

**PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING
SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS AND USING THEM AS TOOLS TO
ACHIEVE THE LEARNING OUTCOMES IN THE SENIOR PHASE
LEVEL IN THE MANKWENG CIRCUIT.**

KGOPA M.S.

PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS AND USING THEM AS TOOLS TO ACHIEVE THE LEARNING OUTCOMES IN THE SENIOR PHASE LEVEL IN THE MANKWENG CIRCUIT OF EDUCATION.

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS OF EDUCATION IN CURRICULUM STUDIES

BY

Makoeea Salome Kgopa

Supervisor: Professor M.B. Mokgalabone

NOVEMBER 2006



b11671439
i12381147

9 372.83044 KGO

On Eskom's Po.

ABSTRACT

South Africa chose an Outcomes-Based Education approach to underpin the new education system called Curriculum 2005, which was later reviewed to become the Revised National Curriculum Statement. This became policy and it was delivered to schools for educators to apply in their learning programmes work schedules and lesson plans. This study focuses on the lesson plan as a tool to be used by individual educators. Although the other curriculum development steps cannot be ignored, the empirical study of this investigation will be on lesson planning.

The empirical study investigates the problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and uses them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes at senior Phase level. In order to find possible solutions to problems experienced by educators in the Department of Education, the following questions were constructed for investigation:

- What is the structure of a lesson plan in the Social Sciences learning area?
- How have educators changed their ways of planning lessons from the old to the new system?
- What are the problems experienced by educators in the planning and use of Social Sciences lessons?

The above questions guided this study to yield the following results:

- The majority of educators does not know and understand how to plan by using learning outcomes in the lesson plan structure. It is not only with learning outcomes but even the use of other elements of a lesson plan structure makes planning difficult for educators.
- Most educators are resistant to change from the old to the new ways of planning lessons. In some cases, educators start by implementing the curriculum without a well written, structured lesson plan because of delays in the delivery of policy documents to schools, workshops which do not address classroom issues but emphasize the design features without relating them to the Social Sciences learning area specifics.

- The majority of educators experience problems in planning Social Sciences lessons because they were not trained in the revised National Curriculum Statement, because of being in excess. They are not taken for training and are frequently not enthusiastic to implement what they have learnt from Outcomes-Based Education workshops in the classroom because they fear failure due to a lack of managerial intervention for support, guidance and follow-ups.

The recommendations of this study were guided by the findings of the empirical results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank God the Almighty for giving me strength, support and protection to be able to complete this study. It would be fair and just to express my sincere thanks, gratitude and appreciation to the following people for making this study a success:


- To my husband Paul, my entire family, and our beloved children who motivated and supported me throughout. I love you very much Thibule, Mabu, Thokozile and Sepelemanane;
- To my supervisor, Prof. M.B. Mokgalabone, thank you for your guidance, and valuable time;
- Dr. Satsope Maoto for opening my eyes in this study. "Ke a leboga!"
- To Ms. Matlala Mahlatji, thank you for being so supportive and giving me courage to continue with this study;
- Ms. Mpho Modipane for extending your helping hand whenever I needed one. "Ke a leboga, Kgabo'a Mokgatla!"

DEDICATION

I dedicate this study to my parents and the Masenya's family, who taught me to pray and persevere to achieve success in life.

DECLARATION

I Makoeea Salome Kgopa, nee' Masenya, herein declare that the dissertation for the Masters of Education in Curriculum and Professional Studies at the University of Limpopo (Turfloop Campus) is my own work, except where the reference material contained therein has been acknowledged.

.....


SIGNATURE

03.04.2008
.....

DATE

TABLE OF CONTENT

TOPIC	PAGE
ABSTRACT	i-ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iv
DECLARATION	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi-xi
LIST OF SUB-THEMES	xii-xvi
APPENDIX	
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND AND ORIENTATION	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION	1-2
1.2. PROBLEM STATEMENT	3
1.3. AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	3
1.3.1. AIM OF THE STUDY	3
1.3.2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	3
1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS	3
1.4.1. MAIN QUESTIONS	3-4
1.4.2. SUB-QUESTIONS	4
1.5. DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY	4
1.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	4
1.7. DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS	5
1.7.1. BASIC CONCEPTS	5
1.7.1.1. Lesson plan	5
1.7.1.2. Social Sciences	5
1.7.1.3. Learning outcomes	6
1.7.2. SECONDARY CONCEPTS	6
1.7.2.1. Planning	6
1.7.2.2. Domain	6

1.7.2.3. Curriculum	7
1.7.2.4. Outcomes-Based Education	7
1.8. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	7-8
1.9. RESEARCH FRAMEWORK	8
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1. INTRODUCTION	9
2.2. EXPLANATION, NATURE, STRUCTURE, AND PURPOSE OF A LESSON PLAN	10
2.2.1. WHAT IS A LESSON PLAN?	10
2.2.2. THE NATURE OF A LESSON PLAN	11-12
2.2.3. STRUCTURE OF A LESSON PLAN	12
2.2.3.1. Social Sciences learning area	12-13
2.2.3.2. Social Sciences learning outcomes	13-15
2.2.3.3. Advantages of Social Sciences learning outcomes	15
• A sense of purpose	15-16
• Motivation	16
• Practical guidelines	16
• Communication	16
• Evaluation of programmes	17
2.2.3.4. Disadvantages of Social Sciences learning outcomes	17
• Unpredictable learning	17-18
• Demonstrations are not always reliable	18
• Demanding learning outcomes	18
• Prescriptive outcomes	18-19
2.2.3.5. Learning strategies	19-20
• Auditory	20
• Visual	21
• Interpersonal	21
• Intrapersonal	21

2.2.3.6. Teaching strategies	21
• Whole class discussion	22
• Small group teaching	22
2.2.3.7. Assessment	22-25
2.2.3.8. Time allocation	26
2.2.3.9. Expanded opportunities	26-28
2.2.3.10. Integration	28
2.2.3.11. Barrier to learning	29
2.2.3.12. Reflection	29-30
2.2.4. PURPOSE OF A LESSON PLAN	30-33
2.3. THE NEED FOR EDUCATORS' PARADIGM CHANGE IN LESSON PLANNING	33
2.3.1. PARADIGM CHANGE	34-35
2.3.2. VISION	35-36
2.3.3. OWNERSHIP	36-37
2.3.4. CAPACITY	37-38
2.3.5. SUPPORT	38-39
2.4. PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS	40
2.4.1. IN-SERVICE TRAINING	40-41
2.4.2. RESISTANT TO CHANGE	41-42
2.4.3. SCHOOL CULTURE	42-43
2.4.4. RESOURCES	43-45
2.4.5. TIMETABLING	45-46
2.4.5.1. Time loss	46
2.4.5.2. Quality learning time	46-47
2.4.5.3. Quality relationship	47
2.4.5.4. Limits to teaching and learning techniques	47-48
2.4.5.5. Authentic learning	48-49
2.5. SUMMARY	49-50

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	51
3.1. INTRODUCTION	51
3.2. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN	51-52
3.3. CASE STUDY	52-53
3.4. POPULATION AND SAMPLING	53
3.4.1. SAMPLE LOCATION AND CRITERIA	53-54
3.5. VALIDITY	54
3.6. PILOT STUDY	55
3.7. VARIABLE	55-56
3.8. DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES	56
3.8.1. INTERVIEW	56-57
3.8.2. CONDUCTING THE INTERVIEWS	57-58
3.8.3. OBSERVATION	58
3.9. ADMINISTRATION OF INTERVIEWS	59
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	60
4.1. INTRODUCTION	60
4.2. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA FROM INTERVIEWS WITH EDUCATORS	61
4.2.1. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT EDUCATORS	61-62
4.2.2. KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE	62-70
4.2.3. HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW METHODS	70-77
4.2.4. PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS	77-84
4.3. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA FROM INTERVIEWS WITH HEADS OF THE DEPARTMENT	85
4.3.1. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT HEADS OF THE	85-86

DEPARTMENT	
4.3.2. KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE	86-89
4.3.3. HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW	89-91
4.3.4. PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS	91-96
4.4. CONCLUSION	96
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSION	97
5.1. SUMMARY	97-98
FINDINGS	98
5.2.1. FINDINGS ON THE GENERAL INFORMATION	98-99
5.2.2. FINDINGS ON THE KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE	99-100
5.2.3. FINDINGS ON HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW	100
5.2.4. FINDINGS ON PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS	100-101
5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS	102
5.3.1. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE GENERAL INFORMATION	102
5.3.2. RECOMMENDATION ON THE KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE	102
5.3.3. RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW	103
5.3.4. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PROBLEMS	103-104

EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS	
5.4. IMPLICATIONS AND REFLECTIONS	104-106
5.5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	106-107
5.6. CONCLUSION	107
REFERENCE LIST	108-115

DATA COLLECTED FROM RESPONDENTS

	THEMES AND SUB=THEMES	PAGE
4.2.1.	GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT EDUCATORS	61
4.2.1.1.	Teaching experience of Social Sciences educators	61
4.2.1.2.	Experience in teaching grade 9	61
4.2.1.3.	Teaching qualifications	61
4.2.1.4.	Teaching qualifications in Social Sciences	62
4.2.2.	KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE	62
4.2.2.1.	Lesson plan structure	63
4.2.2.2.	Summative assessment of Grade 9 learners	63-64
4.2.2.3.	Assessment in Outcomes-Based Education	64-65
4.2.2.4.	Challenges faced by educators in developing learning activities as one of the elements of a lesson plan structure	65-66
4.2.2.5.	Department workshops received on Outcomes-Based Education	66-67
4.2.2.6.	Enthusiastic about taking a class after these workshops	67
4.2.2.7.	Management of time of Social Sciences lessons in the General Education and Training as against that of subjects you teach in the Further Education and Training bands, in a day	67-68
4.2.2.8.	Achievement of Social Sciences learning outcomes	68-70
4.2.3.	HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW METHODS	70
4.2.3.1.	Views concerning the changing curriculum on lesson	70-71

	planning within the school system	
4.2.3.2.	Knowledge of any spill-effects that hinder preparation of the lesson plan steps	71-72
4.2.3.3.	Attitudes towards developing these lesson plan steps	72
4.2.3.4.	Attitudes towards developing lesson plans	73
4.2.3.5.	Support from the Heads of the Department or departmental officials on lesson plan challenges	74
4.2.3.6.	Problems experienced by educators who do not plan Social Sciences lessons	74-75
4.2.3.7.	Problems experienced by educators in planning assessment in Social Sciences lessons	75-76
4.2.3.8.	Solution to lesson plan problems	76
4.2.3.9.	Purpose to shift from the traditional lesson plan to the new	76-77
4.2.4	PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS	77
4.2.4.1	Planning of Social Sciences lessons with the present Outcomes-Based Education curriculum structure	77-78
4.2.4.2	Mechanisms of planning used since 1990 when educators dumped their plan books	78
4.2.4.3	Challenges experienced by educators when planning an Outcomes-Based Education Social Sciences lesson	79-80
4.2.4.4	How do you perceive the old lesson plan as against the present Outcomes-Based Education lesson plans?	80
4.2.4.5	Importance of teaching by using lesson plans	80-81
4.2.4.6	Experiences of teaching without lesson plans in place	81
4.2.4.7	Supply of resources used in the daily planning, teaching, learning, and lesson assessment	81-82
4.2.4.8	Support system to educators with lesson plan problems	82

4.2.4.9	Achievement of Social Sciences learning outcomes without the use of lesson plans	83
4.2.4.10	Importance of the Social Sciences learning outcomes in a lesson plan	83
4.2.4.11	Problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons	84
4.3.1	GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT HEADS OF THE DEPARTMENT	85
4.3.1.1	Teaching experience of Heads of the Department	85
4.3.1.2	Experience in teaching grade 9	85
4.3.1.3	Teaching qualifications	85
4.3.1.4	Teaching qualifications in Social Sciences	85-86
4.3.2	KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE	86
4.3.2.1	Heads of the Department for General Education and Training band or Further Education and Training band	86
4.3.2.2	Monitoring and controlling of the educator's portfolio on lesson planning	86-87
4.3.2.3	Challenges on new lesson plan and curriculum change	87
4.3.2.4	Evidence of a lesson plan in the educator's portfolio	87-88
4.3.2.5	Support given to educators on lesson planning	88
4.3.2.6	Educator's attitude on lesson planning	88-89
4.3.3	HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW METHODS	89
4.3.3.1	Views on the advantages of learning outcomes in Social Sciences learning area	89

4.3.3.2	Disadvantages of teaching with learning outcomes in mind	89
4.3.3.3	Importance of a lesson plan	90
4.3.3.4	Views on the importance of having the learning programme as a step of lesson planning	90-91
4.3.4	PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS	91
4.3.4.1	Problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons	91
4.3.4.2	Problems experienced by educators in using lesson plans as tools to achieve the Social Sciences lesson outcomes	92
4.3.4.3	Assistance needed for educators in planning Outcomes-Based education lessons	92
4.3.4.4	School culture pertaining to new lesson plan issues	92-93
4.3.4.5	Class visits for educator support	93
4.3.4.6	Support of School Management Team on Outcomes-Based Education lesson plan issues	93
4.3.4.7	Achievement level of Grade 9 learners on Social Sciences learning outcomes	93
4.3.4.8	Educators as a designer of learning programmes	94
4.3.4.9	Problems experienced by educators who do not plan lessons before going to class	94
4.3.4.10	Problems experienced by educators who plan lessons before going to class	94
4.3.4.11	Departmental delivery of Social Sciences learning area policy documents to schools	95
4.3.4.12	Training on Outcomes-Based Education approach before or after delivery of these policy documents	95

4.3.4.13	Management of time-table in the Revised National Curriculum Statement and the subjects of the Further Education and Training curriculum at school	95-96
----------	---	-------

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND AND ORIENTATION

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Before 1994 the curriculum in South Africa emphasized aims and objectives specific to subjects, and what the educators set out to achieve (Department of Education, 2000:4). In contrast, the Outcomes-Based Education curriculum has its “emphasis placed on the necessity for a shift from the traditional aims and objectives approach to outcomes-based education” (Department of Education, 1997:1). By implication, educators were expected to change from the old lesson planning approach to new ones. Hence, this study focuses on the problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons for the Senior Phase grades.

The Outcomes-Based Education approach underpins the new education system and Curriculum 2005, and subsequently the Revised National Curriculum Statement. Curriculum 2005 was implemented in 1998. In 2001 the government reviewed its specific features, such as specific outcomes, assessment criteria, range statements, and other principles underpinning the curriculum. The review resulted in the Revised National Curriculum Statement.

The change and implementation plan of the curriculum had some negative impact on most of the educators, namely, fear, uncertainty and stressful working conditions. For this reason, Fotheringham and Harley (2000:89) observe that Curriculum 2005 was introduced into schools without formal preparation and training of the educators. There was no significant change in the material resource base to enable curriculum implementation. This implies a short, or no time to train the educators and develop materials to be used by educators in planning, inter alia, Social Sciences lessons.

According to Curriculum 2005, planning should be done at macro, meso and micro levels. A macro plan is a school-wide plan, whereas a meso plan is phases plan while a micro plan is grade specific (Department of Education, 2001:42). In terms of the Revised National Curriculum Statement planning starts with a learning programme (phase plan) followed by a work schedule (grade plan) and a lesson plan. In this study, planning focuses on changes in planning lessons for the Social Sciences learning area.

In 1990 the Educator's Union Defiance Campaign mobilized educators to defy traditional plans and class visits. Inside the educators' portfolios, lesson plans became part of the dumped teaching materials. Christie (1990:163) mentions that educators complained about officials who made class visits, checked and controlled educators' work based on the quantity of work done rather than giving them support to solve problems experienced in curricular issues. Educators resorted to in-classroom preparations, and teaching became textbook-bound, in order to finish the syllabus rather than teaching effectively. The defiance might have frustrated the nature, structure and purpose of the lesson planning, teaching and learning, in particular.

An Outcomes-Based Education system asks educators to spell out what learners will learn before teaching begins (Criticos, Long, Moletsane, and Mthinyane, 2002:157). This means that if the planning of lessons could be abandoned and ignored, teaching and learning would be affected negatively. Educators might be continuing to have difficulty in transcending from in-class preparation to before class planning.

There has since been a wide gap between the year 1990, when educators did not plan for lesson presentation and the inception of teaching according to Outcomes-Based Education in 1998. Seemingly, the curriculum change came when the educators were not ready to take up the challenges posed by it. Resultantly, problems were experienced regarding planning Social Sciences lessons and using them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes in the Senior Phase.

1.2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Guided by the above background, it seems that educators are experiencing problems in planning Social Sciences lessons and using them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes in the Senior Phase level of the learning area.

1.3. AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Below follows the aim and objectives of the study.

1.3.1. AIM OF THE STUDY

In order to address the problem, this study aims to investigate problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and use them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes in the Senior Phase level of the learning area.

1.3.2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are to:

- explain the structure of a lesson plan in the Social Sciences learning area;
- identify the ways in which the educators have changed from the old lesson planning practices to the new; and
- identify problems experienced by educators in the planning and using of Social Sciences lessons in the Senior Phase.

1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.4.1. MAIN QUESTION

In line with the aforementioned aim and objectives, the main question of the study reads:

What are the problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and using them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes in the Senior Phase of the learning area?

1.4.2. SUB-QUESTIONS:

In order to address the main question, the following sub-questions will be used to direct the study:

- How is a lesson plan in the Social Sciences learning area structure?
- In which ways have educators changed from the old lesson planning practices to the new?
- What are the problems experienced by educators in the planning and use of the Social Sciences lessons?

1.5. DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The investigation was based on secondary schools in the Mankweng circuit. The focus was on the Social Sciences learning area educators and Heads of the Department. The selected participants seemed to be reliably placed for the information that was needed. Their responses yielded the outcomes for purposes of analysis and interpretation.

1.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A study on planning Social Sciences lessons might benefit educators regarding the teaching and learning area. Specifically, it might:

- strengthen the implementation of the Social Sciences curriculum;
- serve as a guide for educators on how lessons could be planned; and
- improve on ways in which lesson plans could be used as tools to achieve the Social Sciences learning area outcomes in the Senior Phase.

1.7. DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

Concepts are key words, which give common ideas and understanding on issues relating to a study. Brown and Knight (1995:42) suggests that they serve as attempts to clarify, control and classify the perceptions on lesson planning experiences in teaching and learning processes. It is therefore necessary to understand some of the afore-mentioned basic and secondary concepts in the context of this study to follow the development of the study.

1.7.1. BASIC CONCEPTS

1.7.1.1. Lesson plan

Walters (1991:26) explains a lesson plan as anticipating what will be taught in a lesson. It is an advance experience, both mentally and emotionally, of the coming lesson, as the educator envisages it. Jacobs and Gawe (1996:13) concur that a lesson plan is a tool designed in advance to guard against learners' behaviour and responses to the subject matter to be presented. In this context, a lesson plan is viewed as a well-developed imagination and anticipation of learners' responses during the learning activities.

1.7.1.2. Social Sciences

Social sciences “comprise the study of relationships between people, and between people and their environment. These interactions are contextualized in space and time, and have social, political, economic, environmental and spiritual dimensions” (Department of Education, 2002:28). The learning area is said to contribute to the development of responsible citizens in a cultural, diverse, democratic society and within an interdependent world. Contextually, the learning area is viewed enabling learners to conduct judgments and actions that might contribute towards sustainable development of the society and the environment.

1.7.1.3. Learning outcomes

Learning outcomes are “statements of intended learner achievement” (Criticos *et al.*, 2002:33). According to Jacobs, Gawe, and Vakalisa (2002:110), they are observable demonstrations of learning that occur at the end of a significant set of learning experiences. Outcomes provide direction to “selection and organization of learning content, preparation of learning programmes, determination of teaching strategies, and assessment of learning programmes” (Jacobs *et al.*, 2002:110). In this study, outcomes refer to what learners should achieve and be able to demonstrate at the end of a learning process.

1.7.2. SECONDARY CONCEPTS

1.7.2.1.Planning

Madaus, Kellegahn, and Schwab (1989:212) describe planning as a tool for the achievement of success by educators. Kramer (1999: 154) concurs by viewing it as an empowering tool whereby the outcomes of the education system could be accomplished. In the context of the Social Sciences learning area, planning involves practical elements that tell what equipment to prepare and collect for the activities in a learning activity.

1.7.2.2. Domain

Sayler and Alexander (1974:148) define a domain as a large group of learning opportunities broad in scope and planned to achieve a unified set of closely related educational goals. This study focused on the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domain of the learning outcomes in the Social Sciences learning area.

