The state can never solve this delicate problem. The state simply comes to settlements, which seek to manage the tensions between the *accumulation* and *legitimation* functions of the state. The state structures “mediate the policy process, ‘determining’ to some extent what issues get on the policy agenda and how, the policy options available and policy outcomes” (Offe in Taylor *et al*, 1997: 30). The state is, thus, important in theorising policy. The latter is an ongoing process because policies have their own momentum inside the state. This happens because purposes and intentions are reworked and reoriented over

time. The problems faced by the state change over time. Policies are represented differently by different actors and different interest groups (Ball, 1994: 17). The state's power to enforce its will through promulgated education policy is, however, increasingly regarded as strongly circumscribed by contextual factors, more covert manifestations of power and dominant discursive patterns (Berkhout & Wielemans, 1999: 408). Jansen's (2001: 272) notion of "political symbolism", as the South African government's dominant approach to education and training policy, seems to illustrate the limitations of the state's power to enforce its will through promulgated education policy. I shall utilise the arguments of Christie (1999) and Fataar (2000) to lend some substance to the latter claim.

Jansen (2001) attempts to provide some evidence for his theory of "political symbolism" as a possible explanation for non-implementation in South African education reform after apartheid. At the National Policy Review Conference of the African National Congress (ANC) and allied movements in October 1998, to consider why new education policies did not lead to changes in schools and classrooms, Rensburg (1998) (then Deputy Director-General of Education), referred to two distinct periods in the implementation of post-apartheid education policy frameworks. The one period, from 1994 to 1999, should be regarded, according to Rensburg (1998: 50), as an "overtly ideological period" which reflects a shift from apartheid ideology to a non-racial democratic order. This first period was used to establish the ideological and political credentials of the new government. The government was supposed to, during the second period from 1999 to 2004, focus on "consolidation and deep transformation" (Rensburg, 1998: 50) of education and training in South Africa. Another part of Jansen's (2001: 273) explanation of his theory concerns the prominence assigned to the symbolic value of policy that is revealed by the way "that politicians and the public lend credence and support to the production of policy itself, rather than its implementation." This symbolic value of post-apartheid education policy is reflected in Kader Asmal's (1999) speech, "Call to Action", in which he glorifies South Africa's education and training policies as equal to the best in the world,

but also stating that implementation takes time. International experts, commenting on the proposals in the report of the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) posit that the NCHE proposals for reform is one of the best tertiary education policy documents ever written, but questioned the South African government's ability to implement these proposals (Jansen, 2001: 273).

The third part of Jansen's (2001: 274) explanation for his theory of "political symbolism" concerns the symbolic role of policy that is displayed by the ways in which policy pronouncements make reference to issues of implementation. We would expect a government bureaucracy, where policy and planning are strongly connected, to provide concrete steps for the implementation of such policies. These implementation plans need not to be part of the immediate policy announcement, but can typically follow soon thereafter. The seven case studies, around which this theory of political symbolism is built, have seldom reflected the latter procedures. The case studies in question include the syllabus revision process, the White Paper on Education and Training, the Hunter report and the White Paper on the Organisation, Governance and Funding of Schools, the teacher redeployment process, higher education reforms and the Presidential Lead Project, the Culture of Learning Programme (Jansen, 2001: 289). "Dramatic policy announcements and sophisticated policy documents continue to make no or little reference to the modalities of implementation" (Jansen, 2001: 274).

What are the consequences of a symbolic approach to education policy? The continuation of such an approach may perpetuate the characteristics of the education system of the apartheid-era of inequality and racial discrimination, and lead to little translation of grand-scale changes, as encapsulated in post-apartheid education and training policies, into reality. One of the consequences "of symbolic legitimation is that it demands more and more symbolic initiatives in the policy domain ... precisely because of the fact that little can be delivered within the domain of practice" (Jansen, 2001: 283). A second consequence of a

consequence of a symbolic political stance is that the participants will be increasingly blamed for the non-implementation of state education and training policies. Policy and planning failures, in turn, are exempted from scrutiny because the problem, according to the government, lies with lazy teachers, incompetent officials, mismanagement and corruption. Errant government policies are, thus, not implicated in the government's explanation of non-implementation of their education and training policies (Jansen, 2001: 284). Jansen (2001: 284-285) concludes that "the continued reliance on political symbolism as the overarching framework for education policy effectively rules out any major transformation of education in South Africa's future. Policy strategy will change, with greater emphasis placed on reducing expenditure under cover of those all-consuming discourses of efficiency and accountability. But schools will not change, and education quality will not improve." The transformation of schools requires more efficient use of existing resources, and also more "significant injections of substantially new and well-targeted resources. And that is unlikely to happen without a political decision to rethink the underlying logic that governs our macroeconomic policy" (Jansen, 2001: 285).

I shall now briefly extend Jansen's (2001: 285) latter call for the government to rethink the underlying logic that governs South Africa's macroeconomic policy, by attempting to explain how the latter has helped to shape our current education and training policy frameworks. Fataar (2000: 19) argues, after an analysis of education policy in South Africa made from 1994 until the end of 1997, that the vision underpinning education policy has narrowed considerably threatening the possibility of reconstructing an equitable and unified education system. South Africa's post-apartheid education policy is, thus, characterised "by a restricted vision of reconstruction, which fails to provide the necessary basis for developing an equitable and united education system" (Fataar, 2000: 19). How did the latter situation, South Africa's education policy being underpinned by a narrow vision of transformation, arise? The transition, in 1994, to a negotiated political settlement curtailed the first post-apartheid government's ability to give

effect to an equity-driven policy agenda, and also a viable agenda of transformation in education. “Contrary to popular perception, the negotiated settlement facilitated the displacement of radical transformation objectives by a narrow reform orientation” (Fataar, 2000: 19-20). Why were the radical transformation objectives of the mass democratic movement, as set out in the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) Reports (National Education Coordinating Movement or NECC, 1992) and the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) of the ANC (1994), before the 1994 political settlement displaced by a narrow education reform orientation after 1994?

The latter displacement of the radical transformation objectives, in education, can be linked to the new government’s efforts to make South Africa part of the global capitalist economy:

The conservative turn in both socio-economic and education policy was the outcome of the government’s choice of a macroeconomic framework that targeted the country’s economic entry into the global economy as the principal and overarching policy ideal of the post-apartheid period (Fataar, 2000: 20).

The state’s choice of a narrow education reform orientation after 1994, instead of the radical transformation objectives of the pre-1994 period, seems to reflect the tensions between the *accumulation* and *legitimation* functions of the state, to which Offe (in Taylor *et al*, 1997: 30) has alluded. The government’s latter choice is probably a temporary settlement to temporarily solve this delicate problem. A key feature of the government’s macroeconomic framework, Growth Employment and Redistribution or GEAR, during the 1990s, on public policy was the principle of fiscal discipline. This translated into decreased spending on public services like education and healthcare, in the form of cutbacks and down-sizing and right-sizing of public servants and educators. South Africa’s macro-education policy development, after 1994, “has to be understood as the outcome of its interaction with the narrowing socio-economic approach. A conservative

education policy discourse was established concomitant to the neo-liberal orientations of the GEAR strategy” (Fataar, 2000: 21). The new government’s first major education policy framework, The White Paper on Education and Training (Department of Education, 1995), reflected the shift from the radical transformation agenda (of the pre-1994 period) to the conservative and narrow reform orientation of the post-1995 period. The mentioned policy framework reflected a redistributive discourse that committed the government to “the integration of education and training, lifelong learning and the overhaul of all aspects of education. It embodied a strong forward mapping approach about the vision of a new system, but failed to root its policies within implementation dynamics. This omission opened up space for policy contestation that impacted upon subsequent policy. A constrained financial environment tempered the WPET’s redistributive thrust” (Fataar, 2000: 21). Education policy, after 1994, has thus favoured the economic growth and development conceptual dimension, thereby compromising a vision of a just and equitable education system. In this context the government has used education as a mechanism for “achieving compensatory legitimation. The government symbolically used policy to signal progress and a commitment to transformation as opposed to effecting real change” (Fataar, 2000: 24-25). Can education policy, alone, effect educational transformation in South Africa?

Christie’s (1999) paper illustrates the limitations of the state’s power to enforce its will through promulgated education policy. It is Christie’s (1999: 279) contention that the fundamental transformation which post-apartheid education and training policy frameworks are supposed to effect, will be difficult to achieve and win support for. Christie (1999) refers, like Fataar (2000), to the lack of detail on implementation in the mentioned policy frameworks, to substantiate her contention. These policy frameworks almost ignore the “contexts of implementation and how the new vision could be put in place in the profoundly unequal school contexts that apartheid left behind. This approach has implicitly assumed that the formulation of policy can be logically separated from its implementation” (Christie, 1999: 281). The fact that the national Department of



policies might be delivered, together with the neglect of implementation issues is a fundamental flaw which has seriously compromised the capacity of these many levels through which education systems operate, is one of the major difficulties in state-led reform. Policy-as-practice is inevitably shaped by the various legitimate policy actors in the education policy process. Policies cannot easily mandate what matters. Not even the best organised of policy-makers cannot mandate the quality of teaching and learning in classrooms (Christie, 1999: 285).

Because education policies always involve certain choices, leadership in the democratic state requires winning the consent of those ruled. This requires “persistent efforts in a continuous process of working within an unstable equilibrium of power. Rather than attempting to silence critics, many of whom are not opponents of the new order, the hegemonic task for leaders is to engage with them” (Christie, 1999: 285-286). Policy-makers cannot, thus, avoid responsibility for strategic engagement to implement change at the place of delivery. A policy approach that separates formulation from implementation and fails to recognise how crucial interactive processes are in implementation, will not achieve the transformation it envisages (Christie, 1999: 286).

I shall now briefly extend Christie’s (1999) suggestion about the hegemonic task of leaders and the need for them to engage with the critics of their education policies. Such engagement is necessary for two reasons. The first reason has to do with the limitations of the state’s power to enforce its will through promulgated education policy. The second reason relates to the inherently political character of the policy processes, which involve compromises, trade-offs and settlements. Power and control are central in policy processes. There will always be political struggles over whose voices will be heard and whose values will be reflected in policies (Taylor *et al.* 1997: 27). Contestation, according to Taylor *et al.* (1997: 29), is also played out in regard to whose voices are heard and whose values are recognised or authoritatively allocated in the policy and which groups ultimately benefit as a result of the policy. Only certain

policy and which groups ultimately benefit as a result of the policy. Only certain influences and agendas that are regarded as legitimate will benefit from this authoritative allocation. The policy will then only voice these certain influences and agendas (Ball, 1994: 16).

