An Investigation Into The Interplay Between Lecturers' Beliefs About Teaching, Learning, Assessment and The College's Conceptual Framework.

University of Nottingham

Degree Award Title: Education Doctorate: Code X30Y

Student's name: Albert Malaba Dlamini

Student Number: 4060946

Date of Submission: 2016

ABSTRACT

This study is a Case Study, carried out at a chosen Teachers' College in Zimbabwe. It was conducted to investigate the interplay between lecturers' pedagogical beliefs and the College's conceptual framework. A purposive sample of eight participants was drawn from across subject areas to try and make it as representative as possible. As the purpose of the study was to explore lecturers' pedagogical beliefs and understand how these inform their pedagogical practices, I preferred to use a qualitative case study design, considered to be an appropriate methodology for this type of study. To collect data I used multi-methods which included participant observation, lesson observations, in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. In the data analysis process I used the inductive approach, characterised by systematic categorisation of data from all the five data sets; and authentic themes emerged from the data. The findings of this study revealed that, some lecturers held traditional teacher-centred pedagogical beliefs, while others held the interactive, learner-centred beliefs. About learning, participant lecturers held different views about how students learn: some believed that students learn by receiving knowledge from the teacher; while others believed students learn by interacting, sharing ideas and constructing their own understanding and knowledge. However, during lesson observation, 6 lecturers used the traditional teacher-centred teaching approaches; while only 2 used the

interactive, learner-centred approaches. About assessment, participant lecturers, while they believed assessment could play a role in the teaching/ learning process; the College culture of assessment was a constraining factor as it has no room for alternative forms of assessment. The findings also show that lecturers are not aware of the theoretical and educational significance of the College's conceptual framework. As a result, lecturers do not model their pedagogical practices to try and achieve or meet the Vision of the College; as articulated by the College's conceptual framework.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all of the participant lecturers who took part in this study; and other lecturers who kindly offered me their assistance and support during the course of this study. I also wish to thank my supervisors: Gordon Joyes, Tony Fisher and Lindsey Smethem for their guidance and support throughout this study.

My gratitude is also extended to all my friends for their unwavering support and encouragement. I wish, also, to extend my deep gratitude to my family for their support throughout this study, especially through the most difficult times in the course of this study when we lost five members of our family.

Finally I wish to extend a special thank you to the College Administration staff, on the site where this study was conducted, for the professional support they gave me. Lastly, but by no means the least, I would like to extend my very special gratitude to the Principal, for hosting me.

CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This chapter will provide a description of the research area; justifying why the study needed to be conducted. The aim and objectives of the study are also provided. To contextualize this research study, the historical background of the case and its scope is presented. The rationale for conducting this study at a chosen site is given. I also give a detailed account of my personal background, explaining how my research idea developed as a result of sustained involvement and engagement in teacher education issues, both as a teacher educator; and also as a student on the Masters in Teacher Education (M. Ed) degree programme. Key terms that are used in this study are also defined. At the end of this chapter a summary is given.

1.2 The research area

This study will investigate the interplay between lecturers' beliefs about teaching, learning and assessment; and the College's conceptual framework. As a researcher researching my own profession (a somewhat practitioner–researcher) I am seeking to understand what beliefs inform lecturers' pedagogical practices. For example, what beliefs inform their choice of teaching approaches; their organization of learning activities; their selection and use of assessment strategies; what beliefs inform the way they use and model the College's conceptual framework (Sections 1.9 and 2.5.3).

The purpose of this study is, therefore, to explore, elicit and explain lecturers' beliefs about teaching, learning and assessment and to understand how these underpin their pedagogical practices. Essentially the study sought to understand the interplay between theory and practice (as exemplified by how lecturers' beliefs impinge on their pedagogical practices) in Teacher Education, in a chosen Zimbabwean Teacher's College. The focus will be, therefore, on finding out possible explanations of how lecturers' pedagogical beliefs influenced their ways of translating theory into practice. Although the aim of this study is not to challenge lecturers' beliefs, it will be important to scrutinize these beliefs and understand how they could be challenged in future to embrace current thinking in Teacher Education. This is important as it would enable lecturers to align their pedagogical practices with their College's conceptual framework; which serves as theory or philosophy that informs and guides lecturers' pedagogical and professional practice.

The main purpose of conducting this study, therefore, is to explore and to understand how lecturers' beliefs underpin and support their own personal philosophies about teaching, learning and assessment.

1.3 Justification of the study

Today, one of the challenges that Teacher Education institutions face in the developing world in general, and in Zimbabwe in particular, is to take on board new ideas and philosophies that are currently informing Teacher Education programmes.

Essentially, the challenge is not only to use research knowledge, but to embrace such knowledge and translate it into practice (Korthagen and Kessels, 1999). At the moment, it appears that Teacher Education programmes in Zimbabwe are still 'based on tradition, intuition and common sense' (Doyle, 1990 in Pepper and Hare, 1999, p. 1.). It seems lecturers and Heads of Departments are still using the traditional, technicist approach, focusing on technical teaching skills at the expense of deep learning and critical conceptual understanding of issues. This is not because the new ideas and research knowledge are contextually undesirable, but simply because, either lecturers have not been exposed to them or they are resisted by lecturers. Why lecturers resist new ideas and research knowledge is, maybe, they (new ideas and research knowledge) do not fit into their cognitive structures (Marzano et al, 2005; Ravitz et al, 2000; Argyris, 1993). This may explain lecturers' apparent failure to adequately conceptualize the new theoretical framework intended to underpin Teacher Education programmes. Standing in the way are lecturers' beliefs about teaching, learning and assessments (Kennedy, 1997; Cochran-Smith, 2001; Tabachnik and Zeichner 1986). A study such as this one is to provide research-based knowledge which could be used to inform lecturers' practice when training new teachers. Since the culture of research, in Zimbabwe, especially in Teacher Education, is not robust enough to galvanize lecturers to appreciate the academic value of research, it is hoped that this study would make a valuable contribution to research in Teacher Education in Zimbabwe, especially at the chosen College, in its pursuit of the reform agenda to train teachers for the 21st century.

1.3.1. The College's conceptual framework.

The College's conceptual framework, like the syllabus, is a policy document. It encapsulates the philosophy, the vision and the mission underpinning teacher preparation programmes.

In this study, I am trying to understand why; and whether or not at this College, lecturers held different, (if not conflicting) beliefs or perceptions about the kind of teacher they were seeking to produce as teacher educators.

Every Teacher Education programme ought to be underpinned by a philosophy or a conceptual framework that guides it and informs all professional practices (Lapsley, 2002). The philosophy must, however, change in response to new challenges and in the light of new research knowledge. Research has shown, however, that it is not easy to change a philosophy that has become a "world-view" (Richards et al, 2001; Fullan, 1991). To change this philosophy, the fixed paradigms (world-views) need to be explored, confronted, and deconstructed. Although this study is not focused on changing lecturers' worldviews, it is, hopefully going to be part of that deconstruction process in future, at the chosen College. This will be done at the end of the study, through the dissemination and sharing of research knowledge provided by the research findings. It is hoped this process will accelerate and enhance attempts to achieve a paradigm shift in lecturers' beliefs systems.

Within the global Teacher Education reform agenda, reformers seek to reorient programmes so that they take on board new theoretical knowledge and practices informed by current research literature (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 1990). This study, in the broader context of teacher education, seeks to investigate how lecturers' beliefs enable or hinder teacher educators from the chosen College to participate in the current reform discourse.

While the traditional, competency-based teacher education (CBTE) model, has dominated teacher education programmes all around the world, including Zimbabwe, for many decades, its critics argue that it has failed (Northcote, 2009; Ballantyne, 2005; Kinchloe, 2004; Brownlee, 2003; Korthagen, 2001; Wideen and Grimmett, 1996; Goodlad, 1990; Zeichner, 1987). Accordingly, these authorities pushing the reform agenda in teacher education, call for a departure from the traditional behaviourist conceptual framework- the CBTE model located in the empirical epistemology- to a an alternative, more dynamic model, the reflective model located in the interpretive epistemology. They challenge the notion that abstract or theoretical knowledge, as propounded by scholars in the academic scientific tradition, is of more value than practical and socially created knowledge (Carr and Kemmis, 1986).

The chosen College in Zimbabwe (The Teachers College) adopted the Reflective model to guide the teacher preparation programme (Appendix A). The model is informed by the contemporary, progressive constructivist philosophy; and is

characterised by learner-centred teaching approaches. What makes the Reflective model appealing is that it essentially, embraces a multiplicity of ways of thinking about learning and teaching and professional development. Pre-service trainee teachers who are exposed to it are given opportunities to actively explore the nature of their learning experiences. This is in sharp contrast to the CBTE model. The Reflective model, according to Richardson (1999: 3) allows a learning "environment in the teacher education classroom that includes using pedagogical tools of dialogue, the development of meaningful tasks and justifying methods to the participants". Lecturers who use this model often model how they want their pre-service students to eventually teach in their own classrooms.

The reformers reject any model that does not engage pre-service teachers in actively exploring and understanding how teachers think about their own work; and what knowledge informs their actions (Fenstermacher, 1994).

1.4 The Aim of the study

1. The overall aim of the study is to explore, understand and explain lecturers' beliefs that inform their pedagogical practices and how these beliefs influence lecturers in the way they model the college's conceptual framework.

Derived from the overall aim of the study are following objectives:

1.5 Objectives of the study

1. To understand what these beliefs are and how they play out in practice, in Teacher Education lecturers' choice of approaches and strategies of teaching, learning and assessment;

2. To explain how these beliefs influence the way Teacher Education lecturers model the College's conceptual framework.

3. To understand how Teacher Education lecturers at this College link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices

4. To share the findings with teacher educators and researchers at local, regional and national levels, with the view to improve teacher preparation practices.

1.6 Research questions

1. What beliefs do lecturers hold about teaching, learning and assessment?
2. What beliefs inform lecturers' actual pedagogical practices?
3. What pedagogical approaches do lecturers employ to meet the goal of the college conceptual framework?
4. How do lecturers link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices?

1.7 The Research Context

1.7.1 The scope

The College is a leader in producing highly qualified teachers. It is widely assumed that this is down to its instructional and administrative culture which is the envy of many similar institutions locally and regionally. Unfortunately this culture has not been reinvigorated to meet the 21st century challenges of producing new teachers. It seems to me, this culture, instead of promoting lecturers' professional development in a way that enables them to adopt pedagogical practices supporting students' deep learning, it, instead, perpetuates practices that support surface learning. Because this culture is so strong, it creates core beliefs in lecturers which seem to constrain them from enacting current research knowledge.

I am not able to discuss national political issues here. However, with regards to College politics, having worked at this College myself, my previous insider positionality enabled me to navigate through sensitive issues of the College politics without causing fears to the respondents. I am confident, therefore, that no issues of a national political nature affected lecturers' responses. I must mention here that "the politics of the College" and "the sensitive national political situation" are two separate propositions. It is important to point out here that, regardless of the sensitivity of the national political atmosphere in the country, the statement or expressing of respondents' professional beliefs was not dependent on or influenced by the national sensitive political situation that prevailed at the time. Core beliefs that inform professional practices are, by nature, very strong and constant, and therefore do not change because of a

national political situation (The nature of beliefs and belief systems are discussed in section 2.2). I am talking about respondents' beliefs as they relate to their professional practice, and not to any national political issues. Whether the national political atmosphere is tense on not, I believe lecturers will express their beliefs about their professional practice. I must emphasize that, in this study, having worked at this College myself before, the lecturers trusted me, and therefore, I do not think the sensitive national political situation affected or interfered with respondents' enactment or discharge of their professional practice.

In 2010 The Teachers College had a staff compliment of about 100 lecturers, operating in various disciplines that include sciences, humanities, and languages, business & commercial and IT. The lecturers are recruited as subject specialists. Like many teacher education institutions in the country, The Teachers College is an Associate (accredited) college of the University of Zimbabwe, operating under a Scheme of Association. According to the policy documents: the Teacher Education Review Committee (TERC) report (Siyakwazi, 1983) and the Department of Teacher Education (DTE) Handbook (Shumba, 2004), the University, through its Department of Teacher Education (DTE), monitors and supervises all academic and professional activities of all its affiliate colleges. In its quality control role, DTE assigns their staff (lecturers) as link persons to all its associate colleges. These lecturers work with their counterparts in teacher education associate colleges to maintain high standards through collaborative staff development initiatives. The relationship

between The Teachers College (and indeed all other associate colleges) and DTE is a symbiotic one, characterized by co-operation, collaboration, collegiality and professionalism (Shumba, 2004).