1.7.2.3. Curriculum

“Curriculum is the planned composite effort of any school to guide pupils’ learning towards predetermined learning outcomes”(Low in Madaus *et al.*, 1989:236). In affirmation, curriculum is viewed as “an attempt to communicate the essential principles and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical survey and capable of effective translation into practice” (Madaus *et al.*, 1989:236). This study focused on the Social Sciences learning area as part of the defined curriculum.

1.7.2.4. Outcomes-Based Education

“Outcomes-Based Education is a system of learning and teaching that is learner-centred and is based on the understanding that all learners can learn”(Naicker, 1999:87). The Department of Education (2003:2) and Harley, Bertman and Mattson (1999:16) define it as an approach that strives to achieve the learners’ maximum potential, promoting integration of knowledge, skills and values closely connected to occupational and academic requirements that is activity-based. This indicates that Outcomes-Based Education links classroom teaching and learning with the workplace.

1.8. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In any situation where one person deals with others, there is a need for precaution and respect towards human dignity. “A researcher should keep and maintain the ethical standards when conducting a research study” (De Vos, 1998:305). Hence, the researcher, abode by the following ethical values during the research:

- Protected the anonymity of all respondents and the schools involved in this study.
- Kept the information and particulars of the respondents confidential,
- Respected the rights of the respondents to, or not to, participate in the research study.

- Gave feedback to the respondents without withholding any information that might influence the interpretation of the data, and

The ethical measures indicated above were taken to maintain the objectivity of the study.

1.9. RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

Chapter One gives the background, problem statement, aim and objectives; research questions, assumptions, delimitation and the significance of the study.

Chapter Two reviews the literature relevant to the study and unfolds the structure of a lesson plan, educators' change and the problems experienced by educators.

Chapter Three is devoted to the qualitative research methodology.

Chapter Four deals with the data analysis and interpretation.

Chapter Five is a presentation of the findings, recommendations and suggestions for further research of the study area.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter One has focused on the background, orientation, problem statement, aim, and objectives, as well as the main question and sub-questions, of the study. Chapter Two reviews the literature. It focuses on the explanation of a lesson plan, its nature, structure, and purpose. Since the chapter unfolds from a detailed theoretical analysis of the literature, it sheds light on curriculum change as the foundation of lesson planning practice.

There is need for educators to change their ways of planning lessons in line with the changing curriculum, and to understand the rationale behind the new curriculum. Bertman, Fotheringham, and Harley (2000:181) criticize the assumption that all educators might need is the information and new material in order to implement the necessary reform. It seems as if the Department of Education simply supplied Curriculum 2005 and Revised National Curriculum Statement policy documents to schools with little, or no, training offered to educators. Thus, it seems as if the delivery of materials preceded the training of educators per phase and per grade.

This Chapter bases its argument on the educators' change and the challenges they face in lesson planning. It is basically grounded on the problems experienced by educators in planning Senior Phase social Sciences lessons. The next section focuses on an explanation of the key concepts of the study: lesson planning, its nature, structure, and purpose.

2.2. EXPLANATION, NATURE, STRUCTURE, AND PURPOSE OF A LESSON PLAN

2.2.1. WHAT IS A LESSON PLAN?

An explanation of a lesson plan will enable educators to conceptualise its nature, purpose and the elements, which constitute its structure. John (1995:11) explains a lesson plan as a connective, like an umbilical link, that drives the process of teaching and learning. Walters (1991:26) and Kramer (1999:121) add that it puts the educator's envisaged lesson on paper for further reference and use as a tool to achieve the learning outcomes. This shows that a lesson plan is an instrument, which drives teaching and learning. Flowing from this, a lesson plan could also be seen as a proactive means of linking the ideas and implementation of educators with a view to achieving the learning outcomes.

The Department of Education (2000:44) stresses that statements that are in the educators' head are thoughts, not plans. Plans are in writing and they could be re-used and shared by educators during, or in their absence. Criticos *et al.* (2002:40) explain a lesson plan as a support to or scaffold of teaching and learning. In planning, "the educator visualizes the future, invents means and ends and constructs the framework to guide the future action" (McCutcheon and Milner, 2002:82). This means that a lesson plan is a support tool for educators, to remember the information to be taught and a scaffold to assist them to transcend from thoughts to the information that must flow smoothly in class.

A lesson plan anticipates the mental and emotional behaviours of learners as well. In this context, Madaus *et al.* (1989:308) explain the concept as a tool to maintain classroom order so that learners can learn, but also to provide an atmosphere in which students can feel comfortable and develop positive attitudes towards themselves and learning. Essentially, a lesson plan entails the nature of information needed for the teaching, learning and assessment processes to attain their goals.

2.2.2. THE NATURE OF A LESSON PLAN

Basically, a lesson plan, like all human phenomena, has its own nature. A lesson plan has the constituent aspects that present a challenge to educators, namely, challenge to know, understand the learning area outcomes and the elements of a lesson plan. These elements represent the nature of a lesson plan and the structure it might follow. Madaus *et al.* (1989:338) and Criticos *et al.* (2001: 41) maintain that educators formulate clear lesson outcomes in order to keep lessons focused and achieve what learners must understand, explore and do. This means that each lesson unit should integrate knowledge, value, attitude and skill outcomes.

Learning outcomes are provided in the Curriculum 2005 and Revised National Curriculum Statement policy documents. Naturally, Social Sciences learning outcomes are so broad, that they could not be achieved in one lesson unit. The Department of Education (1997:19) indicates that outcomes are achieved at the end of the phase. In contrast, the Department of Education (2003:45) furthermore instructs that educators should copy learning outcomes and reflect them in their lesson plans, that is, as they are taken from policy documents. It thus seems that the Department lacks confidence in educators and doubts their ability to formulate clear lesson outcomes from the prescribed outcomes.

The shortcomings of such a curriculum policy is that a curriculum that excludes educators in the planning stage, is destined to inspire little confidence in its educators and may fail to enable them to understand and formulate clear lesson outcomes. Learning outcomes by their nature drive the lesson plan. For this reason, Madaus *et al.* (1989:339) indicate that a learning outcome has cognitive, affective and psychomotor domain. Literally, this means that if Social Sciences learning outcomes could be taught and learned effectively, learners will achieve knowledge and understanding, appropriate value and attitudes, and acquire skill development, respectively.

Stated the other way round, learning outcomes are goals to be achieved in any lesson unit because, more significantly, they dictate which elements to choose when planning a lesson. For instance, Van der Horst and Macdonald (2001:169) maintain that the curriculum requires that educators should select content relating to the outcomes. This means that the selection of appropriate content is the prerequisite for the function of proper knowledge and understanding of the learning outcomes. It follows, therefore, that the nature of a lesson provides a rational structure and purpose for it as a tool to achieve the outcomes of the Social Sciences.

2.2.3. STRUCTURE OF A LESSON PLAN

The rational structure of a lesson is developed from the practical elements that tell what to prepare and choose as the learning activities in a lesson unit. Alcorn, Kinder and Schumert (1970:123) indicate that the lesson structure determine how and what to plan in order to achieve the learning outcomes. For this reason, the structure of a lesson plan reflects how the teaching, learning and assessment processes should unfold. This means that each lesson unit also reflects the elements of a certain learning area, which in this case is the Social Sciences learning area, as well as its planning features.

Below follows a discussion of the structure of a Social Sciences lesson plan.

2.2.3.1. Social Sciences learning area

Social Sciences represent a learning area within the Senior Phase. It consists of two distinct fields of operation, which are of equal value and importance, namely, Geography and History. In this regard, the Department of Education (2003:86) indicates that Social Sciences contribute towards the development of informed and critical citizens who are able to play a role in the cultural diversity and changing society. In this sense, the lessons of the learning area should contribute towards transforming the learner society and its environment through the teaching and learning. For this reason, curriculum change has focused on Social Sciences as a learning area instead of Geography and History, as

isolated subject units. Social Sciences, like any other learning area, has learning outcomes upon which teaching, learning and assessment should focus.

2.2.3.2. Social Sciences learning outcomes

The Social Sciences learning outcomes entail the construction of knowledge and understanding, the development of skills and attitudes; and the application of the past, present and the future. This implies that learning outcomes constitute the environmental context and the methodology according to which they might be structured in the classroom. In explanation, Criticos *et al.* (2002:3), and Christine and Hopple (1995:15) suggest that lesson outcomes are specific competency levels relating to teaching, learning and assessment. Lesson outcomes are purposefully planned to help learners move into the intended direction and put plans into action during the teaching, learning and assessment processes.

The Department of Education (2003:20) indicates that Social Sciences learning outcomes should show cause and effect, and require the student to speculate, analyse, interpret, have knowledge, as well as develop skills such as reading, drawing, presenting, researching and collecting data. This means that learning outcomes focus on the learners' learning, rather than on the teachers' teaching. This implies that the educators should know, conceptualise and understand the learning strategies, which could make learners achieve the Social Sciences learning outcomes.

Learning outcomes and learning strategies are interdependent on each other. Hence, Madaus *et al.* (1989:339), Astin (1993:43) and Criticos *et al.* (2002:36) state that the learning outcomes of a lesson arise out of the subject matter. They represent what the educator would require the learners to be able to do, think about and feel, relative to the learning strategies. On the other hand, Spady (1994:2) defines outcomes as clear learning results that educators want learners to demonstrate at the end of their learning experiences. All these imply that outcomes are actions, performances and competencies

that reflect the learners' competencies in successfully using content, information and tools.

To understand Social Sciences learning outcomes Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill and Krathwohl (in Madaus *et al.*, 1989:340), Astin (1993:43) and Cangelosi (2000:663) recommend that outcomes might be categorized into three groups, namely,

- Cognitive outcomes: concentrate on intellectual and knowledge,
- Affective outcomes: stress feelings, beliefs, aspirations, attitudes and values, and
- Psychomotor outcomes: deals with development of physical and motor skills.

In sum, Madaus *et al.* (1989:340) suggest two components for each outcome:

- Content component: the concept or skill to be learned.
- Behavioral component: describes the observable learner behaviour the educator intends to bring about.

The Department of Education (2000:70) indicates the six Social Sciences learning outcomes, namely, three learning outcomes for History and three for Geography in accordance with this model. The Department of Education (2002:70), Department of Education (2003:20) and Criticos *et al.* (2002:43) indicate the three learning outcomes in each case as follows:

History:

- The learners use enquiry skills to investigate the past and the present (Historical enquiry).
- The learners demonstrate historical knowledge and understanding (Historical knowledge and understanding).
- The learners interpret aspects of history (Historical interpretation).

Geography:

- The learners use enquiry skills to investigate geographical environmental concepts and processes (Geographical enquiry).
- The learners demonstrate Geographical and environmental knowledge and understanding (Geographical knowledge and understanding).
- The learners make informed decisions about social, environmental issues and problems (Exploring issues).

The skills, attitudes and knowledge outcomes highlighted above should allow the educator to make use of learner-centred teaching and learning strategies. However, Calderhead (in John, 1995:1) observes that it is in planning that teachers translate content guidelines, institutional expectations and their own beliefs and ideologies into guidelines for action in the classroom. Contrary to this, McCutcheon and Milner (2002:82) argue that only a few educators plan with learning outcomes in mind because they do not write out detailed plans, but plan mentally with little information on paper. Planning Social Sciences lessons with outcomes in mind might promote communication, motivate learning, instill a sense of purpose, set criteria for assessment, and evaluate the outcome in every Social Sciences lesson.

2.2.3.3. Advantages of Social Sciences learning outcomes

Social Sciences learning outcomes provide guidelines on how and what to achieve in a lesson unit. In essence, learning outcomes might instill an awareness of goals to be achieved in a teaching- learning situation. The advantages of learning outcomes might include the following:

- **A sense of purpose:** Learning outcomes highlight and instill a sense of purpose in both educators and learner activities. Hence, Jacobs *et al.* (2002:30) maintain that learning outcomes enable participants to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant activities in order to prioritise

tasks in a teaching and learning process unit. Learning activities could be focused on lesson outcomes.

- **Motivation:** Learner and educator motivation towards teaching might be the reason for planning with outcomes in mind, in order for both parties to be active in a lesson. For this reason, Jacobs *et al.* (2002:30) observe that even de-motivated learners could be transformed into eager and active learners if educators instill a desire into them to achieve the purpose contained in the outcomes. Learning outcomes describe what learners must be able to do at the end of the teaching and learning process. This means that learning outcomes motivate learners to achieve the envisaged goals.
- **Practical guidelines:** Learning outcomes provide educators with practical guidelines on content, methods, assessment forms and resources to be used. Jacobs *et al.* (2002:30) and Criticos *et al.* (2002:35) agree that what the outcomes demand learners to do, understand and explore, reflect what learners' performances must be produced in order to demonstrate the achievement of the outcomes. In short, an outcome clarifies the content to be selected, observable learners' behaviour to be demonstrated and which tools to be used in order to achieve them in the Social Sciences learning area.
- **Communication:** Outcomes facilitate communication between educators, learners, parents and other stakeholders. For this reason, Jacobs *et al.* (2002:31) indicate that they also promote cooperative planning amongst Social Sciences educators because the learning outcomes create a common purpose and terminology around which educators could venture into structured lesson plans.

- **Evaluation of programmes:** For educators to know what, why and how they could plan and assess, they need guidelines on what to plan, teach and assess. Thus Jacobs *et al.* (2002:31) recommend that outcomes should form the basis for the planning and evaluation of teaching and learning. This means that if few, or no, learners, and others could use the outcomes to investigate the reasons for the success or failure of the lesson.

In sum, learning outcomes might indicate how the educator will teach and how the learners will learn. However, planning might include references to the content the educators might need to convey, the explanation, learners' group discussions, resources required, and how long the lesson would be. Within these advantages, disadvantages of outcomes in planning, teaching and assessment of lesson plans might be observed.

2.2.3.4. Disadvantages of Social Sciences learning outcomes

Learning outcomes “describe the educational purpose of that learning over the entire period of schooling” (Criticos *et al.* 2002:33). This means that although outcomes could provide educators with a picture of what they hope learners could achieve, they do not provide them with the learning details required to develop learning programmes, work schedules and lesson plans. It follows that the following may be some of the disadvantages of learning outcomes:

- **Unpredictable learning:** Learning outcomes focus on unpredictable behavioral patterns of the learners during the learning process. Resultantly, educators might find it difficult to determine if learners had started to learn, or not. In support, Jacobs *et al.* (2002: 31) argue that some learning outcomes are difficult to state and observe in advance as they occur in the learners' minds, and are invisible. Furthermore, Criticos *et al.* (2002:33) indicate that outcomes do not provide educators with what learners must do

to develop the competence, or level of competence, as described. It seems that educators might thus find observing learner performances difficult.

- **Demonstrations are not always reliable:** Jacobs *et al.* (2002:32) argue that the outcomes of lesson demonstrations are not always valid evidence that learning has taken place. Because learners might mislead their educators. As Criticos *et al.* (2002:33) argue, learning outcomes do not always provide what learners might do in order to achieve the purpose. It follows that the achievement of an outcome does not automatically show that meaningful learning has taken place.
- **Demanding learning outcomes:** Since educators in the Senior Phase might have received little, or no, training on Outcomes-Based Education and lesson planning in particular, Jacobs *et al.*(2002:32) estimate that not all educators could show competency in generating ideas to transform the learning outcome statements into interesting classroom activities. Consequently, it might be problematic for educators to unpack learning outcomes into lesson outcomes on their own.
- **Prescriptive outcomes:** Since learning outcomes have been developed by the state policymakers without educators, educators might view them as prescriptive and instructive. Hence, Jacobs *et al.* (2002:32) maintain that educators might feel that learning outcomes are dogmatic, inflexible and leave no room for their discretion in the teaching, learning and assessment process. On the other hand, Christine and Hopple (1995:5) argue that educators are challenged to implement instructions that relate to the prescribed outcome in order to deliver and the learner to show mastery of the outcomes at the end of the Senior Phase without clear understanding of intentions of the outcomes. It follows that learning outcomes might channel educators not to think independently in planning, teaching and producing a quality product expected of a lesson unit.

The structure of the Social Sciences lesson plan comprises learning outcomes and planning with outcomes in mind. Therefore, assessment standards aim at taking learners through to achieve particular levels of competencies through assessment tasks and standards as learners demonstrate knowledge, skills, values and attitudes. A focused lesson plan, therefore, is one where the educator develops concrete, observable and measurable indicators of learners' learning. This means that educators are faced with a challenge to monitor whether learners are progressing in the direction of the kinds of learning outcomes referred to in the Social Sciences learning area. These learning outcomes are learner-paced and are achieved through the use of learning strategies.

2.2.3.5. Learning strategies

Learning strategies are techniques used to achieve the learning outcomes of a lesson unit as suggested in a lesson plan. McCutcheon and Milner (2002:82) observe that learning strategies adopted in a teaching and learning plan determine the complex interaction between learners' pre-existing beliefs and pre-disposition towards and about knowledge and learning. Learning strategies are cooperative and play an active part in learners if planned in an interactive way, rather than being related to individual learners separately. Learning approaches depend on educational contexts. This means that some learners are more likely to recognize the learning potential of learning strategies than others, who tend to focus on reproductive learning.

It is important to recognize the selection of learning strategies when planning lessons as a skill. McCutcheon and Milner (2002:82) point out that the inclusion of learning strategies in lesson planning is important because it represents the affective and cognitive components, which create a safe, risk-engaging and constructive approach to learning, rather than their exclusion, which encourages learners to reproduce information transmitted to them by educators. For this reason O'Malley and Chamot (1990:287) observe that planning lessons with learning strategies in mind promotes learning, peer interaction in learning, is naturally cooperative; fulfill the social skills, enhances mutual exchange of ideas and promotes common task orientation rather than promoting the

retention of ethical or cultural diversity among learners. This means that integrating learning strategies in lesson plans and implementing them promote a decline in disruptive behaviours. However, the implementation of appropriate learning strategies could be risk engaging.

Some educators might depend heavily on published guides and textbooks in planning Social Sciences lessons, rather than being innovative and creative by using various sources that relate to outcomes. Stark and Easley (in McCutcheon and Milner, 2002:81) found that some educators rely on textbooks to plan and teach the basis of the curriculum. The textbook, rather than their professional judgment to plan for the integration between learning strategies and learning outcomes controls such educators. This means that there might be some educators who are experiencing problems in planning Social Sciences lessons at the Senior Phase level by using outdated learning strategies.

According to Kramer (1999:14), planning Social Sciences with learning strategies in mind accommodates even learners who learn through feeling, seeing and hearing to learn effectively. The relevant learning strategies in this case include games, role-play, tuition, and simulation. Some analyse and logically create understanding, while others learn by trying things out and being willing to take risks. Actually, learners might prefer practice to theory. Therefore, the integration of integration of learning strategies might be a great challenge for educators. O'Malley and Chamot (1990:227) further argue that learning strategies require special attention because they deal with how classroom actions, and changes in the behaviour of educators, could be utilized to support learners.

The following learning strategies relate to Social Sciences learning outcomes. AS such they are fundamentally important in promoting a learner-centred approach (Kramer, 1999:14) and could, therefore, be given prominence in planning lessons:

- **Auditory:** these are voice-based through talk, reading aloud and sound-involved activities.

- **Visual:** Sight-based learning, demonstrations based on dialogues, debates and books to read, drawing and writing.
- **Interpersonal:** Thinking and learning cooperatively, learning to share, and developing social tolerance and listening skills.
- **Intrapersonal:** Learning best alone, self-paced and managing activities alone, reflectively and quietly.

It seems that when planning Social Sciences lessons for classroom activities educators might integrate a variety of learning strategies for the acquisition of different learning competencies. Learning strategies are not to be in isolation, but in combination with teaching strategies.

2.2.3.6. Teaching strategies

Teaching strategies serve as plans of action for the selection and planning of teaching. Van der Horst and MacDonald (2000:133) maintain that teaching strategies deal with direct instruction, while the means or tools that the educator uses to carry out the strategy are known as methods. Seemingly, the educator has to decide on a strategy, and then how to select the appropriate methods. Van der Horst and MacDonald (2002:133) clarify that methods in teaching are concerned with how educators organize and use techniques, content and teaching media or resources to meet learning outcomes. This means that teaching strategies might be either inductive or deductive in approach. However, educators might find differentiating teaching strategies from teaching methods difficult. Fact of the matter is that teaching is an art which has methods embedded in it. Various authors agree that teaching methods are inseparable from the teaching strategies and learning strategies (John, 1995:28 and Wright, 1991:52).