In the absence of any concrete suggestions, by Christie (1999: 285-286), on how education leaders should engage with other policy actors such as teachers and bureaucrats, I would suggest a deliberative democratic approach to this engagement. The first reason for the latter approach is that new information is imparted. Deliberation also leads to critical self-reflection on already held views and opinions. Deliberative processes can, thirdly, lead to changes in opinions or views or preferences and considering the common good (Benhabib, 1994: 32). A deliberative democratic approach to the mentioned engagement can create space for the excluded voices, in the final education policy text, to be heard by the education leaders and policy-makers. It can also create space for excluded agendas to be tabled and clarified. It can also create space for those, whose values were excluded, to be articulated and propagated. It can also create space for policy-makers to clarify gaps, contradictions and implementation issues in their policies. Education leaders can also defend orientations of their policy frameworks, but also try to accommodate alternative views. In the end it must be the consideration of the common good that must drive this engagement. Deliberative democracy can succeed if collective judgements can be shifted from the forces of power and money in modern societies, in Habermasian terms, to the forces of talk, discussion and persuasion - the force of deliberation. Deliberative democracy can help to repair torn social fabrics and to create new social relations where the old ones have failed. In this way deliberative democracy can generate its own kind of social adhesive. Habermas refers to the latter as "communicative power" (Warren, 2002: 178 & 180). Deliberative democracy can help to structure political conflict so that it might be settled "through the force of communicative influence rather than through the forces of money or coercive power" (Warren, 2002: 181). The outcomes of such a process should be more "legitimate, more

rational and more ethical than any other possible political arrangement” (Warren, 2002: 189).

Christie (1999) further attempts to substantiate her contention by citing the evidence of two case studies. The studies of pedagogy in USA schools, undertaken by Cuba (1993; 1990) reached the conclusion that “there has been little fundamental change in pedagogy in the past hundred years, in spite of a wide range of policy interventions” (Christie, 1999: 286). Major education policy reforms, in certain African countries, to improve the quality of primary education over the past fifteen years have not managed to change teaching and learning in classrooms (Heneveld, 1994). Citing various authors, Christie (1999: 288) concludes that extensive research reveals that it is very difficult for mandated state policy directives to change established patterns and dynamics in schools and in classrooms, because it is likely to take time. Fundamental educational transformation in South Africa is difficult to achieve and win support for. The framework policy approach of the new education authorities has weakened the possibilities of delivering transformation, because it has separated formulation from implementation. “Social and educational transformation cannot be delivered by democratic elections and policy visions alone. They need to be won in concerted engagement with social, political and economic forces, in which the development of new policies is simply one task” (Christie, 1999: 290).

What, then, must be done to improve the transformative possibilities of South Africa’s post-apartheid education and training policy frameworks? Jansen (2001: 289), after empirically assessing the transformative effects of certain education and training policy documents and programmes that were published between 1994 and 2000 via case studies, calls for a different theoretical perspective to guide the conceptualisation of post-apartheid South Africa’s education and training policy frameworks, because education, at a system-wide level, “remains steeped in crisis and inequality despite the flurry of policy in the six years since the first democratic elections”. Fataar (2000: 19) challenges the narrow and conservative policy environment, which does not provide the necessary basis for

developing an equitable and united education system, and tries to provide an alternative policy approach to education and training. The latter author calls for the reinsertion of equality into the education and training policy frameworks of South Africa and for the conceptualisation of change on the basis of a long-term sustainable development path, because they are key elements of educational transformation.

The creation of an alternative policy approach would involve the following measures. The first measure relates to challenging GEAR's financial stringency because an alternative education policy approach has to be found on a viable alternative to the current macro-economic framework. This is necessary because limited finances in education, due to GEAR's stringent fiscal approach, "have led to a number of measures that target formal equity but which are devoid of effective redress strategies" (Fataar, 2000: 26). Some of the concrete steps that the latter author propose, to counter the constraining effects of GEAR, include appeals to the government to decrease its debt so that more money can be available for social spending. Another concrete step, to effect greater equity and redress in education, is the prioritisation of certain aspects of education over others, in order to identify those areas that have the greatest need. A third step is to encourage former Model-C white schools to share "their resources with poor schools in mutually enriching partnerships that could involve exchange of teacher expertise, sharing of learning resources, use of sport and extra-curricular facilities, and sharing financial and managerial know-how" (Fataar, 2000: 27).

A second measure, to establish an alternative approach to education and training policy, is to shift to a slower and more sustainable pace of transformation, which should be determined by the pace of the overall development of society. This means that it will take a longer period to generate an equitable education system than what has been envisaged. Slower and more sustainable implementation is advisable because teachers, schools and educational bureaucracies take a very long time to adapt to a new orientation. The longer time frame is necessary because teacher identities "are constituted and reinforced over a longer period of

time. The shift to a new pedagogy and thus teacher identity has to be conceptualised and supported over a long period” (Fataar, 2000: 28). A third measure, to ensure that post-apartheid education and training policies achieve their transformative intentions, is to turn around the culture of the breakdown of learning and teaching that exist in many South African schools, because a fundamental precondition for any policy change and innovation “is to establish conditions of stability and orderly routines in schools where the learning culture is currently dysfunctional” (Fataar, 2000: 29).

A fourth measure, towards conceptualising an alternative approach to education and training policy frameworks, is to challenge some of the underlying assumptions of the NQF and Curriculum 2005. The instrumentalist orientation of the latter two policy frameworks has to be counter-balanced by a more open-ended and flexible pedagogy. The latter process can be initiated by recognising the pedagogical differences between education and training. “A more flexible domain-specific approach to pedagogy and assessment has to replace the NQF’s preference for a homogenous approach to learning, which occludes the pedagogical differences in different sites of learning” (Fataar, 2000: 29). As a fifth measure I would suggest that our education policy-makers adopt Elmore’s (1979/80) backward mapping approach to the policy process. This approach challenges policy-makers to start at the point of implementation and work backwards, instead of starting at the point of policy formulation and working forwards to implementation. The rationale behind Elmore’s (1979/80: 52) suggestion is that the forward mapping approach, commonly favoured by policy-makers, falsely assumes that policy-makers are able to control the complex organisational, political and technical factors that affect implementation, particularly at the institutional level. Education policies may be more sensitive to actual conditions in learning institutions if policy-makers have more knowledge about these matters. Policy-makers must take cognisance of the wealth of experience in developed and developing countries that reveal the limitations of national education policies in changing classroom-level practices (Christie, 1999: 288). Policy-makers must also bear in mind that changing established patterns

and dynamics in learning institutions cannot simply be mandated by policy directives alone, because proposed changes may need time to take root.

As a sixth measure I would suggest a deliberative democratic approach to education and training policy, as I have attempted to outline in this chapter. A deliberative democratic approach may, in the light of the political and contestatory nature of the education policy-making process, be an appropriate mechanism for the construction of education policy that will be eventually more acceptable and more legitimate to most of the actors that are involved in the education policy process. A deliberative democratic approach may lead to a discourse that enable more inclusivity and less to the exclusion of dissenting voices. It may also mediate the contestation that is involved in the policy process so that the end-result may be education policies that give voice to the values and interests of the majority of citizens.

#### **5.4 Summary**

I have done a conceptual analysis of teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). I have explored constitutive meanings associated with teacher education policy, like the mentioned policy framework. The first section of this chapter has utilised conceptual analysis to explore constitutive meanings of the concept of “teacher education”. These constitutive meanings were used in the second section of the chapter to illuminate constitutive meanings of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). The latter constitutive meanings were extracted after a close examination of the mentioned policy framework in relation to other South African teacher education policy documents, like the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education (COTEP, 1996) and the Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Training and Development (Department of Education, 1997), and include the following: The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) provide an authoritative standard or

model for the development of learning programmes and qualifications for educators for employment purposes; the notion of applied competence and its associated assessment criteria forms the cornerstone of assessment in post-apartheid teacher education; pre-service (preset) and in-service educators (inset) should be reflective practitioners; teacher education institutions must recognise student voices; teaching practice is an essential feature of teacher education; educators should be lifelong learners; local needs, contexts and cultures must be respected; and existing teacher education practice must be transformed. These listed constitutive meanings seem to reflect, to a great extent, the teacher education outcomes or conceptual orientations of the meanings of teacher education transformation that my conceptual analysis has revealed in Chapter Four.

Constitutive meanings of teacher education in South Africa, in relation to the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), were examined in relation to the central question of this dissertation: Can the new education policy framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), improve learning and teaching in South African schools? I argue that the transformation of teacher education will not be an easy process. The prospects of the mentioned policy framework for improving learning and teaching in South African schools look dim, because of the latter problem. Based mainly on Jansen's (2001: 272) notion of education policy as "political symbolism", I argue that the mentioned policy framework shows signs of "political symbolism" and that the latter policy framework may not lead to deep transformation of teacher education in South Africa.

Jansen (2001: 272) claims that the making of education policy in South Africa can best be described as a "struggle for the achievement of a broad political symbolism to mark the shift from apartheid to post-apartheid society." Jansen (2001: 272) posits further that every "single case of education policy-making demonstrates, in different ways, the preoccupation of the state with settling policy struggles in the political domain rather than in the realm of practice." I

Fataar, 2000) on practical implementation. This may impede deep transformation of teacher education in South Africa. Education policy, alone, cannot lead to educational transformation (Christie, 1999) because of the limitations of the state's power to enforce its will through promulgated education policy. These limitations make it necessary for the state and its education policy-makers to "engage" with other policy actors, like educators, bureaucrats, policy critics and teacher education institutions, if education policies are to effect their intended transformation in South Africa (Christie, 1999). In the absence of any concrete suggestions, by Christie (1999), on how this "engagement" should be effected I have advocated a deliberative democratic approach to this "engagement". Such an approach can improve the transformative potential of the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) to transform teacher education in this country.



## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **THE IMPLICATIONS OF SOUTH AFRICA'S NEW TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING IN SCHOOLS**

#### **6.1 Introduction**

This dissertation made an effort to address the following question, by means of a conceptual analysis: Can the competency-based teacher education framework, as set out in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), improve teaching and learning in South African schools? After exploring constitutive meanings of the concept of education policy, teacher education transformation and teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa, in relation to policy like the mentioned policy framework, I come to the conclusion that the latter policy framework may not necessarily lead to the improvement of teaching and learning in schools. This chapter will lend further substance to the foregoing argument, by examining the seven suggested roles outlined in the mentioned policy framework, in relation to its implications for teaching and learning in South African schools.

