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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This study explored the teachers’ understanding and challenges in implementing integrated curriculum in Lesotho. Integrated curriculum was first implemented in 2013, the inception was introduced in foundation phase (grade one to three) and progressively moved to grade four and five in 2014 and 2015 respectively. The progression will happen until integrated curriculum reaches Matric as the new curriculum is being implemented in phases starting from primary school. Given this the research sites were primary schools in Maseru, the capital of Lesotho. This chapter outlines and gives the research context and what motivated the study.

1.2 BACKGROUND

The value of Education in Lesotho can be traced back to the period before the country was colonized by Britain. The education of boys and girls was done separately instilling traditional values in them. The rationale of this indigenous education was to produce initiates who would pride themselves with their traditional values. The formal training lasted less than a year where boys were trained to fight with sticks and to protect their country from attacks, for girls the focus was more around respect and taking care of the family (Motaba, 1998).

The change in education system then came during colonial rule which can be dated as far back as 1830s with the arrival of missionaries of different denominations. The missionary schools focused on giving Basotho literacy and numeracy skills which were seen as essential then, to produce interpreters and clerks for the colonial administration. The colonial and missionary education strongly opposed the Basotho cultural practices and education which included initiation and polygamous marriages as they were seen as against Christianity. The main purpose of missionary education was to teach the gospel in order to instill Christian values. The education during the colonial rule was not meant to liberate Basotho from poverty but rather instilled the values of obedience, as a result it only produced clerks, teachers and lawyers, there were no engineers or education policy makers (Motaba, 1998).
In the light of this history, on attaining independence in 1966, there was an imperative for Lesotho to reform its education to make it relevant to its national needs (MoET, 2009). However, given that the missionary education provided the churches the absolute control over the daily administration of schools and the curriculum offered in such schools, this then led to the delayed changes in the Lesotho education system (Letseka 1992, Khalanyane 1995).

The need to review Lesotho’s education system in post-colonial regime was therefore motivated by the fact that even though the missionaries introduced formal education in Lesotho, their education was focused on instilling the Christian values on the expense of the development of lifelong skills for the Basotho community (Seotsanyane & Muzvidziwa 2002, Thelejane 1990). Without doubt then the education could not successfully address the needs of the Basotho nation.

In an attempt to make education relevant in addressing the needs of the nation, a number of unsuccessful reforms were adopted in the early 1970s (Raselimo & Mahao, 2015). These reforms included the curriculum diversification reform in 1974 which introduced practical subjects such as agriculture, technical subjects and home economics intended to promote self-reliance among the youth (Raselimo & Mahao, 2015). Another reform, ‘the core curriculum reform’ was adopted to increase the efficiency of education by focusing on organising the school curriculum into subjects with a strong focus on English, Mathematics and Science as core subjects (Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture, 1982). In this reform the core subjects were elevated above the practical subjects, with each allocated more time than other subjects on the school timetable (Raselimo & Mahao, 2015). However, Ansell (2002) cautioned that the review from the national gathering (1978 National Pitso) revealed that an overemphasis on examination prevented this curriculum from adequately addressing national needs, he argued;

> Many of the problems with curriculum and instruction stem from the inordinate emphasis given to the preparation for the terminal exams which undermines the attainment of certain education objectives that are critical for the country’s economic development. These include problem solving, the practical application of concepts and skills, the spirit of co-operation and team work, creativity and imagination, and the development of a moral, socially conscious character. (Ansell, 2002, p.93-94).

More efforts were made to devise means of making education relevant such as having the “Task Force” formed to aid the government on how to develop policies that would benefit the country (Khalanyane, 1995). Ultimately, the reform prior the current one under study was
the ‘O’Level localization reform which was “a long-standing issue in Lesotho since the 1960s” (Raselimo & Mahao, 2015, p.3) because the control of Lesotho examinations had remained with the University of Cambridge. This issue was debated for more than a decade; Lesotho only enacted the reform in 2012 with the aim of making examinations relevant to the Lesotho context. The localisation reform mapped a way for a new curriculum reform which was implemented in 2013.

In 2009, for the first time since Lesotho attained independence from British colonial rule, the Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) published the Curriculum and Assessment Policy (CAP). The major aim of the policy was to provide education for individual and social development. The curriculum reform was necessitated by challenges posed by HIV/AIDS pandemic and other communicable diseases, increasing poverty, climatic and environmental degradation and other needs resulting from globalization (MoET, 2009). The policy was therefore, meant to be a basic document which underlies the ministry’s intention to reform both curriculum and assessment practices in line with the national goals and aspirations. The integrated approach in developing this new curriculum innovation was adopted as a response to the stated challenges. The policy stipulates that school life should be integrated with community life and learners’ everyday experiences to make the curriculum more relevant. The intention of the curriculum is to combat and meet afore mentioned challenges is evident in the alignment of practical life challenges with school learning (MoET, 2009).

The Curriculum and Assessment Policy organized the school curriculum into learning areas at primary level with formal subjects only emerging in the last three years of basic education. The learning areas have led to an integration of eleven school subjects, into five learning areas at the primary level. The learning areas therefore indicate a body of knowledge necessary to equip learners with the competencies needed to address their life challenges. The five learning areas stipulated in the policy are; Linguistic and Literacy, Numerical and Mathematical, Personal, Spiritual and Social, Scientific and Technological and lastly Creativity and Entrepreneurial. This framework views integrated curriculum as a means of effectively dealing with issues addressed earlier. The objectives of the learning areas are to equip learners with key competencies to apply knowledge and skills, integrated curriculum should therefore focus on; effective and functional communication; problem-solving; scientific, technological and creative skills; critical thinking skills; collaboration and cooperation; lastly functional numeracy and learning to learn (MoET, 2009).
The policy further advocates that integrated and learner centred approaches to teaching and learning will be used in the implementation of curriculum in schools. This new curriculum is now in place in Lesotho as its implementation started in 2013 at primary schools while simultaneously the old one is being phased out.

1.3 THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

Integrated curriculum is a new curriculum innovation framework in Lesotho. Due to the short time frame that this framework has been in practice, it is likely that teachers are encountering some challenges in implementing this curriculum. So far, there are no documented studies conducted on teachers’ implementation of this curriculum innovation in Lesotho that I am aware of.

This study therefore, sought to establish the nature of challenges faced by primary teachers in implementing this curriculum in three Maseru primary schools. The findings of the challenges teachers encounter may be used to improve the implementation of this curriculum in schools.

1.4 THE PURPOSE STATEMENT

The purpose of this research was to explore challenges primary school teachers face in implementing the new integrated curriculum in Lesotho. This study intended to find out grade three and grade five teachers’ understanding of integrated curriculum and how they teach it in the classroom. The study also attempted to make a contribution to understanding the challenges teachers have in interpreting and teaching the integrated curriculum. Exploring teachers’ understandings and challenges in implementing this curriculum could help inform implementation and the nature of assistance offered to teachers. Moreover, the findings suggest a gap for further research that can assist curriculum innovators in addressing problem areas in implementation.

1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the study were to explore:

1. challenges teachers face in implementing integrated curriculum
2. teachers understanding of integrated curriculum
3. Pedagogic choices teachers make in implementing integrated curriculum
1.6 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to address the above objectives the following research questions were used to inform the study:

1.6.1 Main research question:

What challenges do teachers face in implementing integrated curriculum?

The following sub-questions were used in order to answer the main research:

1.6.2 Sub-questions

1. What are teachers’ understandings of integrated curriculum?
2. What pedagogic choices do teachers make in implementing integrated curriculum?

1.7 RATIONALE

This study was prompted by the encounter I had with some teachers who seemed to be confused about how they are supposed to teach an integrated curriculum. Given this I chose to explore the challenges teachers face in teaching integrated curriculum in primary schools. I also found it necessary to couple the challenges with the understandings teachers have of integrated curriculum in order to be able to get deeper experience on how the understandings teachers have relate to challenges they have.

Having conducted a thorough literature search, there were no empirical studies published on teachers’ implementation of this curriculum innovation in Lesotho. The study therefore attempted to make a contribution to the understanding of the challenges teachers face in teaching the integrated curriculum. The findings of the study hope to bring to light insights on areas of difficulty so that appropriate support could be given to the teachers as a means of improving implementation. As Fullan, (1992) stated that an important approach to investigating the implementation stage of curriculum development is to observe carefully, and understand why education reforms fail, not only that but also to examine factors that make some succeed.

1.8 CHAPTER OUTLINE

The following section presents the outline of the chapters of this research report, the outline provides brief overview of what each chapter entails.
Chapter 1

This chapter discusses and introduces the study with the discussion of the background to the study, the research objectives and rationale, and lastly states research question and sub questions.

Chapter 2

Chapter two presents a review of literature on curriculum change in Lesotho with a specific focus on what the new curriculum envisages, the chapter further includes literature on studies of curriculum change conducted in sub-Saharan Africa and internationally. Lastly the chapter presents the theoretical frame that underpinned this study.

Chapter 3

This chapter presents the methods and processes followed in designing the study, collecting and analyzing data obtained. The ethical considerations, research sites, participants and tools used to collect data are described in this chapter.

Chapter 4

Chapter four discusses and analyses the findings of the study from the three cases. For each case study, first the data observation is presented, and then followed by interview data, this format is followed for every participant.

Chapter 5

In chapter five the findings are interpreted and followed up with literature in order to address the research questions that inform this study.

Chapter 6

This chapter concludes the study and provides recommendations in the light of findings on teachers’ conceptions and challenges in implementing integrated curriculum in Lesotho.
1.9 Conclusion

In the light of the above discussion, it is pertinent for this study to draw on literature and research about the nature and implementation of integrated curriculum, the following chapter therefore presents literature review.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature within the field of curriculum that focuses on integrated curriculum and its implementation. The main focus however will be on the review of Curriculum and Assessment Policy which stipulates how the integrated curriculum is to be implemented in Lesotho as the context of this study. To deepen the understanding of integrated curriculum, review research done in some education systems in curriculum implementation, the approaches adopted and key factors that enable or constrain success in curriculum implementation form an integral part of this chapter. The significance of reviewing contexts other than Lesotho is to establish the extent to which similar factors may impact on implementation of the integrated curriculum in Lesotho.

The success, or lack thereof, in any curriculum implementation lies mostly, but not solely, with the teachers as they are implementers of such reform. Intense staff and teacher development and training is crucial to success of implementation, as teachers need to change their strategies and adopt new ideologies (Clark, 2005). In the light of this argument the literature review explore studies done elsewhere on teachers’ implementation of a new curriculum in an attempt to establish the extent to which similar factors may impinge on the current study. The need to understand teachers’ challenges and understandings in a curriculum reform per se is driven by the fact that trying to change teachers’ practice without relevant and adequate theoretical background may be ineffective (Clark, 2005). To try and make sense of all the above it is appropriate to explore the literature on curriculum change in Lesotho.

2.2 CURRICULUM CHANGE IN LESOTHO

Many countries across the globe have undergone curriculum change at one point and Lesotho is no exception. The reasons for curriculum reforms varied; around the early 1960’s for instance the United States of America reformed its curriculum in response to the pressure of lagging behind technologically after the launch of Sputnik by Russia in 1957 (Trowbridge and Bybee, 1990). Curriculum change in most countries was influenced by political and economic factors. In 1994, with the end of apartheid era in South Africa, curriculum reform was inevitable as changing the curriculum was considered an important step towards
redressing the inequalities of the past and shaping the new nation (Hoadley, 2013). The issue in South Africa like many other countries has mostly been to fit within the global economy (Tabulawa, 2009, Raselimo & Mahao, 2015). Lesotho as part of the global village also envisions the curriculum change that will be a lever for participation in globalisation while at the same time developing learners for personal and social development (MoET, 2009).

Bernstein (1971) significantly spoke of the educative and opportunity effects of the triple message systems of schooling as, curriculum, pedagogy and assessment, the symbiotic relationship between the three means a shift in curriculum simultaneously shifts both assessment and pedagogy and this is the case in the context of Lesotho.

Curriculum change in Lesotho adopted an integrated approach; discussion that follows explores literature on integrated curriculum and what it means in the context of Lesotho, it will also be followed by a brief overview on both pedagogy and assessment that are embedded within this curriculum innovation in Lesotho.

2.2.1 Integrated Curriculum

The term “integrated curriculum” is very elusive, as a result it cannot be reduced to one universal definition (Beane, 1995). This however should not come as a surprise as the word curriculum carries the same debate. This discussion will use some of the prominent scholars in the field of curriculum to try and set a lens through which the term integrated curriculum can be understood for the purpose of this study.

As a starting point, I would like to bring into discussion what integrated curriculum is not. The premise for this clarity is that “integration seems to mean whatever someone decides it means…” (Kysilka, 1998, p. 198). Given this, it is important to understand that integrated curriculum is not merely rearrangement and cross cutting the concepts through lesson plans (Beane, 1995). The origins of integrated curriculum could be “problems, issues and concerns posed by life itself” (Beane, 1995, p.616) and these problems should be categorized into personal and more social problems. He later reiterates the same point by defining integrated curriculum as such; “curriculum design theory that is concerned with enhancing the possibilities of personal and social integration through organization of curriculum around significant problems…without regard for subject-area lines” (Beane, 1997, p.19). Viewed this way, integrated curriculum should among others be guided by the following principles:
genuine learning takes place as students are engaged in meaningful, purposeful activity...knowledge in the world is not applied in bits and pieces but in an integrative fashion...teachers need to work co-operatively in the educative process to ensure successful learning...and individuals need to learn how to think and should not be receptacles for facts (Kysilka, 1998, p.198).

This is the same notion of integrated curriculum held by the Lesotho curriculum policy as the focus is on personal and social development. Integrated curriculum in Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy is defined as;

_The holistic view and treatment of issues related to intelligence, maturity, personal and social development of the learner for survival purposes and economic development of the nation as opposed to the compartmentalised subject-based form of instruction (MoET, 2009, p.15)._ 

In essence, Lesotho’s conceptualisation of integrated curriculum aligns with the conceptualisation of integrated curriculum above (Beane 1995 & Kysilka 1998). Contrary to the previous structure of curriculum which foregrounded disciplinary knowledge, the present curriculum clearly reflects the goal to provide relevant education through alignment with real life problems. The Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy acknowledges that any Education system is liable to meet both local and global needs, and therefore sees a need to strike a balance between both demands. As a result, the policy asserts that, “curriculum should strive to endow learners with skills, attitudes and values such as creativity, critical thinking, and initiative working with others, willingness to learn in order to promote personal and social development” (MoET, 2009, p.14). To realise this goal the policy (MoET, 2009) further states that the curriculum development is made relevant by the interconnection of knowledge and relevance within the learning areas and relevance to learners’ everyday life.

Envisaged in the Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy is the idea that integrated curriculum should move from the traditional disciplinary knowledge (Bean, 1997, Bernstein 1971, Hirst & Peters, 1970), where primary school curriculum had eleven subjects. Instead it should be organised into “chunks” basically forming five learning areas that focus on life issues from which content from each school subject must be covered. It is argued that these learning areas due, to their interconnectedness, should form a basis for dealing with contemporary societal issues (MoET, 2009, p.18). This change could have been a result of the earlier initiatives; the Government of Lesotho (GoL) in the Education Sector Plan (ESP) 2005 showed a concern that the Lesotho curricula focused too much on academic achievement at the expense of adequately preparing students for Lesotho’s social needs.
The above argument therefore led to the decision to adopt integrated curriculum to meet the intended goals of addressing life challenges and to make education more relevant to individual and social development. Much emphasis was placed on the idea that a learner is part of a community and as such learning should take into account learners’ everyday experiences by moving knowledge “beyond superficial understanding of isolated events” rather integrating knowledge to a “more manageable relevant approach” (MoET, 2009, p.15). Of interest is that, Lesotho is an inland country, totally land locked within Republic of South Africa (RSA) must have witnessed the demise of integrated curriculum in RSA. This raises the concern on whether the implementation will be better in Lesotho, and whether it has learned from short-comings of Curriculum 2005. This study will explore the extent to which the factors that led to the failure of integrated curriculum in RSA may be present in the Lesotho context.