According to Shumba (2004), the overall vision of the DTE is to become a leading and recognized Institute of Teacher Education, providing accreditation, monitoring and an evaluation. DTE also provides quality assurances and standardization services to local and regional teacher education institutions by providing (i) leadership in theoretical and practical research into teacher education, (ii) excellence in teaching and research in both undergraduate and post-graduate teacher education programmes, and by (iii) providing quality extension, support and consultancy services to pre-service, in-service, and other teacher development programmes run by associate colleges.

Like many higher education institutions at a global level, The Teachers College finds itself in a powerful combination of change forces bearing down upon its core business: training teachers for the 21st century. Forces such as the rapid spread of communications and information technology into every facet of everyday lives including education and training; a rapid increase in competition; a significant decrease in funding from government sources; greater government scrutiny and an increasing local and global call for reforms in teacher education to meet the challenges of the 21st century, have not spared the Teachers College. These changes pose huge challenges for, not only the Principal as Chief Executive Officer

(CEO) of the institution and other instructional leaders such as the Heads of Departments (HODs) and lecturers –in-charge (LICs), but also for other academics as well.

In choosing this area of study in the local context, I draw some inspiration from the national and the global perspectives explored in the first module of the Ed D programme, *'Contexts for Teacher Education'*, especially the 'Framework for Analysis strand'. The assigned readings on case studies of Teacher Education programmes and the wide array of current literature calling for reforms in teacher education (Zeichner and Liston, 1990; Cochran-Smith; 2000 Jasman, 2002) have given me illuminating insights into this area of study.

1.7.2 The Case

This study is a Case Study. The justification for this choice of approach is provided in Section 3.2.1. The 'case' is made up of eight lecturers (Table 1.1) drawn from the eight core academic subjects offered at the college. The eight lecturers were purposively selected to ensure that every subject area was represented (Section 3.10). However, the sample of the selected lecturers (the unity of analysis) was not a representative sample. Participation in the study was by invitation; and therefore participants volunteered to participate. Most of the lecturers who volunteered to participate, expressed their hope to learn something by participating, especially those who were already doing their part-time Masters degrees (M. Ed) with some

local universities. Their experiences as lecturers at The College ranged between four and twenty years. This wide range of experience was invaluable to provide some insight into the phenomenon under investigation. Asked if I could include their biographical information, they declined, arguing that the confidentiality of their identity might be compromised.

The other lecturers (although they were not the 'case') who were not participants, were very crucial informants, as they were part of the context within which participants operated. The data they provided were recorded in the field journal and formed part of the data sets that constituted the database. The rapport that I created with these lecturers provided a conducive and congenial research environment that enabled me to interact freely with them and the participants.

1.7.3 Personal and Professional Background

I started my career as a teacher educator in Zimbabwe in 1990. Before that I used to teach in the schools system, first as a primary school teacher for 5 years and later, as a secondary school teacher for 8 years.

After completing my baccalaureate, a Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) degree in 1989, at the University of Zimbabwe, I took up a post as a junior lecturer at a Teacher Training College. I rose through the ranks to become a senior lecturer in 1997. The following year I embarked on a study programme to study for a Masters

of Education (M. Ed) degree in Teacher Education in Zimbabwe. On completion 1999, I was appointed Head of the newly introduced subject area: Professional Studies (PS). This new subject area defined the College's reform agenda. In our discussion with the Principal it was agreed that PS, in addition to its core business of teaching, was to play a central role in the college `s process of transforming itself in response to the demands of the 21st century teacher education. Accordingly, in pursuance of its reform agenda, the college adopted a Reflective Model, (articulated by the college's new conceptual framework) of teacher preparation. Lecturers under my leadership in the PS subject area, guided by the reflective model, were therefore, expected to model the college's conceptual framework, demonstrating the underpinning philosophy or the 'new thinking in teacher education'. Among other things, PS was to be proactive:

- Be a seedbed for educational innovations in teacher education
- Play a leadership role in introducing 'new thinking in teacher education' to guide the practice of preparing teachers.
- Keep track of new and current research literature and knowledge base of issues and ideas in teacher education on the local and global agenda.
- Introduce the idea of practitioner –researcher and professional development: through engaging and promoting collegial and collaborative small scale research work at the college, breaking/dissolving disciplinary divides by carrying out intra and inter-disciplinary collaborative work in developing better understanding of professional and pedagogical issues.

- Introduce action research which both pre-service teachers and educators could engage in collaboratively to improve and enhance professional practice and development.
- Revive and galvanize staff development programmes activities to engage in and sustain professional development.

In our discussion we recognized and agreed that change processes dynamics had to be taken into account in introducing the envisaged educational innovations and "new thinking in teacher education". Teacher educators (lecturers) had to be fully involved at every twist and turn of the process of change in response to the envisaged reform agenda. One way of involving them was to engage them in debates about the envisaged changes, educational innovations, new thinking in teacher education. In my new responsibility as head of PS, I proposed, among other initiatives, the idea of introducing the action research project to be done by all the pre-service students during their practicum. This idea was to be sold to the rest of staff through workshops where academics from DTE and from the college would present papers on the role of action research in professional development; practitioner-research and the concept of professional communities of practice.

In one of the closing remarks of workshop that was organized and mounted by the PS subject area, the Vice Principal made very instructive comments when he said he hoped that educators would embrace and model the conceptual framework in their professional practice, adding:

> "These educational innovations and the 'new thinking in teacher education' reflect the current global trends

> in teacher education. As teacher educators we cannot afford to ignore them nor can we just wish them away. There is definitely a need, therefore, for a paradigm shift on our part as teacher educators".

After this workshop, the College introduced the Action Research Project. The project was to be coordinated by Professional Studies Department. The idea was well received by DTE. However, some of my colleague lecturers were somehow sceptical. This was to be expected, and true to any educational innovation as observed by change processes researchers (Fullan, 1991) and Hargreaves, (1998).

The new conceptual framework: "the reflective model" that guides teacher education programmes at the chosen college marks a paradigm shift from the traditional "competence-based" or "craft model". The professional mantra now is "Preparing the reflective teacher". It is now the reflective approach that should define and underpin the professional practice. Teacher educators are expected to model it. To embrace this model, however, there is a need, not only for all teacher educators but all stakeholders (students, administrators, policy makers) to reconceptualize and "see" teacher education through the same "new Reflective Model lenses". The new conceptual framework underpinning teacher education programme is predicated on the social interactionist paradigm- the constructivist paradigm informed by the interpretivist tradition (Roberts, 1998; Wallace, 1991; Cochran-Smith 2001).

In the twelve years that I was involved in teacher preparation I developed a passion for teacher education. As a lecturer, I interacted, at various forums, with

fellow teacher educators. During this period, I developed an assumption or perception that my colleagues' pedagogical practices were somewhat incompatible with current thinking and incongruous with contemporary issues in teacher education. This assumption inspired me to investigate why this appeared to be so.

The Professional Studies' major role was, therefore, to a model the vision; demonstrating the new thinking in teacher education that was underpinning the conceptual framework.

It is in this kind of academic and professional engagements with all lecturers at this College and those from the University of Zimbabwe's Department of Teacher Education (DTE) that I drew the inspiration to undertake this kind of a study.

1.7.4 Historical background

The Teachers College was founded in 1956 at Heaney Junction, near the city of Bulawayo, the second largest city in the country. It operated on this site for six years before it was moved to its present site, in 1962. The College was established to train both primary and secondary school teachers. The country was called Rhodesia then, named after Cecil John Rhodes. Rhodesia became a British colony after 1890 when Rhodes' army defeated the African army. From then on the British imposed their rule. The apartheid policy of segregating society by colour of the skin was adopted. It permeated all sectors of the society. Under this colonial education policy The Teachers College was established as an institution to train white student

teachers only. The political apartheid system at the time allowed a two-tier education system where whites and blacks studied separately to perpetuate a racially divided society.

In 1980 the country gained its independence from the British after a long and bitter armed struggle. The London Lancaster House Conference of 1979 ushered in a new political era. A new constitution was written, negotiated and agreed upon by all parties. This political process gave birth to a new country called Zimbabwe. The Lancaster House constitution replaced the racially biased constitution used in Rhodesia. Consequently the Teachers College opened its doors to students of all races. Since there was such a high demand of secondary school teachers then, it was decided that The College should enrol and train secondary school teachers only.

According to The College's Five Year Development Strategic Plan (FDSP) document, since its establishment in 1956, The Teachers College has had a fervent 'timeless passion' to prepare highly qualified teachers. It was then planned, by the Rhodesian Ministry of African Education that the Teachers College in Bulawayo was to offer a Bachelor of Education degree course. The Minister, Mr. A. Phillip Smith said then that the course would be sponsored by some recognized University.

In line with the College's vision to train high quality teachers, 46 years later, in 2002, The Teachers College embarked on the process of the transformation, evolving its Certificate in Education programmes to Diploma programmes. The process was a gradual one culminating in the introduction of a 3-year Bachelor of Education degree programme in Mathematics and Science in 2010. The degree would to be done through open distance and e-learning in conjunction with the University of Zimbabwe's Science and Mathematics Education Department.

It is however important to note that, in its history of development, since independence The Teachers College has offered a wide range of other teacher education programmes such as an upgrading In-service Education and Training (INSET) for primary school teachers. These teachers, because of their very high academic subject (e.g. Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, etc) attained after their training as primary school teachers, were then promoted to teach in the new secondary schools that were built all around the country, ostensibly, to solve the problem of the shortage teachers, and to accommodate the large number of students who were denied education opportunities during the war for independence by the previous regime.

Other programmes that were run by the College include: a four-year Post 'O' Level Certificate programme in Education for secondary school teachers; and a three-year Post 'O' Level Certificate in Education for secondary school teachers. Also, from 1981 to 1995, the College ran a Two-year Learner Tutor programme to train teacher

education lecturers in Practical Subjects such as Art and Design, Music, and Physical Education. At the end of their training these candidates received Certificates in Education (CE) awarded by the University of Zimbabwe; a quality assurance, monitoring institution under the Scheme of Association. These certificates qualified them to be lecturers in their respective subjects at any Teacher Training College in Zimbabwe.

It important to point out that, because of, and in recognition of its high quality teachers that it trained, The Teachers College was the first college in Zimbabwe to be accorded Associate Status (AS) by the University of Rhodesia, now the University of Zimbabwe. This special relation (AS), with effect from 2010, is to be reviewed and renewed after every five years.

1.8 Definition of key terms

In this study some terms appear more frequently than others because they have a special significance as they relate to the major themes and concepts explored in this study. It is important therefore that these terms are defined in this chapter.

Beliefs- refer to an individual's personal knowledge, which is constructed from experience acquired through cultural transmission and serves as implicit theories to guide thoughts and actions. The concept of beliefs has been used interchangeably with a number of

terms such as conceptions, attitudes, implicit and personal theories and cognitive maps or worldviews (Pajares, 1992).

Belief systems- refer to the level of thought that defines reality and sets the agenda for the other thought processes of an individual (Nespor, 1987). Belief systems provide metaphors as personal conceptions of teaching and learning. It is such metaphors which may provide snapshots or glimpses of our future teachers as they can provide information on how we as teacher educators, can ensure that methodological theories and principles become part of preservice teachers` experiences (Schoenfield, 1998).

Traditional, behaviourist beliefs- this term refers to teachers' beliefs that are informed by the behaviourist learning theory.

Constructivist beliefs- this term refers to teachers' beliefs that are informed by the constructivist learning theory.

Model- In the context of this study a model is a design used to prepare pre-service teachers to acquire professional knowledge (Wallace, 1991).

Conceptual framework- In the context of this study, this term refers to a philosophy that underpins a teacher education programme, carrying its vision and

organizing its mission; providing a guidepost for programme development and benchmarks (Kennedy, 1997.