Can or should the mentioned roles be integrated? I argue that these roles should not be integrated. The first reason has to do with the predicaments (Burbules, 1997: 65) or dilemmas that make the practice of teaching difficult and complicated and the fact that these predicaments cannot be permanently solved. One of these predicaments, to which I shall draw attention, relates to possible problems of training student teachers to be learning mediators as prescribed by the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 13). I shall highlight three possible impediments to the training of student teachers to become learning mediators. A second predicament relates to the performance of the role of interpreter and designer of learning programmes and materials, by

student teachers and in-service teachers, as expected by the mentioned policy framework. A third predicament that I shall draw attention to relates to the expected performance of the role of manager of learning in the classroom, by student teachers and in-service teachers (Department of Education, 2000: 13). A fourth predicament relates to the expected performance of the role of scholar, researcher and lifelong learner, by and in-service teachers. I shall, fifthly, draw attention to a predicament that relates to the community, citizenship and pastoral role that student teachers and in-service teachers are expected to perform (Department of Education, 2000: 14). The sixth possible predicament relates to the performance of the role of assessor, as prescribed in the mentioned policy framework. The last predicament, to which I shall draw attention to, relates to the seventh role to be performed by student teachers for assessment and qualifications purposes, which is that of learning area/subject/discipline/phase specialist (Department of Education, 2000: 14).

The second reason for my rejection of the mentioned integration relates to the impact of education reforms on teachers, especially in terms of their classroom pedagogy. If the predicaments of teaching cannot be resolved, what then do teaching and learning require so that the predicaments of the practice of teaching can be made more manageable and less debilitating? I have utilised the notion of “the tragic perspective” on education, by Burbules (1997: 66), and the arguments of Biesta (2004; 76) for the necessity of a new language of education, to address the latter question. Teachers can use the tragic perspective on education and a new language of education, instead of the dominant language of learning, to approach teaching differently and to make the predicaments of teaching more manageable and less debilitating. The arguments of Burbules (1997) and Biesta (2004) seem to lend some substance to my contention that education policy frameworks alone, like the mentioned one, cannot resolve the predicaments of teaching, that I shall draw attention to, or improve teaching and learning in South African schools.

## **6.2 Implications for teaching and learning in schools**

There are various reasons why the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) may not necessarily lead to an improvement of teaching and learning in the schools of post-apartheid South Africa. The mentioned policy framework may be an inappropriate framework to structure and guide the transformation of existing teacher education practice because of certain conceptual gaps or shortcomings. These conceptual gaps could be stumbling blocks to improve teaching and learning in our schools.

A major conceptual gap like the one relating to the lack of detail, in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), on how student educators and in-service educators should be trained to be reflective practitioners, has crucial implications for teaching and learning in our schools. If all or most of South African teachers could be reflective practitioners, as the mentioned policy framework envisages, this would be a major step to improve teaching and learning in our schools. This is because these teachers may use their reflexive competence to improve their practices. Being constantly reflexive may create a habit or custom, among teachers, to constantly review their teaching and the learning of their learners, by means of deliberation with other reflexive colleagues. Such habitual actions, like being constantly reflexive about your practice, may lead to the improvement of teaching and learning in our schools, and also help to transform the identities of particularly in-service teachers from being non-reflexive teachers to that of reflective practitioners who can, like other practitioners (doctors and attorneys), think for themselves when confronted with problems and opportunities in their practices.

My emphasis is on the in-service educators because they are the people who are supposed to initiate and socialise the student educators, as mentors, into the new practice of being reflective practitioners. They have to socialise the student educators into a new way of thinking about the practice of teaching. How can

they perform this important mentoring task if they are uninformed or ignorant about the new way of thinking about the practice of teaching?

The last question is important in the light of the transformation of teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) are supposed to provide the outcomes that this transformation should be directed towards. The seven roles that student teachers and in-service teachers are required to perform, for assessment and qualification purposes, form the core of these outcomes. It is, thus, important to examine these seven roles, more closely, to ascertain if these roles will either enhance or either retard teacher education transformation in post-apartheid South Africa. This closer conceptual examination will be done in relation to my arguments that were propagated in the previous chapters.

The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 13), firstly, expect from student teachers and in-service teachers to perform the role of learning mediator: "The educator will mediate learning in a manner which is sensitive to the diverse needs of learners, including those with barriers to learning; construct learning environments that are appropriately contextualised and inspirational; communicate effectively showing recognition of and respect for the differences of others." Will teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa be transformed and will teaching and learning be improved in South African schools if teachers act as learning mediators in their classrooms? I think the latter can possibly be achieved if the obstacles, to become learning mediators, can be addressed. Here I am referring to the fact that being a learning mediator requires a change in identity for in-service teachers. This is necessary because most of these teachers have been trained, via Fundamental Pedagogics, to conduct their classroom pedagogy in a certain manner. This traditional manner centred around the transmission mode of teaching (Pendlebury, 1998: 337). Being a learning mediator, thus, requires in-service teachers to conduct their classroom pedagogy differently. Conducting their classroom pedagogy differently requires, as part of the process of adopting a new identity, from in-

service teachers to adopt new classroom habits and new values about teaching. Unlearning old habits (Hansen, 1997: 171) and learning new classroom habits will not be an easy process, especially for those in-service teachers with many years of service. The latter process may take much longer than the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) may envisage.

It is crucial that in-service teachers must unlearn their old classroom habits, which is part of their classroom pedagogy, because they will likely be the supervising teachers or mentors of the student teachers during their teaching practice and, perhaps, also their mentors when these student teachers start their teaching careers. It is these in-service teachers that must initiate or socialise the student teachers and beginning teachers into the practice of teaching, as propagated by the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000). The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) seems to be blind to the foregoing dilemma that might hinder the training of student teachers to act as learning mediators in the classroom. Student teachers will only fully learn how to be learning mediators when they teach in authentic classroom settings. It is, thus, unfair of the mentioned policy framework to expect of student teachers to perform the role of learning mediator for assessment purposes. Another possible impediment to the training of student teachers to being learning mediators is the influence of their teacher educators. The classroom pedagogy of the teacher educators must also be a living example of learning mediation. In this way teacher educators will model and demonstrate to student teachers how learning mediation is to be performed in the classroom. Teacher educators who persist with a classroom pedagogy that is dominated by the transmission mode of teaching will not be able to model and to demonstrate to their students how the actions, and also its underlying intentions, are to be performed in the classroom. I make these latter arguments in the light of the research findings of Ensor (2000: 188) on how important modelling and demonstration is in the training of student teachers, in especially classroom pedagogy. The summary of research conducted as part of the Presidents' Educational Initiative (Taylor & Vinjevoold, 1999: 143) points to a discrepancy

between teachers' intent and what actually happens in their classrooms, between what they say about their practice, and the ways in which they actually perform. Ensor (2000: 162) attempts to provide a reason for the latter variation by using it as a starting point to shed some light on nearly the same problem she encountered during an empirical two-year longitudinal study she conducted among a group of seven student teachers. A possible reason for the mentioned variation can be located within the structuring of teacher education discourse and its mode of transmission. The latter suggests that teacher education comprises both explicit and tacit forms of knowledge, and that each is associated with appropriate modes of pedagogy. "For teacher educators (either in-service or pre-service) to make available to student teachers the principles that underpin their views of best practice, they need to combine explicit discussion of teaching and learning with modelling and demonstration in the site of practice, the classroom" (Ensor, 2000: 188).

A third possible impediment to teachers becoming learning mediators relates to a weakness in the conceptual foundation of learning mediation. Here I shall briefly focus on the expectation, from the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 13), that student teachers and in-service teachers must "mediate learning in a manner which is sensitive to the diverse needs of learners, including those with barriers to learning ..." Biesta (2004: 75) claims that the new language of learning, which advocates the idea of learning mediation and meeting the needs of learners, has a major conceptual shortcoming. This new language of learning facilitates "an economic understanding of the process of education, one in which the learner is supposed to know what he or she wants, and where a provider (a teacher, an educational institution) is simply there to meet the needs of the learner or ... to satisfy the customer" (Biesta, 2004: 76). The educational process itself cannot and should not, however, be understood in economic terms because of a fundamental difference between the market model and the professional model. Consumers, in terms of the market model, are supposed to know what they need, and producers bid in price and quality to satisfy them. In professional models, on the other

hand, the producer not only services a need, but also defines. Only the physician will know whether a patient who complains of a headache will need painkillers or brain surgery. It is, thus, up to the teacher, as an educational professional, to use his or her professional judgement and expertise to make decisions about what a particular child (learner) actually needs. The emphasis on meeting the needs of learners is, however, based on the underlying assumption that learners come to education with a clear understanding of what their needs are. This is a highly questionable assumption because it misconstrues the role and position of the educational professional in the process, and the role and position of the learner. This assumption is also questionable because it forgets “that a major reason for engaging in education is precisely to find out what it is that one actually needs – a process in which educational professionals play a crucial role because a major part of their expertise lies precisely there” (Biesta, 2004: 75). Another questionable assumption is that education should be about meeting the needs of the learner because the “more important questions about the content and purpose of education become virtually impossible to ask, other, that is, than in response to the needs of the learner” (Biesta, 2004: 75). This exclusion of questions about the content and purpose of education, by the new language of learning, undermines and erodes the role of educational professionals in discussions about the content and purpose of education. The mentioned exclusion also “creates a situation in which there are hardly any opportunities left for democratic deliberation about the content and purpose of education and its role in society” (Biesta, 2004: 76). Questions about the content and purpose of learning should, thus, be part of the educational process itself. To address the foregoing situation we need to reinvent a language of education, which can serve as an alternative for the language of learning (Biesta, 2004: 76). I will extend the latter argument later on in this chapter.

The problem with the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) is that it falsely assumes that in-service teachers, who will act as supervising teachers for student teachers during teaching practice, will immediately know the objectives and intentions of what this policy framework

hopes to achieve. The mentioned policy framework also falsely assumes that the student teacher and his in-service supervising teacher will automatically have a common understanding of what learning mediation entails. I argue this point because student teachers may be put under the supervision of in-service teachers, during teaching practice, whose classroom pedagogy are dominated by the transmission mode of teaching. It is also possible that these in-service supervising teachers may know something about learning mediation, but are, for various reasons, unwilling to change their classroom pedagogy. It is, thus, necessary that in-service supervising teachers should also be trained in the objectives and intentions of the mentioned policy framework. This, however, will not guarantee that these in-service teachers will change their classroom pedagogy in order to model and demonstrate (Ensor, 2000: 188) the performance of learning mediation in the authentic classroom context to student teachers. Another problem with the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) is that it falsely assumes that teacher educators will adapt their classroom pedagogy, in order for them to provide modelling and demonstration of the performance of learning mediation to their students. I make the latter point in the light of the dominance of the transmission mode of teaching at most teacher education institutions during the apartheid-era (Pendlebury, 1998: 337). It is, thus, necessary for both teacher educators and in-service teachers to adapt their classroom pedagogy so that they can model and demonstrate the performance of learning mediation, in the authentic classroom context, to student teachers. This is important because the performance of the role of learning mediator, by the student teacher during teaching practice, is one of the crucial outcomes that are supposed to be assessed for qualifications purposes. To propagate learning mediation alone in the mentioned policy framework is not enough to transform teacher education and improve teaching and learning in South African schools. More intervention is needed, such as the measures that I have alluded to. More research is, thus, necessary on such intervention measures so that we can move closer to the transformation of teacher education in this country. I will extend my discussion of learning mediation later on in this chapter.