Integrated curriculum has been criticised for wearing away disciplinary knowledge by focusing on personal and social meanings (Muller & Taylor 2000). Beane (1995) argues that although critics of integration argue that integrated curriculum wears away the disciplinary nature of knowledge, he maintains that the disciplines can only be meaningful if they enable learners to scrutinize and make sense of the problems that face them (1995, p.620). As a result Beane defends integrated curriculum by arguing that the disciplines of knowledge can be a useful resource that can be used within a learning area, so that the disciplinary knowledge becomes useful in addressing the learners’ daily life challenges. It is worth noting that Beane and Kysilka caution that integrated curriculum should be about deeper meaning making as opposed to merely putting together similar concepts in the curriculum. As discussed earlier that issues of pedagogy and assessment are embedded within a curriculum change, it is necessary to look at pedagogy Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy envisaged.

2.2.2 Pedagogy

In order to examine the pedagogy for which the integrated curriculum in Lesotho advocates, it is significant to interrogate what pedagogy may mean. Pedagogy like integrated curriculum is an elusive term as it is sometimes seen as a polarity between an action of teaching on the one hand and as a discourse on the other hand (Loughran, 2010). Young (2007, p.23) for instance defines pedagogy as, “the activities of the teachers in motivating students and helping them to engage with the curriculum and make it meaningful.” For the purpose of this study Alexander’s (2009) perspective of what pedagogy is will be used. Pedagogy in his view
includes both teaching as an act and theories that inform it, “pedagogy is the discourse with which one needs to engage in order to teach intelligently and make sense of teaching - for discourse and act are interdependent” (Alexander 2009, p.927). Viewed this way, pedagogy becomes meaningful for this study as pedagogy ties together teaching and the ideas that inform it, therefore making it possible to explore both theoretical and practical understandings of teachers’ pedagogic choices.

Critically looking at the definition of integrated curriculum there is an implicit pedagogy that is within it, the learner-centred approach, which makes it clear why education systems that have implemented integrated curriculum have used the learner centred forms of pedagogy. It can therefore be assumed that this is a reason why most countries that have adopted integrated curriculum put so much emphasis on learner centred pedagogy (Tabulawa 2009, Jansen 1999, MoET, 2009). However, it is important to note that the term ‘learner centred’ can mean different things for different people (Hoadley, 2013) therefore it is important to make sense of what it means in the current context. As expected, Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy stresses the need to shift pedagogy, (MoET, 2009) as both curriculum and assessment have shifted. The intended pedagogy is said to move away from teacher oriented modes of teaching but rather focus on the learner centred pedagogy as it is believed that learners bring some knowledge to the classroom. As mentioned in the earlier discussion that the learner’s everyday experiences are to be taken into account. The policy explains pedagogy as follows;

*The focus in pedagogy has therefore shifted more to teaching and learning methods that can further develop creativity, independence, and survival skills of learners. Learners are expected to become more responsible for their own learning processes and thus should be able to identify, formulate and solve problems by themselves and evaluate their work (MoET, 2009, p.22).*

Reflecting on this, the shift in pedagogy also shifts the roles of teachers and learners. This is more aligned to the constructivist theory especially the Piagetian (1964) notion of facilitation. It is further stated that pedagogy should shift from teaching to facilitation and from transfer of facts to learners’ construction of knowledge (MoET, 2009, viii).

In retrospect, Piaget (1964) argued that direct instruction pacifies the learner, and that children should actively engage in discovery learning. The role of the teacher should be to facilitate an environment that can enable learners to assimilate and accommodate new concepts, For Piaget, in order for learning to happen, the teacher should not give direct instruction, but create a learning environment or situation (provide instructional materials) appropriate for the
cognitive level of the learners, and let learners discover or explore, the teacher’s task would be to facilitate. The Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy echoes this as it states that pedagogy should change towards ‘participatory, activity centred methodologies’ as opposed to teacher based didactic pedagogy.

Loughran (2010) also pointed out that learning and teaching have a mutually inclusive relationship and therefore both learning and teaching have bearing on each other, given this it becomes important to note the assumption embedded in this policy that with shift in pedagogy, learners will also fulfil a shift in the role envisioned of being responsible of their own learning instead of being passive receptacles. With the discussion thus far, the next section looks at the assessment that is envisioned within this curriculum.

2.2.3 Assessment

Even though assessment is not an issue of concern for the current study, it is important to review the intended assessment in the current Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy as assessment can influence the curriculum implementation.

In Lesotho, traditional disciplinary learning that characterised the previous curriculum was underpinned by high stakes testing in the form of summative assessment which relied overly on, pen and paper assessment at the expense of what the learner knows and is able to do (MoET, 2009). This traditional mode of testing, which focuses on the scores, fails to acknowledge that learning involves meaning making. Assessment in this view must be freed from “high-stakes testing” but be made relevant and informative in order to benefit learners (Shepard, 2000, p.10).

The new curriculum policy in Lesotho prescribes a change in assessment through broadening modes of assessment from just summative assessment, including formative and monitoring of education progress. (MoET, 2009). The policy further states that assessment should focus on testing achievement from different abilities such as art and sport unlike in the old curriculum where cognitive attainment was the only one tested through summative assessment (MoET,2009).

Shepard (2000) asserts that when education is reformed to a curriculum that acknowledges a learner as an active participant in a classroom, there is always a need to shift modes of assessment. Assessment form that links with teaching nurture and provide the learners with
the opportunity to be inclined towards what instruction is intended for. Looked at this, it explains why Lesotho saw the need to make a shift in assessment.

Raselimo and Mahao (2015) do however caution that in the Lesotho context, formative assessment in the form of continuous assessment as stipulated by the policy might not be successful due to high student-teacher ratios, which adversely increase work load on the part of the teacher, making it impossible to oversee individual learners’ progress. Given this warning, it would be worth finding out whether teachers grapple with this challenge.

The discussion so far has looked at the intended curriculum that Lesotho planned to implement. Raselimo and Mahao, (2015, p.6), point out that though new policies may create opportunities, they also bring with them certain threats and challenges which can mar the envisaged outcomes. From their perspective there is an alignment between the new curriculum and the Lesotho national needs which suggest that there may be successful implementation of the intended policy. Despite this possibility, this success depends on the ability of the “stakeholders involved in curriculum development and implementation to interpret this policy in their specific contexts”. This means that in the interpretation of what the policy means is need to reach common understanding between curriculum developers, and schools, specifically teachers as implementers. This interpretation of curriculum policy is important; curriculum implementation can fail as a result of tensions between theory and practice. In the current study this becomes important to find out whether there is an alignment between the intended curriculum and how teachers interpret it both in theory and practice. At this point, it is pertinent to briefly look at some sub-Saharan African countries where curriculum reform has moved towards integration.

2.3 INTEGRATED CURRICULUM REFORMS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Educational change in Sub-Saharan Africa has been influenced by a number of internal and external factors ranging from political and socio-economic for a long time. In most of these countries the influence has been linked to the colonial and post colonial issues. Even with the end of colonial rule countries still find themselves in poverty, and political instability (Chisholm & Leyendecker, 2008), such issues force the states to reform their education in an attempt to address these issues. This section discusses curriculum reforms in Sub-Saharan African countries which have implemented integrated curriculum reforms at various points in time. The discussion will specifically focus on Botswana, Namibia and South Africa.
Botswana, as one of the sub-Saharan African countries has undergone a phase of integrated curriculum. According to Tabulawa (2009, p.87), this reform came as a response to globalization. The aim of integrated curriculum in this country envisaged a learner with:

*Attributes such as creativity, versatility, innovativeness, critical thinking problem-solving skills and positive dispositions toward team work (p.87).*

It can be noticed that the type of learner that is envisaged by both Lesotho and Botswana have the same attributes. Interestingly, it is worth noting that, the timing of the implementations occurred almost simultaneously. While Lesotho was working towards implementation phase Tabulawa noted the policy contradictions that occurred in implementing the integrated curriculum in Botswana.

The Botswana integrated curriculum policy, the Revised National Policy on Education (RNPE), envisioned that with activities such as projects, discussions, field work and other activity based modes of teaching, the learner would be an independent thinker and develop skills to work with others in a team (Tabulawa, 2009). Another feature, very similar to the Lesotho curriculum, is the emphasis placed on the significance of learner centred pedagogy. Even with the apparent similarities, it cannot be taken for granted that the outcomes of both countries of integrated curriculum would be the same. Tabulawa (p.95) makes an important point that the context from which integration takes place plays a fundamental role as the planning can be the same but the implementation be different due to different social and historical contexts. Learner-centred pedagogy is a new concept in Lesotho, and “if not well adapted to the Lesotho context it can pose a threat to educational development” (Raselimo & Mahao, p.8, 2015). Lesotho needs a careful adoption of integrated curriculum as the education system has been heavily teacher centred for years. In an earlier study Tabulawa (1997) stated that while the Botswana Education Department stipulated a shift in pedagogy towards a learner centred approach, teachers held on teacher centred pedagogy. The context played a major role in making the shift towards a learner centred approach impossible as parents and learners still expected teachers to transfer knowledge in preparation for examination.

South Africa and Namibia like many other post-colonial states had to reform their education in an attempt to redress the past inequalities. To achieve this, Namibia and South Africa adopted learner-centred and outcomes based education respectively (Chisholm and Leyendecker, 2008). Outcomes based education (OBE) it is argued can possibly “displace an emphasis on content coverage, make explicit what learners should attend to, since outcomes
signal what is worth learning in a content-heavy curriculum” (Jansen, 1998, p. 322). While OBE was being implemented, Jansen (1998) questioned its success as he argued that ‘universal claims’ made in developed countries about OBE, were superficial as the same countries have had problems associated with OBE. With OBE as a form of curriculum integration it goes without saying then, that the pedagogy that was attached to this type of education was learner centred one. The dominance of learner centred approaches in education policies in sub-Saharan Africa has been apparent in the 1990’s, the period which marked independence for most sub-Saharan countries (Chisholm and Leyendecker, 2008) however, the extent to which the practices were learner centred left a lot to be desired as Tabulawa (2009) indicated that if the policies are not well adapted to the contexts they may fail. In South Africa per se, the implementation of OBE failed with Curriculum 2005(C2005) short living its anticipated term. The major obstacle to the success of the implementation was teachers’ lack of understanding of what the curriculum meant (Chisholm and Leyendecker (2008). It can be understood from this that without proper understanding the implementation process cannot be successful. Hoadley (2013) reiterates that most teachers implementing Curriculum 2005 failed to understand the new terminology that came with OBE, as a result they referred to whatever they attempted to do, as OBE. OBE was also criticised for being highly regulated and that there was an over-specification of outcomes which resulted in many teachers not understanding how to implement it. This was a result of inadequate training (Jansen, 1998).

The problem was not unique to South Africa; Namibia also placed heavy emphasis on learner-centred education as a means of social transformation. Similarly though, taking the good and well written theory into practice, failed (Chisholm and Leyendecker, 2008). The gaps between classroom practices, what the society expected and learner-centred education were too much to fill (ibid). In both Namibian and South African contexts there was apparent “confusion about meaning and content of the concepts and the intended changes” (p. 202).

The implementation would not be practical without the participation of teachers as major implementers; as such it is essential to briefly look at the relationship between teachers and policy change. As seen from the above discussion tensions between theory and practice, lack of clarity and poor adaptation of policies to specific contexts can affect implementation process. It is also important for this study to find out the extent to which such factors impinge on implementation in Lesotho context. To understand this, the discussion that follows will
examine challenges facing teachers in the implementation of curriculum reforms.

2.4 TEACHERS AND POLICY CHANGE: CHALLENGES FACING IMPLEMENTATION OF A CURRICULUM INNOVATION

There is consensus from literature on the factors that interfere with successful implementations of curriculum reform. Teachers’ development, lack of clarity about the reform, teachers’ identity and resistance to change and additional workload are some of the dominant factors influencing implementation. These factors will be discussed briefly in relation to how they influence teachers in enacting a new curriculum, particularly an integrated one. It goes without saying that it is necessary to gain an understanding of the impact these factors have on teachers, as teachers are unarguably the central implementers of any curriculum reform irrespective from where it emanates (Porter, Fusarelli and Fusarelli, 2015).

2.4.1 Teacher Development

The role of teacher development in the process of policy change may seem obvious, but studies suggest that in many contexts, reforms fail due to lack of teacher development during the implementation of a new reform. According to Fullan (1992) teacher development is invaluable given that curriculum innovation brings new behaviours and ideologies. In the light of this Clark (2005) contends that the implementation can become a challenge for teachers given that in most cases the teacher training on the new innovation is only done for a day or two, as a result teachers are overwhelmed when they are to put the theory that they barely understood into practice. Dello-Iacovo (2009) concurred, in a study conducted in China; the findings reflected that the majority of teachers reported that inadequate training on how to implement the integrated curriculum marred the actual teaching of the innovation.

In the same light Jansen’s (1999) study, to find out how teachers implemented Out-Come Based Education Curriculum (OBE) conducted with grade one teachers from Mpumalanga and Kwa-Zulu Natal provinces revealed that lack of understanding of OBE and its implementation on the teachers side was hindering implementation. Teachers made their own meaning of what OBE was; this clearly indicated inadequate information dissemination to teachers. Teachers revealed that a five day training period was inadequate to equip them with necessary knowledge to implement OBE, this resulted in teachers either not attempting to implement OBE at all or within one school teachers understood OBE differently; as a result
the implementation differed in the same schools (Jansen, 1999 & Hoadley 2013). Without blaming anyone, it can be argued that among other factors intense and continuous teacher training could have improved implementation. Fullan (1992) concurs that, in order for any educational reform to be successfully enacted, acquisition of new knowledge and skills is essential. Lack of this knowledge can lead to a dismal failure of the innovation as Jansen (1998) contends that lack of support and preparation to teachers led to the failure of OBE in South Africa.

Furthermore, in order to understand how teachers understand and implement integrated curriculum in Lesotho the question of how well they were developed for the implementation of this new curriculum is crucial as it may influence success or lack thereof in teaching integrated curriculum. Teacher development is however not the only factor that can influence success or lack thereof during implementation, going forward it is essential then to unpack how at lack of clarity about the curriculum innovation may impinge on its implementation process.

2.4.2 Lack of clarity about curriculum reform

Implementation at any level cannot be successfully done if there is lack of understanding about what is to happen. In an effort to investigate teachers’ challenges and conceptions in implementing integrated curriculum in Lesotho it was appealing to review the impact clarity about curriculum innovation can have on teachers. Porter et al. (2015) contend that policy interpretation and implementation takes place at administrative and at the personal teacher level, the important issue is to have the consensus at both levels of what the policy means. It could be understood then that if the teachers have a different conception of what the policy means its enactment may not be as envisaged by curriculum developers and administrators. This was echoed through Jansen (1999) study where findings revealed that majority of the teachers were doing what they felt comfortable with and what was familiar to them from years of their practical experience. Whether it was OBE or not did not seem to matter much.

Porter et al. (2015) stresses that lack of clarity and misinterpretation causes serious tensions between teachers and administrators which make implementation more difficult. In Botswana, findings suggest that teachers and curriculum planners did not have the same conception regarding implementation. As a result the teachers’ pedagogical practices varied dismally from the expectations of the curriculum planners with teachers holding on to teacher centred
practices while the policy advocated for the learner centred practices. This leads to another important aspect that can impact on the implementation of a curriculum change, teacher identity and resistance to change (Sithole, 2010).

2.4.3 Teachers’ identity and resistance to change

The kind of teacher that is envisaged by most education policies often differ from the kind of teacher that is found in the classroom context. “Every education document contains powerful images of the idealised teacher” (Jansen, 2001, p.242). However, there is a visible disjuncture between policy and practice as Jansen (2001) argues that the teacher image envisaged by the policy is a very fluid one which changes with each reform. Given this argument then, it can be understood that shifting curricula can be emotionally demanding for teachers, especially if changes are too frequent as such changes affect the teachers’ identity (Jansen, 2001). Implementation of a curriculum reform calls for teachers to change their roles and dispositions, these could leave teachers feeling vulnerable, incompetent and insecure (Mahlangu, 2001).