The selection of teaching strategies during lesson planning encourages educators to develop learning activities, which are both open-ended and close-ended. Teaching strategies used in planning and implementing lesson plans will thus now be discussed.

- Whole class discussion: This has been frequently used in traditional teaching approaches but is still used in Outcomes-Based Education approach. It includes brainstorming, problem-solving, explanation, problem-posing, map reading, interpretation and calculation (Criticos, *et al.* 2002:202). It represents structured teacher talk, which is aimed at clarifying concepts, so that learners will be able to understand them. It engages learners and changes their thinking.
- **Small group teaching:** Small group teaching gives every member the opportunity to communicate. Every member shares the problem and this is usually based on problem-solving discussions. By implication, learners come up with solutions. Examples of small group teaching, might include:
 - Problem-based teaching;
 - Resource-based teaching;
 - Cooperative learning; and
 - Indirect teaching (Criticos *et al.*, 2002:203).

Small group teaching might lead to learner centered teaching, on which lesson planning should focus. In planning lessons by using the aforementioned elements, educators should not separate planning from assessment.

2.2.3.7. Assessment

Assessment is a process of gathering information and the utilization of that information for individual and institutional improvement (Astin, 1993:2 and Criticos *et al.*, 2002:35). Schiemer (2002:3) defines the concept as a means of collecting data to measure the teaching and learning process as in the Social Sciences. This means that assessment becomes authentic when learners demonstrate knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes, which result in positive behaviour in a controlled setting, as against real-life situations.

In planning lessons, teaching, learning and assessment are inseparable. Brown and Knight (1995:33) affirm this mentioning that assessment if the learners understand why it is needed, what is being measured and how measurements are being approached. In addition, Jacobs *et al.* (2002:31) and Criticos *et al.* (2002:35) agree that without written outcomes and assessment standards in a lesson plan, the educator would be unable to realize that the outcome has been achieved when reflecting on the lesson taught. This implies that educators should set clear criteria for meaningful assessment and learning well in advance.

In context, Brown and Knight (1995:25) and the Department of Education (2003:21) describe assessment standards as the minimum level of performance by the learner, which gives evidence of the learning outcome for each learning activity. In the same breath, the assessment of learners centres upon outcomes because they describe the goals that learners are supposed to achieve.

The Department of Education (2003:34) and Astin (1993:8) agree that in the Social Sciences assessment is done to enhance growth and development, monitor and facilitate learning, to shape and check learners' progress. In order for learners to reach their full potential and for the lesson to be focused, the Department of Education (2003:34) prescribes that assessment in the Social Sciences should be:

- transparent, clear and focused;
- integrated with teaching and learning;
- based on predetermined criteria of standards;
- participative, that is, actively involve learners;
- varied in terms of methods and contexts, and
- valid, reliable, fair, learner-paced, and flexible.

The afore-mentioned characteristics of an assessment criterion are supported by Alcorn *et al.* (1970:126), while the Department of Education (2003:34) stresses that the learning outcomes and assessment standards in the Social Sciences have been designed to be used together. Succinctly, assessment standards have been fore-grounded to unpack the learning outcomes to be addressed in the learning activities and assessment tasks.

Conversely, teaching without assessment activities, tools, strategies and forms, might be obscure. Hence, Brown and Knight (1995:33) argue that lessons without questioning and unmarked assessment tasks make learners disown the information shared and to let them fail to see any point in doing these activities later on. This implies that such lessons might be boring and unsuccessful. For this reason, the Department of Education (2003:47) has avoided the prescription of assessment forms, or strategies but instead, put all assessment forms together for educators to select from on their own.

The Department of Education (2002:28) indicates that assessment standards should be used as tools to measure the level of achievement relative to a particular learning outcome. These include, among others, tests, classwork, homework, contextual analysis, presentations, assignments, projects, map reading, creative responses, and data handling. The Department of Education (2003:47) refers to the afore-mentioned tools, rubrics, checklists, and reporting tools as assessment forms. Unfortunately, some educators get confused by the assessment jargon, which changes from time to time.

Cangelosi (2000:154) points out that untrained educators use traditional percentage methods to score summative assessment. The percentage does not indicate the content a learner has learned, or the outcomes achieved, but ranks the learners in comparison to scores obtained from assessment. In this context, educators might not understand how to plan lessons and interpret the criterion-referenced assessment as against the norm-referenced assessment.

Brown, Race and Smith (1997:36) and Department of Education (2003:47) maintain that educators and learners need to be prepared to succeed in assessment and add value to what has been learnt by using assessment standards. By implication, educators should formulate clear assessment standards to reveal the hidden agenda in an assessment task. In order to support educators in planning, Jacobs *et al.* (2002:281) argue that educators need to be trained intensively in order to be capacitated on how to plan assessment together on issues pertaining to criterion-referenced assessment, continuous assessment, evaluate assessment activities in the classroom, record, and report assessment results to the parents.

Continuous assessment is an assessment of learners' work and progress on a regular basis, formally and informally; giving marks and making comments for different activities (Jacobs *et al.*, 2002:282). Christie (1990:163) indicates that the government officials to silence educators used this continuous assessment previously and to keep them busy to prevent them from opposing the regime. In actual fact, continuous assessment is not about simply giving learners sets of tests, one after another, and ignoring other learning activities, comments and tasks, which learners have completed during the learning process, but to support learners even for progression to the next grades.

To sum up, planning lessons for assessment in the Social Sciences learning area, like in all other learning areas, might make learners know how they are progressing, correct their weakness, check their strengths, and motivate them to learn. Educators thus need to work hard using various resources, such as time, textbooks and learning strategies to enable learners to become meaningfully involved in all assessment, teaching and learning activities.

2.2.3.8. Time allocation

Time allocation in a lesson plan represents a scarce natural resource, which should be used meaningfully. Dirkx and Prenger (1997:44) argue that time needed for planning a learning experience, is meant for the facilitation of teaching and learning and might therefore, allow maximum participation of learners to complete their activities. This means that time allocated for teaching and learning demands that educators should check with learners, or groups, on the pace they learn, within the stipulated time.

Some learning activities might require more time than others, than that originally planned for by the educator. For this reason, Dirkx and Prenger (1997:137) indicate that time allocated for a lesson should be goal-directed and each activity should be planned, and ranked in order of importance. Hence, the Department of Education (2003:6) indicates that Social Sciences, like any learning area, has 10% allocated time per week and weighting. This means that allocated time on the timetable should be arranged in such a way that learning areas do not overlap. Allocated time should spread evenly with respect to other learning areas. Allocated time should be meaningfully and efficiently used to achieve objectives of the plan.

2.2.3.9. Expanded opportunities

There are specific principles that underpin the education system. Christine and Hopple (1995:4), the Department of Education (2002:12) and the Department of Education (2003:47) concur that lesson planning principles include clarity of focus, expanded opportunity, high expectations, and designing down, deliver-up. These principles could be coupled with the maintenance of a clear focus on the learning outcomes to be achieved by learners within a reasonable period.

The educators might use various teaching and learning strategies to help learners to meet these expectations and to design the outcome related to the curriculum lesson within a given time. "It lies in the learning model that all learners can learn and succeed, if they

are given time and support they need” (Kramer, 1999:106). Kramer (1999:106) argues that because learners learn differently using different resources based on their prior knowledge, culture, social, and economic context educators need to find ways to expand and help learners to tackle learning tasks. On the other hand, Engelbrecht, Green, Swart, and Muthukrishna (2001:24) maintain that all learners learn in a given time and opportunity, practise knowledge and skills to achieve the learning outcomes. Learners might learn better if the real-life context would be taken into cognizance. Even if this support is not given, learners would still be responsible to achieve the expected outcomes at their own pace through care and support.

According to Kramer (1999:108), expanded opportunities are ways educators use to nurture the special interests and talents that the learners might have in a topic of a lesson unit. Christine and Hopple (1995:5) add that learners should receive a second chance on remedial support until they have mastered the content addressing the outcomes. Kramer (1990: 108) further notes that such enrichment activities might be developed and used to:

- Change, expand, and extend the challenges set for learners;
- Provide learners with the opportunity to explore new activities or contexts;
- Provide learners with the opportunity to take individual and group tasks without management by educators;
- Help learners to broaden and deepen learning, and
- Extend the set of general and specific skills that learners acquire in a lesson unit.

It looks as if expanded opportunities include various methods such as the extended opportunities for the educators to use and give remedial support to learners according to the lesson plan. Criticos *et al.* (2002:14) affirm this notion when stating that educators might recognize the problem areas for repetition, revision, or put more input into them to support learning over time. It goes without saying that expanded opportunities, like any other elements in the structure of a lesson plan, require time, while the learner have to

observe that learning is not expected in Social Sciences only, but might be integrated to overlap with information on knowledge, skills, attitudes and values from other learning areas, and within the sections of the learning area itself.

2.2.3.10. Integration

Learners might apply knowledge learnt, skills acquired and values explored in one learning area to deal with issues in another learning area. Kramer (1999:119) refers to integration and states that it occurs when the topics, themes and learning activities have been planned to address the same aspects in different learning areas. This means that integration might be shared and webbed across the curriculum, using central themes in a cooperative lesson plan.

The Department of Education (2002:13) concurs that learning experiences within a learning area are linked and related to other learning areas. If these are properly integrated they might support and expand the learners' opportunities to attain skills, acquire knowledge and develop attitudes and values across the curriculum. Gultig, Hoadley and Jansen (2002:12) indicate that different learning areas have different requirements in terms of integration. Learners could explore the connections of these learning areas at their own time and pace. Gutlig *et al.* (2002:12) further note that integration makes the curriculum relevant to work in real life context, and to re-connect theory and practice.

Learners and educators are thus challenged to integrate theory and practice. This view rejects a rigid learning between academic and applied knowledge or between knowledge and skills. On this basis Gutlig *et al.* (2002:13) and Kramer (1999:19) point out that the Social Sciences learning area has an invisible boundary that is fragmented by the timetable. This perception supports the view that learning areas are independent of each other. The present timetabling model thus seems to remain a challenge to policymakers, educators and managers. Integration shows that learners have different learning competencies from one learning context to another.

2.2.3.11. Barriers to learning

“Barriers to learning refer to the social, emotional, mental, physical, environmental and political contexts which might hinder and disturb the teaching and learning process of a learner in a lesson unit” (Department of Education, 2003:7). In planning Social Sciences lessons, the Department of Education (2003:7) indicates that the steps of planning lessons need to address barriers that learners might experience during the teaching, learning and assessment process. Seemingly, educators should have additional time given to learners with barriers to learning in order to accommodate them in the completion of learning activities.

It is of most importance to know the different types of learning barriers because not all barriers apply to every lesson unit since. Some of them are specific to individual learners only. This implies that when educators develop lesson plans, a clear sense of barriers to learning that exist in their classes should be highlighted so that they could plan to overcome them through the teaching and learning strategies used in structuring the learning activities. Educators might further face challenges to reflect on the good and the bad aspects of the lesson taught.

2.2.3.12. Reflection

A reflective teaching practice is one wherein teaching is an ongoing cycle of learning rather than a linear process. Pollard and Triggs (1997:11) indicate that reflection is applied in a cyclical process in which educators continuously monitor, evaluate and revise their own classroom practices. Criticos *et al.* (2002:15) argue that one lesson feeds into the next cycle when educators learn from their mistakes after teaching the unit lesson. The educators, therefore, assesses or reflects on practices to determine whether the spacing approach used and adopted in the previous lesson has worked or not.

Furthermore, Pollard and Triggs (1997:11) agree with Criticos *et al.*(2002:15) that educators conduct introspection on whether their lessons should be repeated or whether to continue with the next lesson and show competencies to become skillful to:

- Understand and explain why a particular teaching or learning strategy was selected;
- Act affectively on decisions by carrying out basic teaching functions; and
- Monitor and reflect on actions made in a lesson and adjust them.

Pollard and Triggs (1997:18) add that the competencies the educator could show and apply when reflecting on a lesson might include cognitive, interpersonal and motivational abilities in understanding and relating the outcomes of a lesson to be achieved individually, and as a team. Criticos *et al.* (2002:15) add that thoughts and actions inform each other in teaching, learning and assessment processes. This means that educators learning and teaching strategies selected were appropriate and whether the content selected addressed the outcomes in context.

A reflective educator might repeat or continue with the next cycle of a lesson, In order for educators to reflect on the lesson correctly, reflected actions of a lesson unit might be written at the bottom of a lesson plan, so the identified shortfalls and achievements could be used to keep the lesson focused and flowing naturally to the next.

2.2.4. PURPOSE OF A LESSON PLAN

The purpose of a lesson plan is to keep the lesson structured and focused, as Clark and Starr (in Van der Horst and MacDonald ,2001:163) and Sotto (1994:142) point out that educators could plan and conduct closely structured, well-knit and patterned lessons, before they should follow the unstructured route. Educators need to keep abreast with ever-growing knowledge and changes in lesson plan challenges. Hence, Criticos *et al.*

(2002:42), Pretorius and Lemmer (1998:55) and the Department of Education (2002:44) emphasise the fact that the structured lesson plans are written; kept in the plan book or file, on a prescribed form determined by the school or employer, in order to trace, refer, use, and show to curriculum officials on demand. Lesson planning should be done before the beginning of a school year, term, week, day or lesson. In essence, plans specify key elements including outcomes, methods, assessment standards, assessment, resources, and time allocation.

Structured lessons keep lessons focused. In short, the educator should know what he/she wants to achieve at the end of the lesson. Madaus *et al.* (1989:339), Van der Horst and MacDonald (1997:161) and Criticos *et al.* (2002:40) agree that lesson outcomes might be focused on knowledge, values, attitudes, and skills. This integrated learning approach might be realized when learners critically discuss, explore projects and do experiments. Since a lesson plan is a tool to anticipate learning behaviour, there might be provision to manage contingent behavioural patterns arising during the course of a lesson. To curb these unforeseen problems, thoroughly planned lessons might solve classroom management and disciplinary problems that might arise from time to time.

A lesson plan is an accounting and proactive experience, which includes the mental and emotional aspects of an oncoming lesson. Walter's model (1991:26), in agreement with Sotto (1994:144), emphasizes that the purpose of a lesson demands:

- Well-developed imagination and a mastery of subject,
- Knowledge of resource activities,
- Environment, or real-life situation, in which the learner belongs, and
- Comprehension of laws of learning and human behaviour that help educators to anticipate learners' reactions.

In short, the foregoing model might be encapsulated in terms of the following conceptual framework: learning activities, resources, content, context, and learning outcomes (Department of Education, 2003:41).

The purpose of curriculum change demands a change in the way lessons are planned and used by educators as tools to achieve the learning outcomes in the Social Sciences. The Department of Education (2001:4) confirms this by stating that in order to make learning relevant to the learner's real-life context, the management of resources and the way the curriculum is run should strike a balance between the national policy and the local teaching and learning contexts. This implies a need to shift the focus from the previous imbalances in the education system of the country to the new expectations.

To clarify the afore-mentioned philosophy, Christie (1997:290) and Jansen (1997:74) indicate that the new curriculum requires well-prepared educators who are more often mostly found in previously white schools than in black schools. "The demands of the new curriculum have frustrated the curriculum change when most competent educators, resigned for other ventures elsewhere" (Jansen, 1997:74). To curb this, Spady (1998:97) and Ndlovu, Bertman and Cutlig (1999:7) add that curriculum designs and policies should encourage the active participation and involvement of educators and all academic stakeholders to plan and work together in order to avoid little and poor implementation.

Concurrently, South African Democratic Teachers' Union (2004:2) raises concerns when stating that there are no consultations by the government with educator unions and educators. This implies that these parties, as implementers of the new education system, are the last and shallowly informed about lesson planning strategies. Seemingly, information reaches educators at the last minute while there are also frequently communication breakdowns.

A communication breakdown might jeopardize the purpose of curriculum change, most particularly lesson plan changes, as educators might wonder why there was an abrupt need to do lesson preparations before teaching begins. Pretorious and Lemmer (1998:55) indicate that educators are supposed to work backwards from those predetermined outcomes, guiding learners towards achieving them at one stage. This simply means that without purpose, educators might not understand the need for having outcomes to achieve in a lesson. Congruently, the fact that the Department of Education's (2002:44) policy

framework uses written plans as performance standards in teaching, shows that planning is indispensable.

A lesson plan cannot substitute an educator. It could be used as evidence of the educator's work done during his/her absence. For this reason, Criticos *et al.* (2002:40) suggest that a lesson plan enables teaching to happen, what needs to be taught and the sequence in which teaching should be done. While, Walters (1991:26) shows how a lesson plan protects the educator from forgetting important items, secures and maintains the learners' interest. A lesson plan, therefore, assures that progress is made.

The purpose of a lesson as justified afore, demands quality teaching and learning. The change in the curriculum, from the traditional to the new, caused change in lesson plan formats, elements and steps of planning. Educators too, need to be capacitated to change their mindset and approach towards lesson planning. Gradually, they might understand how to achieve the envisaged goal in education.

The next section focuses on how educator's paradigm change, from the traditional to the new, might be interpreted.

2.3. THE NEED FOR EDUCATORS' PARADIGM CHANGE IN LESSON PLANNING

In any curriculum change, educators are expected to change their way of planning lessons, attitudes and cultures of teaching. This involves a paradigm change. Meier (in Sohng, 2003:223) acknowledges that the new approach to teaching and learning introduced a shift in focus, which advocated that educators are challenged to change from being the suppliers of knowledge to being facilitators of learning. Siu (1999:26) explains that in order to meet the challenges and development of the changing world, a shift from traditional rote learning is required. The following concepts feature prominently in many researchers' attempts to define the concept paradigm in curriculum change theory.

2.3.1. PARADIGM CHANGE

Cardwell (2000:180) perceives paradigm as attitudes, values, beliefs, and skills that influence the thinking patterns of an individual and organizations, while Spady (1998:1) sees it in terms of thinking patterns, cultures and educators' decision-making towards the school context. Summing up, educators must be able to interpret the policy of the new system of education in the context of their school culture to establish if it suits the real-life situation in which their school system operates.

Such an interpretation might enable educators to deal with change in the curricula, as well as the purpose of the school's vision and mission statements, capacity, ownership and support for educators in curriculum change because education systems work with changing ideas, transforming understanding, alternating purposes and knowledge revision as might be reflected in the vision and mission statements of their schools from time to time.

Spady (1998:97) indicates that educators need to know and understand the strength, integrity and durability of the education system before actual curriculum implementation can begin. While policymakers argue that teaching, leaning and assessment should be shifted from knowledge acquisition to learning to learn, from passive learning to active learning; from teacher-centred to learner-centred teaching, from subject based to integration; from rigid, prescribed curriculum to flexible and varied learning experiences; from whole class teaching to small group or individual teaching, from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced assessment, and that learner participation must be given more time in their activities (Zehr,1999:4).

However, Bertman *et al.* (2000:182); Ndlovu *et al.* (1999:7) and South African Democratic Teachers' Union (2004:2) observe that educators are often excluded from the educational planning and innovations, to such an extent that they are unable to understand why and how change occurs. Seemingly, there is a need, as a matter of policy that educators should know and understand curricular issues well in advance. Like any other

change, the paradigm change, among educator's deals with the change in the mindset, that is the vision and understanding of the real life to be followed in education. Below follow some arguments relating to educator change, especially regarding lesson planning.

2.3.2. VISION

A vision is like a drawn plan to be followed towards achieving the envisaged goal. Spady (1998:97) defines a vision as a concrete purpose to real life that provides a prescription of how things should look like. In planning, a vision is how lessons should look like during presentations. In the context, a vision gives a school leadership and the educator a vision as a manager of learning programmes to pursue educational and classroom matters. Hence, the Department of Education (2001:44) encourages schools to put their vision and mission statements on paper to give their hearts and minds some frame of reference. It is clear that a vision could assist educators to know and understand the direction of the new education system.

Knowledge outcomes need to be put into practice to be meaningful. On the contrary, Ndlovu *et al.* (1999:80) argue that a vision dies pre-maturely when simply written on paper by policymakers for educators. This looks like imposing a false consensus, especially if there is implementation action that follows. Educators need to be involved in developing a flourishing vision of their classroom activities. For this reason, Spady (1998:98) and Christie (2002:122) maintain that without a vision, lesson plans would be obscure, resulting in educators hesitating to plan before teaching begins because they would be no purpose to plan, teach and a goal to achieve. From the foregoing, it appears that a vision is a roadmap towards curriculum change and its implementation, particularly with regard to institutional and lesson planning.