Student teachers and in-service teachers are, secondly, expected to perform the role of interpreter and designer of learning programmes and materials: “The educator will understand and interpret provided learning programmes, design original learning programmes, identify the requirements for a specific context of learning and select and prepare suitable textual and visual resources for learning” (Department of Education, 2000: 13). What the foregoing implies is that teachers are supposed to be creators of learning programmes and materials. The mentioned policy framework negates the fact that most of the in-service teachers who were trained during the apartheid-era were only interpreters of learning programmes, which they implemented via prescribed syllabi and textbooks. These teachers were seldom required to create original learning programmes. They were also seldom required to identify the requirements for a specific context of learning because their prescribed syllabi and textbooks seldom required such actions. It is these in-service teachers who must initiate and socialise student teachers into the practice of teaching, of which the interpretation and design of learning programmes and materials forms a crucial part. It is crucial in the sense that the in-service teachers must model and demonstrate the latter performance in the authentic classroom context to the student teachers. The in-service teachers are supposed to guide and train these student teachers. It is, thus, necessary or desirable that the latter persons should also be trained in the performance of designing learning programmes and materials. To say that teachers must be designers of learning programmes, in policy frameworks, is not enough to improve teaching and learning in South African schools. More intervention is necessary because it is very difficult to change the classroom habits and dispositions of teachers with many years of service (Hansen, 1997: 171) and who have become complacent (Burbules, 1997: 72).

A third role that student teachers and in-service teachers must perform, for assessment and qualifications purposes, is that of leader, administrator and manager: “The educator will make decisions appropriate to the level, manage learning in the classroom, carry out classroom administrative duties efficiently

and participate in school decision making structures” (Department of Education, 2000: 13). I want to link my examination of this role to the role of the teacher as learning mediator. My emphasis will be on the management of learning in the classroom, by the teacher, as advocated by the mentioned policy framework. The foregoing emphasis seems, in my opinion, to reflect an important aspect of constructivist and socio-cultural theories of learning. These theories of learning advocate the view “that learning is not a passive intake of information, but that knowledge and understanding are actively constructed by the learner, often in co-operation with fellow learners, (which) has shifted the attention away from the activities of the teacher to the activities of the student” (Biesta, 2004: 72). The mentioned theories of learning have, thus, redefined teaching as facilitating learning. The problem with the latter, it seems, is that both the role and the position of the educational professional in the process, and the role and position of the learner are being misconstrued. This is the case because the emphasis on teaching as facilitating or managing classroom learning, as advocated by the new language of learning (Biesta, 2004: 71), seems to negate the professional judgement and expertise of the teacher to make decisions about what his or her learners actually requires. This is especially the case where teachers have to manage learning so that the prescribed outcomes of their subjects or learning areas can be achieved. I will extend the foregoing arguments later on in this chapter.

The management of learning in the classroom seems to suggest that the teacher must act as facilitator or manager of his pupils’ learning and that she/he may need a variety of teaching methods. The implication is that the teacher cannot persist with the dominant mode of teaching of the apartheid-era, the transmission mode. They must alternate it with other modes like group-work and the discussion method. Changing the classroom habits and pedagogy of especially experienced teachers will, however, not be an easy process. The latter process will require time (Hansen, 1997: 171). New teacher education policy, alone, will not bring about the envisaged change that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) seek. I propagate the latter argument against

the background of the fact that student teachers should preferably be trained, via modelling and demonstration (Ensor 2000: 188) by their supervising in-service teachers and teacher educators to become managers of learning in the authentic context of the practice of teaching, the school classrooms. The concerns that I have raised in this section need to be addressed if teaching and learning are to be improved in our schools.

Another role that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 13) require student teachers and in-service teachers to perform is that of scholar, researcher and lifelong learner: "The educator will achieve ongoing personal, academic, occupational and professional growth through pursuing reflective study and research in their learning area, in broader professional and educational matters, and in other related fields." Being a scholar and researcher would require certain skills from teachers. This would also require changes to the identity of teachers because most of them are unfamiliar with these roles that they are supposed to perform. The chances of those teachers who want to improve their qualifications at teacher education institutions may be better than those in-service teachers who do not see the need for such sacrifices, to acquire the skills and knowledge to be scholars and researchers in their learning area, in broader professional and educational matters, and in other related fields. To propagate the view that teachers must be scholars and researchers and lifelong learners in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) is not enough to improve teaching and learning in the schools of post-apartheid South Africa. If the government is serious about propagating the foregoing role then it must recognise the limitations of enforcing identity changes in in-service teachers through promulgated policy frameworks like the mentioned one. The government needs to recognise that more intervention, especially from their side, is necessary to motivate in-service teachers to pursue lifelong learning. This is necessary because for one, the provincial education departments, such as the Western Cape Education Department (WCED), seems to propagate a view of lifelong learning that is determined by monetary concerns. Here I shall use my own case as an example

to highlight the stumbling blocks that teachers have to face to pursue lifelong learning and to be scholars and researchers. The only in-service teachers who are encouraged to improve their qualifications are those with less than three years of training after matric. This is the only category of in-service teachers who can, according to WCED prescriptions, qualify for study-leave with full remuneration. Other categories of in-service teachers can only take study-leave if they themselves remunerate their substitutes. The other option, in WCED schools, is for the latter category of in-service teachers to appeal to the governing bodies of their schools to remunerate their substitutes. If governing bodies, especially those in impoverished communities, do not have the financial resources to remunerate substitute teachers then many in-service teachers will not be able to pursue lifelong learning to develop their skills and knowledge to become scholars and researchers. This is one example of government's lack of will to promote a certain aspect of its own policies. The actions of the WCED, thus, contradict one of the intentions or objectives of the mentioned policy framework.

Student teachers and teachers must, fifthly, perform a community, citizenship and pastoral role: "The educator will practice and promote a critical, committed and ethical attitude towards developing a sense of respect and responsibility towards others. The educator will uphold the constitution and promote democratic values and practices in schools and society" (Department of Education, 2000: 14). This is a totally new role that most of South Africa's teachers are supposed to perform. What do the country's teachers require to perform the mentioned role? I want to link the foregoing question to my discussion in the previous chapter of Aristotle's conception of virtues. I argue that South Africa's teachers may require a virtuous character to make the right decisions and judgements at the right time at the right place, in the classroom and society. An essential part of this virtuous character is the cultivation, within teachers, of a sense of duty towards their profession. The latter argument can be linked to Pendlebury's (1998: 341) view that apartheid education has eroded a sense of duty towards their profession, especially amongst many black teachers:

“Apartheid policy severely constrained the scope for nurturing and exercising professional judgement and one of the consequences of the long struggle against apartheid was an erosion of the ideal of service.” Morrow (1996: 153) also refers to this lack of a sense of duty towards their profession, amongst many black teachers, which can be traced to the struggle against apartheid. This eroded sense of duty needs to be recovered so that teachers can act in the interest of their schools, their communities and their country. What this country, thus, needs is committed teachers, who seek to do good for the common good, in order to uplift their schools, their communities and their country. The problem with the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) is that this policy framework falsely assumes that teachers already have this virtuous character, including a sense of duty towards their profession. A paper by Christie (1998: 283) about the breakdown of a culture of teaching and learning at many black township schools, and how difficult it is to turn the situation around, seems to lend some substance to the latter claim.

It is important that in-service teachers, especially those who will act as supervising teachers for student teachers during teaching practice, acquire this virtuous character, including a sense of duty towards their profession. This is necessary because it is these in-service teachers who have to initiate and socialise these student teachers into the practice of teaching. How can these in-service teachers inculcate, in these student teachers, a sense of duty towards their profession, if they themselves lack such a sense? Promulgated teacher education policy frameworks, like the mentioned one, alone, cannot inculcate such a sense of duty towards their profession. More intervention and engagement, between government and teachers, is necessary to promote such a sense of duty towards their profession within teachers, and to possibly improve teaching and learning in South Africa’s schools. Student teachers will only fully develop this community, citizenship and pastoral role in the authentic practice of teaching because it is only within the authentic practice of teaching where they will acquire the virtuous character that I have alluded to, because as Aristotle (1962: 73) claims we can only acquire virtues by practising them.

Student teachers and in-service teachers also need to perform the role of assessor: “The educator will understand that assessment is an essential feature of the teaching and learning process and know how to integrate the process” (Department of Education, 2000: 14). Student teachers are supposed to perform this role for assessment and qualification purposes. The problem with this expectation is that this role can only be more fully developed in the authentic practice of teaching. Teaching practice does not really provide an authentic context for the assessment of the learning of learners. Assessment, as it currently stands, means that a teacher has to do the following things: collect evidence of the learning of learners (e.g. tasks; research assignments and tests) throughout the academic year; ascertain which of the learners do not progress satisfactorily, try to determine the reasons for their weak progress and conceptualise intervention measures to improve their progress; decide at the end of the academic year which of his/her learners have achieved the set outcomes (passed) and which learners need more time (failed) to achieve the outcomes of the teacher’s learning area or learning areas. The complexity of the task of assessment makes it, thus, nearly impossible for student teachers to perform the mentioned role in an authentic way, for assessment purposes. One can only expect this from them in the real practice of teaching.

Another problem for student teachers is that their supervising in-service teachers are also grappling with the assessment of their learners because it is a new way of evaluating the learning of their learners. In-service teachers now have to deal with learners who assess themselves, learners who assess other learners (peer assessment) and try to reconcile it with their own assessment of learners in order to make correct judgements on the academic progress of her learners. It is these in-service teachers, who still struggle to make sense of the new assessment approach, that have to initiate and socialise student teachers into this new assessment approach. A third possible problem with the role of the teacher as assessor relates to the arguments of Biesta (2004: 77) about one of the constituents of the educational relationship, to which he refers to as “trust

without ground". This means that there is always a risk when a learner engages in learning. There is the risk that the learner will not learn what she wanted to learn or that she will learn things that she could not have imagined she would learn. Another risk is that the learner may learn something that she rather did not want to learn. "To engage in learning always entails the risk that learning may have an impact on you, that learning may change you. This means, however, that education only begins when the learner is willing to take a risk" (Biesta, 2004: 77). To lessen or negate this risk, by specifying in advance the learning outcomes of a learning area, as in the case of outcomes-based education in South Africa, is to miss a crucial dimension of education. One way of handling the mentioned risk is for the learner to trust the professional judgement and expertise of the teacher. This trust is without ground because this trust would be unnecessary for the learner if she knew what would happen to her (Biesta, 2004: 77). To narrow down the role of the teacher to that of assessor of prescribed learning outcomes of the learning area he teaches, is to miss an important aspect of teaching. To address the latter situation may require the formulation of a new language of education. Trust without ground is one of the building blocks of such a language. I will extend the foregoing argument later on in this chapter.