The purpose of the conceptual framework is to ensure coherence of teacher education programmes. It represents a shared vision by faculty based on their beliefs about the best ways of preparing effective teachers. The conceptual framework, therefore, ought to guide and underpin all teacher educators` practices (Cochran-Smith, 2001).

Practice- is a customary action or way of doing something; usually informed by someone `s belief systems (Morris, 1973).

Professional practice- In the context of this study, this term refers to a customary operation in education, from the educational system as a whole, to the individual classroom or teacher.

Ethos- refers to the culture of the program—the norms and values that shape how people interact, the underlying messages about knowledge, teaching, and learning that are communicated both directly and indirectly (Kennedy, 1997; Hargreaves, 1998).

Culture- the shared beliefs- shared paradigms of a set of people. Culture is a set of important understanding that members of a community (e.g. teachers) share in common. These shared beliefs can engender sociocentricity or the tendency of

members to behave as though the members of their community of practice are categorically different from other members of the other communities of practice (Day, 1999; Paul, 1990).

College Culture- in the context of this study this term refers to the way academic activities, (organized around the College calendar), are done. It is the routine way of carrying out academic activities; overseen by Heads of Departments. Academic activities include such things as teaching, assessment, student supervision, drawing up syllabuses and course outlines. College culture is the college ethos; the unwritten policy. All the lecturers at the College are socialised into this culture.

Cultural transmission- in the context of this study, this term refers to a process of socialization through enculturation where individuals assimilate cultural elements surrounding them; education is a purposeful formal and informal learning activity that aims to bring behaviour to conform to the cultural requirement.

Professionalisation- is the process or drive towards creating teachers as professionals (Ramsey, 2000).

A professional- is someone who has the ability to continue learning throughout (their) career, deepening knowledge, skill, judgement, staying abreast of important

developments in the field and experimenting with innovations that promise improvements in practice (Sachs,1997).

Educational principles- in the context of this study, this term refers to values or assumptions that guide decisions concerning pedagogical methods or objectives.

These key terms, and some concepts central to this study are also defined in the next chapter; where I will provide some related literature review; articulating what research authorities say about the topic. It is from this body of literature where I drew the theoretical framework for conducting this study.

1.9 Conclusion

In this chapter I described the research area, the justification, the aim and objectives of the study. I also gave the historical background of the context; explaining the significance of the study, illuminated by the research questions. I also described my personal background, articulating my professional experience and how I was inspired to embark on this study. The key terms used in this study are also defined. In the next chapter I will provide some related literature review; articulating what research authorities say about the topic. It is from this body of literature that I drew the theoretical frameworks for conducting this study.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2. 1 Introduction

This chapter is a critical review of literature about what research authorities say about teachers'/lecturers' beliefs. It is this literature review that provided a framework to guide this study. It also informed the framework for the next chapter: the methodology chapter.

Firstly, the chapter presents a review of literature focusing on what research authorities say about belief systems; the nature of beliefs; the comparison between teachers' beliefs and teachers' knowledge. Secondly, this chapter discusses related studies that were carried out to investigate teachers/ lecturers' beliefs. Finally, this chapter, provides a review of literature that informed the analysis and interpretation of results; focusing on teaching, learning, and assessment. A conclusion of the chapter is also given at the end of the end.

The research questions which the study seeks to investigate are:

1. What beliefs do lecturers hold about teaching, learning and assessment?
2. What beliefs inform lecturers` actual pedagogical practices?
3. What pedagogical approaches do lecturers employ to meet the goal of the College's conceptual framework?
4. How do lecturers link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices?

2.2 The nature of beliefs and belief systems

Defining beliefs and belief systems is a very difficult task. According to researchers, this may be, is because they are studied in many different fields (Uso-Domenech, and Nescolarde-Silva, 2015; Borg and Busaidi, 2011; Eisenhart et al, 1988). What is significant to note though, is that wherever these two concepts are discussed in literature, they are treated together. This, it seems to me, serves to emphasise their mutual relationship. In spite of the fact that psychologists, anthropologists and political scientists use these propositions in rather different senses, their symbiotic relationship is so discernible that it cannot be ignored. While beliefs are a set of conceptual representation which store general knowledge of objects, people, events and their characteristic relationship, beliefs systems are a set of conceptual representations which signify, to the person who holds them, a reality or given state of affairs (Kuzborska, 2011; Zheng, 2009).

2. 2.1 Definition of beliefs

According to literature, the study of beliefs, as a concept, has been of immense interest to researchers from many research fields (Pecore, 2013; Mansour, 2009; Pajares, 1992). This may explain why there is such a great deal of inconsistencies in their definitions and in their meanings. Pajares (1992) contends that, because of the diverse agendas of researchers and studies, "--- the educational community has been unable to adopt a specific working definition" p.313. He highlights the complexity of the concept of beliefs, when he cites a number of terms that have been used interchangeably with the term 'beliefs'. The number of these terms include such terms as 'conceptions', 'attitudes', 'implicit', 'personal theories' and 'cognitive maps' or 'worldviews'. He articulates (Pajares 1992:309) this complexity; and the problematic nature of defining beliefs; and notes how researchers use the word 'belief' in a variety of ways. He says:

> "Defining beliefs is at best a game of player's choice. They (beliefs) travel in disguise and often under alias: attitudes, values, judgements, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, explicit theories, personal throes, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertories of understanding, and social strategy, to name but a few that can be found in the literature".

Mansour, (2009), in Bingimlas and Hanrahan, (2010) concurs with Pajares (1992) about the complexity of defining: "Beliefs can never be clearly defined, nor do they have a single correct clarification" p. 35. However, Tompson, (1992: 132), in the same source, still, defines beliefs, in the context of teaching and

learning, as 'conceptions', while Ernest (1989:250) describes them as 'world views' and 'mental models' that shape pedagogical practices.

Such complexity tends to cloud the concept of beliefs. It is crucial, therefore, that this concept is clearly defined in the context of research intent and meaning. In this study, what I consider to be a working definition of beliefs is one offered by Murphy (2000:6), who draws on a number of well-known studies (Calderhead, 1986; Munby, 1982; Pajares, 1992):

> "Teachers` beliefs represent a complex and inter-related system of personal and professional knowledge that serve as implicit theories and cognitive maps for experiencing and responding to reality. Beliefs rely on cognitive and affective components and are tacitly held".

While acknowledging the lack of a clear definition of beliefs, however, many authorities agree on the broad definition of what belief systems are. They define them as the person's personal assumptions, ideas and ideologies which aggregate to influence his/her way of thinking (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1993; Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1982; Kennedy, 1997). In spite of the common features to these definitions, researchers, however, seem not to agree entirely on the concept of beliefs (Kelly, 1995; Tobin et al, 1994; Pajares, 1992; Pintrich, 1990; Handal and Lauvas, 1988; Tabachnick and Zeichner, 1982). Tobin et al, (1994: 55) describe some of these features when they say:

> "Some of the features of belief systems are the relationship between beliefs and knowledge; the idea that beliefs are acquired through communication; the concept that beliefs prompt

> action; and a continuum that reflects a range of beliefs from factual to evaluative".

Drawing from his review of literature on teacher beliefs, Pajares (1992: 324) provides a synthesis of the findings on beliefs; pointing out that beliefs are formed early and tend to self-perpetuate, persevering even against contradiction caused by reason, time, schooling, or experience. He also notes that individuals develop a belief system that houses all the beliefs acquired through the process of cultural transmission. Thought processes, he argues, may well be precursors to and creators of beliefs, but the filtering effect of beliefs ultimately screens; redefining and reshaping subsequent thinking and information processing.

To maintain consistency in this study, this characterization of 'beliefs' by Pajares will be adopted and maintained. While beliefs are by nature complex and tacit, and therefore not readily accessed or understood by those lecturers and teachers alike who hold them, researchers concur that these beliefs, however, impact so heavily on lecturers/teachers practices. This is because they (beliefs) are accepted as true; and therefore are held with emotive commitment; as they serve as a guide to thought and pedagogical practice (Borg, 2001). For that reason researchers argue that lecturers' and teachers' belief systems can act as a filter or barrier to change (Xu, 2012; Calderhead, 1996; Pajares, 1992; Nespor, 1987). Lecturers' and teachers' beliefs, therefore, remain a challenging area for teacher development and for teacher education. Describing beliefs as socially constructed representational systems, Rust (1994) notes that these systems are

used to interpret and act upon the world. It is therefore not surprising that belief systems may contradict each other since beliefs are generally contextualised and associated with a particular situation or circumstance (Ennis, 1994).

Since beliefs are, by nature, complex and tacit, they are not readily accessed or understood by those teachers who hold them; and yet these beliefs impact so heavily on their practices. Pajares (1992) argues that this is because of the fact that our belief systems can act as a filter or barrier to change. For that reason they remain a challenging area for teacher development and for teacher education.

Many researchers agree that all teachers/lecturers hold beliefs; and that these beliefs are thought to determine the actions of lecturers and prospective teachers during the teaching and learning process. If lecturers are the main driving force for change and improvement, the nature of their beliefs must be understood (Bingimlas and Hanrahan, 2010; Varnava-Marouchou, 2007; Pickering, 2002). However, not all researchers agree that beliefs offer some insight into lecturers/ teachers pedagogical practice. They argue that it is knowledge; instead, that offers greater insight. Roehler et al (1988: 164) contend:

> "--- because knowledge structures focus on the cognitive aspects of teaching, because these structures get "at the heart of the 'thought' in the 'thought to practice'"

They argue that, because of their evolving nature, these knowledge structures are "a more accurate reflection of the present understanding of the "fluid nature of

teacher thought in action", knowledge must take a priority---"p. 164. While, emphasising that knowledge ought to be prioritized over beliefs, they, however, acknowledge that beliefs do, in fact, influence teachers' decision making process. In fact, they agree that all teachers hold beliefs, never mind how they are defined.

2.2.2 Definition of a belief system

Uso-Domenech and Nescorlade-Silva (2015) define a belief system as:

"A belief system is a set of conceptual representations which signify, to its holder, a reality or given state of affairs- - - a guide to personal thought and action" p. 74. They argue that a belief system, therefore serves as a personal guide that helps an individual to, not only define but also to understand the world and themselves. Borg (2001) concurs with this view of a belief system; adding that it is evaluative; and it is accepted as true by an individual and is therefore "imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behaviour" p.186. A belief system, Richards (2003) also observes, consists of substructures of beliefs, which are not necessarily logically structured but are interrelated; varying mainly in degree in which they are systemic.

A belief system develops from beliefs that an individual holds. Using an image of a circle to explain the relationship between beliefs and belief systems, Xiong (2016) contends that a "belief system is shaped like a concentric circle in which beliefs are positioned from the periphery to the core" p. 520. The positioning of these beliefs is according to their importance. The very important ones are positioned at the core;

and it is assumed that these are very resistant to change; but the change of which would influence other beliefs. Thus, Xiong, argues, “the variability of certain beliefs varies according to their positions in the belief system” p.520.

In the context of teacher education, belief systems refer to personal or tacit theories held; and these underpin the ways in which lecturers think about their work with student teachers, (Tabachnik and Zeichner, 1982). Handal and Lauvas, (1988) describe teachers` belief systems as “practical theories”, defining them as the private integrated but ever changing system of knowledge, experience and values which underpin and permeate through lecturer behaviour and practice. According to Kelly (1995) belief systems are practical theories which are personal constructs, continuously established in the individual through a series of diverse experiences. Handal and Lauvas appear to agree with the other authorities (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1993; Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1982) that lecturers are not conscious of their belief systems. The basis of the belief systems is what works or what counts as knowledge, will influence what lecturers actually do in their own practice of professional work. According to Pajares (1992), this is so because belief systems can act as a barrier to learning new practices; or act as a filter to change.

As already noted, researchers concur that beliefs are thought to determine the actions of prospective and in-service teachers during the teaching and learning process and if lecturers are the main driving force for change and improvement, the nature of their beliefs must be understood (Bingimlas and Hanrahan, 2010). Some

researchers concur that prospective teachers and in-service teachers develop their beliefs about teaching from years of experience as students and teachers; and that their beliefs appear to be stable and resistant to change (Borg, 2004; Lumpe et al, 2000; Kennedy, 1999; Nespor, 1987). Yero, (2002) contends that failure to examine beliefs for their validity in the light of new information leads to habitual behaviour- or mindlessness.