South African Democratic Teachers' Union (2005:23) observes that it is not enough to have sound school policies and clear visions without educators forging ahead with their initiatives to plan lessons competently to implement the new curriculum. Educators are thus faced with a challenge to be committed to plan their lessons cooperatively and to

build their vision processes towards academic growth. Such a change would only succeed if there is a corresponding positive change in school culture, educators' academic involvement and participation in curricular issues. An ideal school culture prevails where educators might be motivated to own the processes of the new education system and its new policies.

2.3.3. OWNERSHIP

Vision and ownership could be evident where educators participate and become involved in curricular issues. In other words, a curriculum that is teacher-proof might be frustrated and become poorly implemented. In support to afore-mentioned, Spady (1998:1) explains curriculum ownership as a strong identification with, investment in and commitment to the school organization's stated purpose and vision. Seemingly, attitude and value outcome could be directly addressed as forming part and parcel of what educators could own.

The fore-mentioned further implies that curriculum ownership is the motivation fuel towards successful teaching and learning change. By extended implication, educators could own the education system positively, if they are given a role in planning, shaping and implementing the curriculum via their lesson plans. This argument suggests that educator exclusion might lead "to educators viewing and interpreting the new system as the policymakers' thing and not theirs" (Bertman *et al.*, 2000:82).

Logically, educators might not allow their education system to fail if they were involved and capacitated as implementers. There might be innovative ideas for addressing the challenges, which might arise during implementation. Jansen (1998:1), Spady (1998:97), Bertman *et al.* (2000:182) and Christie (2002:27) agree that educators, if they commanded ownership of the Revised National Curriculum Statement, would not allow their product to fail, but they would capacitate one another because they understand their commitment to the stated national outcomes, purpose and vision.

Ownership might seemingly be frustrated in the sense that aforementioned authors perceived, namely, that civil service employments, in the Education Department after apartheid, has largely been political appointments, not real education experts. This implies that some appointees have little, or no, experience of what happens in classroom sites, which might make educators critical of curricular issues and confuse them with political issues.

In addition, Bertman *et al.* (2000:82) state that trainers come and train educators on policy issues without addressing classroom issues, leaving them still confused about the information received during the workshops. Educators might therefore, find planning Social Sciences lessons difficult if they do not know the vision they are supposed to achieve. It thus seems that Social Sciences lesson plan changes, like any other curriculum changes, demand educators to change accordingly in order to incorporate the new practices. However, a change in ownership might not be assigned to one party and then forgotten. It demands capacity development and ownership by a group of Social Sciences educators.

2.3.4. CAPACITY

Capacity development too, demands the mental preparation of educators through advocacy programmes, consultations and qualified educators to enable these educators to interpret the new policy to implement it properly. Spady (1998:98) defines capacity as the necessary knowledge of skills development, resources and tools that is needed to make changes implied in the education stated purpose and vision successful. This means that the educator's knowledge on how to plan Social Sciences lessons could be a productive element towards change from traditional lesson planning to the new, and to use lesson plans as tools for achieving the desired learning outcomes.

Jansen (1998:2) advocates to the notion that purpose, vision and ownership might fundamentally affect educators' commitment, attitudes and engagement to participate in

Curriculum issues in a productive manner. Van der Horst and MacDonald (2000:64) in a lesson argue that without the capacity of educators on lesson planning changes, the new education system might be a nightmare of errors, frustrations and a lack of change in the implementation process.

Spady (1998:99) affirms that this capacity embodies the entire knowledge skill to plan lessons and implement the new education policy without educators teaching from their heads, using the old approach and making the new policy lesson plans available in times of need. Capacity without subsequent follow-up might be forgotten.

The information pertaining to the elements of a Social Sciences lesson and the skills required to plan relating to learning programmes, demand empowered and competent educators. In conclusion, Cele (in South African Democratic Teachers 'Union, 2005:23) observes that the provincial education system does not deliver changes in the curriculum because of the incapacity of the existing education bureaucracy, starting with the school management. If this is true, it might jeopardize the new curriculum policy. Little or no capacity, coupled with no follow-up support on how educators plan and use lesson plans at tools to achieve the outcomes in teaching, might become a hopeless experience.

2.3.5. SUPPORT

To avoid erroneous implementation in the planning aspects of the new curriculum, support means help and guidance to educators at school level. School-based support reflects commitment to the changing process by school management and the department. Congruently, Spady (1998:99), Jansen (1998:2) and Bertman *et al.* (2000:183) emphasize that adequate and consistent support is needed after the training of educators. Without support, educators might work with anxiety, cynicism and retreat. Practically, support brings assistance and aids the capacity of educators to put theory into practice. Hopkins (in Bertman *et al.*, 2000:182) believes that educator development can be successful only if there are workshops followed by school-based support for teaching practice to change. After workshops the Senior Phase Social Sciences educators could start practicing the

new approaches to lesson planning. Bertman *et al.* (2000:182) suggest that support should be given in collaboration with colleagues who might offer peer support. Subsequently, an external follow-up in this regard could be done to improve the classroom teaching conditions. This might reflect the commitment of the Department towards curriculum change processes, particularly with regard to Senior Phase Social Sciences lesson planning.

This indicates, “change is a phenomenon that affects all aspects of a persons’ life, bringing about alterations in both personal and employment spheres”(Bertman *et al.*, 2000:138). This implies that education change in Senior Phase the Social Sciences lesson planning is a process and not an event. For this reason, Kelly (in Bertman *et al.*, 2000:181) mentions that no change will take place in education, unless the educators accept it. Although Senior Phase Social Science educators might not be seen as the sole determinants of change in education, they nevertheless fulfill the role of determining what happens in their respective classrooms.

In addition, MacFarland (1973:85) maintains that the support currently given to school-based educators might decide whether they should be admitted to professional in-service training, re-direct the educator’s professional competencies and check the level of his/her professional status in Senior Phase Social Sciences lesson planning activities.

In addition, Bertman *et al.* (2000:141) mention that for successful change to take place according to the new curriculum, policy-makers, facilitators and mangers need to understand the educators’ working conditions to give them an enriched support. In conclusion, support findings might guide educators in education towards formulating references when they apply for senior posts. Subsequently, these findings might also sustain critical appreciation and discourse among educators about the practical standards of the profession and the means of attaining them. There are, however, problems experienced by educators in effecting curriculum change processes.

2.4. PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS

The previous discussion serves as a link and base for the following discussion on problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons. The Department of Education (2004:1) maintains that workshops should not disrupt the teaching time and that they should be conducted not earlier than 13h00. It follows that some of the educators attend workshops being tired, after having traveled long distances while others leave before the end of the workshops due to public transport problems or having to move in the opposite direction from the venue of the workshop, in the afternoon. To implement curriculum change, in-service training is, however, needed.

2.4.1. IN-SERVICE TRAINING

The training of educators depends on the premise of the facilitators that educators are the implementers and their perceptions on the new curriculum should change. Previously, educators received training on Curriculum 2005 and argue that some of the facilitators or trainers were not conversant with outcomes-based education. Bertman *et al.* (2000:143) for instance, indicate that the problem of a poorly educated workforce leads to poor manufacturing, fear of the unknown and threats that influence the knowledge and skills of the implementers in education.

This kind of reasoning might create resistance to change amongst educators. For instance, the (South African Democratic Teachers' Union, 2004:2) articulated the following concerns on the training process of educators concerning classroom issues:

- Educators are trained separately from the training manuals developed. This could lead to misinterpretation of Curriculum 2005 principles on Outcomes- Based Education;
- The National and the Limpopo Provincial training process seem to have excluded educators;

- The training of educators has no follow-up support systems based on the educators' experiences in the implementation of the new curriculum;
- During training some Department of Education management officials are skeptical of the process of curriculum changes and this skepticism might confuse and affect the authenticity of the educators' training;
- Heads of institutions seem unsure of what the process means to the post establishment provisioning model as to how it could cater for the General Education and Training Band and for the Further Education and Training Band, which are to be implemented.

In the light of these concerns, the problems experienced by educators might continue to manifest themselves in the way the training of educators is being conducted. In-service training seems to have been coupled with frustration, resistance to change and fears.

2.4.2. RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

Educators seem to be faced with a situation in which they have to shift from the ideas of the apartheid education practices to those of the new dispensation. This might create fear of change amongst them because they are demanded to improve their level of competence in planning lessons and implementing curriculum change as a whole. Bertman *et al.* (2000:182) add that the educators' fear of their image on the type of learners produced from the doubtful implementation of the new curriculum might threaten their competency and status.

Seemingly, school-based support for issues trained at the workshops remains a challenge when new theoretical educational processes have to be applied in real situations. For this reason, Jansen (1997:7) and Christie (1997:290) affirm that research has found that shifting the imbalance of the apartheid education to the new democratic system needs continuous interaction between the vision and conditions on the ground. Jansen (1997:7) further notes that South Africa's curriculum change is like a voyage of change with faith.

Faith that educators might implement, shape, respond positively to Outcomes-Based Education and create learner-centred lessons.

In addition, Jansen and Christie (1997:10) observe that, this might be abused and rejected by the implementers, as it has been a top-down system like the imposed apartheid education system. Seemingly, the way the new education system has been planned and introduced might create resistance. Cutlig, Ndlovu and Bertman (1997:7) add that there has been a limited awareness of the potential for planning of lessons at school level, and a lack of skills required to develop lesson plans. The authors conclude that this problem might manifest itself in a slow and poor implementation process, which might create tension amongst the educators.

Furthermore, Christie (1997:228) and Berman *et al.* (2000:183) add that to curb these tensions, policymakers should change patterns and classroom dynamics which cannot be mandated but enforce school level support systems. Actually, these tensions might destroy the school culture as a whole (Cutlig *et al.*, 1997:7).

2.4.3. SCHOOL CULTURE

School culture differs from one school to another. “Schools differ in terms of their resources, culture, community of learners, educators’ values and beliefs about education” (Bertman *et al.*, 2000:164). These factors influence how curriculum, particularly lesson planning change, happens in a school. In schools where educators are used to sharing and working together, plan and implement lessons accordingly, there might be a greater chance to succeed than in other schools with a culture of independent working. Jacobs *et al.* (2002:134) add that Outcomes-Based Education units and lessons are usually planned by groups of educators and not as in the old curriculum by individual educators. This implies that in schools where educators work in isolation and are not used to share teaching ideas, they might experience problems of talking about how to plan Social Sciences lessons.

On the other hand, Bertman *et al.* (2000:184) highlight the fact that educators who are traditionally not open to ideas of change experience fear and insecurity due to a lack of a learning culture. This means that if a learning culture has a strong base in a school, creative answers will be discussed and explored. Educators will have the freedom to try out classroom curriculum changes. Conversely, Jacobs and Gawe (1996:130) point out that those educators seem to experience problems when they plan lessons because they might not know how much information is needed to be given in a lesson plan and how this could be manipulated in order to achieve the desired outcomes. Seemingly, educators might make mistakes along the way.

2.4.4. RESOURCES

It is a challenge for educators “to become better selectors and better users of textbooks” (Criticos, Long, Moletsane, and Mthinyane, 2000:271). Resources are only able to contribute to teaching and learning because of the thoughtful educators’ design and creativity to relate them to learning outcomes. For this reason, Jansen (in Bertman, 1999:61) and Meier (in Sohnge, 2003:232) argue that Outcomes-Based Education lessons demand well-resourced classrooms, well-designed textbooks and expert educators who are willing to develop resource material, other than textbooks, so that learners could engage in discovery learning. This means that educators should know what learners must learn and how resources could lead to learning. Good resource-based learning relies on the understanding and resourcefulness of the educator regarding how to use the planned resources effectively. Teacher development strategies are needed for educators to be able to work accordingly.

In addition to the problems of resources, Engelbrecht, Kriegler and Booysen (1996:3) And Meier (in Sohnge, 2003:232) indicate that tattered textbooks that are shared by overcrowded classes, worn out furniture, no hope of replacement of retired educators, overloading of work, understaffing, shabby buildings, and late payment of educator salaries might result in a situation where the latter would revert to traditional modes of teaching. These problems might jeopardize the commitment of educators to welcome the

new lesson plan changes. In addition, Mkhathshwa (in Van der Horst and MacDonald, 1997:1) emphasizes that what educators know, think, believe, value and do at the level of the classroom will ultimately shape the kind of learning the learners are exposed to:

MacFarland (1973:74), John (1992:82), Van der Horst and MacDonald (1997:161), and Criticos et al. (2002:275) stress that resources prepared for a lesson should be accurate, well laid out and readable, interestingly linked to the content and intended outcomes of a lesson, and be constructively used. Pollard and Triggs (1997:259) add that all learning activities require the educator to spend time to think about how the resources could be used in a lesson and how to make them part of the preparation to teach. This implies that good resource-based learning relies heavily on the resourcefulness and understanding of the educator regarding the resources used and the outcome to be achieved. For this reason, Yule and Steyn (1992:3) suggest that the teacher has to unfold the child to reality. Notwithstanding, educators might use the afore-mentioned competencies to create reality and make learning simple.

In support of resource-based teaching, Criticos *et al.* (2002:273) reflect that a resources-based model

- gives learners real life and relevant experiences that will help them to understand new ideas and concepts;
- can help learners to discover new ideas without being told by the educator;
- gives learners opportunities to develop new skills;
- creates interest and makes learning more fun; and
- gives learners the opportunity to be practically involved in and take responsibility for their own learning.

In conclusion, learning resources develop the learner's reasoning powers, provoke emotions and motivate learners. These resources should be tied to the age and ability range in the class, the time available, the teaching one has adopted, and the classroom layout.

2.4.5. TIMETABLING

In every teaching and learning situation lessons are meant for a certain grade; addressing knowledge, attitudes, values and skills of a learning area, within a certain allocated time in the school timetable. This means that lessons need to be planned before teaching begins. A lesson that has not been carefully planned might result in wasted time and efforts. It follows that "the first few minutes at the beginning of a class may be used to challenge activity, read a task, ask thought provoking questions to prepare for review lesson" (Madaus *et al.* 1989:330). Undoubtedly, educators are challenged to present thought-provoking questions and make learners not waste time in any way.

Kramer (2005:165) indicates that schools in South Africa, use a fixed number of periods and this pattern is sustained for five working days. All these periods are of equal length of time and mostly 30 minutes according to policy. Furthermore, he denotes that these periods do qualify for Outcomes-Based Education timetable model but they are quite short, even if they may extend over one period. Kramer (2005:166) explains the following timetable models that are commonly used by various countries worldwide:

- The Convectional timetable is a single period model commonly used in South African schools;
- The Copernican plan timetable has two blocks per day for one or two learning programmes;
- The Alternate day plan is alternating sets of learning areas offered per day;
- The 4x4 block schedule has 4 learning areas per term;
- The Mixed timetable mixes the 4x4 block-scheduling model with the Convectional timetable.

The researcher realized that the Social Sciences educators and their management need to know and have skills to design the timetable that relates with the South African Outcomes-Based Education curriculum change because the time allocation might differ from school to school.

The Social Sciences learning area requires 12% of the teaching time per week in the Senior Phase (grades 7, 8 and 9), as stipulated in the policy document of the Department of Education (1997:28) and Kramer (2005:163). This means that the educator should calculate the time to be taken by the learning area per day. However, Kramer (1999:166) indicates that the traditional timetable structure has many flaws that include the following:

2.4.5.1. Time loss

In some secondary schools, learners move from one class to another to attend lessons. In other schools it is the educator who moves from one class to another. Kramer (1999:166) indicates that they take 5 minutes per period to move and settle down as a class before teaching begins. The time loss for the lesson period might not be covered. In addition, circuit meetings that start at 12h00 might negatively affect afternoon lessons.

2.4.5.2. Quality learning time

The traditional many-period timetables engage learners and educators in many fragmented and unrelated pieces of the curriculum. Kramer (1999:166) indicates that these short 35 minutes-periods make in-depth teaching and preparation of Outcomes-Based Education lessons difficult. This means that the arrangement of periods does not allow the unfolding relationship of the learning areas. Learners find them disintegrated,

while educators seem to offer learning areas they have not been trained for in this band. This might influence learner-educator relationship.

2.4.5.3. Quality relationship

The relationship amongst educators, learners and learning area might make timetabling a serious difficulty in a school with grades 8 and 9 (Senior Phase), and grades 10, 11 and 12. South African Democratic Teachers' Union (2005:22) discloses that educators are faced with the problem of fostering a quality relationship between subjects and learning areas when providing for them on a single timetable for grades 8 and 9 with eight learning areas while at the same time including grade 10, which offers seven subjects and add the six subjects for grades 11 and 12. In addition, there might be scenarios where one educator offers more than one learning area in the Senior Phase and a subject either in grades 10,11 or 12.

Congruently, an educator might be teaching large classes and have short contact times between fellow educators and learners. This might strain the teaching and learning process that it becomes difficult to build a close and trusting relationship. By implication, class discipline and use of appropriate teaching and learning strategies, with adequate resources, during lesson presentation, could be a nightmare.

2.4.5.4. Limits to teaching and learning techniques

Short periods might prevent educators from expanding their range of teaching, learning and assessment strategies. They might be channeled "to operate within the allotted time and pressurized to lecture and pass information in a shorter time than using different learning styles that learners have" (Kramer, 1999:167). Seemingly, quality learning which should be learner-paced might be overlooked, resulting in educators relying on

using teaching strategies that promote lecture methods rather than learning strategies, which are learner-centred and capable of promoting authentic learning.

2.4.5.5. Authentic learning

Teaching with outcomes in mind, Kramer (1999:167) indicates, demands teaching in context and locating learning content appropriately. The skill to be taught within a context might take more time than the timetable allows. Criticos *et al.* (2002:325) agrees with the latter that teaching in context is time consuming, difficult and it demands detailed cooperative planning with imaginative timetable. Furthermore, Criticos *et al.* (2002:320) explain that teaching in context of the desired outcomes is theme teaching, which teaches knowledge around real life experiences and skills in-use. This means that authentic learning must be linked with the learners' life.

The timetabling of the General Education and Training and the Further Education and Training bands, at the same school, might impact negatively on the authentic learning of learners if it is not appropriately planned. In support, South African Democratic Teachers' Union (2005:22) indicates that three timetables for grades 8 and 9 (Senior Phase), and grades 10,11 and 12, might run concurrently in the same school, resulting in noise disturbances and school time management pertaining to lunch-time and school out, disrupting learning.

For this reason, Dirkx and Prenger (1997:58) maintain that teaching in context makes the content relevant to learners, allows learners and educators to focus their attention on communication, self-expression, and discovery rather than on phonics. Seemingly, this approach is learner-centred and might require more time to integrate real-life context with curriculum content. In support, Kramer (1999:167) highlights that learning programmes are developed from more than one learning area content, but that learners are often incapable of detecting the linkage between different parts of the curriculum, due to

focusing on areas in discreetly and at different times. By implication, traditional timetables need to be revised in order to allow for fewer, but longer periods per day.

In conclusion, the use of timetabling might be a challenge to school management at schools with General Education and Training and Further Education and Training bands to put learning areas on a single, or separate, timetable according to phases, at the same school. Equally, lesson plans are tools that are demanded by the Department of Education as proof of what happens within a set period in a school timetable. This might pose challenges to the school management in control of both bands, on time management, at the same school.

2.5. SUMMARY

In the light of the literature reviewed in this chapter, the critical issues to be investigated are based on lesson plan changes. Jansen (in Jansen and Christie, 1999:203) and Bertman *et al.* (2000:180) maintain that for educators to understand properly lesson planning, they must get adequate training, resources and incentives. Bertman *et al.* (2000:179-180) and Tchibozo (2003:296) add that all educational changes, including lesson planning, require new skills, behaviour, beliefs and understanding of the changes in the curriculum. By implication, educators could integrate resources, teaching techniques and assessment standards to create effective teaching and learning situations.

In order to establish sound qualitative research on the problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and their use, the critical issues to be investigated in the next chapter are based on the following research tools: interviews and observation on lesson plan issues and their use in the classroom. The interview questions will be categorized as follows:

- The structure of a lesson plan
- Educators' change from the old lesson planning practices to the new, and
- Problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

The theoretical framework for this study was done on the analysis of the ways in which the educators have shifted from the old lesson plans to the new, how they use lesson plans, the structure of a lesson plan, and the problems experienced by educators in lesson planning.

In the light of what has been investigated in the previous chapter, this chapter deals with the qualitative research design; data collection techniques, namely, interviews and observation. The objective of the qualitative research design in this study was to establish through interviews, what problems were experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and the way educators were using them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes and classroom observation. The observation of the lesson plan in the book or educator portfolio helped the researcher to ascertain how the educators had shifted from the old ways of planning lessons to the new.