The seventh and last role to be performed by student teachers and in-service teachers, as expected by the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 14), is that of learning area/subject/discipline/phase specialist: "The educator will know about different approaches to teaching and learning (and, where appropriate, research and management), and how these may be used in ways which are appropriate to the learners and the context." This role requires, from student teachers and in-service teachers, knowledge about different approaches to teaching and learning in the subject or learning area that they teach. These teachers have to use this knowledge to judge which approach or approaches to teaching and learning are correct for the learners in a certain context. To expect the demonstration of such judgements, by student teachers during teaching practice for assessment purposes, is unfair. Judgements of the

mentioned kind can only be fully developed in the authentic practice of teaching where they will gradually come to know the context in which they teach.

How will student teachers acquire practical knowledge about different approaches to teaching? This is an important question because student teachers have to demonstrate their knowledge about different approaches to teaching for assessment purposes. I argue that their only source will be the in-service supervising teachers and their educators. One must remember that most of the in-service teachers have more many years utilised only the transmission mode of teaching (Pendlebury, 1998: 337). Many of them may still persist with this mode of teaching and may not find the need to explore other modes of teaching. It is these in-service teachers that must initiate and socialise student teachers into the practice of teaching, which is supposed to be characterised by different approaches to teaching. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), thus, falsely assumes that in-service teachers, who should guide and supervise student teachers during teaching practice, will automatically know that they have to extend their classroom pedagogy so that they can expose student teachers to different approaches to teaching.

The other important source for student teachers to acquire practical knowledge about different approaches to teaching is their educators at teacher education institutions. The problem, however, is that many of these teacher educators have for many years mostly utilised the transmission mode of teaching. Many of them still have to extend their classroom pedagogy to include other modes of teaching. It is these teacher educators that have to initiate and socialise student teachers into the practice of teaching, which is characterised by different approaches to teaching. The mentioned policy framework, thus, falsely by way of saying nothing about pedagogy, assumes that teacher educators will know that they have to do to extend their classroom pedagogy such as to train their student teachers in the practical application of different approaches to teaching. Teacher educators who persist with only the transmission mode of teaching cannot possibly hope to



demonstrate the practical application of different approaches to teaching. My arguments are partly based on the research findings of Ensor (2000: 188) who makes a credible claim that student teachers learn the best about classroom pedagogy, by way of modelling and demonstration by teacher educators. To propagate the view that teachers must have knowledge about different approaches to teaching and to be able to make judgements about the appropriate approach to teaching to be used in a certain context, is not enough to improve teaching and learning in South African schools. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) seems to negate the complexity of the current situation in which student teachers have to acquire practical knowledge about different approaches to teaching and how to make practical judgements about which approach to teaching to use for certain contexts. To expect student teachers to demonstrate the latter for assessment purposes, in an authentic way, is thus unfair.

This brings us to the next question: Can or should the first six roles, as prescribed by the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), be integrated into the seventh role of learning area or subject specialist? I argue that the first six roles should not be integrated into the seventh role. The reasons for my argument are mainly based on the ideas of Biesta (2004) and Burbules (1997). The foregoing paragraphs have revealed the complexity of the seven roles. I have highlighted the possible obstacles that student teachers might face in their endeavours to learn to perform these roles for assessment purposes. These possible obstacles seem to lend some weight to the claim by Hansen and Burbules (1997: 1) that teaching, like parenting, is a complex human endeavour, which feature distinctive predicaments. What is a predicament? Hansen and Burbules (1997: 1) define a predicament as follows:

A predicament is a problematic state of affairs that admits of no easy resolution. Predicaments require compromise and trade-offs. They do not necessarily paralyse human action; people can and do respond to them all

the time. However, responses to predicaments tend to take the form of provisional, working resolutions ...

What the foregoing definition indicates is that a human endeavour such as teaching is punctuated by difficulties and problems. It also seems as if there are no permanent solutions to the predicaments of teaching. The possible obstacles to the learning of the performance of the seven roles, by student teachers, that I have allude to earlier on in this section can possibly be regarded as predicaments. It can be regarded as predicaments because they are problematic states of affairs that admit of no easy resolution. It is, thus, undesirable to integrate the first six roles into the seventh role. It is undesirable because the “teacher’s world is characterised by uncertainty, ambiguity, and sometimes irreconcilable expectations. Those conditions make teaching unpredictable” (Hansen & Burbules, 1997: 2). Such a variety of roles, which were never modelled and demonstrated to them, will only confuse, especially in-service teachers. It is undesirable to integrate the first six roles into the seventh role, as prescribed by the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), because the predicaments of teaching in terms of the roles that I have alluded to earlier on, cannot be solved. These predicaments can only be better managed and be made less debilitating.

A second possible reason for the undesirability of integrating the first roles into the role of the teacher as subject or learning area specialist relates to the possible impact of calls for reform on the practice of teaching. Reforms often require teachers to teach more than they understand. The language of reforms, in the form of policy frameworks, encourages “teachers to move away from comfortable modes of practice, without clarity about what they should move toward. The reforms give general guidance, rather than specific suggestions” (Floden, 1997: 14). Jansen (2001: 272) and Pendlebury (1998: 342) claim that South Africa’s post-apartheid teacher education policy framework, which aims to transform teacher education, lack detail on implementation issues. One can, thus, say that South Africa’s in-service teachers are expected to transform their

teaching. The problem, however, is that these teachers are asked to “change to practices of which they have no clear images” (Floden, 1997: 14). The transformation of the practice of teaching that the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000) seeks, do not only require that in-service teachers implement specific changes in their practices. The mentioned policy framework also, by implication, expects in-service teachers to become involved in creating a new practice. It is these teachers, still busy trying to make sense of what this new practice of teaching entails, who, must initiate and socialise student teachers into this new practice of teaching in post-apartheid South Africa. This new practice of teaching still has to develop a substantive history and tradition. To integrate the first roles with all its conceptual shortcomings into the seventh role is thus undesirable.

If the predicaments of teaching cannot be resolved, what then do teaching and learning require so that the predicaments of teaching can be made more manageable? I shall argue that the ideas of Burbules (1997) and Biesta (2004) provide a possible response to the foregoing question. Burbules (1997: 65) proposes a perspective towards education, and its possibilities and limits, which he calls “the tragic perspective.” This tragic perspective rejects any utopian hopes in education. It rejects a belief in personal or social perfectibility. The tragic sense does not believe that our educational endeavour always does good and never harm. A focus on minimal and incremental improvements cannot be accommodated in the tragic perspective. What is needed, instead, is reflection on the conflicted aims and values inherent in any educational activity. The tragic perspective on education enables us to think positively and constructively about teaching and what it can and cannot accomplish. The tragic sense, besides propagating a dualistic perspective of teaching, which acknowledges its possibilities and limitations, also frees us to regard those moments of failure as occasions for new learning. The tragic perspective on teaching, thus, gives us a reason to care, to persist in our efforts to improve our practice (Burbules, 1997: 65-66).

How can the tragic perspective be utilised to improve the practice of teaching? Burbules (1997: 66) couples his notion of the tragic perspective on teaching to the idea of a dilemma. The latter idea urges teachers to recognise that there is a deep, intractable contradiction between competing aims and values in teaching. Dilemmas disturb and challenge us because we are recognising at a distance the trade-offs that most complex human activities inevitably entail. What makes these dilemmas tragic is that we see conflict and contradiction reflected in our own hopes and desires- a reflection that throws into doubt some of the very values that inspire our educational endeavour in the first place. What we do not know is how to reconcile the dimensions of our own beliefs and motivations, and to recognise conflict in those is to unsettle the very basis of any confidence that such conflicts can be overcome (Burbules, 1997: 66). Elaborating on his view that the tragic perspective requires teachers to reflect on the conflicted aims and values inherent in any educational activity, Burbules (1997: 66-67) claims that there are five conflicts surrounding teaching, which touch upon unavoidable conditions of teaching as a practice. "We can question or doubt those conditions, but we cannot continue to teach without continuing to struggle with them" (Burbules, 1997: 67). I shall only refer to three of these conflicts because they are relevant to the issues under examination in this chapter. The first of these conflicts are the ambivalent benefits and costs of authority. How can authority, which is inherent in any teaching-learning situation, be used to advance teaching and learning in the classroom? Valuable learning can be fostered, in the classroom, by encouraging students to question authority and by even inviting challenges to one's own authority as a teacher. This can, however, only be done by a person in authority, like a teacher. There can be stumbling blocks to the exercise of encouraging students to question the authority of teachers, such as student habits and expectations, or those of their parents or the larger community, that place demands upon teachers that are not compatible with the maintenance of a self-questioning authority. Another possible stumbling block to the exercise of encouraging students to question the authority of teachers is the influence that comes with authority and the pride that teachers feel to see their plans and intentions come to fruition. Balancing the

foregoing tensions “is a skill of good teaching. But the terms of success are not entirely within one’s control” (Burbules, 1997: 67).

Another conflict flows from “current views of education and society that stress the centrality of diversity and tolerance. But any educational practice, however fluid and multifaceted, has the inevitable effect of making people more alike, in at least some respects” (Burbules, 1997: 69). Diversity is, however, lessened to the extent that a common syllabus, a common set of evaluation criteria, a common classroom culture, has the effect of drawing students gradually away from their personal and cultural differences into a common culture. The practice of teaching has a normalising effect by bringing students under the sway of common, homogenising influences. Education does not need less diversity, but requires diversity, because the value of conversation and debate in schools depends upon the mutual enrichment and challenge of alternative perspectives (Burbules, 1997: 69). I will extend the foregoing argument later on in this chapter where I shall link it to Biesta’s (2004: 78) notion of “coming into presence”.

A third conflict is the “uncertainty involved in assessing outcomes, the uncertainty about what constitutes success as a teacher. Every human action has multiple outcomes, most of which are unforeseeable and unintended ...” (Burbules, 1997: 69). The narrow and obsessive focus on preset outcomes is deceptive because it artificially excludes all other outcomes, which may be more ambivalent, uncertain and difficult to reconcile. The narrow focus on preset outcomes is undesirable because the “effects of teaching are too varied, too mixed between the beneficial and the harmful, too delayed, and too indirect to be the subject of any simple abstracting of intended from unintended effects” (Burbules, 1997: 70). The three dilemmas that I have briefly discussed are at one level or another intrinsic to the teaching endeavour.