Arguing about the centrality of the teachers' epistemological beliefs, Pajares (1992) contends that, not only do they play a key role in the interpretation of knowledge, but also that teachers tend to prioritize them according to how they (beliefs) relate to other cognitive structures. Such educational beliefs therefore must be understood in terms of their relationship, not only to other beliefs but also to other beliefs that are more central in their belief system such as values and attitudes. This helps, he argues, to explain why teachers' perceptions "are instrumental in defining tasks and selecting the cognitive tools with which to interpret, plan, and make decisions" (p. 324). The critical role that teachers' beliefs play is underpinned by the fact that not only do they define and influence teachers' behaviour in the way they organize knowledge and information, but also that they strongly influence teachers' perceptions. This makes teachers' beliefs an unreliable guide to the nature of reality; and hence the need for teachers to explore and examine them. To this end teacher education programmes ought to target student teachers' educational beliefs as they are already well established by the time they get to college (Kennedy, 1994).

2.2.3 Lecturers' beliefs

This section briefly touches on what researchers say about beliefs (Section 2.2.2) in general; and what they say about teachers/ lecturers' beliefs in particular. In this chapter, the terms 'lecturer' and 'teacher' may be used interchangeably. The rationale for this is that in the context of this study, and indeed, of Zimbabwe, lecturers are teachers who have been promoted to teach at Teacher Education Colleges (Table 1.1). It can be argued that lecturers do not cease to be 'teachers' on assuming teaching responsibilities at a further education college or university.

To put the issue of teachers/lecturers' beliefs into context, it is the Zimbabwe government ministry policy, through the Scheme of Association with the Department of Teacher Education (DTE), that any lecturer who is promoted to teach at a Higher Education College must be a qualified teacher, with not less than five years teaching experience in the school system (TERC report, 1983; Shumba, 2004). The review of literature about teachers' beliefs, leading to the investigating of lecturers' beliefs, is therefore, in my view, a logical and necessary starting point to understanding lecturers' beliefs. The terms 'teacher' and 'lecturer' are, therefore used interchangeably in this section.

The study of lecturers' beliefs has a potential to provide significant and profound insight into many aspects of the lecturers' professional world. Paying attention to lecturers` beliefs can inform educational practice in ways that prevailing research has not. Lecturers without any formal training in teaching do develop their own

pedagogical conceptions about what is good or bad; based on their experiences as students; and now as lecturers and, possibly, influenced by their colleagues. Essentially, the decisions that they make are based on what works for them. Understanding this about lecturers is essential to improving their professional preparation and teaching practice (Varnava-Marouchou, 2007). Arguing that beliefs may be the clearest measure of a teacher's professional growth, Kagan (1992) affirms that the study of beliefs is critical to educational practice. Since beliefs influence choices and decisions that lecturers make, they tend to be the best indicators of the beliefs lecturers hold. It is these beliefs that underpin pedagogical decisions that are made by individual teachers in the course of their life times (Rokeach, 1968). The interest in research literature in lecturers' beliefs suggests that beliefs will eventually prove themselves to be the most valuable psychological construct for teacher education (Northcote, 2009).

Pajares (1992), in his synthesis of research literature on teachers' beliefs, observes that, while they (teachers' beliefs) are defined in various ways, the researchers agree that beliefs play an important role in the life of a teacher. Some researchers contend that lecturers/teachers and prospective teachers develop these beliefs about teaching from years of experience as students and teachers; and that their beliefs appear to be stable and resistant to change (Lumpe et al, 2000; Kennedy, 1997; Argyris and Schon, 1974). Arguing for the need to confront and change teachers` beliefs, Pajares, (1992: 323) puts it succinctly:

> "One place where change may take place in teachers` beliefs about teaching and learning is the teacher education programmes---- teacher education programmes can ill-afford to ignore the entering beliefs of pre-service teachers".

Emphasizing the need for lecturers'/ teachers' beliefs to be examined, Yero, (2002), Pepper and Hare, (1999) and Atkin, (1996) concur that failure to examine beliefs, especially for their validity in the light of new information leads to habitual behaviour or mindlessness; and routine practice informed only by tradition and common sense.

The thrust of this study is, therefore, an investigation of lecturers' beliefs (Section 1.7.2). As literature reviewed in this section will show, teachers' and lecturers' educational beliefs are contextually dependant and have been learnt over a long period of time through the process of observation and socialisation (Raturi and Boulton-Lewis, 2014; Borg, 2004; Lortie, 1975; Kennedy, 1997; Pickering, 2002); and they are resistant to change. However, through a process of targeted deconstructions of maladaptive beliefs, lecturers' beliefs can be challenged. Lecturers who hold the beliefs ought to be involved in examining, clarifying, justifying and interpreting their beliefs; and challenge those that are incompatible with the desired ones, only then can the negative beliefs be changed (Atkin, 1996).

In the case of teacher educators, researchers concur that belief systems may refer to personal theories (tacit or articulated theories) held and these underpin the ways in which lecturers think about their work with student teachers, (Raturi and Lewis-

Boulton, 2014; Handal and Lauvas, 1988). Tann, (1993), Sergiovanni and Starrat, (1993) and Argyris and Schon, (1974) describe teachers` belief systems as practical theories – the private integrated, but ever changing system of knowledge, experience and values which underpin and permeate through lecturer behaviour and practice. This means that belief systems are practical theories which are personal constructs, continuously established in the individual through a series of diverse experiences. Handal and Lauvas appear to agree with the other authorities (Sergiovanni and Starrat, 1993; Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1982) that lecturers are not conscious of their belief systems. The basis of the belief systems is what works or what counts as knowledge will influence what lecturers actually do in their own practice of professional work.

Dilts (1999), recognizing the 'messy' nature of beliefs, prefers to define them simply as judgements and evaluations that teachers make about themselves, about others, and about the world around them. Studies have shown that even those lecturers who recognise their practical theories, they have problems in formulating them (Tann, 1993; Denicolo and Pope, 1990; Clandinin and Connolly, 1987; Elbaz, 1983). Proctor, in Calderhead and Gates (1993), argues that such lecturers can not explain the anomalies between what they say they do and what they actually do. Some studies agree with this observation (Handal, 2003; Tann, 1993; Handal and Lauvas, 1988). Describing this anomaly (i. e. failure by lecturers to explain what they do and what they actually do), Zeichner and Tabachnick, (1982) assert, with regard to tutors` roles as supervisors, that tutors who believed

that they were implementing a clinical supervision approach were in fact; practising different approaches not reflecting the clinical supervision philosophy. These anomalies help to explain the existence of belief systems that lecturers carry around in their heads.

There is need, therefore, for better understanding of lecturers' beliefs; and how lecturers operate; and how they make sense of their practice when they carry out their professional work. This study, seeking to explore and identify lecturers` belief systems as personal conceptions that underpin their pedagogical and professional practices, is important since the belief systems provide metaphors as personal conceptions of teaching and learning (Phipps and Borg, 2009; Northcote, 2009; Richardson, 1997). As lecturers in teacher education, it is such metaphors which may provide us with snapshots or glimpses of our future teachers. Metaphors such as these can provide information on how we, as teacher educators, can ensure that methodological theories and principles become part of preservice teachers` experiences.

2.2.4 What some contemporary research studies say about lecturers' beliefs

Many research studies about lecturers' beliefs concur that at the heart of teaching are the lecturers' beliefs (Raturi and Boulton-Lewis, 2014; Bingimlas and Hanrahan, 2010; Arenas, 2009; Biggs and Tang, 2007). Lecturers' belief systems may indicate that teachers select or design instructional material, deliver it and assess students`

performance basing their choice on these personal philosophies/theories and pedagogical practices: the teacher-centred philosophy or learner-centred philosophy. Some authorities put lecturers'/teachers ` beliefs into two categories (Phipps and Borg, 2009; Becker and Riel, 1999; Cuban, 1993): those closer to transmission theory (the behaviourist learning theory); and those that are closer to interactionist theory (constructivist learning theory). They contend that most teachers hold beliefs consistent with teacher-centred pedagogy; and that rarely do they use the learner-centred pedagogy. However, they argue that some lecturers / teachers may hold learner-centred beliefs but the school bureaucratic culture and public expectations of measurable documentation of student achievements severely constrain most lecturers/teachers from using learner-centred pedagogy.

Research has identified anomalies or variances among the systems of beliefs of different teachers from within a similar group (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986; Calderhead, 1996; Nespor, 1987). Some researchers discuss beliefs in terms of complex organizations consisting of discrete sets of inter-related concepts (Calderhead, 1991; Wehling and Charters, 1969). These concepts include beliefs in the category of representations, or mental schemata or cognitive maps of the external world. These serve as mediators or filters for experiencing and responding to reality. This conception of beliefs coincides or fits in with the notion of beliefs as personal knowledge, personal pedagogies and implicit theories. Equating teachers' beliefs with implicit theories, other researchers argue that teachers' theories and beliefs represent a rich store of knowledge from which they draw to make sense of

their complex world and to respond to reality (Clark and Peterson, 1986; Munby, 1982). Concurring with these researchers, Keegan (1992) notes that teachers do, in fact, form a complex system of personal and professional knowledge and theories with which they respond to their contexts. Hill et al, (2008); Fives and Buehl, (2008) concur that teachers'/lecturers' complex belief systems are often tacit and unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms and materials to be taught.

Raturi and Lewis-Boulton (2014) reveal that lecturers' beliefs can be classified according to their (lecturers) orientation i.e.(i) whether they are student centred/learning oriented; (ii) teacher centred/content oriented; or (iii) student teacher interaction/apprenticeship oriented. They argue that these orientations were developed well before lecturers assumed their teaching responsibilities. They contend that lecturers' conceptions of learning, in large measure, developed during their many years of schooling during which they were subliminally socialised into these orientations. This view concurs with those of Kennedy, (1999) and Lortie (1975) in respect of school teachers.

Some studies show that lecturers' orientations can also be shaped by the academic context in which they are employed, especially what they see from their more senior colleagues. With regard to lecturers with no formal training, they develop their conceptions of teaching from their own experiences. Their pedagogical decisions

are mainly based on what works or what they learn form their colleagues who have been teaching for some time before them.

Beliefs about teaching and learning may also have their source from cultural roots. Raturi and Lewis-Bolton (2014: 70) contend that cultural epistemologies can be very influential in the lecturers' thinking about teaching and learning as lecturers reflect on these and make explicit pedagogical decisions. For example, in some cultures, they argue:

> "a lot of emphasis is placed on social gatherings, cultural functions and ceremonies; promotion of communal values: living in communities or groups/ work in groups as opposed to individual aspirations for advancement".

The cultural influence will, therefore, orient the lecturer (raised in such a culture) towards learner-centred learning model characterised by group or interactive activities in the classroom. This learning model, according to researchers, is the most effective. However learners need supporting, through lecturer facilitation, to take control of their own learning, leading to deep learning (Biggs and Tang 2007). Lecturers who hold learner-centred beliefs tend to improve quality learning that result in conceptual change in students as they create knowledge (Muijs, 2007). Researchers concur that the learner-centred teaching approach, is more likely to result in independent learning, with lecturers playing a supportive role (Stephenson, 1990, in Raturi, 2014:70). The advantage of this approach, Kimber, (1998) argues, is that it allows exchange of ideas; and that enhances students' confidence and capability.

In some cultures (such as my own in Zimbabwe), it is the elder person who teaches children something they do not know. Children are not experienced enough to know something or to have acquired some knowledge that they can teach to others, let alone to the elder person. When children are among elders, they are expected not to talk, but remain silent. If they talk they are regarded as being disrespectful. The common saying in our culture is, in the presence of elders: “Children must be seen but not be heard”. Lecturers raised in such a culture tend to be oriented towards teacher-centred/content oriented model of teaching and learning. Lecturers of such orientation will inevitably be influenced (by the beliefs that they hold) to play a direct and dominant role in the classroom; with learners playing a passive role. One research study by Arenas (2009) shows that teachers who hold teacher-centred beliefs tended to want to transmit knowledge; and that this is influenced by cultural (and even academic) context.