Beane (1995) highlighted that one of the major obstacles for teachers to take up integrated curriculum for what it really is, is mainly due to the fact that teachers have formed their identities alongside the knowledge disciplines they teach - as “math teachers, language teachers etc”(p.619). An implication is that a curriculum reform such as integrated curriculum can dismantle the world of the teachers who have lived and identified themselves through the disciplines they teach. In a context where a teacher has built a career as History teacher the implementation of a new reform could mean that the focus should not be on history as a discipline but on an area within which History falls, this could seems to strip the teacher’s identity and could hinder smooth implementation. Another identity shift during a reform was also the issue that teachers felt the policy change made them feel like it is their first year of teaching as they had to acquire a lot of new knowledge and which affected their jobs (Porter et al, 2015). This is relevant for this study since initially Lesotho teachers progressed with the same learners until they finished their seven years of primary school, however now they have to stay within the same grade, so it is worth finding out how this influences teachers’ identities, as this could make them feel like novice or junior teachers. With teachers’ identities being challenged the result can be resistance to change. Fullan (1992) argues that teachers will implement curriculum in ways that aligns with their own ideologies and practices that they are comfortable with. This resistance can arguably be
influenced by the fact that policy change dismantles the teachers’ identities as a result their defence mechanism become to resist and hold on to what they know and are comfortable with.

Findings from a study done in England and Finland where there was a move from a subject based curricula to an integrated one, show that teachers from the primary schools reported that they were not keen to participate in the move from traditional curriculum. This study concluded that the identities of primary school teachers play a major role in facilitating the imposed curriculum reforms (Vulliamy, Kimonen, Valainen and Webb, 1997, p.102). In the light of this discussion, it is important finally look at additional work load as one of the possible barriers to a successful implementation of integrated curriculum.

### 2.4.4 Additional workload

In the light of earlier discussions integrated curriculum marks a move from being a mathematics teacher to teaching a combination of subjects. This could possibly be a challenge in Lesotho as most teachers had been teaching specific subjects for a long time. Another possible work load implication was noted by Raselimo and Mahao (2015) that student-teacher ratios may impact negatively on teachers’ ability to successfully implement integrated curriculum. This in sum means that teachers need to learn more knowledge, and to also shift on pedagogy and assessment practices. Mahlangu (2001) contends that additional work load that is embedded within a curriculum reform cannot be disregarded. The process of planning for and implementing integrated curriculum can be daunting for teachers.

Jansen’s (1999) study concurs saying that teachers lamented that OBE was too demanding, stressful and time consuming. It is not surprising that Mahlangu (2001) asserts that due to increased work load during the implementation of a curriculum reform, some teachers may be unwilling to go an extra mile in the work they do. In the current study it was significant to find out whether the issue of extra work load is also experienced by the teachers and also to get insight as to the extent to which this could impinge on the implementation process.

It is evident from the literature that implementation of a new curriculum is not easy. The challenges are more burdening for the teachers as they are the ones who are expected to enact the curriculum. In developing and planning educational changes, factors such as clarity about such a reform, teacher development, additional workload teacher identity and resistance to chance must be taken into consideration. The next section discusses the theoretical
framework that is used in this study to analyse the knowledge integration and pedagogic practices teachers made to implement integrated curriculum in Lesotho.

2.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A theoretical framework is important in setting a lens through which research is conducted and analyzed. It further provides insights on what is known about the issue under study, and provides a systematic way to analyse and observe causes and outcomes of phenomena studied (Bell, 2005, Basit 2010).

The theoretical framework that informed this study is Bernstein's (1971, 1996, and 2000) concepts of classification and framing of educational knowledge. Bernstein’s theory provides a framework that researchers can use to analyse both intended and enacted curriculum. In this study the concepts of framing and classification, were used as they provided a language for describing and analysing issues of knowledge and pedagogy in teaching an integrated curriculum. These concepts enabled this study to explore the teachers’ understandings and challenges in implementing integrated curriculum in the classrooms, and further observed the relations of control that are embedded within teachers’ pedagogic choices. This provided an understanding of how the intended curriculum is being realised at the level of the classroom.

Classification refers to the strength of boundaries between and within categories (Bernstein, 1971). In the case of this study, relations within Personal, Spiritual and Social-PSS (as an integrated learning area), and relations between PSS and other subjects, lastly relations between PSS and everyday knowledge were explored. The relations if any between the PPS and disciplinary knowledge were also looked at.

In strong classification (C+), contents are well separated; while weak classification (C-) is observed when contents are brought together and boundaries between them are blurred. A curriculum characterised by strong classification is called a collection code, and one with weak classification the integration code (Bernstein, 1996, p.25). Thus classification was used, in this study, to develop analytical tool to explore the extent to which PSS is related to other subjects and the everyday knowledge of the learners, in an attempt to explore both the understandings and challenges of teachers in working with integrated curriculum. Weak classification would mean a high degree of interrelationship between PSS, other subjects and everyday knowledge. Where lessons were characterized by weak classification, it meant there was an explicit link between PSS, and other subjects and also between personal, social and
spiritual issues of the learners.

Classification does not only focus on the relations of subjects, but also classification of agents. This could be seen in the instance of the boundaries between curriculum innovators and teachers, or in the classroom between teachers and learners. In this study, this classification enabled an analysis of issues of power relations between PSS teachers and learners in a pedagogic situation.

Meanwhile, the tenet of framing refers to control over the selection of knowledge, its sequencing, and pacing and evaluation criteria. It further includes control over the social relations which make knowledge transmission possible (Bernstein, 1996, p. 26). In a classroom where framing was strong (F+), the teacher had explicit control in pedagogic practice, whereas in a weak framing (F-) the learner seemingly had control. Within Bernstein’s (1971) theory, strong framing is associated with didactic teaching methods, and weak framing with progressive pedagogy. The concept of framing was consequently used in this study to analyse control relations in the classrooms. This was be in order to understand the pedagogic choices teachers made and how those choices present options for learners, over pacing, sequencing and knowledge selected. Hoadley (2007) notes that framing actually supplements classification, as “it is through interaction (framing) that boundaries between discourses, spaces and subjects are defined, maintained and changed.” Understood this way then classification and framing complement each other.

The Curriculum and Assessment Policy Framework adopts a new pedagogy, which requires learners to take more responsibility for their own learning. This pedagogy is a move away from a teacher as a transmitter of knowledge but towards a teacher as a facilitator of learning (MoET, 2009). The extent to which the intended curriculum allows teachers and learners to make independent curriculum decisions, and the extent to which teachers facilitate an environment that creates interaction among learners themselves in exploring personal, spiritual and social issues portray the extent of change in the pedagogy from the former teacher centred pedagogy.

It is this understanding of Bernstein’s classification and framing that was used in this study. The sociological nature of Bernstein’s theory made it appealing in providing opportunities to understand the interactions and control at the classroom level. This made it possible to answer the research questions as the way teachers structure their pedagogy sheds some light
on how they understand integrated curriculum and in turn how they understood integrated curriculum greatly influenced their pedagogy. The way they interacted with learners also shed some light into how they interpret the curriculum they teach.

2.6 CONCLUSION

The literature reviewed has revealed that integrated curriculum has the potential to provide learners with the education that can promote autonomy, through critical thinking as put forth by Bean’s (1995) view of curriculum integration. However, studies which were conducted in Sub-Saharan Africa and internationally reveal that the implementation of integrated curriculum has been problematic. This suggests that any country which opts to reform curriculum this way should be cautious of the same weaknesses. In this particular study it is important to explore how implementation is done Lesotho and the extent to which similar factors may affect implementation in this context. Bernstein’s theory of classification and framing was used to show how teachers implement integrated curriculum in Lesotho primary schools.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This study intended to find out how grade three and five teachers’ understood the integrated curriculum and how they taught it in the classroom. The study also attempted to understand the challenges teachers have interpreting and teaching the integrated curriculum. In conducting this study it was essential to understand the systematic nature of research. It is through research that one can expand one’s knowledge and add valuable insights to the already existing body of knowledge. This can be achieved through a careful selection of systematic methods of enquiry (Bell 2005). The purpose of this chapter therefore is to discuss and outline the approach that was followed to carry out this study.

3.2 RESEARCH APPROACH

There is a vast range of literature distinguishing between quantitative and qualitative research approaches (Macmillan & Schumacher, 2010, Creswell et al., 2011, Bell 2005). It becomes the researcher’s discretion which approach to take, based on the phenomena under inquiry. Qualitative research is concerned with exploring and describing the phenomena of interest, and how people perceive and understand the world (Macmillan & Schumacher, 2010). It involves an interpretive approach rather than a statistical one. As I explored teachers’ interpretations of integrated curriculum, challenges they face in implementing an integrated curriculum, it was appropriate to use the qualitative approach. I was interested in perspectives of teachers about the curriculum implementation and I hoped to get detailed data from the participants in order to understand the way individuals “create, modify and interpret the world in which he or she finds himself or herself” (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p.8). For this study the choice of this approach therefore was motivated by the assertion that researchers who follow a qualitative approach are interested in understanding individuals’ perceptions and insights of the world (Bell, 2005).

3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

Qualitative research has numerous research designs; the appropriateness of each depends on the phenomenon under study. After careful consideration of other research designs, I found it
appropriate to use a case study design for this project.

3.3.1 Case Study

According to (Macmillan and Schumacher, 2010, Bell, 2005, Maree, 2011), a case study is a “bounded system” in conducting research, in which a researcher defines each case within its boundaries. Based on the philosophical underpinnings of the researcher a case study may be positivist, interpretive or critical (Maree, 2011). For the purpose of this study, the interpretive lens of a case study was taken as it allowed me understand the subjective views of the teachers in their specific contexts. The interpretivist approach is founded on the view that reality is not objective but constructed and interpreted by humans through their value systems, and therefore rejects the notion of value free research (Darke, Shanks & Broadbent, 1998).

Another reason for adopting a qualitative case study approach was that it allowed me to identify a number of interactive processes that at play during implementation process. In this study the significance played by a qualitative case study was to investigate teachers’ understandings, challenges and pedagogic choices teachers make in implementing integrated curriculum. This means that in finding the teachers’ conceptions of integrated curriculum I was able to understand the pedagogical choices that such teachers opt to use. The findings confirmed that teachers understanding of integrated curriculum influenced their choice of pedagogy; this aspect could have been hidden in other designs (Bell, 2005).

Equally important, a case study can give a voice to the usually marginalised or dominated group, (Maree 2011) in this study this was relevant as literature shows that in many reforms teachers’ voice is taken for granted yet successful implementation of such a reform is basically dependent on them. It confirms that case study was appropriate as it assisted in getting insights into teachers’ views and perspectives.

Case study research can focus on one or two variables that are essential to understanding a system being examined (Maree, 2011). The researcher in a case study can use multiple techniques of data collection (Bell, 2005, Maree, 2011), given this strength of a case study approach, this study benefited from use of multiple data collection techniques as interviews, observations, and policy review were used in order to get comprehensive data. The use of these multiple data collection techniques enabled triangulation to improve the trustworthiness and validity since the issue being researched was being tested through different methods.
These data was from three schools hence three cases, which enabled access to gaining deeper insight of teacher implementation at a range of different sites. The use of multiple cases enabled cross case analysis and comparison of the implementation challenges in different settings (Yin, 1994), this also allowed me to contrast findings from government, missionary and private primary schools.

### 3.4 SAMPLING OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOLS

#### 3.4.1 Teachers

There are a number of factors that affected the choice participants for this study. Among others was the experience the teachers had prior to the reform, the experience in the reform and the grades the teachers are practicing in. The teachers also had to teach the concept or theme from PSS, by virtue of an integrated learning area, PSS would have afforded more opportunities of integration than other learning areas. Those factors enabled me to get the data I wanted as I was able to get teachers who had the experience that allowed them to compare how this reform differs from the old curriculum. In Lesotho prior to 2013, primary school teachers moved progressively with their classes, that is, if a teacher was allocated grade one (then called standard one) in 2012, the same teacher would move with the same group of students for the duration of their primary education, when they complete, which would be in 2018. However, with this integrated curriculum reform, the teacher who was allocated to teach grade one when the reform was first implemented in 2013 was expected to teach the same grade for at least five years. This means that the teachers who started with the reform in 2013 in either grade one; two or three are still teaching the same grades (in 2015). As a result such teachers are in their third year of implementation, however, the grade four teachers are in their second year of implementation while the grade five teachers are only on their first year of implementation. This means that even though the Curriculum and Assessment Policy is in its third year of implementation, the experience the teachers possess varies according to the grades they teach.

There are a number of sampling techniques that a researcher can use to obtain data for the study. However the choice of such sample depends on the type of study undertaken. Macmillan and Schumacher (2010) give a detailed distinction between these techniques, all of which fall within two classes; probability and non-probability sampling. For the purpose of this study the probability sampling was inappropriate because participants would be drawn from a larger population with a possibility of selecting any member for a sample group.
(Macmillan & Schumacher, 2010). The challenge that this selection strategy would have posed, was that I would have ended up with teachers who do not have the traits that are needed to address the research questions. In the light of this, non-probability sampling was used. Given the nature of this study, in selecting teachers, purposive sampling as one of the non-probability sampling strategies, was used where the researcher had specific purpose in mind, and population was selected due to its particular elements of interest about the topic of inquiry (Maree 2011, Macmillan & Schumacher, 2010).

Purposive sampling enabled the selection of teachers who have insight of the previous curriculum and who are currently engaged in implementation of the new curriculum. Therefore, the purposive strategy was the best as a total of six teachers who had at least started practicing before 2011 were selected so that they have had experience before the reform and also had been part of the first stage of new curriculum implementation. Therefore they knew of challenges and had insight of the implementation process. Notwithstanding the specific and careful selection of teachers, there was one instance where one Grade five teacher was a new teacher, and he was the only one Grade five teacher in that particular school, even though he did not necessarily meet all the criterion for selection, he was used because he had undergone the teacher training workshops prior to the implementation of integrated curriculum. Due to my struggles in getting access in schools and time constraints, it would have been difficult to replace him. The table below presents the profiles of the teachers who participated in this study.

Table 1: Profile of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Ms Maama*</th>
<th>Mr Letsie*</th>
<th>Ms Seeiso*</th>
<th>Ms Lerotholi*</th>
<th>Ms Nkuebe*</th>
<th>Mr Mathealira*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government primary school</td>
<td>Government primary school</td>
<td>Missionary primary school</td>
<td>Missionary primary school</td>
<td>Private Primary school</td>
<td>Private primary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the school</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 Schools

However, in sampling of the schools both convenience and purposive sampling were used, which means first the selection was made on the basis of accessibility to the researcher, (Macmillan and Schumacher, 2010). The decision to conveniently select the schools was driven by both time and financial constraints. Then three schools were purposively selected on the basis of being; one government school, one private school and one missionary primary school as they are a representative of majority of schools in Lesotho. I wanted to find out whether the implementation of the new curriculum in all these schools is the same, and to find out whether challenges teachers faced are similar.

The sampling based on school proprietorship was motivated by the issue that the government does not have the same influence on the schools that were either privately owned or those owned by missionaries (Motaba,1998) therefore this would have direct bearing on how schools adopt government policies, whereas government schools would be bound to implement the policies as they are. What follows is the brief context of these research sites; some information was deliberately left out as it risks exposing the identity of these schools. Even though the schools admit children from different social classes, the issue of class was not taken as relevant in this study as the concern was on how teachers conceived and enacted integrated curriculum.

*Not their real names*
School A

School A was a government primary school which was established in 2006. The building of this school was built as a Japanese aid to Lesotho in the government’s effort to make primary education free and accessible to all. The school building is very modern and still new and under used. Most of its classrooms were empty during the school time. Some of the unused classrooms are rented out to a community church.

This school is located on the periphery of the urban Maseru, the capital of Lesotho. Most of the community around the school is a middle class community who sent their children to prestigious private schools mostly located in the heart of town. Given this, most of the children admitted to this school are not from around the school but are from the neighbouring villages and locations. The school has of approximately 350 learners, and about seven teachers including the Head teacher. The grade three and five classes had 46 and 55 learners respectively. The government has full control on this school. Since government implemented a free primary education to all policy over a decade ago, there are no fees charged in this school.