How should teachers respond to these dilemmas? I shall now briefly outline the suggestion of Burbules (1997: 71) on how to approach the mentioned dilemmas.

Teachers should not try to make these dilemmas disappear, but should rather keep the tension alive- “a dialectic that does not move toward resolution but yields creativity out of the sustained movement back and forth between the two (or more) alternatives” (Burbules, 1997: 71). The tragic perspective on teaching urges teachers to hope for progress, but also to acknowledge that “the path is neither straight nor smooth; indeed, it is not even *one* path, but many ...” (Burbules, 1997: 72). The tragic perspective inclines teachers to approach teaching in a different manner by urging them to “accept the uncertainty of short-term and long-term consequences and the varied perspectives from which any teaching-learning encounter might be viewed either as a success or as a failure” (Burbules, 1997: 72). The latter author is, thus, suggesting “the benefits of a conception of teaching, and an attitude toward oneself as a teacher, that is more unsettled and hence more difficult to sustain ...” (Burbules, 1997: 72). The use of the tragic perspective on teaching can help teachers to make the dilemmas more manageable and less debilitating, by approaching teaching in six different manners. These six different approaches to teaching are also seen as the benefits of using the tragic perspective in teaching.

The first different approach to teaching expects from teachers to abandon the expectation that they will be expert in all matters pertaining to their subject. Teachers should be more open to new opportunities for discovery and insist a little less upon their conclusions as the best or only ones. Teachers should adopt an inquiry orientation with their students, expect to learn with and from them, and feel less threatened by occasions in which they need to admit to their learners that they do not know or understand something (Burbules, 1997: 73). The terms of the predicament teachers face, of regarding themselves as experts in every learning situation, can be altered by placing learners more at the centre of the classroom so that they can be active in creating knowledge and in learning. Teachers should, instead of stressing about the responsibility of providing answers, learn how to guide classroom discussions so that the participating learners build appropriate, grounded understanding. “If classroom learning can rely heavily on interactions among students and on insights that students achieve

independently, the need for teachers' content understanding is reduced, or at least revised" (Floden, 1997: 17). Teaching is not only about helping students acquire understanding. Reformers also expect learners to acquire a desire to learn outside school, acquire the ability to work cooperatively, and to develop their creativity. None of these attributes can, however, simply be transmitted to learners. "The teacher's role in promoting such learning is a combination of exemplifying those goals (for example, displaying her own eagerness to learn) and arranging classroom activities that encourage creative, cooperative efforts" (Floden, 1997: 18). In the end teachers can teach more than they know, by drawing on students themselves. It is, however, the knowledge of the teacher that helps to ensure that what learners learn is well grounded. There is a problem, however, because the constructivist perspective of education, which propagates the view of learning through cooperation and shared learning activities, is violated in practice, although it is conceded in theory. Educational practice tends to drift towards the transmission mode or mimetic tradition (Dewey in Boostrom, 1997: 51-52). The summary of research conducted as part of the President's Educational Initiative also seems to echo the same sentiments as Dewey (Boostrom, 1997: 51-52) about the violation of learner-centred pedagogy in the practice of teaching, although it is conceded in theory: "Some researchers observed significant contradictions between what individual teachers said about how they thought children learn, and the classroom practices of those same teachers ... All indications are that these teachers have accepted the desirability of learner-centred pedagogy, but are unable to practise it" (Taylor & Vinjevold, 1999: 142).

The second different approach to teaching or the second benefit of using the tragic perspective in teaching is that an openness to the unexpected creates a real dynamism in the teaching-learning encounter. Such an openness can foster a type of dialogue that is exploratory because it does not have, from the teacher's point of view, an end point or conclusion:

This attitude respects deep complexity, not only in the sense of a complicated puzzle to be worked out or solved but in the sense of a perpetually open question, always susceptible to new perspectives, new pathways, new discoveries. This suggests a transient and provisional sense of knowledge and understanding (Burbules, 1997: 73).

I want to extend the foregoing argument by linking it to the argument of Biesta (2004: 77) about the centrality of “risk” in the learning situation. Any learning situation entails the possibility of risk, in the sense that a learner may not learn what she wanted to learn. There is also the risk that the learner may learn things that she could not have imagined she would learn. To engage in learning, thus, always, entails the risk that learning may have an impact on the learner and that learning may change the learner. Biesta (2004: 77) rejects efforts by the new language of learning to reduce or negate the risk involved in engaging in education, by trying to direct learning towards learning outcomes that is specified in advance, as a gross misinterpretation of what education is about. The mentioned author, thus, also propagates a view of teaching and learning that is open to unexpected outcomes. The third different approach to teaching or the third benefit of using the tragic perspective on teaching urges teachers to accept the occasional state of being lost, confused, and unsettled as a condition of exploration and discovery. A great deal of insight can be “gained by reflecting on the educational centrality of making mistakes, of being wrong, of feeling doubt or puzzlement” (Burbules, 1997: 73). The tragic perspective on teaching can help teachers to “maintain a humble respect for such experiences and accept them as a condition of life rather than as something to be transcended, avoided, or explained away” (Burbules, 1997: 73).

A fourth benefit of the tragic perspective on teaching is that teachers should help students to think differently. This means that teachers should encourage their students to stand outside “a particular set of assumptions, categories, and values to consider the possibility of how the world is, given a different set of them” (Burbules, 1997: 74). I want to extend this point by adding the views of Biesta



(2004: 76) about what learning entails. I am referring to one of the constituent concepts of an educational relationship and also one of the building blocks of an alternative language to the language of learning that the latter author tries to propagate, namely “transcendental violence”. Learning can be regarded as responding to what is other or different, to what challenges, irritates and disturbs us, rather than as the acquisition of something that learners want to possess. In education teachers are ultimately concerned with the agency of the learner. Learning as acquisition is only about getting more and more, while learning as responding is about learners showing who they are and where they stand. The foregoing actions are about a process of “coming into presence” (Biesta, 2004: 78).

For learners to come into presence, means that they come into presence in a social and intersubjective world, a world they share with others who are not like them. This means that if education is directed towards the subjectivity and agency of the learner, then teachers should regard education as the situation or process, which provides opportunity for individual learners to come into presence and to allow them to show who they are and where they stand. Learning, within such a conception, is thus not confined to acquisition and copying. This makes the action of coming into presence, by learners, thoroughly relational and intersubjective:

Coming into presence is as much about saying, doing, acting and responding, as it is about listening, hearing and seeing. In all cases, therefore, coming into presence is about being challenged by otherness and difference. Teachers and educators have a crucial role to play in this, not only by confronting learners with what and who is other and different – and this raises crucial questions about curriculum and the social organisation of schools – but also by challenging students to respond by asking such fundamental questions as “What do you think about it?”, “Where do you stand?”, “How will you respond?” ... (Biesta, 2004: 78-79).

Coming into presence, thus, seems to provide a violent dimension to education because it is not necessarily a pleasant and easy process “since it is about challenging students, confronting them with otherness and difference and asking them difficult questions ...” (Biesta, 2004: 79). Acknowledging the difficult character of education is foreign to the new language of learning that want to depict learning as something that is easy, without risk and without deep, transforming and disturbing challenges. The first responsibility of the teacher is, thus, for the subjectivity of the student and for that which allows the student to be a unique, singular being, because teaching is about creating opportunities for the students to come into presence and about asking difficult questions. This responsibility is unlimited because taking responsibility for the singularity of the student, for the uniqueness of this particular student, is incalculable. This responsibility is incalculable or unlimited because the responsibility of teachers and educators for individual learners is not and cannot be based upon knowledge about what these people take responsibility for. “Responsibility without knowledge” is, then, the third building block of the language of education, which is the alternative to the new language of learning, that Biesta (2004: 79) proposes. It is this dimension of the learning situation, which complicates the work of teachers and educators if they really engage with this responsibility and do not deny its existence (Biesta, 2004: 79).

The fifth benefit of the tragic perspective on teaching is that it suspects method, especially the search for any single method. This is because the practical experience of teaching shows teachers that there is no single approach that works with every student and every subject matter. One of the insights that such experiences yield is that a teacher “becomes an experienced teacher not by mastering a single method but by acquiring the good judgement and sense of security to adopt alternative approaches and to change midstream when necessary, as circumstances and student reactions warrant. But such pluralism implies judgement and choice, and that implies errors- *our* errors, not the shortcomings of some method” (Burbules, 1997: 74). A second insight is that

teachers must reject the notion of a method of teaching. They should rather think of the latter as a *way* of teaching or a path or direction. Such a notion of teaching should be seen, by teachers, as a reference point against which they can judge their present position and course. If teachers are lost they should find a new way and not be hampered by the habit of simply persisting with what works (Burbules, 1997: 74-75). It is, however, very difficult for teachers to change their classroom habits. This is because a teacher's pedagogical habits operate with a mind of their own. This causes a gap between what teachers say they want to do and what actually takes place in the classroom. These pedagogical habits always represent more than sheer behaviour. They also convey dispositions and attitudes. The pedagogical habits of a teacher can only be altered over a fairly long period of time because they were formed over a long period of time. "the gap between aims and beliefs on the one hand and habitual practice on the other can never be fully closed. That predicament comes with practice. Teachers can never quite know what they are doing or what influence they are having while actually teaching" (Hansen, 1997: 173).

The sixth benefit of the tragic perspective is that it erodes teachers' sense of "self-sufficiency and independence. It makes clear our need to seek out with others (our colleagues, our friends, our students, and their parents) alternative ideas and different problem-solving approaches as well as seek from them a sense of common purpose and possibility" (Burbules, 1997: 75). I want to extend the latter point by linking it to my discussion of the mentorship approach to teaching practice in Chapter Four. One of the intentions of the UWC mentorship programme, stressing teacher collaboration and collaborative reflection about educational purposes and practices (Robinson, 2001: 101), is to bring together different teachers to share experiences and to encourage cooperation and debate among teachers within a particular school. The mentorship approach would enable teachers to become more critically aware of their classroom practices, through consistent and purposeful dialogue with one another (Robinson, 2001: 101).

Why should teachers continue to teach despite the dilemmas they face on a daily basis? The tragic perspective forces teachers to ground their commitment to teaching in what their ability can and will sustain. Teachers should love teaching for the sake of teaching (Burbules, 1997: 76). The six different approaches to teaching, that I have outlined above, can hopefully make the predicaments of teaching in South African schools more manageable and less debilitating. I think this discussion has provided some substance to my argument that policy alone, like the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), is not enough to transform teacher education in South Africa and improve teaching and learning in our schools.