3.2. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH DESIGN

The study adopted a qualitative approach, using narrative data analysis from individual interviews and observation of Social Sciences educators in classroom practice. Powell and Renner (2003:1) explain individual interviews as the way to produce data in the form of notes or make a summary of the Social Sciences educator's interview for question-by-question analysis. The observations were recorded to describe what was seen and heard during classroom presentations.

“Qualitative research involves documenting real events, recording what people say (with word, gestures and tone). Observing specific behaviors, studying written documents or

Examining visual images” (Neuman, 1997:328). This methodology captures what the respondents say and interpret the complexities of lesson planning in this study.

The descriptive method was used to describe how the educators were planning their lessons by looking into the lesson plan structures they had adopted as policy. However, a case study would couple the descriptive and explanatory methods to get in-depth information. This means that educators could show competence on how they used lesson plans as tools to achieve the learning outcomes with their lesson plan design and presentations.

The explanatory method was used to learn the truth about the problems experienced by educators in planning and using Social Sciences lessons for the Senior Phase level during the interview process. The experiences in this context determined the educators’ problems on how to plan and use the lesson plans, their attitudes and emotional responses on lesson planning in order to detect their paradigm shift from the old to the new. In short, the study investigated how the educators shifted from the old ways of planning Social Sciences to the new approach.

In this design, the researcher carefully listened to the responses in order to understand and capture information without imposing pre-existing experiences.

3.3. CASE STUDY

A case study research design is suitable to be used to get immersed information. Neuman (1997:331) defines a case study as a design that gathers a large amount of information on one or a few lesson plan cases so that the researcher should go into great depth and get sufficient details on the cases being examined. The researcher visited schools to get qualitative information and became familiar with how educators were planning lessons and using them as tools to achieve the Social Sciences learning outcomes in their presentations.

Not all schools in the Mankweng Circuit could be visited. A purposive sampling of four secondary schools was selected for the purpose of this study. Ramchander (2004:126) explains a purposive sampling as a non-probability sampling applied when conducting in-depth personal interviews because the researcher decides about who or what study units would be involved. In this study, a purposive sampling of educators offering Social Sciences in grade 9 would be involved.

3.4. POPULATION AND SAMPLING

The population was all educators offering Social Sciences in the Senior Phase established for the study. In this study, the population of educators was selected from the Mankweng Circuit. The sample is a subset of the target population. In this study, the purposive sampling consisted of four Social Sciences educators teaching in grade 9 and their respective four Heads of the Department.

3.4.1. SAMPLE LOCATION AND CRITERIA

Two rural and two semi urban secondary schools in the Mankweng Circuit, with Senior Phase Social Sciences learning area, were selected. The secondary schools were selected by looking into their final learner performance in Grade 12. Two of the best and two poorly performing secondary schools in terms of the final Grade 12 analysis of results were selected for the study. This criterion has been chosen because these summative results were made available to the public. The study focused on the Grade 9 class as the output in the Senior Phase level of the General Education and Training Band.

The schools were selected because the lesson plans informed the researcher of the planning diversity practiced by individual educators at their various schools. A preparatory letter was sent to the sampled schools in the Mankweng Circuit before the researcher visited the institutions. This letter served as proof of permission from the Department of Education for the researcher to conduct research at its public schools.

The researcher stayed at the institution for a week to collect information. Although the major participant was the grade 9 Social Science educator, the Head of the Department in the learning area as the curriculum leader and manager at school would also be selected. The Head of the Department was participating because he/she is the school-based curriculum coordinator and supporter of educators in the social Sciences learning area. This means that these latter participants could reveal the problems experienced by educators in planning lessons.

Grade 9 classes were visited to investigate how lesson plans were used as tools to achieve the Social Sciences outcomes. The educators showed how teaching strategies, assessment, integration of outcomes, and resources were selected and used. The selected participants furnished the researcher with rich information as they were directly involved in the teaching and learning process of the Senior Phase, Social Sciences learning area.

Social Sciences educators as implementers, designers of learning programmes and curriculum leaders were worthy to be selected, interviewed and observed, as they were the participants who might be experiencing the problems investigated in this study. One educator was selected in each case.

3.5. VALIDITY

Validity is an appropriate measure to check specific decisions that relate to the research problems to describe how the instrument is used to collect data. Maxwell (1996:87) refers to validity as the correctness of an explanation or description and interpretation of data. In the case of this study, a valid description emanates from what the researcher saw during observation and heard during the interview. Commensurate to this, Creswell (2003:171) defines validity as the ability to raise the potential facts about that which draws the correct inferences from the data collected in the study. For this reason, the researcher will describe in detail the procedures to be followed in conducting this study. Validity thus refers to the degree of relevance of the instrument to be used to collect the

necessary data. A reliable instrument would assist the researcher to obtain information that is free from measurement errors.

The researcher thus observed the educators portfolios to check on how competent they were in designing the structure of a lesson plan. The problems they were experiencing on a regular basis were investigated during the interviews. One class visit was deemed sufficient per school per educator.

3.6. PILOT STUDY

A permission letter to conduct a pilot study pertaining to this research was issued by the Department of Education. Maxwell (1996:45) and Babbie (1992:105) define a pilot study as a test of ideas and methods used to conduct an inductive study. The purpose of a pilot study assisted the researcher to generate an understanding of the concepts relevant on lesson planning in a school set-up. A plan without implementation would be meaningless; hence, the use of lesson plans as tools to achieve the learning outcomes was looked into. The pilot study was done at one secondary school in the Mankweng Area for a period of two weeks.

This pilot study assisted the researcher to choose a title and formulate the problem statement, aim and objectives and the research design of this study. The researcher also decided to focus on grade 9 class of the Senior Phase level for data collection because that was where the achievement of outcomes should be noticed.

3.7. VARIABLE

A variable as an event, category and behaviour that the interviewee would express and it could have different values in a study. Schumacher (2001:84) indicates that there are categorical variables and measured variables. The study opted for a categorical variable. Powell and Renner (2003:2) add that categorizing information brings meaning to the

study and it helps to organize and describe the sub-themes, which were identified through responses to each question.

The categorical variable was based on knowledge and understanding of the desired outcomes, the way educators shifted from the old to the new lesson plan approach for both trained and untrained educators and the problems experienced by Social Sciences educators in planning and how they were using those plans to achieve the learning outcomes.

Furthermore, some educators were opting for structured and unstructured lesson plans. The general information was gathered to investigate whether Social Sciences educators and their Heads of the Department were qualified or unqualified, experienced or inexperienced in the teaching and management of the Social Sciences learning area as well as on the problems based on achieving and not achieving the desired outcomes, among others.

The variable competence in educators on lesson planning was an antecedent to the variable achievement of the learning outcomes in Social Sciences learning area. The achievement of outcomes, therefore, was a result of the competence of the educators to plan appropriately. The classroom variables such as the use of teaching styles, integration patterns and cognitive level of the formative assessment questions during lesson implementation, and the environment variable are unavoidable during data collection when using interview and observation.

3.8. DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

3.8.1. INTERVIEW

Structured interview and un-structured questions for educators and the Heads of the Department were used. The structured questions might be supplemented with follow up questions as probes, with the intention not to obtain 'yes' or 'no' responses from the

responses but they were meant to address the ambiguities. These assisted the researcher to establish how the educators were experiencing problems in planning lessons and to explain the events in their teaching environment. These were used to enrich data through their gestures while their feelings could be openly exposed.

A tape-recorder was used to obtain information from the participants and it was later transcribed. The researcher explained the purpose of recording the discussions to all the respondents in detail and assured them that it was made for this study only. Note taking was used to write and capture gestures that showed behaviours and attitudes depicted by the participants.

Each participant was interviewed for 1(one) hour per day to accommodate contingencies and allow the participants to give sufficient details. The researcher returned on three occasions to conduct interviews at each school. The interview questions consisted of 45 structured questions for the educators as well as 25 questions for the Head of the Department. The questions for the educators and Heads of the Department were guided by the following categories:

Category A: Seven interview questions dealing with the general information, namely: gender, teaching experience, qualifications learning area and other subjects offered in the General Education and Training and Further education and Training Band. This would be used for the educator and the Heads of the Department.

Category B: Dealing with the use of lesson plans, knowledge and understanding of the structure of a lesson plan.

Category C: Dealing with how educators changed their ways of planning lessons from the old to the new ways.

Category D: Dealing with the problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons.

3.8.2. CONDUCTING THE INTERVIEWS

The researcher used individual interviews for both educators and Heads of the Department in each school visited so that each interviewee could be free to divulge information. The focus group was difficult to get together because the purpose of the study was not to disrupt the smooth running of the school and to avoid the dominant personalities from influencing the responses.

The researcher encouraged the respondents to continue talking while nodding the head, making sounds that showed interest and encouraging them to talk more. Respondents were encouraged to repeat and elaborate on their discussion in order to get to the true patterns of interactions and events that are common, similar and differing in terms of responses in lesson planning problems. The sub-themes or responses were identified and classified into categories. The researcher explained the actual meaning of the data, and the logical reasoning was achieving.

In order to avoid missing the information, the responses were captured by using a tape-recorder and the writing down of facts in a notebook to be a backup of any technological problem that might arise during the interview. The responses or sub-themed from the interviewees were translated into meaningful descriptions.

3.8.3. OBSERVATIONS

The researcher observed lesson presentations and related her observations with the objectives of the study, drawing conclusions and analysing data continuously, which depicted the use of a lesson plan as a tool to achieve the Social Sciences learning outcomes. The very act of viewing lesson plan books or educators' portfolios and recording the findings evolved the understanding of the lesson plan problems experienced.

3.9. ADMINISTRATION OF INTERVIEWS

The request for permission to conduct the study was forwarded to the Limpopo Department of Education (see appendix 1) and written permission from the management was granted (appendix 2). Furthermore, the researcher wrote a letter to the selected schools and attached a copy of the permission letter (appendix 2) to make the appointment authentic.

The purpose was to prepare school heads of the Department and Social Sciences educators in grade 9 to expect a visit from the researcher. In case A, two educators were supposed to participate; but unfortunately one withdrew without prejudice due to sport commitments of the school. The researcher then explained the rights of the participants before the interview began. Among others, it was mentioned that their participation was voluntary, anonymous, and that they had the right to withdraw. A private and silent venue was organized for the interview to be conducted without disturbances in all instances.

One school could have been used but the researcher wanted to get more in-depth information about the problem statement, the problems experienced by educators in planning lessons and how to use them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes in the Social Sciences learning area.

The following chapter analyses and interprets the data collected from the four case study areas. One educators and one Head of the Department were interviewed and only grade 9 Social Sciences educators were observed.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter the researcher discussed how she collected data from the respondents. In this chapter, the researcher presents the data obtained from the respondents at the four schools visited. The narrative data analysis from the Social Sciences educators and Heads of the Department interviews are presented question by question, coupled with evidence from the observation made.

The data collected consists of the categories stated in Chapter One, namely;

- Category A: General information
- Category B: Knowledge and understanding of the lesson plan structure
- Category C: How educators changed their ways of planning lessons from the old to the new approaches; and
- Category D: Problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons.

In this section, data were collected using structured and semi-structured interviews. The semi-structured interviews were used to get intensive or in-depth information as a result of spontaneous responses that emanated during the interview sessions. Analysis of data based on the general information and the narrative research design would be applied to the main categories or themes and sub-themes of the study.

4.2. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA FROM INTERVIEWS WITH EDUCATORS

4.2.1. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT EDUCATORS

This category assisted the researcher to understand the reason behind the findings of this study. The aim and objectives of the study dealt with the following general information:

4.2.1.1. Teaching experience of Social Sciences educators

Educators have varying teaching experiences. Three of the Social Sciences educators interviewed had more than 20 years' teaching experience, one less than 20 years' which included experience gained prior to the inception of Outcomes- Based Education in 1998. This indicated that all the Social Sciences educators interviewed started teaching through the old curriculum approach.

4.2.1.2. Experience in teaching grade 9

Two of the respondents had less than 5 years' teaching experience in grade 9 specifically while one respondent from school B of the four educators interviewed had more than 5 years' teaching experience while the educator in school C had between 10 and 20 years' teaching experience in the field. This means that no inexperienced Social Sciences educator was offering this learning area in grade 9 as per selected cases.

4.2.1.3. Teaching qualifications

All the educators from the schools visited were professionally qualified. They are qualified as follows: In school A the respondent has National Professional Diploma In Education, school B and D the respondents have Secondary Teacher's Diploma and in school C the respondents has post Graduate Certificate in Education.

4.2.1.4. Teaching qualifications in Social Sciences

In this sub-theme three of the four respondents had academic and professional qualifications in Social Sciences. Although all these educators were professionally qualified as educators (sub-theme 4.2.1.3), only one respondent was teaching Social Sciences without the relevant professional and academic qualifications. The educator was qualified in Mathematics and Physical Science, which are not related to the Social Sciences learning area in context. The educator indicated that the learning area was allocated to her because the school management mentioned that Social Sciences was not problematic. She further complained that the Social Sciences classes were overcrowded, and they added workload to her field of specialty.

4.2.2. KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE

This category of the knowledge and understanding of the lesson plan structure entails what a lesson plan is and which elements are associated with it. A lesson plan as described in Chapter Two refers to the tool that maintains classroom order and entails the nature of the information needed for the teaching, learning and assessment process in order to achieve the desired outcome in Social Sciences, while knowledge refers to the insight information received. Understanding in this context, being how that knowledge of the lesson plan structure is perceived and apprehended as agreed upon.

These elements show the nature of information needed in the classroom. They include the learning area, grade, time, content or key concepts, context or theme, learning outcomes, assessment standards, resources, learning activities, assessment, teaching strategies, learning barriers, expanded opportunities, reflection, school policy, and integration. All these elements within a lesson plan needed Social Sciences educators to know and understand how to plan and use these plans to guide the lesson presentations.

4.2.2.1. Lesson plan structure

Sub-theme 4.2.2.1 indicated that two of the respondents were aware of the lesson plan structure but three of the respondents revealed that they had been trained in the old way, while two of the four respondents interviewed were aware that it was a tool for preparation of the coming lesson. These respondents were aware that they were expected to plan. Only one of the interviewees with more than 10 years' teaching experience indicated that they could not start with the unknown. Their facial gestures showed negativity towards lesson plan structures. They raised their shoulders up and down to depict that they did not know how to plan Social Sciences lessons using the new approach.

The researcher asked them what they were not aware of in a lesson plan structure. All four indicated that they were aware that a lesson plan is important in teaching but they were afraid to plan and teach using learning outcomes because they did not know how these desired outcomes should be achieved, what to look for, and what was expected from them as educators to do in class in order to portray competencies to teach with outcomes in mind.

4.2.2.2. Assessment of Grade9 learners

It is evident that three of the four Social Sciences educators were using the old way of assessment and they did not know how to use the new assessment methods and forms. The fourth one indicated that they were unable to assess using the assessment standards. It was clear that all four Social Sciences educators were still stuck with the old assessment method. These respondents indicated that they did not know what to assess and how to allocate marks for projects, presentations, debates and interviews without being subjective.

The educators disclosed that they were just recording marks for the completion of the mark schedules but failed to disclose how the recording of marks was done. However,

When the researcher observed the lesson in progress, she evaluated quality of formative assessment used in the classroom, which was mostly objective and used closed questions rather than mixing with subjective and open ended questions.

I also looked into the educator's portfolio, which contained the assessment tasks and records of the learners. A portfolio is defined as "a showcase for the educator's work, where many types of assessment activities, forms and records are collected and kept" (Stenmark in Kramer, 2005:80). There was no lesson plan given to her during lesson presentations. This motivated her to request for the educator's portfolios. There were no lesson plans in these educators' portfolios to show the link towards achievement of learning outcomes with the few, loose summative assessment tasks and record she found in schools B and D. In school A assessment records and tasks were available with no trace of relating plans.

Assessment was still done in the old way and was separated from lesson planning. The assessment as an element of a lesson plan had many gaps in all four educator's work because they had not disclosed what they were supposed to assess and write in the lesson plan or explain their ways of assessment.

4.2.2.3. Assessment in Outcomes-Based Education

All the respondents in this sub-theme indicated that they had problems with the assessment jargons. They assessed knowledge and understanding outcomes through testing. In addition, three of the educators interviewed admitted that they were still stuck in the old assessment methods for the sake of progress. This was revealed by forms of frustration from one respondent in school D, who was throwing hands into the air continuously with his eyes closed. He further remarked "We teach and waste energy throughout the year and find the final continuous task for assessment for grade 9 from the National Department of Education being irrelevant to the work done during the academic year and learners copy work from one another and pass." This showed that transition in assessment is not easy.

In support, two out of the four respondents revealed that they were unable to assess using assessment forms such as debates, interview and presentations (sub-theme 4.2.2.2). In other words, marks were given randomly without using assessment guidelines.

The researcher further asked the respondents how they included the assessment standards in the lesson plan. Three of the interviewees ignored this unstructured question but one interviewee indicated that she did not understand why there were assessment standards and assessment as two different elements within a lesson plan. She further indicated that she knew how to determine assessment standards written with learning outcomes, but she was still struggling to choose the correct one from the list given in the policy document.

The findings in sub-theme 4.2.3 suggested that educators were still mainly using tests to assess learner's work. The home-based activities in Outcomes- Based Education favoured learners with a well-structured support system at home. This means that assessment might need further research to substantiate this. Although, this study does not focus on assessment but on lesson planning, assessment cannot be ignored as lesson planning and assessment are inseparable. However, the study would not investigate assessment in depth.

4.2.2.4. Challenges faced by educators in developing learning activities as one of the elements of a lesson plan structure

Teaching, learning and assessment changes become less teacher-centred and more learner-centred as well as, less transmissional where educators transmit or transfer knowledge to learners. The Outcomes- Based education approach tends to be transactional where both educators and learners interact as a team in pursuit of learning. Kramer (2005:89) defines learning activities as roles that make the educator to move away from being active providers of information thereby making learners passive consumers in education.

Three of the respondents revealed that there was a shortage of worksheets for the development of learning activities to be able to transcend, although this merely symbolized the lack of knowledge on how to develop learning activities. To add to this, Social Sciences educators were experiencing problems with learning activities in that they were not sure whether they were designed in worksheets to be available for perusal in the plan book or on lesson plans to make them serve as tools to achieve the desired outcomes. The researcher suspected that they thought worksheets should be made readily available to educators.

Evidently, two out of the four Social Sciences educators showed a negative attitude towards designing learning activities because they indicated that they were a waste of time and did not address the needs of all learners from different socio-economic backgrounds. Furthermore, the current teachers' guides in Outcomes-Based Education published ready-made lesson plans and assessment rubrics, which are against developing educators to be designers of learning programmes.

4.2.2.5. Departmental workshops received on Outcomes-Based Education

Since the educators showed in sub-theme 4.2.2.4 that they were unable to develop worksheets and had negative attitudes towards them as a resource, three of the respondents complained about insufficient workshops with little or no information to address Social Sciences lesson planning problems specifically. They indicated that they had left workshops without having gained Social Sciences lesson plan information and were dissatisfied. Their expectations were thus not met.

Furthermore, one educator disclosed that they were work-shopped in big numbers and unfortunately, those who failed to achieve their learning outcomes during their time of training as educators found it difficult to understand what was going on. They needed to be given retraining. This means that they needed to be trained in small numbers and that in-service training centers should be made available for crucial classroom issues.

Two of the respondents found Outcomes-Based Education too abstract to implement and they needed the trainers to suggest comprehensive approaches. This meant that the Social Sciences educators remained demotivated about planning Social Sciences lessons and implementing what they had learnt from the departmental workshops.

4.2.2.6. Enthusiastic about taking a class after these workshops

In this sub-theme, three of the educators were not enthusiastic to implement Outcomes-Based Education lesson planning after having attended workshops because they still lacked guidance, support and follow-up. They found the workshops boring. It is evident from one of the responses received that the facilitators were incompetent and did not devote the workshops to real classroom issues and make the educators work as implementers. One Social Sciences interviewee disclosed that they were experiencing problems with lesson planning because at workshops, they listened to trainers reading manuals rather than making them know what to do in class.

They emphasized that the workshops should not be talk shows. The Social Sciences educators were undoubtedly unhappy on how the workshops were conducted. One interviewee in school B added that they were attending the workshops to eat expensive meals and they left without being capacitated on actual classroom issues, lesson planning included.