School B

School B is a missionary primary school and one of the oldest, with its establishment dating as far back as 1960. The buildings in this school are unsurprisingly old but very clean and well maintained. All the classrooms in this school were occupied with learners.

The school is also in the urban Maseru, located just about two kilometres from the city centre. Similar to School A, the education in this school is also free, however due to its long standing reputation of good results; the learners in this school are from both middle class and working class families that are mostly found around the school. The school has approximately 15 to 20 teachers. The grade three and grade five lessons observed had roughly 45 learners each. The governing body of the school that oversees the management of the school is mainly from the church council; however the council is mandated to oversee the implementation of the government policies.

School C

School C is a private school owned by certain individuals from the community around the school. This school is located about 10 kilometres away from School A and about 15 to 20
kilometres away from school B. This means School C is the furthest away from the capital Maseru. The school was established in 1989, and has standard buildings, with high walls surrounding the school.

Although the government passed the bill of free primary education for all, this school and many others that are privately owned still charge school fees. The school has a reputation of high standards and administers strict admission criteria. The observed classroom had about 40 to 50 learners each. Even though the school is literally located in a village, most of the children attending school here are not from around the area of the school, as there are about three free primary schools nearby where most parents send their children. The management of the school has the full control of day to day running of the school and it seems it is their discretion on which government policies to adopt.

3.5 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

There are a number of data collection instruments that can be employed in a qualitative study. This study used three of the methods, namely; interviews, observations and document analysis. This was essential in enabling data triangulation. Triangulation reduces the possibility of bias as it relies on data collected from a various sources using variety of methods (Maree, 2011). Due to its reliance on multiple data collection techniques, case study research minimises the bias as the results may be tested through different methods. As a researcher I was able to ensure credibility by providing enough evidence of how I arrived at the findings presented to the readers. The use of different techniques enabled me to establish validity by explaining in detail how I reached conclusions and interpretations (Yin, 1994). Triangulation as a result enhances validity by viewing one issue from different angles.

3.5.1 Interviews

Interviews, grant both participants and the interviewer an opportunity to gain insight into how people interpret certain situations from their own point of view (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007). For this reason this study used interviews in order to understand the challenges teachers face in implementing the curriculum, and in understanding how they interpreted the process of implementing an integrated curriculum.

Three distinct types of interviews are given as open-ended interview, semi-structured and structured. While the open-ended and structured are at extreme ends of a continuum (Maree,
(2011), the semi-structured was the one appropriate for this study. Semi-structured interviews permit the interviewer to probe for clarification of responses in cases where the respondent did not give a clear response (Bell, 2005). This technique for these reasons was appropriate as it provided an opportunity to get a deeper understanding from the teachers, by granting me the opportunity to follow up ideas, and probe teachers’ responses. Open-ended interviews were inappropriate since they require very skilled interviewers as the participants may go off topic due to its unstructured nature, and that could be very time consuming (Basit, 2010).

Interviews were audio taped to allow the researcher to have reference during the time of transcription. Recording an interview is of significance as it allowed me to check the wording of statements of interest that I quoted during the analysis. It also helped to keep eye contact during the interview process as the interview is a one-on-one conversation; it is conversation etiquette for the listener to keep eye contact to show the speaker that one is paying attention, also to make sure that whatever I write is accurate (Bell, 2005).

In order to successfully conduct the interviews, especially semi-structured ones as a researcher, I needed to have an interview schedule (see Appendix A) comprised of formulated questions as a guide to the interaction between the researcher and the participant (Basit, 2010). The design of the interview schedule is informed by the type of data that the researcher is hoping to find. The interview questions spoke to the main research questions such that the responses elicited from the participants should be able answer the research questions. Of importance was that the interviews granted me an opportunity to explore teachers’ views and feelings on the implementation of integrated curriculum in their respective schools. The interviews sessions all lasted approximately 30 minutes, and they were all conducted at the teachers’ schools.

It was essential to test the research instruments before conducting the actual research as this would make it possible to identify any shortcomings with the instruments. In formulating the questions it was essential to avoid, ‘ambiguity and imprecision, assumptions, double questions, presumptive questions, hypothetical questions and offensive questions’ (Bell, 2005, p.140-144). It was appropriate therefore that in designing the interview schedule the questions be clear and straightforward, without leading the interviewee to answers that she/he might think the researcher is looking for.

I tested the set questions to see whether I would get useful and valid data. The sample of the pilot study was representative of the actual study, including the approach, methodology and
methods (Basit, 2010). In conducting a pilot study I used three teachers who are currently teaching the new curriculum who also have the experience in the teaching of the old curriculum that is being phased out. I learned that the questions were indeed adequate to address the research questions therefore no adjustments were made. However, the teachers that participated in the pilot were not part of the actual study. The audio recording was also used in the pilot study to ensure that the equipment would work well during the actual data collection process. The outcomes of the pilot study should give an indication of what outcomes I can expect and also if my data collection tools need adjustment (Bell, 2005).

3.5.2 Observations

Like interviews, observations can be “structured or unstructured, participant or non-participant” (Bell, 2005, p.185). This study took a non-participant structured observation in which an observer goes into the observation with clear objectives of what to observe, and the importance of observing a particular aspect of the participant behaviour (Bell, 2005). For this study the observer focused on how the aspects of classification and framing played out in the observed lessons. This aspect was helpful for the current study as the objectives were known to the observer, in this case was to observe how participants teach the new syllabus therefore an approximately 45 minute lesson was observed per teacher.

It was difficult to gain access to schools, and to persuade teachers of the necessity to observe their lessons. However, this had minimal impact on the data because I still managed to get the cases that I needed. The Head teachers of the three schools that finally granted access were more welcoming to the idea of their schools participating in this study; therefore they convinced the teachers to partake in study. In order to capture all the details teachers’ lessons were video recorded. The use of the video recording preserved the depth of the data. “Video recording is an excellent way of recording non-verbal communication” (Basit, 2010, p.114). Capturing these on film was necessary given that the lesson cannot be paused for the researcher to note the important aspects of the lesson, such as non-verbal cues from the teacher, the non-verbal interaction and the teaching aids. Video also granted a good opportunity to the researcher to retain the lesson and revisit it as frequently as necessary during the analysis process; therefore this increased the validity of the findings.

As a researcher I had to consider the effect I would likely have had on the lessons I observed. The presence of the outsider could yield negative or unusual environment in the classroom as the learners could have behaved in a way they would not normally behave or the teacher’s
behaviour could change. In this study the presence was not much of a distraction because of the same ethnicity and that age difference between the researcher and the participants was not very big.

3.5.3 Document Analysis

Bell (2005) indicates that in some studies the document analysis may be a method used to supplement other sets of data already obtained. This is true for this study as the review of the Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy was used as a way of deepening insights into what the interviews and observations have revealed. The curriculum and assessment policy is intended to benchmark teachers’ responses to interview questions seeking their understanding, interpretation of the policy and how their understanding translates into their actual implementation in the classroom. Bell (2005) refers to this kind of source as an inadvertent sources, meaning it is utilized by the researcher for the purpose other than the one intended. Although the policy was not necessarily intended for research purposes this study used it as a data source.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

When the process of data collection was completed, it was my responsibility as a researcher to make sense of the raw data collected through analysis and interpretation so that it can be accessible to the readers. Data analysis “involves organizing, accounting for and explaining the data, which means making sense of the data in terms of the participants’ definitions of the situation, noting patterns, themes, categories and regularities” (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007,p.461). The process below was followed in analysing the interview data. I listened to the audio-tapes to recapture the responses from the participants which helped simplify the next stage. Then I transcribed each interview, coded and categorized it, to identify the themes that emerged so that I could show relationships or contrasts across the six interviewees’ responses. This approach to analysis is termed ‘systematic approach to data analysis’ (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007, p. 470). The data was then analysed in relation to the research questions informing this study. Bernstein’s (1971) theory was used as a framework to analyse both intended and enacted curriculum. In this study the concepts of framing and classification, were used as they provided a language for describing and analysing the issues of knowledge and pedagogy in implementing integrated curriculum.

3.6.1 Analysis of lesson observations
The following table was used to analyse the lesson observations using the criteria detailed on the table, I was able to identify the degrees of knowledge integration which was then analysed accordingly.

*Table 2: Analysis of degree of knowledge integration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical categories</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relations between Personal, spiritual and social (PSS)</td>
<td>How (or whether) relations are made between personal issues, spiritual issues and social issues</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C−−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between PSS and school knowledge</td>
<td>How (or whether) relations are made between PPS and other subjects</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C−−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between PSS, everyday knowledge and</td>
<td>Whether relations are made between PPS and everyday knowledge</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyday knowledge and</td>
<td></td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C−−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*modified such that it becomes specific to my study

The modification (Bertram, 2008) of table 2 below was made because even with lessons which reflected strong classification (C+) the strength was not the same. From the table above C represents classification, where classification is ++ very strong it meant that a lesson had a clear demarcation between the subject being taught and other subjects which meant no
knowledge relations were made between school and everyday knowledge therefore no integration, + strong classification was used where there was demarcation of subjects but was not very strong, some reference was made to other subjects or everyday knowledge even though not very explicit. With –weak classification the links were made between subjects being taught however the links were often only between subjects being taught and everyday knowledge --very weak was used for lessons that reflected some level of integration encompassing relations between everyday knowledge and links between other subject.

Table 3 below indicates statements used to analyse selection of knowledge, its sequencing, and pacing and evaluation criteria. The four point scale was also used to analyse framing. The table was adapted from Hoadley (2012) and Bertram (2008).

**Table 3: Analysis of Framing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical categories</th>
<th>coding</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>The teacher makes decisions over what knowledge is selected for teaching and learning, learners don’t have input on this decision. Learners have control over what knowledge is selected for teaching and learning in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>The teacher has control over the sequence of the steps that the lesson takes and doesn’t take into account individual learners’ inputs or needs. He or she doesn’t divert from the set sequence. Learners have input or may make decisions about the order in which learning occurs. Their input in the lesson partly or wholly determines the order of events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table is a summary of the alignment between the methods and the questions made in order to ensure that the data collected was able to address the research questions. The table indicates which methods will answer which research question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>F++</th>
<th>F+</th>
<th>F-</th>
<th>F--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The pace is wholly or mostly determined by the teacher, and he or she is not deterred or slowed down by individual learners’ inputs, questions or interventions. How quickly the learning proceeds is partly or wholly determined by the learners’ input, needs or interventions. The lesson may slow down in response to their questions, concerns or comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social interaction</th>
<th>F++</th>
<th>F+</th>
<th>F-</th>
<th>F--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher retains authority by giving direct orders. The teacher is keen to maintain order. Clear instructions are almost given by the teacher. Learners talk when responding to teacher’s questions, and they rarely ask questions. Relations between the teacher and learners are hierarchical.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher maintains authority, but sometimes allows room for open relations and negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between the teacher and learners and among the learners are open. Control of the teacher is implicit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between the teacher and learners are informal. He/she makes jokes to release tension. Teacher creates contexts for dialogue and critical engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table *Adapted from Hoadley (2012) and Bertram (2008).*
Table 4: Alignment between methods and research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTIONS</th>
<th>DATA USED TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS</th>
<th>ANALYSES OF DATA USING BERSTEIN’S CLASSIFICATION AND FRAMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are teachers understandings of integrated curriculum?</td>
<td>Analyses of interview transcripts and lesson transcripts</td>
<td>Teachers’ whose lesson are strongly classified and framed lack understanding of integrated curriculum. While those who showed some understanding made links with everyday knowledge and linked across subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What pedagogic choices do teachers make?</td>
<td>Analyses of lesson transcripts and interview transcripts</td>
<td>Teachers’ who choose pedagogy that has weak boundaries reflect understanding of integrated curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What challenges do teachers face in teaching integrated curriculum?</td>
<td>Analyses of interview responses</td>
<td>The data here was interpreted based on themes that emerged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 TRUSTWORTHINES, CREDIBILITY AND TRANSFERABILITY

In qualitative research it is of importance to ensure that trustworthiness of data is judged by whether it can be dependable, credible and transferable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Already discussed is the triangulation as an effective way of making sure that data are trustworthy and dependable. In further ensuring trustworthiness the following was done;

3.7.1 Credibility

For data to be credible, the findings must reflect that they happened the way the researcher says they did (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Moreover, the credible study is characterized by faithful descriptions of which readers with similar experience can relate to. In this study, to ensure data credibility after transcribing the data I sent back the data transcripts to the interviewees for them to verify that what I have written is indeed what they said. This though
could be risky as some participants could have withdrawn some comments they had initially made during the interview (Basit, 2010). Fortunately, this did not happen, as I would have had to interview different teacher/s.

3.7.2 Transferability

In qualitative research the findings are said to be transferable when they can be applied in another context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The possibility of transferability depends on how adequately the methods applied are explained. As a result I explained in detail the method that I followed in this study, this should enable other researchers to make judgments and use the findings of this study in other research studies. The results of the pilot data and those of this actual study revealed contrasting results yet the methods used were similar, this shows that the study can be replicated but not generalised.

3.7.3 Dependability

For the study to be dependable its process must provide the chance to be audited, and that given the same conditions and circumstances another researcher would come up with more or less the same findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This can be difficult as the teachers responses are mostly subjective to individual teachers, and can change. I however went through data thoroughly to look for similarities and differences between the responses of the teachers. I also checked for continuities and contradictions between what the teachers said in the interviews and what they did in the classrooms. Most importantly I made sure I used the same data collection instruments, and interviewed all the teachers at their places of work. Although the social contexts of teacher’s schools differed, I interviewed teachers of the same grades (three and five), so that the data can be dependable. The differences in the contexts of the three schools were taken into account to see if they may result in variations. The transcripts are available for verification.

3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is the responsibility of every researcher to take into consideration the ethical issues in order to protect the participants from any harm. This involves giving respect due to the participants and the researcher should therefore meet the moral obligation of protecting the participants from any harm or prejudice that may result from the investigation (Cohen et.al, 2000) One of the most important aspects of these is to seek consent from the participants. (See Appendices C-H) Moreover, the participants were made aware in writing that their participation is totally
voluntary and they can withdraw at any stage of the study without any prejudice (Leedy and Ormrod, 2001). The presence of learners in the classroom made them secondary participants therefore since they were minors their parents’ consent as well as assent of learners was sought and received (appendices H-I). There were few cases where learners never returned the forms, in filming lessons, capturing learners’ faces was avoided.

It is of outmost importance that the researcher protects the privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of the participants (Maree, 2011). In order to adhere to these as a researcher I made sure that the identity of the participants and that of the schools remain anonymous in all writings about the study by using pseudonyms instead of their real names (see Appendices C& D). Any identifying information that might reveal the participants or the schools was eliminated in writing this report. To ensure confidentiality, the details of the interviews will not be discussed anywhere other than for the purposes relating to this study.

The research should receive ethical clearance from the Ethics Committee of the institution from which the study is undertaken (Maree, 2011) for this study clearance was applied for and granted by the University of the Witwatersrand, with the protocol number 2015ECE026M the procedure of which I underwent before conducting the study. The permission to conduct the study was also sought and granted by The Ministry of Education and Training in Maseru. All the raw data will be kept in a password protected laptop where I am the only one who can access them until they can be destroyed within the period given by the ethics committee.

3.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed and outlined the approach and methods that were followed to carry out this study. The purpose of the study was to find out the challenges and understandings primary school teachers encounter in implementing integrated curriculum in Lesotho. The study used a case study qualitative approach in order to address the research questions, the results and analyses are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the data analysis for each teacher based on data from both interviews and observations. The three research questions that informed this study were used to organise the data. The presentation will first focus on the analyses of lesson observations for each of the six teachers using Bernstein’s concepts of classification and framing in order to determine the extent to which each teachers’ pedagogic choice displays integrated curriculum. Then the interview data is analyzed to establish the teachers’ understandings and challenges of integrated curriculum. The data for both observation and interviews is presented per school, from each school it is then presented teacher by teacher.