### **6.3 Limitations of this study and possibilities for future research**

A conceptual study, like this dissertation, has its limitations. It is a theoretical exercise about something practical, like the practice of teaching. Some empirical research, in the form of classroom observations and interviews with various categories of teachers, teacher educators and student teachers at a few teacher education institutions, would have provided more substance to my arguments. I, however, think that this theoretical exercise may provide a modest contribution to efforts to understand what is at stake in the efforts to transform teacher education and the practice of teaching in South Africa. There are also possibilities for further research. The Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000: 9) states that this policy framework “needs to be informed by continued research, and provides a focus for that research.” The predicaments of the practice of teaching that I have examined in this chapter can be a source of interest and inquiry on the part of teachers and researchers who care about the practice of teaching (Hansen & Burbules, 1997: 2). The possibilities for further research in South African teacher education, in terms of the foregoing, can include research on how to better manage the predicaments of teaching, in relation to the seven roles as advocated in the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), that I have alluded to earlier on in this chapter. Further research should focus on how these mentioned predicaments

can be made less debilitating so that teaching and learning in our schools can be improved. Such research would make those involved in teacher education aware that they still have much to learn and appreciate about the practice of teaching in their efforts to transform teacher education in post-apartheid South Africa.

#### **6.4 Summary**

This chapter has highlighted why the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Educators, 2000) may not necessarily lead to the improvement of teaching and learning in South African schools, in the post-apartheid era. I have, firstly, examined the seven suggested roles in relation to its implications for teaching and learning in South African schools to reach the foregoing conclusion. I have, secondly, attempted to address the following question: Can or should the roles be integrated? I argued that the first six roles should not be integrated into the seventh role, which is that of subject or learning area specialist. The first reason has to do with the predicaments or dilemmas that make the practice of teaching difficult and complicated and the fact that these predicaments cannot be permanently solved. The second reason for my rejection of the mentioned integration relates to the impact of education reforms on teachers, especially in terms of their classroom pedagogy. If the predicaments of teaching cannot be resolved, what then do teaching and learning require so that the predicaments of teaching can be made more manageable? Burbules (1997: 65) argues that teachers can use his notion of a “tragic perspective on education” to make these predicaments or dilemmas more manageable and less debilitating. Teachers should also use the tragic perspective on education to approach teaching differently. I have combined the latter suggestion with the ideas of Biesta (2004) about the need for a new language of education, which can replace the current language of learning, to suggest how the practice of teaching can be approached differently. The arguments of Burbules (1997) and Biesta (2004) seem to lend some substance to my contention that education policy frameworks alone, like

the Norms and Standards for Educators (Department of Education, 2000), cannot resolve the predicaments of the practice of teaching, that I have alluded to, or improve teaching and learning in South African schools. Further research is necessary to examine how the predicaments of teaching can be made more manageable and less debilitating. Such research would hopefully contribute to efforts to improve teaching and learning in our schools in post-apartheid South Africa.

## REFERENCES

African National Congress (ANC). 1994. *A Policy Framework for Education and Training*. Johannesburg: ANC Education Department.

African National Congress (ANC). 1994. *The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP)*. Johannesburg: ANC.

Aristotle. 1901. *The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. Peters, F.H. (trans.). London: Kegan Paul.

Aristotle. 1962. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Rackham, H. (trans.). London, Cambridge & Massachusetts: William Heinemann Ltd. & Harvard University Press.

Asmal, K. 1999. Call to action: Mobilising citizens to build a South African Education and Training system for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Pretoria: Ministry of Education.

Avalos, M. 1999. Linking the global teacher education community. *Perspectives in Education*, 18 (1): 35-53.

Badat, S. 1992. Democratising education policy research for social transformation. In Unterhalter, E. *et al.* (ed.). *Education in a Future South Africa: Policy Issues for Transformation*. London: Heinemann: 17-38.

Ball, S. 1994. *Education Reform: A Critical and Post structural Approach*. Bristol: Open University.

Bengtsson, J. 1995. What is reflection? On reflection in the teaching profession and teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 1 (1): 23-32.

Bengtsson, J. 2001. Towards an ontological understanding of teaching. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 21: 134-148.

Benhabib, S. 1994. Deliberative rationality and models of democratic legitimacy. *Constellations*. 1 (1): 26-52.

Berkhout, S. & Wielemans, W. 1999. Toward understanding education policy: An integrative approach. *Educational Policy*, 13 (3): 402-420.

Bernstein, B. 1975. *Class, Codes and Control*. Volume 3 *Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions*. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Biddle, B. & Anderson, D. 1991. Social research and educational change. In Anderson, D. & Biddle, B. (eds.). *Knowledge for Policy: Improving Education through Research*. London: Falmer Press, 1-20.

Biesta, G. 2004. Against learning: Reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 24: 70-82.

Bohman, J. 1996. *Public Deliberation: Pluralism, Complexity, and Democracy*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Boostrom, R. 1997. Teaching by the numbers. . In Burbules, N. & Hansen, D. (eds.). *Teaching and its predicaments*. Colorado & Oxford: Westview Press, 45-64.

Bowe, R., Ball, S.J. & Gold, A. 1992. The policy process and the process of policy. In Bowe, R., Ball, S.J. & Gold, A. *Reforming Education and Changing Schools*. London: Routledge-Kegan Paul, 6-23.



Broad, C. 1958. Two lectures on the nature of philosophy. *Inquiry*. 1(2): 42-75. Reprinted (1963) in *Clarity is Not Enough*. Lewis, H. (ed.). London: Allen & Unwin.

Burbules, N. 1997. Teaching and the tragic sense of education. In Burbules, N. & Hansen, D. (eds.). *Teaching and its predicaments*. Colorado & Oxford: Westview Press, 65-77.

Carr, W. 1998. What is an educational practice? *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 167-183.

Carr, W. 2004. Philosophy and education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 38 (1): 55-73.

Carson, T. 1995. Reflective practice and a reconceptualization of teacher education. In Wideen, M. F. & Grimmert, P. P. (eds.). *Changing Times in Teacher Education (Restructuring or Reconceptualization?)*. London & Washington D.C.: Falmer Press, 151-162.

Christie, P. 1998. Schools as (dis)organisations: the “breakdown in the culture of learning and teaching” in South African schools. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 28 (3): 283-300.

Christie, P. 1999. OBE and unfolding policy trajectories: Lessons to be learned. In Jansen, J. and Christie, P. (eds.). *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*. Cape Town: Juta & Co.

Committee on Teacher Education Policy (COTEP). 1996. Norms and Standards for Educators. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Cowen, R. 2002. Socrates was right? Teacher education systems and the state. In Thomas, E. (ed.). *World Yearbook of Education 2002: Teacher Education (Dilemmas & Prospects)*. London: Kogan Page, 3-12.

Department of Education. 1995. White Paper 1 on Education and Training. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education. 1995. National Teacher Education Audit: Synthesis Report. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education. 1996. National Teacher Education Audit: Colleges of Education. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education. 1997a. Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Training and Development (Discussion Document). Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education. 1997b. *Policy Document on Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET)*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education. 1998. Norms and Standards for Teacher Education, Unpublished Draft. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education. 2000. Norms and Standards for Educators. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Donn, G. 1998. International policy-making: global discourses and the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). In Morrow, W. and King, K. (eds.). *Vision and Reality*. Cape Town: UCT Press: 70-85.

Dreyfus, H. & Rabinow, P. 1982. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Sussex: The Harvester Press.

Du Plooy, J.L. & Killian, C.J. 1981. *Introduction to Fundamental Pedagogics*. Pretoria & Cape Town: HAUM.

Elmore, R. 1979/1980. Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. *Political Science Quarterly*, 94 (4): 601-616.

Elster, J. 1998. Introduction. In Elster, J. (ed.). *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-18.

Ensor, P. 2000. Knowledge and pedagogy in initial teacher education. *Journal of Education*, 25: 161-191.

Evers, C.W. 1998. Analytic and post-analytic philosophy of education: methodological reflections. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London & New York: Routledge, 120-132.

Fataar, A. 1999. Theorising about education policy making: between normative intent and policy recreation in practice (Mimeograph, University of the Western Cape), 1-8.

Fataar, A. 2000. Challenging the narrowing trajectory of education policy in South Africa. In *Southern African Review of Education*, 6: 19-30.

Fay, B. 1975. *Social Science and Political Practice*. London: Kegan Paul.

Floden, R. 1997. Reforms that call for more than you understand. In Burbules, N. & Hansen, D. (eds.). *Teaching and its predicaments*. Colorado & Oxford: Westview Press, 11-28.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge (Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977)*. Gordon, C. & Gordon, C. et al. (trans.). Sussex: The Harvester Press.

Gaydon, V. 1987. *Race Against the Ratios*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR).

Gough, N. 2000. Methodologies under the microscope. Unpublished Notes for a Presentation to a Doctoral Research Students' Conference on 8 October 2000, 1-8.

Grimmett, P. P. 1995. Reconceptualising teacher education: preparing teachers for revitalised schools. In Wideen, M. F. & Grimmett, P. P. (eds.). *Changing Times in Teacher Education I (Restructuring or Reconceptualisation?)*. London & Washington D.C.: Falmer Press, 202-225.

Groener, Z. 1998. Political roots of the debate about the integration of education and training. In Morrow, W. and King, K. (eds.). *Vision and Reality*. Cape Town: UCT Press, 86-95.

Gultig, J. 1999. Re-thinking the role of theory and practice in South African teacher education. In *Perspectives in Education*, 18 (1): 55- 80.

Gunter, C.F. 1974. *Aspects of Educational Theory*. Stellenbosch & Grahamstown: University Publishers & Booksellers.

Gustavsson, B. 1997. Lifelong learning reconsidered. In Walters, S. (ed.). *Globalization, Adult Education and Training: Impacts and Issues*. Cape Town: Centre for Adult and Continuing Education (CACE), University of the Western Cape (UWC), 237-249.

- Gyekye, K. 1997. *Tradition and Modernity: Philosophical Reflections on the African Experience*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halstead, V. 2003. Teacher education in England: analysing change through scenario thinking. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 26 (1): 63-75.
- Hansen, D. & Burbules, N. 1997. Introduction. In Burbules, N. & Hansen, D. (eds.). *Teaching and its predicaments*. Colorado & Oxford: Westview Press, 1-10.
- Hansen, D. 1997. Being a good influence. In Burbules, N. & Hansen, D. (eds.). *Teaching and its predicaments*. Colorado & Oxford: Westview Press, 163-174.
- Harber, K., Payton, G. & Gatherer, W. 1979. *Heineman English Dictionary*. London: Heineman Educational Books.
- Harley, K. & Parker, B. 1999. Integrating differences: Implications of an Outcomes-based national qualifications framework for the roles and competencies of teachers. In Jansen, J. & Christie, P. (eds.). *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-based Education in South Africa*. Cape Town: Juta & Co., 181-200.
- Hedges, J. 1999. Conflict and control, agency and accountability: Teachers' experiences of recent change in English and Welsh Education. *Perspectives in Education*, 18 (1): 111-129.
- Heneveld, W. 1994. *Planning and Monitoring the Quality of Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Hirst, P. 1998. Education, knowledge and practices. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 384-395.