In some cultures, however, where children learn by observing the elders and imitating them, the role of the elder person is to demonstrate the skill and then give the learner some time to practice it. This type of learning is characterised by verbal interaction between the learner and the teacher on one hand; and by lack of interaction between or among learners on the other. Lecturers raised in such cultures tend to be oriented towards student-teacher interaction/ apprenticeship model.

Lecturers who are raised in such cultures have their epistemological beliefs shaped by their cultural influences. Inevitably such cultural influences inform their choice of

how they organise learning situations and learning strategies in the classroom. Research studies show that if these lecturers' beliefs are not challenged, they will continue to teach in the same way, without questioning their pedagogical practice (Biggs and Tang, 2007; Atkin, 1999). This is why researchers argue that there is a need for lecturers to be exposed to new experiences and new research ideas. It is in the face of these that lecturers will also see the need for them to challenge, examine, clarify, interpret and justify their existing beliefs (Raturi and Boulton-Lewis, 2014; Varnava-Marouchou, 2007; Pickering, 2002; Tabachnik and Zeichner, 1986).

While researchers acknowledge the centrality of lecturers' beliefs in informing their pedagogical practice, their biggest challenge has been how to access these beliefs in order that lecturers can examine, clarify and interpret them; with the view to challenging the maladaptive ones. Some studies show that the kinds of methods and procedures used by researchers to elicit teachers' beliefs and gain access into their thoughts and thinking are complex (Pajares, 1992; Clandinin and Connelly, 1987; Tann, 1993). This suggests there is so much interest in researchers trying to make explicit and visible the frames of reference through which individual lecturers/teachers perceive and process information (Clark and Peterson, 1986).

Pajares (1992) argues that the construct of beliefs does not lend itself readily and easily to empirical methods of investigation. This is because, he contends, beliefs are not observable and thus have a very covert nature; and even teachers who hold them may not recognize them (Milne and Taylor, 1995). Since beliefs are often tacit

and unarticulated, they belong to the category of cognitive processes and are thus unobservable in the same way that behaviour would be (Clark and Peterson, 1986).

Pointing to a number of drawbacks to such inappropriate methods of studying beliefs, Munby, (1984: 29) contends:

> "While the items of the research instrument generate a response, they may be doing so not because the teacher would necessarily have thought of the belief represented by the items but because the test developer did. In other words, the score represents what the teacher says is believed when he or she is physically presented with various beliefs of interest to the researcher (and possibly identified by many other teachers), and these do not necessarily respond the beliefs which are paramount to the individual teacher's handling of the immediate and unique professional environment".

A further characteristic of beliefs which many researchers point out as problematic is their tacit nature (Leatham, 2006; Keegan, 1992; Woods, 1996). This character poses a lot of difficulties for researchers who are trying to access them. Woods (1996) posits that even the seemingly appropriate direct questioning technique, in an interview situation can yield misleading results. Woods, (1996:27) further argues:

> "Beliefs (and their interrelationships) may not be entirely consciously accessible, and teachers may, in responding to questions about generalized beliefs, answer according to what they would like to believe, or would like to show they believe in the interview context. When a belief or assumption is articulated in the abstract as response to an abstract question, there is a much greater chance that it will tend more towards what is expected in the interview situation than what is actually held in the teaching situation and actually influences teaching practices".

Woods identifies a further problem which arises in relation to the way in which the questions may be posed. It is the fact that certain terms used by the researcher in his/her interview schedule may mean different things to different people. As a result the use of certain terms by researchers in their interviews and the attendant responses may be misleading.

Expressing similar concerns about the approach of much of the research on teachers' thought processes and beliefs, Fang (1996), posits that studies of teacher cognition and beliefs must, of necessity, address the personal experiences of individual teachers and their influence on shaping these beliefs. To elicit genuine beliefs, Fang (1996), recommends approaches such as life history, personal anecdotes such as narratives and autobiographies. He argues that these approaches can capture the complexities of teacher beliefs. Woods (1996) concurs, and proposes investigating the contexts of teacher stories about these experiences and events. Arguing for similar approaches, Munby (1984) emphasizes the need for teachers to be given opportunities to talk about their core beliefs. Clandinin and Connolly, (1987) also assert that teachers` stories play a significant role in exposing teachers` fundamental beliefs and can serve to illuminate teachers` thinking behind their pedagogical and professional practices.

2.2.5 Teachers' beliefs as teacher knowledge

Researchers concur that, not only is it very difficult to access lecturers' beliefs, but also very difficult to separate them from the lecturers' knowledge (Biggs and Tang, 2007; Day, et al, 2000; Clandinin and Connolly, 1987; Calderhead, 1996; Tabachnik and Zeichner, 1986; Zeichner, 1984). Some researchers, however, argue that knowledge is different from beliefs; and that it is knowledge that offers some insight into lecturers' pedagogical practice; and not beliefs (Roehler et al, 1988). These researchers argue, therefore, that lecturers' knowledge ought to be prioritised over beliefs.

Some researchers, however, observe that there seems to be some confusion between teachers` beliefs and teacher knowledge (Griffin and Ohlsson, 2001; Clandinin and Connolly, 1987). It is not clear whether knowledge differs from, or is the same as, beliefs or whether beliefs themselves constitute a form of knowledge. Nespor (1987) theorizes that beliefs "serve as a means of defining goals and tasks, whereas knowledge systems come into play where goals and paths to their attainment are well defined" (p.310). He argues that belief systems can be said to rely much more heavily on affective and evaluative components than knowledge systems. For instance, the teachers` beliefs expressed in values and feelings may conflict with what and how she/he may teach the subject i.e. the knowledge domain. Nespor posits that belief systems are composed mainly of episodically stored material derived from personal experience. It is these episodes or events which later influence the comprehension of events in the future. He concludes that whereas beliefs reside in episodic memory, knowledge is meaningfully stored.

A further distinction between beliefs and knowledge that Nespor (1987) note is that, while beliefs are static and difficult to change, knowledge often changes. This is because knowledge can be judged and evaluated but beliefs can not, because of lack of consensus about how they should be evaluated. Not withstanding the problematic nature of distinguishing between the two constructs, Nespor argues, however, that a better understanding may be gained by exploring the relationship between beliefs and knowledge by considering beliefs as form of knowledge i.e. personal knowledge. Some researchers (Leatham, 2006; Kagan, 1992; Clandinin and Connolly, 1987; Feiman-Nemser et al, 1987) concur, referring to beliefs as a form of personal knowledge, with most of a teacher's /lecturers professional knowledge being regarded as belief. They note that the teacher's/lecturers' personal knowledge grows and is enhanced with experience in the classroom or in the field of teaching. This personal knowledge forms a highly personalized pedagogy or belief system that serves as a filter, controlling the perception, judgement, and behaviour of the teacher. Keegan (1992:74) notes:

> "A teacher's knowledge of his or her profession is situated in three important ways: in context (it is related to specific groups of students), in content (it related to particular academic material to be taught), and person, (it is embedded within a teacher's unique beliefs system".

Recent studies show that lecturers' beliefs have emerged as a major area of enquiry in the field of teaching and learning at universities (Biggs and Tang, 2007; Varnava-Marouchou, 2007; Pickering, 2002). One area of interest is the relationship between teachers` beliefs and their classroom practices. There has been significant interest in the extent to which teachers lecturers' espoused beliefs correspond with their

pedagogical practices; and there is evidence that the two do not always coincide. While some research studies have described consistencies between beliefs and pedagogical practices, others have identified inconsistencies (Hill et al, 2008; Fives and Buehl, 2008; Kagan, 1992; Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Nespor, 1987).

According to some researchers, the study of lecturers' beliefs provides significant and profound insight into many aspects of their professional world (Steel, 2009; Varnava-Marouchou, 2007; Boulton- Lewis, 2004; Pickering, 2002). Pajares (1992) also argues that such a study can inform educational practice and is essential to improving teachers` professional and teaching practices. Kagan (1992) affirms that the study of beliefs is critical to educational practice, arguing that "beliefs may be the clearest measure of a teacher's professional growth" and that understanding them is "instrumental in determining the quality of interaction" (p.85). In fact beliefs, concludes Rokeach (1968), are the best indicators of the decisions made by individual teachers in their lifelong careers. A surge of emerging literature suggests that there is growing interest among researchers to understand not only teachers` beliefs, but also lecturers' (Northcote, 2009; Steel, 2009; Phipps and Borg, 2009; Varnava-Marouchou, 2007; Biggs and Tang, 2007; Lyle, 2003; Pickering 2002). Pintrich, (1990) posits that beliefs will eventually prove to be the most valuable psychological construct for teacher education.

Some researchers equate teacher's beliefs with implicit theories (Argyris and Schon, 1974; Handal and Lauvas, 1988; Clark, 1988). These implicit theories become

personal pedagogies or theories that inform teachers' practices. Nespor (1987: 324) explains:

> "Teachers' beliefs play a major role in defining teaching tasks and organising the knowledge and information relevant to those tasks. But why should this be so? Why wouldn't research base knowledge or academic theory serve this purpose just as well? The answer suggested here is that the contexts and environments within which teachers work, and many of the problems they encounter, are ill-defined and deeply entangled, and that beliefs are peculiarly suited for making sense of such contexts".

The significance of the role lecturers' beliefs play in their teaching and learning can not be over emphasised. Recent studies show that lecturers' beliefs have emerged as a major area of enquiry in the field of teaching and learning at universities (Biggs and Tang, 2007; Varnava-Marouchou, 2007; Pickering, 2002). One area of interest is the relationship between teachers` beliefs and their classroom practices. There has been significant interest in the extent to which teachers lecturers' espoused beliefs correspond with their pedagogical practices; and there is evidence that the two do not always coincide. While some research studies have described consistencies between beliefs and pedagogical practices, others have identified inconsistencies (Hill et al, 2008; Fives and Buehl, 2008; Kagan, 1992; Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Nespor, 1987).

Despite a great amount of work done in the field, concerning the various roles of lecturers' beliefs in promoting learning and teaching, (Biggs and Tang, 2007;

Boulton-Lewis, 2004; Pickering, 2002), not much (if any) has been written on lecturers' beliefs in Zimbabwe; hence this study.

2.3 Can lecturers' beliefs be changed?

In this section, the terms "lecturers" and "teacher educators" will be used interchangeably. Although this study does not seek to challenge lecturers' beliefs, understanding lecturers' beliefs alone is not enough. There is need therefore for me to understand whether they can be changed; and if so, how. Literature argues that lecturers' beliefs change; and that teaching is, in essence, the process of changing incongruous beliefs by engaging learners in concept changing activities that target misconceptions and folk pedagogies (Bruner, 1999). Richards et al (2000) argue that changes in teachers'/lecturers' practices reflect changes in their beliefs. I consider it very crucial to understand how lecturers' beliefs change, as change in their beliefs result in change in their pedagogical practices. The change in beliefs invariably has a marked influence on what, how and why lecturers make instructional and pedagogical choices and decisions. Researchers contend that it is also crucial to understand several assumptions about the nature of lecturer belief change that underpins current approaches to lecturer professional development (Roesken, 2011; Brownlee, 2003; Atkin, 1996; Blenkin, 1992).

Darling-Hammond (1990) in Richards et al (2000:1) proffers some of the reasons why understanding how teachers' beliefs change is crucial:

> "Teachers' beliefs play a central role in the process of teacher development. Changes in teachers' practices are the result of changes in teachers ` beliefs. The notion of teacher change is multidimensional and is triggered both by personal factors as well as professional contexts in which teachers work".