4.2 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF LESSONS

All the analyses of the lessons was done based on the four point scale of both classification and framing ranging from very strong to very weak. The indicators were as discussed in the methodology (refer to table 2 & 3). The F--,F++,C++,C-- were added as the lessons reflected that even those lessons that had strong classification for instance, were not equally strongly classified.

4.3 SCHOOL A

School A was a government primary school. The discussion that follows presents data from the first teacher, Ms Maama, a grade three teacher from School A, which will be followed by the presentation from the second teacher, Mr Letsie, a grade five teacher from the same school. The names used for the teachers are fictitious.

4.3.1 Ms Maama’s lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>F++</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>F++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge- relations between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relations between PSS and everyday knowledge
PSS & other subjects
Relations within PSS

C
C
C

Ms Maama’s lesson as exemplified by table 5 above was characterised by strong framing, the value of strength varied from very strong to strong, the decision around what to teach was wholly determined by the teacher, the learners had no input on the selection of the content to be taught. The sequence that the lesson followed was also the decision of the teacher alone, while the pacing was less strong as the teacher allowed learners to give their inputs on what they could recycle and reuse, the sequence was determined by the teacher as she carefully led learners through the text and also decided when learners could move from activity one to the next. Extract 1 below supports this argument.

**Extract 1 Ms. Maama’s lesson**

Ms. Maama: there is this item that boys especially like, that when they pass they would normally ask their parents to buy them, and then they ride on, what do we call that?

Motselisi: It’s called a bicycle

Ms. Maama: yes correct, so how do we ride on the bicycle?

Learners: we cycle

(Learners demonstrate with the teacher using hands to show how to ride a bike).

Ms. Maama: you see the wheels on the bicycle turn and turn that is a circle as these wheels turn. So the wheels turn, so we do recycle. Which means if today I buy a bottle of still water (shows the empty bottle to the learners), not the one you draw from the well or you get from the tap, I mean that water that was bottled by the experts’ right? Then you went and bought a bottle of water, after drinking the water, what do you do with the empty bottle?

Learner: I throw it away!

Ms. Maama: Well, you throw it away? What would others do with the empty bottle after drinking the water?

(The lesson continued with learners giving a range of responses, and items they would recycle and reuse).

In relation to the evaluative criteria, Ms Maama’s lesson had strong framing as she indicated in the beginning of her lesson what learners are supposed to learn, at different points of the lesson however, the evaluative criterion were not made as explicit, extract 2 below for instance reflects the interaction between learners where the teacher focused on the common error made by learners, instead of explicitly showing learners the correct answer, she encouraged them to find the correct procedure and answer themselves.
Extract 2 Ms. Maama’s lesson

Learners: (reading from their texts as directed by the teacher) they collected empty bottles to reuse, they collected 124 bottles in the 1st week, and 157 in the second. They added the bottles like this:

Ms. Maama: (writing the numbers of the bottles collected) How many bottles did they collect the 1st week?

Learners: 157 bottles

Ms. Maama: in the 1st week?

Learners: they collected 124 bottles

Ms. Maama: what about the second week?

Learners: 124

Ms. Maama: we are told they added. What sign am I supposed to use to show they added?

Bathabile: It’s a plus sign

Ms. Maama: yes that’s right. This means the sign that we are going to use today is addition, and be aware that the addition that we are doing today is the carry forward, so it means we’re going to add and carry forward. (She writes the numbers on the board)

\[
\begin{align*}
124 \\
+157 \\
= 2711
\end{align*}
\]

Ms. Maama: (writes the numbers for addition on the board and deliberately doesn’t put the tenths and hundreds where they are supposed to be, while she adds the numbers with the learners) Am I correct to have put the answer like this? (Points at the 2711)

Learners: No teacher!

Ms. Maama: but when you write to me you present the answers like this. Tell me then how I am supposed to do the addition. [She underlines 2- (hundreds) 7- (tens) 11-(units)] So who can tell me how we were supposed to add the numbers?

Khothalo: You take 4 and add it to 7 = 11. Then you put 1 under units and carry the other 1 to the tenths, then add 5 and 2 plus the 1 that has been carried over, then add 2 plus one from the hundreds the total will be 281

Ms.Maama: she writes the numbers as Khothalo gives them:

\[
\begin{align*}
124 \\
+157 \\
= 281
\end{align*}
\]

Ms. Maama: So it is correct like this...

(The lesson continued with learners doing individual work and the teacher went around marking).

In terms of classification, knowledge was weakly classified, there was strong integration between the subject being taught and every day knowledge, with regard to integration between PSS and other subjects, the classification was weak, though Ms. Maama only integrated Mathematics with the focus on procedure of ‘carrying forward’ in addition. The
extract below reflected how the teacher used the theme of recycled bottles to introduce addition.

It is worth noting that as the discussion in these lesson proceeded, the teacher and the learners focused on the mathematical procedures and little or no reference was ever made to the everyday knowledge (the collected bottles), but both learners and teacher got immensely involved in the mathematical problem-solving procedure. Mathematics is not a PSS subject therefore Ms Maama made a link across learning areas, and the focus mathematical procedures without much reference to everyday knowledge could be to help learners get access to the systematic nature of school knowledge. As could be understood from Ms Maama’s lesson, reference to everyday knowledge does not necessarily weaken subject classification as the Mathematics lesson remained strongly classified; however everyday knowledge was used to make school knowledge accessible to the learners.

Ms Maama’s understanding of integrated curriculum

In an interview with Ms Maama, a grade 3 teacher, she was very upbeat about the new curriculum and spoke confidently and strongly expressed this about the new curriculum, “It is good. I love it because it teaches learners to be independent and to have means of survival… Ms Maama’s view is aligned with the policy as it envisions curriculum that will enhance among others ‘independence and survival skills’ in learners (MoET, 2009).

Ms Maama’s understanding of integrated curriculum showed that she saw the curriculum as linking school knowledge to everyday knowledge. As seen in the earlier discussions, this understanding was also reflected in her lesson where she integrated school knowledge with learners’ everyday knowledge. She expressed her views and understanding as thus;

Looking at this new curriculum, it requires us to draw everything from the children’s everyday life, including using their play time experiences.

Furthermore she made an interesting assertion about the integrated curriculum, and claimed that the new curriculum foregrounds everyday knowledge;

...so we emphasise that whatever learners experience when they play they can share during the lesson, we trying to merge the outside world with the school life.

Her response suggests that integrated curriculum puts everyday knowledge to the fore, however, her lesson even though it reflected a certain level of integration, it did not seem to have foregrounded everyday knowledge.
Ms Maama went on to express her understanding of integrated curriculum as being informed by the learner centred approach. She insisted that the teaching and learning activities are done by learners.

*Most of the teaching activities are done by them (learners).*

As she expressed that integrated curriculum is child centred with teaching activities done by learners, one could expect higher levels of learner involvement in the lesson, notwithstanding limited learner involvement Ms Maama focused on the common error (extract 2) that learners made, and that letting learners correct themselves was an effort to give learners a platform to be in charge of the learning. The discussion that follows presents Ms Maama’s perceived challenges.

**Challenges Ms Maama faced in implementing integrated curriculum**

During the interview with Ms Maama, she expressed that the implementation of the current curriculum is really not very challenging for her. She said this is due to the fact that the curriculum is very good and teaches learners independence and the environment can be used as a teaching resource. She however indicated that that there is one challenge for her,

*The only challenge however, is the materials we don’t have; I mean those that I personally don’t have access to, for instance like having to teach using computers, how can I use a computer when we don’t even have electricity?*

Having looked at Ms Maama’s pedagogy and her understanding of integrated curriculum, the following discussion presents Mr Letsie’s lesson analysis in order to find out if there are any similarities or differences given that they are in the same school.

**4.3.2 Mr Letsie’s Lesson**

Mr Letsie’s lesson who is a Grade five teacher at the same school with Ms Maama, it is important to remember that as Ms Maama was in her third year of enactment of this curriculum, it was the first year for the Grade five into the curriculum enactment, not only that but also the first year of Mr Letsie’s in teaching. Table 6 below summarises Mr Letsie’s lesson in terms of classification and framing.
Mr. Letsie’s lesson focused on the Alcohol and drug abuse theme. The discussion was closely led by the teacher; the learners were given an opportunity to give definitions and examples of the substances they knew. This made the lesson have weak pacing as the teacher’s lesson was slowed down by the learners’ inputs. The sequence due to learner involvement was less strong; however, selection was strongly framed as the teacher was entirely in control of what was discussed. In terms of classification, the teacher allowed learners to give the examples from their everyday knowledge, however from time to time he kept referring them to the text either to confirm or correct their responses. This is exemplified by extract 3 below.

**Extract 3 Mr. Letsie’s Lesson**

Mr. Letsie: *we also have glue and benzene as some of the addictive drugs, under which type or category do we find glue and benzene?*

Retsepile: *Medicine?*

Keneiloe: *No they are under tobacco.*

Thabile: *alcohol*

Mr. Letsie: *under tobacco, check and confirm from your textbook*

Learners: *Yes Sir!*

Mr. Letsie: *Do you know any people who use glue as a drug?*

Learners: *Yes Sir!*

This then means there was visible integration between the subject being taught and everyday knowledge. Integration between PSS and other subjects was not visible which means the lesson was strongly classified between PSS and other subjects. Mr Letsie’s lesson on drug and substance abuse, everyday experiences were used to expand on the text that was used in

**Table 6: Summary of analysis of Mr Letsie’s lesson on drug and substance abuse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>F++</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>F-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between PSS &amp; other subjects</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between PSS and everyday knowledge</td>
<td>C--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations within PSS</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the lesson. Time and again the teacher let learners bring their own experiences observations of instances of drug abuse into discussion, he also provided learners with examples from his own experiences. However, when the discussion on drug and substance abuse was concluded, the teacher urged the learners to close their books and moved on to History lesson on the San and the Khoikhoi, no connection whatsoever was ever made between drug and substance abuse discussion and history, even though history forms part of PSS.

**Mr. Letsie’s understandings of integrated curriculum**

Considering that integrated curriculum was implemented for the first year in Grade five which Mr Letsie, was teaching it was of importance whether his views are any similar with Ms Maama’s, her colleague, not only that but also to find out whether they experience the same challenges since they teach in the same school. In the interview, Mr Letsie also displayed a positive outlook towards integrated curriculum.

In expressing his understanding of integrated curriculum Mr Letsie highlighted that with integrated curriculum learners have an opportunity to have a better understanding of concepts as they are taught across the learning areas. Therefore he argued that with integrated curriculum, children learner better than in the previous curriculum where subjects stood in isolation. In further expressing his understanding he said;

> The experiences are incorporated into teaching and learning so that the children see the link between school life and daily experiences.

This response shows that like Ms Maama, Mr Letsie also views and understands integrated curriculum as link between school knowledge and everyday knowledge. Even though teachers clearly put much emphasis on integration as linking the daily experiences, the policy does show that there should be interconnection between the content of all subjects and also link with learners’ everyday knowledge and experiences.

**Challenges Mr Letsie faced in implementing integrated curriculum**

When it comes to challenges of implementing integrated curriculum, Mr Letsie asserted that the biggest challenge comes with the workload that is embedded within implementation of integrated curriculum. Mr Letsie expressed this as follows;

> This curriculum gets challenging because as a teacher you have to pay extra attention
Extra workload is a challenge as Mr Letsie puts it. Although this aspect was not so obvious in his lesson as a challenge his lesson, it is understandable why he may view it as a challenging given that he did actually try to get learners involved in the classroom activities, with around 65 learners his class had it truly can be daunting to focus on individual learners. Mr Letsie made an effort to invite participation from learners who were initially unwilling to partake in the classroom discussion.

Taken together, both teachers from School A embrace and do enact the new curriculum despite that their level of enactment differed. Ms Maama for instance understands and enacts curriculum through linking learners’ everyday knowledge, she however did not end there, and she went further to integrate through linking with Mathematics. Mr. Letsie on the other hand focused on linking his lesson with everyday knowledge and life experiences of his learners, however, there were no links made between PSS and any other subject, even when he introduced History it was in isolation rather than relating it with what he was already teaching. However, they both lacked ability to show knowledge relations within (as can be seen from table four and five above) PSS and relations across other subjects were either limited or not there. In this school one can assume that Ms Maama’s better enactment was influenced specifically by the three years she has within this new curriculum enactment and her qualification as a teacher in general, while Mr Letsie was not qualified as a teacher and above that the implementation had just started in grade five. The commonality between these two teachers was that both of them believed the enactment required them to use a learner centred approach to teaching, however their practice of learner centeredness was limited.

4.4 SCHOOL B

The following discussion presents School B which is a missionary school with a long standing reputation of good results. The following discussion will present data from Ms Seeiso, a Grade three teacher in this school; it will then be followed by Ms Lerotholi, a Grade five teacher who is the second teacher in the same school.

4.4.1 Ms Seeiso’s Lesson

Ms Seeiso is a Grade three teacher in School B. She started her teaching career long before introduction of integrated curriculum and has also been teaching Grade three since the
inception of integrated curriculum in this school. The following table presents a summary of her lesson in relation to classification and framing. Following that will be the analysis of the same lesson, where Ms Seeiso integrated learners’ everyday knowledge of types of houses and Mathematical knowledge on the use of bar graphs in order to get insight of what the table means.

Table 7. *Summary of analysis of the Ms Seeiso lesson*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>F++</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>F++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between PSS and everyday knowledge</td>
<td>C−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge- relations between PSS &amp; other subjects</td>
<td>C−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations within PSS</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table summarises Ms Seeiso’s Grade three classroom activities. The sequence and selection were very strongly framed as the teacher decided on what activities to do, as seen from extract 3 below.

*Extract 4 Ms Seeiso’s lesson*

Ms. Seeiso: *(Writes “unit 3- the world around us”). Turn to page 35 and tell me what you see on that page.*

Learner: *I see a house*

Learners: *houses*

Ms. Seeiso: *what is the importance of having house?*

Rethabile: *it is for people to live in.*

Ms. Seeiso: *oh good, is it people only who have houses?*

Thabang: *Even rats.*

Learner: *cats.*

Learner: *dogs.*

Ms. Seeiso: *Yes dogs do have their own houses, we don’t live with them in our own house, and even pigs do have their own sties as their houses. So tell me from the houses pictured in your book, which one is similar to the one you stay in?* (The lesson continued with learners reading and differentiating between different types of houses from their text books).
The pacing was not as strongly framed as the teacher allowed the learners to read and provide responses on the types of houses they knew. For instance, Ms Seeiso led the learners to the text and they were the ones reading and providing the examples of the type of houses they see in the book and the ones they know.

Classification of knowledge was very weak between everyday and school knowledge. However, the relations between PSS other subjects was not very weak as Ms. Seeiso for instance only used the concept of bar graph (extract 5) in order to make learners work out the total of the number and types of houses around their school. No other connections whatsoever were made to other subjects or concepts within PSS to integrate knowledge. The Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy (MoET 2009) states that in this within PSS, the personal, spiritual and social issues should be integrated, this issues can be taken from history, religious education and health among other subjects.

**Extract 5**

Ms Seeiso: Alright thank you. When we go out in this area surrounding the school we find that we have 5 roundavels, 8 cottages, 7 bungalows, 1 thatch house, 3 huts. This numbers we can put on a bar graph so that the person who reads can easily understand how many houses are found around our school. (Learners are shown a sample of a bar graph drawn on the board by the teacher as the learners book had no bar graph and they sit down to put the number of houses in a bar graph).

(The learners worked individually to put the numbers in a bar graph, and the teacher went around marking).