4.2.2.7. Management of time of Social Sciences lessons in the General Education and Training as against that of subjects taught daily in the Further Education and Training bands

All the respondents indicated that there was one general timetable for all grades at their schools. In support, observations showed that all four cases visited were using one timetable with different time allocations per lesson period. In school A they used 45 minutes, school B and C used 35 minutes while school D used 1 hour 30 minutes for General Education and Training band and 45 minutes for the Further Education and

Training band. No definite policy was being followed. The timetables differed from one school to another. Two of the interviewees suggested that the schools should be divided into General Education and Training and Further Education and Training bands in order to adhere to the time allocation as required by policy, which is 30 minutes per period.

In addition, three of the interviewees agreed that a chaotic situation would result if the Senior Phase, grade 10 with National Curriculum Statement and the old syllabus for grade 11 and 12 time allocation could be done in the same school differently. This could be attributed to the fact that two of the respondents showed that the time allocation for Social Sciences as directed by policy was presently ignored.

This means that only one type of timetable per school was used to keep the teaching and learning process in progress. This is the convectional timetable as explained in Chapter Two. This study has thus revealed that timetabling is problematic in relation to the present school set-up and curriculum change. The Social Sciences educators were not sure whether the timetable used was suitable to the new curriculum approach because it differed from school to school visited. Timetabling, therefore, needs further research.

4.2.2.8. Achievement of Social Sciences learning outcomes

In sub-theme 4.2.2.8, three of the respondents revealed that the learners had not achieved the social Sciences learning outcomes because they just progressed to the next grade. In fact, the educators were not satisfied with the achievement of the learning outcomes. This might be attributed to the fact that the educators still found Outcomes-Based Education assessment difficult (sub-theme 4.2.2.3). This research stud has clearly shown that the grade 9 learners had not fully achieved the desired outcomes.

In this category, Social Sciences educators interviewed were also asked about the other elements of lesson planning, including barriers to learning, content, context, resources, expanded opportunities, reflection and integration. They showed understanding of elements such as content and resources only. They were quiet for a long time and the

researcher avoided pestering them to respond because they showed a lack of knowledge, and they were shy.

One respondent from school C, which had a school culture of trying out curriculum issues, revealed that she had a problem in differentiating between the expanded and extended opportunities. She further indicated that the facilitators at one workshop she had attended trainers had described these elements as one thing. The researcher gave an explanation and even referred to the explanation in the national Curriculum Statement policy document.

One educator in school A wanted to be clarified about integration, but he indicated that he was not teaching sections in Social Sciences which were being taught in other learning areas because he considered that as repetition and a time waste due to his heavy workload. The researcher explained the concept and immediately mentioned that lesson plan concepts were difficult and hidden to ordinary educators. He further suggested that there should be in-service training for educators.

At the end of this category during the interview, the educator in school A requested a copy of a lesson plan template and the researcher gave it to him the next day and to her surprise, during the observation day, no lesson plan was produced and when she was on her way to leave, the educator gave her that very template she had handed out. He was thus clearly unable to design learning activities, did not write the context which the lesson was going to follow, and it was only the resources column, content, grade, and the length of the period which were filled in and the other elements were not done.

He merely laughed and stated that the template looked simple but it was difficult for him to fill in because he did not know and understand how to apply what he thought he should write, select learning outcomes, and all their related elements. This showed that many social Sciences educators do not know how much information is needed in a lesson plan. They also bombarded learners with information and the learners were expected to respond to new information within a short time while they tended to be passive.

The other problem was that the Social Sciences educators were teaching without allocating time to each activity in a lesson. There were no activities given to learners. Only teacher talk dominated the lesson. Two educators visited were reading from the textbook and the other Social Sciences educators photocopied the relevant pages to teach about and gave them to the learners to be used during lesson presentation. This was the same as being textbooks bound. It meant that some social Sciences educators were controlled by textbook rather than by their professional judgment to plan for integration between learning strategies and learning outcomes.

4.2.3. HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW METHODS

In this category, like in any curriculum change, Social Sciences educators were expected to change their ways of planning lessons, attitudes, cultures of teaching, and assessing learning outcomes. This involves a paradigm change of educators in terms of a shift in focus to change from being the suppliers of information to being facilitators of learning, from negative to positive attitudes and to skills that will make educators designers of learning programmes that would ultimately influence their thinking patterns. The following responses from the sub-themes below elucidated different findings.

4.2.3.1. Views concerning the changing curriculum on lesson planning within the school system

Two out of the four respondents revealed that there was still resistance to change from the old assessment methods to the new approach. Only one interviewee from school B indicated that it was difficult to shift from the old teaching methods of supplying information to being facilitators of learning because he indicated that he had never been taught how to teach in the Outcomes-Based Education approach while those who happened to receive training complained that it was just piecemeal.

All respondents interviewed blamed the School management Team for being too rigid to change. The four respondents blamed the experienced educators for being resistant to lesson plan changes. Ultimately, everybody was blamed for being resistant to accept lesson plan change within the curriculum. From the schools visited, no Head of the Department was teaching grade 9 classes. These classes were overcrowded with many curriculum challenges. School A had 95 learners, school B had 125 learners, school C had 55 learners and 95 learners in school D. The grade 9 classes were overcrowded and all respondents wanted to know how to plan for this kind of classes. It was also evident that there was no school policy followed in relation to the new curriculum changes.

Resultantly, three of the respondents showed that the lesson plan change within the curriculum had left educators change behind. Hence, there were no lesson plans in place during the observation of most of the educators. Lesson presentation was done directly from the Social Sciences textbooks and not informed by learning outcomes. Investigating this information, three of the Social Sciences educators revealed that they had received piecemeal training because the trainers too were not well conversant with the new approach. The responses revealed that there had been no shifting of educators from the old to the new lesson plan approach.

4.2.3.2. Knowledge of any spill-effects that hinder preparation of he lesson plan steps

In this sub-theme, two respondents reported that changing of the mindset of educators was still difficult. Evidently, there was a lack of teamwork from educators for cooperative plans to be made. Most of the respondents indicated that they were experiencing numerous disturbances that were disrupting the preparation of the lesson plan steps. The researcher deduced that in general educators were not prepared to plan cooperatively.

The researcher suspected that these educators were dodging certain points. She thus further asked them what the causes of these disturbances were. They differed. One

respondent in school C mentioned that planning is tedious and demanding in its beginning, while the respondent from school B reported that educators would be too tired from marking and preparing assessment reports at the end of the year in order to start lesson plan steps for the coming year. Two interviewees in school A and D, respectively, stated that working hard without incentives was demoralizing. When this statement was made one educator rubbed his thumb with the pointing finger gesture indicating that he wanted more money.

They were asked if the Limpopo Department of Education would increase their salaries with immediate effect, would they improve on lesson planning but they reported “provided we were trained intensively on lesson planning techniques”. Two out of four respondents in school A and D were focusing on an extrinsic motivation, which disregarded knowledge and understanding of the lesson plan structure and a shift from the old lesson plan approach to the new curriculum. Furthermore, they never showed any signs of willingness to improve their lesson planning techniques.

It can be deduced that these educators were striving for incentive payments without acquiring the internal information of planning lessons and understanding of other classroom issues in order to achieve the desired outcomes in teaching. This revealed that some professionals were more interested in what they should earn than in what were supposed to know, plan, implement, and assess.

4.2.3.3. Attitudes towards developing the lesson plan steps

All the respondents were not planning well-structured lessons and lesson plan steps because they lacked the knowledge and motivation to do so (sub-theme 4.2.3.2). Two out of the four respondents demonstrated a negative attitude towards lesson planning. Only one respondent indicated that other activities from the Limpopo Department of Education were disrupting the planning of lessons, hence the lack of lesson plans. The other two respondents were teaching without training on how to plan Social Sciences lessons. This

implies that the Social Sciences lesson plans were not used as tools to achieve the desired outcomes.

This revealed that Social Sciences educators interviewed were unwilling to shift from the old approach of planning to the new lesson plan methods. In addition, the Social Sciences learning area periods in the General Education and Training band were done without looking into the educator's competencies and qualifications (sub-theme 4.2.1.4).

4.2.3.4. Attitudes towards developing lesson plans

The respondents showed a negative attitude towards lesson planning (sub-theme 4.2.3.3). Two of the respondents interviewed had different interpretations on lesson planning. They explained certain elements differently such as the number of learning outcomes to be written on a lesson plan, the difference between teaching strategies and learning strategies. Some educators just avoided the planning of lessons. It was evident that the Social Sciences educators were aware of the fact that a lesson plan is a tool demanded by the Department but they were not doing so.

One respondent in school A revealed that the policy documents on the Integrated Quality Management System and lesson planning guideline demanded that educators should plan lessons before teaching. The lack of lesson plans was creating conflicts among the educators and school management to such an extent that in some schools it disrupted cooperative planning. An educator in school C revealed in their school, educators attended different workshops and came up with different interpretations of the elements of a lesson plan. To avoid strained human relations, the educators resorted to unstructured plans. By observation, educators find the planning of lessons difficult and are skeptical about it.

4.2.3.5. Support from the Head of the Department or departmental officials on lesson plan challenges

Three of the respondents revealed that there was no support for educators from Heads of the Department and government officials while one of the Social Sciences educators were skeptical about management's knowledge on how to plan. In addition, the educator in school B reported that the School Management Team does not want to teach senior Phase classes. On the other hand, two respondents reported that most trainers were not clear about lesson planning.

The educators indicated that they were experiencing problems on how to relate content to the desired learning outcomes and how to assess according to the new curriculum. This lack of support made them think that curriculum change on lesson planning was not important.

4.2.3.6. Problems experienced by educators who do not plan Social Sciences lessons

One respondent indicated that the educators were negative about lesson plan changes and they dodged lessons, while two interviewees disclosed that some educators were attending to their personal issues during periods as they had lost interest in school lessons.

Three of the respondents were worried about the newly appointees who had just been employed and had to teach Social Sciences in grade 9 without prior orientation or training on lesson planning remained a question to some of the respondents. They were worried that how can the newly appointees after staying home without preparatory training on lesson plan changes would just resume their duties. This may influence other experienced educators and other senior officials not to take this lesson plan change seriously.

This lack of knowledge on Outcomes-Based Education lesson planning was making effective teaching difficult and led to many classroom disorders. Two of the respondents indicated that many educators were knocking off early before the bell rang for the next period. One interviewee showed that there was a minimal knowledge on how to plan learning area content that could relate to the learning outcomes. Problems such as knocking off early from class caused ill-disciplined classrooms and learners dodging classes for loitering outside classrooms.

In short, three of the respondents indicated that there was no need to plan lessons since the new appointees just resumed their services without orientation. During observation, the interviewees started their lessons late and teaching was done straight from the textbook without the aid of any other resources. Some of the learners were sleeping on their desks while others were not attentive and only active learners took part in the class discussions. All these factors indicate that learners are finding teaching and learning meaningless.

4.2.3.7. Problems experienced by educators in planning assessment in Social Sciences lessons

Sub-theme 4.2.3.7 shows that all of the respondents reported that the educators did not understand the assessment jargon and assessment forms. They were still following the old way of planning without including assessment (sub-theme 4.2.2.2). Their responses revealed that the educators were unable to use the assessment forms as part of the elements of the lesson plan structure during planning.

In addition, two out of four respondents reported that assessment was difficult to some of the educators because they were unable to allocate marks on assessment forms. Two of the four respondents regarded assessment as a separate entity from lesson planning (sub-theme 4.2.2.2 and sub-theme 4.2.2.3).

During observation of the lessons, it was only in school D where the respondent had an assessment plan. The problem was that the educator's lesson plan had two learning outcomes and two assessment standards. There was no relationship between the learning outcomes, assessment standards, and the learning activities.

4.2.3.8. Solution to the lesson plan problems

Two of the respondents indicated that Outcomes-Based Education lesson planning was managed and implemented on a trial and error basis at schools and from above. It may thus be concluded that managers might not know how to plan Outcomes-Based Education lessons. To solve this, only one respondent indicated that there should be a clustering of schools for workshops using the competencies of subject advisors and specialized employees in classroom issues.

Two respondents indicated that the Limpopo Department of Education should provide readymade lesson plans to schools because the educators would then be able to transfer information as facilitators do at workshops. The researcher found the latter, contradicting with the norms and standard policy framework on the roles of educators. When the respondents were asked for clarity, one commented that it would make lesson planning for educators easy, while the other three respondents found the information similar to textbook bound teaching. This showed that some educators would not want to be turned into receivers of information instead of being designers of learning programmes.

4.2.3.9. The purpose to shift from the traditional lesson plan to the new

Initially, two Social Sciences respondents did not know the purpose of shifting from the old to the new approach of lesson planning. Some respondents revealed that lesson plans needed educators who are competent and worked with commitment. Only one respondent stated that educators needed to change the ways of lesson plan writing with the changing times (sub-theme 4.2.3.1 and 4.2.3.2).

All the respondents further indicated that there were only a few staff development programmes done in education to help educators move from using the old approach of teaching to the new. In support, three respondents revealed that the new approach on lesson planning was just demanded from them without prior orientation and training, explanation for change and the purpose to plan with outcomes in mind. They knew lesson plans from their previous experiences and teacher education before the inception of Outcomes-Based Education. However, they were expected to plan lessons without receiving training on the new lesson plan approach.

Their emotional utterances included that “educators would soon be blamed for failure to implement the curriculum, media would also belittle us on this, the whole nation is looking at us ... it is better that we resign to save our image”. Reading through this, it became evident that the respondent was afraid to face the challenges.

4.2.4. PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS

All the respondents were still using the old teaching approaches because they did not know how to plan Social Sciences lessons using the learning outcomes. In fact, all of the educators interviewed agreed that it was difficult for them to understand the learning outcomes because they had never received training in outcomes-Based education Social Sciences lesson planning, while three revealed that they were failing to integrate Outcomes-Based Education information.

The failure to understand the learning outcomes shows a lack of insight and conceptualization of the desired outcomes. All four Social Sciences educators interviewed revealed that they were just writing down the important points before going to class. This may be interpreted that educators merely copy information from textbooks and impart it to the class without planning according to the learning outcomes. Three out of the four agreed that certain textbooks of the new curriculum contain insufficient content knowledge.

The researcher informally asked what they were doing to solve the problem: They reported that they relied solely on textbooks because they did not have time and resource centers to search for more information to support learning. The respondents wanted to be supplied with everything without them taking the initiatives of their envisaged lessons in context. This would be contrary to the democratic principles, which the Outcomes-Based Education curriculums advocate.

This revealed that the Social Sciences educators interviewed were concerned with what they were going to teach in class instead of how they were going to manipulate learner's activities to achieve the desired outcomes. Learner involvement and learner-centred teaching are a greater challenge than using textbooks in the new approach throughout in the educators' professional life. The other challenging lesson plan problem is that the educators should improve their professional competencies beyond their first year of teaching.

4.2.4.2. Mechanism of planning used since 1990 when educators had dumped their plan books

Three respondents had no plan books, while two indicated that they had no lesson plans. One respondent was adamant that classroom issues should be the educator's private concern. However, two out of four interviewees indicated that they were trying to create lesson plans, but there was no plan book available. During observations, all the respondents did not have a well-structured lesson plan.

4.2.4.3. Challenges experienced by educators when planning an Outcomes-Based Education Social Sciences lesson

The educators were faced with challenges in designing a Social Sciences lesson plan and using them as a tool to achieve the desired learning outcomes. This was highlighted by the acknowledgement by educators that there were problematic concepts in the lesson plan structure. They further revealed that lesson plan preparation is time-consuming, while some of the educators were not sure if they could follow the lesson plan steps.

Three of the respondents were scared to initiate lesson plan changes at school because they indicated that they were not sure of the Social Sciences lesson planning steps. This had been supported by the fact educators from various phases attended workshops at different times and came up with different knowledge, interpretation and understanding of the lesson plan issues.

The fact that educators loathed the planning of lessons confirms the negative attitude they have on lesson planning (sub-theme 4.2.3.3 and 4.2.3.4). Since two of the respondents showed that there were numerous conflicts among the staff members due to the different interpretations of lesson plan structures by different educators. Furthermore, there was such an enormous workload that they had no chance to plan.

Three of the educators interviewed emphasized that training workshops from the Limpopo Department of education should address specifically challenges on planning for overcrowded classes and not for some educators to make the inception of lesson planning difficult because overcrowding of classes should be taken as a challenge for educators to show creativity to plan in context.

In addition, three respondents were scared to initiate the lesson plan changes at school because they were not sure on how the social sciences lesson planning steps were supposed to be done. The remaining respondent confirmed that the negative attitudes

these educators had on lesson planning (sub-theme 4.2.3.3 and 4.2.3.4) prevented planning of lessons.

4.2.4.4. Perceptions of the old lesson plans as against the Outcomes-Based Education lesson plans

Two respondents agreed that the old lesson plan approach was superior to the Outcomes-Based Education lesson approach because it was content-based while the Outcomes-Based education has no syllabus to follow. This means that the educators' mindsets towards the development of learning programmes as guidelines to follow in the new curriculum still a challenge. One respondent showed that educators did not know Outcomes-Based Education lesson planning and lacked the confidence to design the lesson plans. This is indicated by the fact that one respondent was not sure of the concepts used in lesson planning and was unable to differentiate content and teaching in context.

What the educators learnt during their teacher training did not relate to what they found in the actual teaching situation. One Social Sciences interviewee disclosed that they did not apply what they had acquired during their teacher education. By interpretation, educators do not know whether they should plan and teach to achieve the Social Sciences learning outcome or whether they should plan and teach to achieve content. For this reason, the educators resorted to their own individual unstructured lesson planning and their personal interpretation of what they were supposed to achieve.

4.2.4.5. Importance of teaching by using lesson plans

All the educators interviewed were aware of the importance of a lesson plan but they were not planning lessons (sub-theme 4.2.3.4) due to the fact that they found it too difficult and strenuous. In addition, the educators regarded designing lesson plans as time-consuming and increasing the workload (sub-theme 4.2.3.5). The heavy workload in the lesson planning appeared to discourage educators from developing their skills.

All four respondents indicated their awareness of the importance of lesson plans as tools for tracing the educator's progress, assisting the educators to see whether objectives had been met and building a good relationship between educators and learners. Two of the respondents further showed that lesson plan assisted them to know when to proceed and maintain classroom order and school discipline. The afore-mentioned revealed that although they knew and understood the importance of a lesson plan, they found it strenuous and difficult to execute.

4.2.4.6. Experiences of teaching without lesson plans in place

Three of the four respondents indicated that most educators without lesson plans did not stay in class for the duration of the lesson while three of the interviewees confirmed that other educators were dodging lesson attendance as well. The latter also remarked that no lesson plan, on purpose to go to class. By observation, educators often tended to arrive late in class and left early. In school B, the educator whiled away time by taking truant learners out of the class before the real teaching began.

4.2.4.7. Supply of resources used in the daily planning, teaching, learning, and lesson assessment

Once again all the interviewees indicated a shortage of classrooms and textbooks as an obstacle to effective teaching. There were overcrowded classrooms in all four schools visited. The educators revealed that there was a shortage of classrooms. In two of the schools visited, management ignored the learning area while the educators felt unattended and unwanted since there was no Head of the Department or coordinator to monitor and give support to Social Sciences educators. For example, one respondent said "we are left alone in grade 8 and 9 with no direction, no supervision, while other learning areas used to have departmental meetings with their Heads of the Department". This shows that the Social Sciences learning area is ignored and planning, teaching and assessment becomes an individual matter.

Three respondents showed that they ran short of maps and their schools had few photocopiers. These findings revealed the problems experienced in the planning of Social Sciences lessons without resources at the educators' disposal. Sometimes learners were given newspapers to do projects at home. They instead use them for other household activities and they substituted toilet rolls. This meant that resources given to learners were misused.

4.2.4.8. Support system to educators with lesson plan problems

All the respondents clearly articulated the need for workshops, in the Social Sciences learning area, in particular, so that educators could acquire skills needed for the planning of Social Sciences lessons and the designing of assessment plans in relation to learning outcomes. All four respondents further added that the School Management Team and district management must be capacitated to really recognize the urgency of curriculum change.

Three of the respondents indicated that school and circuit managements needed to be capacitated concerning Outcome-Based Education curriculum issues to minimize their skeptical nature at present. In addition, they further indicated that workshops should be accompanied by follow-up support programmes, in-service training centers be made available and intensive training given to the newly appointees. Two out of four respondents revealed that the school policy was operating against the new curriculum on assessment, lesson planning and timetabling.