Teacher education literature and research studies concur that teachers appear unable to change beliefs they are unaware of; and are unwilling to change those they are aware of unless they perceive good reasons to do so (Marzano et al, 2005; Kennedy, 1997; Denicolo and Day, 1999; Raths, 1990). For teacher educators to change their beliefs, it is crucial that they do so by engaging in collaborative initiatives that would expose their beliefs to peer scrutiny and analysis. This process kicks in a cognitive conflict, creating disequilibrium in the individual `s mental structure. This cognitive imbalance is a necessary condition enabling teachers to examine existing beliefs. Teacher educators need to take what Pajares (1993:1) calls "the risky but exciting step of systematically studying their practices" by dismantling and disentangling old schemata in which old beliefs are embedded. In this process of deliberate reflection on the beliefs that they hold, lecturers can manage to deconstruct their old frames of reference that anchor old beliefs. This process enables them to construct new frames of reference in the light of new understanding. Researchers concur that through this process of questioning, re-

examining, clarifying, deconstruction, budging and debunking of existing mental structures; a paradigm shift can be achieved (Marzano et al, 2005; Day et al, 2000; Atkin, 1996; Tabachnik and Zeichner, 1984; Kuhn, 1962). It is this paradigm shift: a new way of thinking that reflects a change in lecturers' beliefs.

Researchers attribute the failure of many teacher education programmes to the fact that these programmes are ineffective in improving the current practice. Where they seem to fail is where teacher educators choose to prepare teachers to fit into the patterns of current practice underpinned by inappropriate beliefs; while ignoring to critically examine and improve current practice. Such programmes, Raths (1990) argues, simply hire lecturers to offer traditional methods courses and eschew those that would whet teacher candidates` appetite to question current ways of teaching and practice. Researchers contend that it is ironic that while many teacher educators wish to improve their current practice; but they still cling to unexamined beliefs and practices or folkways (Fullan, 1991; Bruner, 1996; Day, 1999). In spite of protracted efforts of their desire to improve their current practices, research abounds with cases where these aspirations have not been realised. The implication of these studies of these studies are significant for teacher educators: It is about time teacher educators took the initiative, tasking themselves to changing some of their pedagogical beliefs to optimize the impact the programmes may have on learning new practices. The findings of these studies on attribution theories, Raths (1990:2) contends, provide compelling evidence of the need to change current beliefs of teacher educators. He argues:

> "The attributions that teachers make to their pupils who are doing poorly, may be, reflect their beliefs but also hinder their effective interventions with pupils. So, academic failure often is attributed to external factors--- rather than reflecting on problematic teaching (and practices)". [Parenthesis my own]

What this means, in essence, is that learners become victims of teachers` unexamined pedagogical beliefs. The tendency, owing to pedagogical folkways, is that when learners become targets of these attributions, chances in which teachers can effectively address learning problems are narrowed. In an attempt to address this challenge, researchers concur that there is a need for lecturers to be clear about how to change their beliefs before they can begin to address their pedagogical practices (Rokeach., 1968; Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1984; McDiarmid, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Day et al, 2000). Lecturers need to appreciate assumptions that underpin the process of changing beliefs. Raths (1990:2) summarises these assumptions as:

> "The challenge to change beliefs is enormous. Some beliefs are more important than others to individuals. The more important the belief, the more difficult it is to change. If central belief is changed, other beliefs within the person's belief system are affected. Beliefs about teaching are very central and as such, resist change".

Research has shown that to change beliefs, teacher educators need to engage in reflective processes to elicit, examine and confront the maladaptive beliefs (Leatham, 2008). According to dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957 in Raths, 1990) cognitive dissonance refers to a situation involving conflicting attitudes, beliefs or

behaviours. A conflict or dissonance is triggered when teacher educators engage in collaborative work activities that expose their misplaced beliefs. Challenging these beliefs helps budging mental structures in which the misplaced beliefs are embedded. This reflective process helps teacher educators construct a new mental framework that accommodates alternative perceptions. Thus, a change in beliefs is achieved.

2.4 Literature that informs data analysis

The literature review presented in this section was very illuminative as it provided deep insights into the critical interplay between teachers' beliefs and their pedagogical practices.

2.4.1 Learning theories and lecturers' pedagogical beliefs.

Research literature has shown that lecturers' practice of instructional design is closely linked to their beliefs about pedagogical issues (Prichard, 2009; Varnava-Marouchou, 2007; Norton et al, 2005; Pickering; 2003; Richardson, 2001). Pedagogical issues are, generally, underpinned by philosophies of epistemology and the assumptions about the learner i.e. about the learner and how the learner acquires knowledge. Current research on teaching or instruction shows a major shift from the traditional, teacher-centred approaches informed by behaviourism learning theory (Muijs, 2007) to more progressive, learner-centred, interactionist and experiential learning approaches (Blumberg, 2008) informed by the constructivist learning theory (Brooks and Brooks, 1993; Roberts, 1998, Kolb

1985). The traditional, teacher-centred, transmission approaches, on one hand, are based on the philosophical assumptions that knowledge is absolute, static and separate from the learner (Rainer and Guyton, 1999). According to this school of thought the learner is viewed as an empty vessel or blank slate to be filled with knowledge. The interactionist and experiential approaches, on the other hand, are based on the philosophical assumptions that knowledge is not absolute; it is socially constructed and keeps on changing (Prichard, 2009). This school of thought, researchers concur, views the learner as an active learner who possesses significant prior knowledge; a learner who actively constructs and tests his/her understanding of this knowledge and the representation of the world (Felder and Brent, 2009; Blumberg and Everett, 2005; Weimer, 2002; Kroll, 2004; Rainer and Guyton, 1999).

In the traditional, teacher-centred, transmission perspective, learners are expected to accumulate knowledge of the natural word; while the role of the teacher is essentially that of transmitting that knowledge to the learner. Teaching approaches underpinned by this view are largely characterized by lecturing. In contrast, according to researchers, in the progressive, learner-centred, interactionist and experiential perspective, learners are expected to construct knowledge through active involvement in the learning process, utilizing their mental structures or schemata to form concepts (Muijis, 2007; Fosnot, 1996; Brooks and Brooks, 1993). Teaching approaches underpinning these approaches are largely interactionist and collaborative (Blumberg, 2008; Kroll, 2004; Rainer and Guyton 1999; Saljo, 1979).

2.4.1.1 Behaviourist learning theory: How it informs lecturers' pedagogical beliefs

In the previous section, it has been shown that in the traditional perspective about pedagogy, teaching and learning are guided by the behaviourist learning theory. Researchers concur that this theory is, characterized by assumptions that learners are passive recipients of knowledge and the teacher is omniscient, and pours knowledge into the empty heads of learners (Prichard, 2009; Muijs, 2007; Fosnot, 1996). In this perspective, the teacher manipulates the classroom environment to elicit appropriate responses from the learners. At the end of a lesson, learners are expected to exhibit the required behaviours, and if they do not then the learners are not good enough, but if they do, then the teacher is indeed a good teacher. The proponents of this perspective argue that: "The profession of teaching will improve in proportion as its members direct their daily work by the scientific method" Carr and Kemmis, (1986:56). The learners are expected to apply the knowledge they receive from their teachers. Teaching is characterised by transmission or lecture method; and the lecturer is dominating; and is controlling the learning environment.

According to the traditional perspective, Carr and Kemmis (1986) observe that teaching and learning are seen as applied science in the sense of engineering or medicine. All educational activities (including teaching and learning) are reducible to

laws and principles and as scientific in nature (Fish, 1989). Fish notes that the scientific tradition holds sway among many in the field of education and it appears it has had great attraction to teacher education theorists and administrators. Its appeal lies in the fact that it appears to provide for clear-cut thinking and straight-forward decision-making.

2.4.1.2 Constructivism learning theory: How it informs lecturers' pedagogical beliefs.

Constructivism has become the guiding philosophy in teacher education globally as indicated by contemporary literature (Muijs, 2007; Schunk, 2003; Rainer–Rangel, 2002; Fosnot, 1996). Current literature also indicates that more and more teacher education programmes around the world portray themselves as following a constructivist approach in their preparation of teachers, both at pre-service and in-service levels (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Richardson, 1997; Cannella and Reiff, 1994).

While the traditional perspective and the scientific model of preparing teachers has had a far reaching influence on teacher education programmes around the world, its critics argue that it has failed (Korthagen, 2001; Rainer and Guyton, 1999; Wideen and Grimmet, 1996; Leinhardt, 1992; Goodlad, 1990; Zeichner, 1987; Louis, 1981). These critics now call for a radical departure from the teacher-centred, traditional perspective located in the empirical epistemology, to a more progressive learner-centred perspective. Researchers challenge the traditional notion that abstract or theoretical knowledge is of a higher standing and of more value than practical and

socially created knowledge. This traditional notion of learning and teaching is, they argue, inappropriate for social sciences such as education. Arguing for the interpretive approaches to social science, researchers assert that subjective and social factors play a crucial role in knowledge creation and that learners' prior knowledge is fundamental in the process of teaching and learning. Knowledge, they argue, is not fixed and eternal, but tentative and temporary (Korthagen et al, 2001; Leinhardt, 1992). Learning, they contend, is a social endeavour, a process of constructing and reconstructing knowledge. Knowledge, therefore, is socially constructed through social interactions characterized by dialogue, debates, discussions, writings, simulations and collaborative activities (Rainer and Guyton, 1999).

The emphasis is now on learner-centred perspective, informed by the constructivist learning theory. Proponents of the learner-centred view of teaching and learning recognize the autonomy and individual needs of the learner. They argue that learning must be internally determined instead of externally controlled as defined by the behaviourist theory. Advocates of the learner-centred view argue that what we know is context situated, and the context is the social environment. Knowledge is therefore a result of human action and this action is context bound (Blumberg, 2008; Perkins, 2006; Schunk, 2003; Richardson, 1997; Fosnot, 1996; Carter, 1990).

The core principle of the learner-centred perspective informed by the constructivist learning theory is, according to Williams and Burden (1997) in Roberts (1998) that

learners as social beings will make and interpret their own ideas using their own frames of reference in ways that are personal to them and thus create their own reality. This perspective assumes that learning is a process of knowledge construction by learners themselves. In contrast with the traditional perspective, the contemporary learner-centred perspective emphasises learner interaction as it assumes that knowledge emerges from human activity as people interact with each other and with the physical world. Learners do that when; use their minds and bodies as well as their material and symbolic tools available in their immediate environment and culture. Thus learners actively construct their knowledge and don't simply receive it from experience or from the expert teacher. It is the learners` activity, both as individuals and with others, that is crucial to transforming prior knowledge and experiences, connecting it to new information, into new knowledge. Korthagen et al, (2001: 9-10), summarize the tenets of a constructivist-informed learner-centred conceptual framework (to inform Teacher Education programmes) when they say:

> "It starts from concrete practical problems and the concerns experienced by student teachers in real contexts. It aims at the promotion of systemic reflection of student teachers on their own; and their students wanting, feeling, thinking and acting on the role of context, and on the relationship between those aspects".

Korthagen et al (2001) emphasize that the learner-centred conceptual framework builds on the personal interaction between the teacher educator and the student teacher and on the interaction among the student teachers. This framework, they

argue, has a strongly integrated character involving the integration of theory and practice and the integration of disciplines.

This contradicts with the traditional perspective informed by the behaviourist theory where learning is teacher dominated. As already mentioned, in the traditional perspective, teaching is telling, learning is imbibing, copying or memorizing knowledge from the teacher (Russell, 2007). The learner-centred teaching/learning approach, (in the context of Teacher Education), creates opportunities in which learners challenge their own beliefs and assumptions about teaching and learning. In this approach, learners are provided with a multiplicity of ways to examine many issues about learning, teaching and development. In the context of Teacher Education, Feiman-Nemser & Buchman, (1987) and Zeichner, (1987) advocate for programmes built on the principles that embrace learning as a developmental process and not a one-off event. What makes the constructivist approach appeal is that it represents a multiplicity of ways of thinking about learning and teaching and professional development.

Teacher Education programmes must, accordingly, expose pre-service teachers to this constructivist informed learner-centred perspectives (Kroll and LaBosky, 1996; Steffe and Gale, (1995), in Kroll, 2004). This is succinctly put by Richardson, (1999), in Hassard, (1999:3) who echoes Calderheard`s (1989) ideas and explains:

> "The process of constructivist teacher education approach involves using constructivist methods of education --- to create a constructivist environment in

> the teacher education classroom that includes using the pedagogical tools of dialogue, the development of meaningful tasks, and "giving reason" to the participants. These processes are often used by teacher educators to model how they want their students to eventually teach in their own classrooms".