Ms. Seeiso’s understandings of integrated curriculum

The interview with Ms Seeiso also revealed that she sees integrated curriculum as a good curriculum that has an opportunity to benefit the education in Lesotho, she expressed this in these words;

*It is good; it has an opportunity to make learners grow because it teaches them about life issues...*

Given this, it is important to look at how Ms Seeiso then understands this good curriculum. The findings from the interview with Ms Seeiso suggest that she understands integrated curriculum that relates the concepts from across the different learning areas. She expressed that,

*I see that there is a relationship between lessons...there is continuity between concepts, this new curriculum builds on concepts from topic to topic and across subjects, in fact we no longer have independent subjects*
Ms Seeiso’s conception of integration differs from the School A teachers whose understanding reflected the link between school and everyday knowledge. The understanding of integrated curriculum from her perspective is making the links between the concepts explicit, and significant emphasis is also placed on the idea that this interconnection must be evident in one lesson. …*one lesson captures different subjects to help learners view life as a whole not as bits and pieces that don’t go together.*

In addition she also holds the same views of integrated curriculum as a learner centred, Ms Seeiso went further to express the following:

*This curriculum is very child centred, learners come with ideas, as a teacher I only facilitate and make sure learning takes place, and most of the work is done by learners.*

Looking back at Ms Seeiso’s lesson, her understanding of making links between the PSS lesson and other subjects was limited to the mathematical procedure of counting the types of houses using the bar graph. More links could have been made to integrate more subjects, history for instance as one of the subjects integrated within PSS could have been used to show how Basotho villages/houses transformed with time.

**Challenges Ms. Seeiso faces in implementing integrated curriculum**

In relation to the challenges that come with the implementation of this curriculum innovation, Ms Seeiso’s strongly expressed that the curriculum is very challenging, her views were as such;

*The biggest challenge is that this curriculum is very demanding when you (I) plan it takes time because you have to think of links, ... how concepts or topics can be integrated, so it is time consuming because the old curriculum you just had to plan for English if it was English lesson*

Other than workload and being time consuming ,Ms Seeiso lamented that the training workshops that were done in preparation for the implementation were inadequate. She showed the concern that since the inception of the integrated curriculum implementation; the school never got any visits from Ministry of Education and Training to check how the implementation process is going, as a result teachers do not know whether they are doing what is expected or not. She further indicated that there were still some resources needed to make implementation successful.

*I mean we were trained only for a week and then we were expected to come and...*
implement, it is challenging.

We must be provided with scheme books and record books, those resources could make our work a lot better.

Lastly, she indicated that assessment is another challenge that comes with the new curriculum. In the previous curriculum, the assessment was almost entirely in the hands of teacher but now as Ms Seeiso reflects;

The other thing is the mode of assessment is very shallow, we assess only one thing, the questions come ready every year so it doesn’t allow us to assess other aspects of what we are teaching.

It can be understood why Ms Seeiso felt assessment in this current curriculum is limiting as in the old curriculum teachers had more control over their schools summative assessment. However, given that the policy has broadened the modes of assessment therefore teachers are expected not only to test cognitively but to use formative assessment to test learner achievement in other domains, one would have assumed that the pre set questions could not have be a problem since currently a lot could be assessed.

4.4.2 Ms. Lerotholi’s Lesson

Ms Lerotholi is a Grade five teacher in School B, as was the case with all Grade five teachers was enacting integrated curriculum for the first time, despite having taught for 24 years. The discussion that follows presents the analysis from Ms Lerotholi lesson on Lesotho features and lesson, it will later be followed by the analysis of data from the interview. The table below summarises the lesson in terms of classification and framing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>F**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>F**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between PSS</td>
<td>C--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and everyday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>C--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within PSS</td>
<td>C--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between PSS</td>
<td>C--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; other subjects</td>
<td>C--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Lerotholi introduced her lesson by instructing learners to sing the National Anthem, and then progressed into directing learners into naming Lesotho features, basically the mountains and how they are characterized. The features were mainly given by learners rather than the teacher telling them to the learners; however she kept reinforcing their responses where they were correct and challenging them where they provided the incorrect responses. The teacher went around encouraging all learners to participate, also led them to the next feature when she felt they had dwelled enough on the previous feature. This is illustrated in the extract six below.

**Extract 6: Ms Lerotholi’s lesson**

*Ms. Lerotholi:* (walks in between learners encouraging them to respond) *You see it is good when we get responses from different people, it shows we are all learning! Let’s talk of other ranges central and front ranges. We all know which districts are in the highlands and which ones are in the lowlands so look at the districts where we find those mountains so that we can be able to have an idea of where the range is found.*

*Thabiso:* Central range is in the highlands

*Tsoarelo:* Central range is in the foothills

*Ms.Lerotholi:* Come on, let’s think about it, think of places found within this range

*Thatohatsi:* Central range is in the lowlands

*Ms.Lerotholi:* Yes when we reach the central range we are moving downwards from the high mountains towards the lowlands

*Retsepile:* Front Range is in the lowlands
Ms. Lerotholi’s classroom was very relaxed and the social relations between her and her learners were very weakly framed. The teacher control was implicit. Selection and sequence were strongly framed, but the pacing was weak, learners had apparent control of how quickly they are learning however, when the learners, under the guidance of the teacher had characterized all the mountains into highlands, foothills and lowlands, the teacher then (in a playful mode) asked all the learners to stand and actively engage by showing with their hands where they could find highlands, foothills and lowlands. After this display the lesson was concluded by giving learners a task to formulate the English from the sentences to show the categories and classification of the mountains they have learned. The figure below shows the classification of mountains ranges that were discussed in Ms. Lerotholi’s class and from which learners were expected to write sentences showing these categories.

**Figure 1**

Lesotho features

In terms of classification, there was high integration of learners’ everyday knowledge and school knowledge which meant the lesson was weakly classified in this respect. Moreover, there was also an explicit integration between PSS and other subjects, the teacher for instance made learners use the concepts to construct English sentences. Music was also integrated in the lesson and the teacher also pointed that out to the learners, and made learners aware that they should know the national anthem, she further used some of the words of the national...
anthem to take learners to the features of Lesotho and specifically focused on one feature; mountains. Extract 7 below exemplifies this.

**Extract 7**

Ms Lesotho: Listen! I hope you paid attention to the words of the song, please repeat the first two lines of the anthem.

Learners: (in chorus) Lesotho fats’e la bo ntata rona! Har’a mafats’e le le tle ke lona!
(Translated: ‘Lesotho, land of our Fathers! You are the most beautiful country of all!)

Ms Lerotholi: Good! You said Lesotho is the most beautiful country, so today we are going to look at Lesotho features that make it so beautiful!
(The lesson started with learners giving a range of features such as rivers, when learners got to mountains, Ms Lerotholi focused the lesson on mountain ranges.)

Ms. Lerotholi’s understandings of integrated curriculum

Ms. Lerotholi also reflected a lot of optimism about integrated curriculum, and she said “it is a beautiful landscape” with the opportunity to teach learners about critical life issues. Looking at how she understands it and the challenges, what follows will reveal that.

Ms Lerotholi expressed integrated curriculum as a curriculum that …derives and puts together two or more topics from different learning areas in one lesson. As can be seen from the view expressed by Ms Lerotholi, it is apparent that her understanding is not very different from the Ms Seeiso’s who also conceived of integration as linking or interconnections between concepts within and across learning areas. The analysis of her lesson reflected this understanding as the connection of ideas from different learning areas was evident.

Important to note is the fact that Ms. Lerotholi further shared the view of integration should further be made to learners’ everyday experiences, she said:

> Other than connecting all the subjects, it integrates life issues so that learners see the relationship between life issues and learning areas. Learning areas are good because they show learners that life is interconnected not separate chunks

She lastly insisted that the learners are supposed to play an active role and should be able to see the links between the concepts and learning areas. Learners are expected to see that these learning areas interrelate.
Challenges Ms. Lerotholi faces in implementing integrated curriculum

Ms. Lerotholi is no exception when it comes to challenges of enacting integrated curriculum. She acknowledged that enacting this curriculum is cumbersome, therefore for integrated curriculum to work teachers need to prepare carefully for their learners to be able to see the links and connections between the concepts. She further then disclosed that even though the curriculum is good, it is challenging in that teachers’ workload is increased as:

You need intense reading and preparation because even with the same learning areas you can integrate the topics, and that takes a lot of time.

As Ms Lerotholi puts it then one can understand that the planning for integration needs to be carefully thought of and well implemented in order to make it work.

As discussed in the methodology chapter, School B is a missionary school with a good reputation and long standing record of good performance. As can be seen from the above discussion, both teachers from this school are optimistic and enthusiastic about the integrated curriculum. Both teachers understand integrated curriculum as linking concepts across subjects, this understanding was evident in both their lessons. However the irony is that Ms Seeiso, the grade three teacher who during the data collection period, was in the third year of enactment showed lesser understanding as compared to her colleague Ms Lerotholi, as Ms Seeiso’s lesson hardly showed link across subjects, this was possibly influenced by her general teaching experience. Significantly, they both further understood that the curriculum needs them to use a learner centred approach to teaching, despite that the practicality of this differed as Ms Seeiso’s lesson reflected limited understanding of learner centred as she notably only had learners’ involvement through asking questions and making them read.

4.5 SCHOOL C

The last school presented below is School C, which is a privately owned. What follows is the presentation of the lessons and interviews of the two teachers who participated from this school. First data is presented from Ms Nkuebe a Grade three teacher; it will ultimately be followed by the data from Mr Lerotholi lesson and interview, a grade five teacher from the school.
4.5.1 Ms Nkuebe’s lesson

**Table 9: Summary of analysis of the Ms Nkuebe lesson**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge- relations between PSS &amp; other subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between PSS and everyday knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations within PSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to the lessons discussed from Schools A and B above, Ms Nkuebe’s Grade three lesson was characterized by little or no learner involvement, which meant the relations between student and teacher were strongly framed. The selection, sequence and pacing were also very strong as the learners were not given an environment to interact with the teacher, or among themselves. In terms of classification and framing, table 9 sums up Ms Nkuebe’s lesson which was characterized by strong framing (f++) of selection, sequence and pacing as the lessons, hardly had any learner input solicited by the teacher except where the teacher expected affirming answers and in cases where the teachers expected the learners to read certain parts of the text aloud.

Ms. Nkube’s class showed strong classification of knowledge; which in essence means there was no relations made between school knowledge and everyday knowledge, nor were any made between any subject. In this lesson, even though the teacher moved between two subjects in one lesson, it is important to note that there no were links made between these two subjects (Mathematics & English), rather, they were taught separately with boundaries clearly demarcated. This means there was no integration. Given that Ms Nkuebe’s lesson started with her marking mathematics activity on sets, then moved on to reading a story that she reminded learners they had read before, her understanding of an integrated lesson could be
that she deals with lessons that she needs to catch up on.

In her lesson Ms Nkuebe only asked questions that solicited the yes/no responses from the learners. Given that it was called a ‘PSS’ lesson, one would have expected Ms Nkuebe’s lesson to have elements of integration between personal, social and spiritual issues and across other subjects. On the contrary the lesson started with the teacher marking an activity on sets, which was from a mathematics lesson, the following picture shows the activities that were done in Ms Nkuebe’s class.

![Picture A: Ms Nkuebe lesson activities](image)

Interestingly, from the Mathematics task that learners were marked on, the lesson then proceeded to learners’ reading activity which was written on the chalk board (see picture above). Extract eight below illustrates more clearly what the activity entailed. The following extract cites an example of the lesson

**Extract 8 Ms Nkuebe’s lesson**

*Ms. Nkuebe:* You don’t know how to draw a chair?
*Learners:* Yes teacher!
*Ms. Nkuebe:* Who is going to draw for you?
*Learner:* Me too teacher
*Ms.Nkuebe:* And you? Who is going to draw for you? Topollo, settle down and spell the word chair. Ok now let’s read the sentences on the board.
Learners: (reading aloud from the board) Meet Teboho and Palesa. They are brother and sister. Teboho is 8 years old; he is a happy little boy and has brown eyes. At school he wears grey shorts, a white shirt, and long grey socks with grey rims around ....In winter he wears a school tie, but when the weather is warm the collar of his white shirt is open.

Ms.Nkuebe: you remember we read this story yesterday?

Learners: Yes teacher

Ms: what do we call this word? (Writes and points at the word winter)

Learners: Winter

(The spelling activity continued and the teacher went around marking, no mention or reference was ever made to the first two activities the example of the activity is given in the picture below).

The aim/ the evaluative criteria of the reading activity weren’t clear. After the learners’ read there was no reference made to what they were supposed to have learned from the reading nor any questions asked in relation to the reading task, however the third activity where learners were instructed to spell words was mostly based on some of the words from the story even though no explicit links were made between the activities or any other subject. Regrettably, where learners indicated that they had a problem, no assistance or guidance was provided by the teacher, instead the teacher changed and focused on a different activity.

Ms Nkuebe’s understandings of integrated curriculum

Contrary to the teachers from both schools A and B who showed a lot of optimism about integrated curriculum, Ms Nkuebe’s interview revealed a lot of negativity, and she expressed that, It (the curriculum) has no value. It has really lowered the standard of education in Lesotho. Given this, it is important to get her conception of this curriculum.

Ms. Nkuebe’s interview data brings a different perspective to the whole data as she was without doubt unimpressed by the reform, she felt it is a waste of time and with no value. With that said, she shared her understanding of integrated curriculum by expressing that, the subjects are merged, so there are no longer boundaries between subjects. As it can be seen that even this teacher understands integrated curriculum as linking the subjects as the other teachers have put it, contrary to all the teachers from the schools discussed earlier Ms Nkuebe
does not see blurring of boundaries between subjects as a good thing as she commented:

     When the boundaries are no longer there between subjects, it gets confusing; you no longer know what subject you are teaching...

In light of Ms Nkuebe’s lesson presentation, it did not come as a surprise that she views integrated curriculum this way as her lesson was strongly classified with no links between, subjects or everyday knowledge. Her pedagogic choice becomes clear that it was motivated by the understanding that blurring the boundaries between the subjects is not a good thing. Without blaming anyone, it is worth noting that Ms Nkuebe is the only teacher who expressed that linking subjects is the wrong thing to do, as the rest of the teachers in fact expressed that linking subjects open opportunities for children to learn.

Looking at how she clearly demarcated between all the subjects that she taught, it could be that she does not understand integrated curriculum therefore she chose not to integrate as she acknowledged that it can be confusing. However given that she also expressed that when the subjects are integrated one no longer know what subject one is teaching and that integrated curriculum has no value she could simply be resisting change hence why she still wants to hold on to subject lines not learning areas.

**Challenges faced by Ms. Nkuebe in implementing integrated curriculum**

While the other teachers experienced integrated curriculum as adding burden to their work, it is worth noting that Ms Nkuebe felt that this new curriculum has actually reduced teachers work load. Even with this assertion it is strange given that her lesson reflected no integration at all. Given how she structured her lesson, with very short activities with clearly demarcated boundaries, she could possibly be viewing preparing for those short activities as lesser work compared to preparing a 45 minutes lesson centred on one concept.

     The only good thing about this curriculum is that it has reduced a lot of work because it puts everything together, because of this there is less work in planning for my lessons

The irony of the above comment is that Ms. Nkuebe clearly does not believe in integrated curriculum and neither does she enacts it, therefore it is strange that in her view the advantage of this curriculum is that “it puts everything together” while on the other hand she felt when “boundaries are no longer there you don’t know what you are teaching”.

Meanwhile, Ms Nkuebe unsurprisingly confessed that the biggest challenge for her part as far
as the enactment of this curriculum framework is concerned she still does not understand fully what needs to be done, this became clear through her lesson and the interview, her interpretation of integrated curriculum clearly shows she does not understand how collapsing boundaries between subjects works, not only that but she did not even include any of the subjects that are integrated in PSS even though she called that integrated area. She fortunately acknowledged that she lacks understanding as she said;

*More workshops and trainings are still needed for us teachers in order to get what is needed and expected from us. The training that was done was too short for us to be able to know what we are supposed to do.*

She further suggested that the training should also be done for parents as parents also do not understand what integrated curriculum means for their children. Having presented this analysis of Ms Nkuebe it is of importance to look at the views of her colleague Mr Mathealira, in order to establish whether their conception of integrated curriculum is the same or any different since they are in the same school.