Only one of the four respondents revealed that the time allocation for the Social Sciences learning area within the school timetable was problematic. She revealed that the time allocation was too short for context-based teaching and affecting the quality of her teaching time negatively. This was not examined in depth because it demanded numerous questions to be asked. This time allocation might need further research on the present timetabling versus curriculum changes in the Social Science learning area (sub-theme 4.2.3.6 and 4.2.3.7).

4.2.4.9. Achievement of learning outcomes without the use of lesson plans

Three of the respondents agreed that it was difficult to teach with learning outcomes in mind without well structured and written lesson plan in place. Evidently, three of the educators needed to know how to develop a written plan for the achievement of these outcomes. In support of the afore-mentioned, there seems to be a need for workshops on the understanding of the learning outcomes.

Educators need to know how to administer assessment recording and reporting in order to show competence in the achievement of the Social Sciences learning outcomes at the Senior Phase level. During observations, there was no written, well-structured lesson plans for most interviewees in the Social Sciences learning area. Two respondents said, “Ah! We just take the textbooks and go to class.” This shows teaching is textbook bound with no lesson in place.

4.2.4.10. Importance of the Social Science learning outcomes in a lesson plan

Three respondents stated that educators and learners should think critically in relation to the learning outcomes, while two of the respondents showed the importance of learning outcomes on planning. Three respondents revealed that learning outcomes help educators and learners to think critically on how planning, teaching, learning, and assessment should be done.

In addition, some respondents said that the learning outcomes guide and determine whether planning and the implementation processes had been achieved. The researcher could sense that the responses given were not relating to teaching. Some were furthering their studies on curriculum issues. They were responding in relation to what they had learnt and not on what they were doing in class. This is guided by the fact that Social Sciences respondents were not planning lessons and had no trace of learning outcome in place but they gave relevant responses.

4.2.4.11. Problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons

Three respondents (as supported by sub-theme 4.2.4.3 and 4.2.4.5) revealed that they did not know and understand how to plan and what was needed in the planning of lessons in the Social Sciences learning area. This showed that the educators were experiencing problems with planning Social Sciences lessons as tools to achieve the intended learning outcomes. On the other hand, two of the respondents indicated that they were trained in either History or Geography. This means that it was problematic for them to address the Social Sciences part they were not trained in. In addition, planning and teaching the overcrowded classes was a problematic experience for the educators.

In conclusion, all the respondents did not know how to develop a lesson plan structure in relation to the learning outcomes of the Social Sciences learning area. Furthermore, three of the educators were resistant to change for fear of failure to plan and use lesson plans as tools to achieve the desired outcomes. Although one educator interviewed tried to plan lessons, she was not sure whether what she was doing at her school was right, or wrong (sub-theme 4.2.3.8).

All the respondents agreed that they were experiencing problems in planning, teaching, selecting, and using assessment standards in Social Sciences lessons with learning outcomes in mind. In essence, analysis and interpretation of categories A, B, C, and D shows a trend in the problems experienced by the educators in planning lessons, irrespective of their academic qualifications and Social Sciences teaching experiences.

The following section will reflect an analysis and interpretation of data based on the Heads of the Department responses.

4.3. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA FROM INTERVIEWS WITH HEADS OF THE DEPARTMENT

4.3.1. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT HEADS OF THE DEPARTMENT

4.3.1.1. Teaching experience of Heads of the Department

All four of the Heads of Department interviewed had more than 10years' of teaching experience, while three of them had more than 20 years'.

4.3.1.2. Experience in teaching grade 9

Two of the Heads of the Department interviewed, their experience in the teaching of Social Sciences in grade 9 was minimal. Three of them were not teaching grade 9. This might be the reason that they did not allocate learning areas in the Senior Phase level to themselves.

4.3.1.3. Teaching qualifications

The Heads of the Department from the schools visited were professionally qualified. In school A, the Heads of Department had Senior Teacher's Diploma, in school B, National Professional Diploma In Education, in school C, Primary Teacher's Diploma and in school D, the Head of Department had Senior Teacher, Diploma.

4.3.1.4 Teaching qualifications in Social Sciences

The learning area qualifications of the Heads of the Department in Social Sciences were nil. The criterion of having the required competency relevant to the Social Sciences learning area was apparently ignored in the appointment of these Heads of the Department. In school A and C, the Head of the Department and the acting Head of the Department were Natural Sciences educators and in school D, there was no Head of the

Department in Social Sciences, senior educator volunteered to coordinate the learning area. She had specialized in Home Economics. In school B the Head of the Department had the Geography part and had no History to lead the learning area in context.

4.3.2. KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE

This category has been explained in the first section. It would help in collecting data from the school management side in order to close the gaps.

4.3.2.1. Heads of the Department for General Education and Training or Further Education and Training bands

All four respondents in this sub-theme indicated that there was no focus on the General Education and Training band learning area. The Heads of the Department at schools were working in both bands. One interviewee revealed that there was no support for educators in grade 9 and no Head of the Department at his school for the Social Sciences learning area. She volunteered to coordinate the learning area due to shortage of human resources. This means that the Social Sciences learning area was given the last attention when compared to other learning areas.

4.3.2.2 Monitoring and controlling of the educators' portfolio on lesson planning

Three of the respondents agreed that Heads of the Department just checked on the number of tests given and the sections the learners had been tested upon without investigating the relationship of the tests with the planned learning outcomes. The monitoring and controlling of the educators' portfolio was based on the number of tests and not on lesson plans.

One respondent indicated that they were checking lesson planning with more emphasis on the National Curriculum Statement approach model, which they were just guessing.

This means that the Heads of the Department were not sure of what to check about lesson plans. She further indicated that Social Sciences educators were more knowledgeable than the management because they had never been trained. Two out of the four Heads of the Department interviewed mentioned that senior teachers were controlling the educators' work while others indicated that educators were expected to take care of their own work through self- evaluation. In other words, there was no control of the educators' work.

4.3.2.3. Challenges of monitoring the lesson plans by Heads of the Department

Three of the respondents did not know how to plan Social Sciences lessons and what support to get. In addition, two Heads of the Department complained that they had nowhere to go for consultation on issues pertaining to lesson planning when they encountered problems at school. There was no support structure in place from the department. She further indicated that other educators were using her periods to give additional activities to learners. The Social Sciences classes were overcrowded and one added she was unable to teach in groups.

Two of the respondents blame educators for the negative attitude they have towards lesson planning. During observation, however, they too had no lesson plans in place. This failure to plan lessons using the new approach in Social Sciences made their school-based support weak. Two of the respondents resorted to the old ways of teaching without structured lesson plans and three of the interviewees indicated that they never received training as part of the management. This shows that the Heads of the Department are not ready to face the challenges of the lesson plan and the curriculum.

4.3.2.4. Evidence of a lesson plan in the educators' portfolio

This showed that three respondents agreed that there was no evidence of a structured lesson plan because they did not understand how to plan Social Sciences lessons. In addition two Heads of the Department interviewed were in agreement with the educators

by indicating that lesson planning is time wasting and that they were just teaching directly from the textbook.

One respondent tried to plan but was not sure of what to do as a result of the lack of a support structure (sub-theme 4.3.2.3). Three of the respondents stated that Social Sciences educators and Heads of the Department were using unstructured lesson plans, which were thrown away after every lesson – hence the lack of evidence of a structured lesson plan.

4.3.2.5. Support given to educators(s) on lesson planning

Two of the respondents had not started with the planning of Social Sciences lessons because the concepts in planning still needed to be clarified. Furthermore, there was no support for educators while one interviewee disclosed that staff members were arguing on lesson plan issues due to their uncertainty and lack of a support structure. This might hinder innovative schools from progressing with lesson planning.

4.3.2.6. Educators' attitude to lesson planning

The fact that the educators did not know how to plan lessons mainly led to their negative attitude towards the planning of lessons. To support this, two Heads of the Department interviewed showed that lesson plans were too theoretical and an administrative burden.

By interpretation, lesson planning is divorced from the teaching, learning and assessment processes. However, three respondents revealed that the educators and the school management were eager to know how to plan. One respondent showed that although the educators were negative towards lesson plans, they were also negative towards reading lesson plan policies already delivered to schools.

In short, most educators and Heads of the Department interviewed do not know and understand the lesson plan structure due to their negative attitudes towards it and the lack

of support to address their fears within the curriculum change. All four Heads of the Department interviewed indicated that they had never received training in Outcomes-Based education lesson planning.

4.3.3. HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW

4.3.3.1. Views on the advantages of learning outcomes in the Social Sciences learning area

According to sub-theme 4.3.3.1, Heads of the Department were unable to show the advantages of learning outcomes because they lacked understanding of them. Two respondents indicated that they thought the learning outcomes would improve the learning life of the learner and help to identify teaching problems. Their facial expressions and gestures shown by raising their shoulders, however, revealed that they were uncertain of what they thought were the advantages of the learning outcomes. During the observations, the learning outcomes had not been written down anywhere in their portfolios. They did not have monitoring tools in place for lesson planning support.

4.3.3.2. Disadvantages if teaching with learning outcomes in mind

Three of the respondents mentioned that they were content bound rather than striving to achieve the outcomes through the lesson plan as a tool to guide them in teaching, while one Head of the Department did not bother about what the learners were learning in class. They were merely leaving the whole process to the Social Sciences educators without giving them any support. This shows that there is generally no monitoring and controlling of educators' portfolios. By interpretation, both educators and Heads of the Department do not know how to teach with outcomes in mind. The Heads of the Department shifted the curriculum changes to the educators who might have left them unattended.

4.3.3.3. Importance of a lesson plan

Three respondents concurred with the view that a lesson plan should serve as evidence for the work done by the educators. It encourages punctuality in class, maintains discipline and keeps effective teaching in place. Two out of the four Heads of the Department wanted the lesson plans to be made readily available at schools from the department, prepared by curriculum advisors and educators at clusters. Two of the Heads of the Department mentioned they were not aware that the department had already delivered lesson plan policy guidelines on planning to their schools. This was supported by the fact that the educators had a negative attitude towards reading curriculum issues (sub-theme 4.2.3.4).

Three of the respondents indicated that a lesson plan should serve as evidence for the educators' progress for monitoring of the internal and external officials. In addition, it should urge educators to consult and work as a team and encourage record keeping. It is further indicated that the Heads of the Department are aware that a lesson plan encourages punctuality in class and regular class attendance.

4.3.3.4. Views on the importance of having the learning programme as a step towards lesson planning

One Head of the Department disclosed that he was a registered educator-learner in the National Professional Diploma in Education where he was taught about the steps of planning lessons and he explained that planning streamlined the Outcomes-Based Education policy. Three respondents indicated that they were not sure of the lesson plan steps while one respondent acknowledged the importance of lesson plan steps. By interpretation, lesson planning is disliked by both educators and Heads of the Department. Their body language revealed that they had never tried to plan lessons using the new approach.

He educator-learner Head of the Department further disclosed that since his completion of the section on lesson planning, he never implemented the knowledge acquired from the university at school because lesson planning and other classroom issues were never used in the real work situation. The researcher realized that what had been acquired from higher institutions was not implemented in the real work situation.

The following category will investigate further problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and how they were using them as tools to achieve the desired learning outcomes.

4.3.4. PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS

4.3.4.1. Problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons

All four respondents mentioned that the lesson plans were problematic and difficult for the educators and Heads of the Department to do for overcrowded classes. During observation it was noted that no Head of the Department had a lesson plan in his/her plan books although the Social Sciences educators were expected to plan. Hence, the educators were reluctant to plan, skeptical about their management's competency in Outcomes-Based Education and experiencing conflicts with the Heads of the Department (sub-theme 4.2.3.5 and 4.2.4.8). During observation, the learners were arranged in groups of 8-9, but this method was dysfunctional due to overcrowding and lack of classroom space that could allow educator movement.

In addition, there was a lack of sufficient and appropriate textbooks to enrich content in the teaching and learning process. Two of the respondents agreed with the educators that there was a need for in-service training for management prior to that of the educators. In other words, the managers should know what, how and why they should manage lesson plans as tools to achieve the learning outcomes in the Social Sciences learning area.

4.3.4.2. Problems experienced by educators in using lesson plans as tools to achieve the Social Sciences lesson outcomes

This sub-theme convinced the researcher that the respondents were not sure how to use the lesson plan tool in order to achieve the learning outcomes. The Heads of the Department found a link between the learning outcomes and the lesson plan and its flow to the assessment standard difficult. One respondent confirmed that he did not know what to correct, comment on and support educators in. He just signed and approved tests. Two of the Heads of the Department interviewed raised a problem that both the educators and learners had a language barrier and time management problem in the teaching and learning process. This is because Social Sciences is offered in the First Additional Language, namely English Second Language in grade9.

4.3.4.3. Assistance needed for educators in planning Outcomes-Based education lessons

Two of the respondents indicated that Social Sciences educators should also have school-based workshops by using invited experts or educators who were furthering their studies on curriculum issues for support.

4.3.4.4. School culture pertaining to new lesson plan

Policy documents were delivered at schools but as both Social Sciences educators and Heads of the Department interviewed were waiting for the Limpopo Department of Education to train them first, no initiatives were made to start reading these documents and try to plan lessons, accordingly.

Only one respondent indicated that their school culture tried to apply many curriculum aspects, lesson plan included. The responses of two of the four Heads of the Department interviewed, related to the sub-themes in category B, while one interviewee was reluctant to respond and stood up. He started to respond while standing and showing little interest

in the interview process. The researcher kept on thanking him for every response he made. The researcher visited his school twice in order to finish the interview. This means that the latter head of the department had no interest on the new lesson plan curriculum.

4.3.4.5. Class visits for educator support

Two of the interviewee revealed that there were no class visits done for evaluating the educators. Furthermore, two of the Heads of the Department interviewed just checked whether the summative assessment records and continuous assessment requirements were available. In fact, three of the Heads of the Department interviewed were not comfortable about class visits because they too, were not conversant with what to support educators in.

4.3.4.6. Support of the School Management Team on Outcomes-Based Education lesson plan issues

One interview kept on stating, “We will try, we will try,” showing embarrassment and shame. The researcher even lowered her voice. This means that this respondent had no knowledge of what to support educators in. The other three respondents were reluctant to comment about this sub-theme.

4.3.4.7. Achievement level of Grade 9 learners on Social Sciences learning outcomes

The Heads of the Department responded passively and their faces showed that they regarded Social Sciences learning area as belonging to the respective educators and not to them. Three out of the four respondents agreed that assessment and teaching in Grade 9 were done in the old way during the course of the year, while one respondent indicated that teaching was based on textbook knowledge. In other words, the assessment tasks written at the end of the year had no link with the current year’s activities because the educators still found assessment problematic, hence they separated assessment from lesson planning.

4.3.4.11. Departmental delivery of Social Sciences learning area policy documents to schools

Three respondents showed that the delivery of policy documents had been done in advance before workshops commenced. Only one respondent disclosed that he was trying to read the policy documents but failed to implement them due to arguments, which arose during school-based workshops. This negation by colleagues humiliated him and he failed to initiate curriculum change. The researcher wanted to know what causes the arguments and it was mentioned that his colleagues had no confidence in him and started to ask him questions and argued that Outcomes-Based Education had failed in other countries and that he was not a curriculum specialist.

4.3.4.12. Training on Outcomes-Based Education approach before and after the delivery of these policy documents

The Heads of the Department interviewed had never received training about Outcomes-Based Education, Social Sciences lesson planning as well as school-based management. They acknowledged that no follow-up was done for educators who had attended the grade 10 workshops on the National Curriculum Statement. In addition, educators and Heads of the Department who were in excess to post establishment were deprived of the opportunities to attend the workshops because they were to leave the school. Unfortunately, the respondents did not disclose who had disadvantaged them.

4.3.4.13. Management of the timetable in the Revised National Curriculum Statement and the subjects of the Further Education and Training curriculum at school

Two respondents showed that the educators were engaged in both the General Education and Training and Further Education and Training teaching and learning processes. There was a difference in time allocation per period according to policy, but in practice they had the same time allocation. One respondent showed that the School Management Team

needed support in timetabling based on the new lesson planning and that the long periods were making lesson planning even more demanding.

In the same context, most of the Heads of the Department agreed with educators that timetabling was done against the instructions of the policy in order to accommodate both the General Education and Training and Further Education and Training band grades. When the researcher made observations on timetabling, all schools visited did not have the same time allocation per period of the Social Sciences learning area. Periods in Social Sciences learning area lasted 35 minutes, 45 minutes, 60 minutes and 30 minutes, respectively. The schools policies were silent about the allocation of these periods.

4.4. CONCLUSION

This chapter presented a detailed analysis and interpretation of the study. The next chapter will present the findings of the study following the data analysis and interpretation. Furthermore, it will discuss the implications of the data obtained, the researcher's reflections and the recommendations in relation to the research aim and objectives of the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS; IMPLICATIONS AND REFLECTIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1. SUMMARY

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and use them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes in the Senior Phase level. This was done in the context of the South African Outcomes-Based Education based reforms. The study was guided by this main aim and finding answers to the following questions:

- How is a lesson plan in the Social Sciences learning area structured?
- In which ways have educators changed from the old lesson planning practices to the new?
- What are the problems experienced by educators in the planning and use of Social Sciences lessons?

The questions that the researcher attempted to address in this study emerged from issues that appeared to contribute towards problems experienced by educators in the planning of lessons, as well as their use in teaching, learning and assessment for proper implementation of the new curriculum. Planning is the first step for every implementation process, including lesson planning.

The method of this study included data collection from grade 9 Social Sciences educators and Heads of Departments. The literature review was based on books, newsletters, newspapers, articles from journals, the internet, and the Social Sciences policy documents on Curriculum 2005 and the National Curriculum Statement.

In the background and orientation of this study, the fact that educators through the defiance campaign against the previous education system in 1990, dumped the lesson plan files at the circuit offices of the Department of Education countrywide, made the culture of teaching and learning at schools to collapse. Thereafter, South Africa adopted the Outcomes-Based Education approach towards curriculum change in 1998 in order to address teaching and learning. In 2001, that curriculum was reviewed. This contributed towards an interest in conducting this research study.

Data were collected through interviews where open-ended questions and closed questions were administered to grade 9 Social Sciences educators and Heads of the Department. In addition, the observation data collection technique was used to supplement the latter method. Although the study was qualitative in nature, the narrative case study method was used to present the results, which were explained and interpreted. In this chapter a summary of the findings, recommendations; implications and reflections, suggestions for further research and the conclusion are given.

5.2. FINDINGS

Findings were made on the basis of the data analysis and interpretation in the previous chapter. Lesson planning problems experienced by Social Sciences educators and how they used these plans in Social Sciences lessons were the main theme of the analysis. The following themes emerged; general information to give a background of the type of educators the researcher worked with, their knowledge and understanding of the lesson plan structure, and the ways the educators changed from the old ways of planning to the new.

5.2.1. FINDINGS ON THE GENERAL INFORMATION

- Social Sciences educators at Senior Phase level are experienced and qualified, mainly, in either History or Geography. The majority of the Heads of the Department are not relevantly qualified in Social Sciences because some are in an

acting capacity, as promotion posts are still processed, while others coordinate the learning area due to a shortage of staff.

- Social Sciences educators with less than 5 years' teaching experience offer lessons in grade 9, while the majority of Heads of the Department do not allocate periods for themselves in the Senior Phase level. They teach in the Further Education and Training grade, which has not yet started with the new curriculum.

5.2.2. FINDINGS ON THE KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE USE OF THE LESSON PLAN STRUCTURES

- The majority of the educators and Heads of the department do not understand and know how to plan using the new lesson plan structure and steps. In fact, they are unable to link policy, learning programmes, work-schedules and lesson plans. This hinders the fundamental competency of the educators in satisfying their role as designers of learning programmes.
- Almost all educators and Heads of the Department have been trained in the old way and they are still practicing the old teaching and assessment strategies. They have never been trained on how to plan Social Sciences lessons using the Outcomes-Based Education approach; hence they do not plan lessons.
- The majority of educators and Heads of the Department still separate lesson planning and assessment.
- Most of the educators do not know how to use and understand the assessment jargon, forms, recording, reporting, and the assessment standards in relation to the learning outcomes in the Social Sciences learning area.

- The grade 9 learners in the Senior Phase level do not satisfy the majority of the educators because they are not sure of what they are doing within the new approach.
- Most educators would like to know how to plan in Social Sciences learning area lesson for learners with different socio-economic backgrounds and teaching overcrowded classes.
- The majority of the educators do not understand what, how and why the learning outcomes want them to do, to plan, to use them as tools to guide teaching and learning and the purpose of planning, teaching and assessing with outcomes in mind. Therefore, they teach directly from the textbook.
- The selection of content relating to the learning outcomes, differentiating content and context; and teaching in context are still problematic to most educators.