In spite of a surge in research literature about the need for learner-centred approaches to prepare new teachers (Blumberg, 2008; Muijs, 2007; Russell, 2007; Norton et al, 2005; Rainer and Guyton, 2004; Kroll, 2004; Pickering 2002; Cochran-Smith, 2001; Korthagen et al, 2001; Richards et al, 2001; Kroll and LaBosky, 1996; Calderhead, 1989) the question to ask is: Why is that some teacher education programmes still cling to the traditional teacher-centred perspective to inform their models of preparing new teachers? There might be barriers, perhaps, that stand in the way of teacher educators to embrace the learner-centred approaches to preparing pre-service teachers.

2.5 Literature that informs the discussion and interpretation of the findings

Literature reviewed here provides a framework for analysing and interpreting data.

2.5.1 Teaching and learning

Lecturers preparing new teachers are expected to understand the philosophy that informs teacher training programmes (Lapsley, 2002). Lecturers themselves, whose teacher preparation programme is underpinned by the constructivist philosophy, ought to understand that this philosophy recognizes that the learning environment is social, with multiple opportunities to implement teaching strategies and skills during

field experiences. In their teaching, therefore, lecturers are expected to model this philosophy (Cochran-Smith, 2001).

Researchers' views have shown that successful teacher education programmes were built on the epistemological perspective that learning to teach was a deeply personal activity in which the learner examined beliefs and prior knowledge in light of their learning programmes and teaching contexts (Rainer-Dangel and Guyton, 2004; Richards et al (ms); Wideen et al, 1998). These ideas and research studies indicate that constructivist teacher education may have a more significant impact and influence on teachers than the traditional didactic, content oriented programmes. While there is need for critical analysis of the constructivist ideas and research studies by teacher educators to establish their effectiveness, current literature (1990-present) seems to support constructivism as a new guiding conceptual philosophy (Kroll, 2004; Korthagen, 2001; Rainer and Guyton, 1999; Kroll and LaBosky, 1996; Goodlad, 1990).

Constructivism is an epistemology that offers an explanation of the nature of knowledge and how human beings learn. It is, therefore a learning theory, rather than a teaching theory (Fosnot, 1996). In recent years it has received considerable attention in educational scholarship, especially in Teacher Education (Cannella and Reiff, 1994). Constructivism maintains that individuals create or construct their own new understandings or knowledge through the interaction of what they already know. Accordingly, learning activities in constructivist classrooms are characterized

by a learner who is a co-explorer, engaging in active enquiry and problem-solving activities in collaboration with other learners. The role of the lecturer is that of a guide, facilitator, and co-explorer rather than a dispenser of knowledge. He/she encourages learners to question, challenge and create their own ideas, opinions and conclusions (Abdal-Haqq, 1998).

A constructivist philosophy envisions learners who are active, self-motivated, self-regulated; learners who engage in collaborative problem-solving. Teacher candidates, whose training programme is informed by this philosophy, expected to embrace instructional models that are learner-centred, interactive, constructive and generative. This approach prefers collaborative, flexible and heterogeneous groupings (Brooks and Brooks, 1993). Accordingly, faculty, whose programme is premised on constructivism, ought to model the practice consistent with the constructivist perspective of learning and teaching. During their training teacher candidates need to acquire a solid knowledge base. They ought to demonstrate scholarly practice through a solid grasp of subject matter and professional practice of pedagogy. Knowledge of content is critical to enable the candidates make important connections and foundations for ideas and skilfully link new knowledge to prior knowledge. Candidates should be able to transform subject knowledge into meaningful knowledge that supports development of pedagogic content knowledge (Maynard and Furlong, 1995, Shulman, 1987). Their preparation programme should enable them to develop an awareness of the fact that learners

are unique and heterogeneous and; and the teacher should attend to their needs which are, essentially, situated and influenced by their social context.

It is crucial that teacher candidates recognise that teaching is an emotional practice (Hargreaves, 1998). They need to understand and appreciate that knowledge about learners requires insightful listening and interpretation; and that the teacher sees learners as thinkers in their own right, capable of productive reasoning. Ball and Cohen, (1996) emphasise that, teacher candidates must be able to apply their knowledge of human development; and of how cognitive and social-emotional factors influence decision making. Teacher candidates can draw from that knowledge to create effective learning environments for all learners, recognizing that all learners are capable of learning.

The teacher education programme premised on the constructivist philosophy values the practicum because it provides opportunities for teacher candidates to begin to experience real classrooms, where candidates test new ideas and apply theory to practice. Cooperating teachers provide models for best practice (hopefully) as they work co-operatively and collaboratively with teacher candidates and faculty representatives. Modelling of co-operating teachers, connecting it with theory learnt at college classrooms allows teacher candidates to develop their own perceptions and personal theories (Bransford et al (1999).

The constructivist philosophy recognizes that teachers' beliefs play a central role in the process of teacher development. Changes in teachers' practices are the result of changes in teachers' beliefs. Researchers concur that the notion of teacher change is multidimensional and is triggered, both by personal factors as well as by the professional contexts in which lecturers work, such as the college or school culture (Richards et al, 2001; Hargreaves, 1998). Lecturers, should therefore, understand that their teacher training programme ought to create opportunities for teacher candidates to explore their core beliefs and deconstruct those that may interfere with teacher development; and enable them to reconstruct their frames of reference in light of new understandings (Darling- Hammond, 1990).

2.5.2 Assessment

Literature shows that calls for reforms in the preparation of pre-service teachers in Teacher Education colleges and universities (Wideen and Grimmet, 1995; Hopkins, 1996) has been matched by calls for reforms in assessment techniques in similar institutions (Shulman, 1987, 1998; Smith, 1990). These calls have reverberated globally; resulting in much determined efforts by lecturers to design new forms of assessment for their students. These efforts are driven by the growing wave of literature that advocates for new assessment strategies, not only to enhance learning, but also to deal with the complexities of the knowledge that lecturers and learners bring to bear in the learning process (Boud and Flachikov, 2005; Rennert-Ariev, 2005; Akerlind, 2004; Black et al, 2003; Weeden et al, 2002; Lambert and

Line, 2000; Black and Wiliam, 1998; Wiggins, 1998; Shulman, 1998; Aikehead, 1997; Brookfield,1995; Darling-Hammond et al, 1995).

The new assessment regimes seek to transcend the traditional limits in their bid to provide ways to sensitively document the personally and contextually complex nature of teaching. Acknowledging the significance of the movement towards new forms of assessment for pre-service teachers, Darling-Hammond et al (1995) note that the movement is characterized by a departure from standardized paper and pencil tests, seeking to evaluate the acquisition of knowledge and skills, using a marking guide or checklist detailing a list of teaching behaviours. They criticize these types of tests for reflecting a narrow conception of teaching. Shulman, (1988) and Wolf et al (1996) concur with this view of traditional standardized paper and pencil tests. They call for alternative, authentic forms of assessment that can capture the complexities of teaching and learning as they develop over time: the continuous assessment.

2.5.2.1 Historical perspectives of assessment

Broadfoot (1996) in P. Woods (1996) gives very a strong argument of why countries around the world have, for centuries, valued assessment or educational measurement so highly. She ascribes this to what she called the 'the diploma disease' syndrome. She deplores the undue pressure the measurement assessment is brought to bear (by society) on the education system. This is because society sees assessment as playing a central role as it determines

opportunities for future jobs and enhanced social status. Barefoot, (1996:204) demonstrates this view of society about the role assessment plays, arguing that every country of the world assumes that the:

> "Techniques available to measure students' achievements are sufficiently accurate, that their use provides the most rational, the most just and hence the most acceptable method of allocating educational opportunity".

That is why, she argues, for every country of the world, educational assessment has become established as the key mechanism for the allocation of individual life-chances in modern societies. This, she continues to argue, leads to distortion of the curriculum, trading for grades; inculcating instrumental attitudes in the learner at the expense of meaningful learning itself. She argues that this perceived legitimacy of educational assessment is based on the assumption that the measures generated, i. e. the assessment results, are true. Broadfoot (1996:205) argues that, in the contemporary world that is pervasively concerned with international competition, certificates become:

> "---a performance indicator of the quality of the education process itself. Governments, teachers, parents, and students around the world have learned to define educational quality in terms of the results public examinations and off other kinds of standardized tests".

In spite of some criticism levelled at educational measurement or measurement-oriented assessment by some researchers, assessment as an educational concept is, in itself, a very special part of the learning process. Our modern examination has

evolved from the ancient civilizations in response to the dictates of time and place. Historically, Broadfoot (1996) contends, the purpose of assessment was to “attest to personal competence and by association, to the quality of work, goods or skills of a given craftsman” p.208. Gradually, the need arose to select suitable candidates in terms of numbers and competency, for particular professions or trades, giving rise to a second purpose for assessment. Accordingly, the three pillars of an examination evolved to avoid any possibilities of or minimize chances of cheating or favouritism.

First, reliability in assessing the given competence; second, ranking candidates in accordance with their achievement to render fair competition; and third, to control-convincing the unsuccessful candidates of the fairness of the selection procedures and accept the results (Broadfoot, 1996).

With time, Broadfoot observes, the examination system became problematic as it became fraught with (un)professional vagaries of patronage and nepotism. There was need to replace it and bind it up with search for power. Political ideologies permeated the examination systems, giving rise to ideological and pragmatic pressures, which in turn gave birth to the concept of meritocracy. Accordingly, educational measurement or assessment assumed an important political and social role.

The spirit of the age (the age of Enlightenment), in the nineteenth century, demanded that the twin principles of uniformity and standardization be applied the

way (the scientific way) to educational measurement or assessment as it was applied to industrial production. However, Broadfoot (1996:212) notes, that at the time:

> "---the principles regarding methods, motivation and the effect of examinations were almost wholly untested and unvalidated: there was little substantial critique of examinations as technique or as a process and there was no serious questioning of the utilitarian values of the examination reformers".

The critique of the examination, although it made little impact on the examination per se, it informed the move from assessing achievement to measuring the mind-psychometrics. Essentially this was new development in search of an ever-more unbiased, scientific means of measuring merit. Psychologists of the time convinced academics that not only were it possible to measure intellectual ability accurately, but that it was also possible to predict future academic and occupational performance with some measure of certainty (Broadfoot, 1996). This development was considered a significant and revolutionary scientific breakthrough in the field of educational measurement or assessment. Wiliam, (1974) in Broadfoot, (1996: 210) puts it this way:

> "To the scholars and men of science of the Victorian era imbued as this era was with the spirit of the physical sciences, the thought that qualities as intangible and as insensible as intelligence could be accurately measured, was revolutionary indeed".

It should be noted, however, that though revolutionary this new development was, it was only limited to measuring the ability to learn and not learning itself. The new development made it very simple to manage, standardize, and administer tests that were considered objective, easily comparable and reliable. This form of testing dominated and shaped both the form and content of what was measured and, hence, ultimately, what was learned (Broadfoot, 1996). Power dimensions inherent in this type of testing meant that particular values were elevate at the expense of others. Such a society is an unjust society. Revolutionary or not, can educational assessment be scientific (in the narrow sense used in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries i.e. the truly real)? Current educational researchers argue that objective measurement or assessment is not possible- it is a myth to say educational assessment can be measured objectively and accurately. Why? Werner Heisenberg, in Broadfoot, (1996:215), cited in Johnson, (1991), contends:

> "Because we observe using instruments which we construct, we interpret what we observe using what we already know and describe what we observe using the language we have available. Making knowledge is a constructive, interpretive process. A process of using instruments to observe changes the very nature of what is observed".

The above statement by Heisenberg recognizes that our culture and values inform our interpretation of the world i. e. they become lenses through which we see and interpret the natural world (Broadfoot, 1996). Essentially this means that the assessment procedures, through to interpretation of the results, can never be neutral. Wolf et al, (1991) argue for a new perspective, arguing that assessment

fulfils more than one role. In its traditional role, assessment grades students and eventually certificates them. It is now also well recognised that assessment also plays a significant role in supporting students' learning. The focus now, researchers argue, ought to shift from the traditional view of assessment that considers assessment as "measurement" to an alternative view of assessment that considers assessment as an integral part of teaching and learning (Black and Wiliam, 1998; Boud, 2005). The alternative assessment view recognises that the role of a student has changed, and that many teachers now see their students as active participants in the learning process. However, in spite of the fact that higher education institutions acknowledge the central role played by formative assessment in aiding learning, many teachers still give prominence to the traditional summative assessment. This creates what Lambert and Line, (2000) called the 'backwash effect' i.e. the bad drives out the good so that however noble and effective the learning strategy, the students will abandon it if it does not lead to a success in examination, (a notion that is emphasized in summative assessment).