### 4.5.2 Mr Mathealira’s Lesson

Mr. Mathealira’s lesson focused on English, (the use of articles, *a*, *an*, and *the*) with little or no learner involvement and interaction. Looking back to Ms.Nkuebe’s lesson one can see the similarity between the approaches both teachers used in administering their lessons, which gave both lessons very strong teacher control.

**Table 10: Summary of analysis of the Mr Mathealira lesson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>F**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>F**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>F**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge- relations between PSS &amp; other subjects</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations between PSS and everyday knowledge</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation within PSS</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Mathealira’s lesson in which the use of articles was being taught, in terms of classification, the knowledge was strongly classified as English knowledge with no links whatsoever to any other subject. The integration between what the teacher termed as ‘PSS’ and other subjects was not visible. With regard to framing, there was strong framing of selection, sequence and pacing, there was minimal learner involvement, even the examples were selected by the teacher from his book and learners were not given a chance to come up with their own examples.

The learners were strongly confined by the scope of the set lesson, the only questions they were asked solicited the yes or no responses. No detailed explanations were provided to the learners, for instance, learners were told that the article ‘AN’ can be used before some words beginning with letter “H” but the reasoning behind this was not provided, even an explanation of which words falls under this category was absent. Even though the teacher insisted that this was a “PSS” lesson, there were no relations between the content being taught to any other subject, or everyday knowledge, it was apparent that the lesson was an English grammar one. What follows is the extract that exemplifies what Mr Mathealira’s lesson looked like.

**Extract 9 Mr Mathealiara’s lesson**

Mr Mathealira: So there goes an ‘h’ so you should know that some of the words that start with an h are also preceded by an article an. Example number 3: An estuary is a mouth of a river as it enters an ocean. In this case we have got ‘e’ as a vowel, and as it enter an ocean. ‘O’, in the word ocean, e for estuary meaning the mouth of a river. Is it clear?

Learners: Yes sir.

(The lesson proceeded and thereafter the learners were given an activity to do using articles)

**Mr. Mathealira’s understandings of integrated curriculum**

Mr. Mathealira’s interview also showed optimism towards the new curriculum being implemented, he felt that it is “very helpful”, the following discussion will shed some light on how he views and understands integrated curriculum.

The understanding of integrated of curriculum as expressed by Mr. Mathealira also stressed that concepts build on each other as a result there is continuity of these concepts. He reiterated the view of the other teachers that *subjects have been brought together in such a*
way that they link. Notwithstanding the similarity in view, however, he did not share the same understanding on what it means to ‘link subjects’, for him it does not mean the connection should be observed in one lesson. Ms. Nkuebe’s understanding possibly was influenced by this, as Mr. Mathealira proclaimed that actually I am the one who went to the workshop and later on work shopped the staff. Then it explains that if he came with a misconception from the work shop, the he passed it on to the colleagues.

He explained that: when you teach one subjects you don’t have to put the other on the right hand side, you can do the links the following week. This is a significant difference because on the surface he seemed to view/ understand integrated curriculum the same way as the other two teachers from School A, however, their view of interconnection between subjects differ significantly as Ms Seeiso and Ms Lerotholi from School A put their emphasis on the relationships being made explicit in one lesson, while Mr Mathealira on the contrary clearly said that the links can be made the following week in a different lesson and within a different subject.

This somehow explains the strongly classified lesson that Mr Mathealira delivered as there were no links whatsoever; in expressing his pedagogic choice he claimed that,

*Nothing has changed, everything is still the same, the way we teach and how learners’ learner is all the same, nothing has changed.*

Mr Mathealira’s understanding of integrated curriculum reflects just reference to concepts learned earlier on either in the same subject or a different one, he justified this by saying; that is why when we were reading the story I drew their attention to the apostrophe because we did it last week. Even though he expressed it as “drawing attention” while he read he made a mention of an apostrophe and reminded learners that the learned about apostrophe the previous week, therefore he understands it as linking concepts within a subject.

**Challenges Mr Mathealira faced in implementing integrated curriculum**

In terms of the challenges encountered, Mr. Mathealira expressed that duration of the training provided to the teachers is not only short but it is delayed.

*The workshops should be done on time, like now the teachers, who will implement the grade 6 next year, will have problems since nothing has been done yet to prepare them.*

For him it is not only the workshops that come late but the materials come late …*they should*
provide resources on time. He argued that implementation become challenging because of the delays, in his view if workshops were timeous, teachers would have a chance to adjust in time.

In general the two teachers from School C have more in common than meets the eye in relation to integrated curriculum enactment. Their lessons for instance displayed strong teacher control with no learner involvement. In both lessons learners were only ever required to respond to closed questions. Most significantly these two teachers did not attempt to implement the set curriculum as per the policy. They continued with their usual way of teaching. This was further corroborated from Mr. Mathealira who insisted this new curriculum comes with no changes at all, which shows that his explanation matches his way of teaching and he wasn’t implementing the curriculum as intended. Contrary to this he had acknowledged that the curriculum requires links to be made within subjects. Clearly teachers in this school are not implementing integrated curriculum. Among many factors that could have influenced this lack of implementation it could be that since the school is privately owned and there is no pressure in implementing government policies, and or because the misconceptions they have about how it is done.

4.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter presented data from the interviews and lesson observations from all the six teachers who participated in this study. The presentation was done school by school in order to allow cross case analysis. The next chapter will present the discussion and interpretation of the findings, the comparison of the three cases will be made in the same chapter in order to determine how each school enacts the integrated curriculum.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter four presented data from both interviews and lesson observations of the six participant teachers. This chapter discusses and interprets the findings that emerged from the three research questions that underlay this study; as a result the research questions guide this discussion. The findings are also juxtaposed with the literature and theoretical framework that informed this study.

5.2 WHAT ARE TEACHERS’ UNDERSTANDINGS OF INTEGRATED CURRICULUM?

Understanding the intended curriculum is of great importance as literature indicated that lack of understanding of what the curriculum policy envisages and the actual practice can cause tensions between implementers and administrators (Raselimo & Mahao, 2015, Hoadley 2013). In this study the teachers’ understandings of integrated curriculum varied from school to school and from teacher to teacher, however the similarity is that most of them in theory understood integrated curriculum as “linking concepts”. Teachers’ responses generally reflected an understanding of integrated curriculum as a framework that links concepts within a learning area and across other learning areas. Teachers often used the words such as ‘link’, ‘connect’ and ‘merge’ when they referred to how they understand integrated curriculum. This understanding was common in all schools.

The understanding of integrated curriculum shown by teachers was not limited to a link between concepts within school knowledge but they generally understand as also linking school knowledge and everyday knowledge. This understanding was noted both in theory and practice, with teachers from Schools A emphasizing integration as link between everyday and school knowledge while teachers from School B emphasizing link within and across learning areas, therefore this understanding was displayed in their lessons, only School C teachers neither linked concepts nor everyday knowledge both their interpretation was clearly confused.

The Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy defines integrated curriculum as:
The holistic view and treatment of issues related to intelligence, maturity, personal and social development of the learner for survival purposes and economic development of the nation as opposed to the compartmentalized subject-based form of instruction (MoET, 2009, p.15).

Considering how integrated curriculum is viewed from the policy it becomes apparent that most teachers still lack clarity and useful insight regarding integrated curriculum. In theory, most of the teachers from the three schools clearly understood that integrated curriculum does not require them to use “the compartmentalised subject-based form of instruction” as the policy states. Notwithstanding this, their understanding of integrated curriculum as link making across subjects, the teachers understanding is generally limiting as it is apparent that they only made the link for learners without paying much attention to whether learners are able to make their own meanings. Beane (1995) cautioned against this as he argued that integrated curriculum should not be just about cross cutting concepts from the subjects but rather should be about deeper meaning making for learners.

Contrary to the above understanding that dominated from the three schools, in practice teachers from School C still taught subjects in isolation with no integration between concepts. This however did not come as a surprise as one of them clearly claimed that integrated curriculum is no different from the previous curriculum therefore this explained how he understood the curriculum as his lesson had no elements of integration. The other teacher from the same school also did not attempt to implement the integrated curriculum this was understood to have been influenced by her interpretation that blurring boundaries makes one not know what subject one is teaching, the idea of learning areas has not been clear in the case of School C.

As can be seen from all the teachers, whether from the Schools that are implementing the curriculum or from School C whose teachers are clearly not attempting implementation, there is one thing clear that most if not all teachers lack clarity about the implementation process. This is not unique to the Lesotho case as there is consensus from literature (Sithole 2010, Jansen 1999, Porter et. al 2015) that lack of clarity about the reform can wreak havoc to the implementation process. As can be seen literature validates the importance of understanding what the policy means at the local level of the classroom. Porter et al. (2015) argue that policy interpretation and enactment occurs at different levels, it is important that there must be mutual agreement between policy makers and the teachers of what the policy means. This becomes clear that with lack of clarity witnessed from most of these teachers this could lead
5.3 WHAT PEDAGOGIC CHOICES DO TEACHERS MAKE?

One can only imagine that for any teacher to make a pedagogic choice that aligns with integrated curriculum, that teacher would have to first understand integrated curriculum. From the above discussion it has become clear that teachers had an idea of what was needed to be done, however most of them lacked insight and clarity about what integrated curriculum entails. The Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy (MoET, 2009) clearly indicates that in order to successfully enact the integrated curriculum teachers must move from didactic approaches to teaching towards creating educative opportunities for learners to be creative and take responsibility of their own learning, it states that this could be achieved through a shift towards a more learner centred approach to teaching.

With respect to the findings of this study four of the six teachers echoed that the pedagogy must shift from the traditional one to a more learner centred one. Teachers from both School A and B expressed that the new curriculum requires them to use learner centred pedagogy with most learning activities done by learners. While in theory the pedagogy embedded within integrated curriculum was understood in the same way in these two schools the level of implementation is limited, teachers from School C however did not share this view.

In theory most teachers understood that the pedagogy requires child centred approach, however teachers did not fully practice that. The teachers did attempt to involve learners in their lessons activities however it was in a limited manner of only at a question answer level. Kysilka (1998,p.198) cautions against teaching learners as though they are containers to absorb facts presented by the teacher, he argues that for integrated curriculum to benefit learners they need to be taught how to think. Teachers did say that they need to facilitate learning; this as Piaget (1964) advocated that direct instruction pacifies the learner, rather children should actively engage in discovery learning .The role of the teacher should only be to facilitate an environment that can enable learners to assimilate and accommodate new concepts. It could have been more learner centred if teachers really did involve learners in ways that involve their thinking. Without providing opportunities for learners to exercise problem thinking and critical thinking skills as the policy (MoET, 2009) advocates, then education for personal and social development will be difficult to attain.

With reference to teachers from School C, who did not attempt to use child centred approach to
teaching but rather used the didactic way of teaching, clearly their choice defeats the purpose of the envisaged pedagogy of “participatory,… interactive methodologies”(MoET,2009,viii).

As aforementioned, the teachers’ understanding of integrated curriculum strongly influenced what they do in the classrooms, case in point Ms Lerotholi from School B understood that integrated curriculum draws concepts from across and within learning areas, this was observed from her lesson as she integrated a number of aspects such as English, music, and social issues about knowing the country. The choice that she made in teaching was more participatory with some learner control unlike most of the teachers.

It is worth noting that most teachers really taught the way they had expressed their understanding of the curriculum. Even those teachers from School C who were clearly not implementing, their reasons for their choice of holding on to their didactic pedagogy could be inferred from their understanding as one believed integrating is bad and has no value, it blurs boundaries and once there are no boundaries one does not know what one is teaching. While the other one felt that nothing has changed, therefore he needed no change in pedagogy. This is not a new scenario as Jansen (1999) also found that majority of the teachers in his study did what they felt comfortable with and what was familiar to them from years of their practical experience. Whether it was OBE or not did not seem to matter much. In this study then the limited knowledge of integration meant limited choices in pedagogy for the teachers. Fullan (1992) also conceived that teachers will teach in ways that corresponds with their ideologies, given this it is not surprising that teachers’ pedagogic choices were as thus.

5.4 WHAT CHALLENGES DID TEACHERS FACE IN IMPLEMENTING INTEGRATED CURRICULUM?

All teachers who participated in this study clearly encountered challenges as they implement the integrated curriculum. Firstly, teacher support, training and development were a challenge for most teachers. The training the teachers received prior implementation was deemed inadequate to prepare them to implement the curriculum. Teachers from both School B and C respectively lamented that more workshops are still needed in order for them to successfully implement the curriculum.

The issue of teacher development is vital in making a curriculum reform successful, this is not the case peculiar to Lesotho as Dello-Iacovo (2009) concurred: in a study conducted in China, the findings of which reflected that the majority of teachers reported that inadequate
training on how to implement the integrated curriculum marred the actual teaching of the innovation. As discussed in Chapter two (Fullan, 1992, Jansen 1999 and Clark 2005) this is a wide problem that can result in a reform failing regardless of how good it was theoretically.

For the teachers the issue was not only the short training that was a problem but also lack of education inspectors visiting their schools to oversee how they are implementing the curriculum, as a result it becomes a serious challenge for them to continue implementing the curriculum when they do not know whether they are on a par with administrators’ expectations. This is not surprising given that their lessons reflected inadequate understanding which with support could better their implementation. One can imagine that without follow up on how implementation is done, the situation could lead to a lot of variations in practice even in one school as Jansen, (1999) and Hoadley (2013) studies reported. This was also confirmed by this study as the teachers’ implementation and understandings showed lot variations.

In addition to short teacher training and lack of support, another challenge encountered was that of increased workload. As Mahlangu (2001) asserted additional work load that is embedded within a curriculum reform cannot be disregarded. Then it becomes clear that the process of planning for and implementing integrated curriculum can be overwhelming for teachers. In the light of this assertion, the findings of the current study corroborate the argument Mahlangu (2001) made as teachers felt that this new curriculum has increased their work load significantly from the amount of work they were used to during the previous curriculum.

Considering that some teachers felt the work load as overwhelming and time consuming the issue of workload did not just affect teachers in relation to planning for lessons. Compounding the workload problem, the teachers felt even more challenged when teaching as the current curriculum requires them to be more focused on individual learners therefore with many learners in the classrooms it becomes difficult.

Raselimo and Mahao (2015) cautioned that due to high student-teacher ratios in Lesotho schools, which adversely increase work load on the part of the teacher; it becomes impossible to oversee individual learner’s progress. The irony however was that the teachers who felt the increased work load actually were all from Schools A and B, who were implementing the integrated curriculum, Ms Nkuebe, whose lesson revealed no implementation was the odd
one who felt that the new curriculum actually lessened the teachers workload. This as can be understood to really validate that she is not implementing the curriculum as the teachers who are actually doing it understand and feel that there is work load increased, it is ironic that she says “putting together everything” reduces work load when her lessons did not show any sign of integration.

5.5 CLASSIFICATION AND FRAMING

Given that the analytic framework used in this study draws from Bernstein (1971) concepts of classification and framing, it is pertinent to summarize the above discussion by briefly commenting on what the teachers’ conceptions and challenges mean in terms of the framework. According to Bernstein (1971) an integrated curriculum stresses the inter-dependence of various areas of knowledge and surpasses traditional subject boundaries. Bernstein further introduces the classification and framing concepts as discussed in chapter two, to provide a language for description of pedagogic discourse.

As noted from earlier discussion, the view of integrated curriculum envisioned through the Lesotho Curriculum and Assessment Policy is in line with Bernstein’s (1971) view of integrated curriculum. The findings show that in theory, teachers do understand the envisaged inter-dependence of various areas of knowledge; however the pedagogic choices they make are limited. The structure of knowledge as Bernstein’s (1971) theory highlights mean that,

*Where classification is strong, contents are well insulated from each other by strong boundaries. Where classification is weak, there is reduced insulation between contents, for the boundaries between contents are weak or blurred (Bernstein, 1971, p. 89).*

This could be understood that teachers whose practice was characterized by strong classification were not implementing integrated curriculum as their lessons had no integration of knowledge areas. However, teachers whose lessons had weak classification were seen to be implementing or attempting to implement integrated curriculum as the ‘boundaries between contents were weak’. It is worth noting that, even those teachers that attempted to blur the boundaries, their level of integration was also very some of them merely made reference to everyday knowledge without integrating knowledge areas.