5.2.3. FINDINGS ON HOW EDUCATORS CHANGED THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW

- The majority of the educators are resistant to change from the old ways of lesson planning to the new.
- Lesson plan change within the new curriculum has left educator change behind.
- Since there are no lesson plans the majority of the educators rely on unstructured lesson plans.
- There is a lack of teamwork for cooperative lesson plans to be made. Most educators indicate that they have a lot of workload.
- The majority of educators' attitude towards lesson planning is negative because they say it is time wasting, and tedious without incentives.

5.2.4. FINDINGS ON PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS

- The majority of the Senior Phase educators need in-service training.
- Most educators never received training from the Department of Education on the National Curriculum Statement lesson planning. Those who received Curriculum 2005 training, at least complain that they are not sure whether they are on the right track or not. There is no follow-up, guidance intervention strategy to support them on how to plan and use lesson plans as tools to achieve the learning outcomes.
- The majority of the Heads of the Department and Social Sciences educators complain about the competency and qualifications of some office-based facilitators in Outcomes-Based Education workshops. In fact, the department uses the services of the former College lecturers without retraining them as curriculum support agencies.
- The majority of the Social Sciences educators and Heads of the Department would like to focus on either the General Education and Training or Further education and Training band.
- Schools are working in isolation. The clustering of schools could help educators to share knowledge.
- Time-tabling for General Education and Training and Further Education and Training learning areas and subjects, respectively, is problematic. Policy time allocation per learning area is ignored.
- The school culture is not conducive for initiative educators to implement new Social Sciences lesson plan approaches.
- Some educators are deprived of the opportunity to attend Social Sciences Outcomes-Based Education workshops if they happen to be in excess to the post-establishment of the school. These educators experience problems in planning Social Sciences lessons because they are not trained in Curriculum 2005 and National Curriculum Statement. Those who remained and happened to be trained are not enthusiastic to implement what they have learnt from

Outcomes-Based Education workshops because they fear failure due to a lack of managerial support, guidance and follow-ups.

- The newly appointed educators get employed and resume work without prior orientation and training.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings:

5.3.1. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE GENERAL INFORMATION

- Qualified and balanced experienced and inexperienced Social Sciences educators should be appointed and the allocation of work in the teaching of the Social Sciences learning area should take this fact into consideration.

5.3.2. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE LESSON PLAN STRUCTURE

- In-service training centers should be made available for purpose of problems experienced by school management and educators in lesson planning.
- Lesson planning training could be conducted during school holidays and weekends.
- Training of school-based managers should be done prior to that of educators in order to empower them as curriculum leaders and managers at school. Curriculum change is in the school-based managers' hands. They can sustain it or make it fail.
- In-service training centers should be accessible to schools; for example, there should be one in each circuit.

5.3.3. RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW EDUCATORS SHOULD CHANGE THEIR WAYS OF PLANNING LESSONS FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW

- Teacher-pupil ratio should be 1:35 in the actual classroom teaching, learning and assessment situation in order to enable educators attend to the learning barrier caused by overcrowded classes.
- Social Sciences educators should collect learning resources such as maps after learners had written external examination papers. This could be cost-effective for the school and the department.
- A reduction of overcrowded classrooms would lessen the problem of heavy workloads, which will, in turn, influence the positive attitude of educators towards planning.
- Social Sciences educators should further their learning in curriculum studies, lesson planning, learning programmes design and be able to interpret policy documents at school.

5.3.4. RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED BY EDUCATORS IN PLANNING SOCIAL SCIENCES LESSONS

- The Department of Education should train Heads of the Department on what, how and why quality school based follow-ups, support strategies and guidance should be conducted to make lesson planning, implementation and evaluation of service in the classroom effective.
- Qualifications of office-based educators and trainers in Outcomes-Based Education should be reviewed regularly. Funding should be made available to this effect.
- The Department of Education should separate schools into the General Education and Training and Further Education and Training bands in order to solve the time-tabling problem, to attend to theme-teaching and keep educators focused.
- The clustering of schools could help the spread of knowledge and understanding of lesson planning and cooperative planning.

- The clustering of schools could help the spread of knowledge and understanding of lesson planning and cooperative planning.
- The Department of Education should appoint competent school support teams at circuit, district and provincial levels in order to address the problem of support, follow-ups and implementation of lesson plans.
- The new appointees who have qualified five years ago, that is, prior to the revision and implementation of the new approach, should receive training and orientation on lesson planning during school holidays and weekends. This would address the skepticism and resistance towards lesson planning of experienced educators.
- All educators are entitled to attend workshops irrespective of their being in excess, or not, because they are employees of the department. A clear policy in this regard is necessary.

5.4. IMPLICATIONS AND REFLECTIONS

In this study lesson planning was viewed as a cyclic process that occurs in a cooperative framework, distributed in a year at the phase, grade and an individual lesson levels. In this study, focus was on lesson planning. Among other things, this study revealed problems experienced by educators, which also accounts for the in-availability of lesson plans in the Social Sciences educators' portfolios. To organize the researcher's description and analysis of the data, the main aim and objectives of the study were used as headings for purpose of organizing the emerging sub-themes categorically.

It is important to note that in planning lessons issues such as teaching, learning and assessment are dealt with together, because they are inseparable. The following are reflected upon during lesson planning: skills, attitudes, beliefs, values, knowledge, and understanding of content in context. Lessons are planned taking into consideration all these aspects at the same time.

Educators and management should not ignore lesson planning if proper implementation of the new Outcomes-Based Education curriculum has to be achieved. Educators' workshops should start with lesson planning. The study reveals that the current practice in workshops is more narrative, transmissional and full of talk than educator involvement, transformation and mutual learning about the use of various elements on lesson planning.

The study, has revealed that the four Social Sciences educators and their Heads of the Department lacked training and experienced overcrowded workshops and classes which hindered participation and learning. They received no regular workshops on lesson planning from the department, while there were no cluster schools for educators to collaborate on lesson planning and other classroom matters pertaining to the new curriculum. This implies that ongoing school support; follow-up to those who receive training should be a matter of urgency.

The way workshops are conducted as revealed by the findings, need to be reviewed. There is need for development of training manuals for use by educators at workshops. This could result in a lesson plan sample designed cooperatively by facilitators and educators at the end of the workshop. Schools are working in isolation. It could enable the educators feel capacitated to draw up lesson plans of their own at their respective schools. Educators would, subsequently, use the lesson plan sample as a source of reference.

Regular class visits that provide support for educators at school level need continuous reflection of each lesson presented, as changes in the curriculum cannot be overlooked. To reflect on what was emphasized in this study, the Social Sciences educators interviewed were silent on differentiating between expanded and extended opportunities as elements of a lesson plan.

This was not investigated in-depth since the educators showed to lack less information about them. The problem revealed by educators and their Heads of the Department on knowledge and understanding of learning outcomes showed that there were challenges on

how to plan lessons with the desired outcomes in mind. This is evident from the educators' negative attitudes on lesson planning and this made them to disown and be resistant to curriculum change.

Cooperative and individual lesson planning suggest the practice should be underpinned by democratic principles. This means that every educator should be seen as a designer of learning programmes and selector of related content to the learning outcomes, which, unfortunately, educators tend to find tedious and difficult. Through mutual support, follow-ups and the willingness of educators, management and facilitators to learn about planning and implementation of lessons, it seems, these obstacles might be overcome.

Data collected was challenging for the researcher, particularly the use of purposive group interview because it had to be conducted during working hours, after 12h00. This compelled the researcher to resort to a narrative case study involving individual interviewees. Traveling from one school to another, using public transport was costly and strenuous. However, this did not hinder checking on shortcomings such as how the timetable related to the learning area demands.

In summary, the problems experienced by educators on lesson planning and their use as tools to achieve the desired Social Science learning outcomes in the Senior Phase level are enormous to such an extent that they result in educators not planning lessons and designing plan books for the envisaged lessons.

5.5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- The present timetabling model in relation to the requirements within curriculum change in the General Education and Training and Further Education and Training band.
- Assessment jargon, reporting and recording in the teaching and learning process.
- Review of teacher pupil ratio in relation to the shift from whole class teacher talk to small group learning.

- Implementation of the Social Sciences learning area in the new Outcomes-Based Education curriculum reform.

5.6. CONCLUSION

In the light of the exposition in this chapter, it can be concluded that most educators experience problems in planning Social Sciences lessons and using them as tools to achieve the desired learning outcomes. This has a negative impact on the implementation and assessment of the Social Sciences learning area in the Senior Phase level of the General Education and Training band.

Since planning is the first step prior to implementation of all social operations and a component of classroom management, no success will be achieved in the implementation of the new curriculum if it is ignored. It is evident that a lesson plan puts the educator's envisaged lesson on paper for future reference, guidance and can be re-used by educators, but it cannot substitute the educator.

REFERENCES

Alcorn M. Kinder J.S., Schumert J.R. 1970: **Better Teaching in Secondary Schools.** New York: Rinehart and Winston Publishers.

Anderson L.W. 1984: **Time and School Learning: Theory, Research and Practice.** Beckenham: Croom Helm Ltd & Burrell Row Press.

Astin A. 1993: **Assessment for excellence: a Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education.** Phoenix: Arizon Oryx Press.

Babbie E.R. 1992: **The Practice of Social Research.** Belmont. Wadsworth Publishers.

Beane J.A. Toepfer C.S. and Alessi A. 1986: **Curriculum Planning and Development.** Boston, Massuchette: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Betram C. Fotheringham R. and Harley K. 2000: **Curriculum Studies Learning Guide.** Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Blandford S. 1997: **Resource Management in Schools: Effective and Practical strategies for the self managing school.** London: Pitman Publishing.

Brown S. and Knight P. 1995: **Assessing Learners In Higher Education.** London: Kogan Page Publishers.

Brown S. Race P. and Smith B. 1997: **500 Tips on Assessment.** London: Kogan Page Publishers.

Burns A. & Grove T. 1998: **Problem-Based teaching for Nurses. London:** Kogan Page Publishers.

Cangelosi J. S. 2000: **Assessment strategies for monitoring student learning**. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. Publishers.

Cardwell M. 2000: **The complete A-Z Psychology Handbook**. 2nd Edition, London: Hodder & Stoughton, Green Gate Publishers.

Cele M. 2005: **The Educator's voice**. Newsletter. Volume 9. Number 11. Johannesburg.

Christie P. 1990: **The right to learn**. Pretoria: Juta & Co.

Christie P. 2002: **Global trends in local contexts: South African Perspective on Competence Debates**. *Studies in the Cultural politics of education*, Vol. 18, No. 1 1999, pp5-69.

Christine J. and Hopple M.S. 1995: **Teaching for Outcomes in Elementary Physical Education: a Guide for Curriculum and Assessment**. London: Human Kinetics Publishers Inc.

Creswell J.W. 2003: **Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches**. London: Sage Publishers

Criticos C. Long L. Moletsane R. and Mthinyane N. 2001: **Getting Practical About Outcomes Based Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Department of Education. 2001: **Curriculum 2005 in a nutshell. Outcomes Based Education: Intermediate and Senior Phase**. Pretoria: Department of Education Print.

Department of Education. 2002: **Managing Transition: FET**. Pretoria: Department of Education Print.

- Department of Education. 2002: **Revised Curriculum Statement Grades R-9.**
Social Sciences School Policy. Pretoria: Department of Education Print.
- Department of Education. 2002: **National Curriculum Statement. Grades 10-12 for Schools.** Overview. Pretoria: Department of Education Print.
- Department of Education . 2002: **Education White Paper 6: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System.** Pretoria. Department of Education Print.
- Department of Education. 2003: **Resolution 8 of 2003.Integrated Quality Management System.** Pretoria: Department of Education Print.
- Department of Education. 1997: **Senior Phase (Grade 7 to 9) Policy Document.**
Pretoria: Department of Education Print.
- De Vos P 1998: **Research at Grass Roots: a Primer for the caring professions.**
Pretoria: J.L.van Schaik.
- Dirkx P., Prenger A. 1997: **A guide for planning and implementing instruction for adults: a theme based approach.** San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers
- Douglas J., Helga H. and Tuck A 1999: **Human and Social Sciences in the Classroom. An introduction to the teaching of Human and Social Sciences in South African Schools.** Pietermaritzburg: Natal College of education. SACOL.
- Engelbrecht P., Kriegler M. and Booyesen M. 1996: **Perspectives in learning difficult international concerns and South African realities.** Pretoria. J.L. van Schaik.
- Engelbrecht P., Green L, Swart E, Muthukrishna N. 2001: **Promoting learner development: Preventing and working with barriers to learning.** Pretoria. Van Schaik.

Gorman G.E. and Clayton P. 2000: **Qualitative Research for the Information Professional. A Practical Handbook.** London: Library Association Publishers.

Graham G. 1989: **Teaching Students to learn.** Milton Keynes, Stoney Stratford: Open University Press.

Gultig J. Hoadley U. & Jansen J. 2002: **Curriculum From Plans to Practices.** Reader. Cape Town: South African Institute for Distance Education. Oxford University Press.

Harley K. Bertram C. and Mattson E. 1999: **Classroom Studies. Researching Teacher Roles in Policy and Practice.** Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Jacobs M and Gawe N. 1996: **Teaching-Learning Dynamics: a Participatory approach.** Johannesburg. Heinemann Publishers

Jacobs M. Gawe N. and Vakalisa N. 2002: **Teaching and Learning Dynamics: a Participatory Approach for OBE.** Johannesburg: Heinemann Publishers

Jansen J. 1997: **Unpublished Paper document: Why OBE will fail.** Durban: University of Durban Westville.

Jansen J & Christie P. 1999: **Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-based Education in South Africa.** Cape Town: Juta & Co.

John P. 1995: **Lesson Planning for Teachers.** London: Cassel Publishers

Kramer D. 1999: **OBE Training Toolbox.** Pietermaritzburg: Vivlia Publishers

Kramer D. 2005: **OBE Training Toolbox.** Pietermaritzburg: Vivlia Publishers

MacFarland H.S.N. 1973: **Intelligent Teaching.** London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Madaus G.F. Kellegahn T. & Schwab R. 1989: **Teach Them Well: an Introduction to Education.** New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Maxwell J.A. 1996: **Qualitative Research Design. An interactive Approach.** London. Sage Publishers

McCutcheon M. & Milner H.R. 2002: **A contemporary study for Teacher Planning in a High School English Class. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice.** Journal Volume 8, Number 1. New York.

Naicker S.M. 1999: **Curriculum 2005: A space for all.** Cape Town: National Book Printers.

Ndlovu T.N. Bertman C., Mthinyane N and Avery N. 1999: **Creating People - Centred Schools: School Organization and Change in South Africa. Learning Guide.** Cape Town: South Africa Institute of Distance Education and Oxford University Press.

Neuman W.L. 1997: **Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.** Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

O'Malley J.M. and Chamot A.H. 1990: **Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.** Cambridge. Cambridge University

Pollard A. & Triggs P. 1997: **Reflective Teaching in Secondary Education.** London: Cassel Education.

Powell E.T. and Renner M. 2003: **Pamphlet: Program Development and Evaluation. Analysing Qualitative Data.** Madison: University of Wisconsin- Extension, Wisconsin.

Pretorius F & Lemmer E. 1998: **South African Education and Training: Transition in a Democratic South Africa**. Randburg: Hodder and Stoughton Educational.

Pretty G 1993: **Teaching Today: A Practical Guide**. London: Stanley Thorne Publishers.

Ramchander P. 2004: **Research and Methodology. Pamphlet**. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Report. 2002: **C2005 Review Committee Executive Summary**. Pretoria: Department of Education. Oxford University Press.

South African Democratic Teachers' Union. 2004: **The Educator's Voice**. Newsletter. Volume 8, Number 10. Johannesburg.

South African Democratic Teachers' Union. 2005: **The Educator's Voice**. Newsletter. Volume 4, Number 2. Johannesburg.

Sayler G. and Alexander W. 1974: **Planning Curriculum for Schools**. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Schiemer S. 2000: **Assessment Strategies for Elementary Physical Education**. Champaign III: Human Kinetics Printers.

Schumacher M. 2001: **Research and Methodology. Pamphlet**. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Siu M. 1999: **New roles for design teachers. Education Today**. Journal, Volume 49, Number 1. March 1999. Cape Town.

Sohnge W.F. 2003: **The origins and development of child-centred education: implications for classroom management.** Journal Volume 32. Number 1&2. Pretoria: UNISA

Sotto E. 1994: **When Teaching Becomes Learning: A Theory and Practice of Teaching.** London: Wellington House, Cassel Publishers.

Spady W. 1995: **Outcomes Based Education: Critical Issues and Answers.** New York: Breakthrough Printers.

Spady W.G. 1998: **Paradigm Lost: Reclaiming America's Educational future.** New York: Arlinton Press.

Tchibozo G. 2003: **Some aspects of success performing in departments preparing candidates for language teacher recruitment in French secondary education system.** Journal for Language Teaching Volume 37, Number 2. December 2003. London: Cassel Printers.

Van der Horst H. & MacDonald R. 2001: **Outcomes-Based Education: Theory and Practice.** Pretoria: Kagiso Publishers.

Walter R. 1983: **Teaching Under Attack.** Beckenham: Croom Helm Publishers.

Walters R. 1991: **School Management in Teaching Practice 1: Method for student teachers.** Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

Wiggins S.P. 1957: **The Student Teacher Action.** London: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Wright T. 1991: **Roles of teachers and learners.** Walton Street, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yule R.M. & Steyn P.M. 1991: **Teaching and Learning Aids**. Johannesburg: Lexion Publishers.

Zehr M.A. 1998: **Education week on the web, technology counts' 98, Educational Media International**. Journal Volume 36, number 4, December 1998.

APPENDIX 1

Enq.: Kgopa M.S.
Cell. No. 0829329650

P.O. Box 4842
SOVENGA
0727
13 June 2005

Head of the Department
Limpopo Department of Education
Private Bag x9489
Polokwane
0700

Sir/Madam

APPLICATION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AT SCHOOLS IN MANKWENG CIRCUIT

1. The above matter refers.
2. I hereby apply to conduct research at the following schools:
 - Four Secondary schools- Mankweng circuit
3. I am a registered student for Masters in Education, specializing in Curriculum and Professional Studies, at the University of Limpopo, School of Education.
4. I conducted a pilot study in 2004 and presently I hereby apply to collect data for the study early February 2006.
5. The description of my study is as follows:
 - Research title- Problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and use them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes for Senior Phase level in Mankweng Circuit of Education.

6. A concise description of the research is that I intend to do a case study, and visit schools in Mankweng Circuit as follows:


- Respondents

6.1. Social Sciences, grade 9 educators and

6.2. Heads of the Department

7. I promise to uphold the code of ethics in my research study.

Yours faithfully



.....

KGOPA M.S.

APPENDIX 2



Corner 113 Biccard &
24 Excelsior Street
Private Bag X9489
Polokwane 0700
Tel: 015-290 7600
Fax: 015-297 6920
015-297 4220
015-297 4494

Enquiries: Mokoka M B
Telephone: 015 290 7918
Fax: 015 297 2690
Reference: 2/5/6/1

Kgopa M S
P.O.Box 4842
Sovenga
0727

Dear Madam

Application For Permission To Conduct Research

1. Your letter of application dated 13th January 2006 bears reference.
2. The Department wishes to inform you that your request for permission to conduct research at schools in Mankweng Area in Capricorn District is approved. The research topic is: "Problems experienced by educators in planning Social Sciences lessons and use them as tools to achieve the learning outcomes for Senior Phase level in Mankweng Circuit of Education, Capricorn District of Limpopo Province".
3. However, the following conditions must be adhered to:
 - 3.1. The research should not have any financial implications for Limpopo Department of Education.
 - 3.2. Arrangements should be made with the Circuit Office concerning the conduct of the study and the research should not be conducted during the fourth term of the calendar year as schools would be writing end-of-year examinations.
 - 3.3. The research is conducted in line with ethics in research. In particular, the principle of voluntary participation in this research should be respected.
 - 3.4. You share with the Department, the final product of your study upon completion of the research assignment.
4. It is expected of you to produce the accompanying letter at offices where you will be conducting your research, as evidence that permission for this activity has been granted.
5. The Department appreciates the contribution that you wish to make and wishes you success in your investigation.


HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

DATE: 25/1/06