Hirst, P. & Peters, R. 1998. Education and philosophy. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York, Routledge: 27-38.

Hofmeyr, J. & Hall, G. 1996. The National Teacher Education Audit. *Perspectives in Education*, 17(1): 135-140.

Hornby, A. S. 1978. *Oxford Student's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford & London: Oxford University Press.

Houston, W.R. 1987. Competency-based Teacher Education. In Dunkin, M. (ed.). *The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education*. Oxford & New York: Pergamon Press, 86-94.

Hoyle, E. & John, P. 1998. Teacher education: the prime suspect. *Oxford Review of Education*, 24 (1): 69-82.

Hughes, G. 2001. *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Aristotle on Ethics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Jansen, J. 2001. Explaining non-change in education reform after apartheid: political symbolism and the problem of policy implementation. In Sayed, Y. & Jansen, J. (eds.). *Implementing Education Policies: The South African Experience*. Cape Town: UCT Press, 271-292.

Jessop, T. 1997. *Towards a Grounded Theory of Teacher Development: A Study of the Narratives of Rural Primary Teachers in KwaZulu-Natal*. (PhD, King Alfred's University College & University of Southampton, UK).

Kallaway, P. 1998. Whatever happened to rural education as a goal for (South) African development? In Morrow, W. & King, K. (eds.). *Vision and Reality*. Cape Town: UCT Press, 20-38.

Kallaway, P. 2002. Introduction. In Kallaway, P. (ed.). *The History of Education Under Apartheid 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning and Culture Shall Be Opened*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman, 1-36.

Knight, K. (ed.). 1998. *The MacIntyre Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Korsgaard, O. 1997. The Impact of Globalization on Adult Education. In Walters, S. (ed.). *Globalization, Adult Education and Training: Impacts and Issues*. Cape Town: Centre for Adult and Continuing Education (CACE), University of the Western Cape (UWC), 15-26.

Krathwohl, D. 1993. *Methods of Educational and Social Science Research: An Integrated Approach*. New York: Longman.

Kruss, G. 1998. Teachers, Curriculum 2005 and the education policy-making process. In Morrow, W. and King, K. (eds.). *Vision and Reality*. Cape Town: UCT Press, 96-111.

Larson, S. 1997. The meaning of life-long learning. In Walters, S. (ed.). *Globalization, Adult Education and Training: Impacts and Issues*. Cape Town: Centre for Adult and Continuing Education (CACE), University of the Western Cape (UWC), 250-261.

MacIntyre, A. 1981. *After Virtue*. London: Duckworth.

Mackenzie, D. C. & Augarde, A. J. 1981. *The Oxford School Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGrath, S. 1998. Questioning education and training in South Africa: the challenge of moving from policy to practice. In Morrow, W. and King, K. (eds.). *Vision and Reality*. Cape Town: UCT Press, 112-118.

Mitchell, D. 1985. Research impact on educational policy and practice in the USA. In Nisbet, J. et al. (eds.). *World Yearbook of Education 1985: Research, Policy and Practice*. London & New York: Kogan Page & Nichols Publishing, 19-41.

Moletsane, R. 2002. Strategic choices for teacher development in South Africa: enabling effective transformation in education. In Thomas, E. (ed.). *World Yearbook of Education: Dilemmas and Prospects*. London: Kogan Page, 69-79.

Morrow, W. 1995. Definition of teacher education and the professional development of teachers. In: *The Regeneration of Professional Teacher Education in South Africa*. Report of the Task Group on Teacher Education to the National Commission on Higher Education, 15-32.

Morrow, W. 1996. Teacher education – reconstruction and challenges. *Perspectives in Education*, 17 (1): 149-156.

Morrow, W. & King, K. 1998. Preface. In Morrow, W. & King, K. (eds.). *Vision and Reality*. Cape Town: UCT Press, xii-xvi.

Nasson, B. 1990. Redefining inequality: education reform and the state in contemporary South Africa. In Nasson, B. & Samuel, J. (eds.). *Education: From Poverty to Liberty*. Cape Town & Johannesburg: David Philip, 48-78.

National Education Co-ordinating Committee (NECC). 1992. *Teacher Education*. Report of the NEPI Teacher Education Research Group. Cape Town: Oxford University Press/NECC.



National Education Co-ordinating Committee (NECC). 1992a. *Adult Basic Education*. Report of the NEPI Adult Basic Education Research Group. Cape Town: Oxford University Press/NECC.

National Education Co-ordinating Committee (NECC). 1993. *Adult Education*. Report of the NEPI Adult Education Research Group. Cape Town: Oxford University Press/NECC.

National Institute for Lifelong Learning Development (NILLD). 1997. A Conceptual Framework, Third Draft, May 1997. Pretoria: NILLD.

Neuman, W. L. 1997. *Social Research Methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Nisbet, J. 1985. Introduction. In Nisbet, J. *et al.* (eds.). *World Yearbook of Education 1985: Research, Policy and Practice*. London & New York: Kogan Page & Nichols Publishing, 9-16.

Nkabinde, Z.P. 1997. *An Analysis of Educational Challenges in the New South Africa*. Maryland: University Press of America.

Odman, P.J. 1988. Hermeneutics. In Keeves, J.P. (ed.). *Educational Research, Methodology and Measurement: An International Handbook*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 63-70.

Oakeshott, M. 1998. Education: The engagement and its frustration. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 284-310.

Organisation For Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 1996. *Lifelong Learning For All*. Paris: OECD.

- Patterson, R. 1990. *Concise English Dictionary*. London: Tophi Books.
- Pendlebury, S. 1998. Transforming teacher education in South Africa: A space-time perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 28 (3): 333-350.
- Pendlebury, S. 1998a. Feminism, epistemology and education. In Carr, D. (ed.). *Education, Knowledge and Truth: Beyond the Postmodern Impasse*. London & New York: Routledge, 174-188.
- Pillay, P.N. 1990. The development and underdevelopment of education in South Africa. In Nasson, B. and Samuel, J. (eds.). *Education: From Poverty to Liberty*. Cape Town & Johannesburg: David Philip, 30-47.
- Pimm, D. & Selinger, M. 1995. The commodification of teaching: Teacher education in England. In Wideen, M. F. & Grimmer, P. P. (eds.). *Changing Times in Teacher Education (Restructuring or Reconceptualisation?)*. London & Washington D.C.: Falmer Press, 47-66.
- Rensburg, I. 1998. Qualifications, curriculum, assessment and quality improvement: laying the foundations for lifelong learning. Report on the National Policy Review Conference on Education and Training, 9-12 October, Johannesburg.
- Ricoeur, P. 1981. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*. Thompson, J.B. (ed. & trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, M. 2001. Teachers as mentors: A critical view of teacher development in South African schools. *Perspectives in Education*, 19 (2): 99-115.
- Robinson, M. & Vergnani, T. 2001. Becoming a teacher at UWC: the case of the Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE). In Fataar, A. (ed.). *UWC Papers in Education*, 1: 66-76.

Rubenson, K. 1994. The functions and utilisation of policy-oriented research. In Garrison, D. R. (ed.). *Research Perspectives in Adult Education*. Florida: Krieger Publishing Company, 151-165.

Samuel, J. 1990. The state of education in South Africa. In Nasson, B. and Samuel, J. (eds.). *Education: From Poverty to Liberty*. Cape Town & Johannesburg: David Philip, 17-29.

Sedibe, K. 1998. Dismantling apartheid education: An overview of change. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 28 (3): 269-283.

Soltis, J. 1998. Perspectives on philosophy of education. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 196-204.

Soobrayan, B. 1997. From apartheid education to lifelong learning: assessing the ameliorative potential of emerging education policy in South Africa. Paper Delivered at Conference on Lifelong Learning, at the University of Surrey, England.

Stokes, S. 1998. Pathologies of deliberation. In Elster, J. (ed.). *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 123-139.

Taylor, C. 1985. *Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, N. & Vinjevold, P. (Eds.). 1999. *Getting learning right: Report of the President's Education Initiative Research Project*. Johannesburg: Joint Education Trust.

- Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B & Henry, M. 1997. *Educational Policy and the Politics of Change*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Tickle, L. 2000. Teacher probation resurrected: England 1999-2000. *Journal of Education Policy*, 15 (6): 701-713.
- Tisher, R.P. 1995. Readjustments, reorganisation or revolution? The changing face of teacher education in Australia. In Wideen, M. F. & Grimmett, P. P. (eds.). *Changing Times in Teacher Education (Restructuring or Reconceptualisation?)*. London & Washington D.C.: Falmer Press, 34-46.
- Waghid, Y. 2002. *Democratic Education: Policy and Praxis*. Matieland: Stellenbosch University Printers.
- Waghid, Y. 2003. *Education as Virtue: Cultivating Practical Reasoning and Compassion*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University Printers.
- Walters, S. 1999a. Lifelong learning within higher education in South Africa: emancipatory potential? *International Review of Education*, 576-587.
- Walters, S. 1999b. Globalisation, adult education and development. Unpublished Paper, 1-16.
- Warren, M. 2002. Deliberative democracy. In Carter, A. & Stokes, G. (eds.). *Democratic Theory Today: Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 173-202.
- Wideen, M. F. & Grimmett, P.P. 1995. Preface. In Wideen, M. F. & Grimmett, P. P. (eds.). *Changing Times in Teacher Education: Restructuring or Reconceptualisation?* London & Washington D.C.: Falmer Press, vii-viii.

Wideen, M.F. 1995. Teacher Education at the Crossroads. In Wideen, M. F. & Grimmett, P. P. (eds.). *Changing Times in Teacher Education: Restructuring or Reconceptualisation?* London & Washington D.C.: Falmer Press, 1-16.

Wideen, M. F., Grimmett, P. & Andrews, I. 2002. International teacher education: from dilemmas to principles of action. In Thomas, E. (ed.). *World Yearbook of Education (Dilemmas and Prospects)*. London: Kogan Page, 111-122.

Wittgenstein, L. 1953. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

White, J. & White, P. 1998. Education, liberalism and human good. *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I Philosophy and Education. Hirst, P. & White, P. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge, 348-366.

Viljoen, T. & Pienaar, J. 1971. *Fundamental Pedagogics*. Durban: Butterworths.