Finally, classification and framing complement each other in showing how pedagogy is structured. Embedded within integrated curriculum is learner centered pedagogy as seen from earlier discussion. Framing affords an opportunity to interrogate the level of interaction.
between learners and students. Bernstein (1971) posits that where framing is strong there are limited opportunities offered to learners whereas weak framing means more options and interaction open for learners. Most teachers had strongly framed lessons which limit the practice of learner centered methods as envisaged by the integrated curriculum. This could further be understood as limited understanding of what integrated curriculum is about. From all six lessons observed, there was strong teacher control over the content and sequence, while strength of pacing varied slightly across the lessons.

5.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter looked at the interpretation of the data in answering the three research questions of this study. The chapter also used literature in order fit the findings of Lesotho context within a larger body of literature relating to understandings and challenges teachers have during implementation of a curriculum reform. Finally, the discussion was ended by drawing from Bernstein (1971) concepts of classification framing in understand how teacher structured their pedagogy.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 OVERVIEW

This study explored grade three and grade five teachers’ understanding and challenges in implementing integrated curriculum in Lesotho. Through classroom observations and the teacher interviews, the objectives of the study were to find out;

- Challenges teachers face in implementing integrated curriculum.
- Teachers’ understandings of integrated curriculum.
- Pedagogic choices teachers make in implementing integrated curriculum.

The data was organized from the themes that emerged then analyzed under the research questions. The further analyses were made using Bernstein’s theory of classification and framing.

The study points out that there is a variation between teachers’ level of understanding of integrated curriculum, nonetheless all teachers reflected some limited clarity on the implementation process. Comparatively however, teachers from both government and missionary schools were implementing the curriculum better than the teachers from the private school whose lessons reflected no integration. The findings further showed that teachers in general made pedagogic choices that limited learner participation. In terms of classification and framing, as seen in chapter four their lessons had strong teacher control over sequence and selection and a lesser controlled pacing for some teachers. This was opposed to the pedagogy that encourages learner participation as stated in the policy. Moreover, most of the teachers did not weaken classification enough to allow knowledge integration. This was understood as among others lack of clarity on the implementation process which was reflected by the teachers through interviews and further aligned with their actual classroom practices which explained the pedagogic choices they made.

This limited understanding of the curriculum could be attributed to inadequate teacher training. One of the concerns mentioned by the teachers was that the training they received was brief. Be that as it may, teachers also showed that post training they received no support from the Ministry of Education and Training as a follow up to inspect how they are
implementing the curriculum. Despite these issues, the study has shown that four of the six teachers were willing and enthusiastic about implementing the new curriculum.

6.2 KEY EMERGENT ISSUES

As has been discussed, the teachers’ understanding varied the range of success or lack thereof in curriculum implementation; these could be attributed to many factors. Among others, the management of the schools is the possible influence, for instance while collecting data, the observation made was that in School B the Head teacher was more actively involved with the teachers and they had even planned a school workshop as a means of extending support to all teachers as not all teachers had undergone teacher training prior the implementation.

In Schools A and C however it was apparent that the Head teachers were not very actively involved in the daily issues pertaining to the implementation. In School A for instance the Head teacher did not show much interest on the integrated curriculum and insisted the teachers are the ones who should know better as she missed the opportunity to attend the training for the Head teachers, it is also in this school where Mr Letsie experienced lack of support given that he is not a qualified teacher. Notwithstanding this, teachers in this school were implementing the integrated curriculum the best way they know how. School C however, was the odd out one as teachers in this School were both not implementing even though their Head teacher had insisted that the implementation was being done.

In the light of this, this study concludes that teachers generally do show zeal to enact integrated curriculum, however their understanding of what needs to be done is limited. The variation in their success of implementation could be attributed to the support and the nature of the school, as seen with School B, being an old reputable School the principal could be actively involved to make sure the curriculum implementation succeeds in order to uphold the good reputation of the school. School C on the other hand as a private school, could still be holding on to the old curriculum because the Head teacher does not have any direct pressure from the government.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from this study have shown that teachers have not fully understood integrated curriculum and how to enact it; therefore they have challenges that need to be addressed in order to assist to better implement. Firstly, the study suggests that the duration of the workshops be extended in order to proficiently benefit the teachers. Given that, a week or two
of training proves to be inadequate to provide teachers with full understanding of how to enact the curriculum. The study further suggests that the Ministry of Education and Training and National Curriculum Development Centre provide an ongoing in-service training for teachers, especially in the beginning of the implementation process. Secondly, the Education officers should do regular visits to schools in order to oversee how teachers are implementing the curriculum. This way, any challenges the teachers have may be recognized before it is too late.

Further comparisons between the cases show that the teachers whose school has co-operation better implements the curriculum; in the light of this the study suggests team teaching in schools in order to enable teachers to learn from one another.

Lastly, further research is needed in order to find out if the factors that affected the implementation of integrated curriculum in these three schools could possibly apply in other contexts. Further research could also interrogate issues of classification and framing further to find out whether teachers themselves have any control over selection, pacing and evaluation criteria. Not only that, but research can also question the importance of the link between school knowledge and everyday knowledge in implementation of integrated curriculum, such that the former is not subordinated.

6.4 LIMITATIONS

By virtue of being qualitative, this study was susceptible to a number of limitations. This study like all qualitative studies has a limitation that the findings cannot be generalized. This can be understood as the pilot study had revealed that teachers from the private school piloted were more enthusiastic about the integrated curriculum but the actual study revealed the opposite. Therefore in this light the findings are limited to the specific context.

Another limitation is that I struggled to gain access to schools as some Head teachers either kept telling me to come next time or that they would call which never happened. In other cases where Head teachers allowed me access, teachers could not allow me to observe their lessons as they felt like I am checking up on them; therefore it meant I had to look for different schools. This was time consuming but the quality of data was not affected as I still managed to get the schools and teachers that I needed.
6.5 FINAL REMARK

Through this study, I have learned that research is a strenuous journey. Notwithstanding that, the value of the knowledge I gained as I worked with the topic is unimaginable. I have grown both emotionally and academically. The insights into integrated curriculum that I gained as I worked on this research made me realize how little I knew about the topic. As the findings revealed that teachers’ understanding is limited in terms of the integrated curriculum, it is my fervent hope that this study could be a humble contribution to the further studies on challenges teachers face in implementing integrated curriculum.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

Introductory questions:

1. When and where did you do your teacher training?
2. How long have you been teaching?
   a. What is your understanding of integrated curriculum?
   b. What changed ideas of teaching are entailed within integrated curriculum?
   c. What changed ideas of learning are entailed within integrated curriculum?
   d. Please explain your approach to implementation of the integrated curriculum?
   f. Are there any challenges that you encounter when implementing this curriculum?
      - If so please mention them.
   g. How may NCDC assist in overcoming these challenges?
   h. Are there any resources that have contributed most to your ability to teach this new curriculum?
   i. What are your general views on the integrated curriculum?

Closing questions:

1. Is there anything we have not talked about that you would like to share with me?
2. Do you have any questions for me?
Appendix B

Letter to the Ministry of Education

The Ministry of Education and Training
Senior Education Officer
P.O. Box 14
Maseru 100
Lesotho
Dear Sir/Madam

Request: Conducting research in a school in Maseru district.

My name is Cecilia Selepe. I am a Masters student (student number: 937837,Protocol Number: 2015ECE026M) at the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. As part of my Master's degree, I am conducting research within the field of curriculum. The study is titled: Curriculum reform in Lesotho: Teachers’ conceptions and challenges. Integrated curriculum is a new curriculum innovation in Lesotho, little is known about its implementation in the classroom, my study therefore seeks to investigate teachers’ understandings of this framework and also how they teach it in the classroom.

For this reason, I wish to request your permission to collect data from three primary schools in Maseru district.

Participation will require that six teachers, 2 be interviewed in semi-structured interviews which are estimated to take 45 minutes to an hour per participant. The interview process will take place in the school premises, at a time that will not interfere with teaching. Also the participants will be observed while they are teaching. The research participants will not be advantaged or disadvantaged in any way. They will be reassured that they can withdraw their consent to participate at any time during this project without any penalty. There are no foreseeable risks in participating in this study. The participation in this study is voluntary and so participants are not going to be paid for taking part in this study.

The data that will result from this study will be documented in a research report and it is envisaged that the research findings be used for academic purposes including academic conference presentations and publications. All research data will be stored in a safe place and it will be destroyed between 3-5years after the research has been completed. The research is proposed to take place in August, and the research process is estimated to be conducted over a period of two weeks.

If you have any queries or questions you would like to ask, please don't hesitate to contact me at; (+27) 61 4402 860 (South Africa) or (+266) 5615 6146 (Lesotho) or email me at

Celsea.pe.cs@gmail.com/ 937837@students.wits.ac.za

I look forward to your response as soon as it is convenient.

Yours faithfully

Cecilia Selepe
Appendix C

Letter to the Principal

17 June 2015

Dear Principal

My name is Cecilia Selepe (Student number: 937837, Protocol Number: 2015ECE026M) I am a Master of Education student in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am doing research on Curriculum reform in Lesotho: Teachers’ conceptions and challenges. The purpose of the study is to understand teachers’ understandings and challenges on the current curriculum reform that is being implemented in Lesotho namely, Curriculum and Assessment Policy Framework (CAPF). The study also intends to gain insight on how teachers actually teach this curriculum in their classrooms.

My research involves conducting semi-structured interviews with six teachers. In order to participate in the study interested teachers need to have acquired approximately five years of teaching experience before the introduction of the new curriculum, and also currently be teaching in either grade three or five.

The interviews will be held at school at the time convenient to you. The interviews will be audio-recorded with teachers consent after I presented them with the consent form to sign. The interviews will be held for approximately an hour depending teachers’ responses. The reason I have chosen your school is because of convenience, due to the limited time and costs to conduct the study. I therefore request your permission to interview and observe two teachers from your school. Teachers’ names and the name of the school will be kept confidential at all times and in all academic writing about the study. All research data will be destroyed in 3 years after completion of the project and the recordings will be kept in a password protected folder.

Neither the school nor the teachers will not be advantaged or disadvantaged in any way. There are no foreseeable risks in participating and no one will be paid for this study. Please let me know if you require any further information. Thank you very much for your help.

Your participation will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully

Cecilia Selepe

937837@students.wits.ac.za

0614402860
Appendix D

Principals’ consent form

Please fill in and return the reply slip below indicating your willingness to allow your school to participate in the research project called:

Curriculum reform in Lesotho: Teachers’ conceptions and challenges

I, ________________________ the principal of ______________________

Permission to conduct research

I agree that research be conducted in my school. YES/NO

Sign_____________________________ Date___________________________
APPENDIX E

LETTER TO TEACHERS

Dear Teachers

My name is Cecilia Selepe (Student number: 937837 Protocol Number: 2015ECE026M.) I am a Master of Education student in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am doing research on Curriculum reform in Lesotho: Teachers’ conceptions and challenges. The purpose of the study is to understand teachers’ understandings and challenges on the current curriculum reform that is being implemented in Lesotho namely, Curriculum and Assessment Policy Framework (CAPF). The study also intends to gain insight on how teachers actually teach this curriculum in their classrooms.

If you would like to voluntarily participate in my study, I would like to interview you for approximately an hour. In order to participate in the study you need to have acquired approximately five years of teaching experience before the introduction of the new curriculum, and also currently be teaching in either grade three or five.

The interviews will be held at school at the time convenient to you. The interviews will be audio-recorded with your consent after I presented you with the consent form to sign. I therefore request your participation in the study and I request to observe you teach. The lesson will be both audio taped and video recorded with your permission. The reason why I need to video record the lesson is to make sure that I capture the whole lesson including the non verbal interaction. Your name and identity will also be kept confidential at all times and in all academic writing about the study. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study. All research data will be destroyed in 3 years after completion of the project and all recordings will be kept in a password protected folder.

You will not be advantaged or disadvantaged in any way. Your participation is voluntary, so you can withdraw your permission at any time during this project without any penalty. There are no foreseeable risks in participating and you will not be paid for this study. Please let me know if you require any further information. Thank you very much for your help.

Your participation will be highly appreciated

Yours faithfully

Cecilia Selepe  937837@students.wits.ac.za 0614402860
Appendix F

Teachers consent form

Dear Teachers

Please fill in and return the reply slip below indicating your willingness to be a participant in my voluntary research project called: Curriculum reform in Lesotho: Teachers’ conceptions and challenges.

I, ________________________________________give my consent for the following:

Permission to be audio taped

I agree to be audio taped during the interview or observation lesson  YES/NO

I know that the audiotapes will be used for this project only.  YES/NO

Permission to be video taped

I agree to be videotaped as I teach.  YES/NO

I know that the video tape will be used for this project only.  YES/NO

Permission to be interviewed

I would like to be interviewed for this study.  YES/NO

I know that I can stop the interview at any time and don’t have to answer all the questions asked.  YES/NO

Informed Consent

I understand that:

my name and information will be kept confidential and safe and that my name and the name of my school will not be revealed.  □

I do not have to answer every question and can withdraw from the study at any time. □

I can ask not to be audio taped, photographed and/or videotaped □

all the data collected during this study will be destroyed within 3-5 years after completion of my project and kept in a password protected folder. □

Sign_____________________________ Date_________________________
APPENDIX G

Letter to Parents or Guardians

Date: 17 June 2015

Dear Parent/Guardian

My name is Cecilia Selepe and I am a student in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand.

I am doing research on Curriculum reform in Lesotho: teachers’ conceptions and challenges

My research involves observing teachers teach and I would record the lesson for about 45 minutes using a video tape.

The reason why I have chosen your child’s class is because she/he is part of the class I will be observing.

I was wondering whether you would mind if I observe and video tape the lesson in which your child is participating.

Your child will not be advantaged or disadvantaged in any way. S/he will be reassured that s/he can withdraw her/his permission at any time during this project without any penalty. There are no foreseeable risks in participating and your child will not be paid for this study.

Your child’s name and identity will be kept confidential at all times and in all academic writing about the study.

All research data will be destroyed between 3-5 years after completion of the project.

Please let me know if you require any further information.

Thank you very much for your help.

Yours sincerely,

SIGNATURE

Cecilia Selepe

937837@students.wits.ac.za

0614402860
APPENDIX H

Parent consent form

Dear Parent / Guardian

Please fill in and return the reply slip below indicating your willingness to allow your child to be a secondary participant in my research project called: Curriculum reform in Lesotho: Teachers’ conceptions and challenges. What this means is that your child you allow me to conduct my study in your child’s class.

I, ________________________________________ give my consent for the following:

Permission to be video taped

I agree that my child can be to be videotaped as part of the observed class. YES/NO

I know that the video tape will be used for this study only. YES/NO

Informed Consent

I understand that:

my child’s will not be exposed to any harm due to this study.

I can ask for my child not to be photographed and/or videotaped

all the information collected during this study will be destroyed within 3-5 years after completion of my project and kept in a password protected folder.

Sign_____________________________ Date___________________________
APPENDIX I

Learners’ assent form

Moithuti ea khabane

Ke kopa u tlatse pampiri ena ele pontso ea ho ntumella hoba teng ka sehlopheng sa hao. Ke moithuti le nna, ha u tekane mona u bont’sa hore u ananela kopo eaka.

‘Na ____________________________________________ke fana ka tumello ho tse latelang:

Tumello ea ho hatisoa setsoantso ponong:

Ke lumela hore ho nkoue khatiso ka sehlopheng sa ka. E/CHE

Kea utloisisa hore khatiso eo etla sebetsa boithutong bona feela. E/CHE.

Ho nka karollo ka boithaope

Ke utloisisa hore:

Ha ho kotsi ea letho e nka ba ho eona ka lebaka la boithuto bona.

Nka kopa ho se hatisoe kapa ho nkoua litsoantso/ kappa ho hlahisoa setsoantso ponong

Litaba tsohle bokeletsoeng boithutong bona litla lahoa ka mora lilemo tse 3-5.

motekeno________________________ letsatsi : ___________________________