Over the course of the last decade, many higher education institutions, especially in teacher education departments have sought to design new forms of assessment for preservice teachers. Rennert-Ariev (2005:1), citing Shulman (1987) and Smith, (1990) strongly puts it this way:

> "The efforts (to design new forms of assessments) have stemmed from a growing sentiment that the more powerful and nuanced assessment strategies are now needed to target the complexities of the knowledge that bring to bear in their teaching as well as subtleties of innovative teaching practice. Efforts

> to create new forms of assessment have sought to transcend the limits of traditional testing practices as they provide ways to sensitively document the personally and contextually complex world of teaching."

Here Rennert-Ariev (2005) advocates for the change of assessment practices form the traditional forms of assessment to the contemporary forms that are informed by current research on how learners learn; and support learning.

2.5.2.2 Traditional purposes of assessment

The purposes of assessment are well documented in literature. Though different terminology is used by different writers, there is considerable concurrence in the purposes served by assessment (Wiliam and Black, 1996; McKellar, 2002). According to Lambert and Lines ((2000) assessment has three purposes. Firstly, it is designed to support and, therefore enhance learning; secondly it measures progress, and thirdly, as a form of accountability mechanism, it provides quality assurance to stakeholders. For the student, argues Lines, the first appears to be crucial and yet for the stakeholders, it appears, the third purpose is very critical. While on one hand the student is interested in passing examinations and proceed to the next level of education, the stakeholders, on the other hand, are interested in judging the value of education. Stakeholders want to know if education is indeed good 'value for money' (Lambert and Lines, 2000:1). Hence the assessment of education has become so pervasive: students want to pass an examination so that they can attain a higher social status; stakeholders are worried about the `worth` of education; the `value for money ` aspect of education. Consequently the

assessment for education has suffered in the face of these two cultures of assessment. Assessment *of* education has taken precedence over assessment *for* education. This is worrying. The purposes of assessment need to be reviewed with the view to changing them, aligning them to the principle of active learning. There is need to recognize changing views about ways people learn. Unless assessment is changed all attempts to teach for deep learning will fail, given the current knowledge of how students learn. There is now recognition by researchers that students are not 'passive learners' whose heads are empty vessels to be filled with knowledge by the teacher. Students are now recognised as 'active learners' who construct knowledge in partnership with the teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Fosnot, 1996; Brooks and Brooks, 1993).

2.5.2.3 The contemporary purposes of assessment

Literature shows that, historically (18th to early 19th century), assessment emphasized the summative function, where the student was seen as a test taker, while contemporary literature now emphasizes the formative function, which has since gained prominence (Rennert-Ariev, 2005; Aikenhead, 1997; Broadfoot, 1996). Assessment must help students prepare for life. This is what Boud, (2000) conceptualized as sustainable assessment. He argues that assessment must prepare the student for future roles in life –that is, learning in professional life. It is this purpose of assessment which has significant currency in literature. Researchers criticise the traditional summative, pencil and paper assessment, viewing it as inadequate to the task of preparing students for lifelong learning (Shulman, 1987;

Darling-Hammond; Boud and Flachikov, 2005). Despite growing interest in formative assessment, limitations of this type of assessment have been identified: it tends to focus on immediate outcomes such as the improvement of a specific assignment or student achievement within a specific course; it is time-limited and focused on immediate learning concerns. Black and Wiliam, (1998) in Boud and Flachikov, (2005) however, discount these critiques and argue that, while these are perceived as limitations, they are, in fact elements of good practice, since they 'underpin conventional advice' (p.2) that, if assessment is to support learning, it should be timely. It should also focus on specifics, be based on standards and most importantly, it must encourage students to make their own judgements and, ultimately, to take responsibility of their own learning. He contends that these critiques ignore the wide assessment agenda: that these practices do in fact aid students to become active participants in the learning process and to manage their own learning, and necessarily their own assessment beyond the course (Boud and Flachikov, 2005). They argue that formative assessment initiatives that have built-in them peer and self assessment techniques have the potency to engage students with the challenges of lifelong learning.

2.5.3 Types of assessment strategies

New assessment forms have been developed in a bid to try and obviate negative criticisms and address the perceived inadequacies or limitations levelled against both summative and certain practices of formative assessment. Boud and Flachikov (2005) observe that a large array of both self and peer assessment practices have

now been developed, citing forms of portfolio assessment which have taken root in higher education as evidence. They give examples of these 'authentic assessment' in Newman and Archibald, (1992) which are being taken up: "linking assessment tasks with normal professional tasks to ensure that there is greater correspondence between student work and that undertaken in work places" p. 2. Regrettably broader institutional acceptance of these practices is still a far cry. This is attributable to the dominant assessment culture that still upholds the traditional assessment practices. Traditional beliefs still hold sway, with the summative, unseen pencil and paper examination often eclipsing the alternative `authentic assessment. Higher learning institutions are yet to genuinely shift from the dominant assessment culture and, not only accept alternative assessment, but also recognise that assessment is an integral part of learning. They should, accordingly, recognise that, "for learning to be integrative and lasting, teaching, learning, and assessment must be coherent, not only across modules but also across courses and programmes" (Boud and Flachikov 2005:2).

Accordingly, research literature has shown a growing representation of the need for a paradigm shift in assessment: from the traditional forms, to alternative forms, (Shulman, 1987; Darling-Hammond, 1990). According to Rennert-Ariev (2005), the movement towards new forms of assessment for preservice teachers has been marked by movement away from standardized paper and pencil tests of knowledge and skill and the use of observational checklists of teaching behaviours. Calls for more alternative forms of assessment: authentic forms that can capture the

complexities of teaching and learning; have reached a crescendo (Boud and Flachikov, 2005; Rennert-Ariev, 2005; Black and Wiliam, 1998; Zeichner and Liston, 1987; Aikenhead, 1997). The authentic assessment focuses on the need for assessors to be sensitive to contextual issues that impinge upon the learners' understanding; and those pedagogical and personal principles that underpin the work of teaching and learning. Characterizing authentic assessments, Darling-Hammond (2000) in Rennert-Ariev (2005:1) asserts that:

> "It samples the actual knowledge, skills, and dispositions of teachers in teaching and learning contexts; requires the interaction of multi types of knowledge and skill; relies on multiple sources of evidence collected over time and diverse contexts; and is evaluated using codified standards".

Emphasis is put on the notion of 'authenticity' which must be reflected through the intellectual work of practicing professionals, characterized by active engagements, exploration and inquiry on the part of the student. Rennert-Ariev (2005) further contends that, assessment reformists, insisting on the 'authenticity' of assessments, "claim that authentic assessments help students create discourse, products and performances, that have value or meaning beyond success in school" p.1. The shift from a teacher directed pencil and paper assessment to one which is competence-oriented recognises what Biggs (1996), has called 'constructive alignment` i. e. the link between learning outcomes, teaching and assessment. The emphasis is on integrating and aligning learning, teaching and assessment. Instructional designers, must, of necessity, make a careful consideration of the learning outcomes; how best

to achieve these through the appropriate instructional delivery strategies and to use appropriate assessment techniques that support learning.

2.6 The purpose of the conceptual framework in a learning institution vis-a-vis lecturers' beliefs

According to literature, the purpose of the college's conceptual framework is to ensure coherence of teacher education programmes (Lapsley, 2002; Cochran-Smith, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 1990). The conceptual framework represents a shared vision by faculty based on their beliefs about the best ways of preparing effective teachers. It, therefore, ought to guide and underpin all teacher educators` practices. Ideally the development of the conceptual framework must, of necessity, involve all teacher educators as well as other stakeholders from within and outside the institution. It is argued that this broad involvement guarantees input from all constituencies and insights from a wide range of professional experiences. It is recognized that a conceptual framework developed by people who feel ownership is more likely to succeed. For teacher educators, specific knowledge provides the foundation for the skills and predispositions necessary for their work. The conceptual framework that underpins teacher preparation programme ought to articulate this specific knowledge and dispositions.

The four most successful teacher education programmes studied in the USA were deemed to have had well articulated conceptual frameworks (Darling-Hammond,

1990). In her report Darling-Hammond argues that the conceptual framework guiding teacher preparation programmes in any teacher education institution must be based on current research and scholarship in teacher education. It must be reflective of the collective knowledge, beliefs and values of a wide range of stakeholders who include educators, policy makers, students and local community. According to NCATE, (2001) in Lapsley, (2002), the conceptual framework must be the underlying structure of the programme that sets forth the vision the programme and provides a theoretical and empirical foundation for the direction of programme courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service and programme accountability.

For the teacher education institution, Cochran-Smith (2001) contends, the conceptual framework is a flagship- a command centre encompassing the philosophy that organizes the very mission of the institution. Because the conceptual framework reflects the shared vision of the professional competence of the teacher preparation programme, she argues, it must essentially provide a guidepost for all programme developments and bench marks for evaluation. Teacher educators and theorists argue that professional education programmes that are conceptually organized are very effective (Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1990; Rainer and Guyton, 1999; Cochran-Smith, 2001). These educators contend that the conceptual frameworks of successful teacher education programmes are organized around attested themes driven by current literature and scholarship in teacher education. Because such conceptual

frameworks provide theoretical and empirical foundation for the direction of programmes, superior contexts for training professional teachers are assured.

The central themes, put together, unify the conceptual framework, making it possible for educators to articulate the kind of teacher they are preparing. This is so because each theme is central to the mission of the institution (Lapsley, 2002). The conceptual framework, therefore, informs not only the development of the curriculum and the selection of instructional practices and assessment strategies but also the indicators for programme evaluation. Therefore, Lapsley (2002) argues, an explicit conceptual framework enables teacher educators to define teaching abilities, qualities and dispositions that can be derived from and made the basis for thematic programme activity.

While the conceptual framework carries the vision and organizes the very mission of the teacher education institution- providing a guidepost for programme development and benchmarks for its evaluation, it is not easy for all members of faculty to implement it. This is because the conceptual framework envisions teaching approaches different from those that lecturers are used to, those which emphasize subject content knowledge, facts and procedures. On the contrary, the new conceptual framework emphasizes conceptual teaching and learning approaches i.e. approaches whose content of interest is concepts and strategies rather than facts and procedures (Kennedy, 1997). At the core of these approaches is the method of teaching that involves a lot of student participation in examining,

reasoning, evaluating and debating about, these concepts and strategies. For teacher educators, this new conceptual framework guiding teacher education programmes becomes new learning. To understand the new conceptual framework and implement it, lecturers need to first learn it conceptually, through a new conceptual learning process.

The immediate implication is that lecturers need to deal with their belief systems about what constitutes good teaching, effective learning and how to prepare a good and effective teacher. This is so because, woven into the very fabrics of the programme are the core themes of the new conceptual framework that constitute its pillars. These core themes have, embedded within them, a set of belief assumptions about teaching, learning and professional competence. Each theme implies a set of commitments for professional development envisioned by the programme. However lecturers may not share these assumptions and commitments. This, then, creates a problem for implementation of the conceptual framework.

Lecturers have their own beliefs about what constitutes effective learning and teaching; and how to prepare a good teacher. It is these beliefs, acquired over long years of schooling and personal experience that shape the lecturers` professional practice. In an institution, these different personal beliefs among lecturers are a source of conflict. To some degree, differences in experiences, knowledge and values have to be resolved to arrive at some viable, shared practice, and to

establish a collective basis for their work (Handal and Lauvas, 1988). Resolving these differences of experiences, knowledge and values means lecturers` deeply entrenched and tacit set of preconceptions they currently hold about what constitute preparing an effective teacher, good teaching and effective learning, must be deconstructed. A new paradigm must be embraced by lecturers. This new paradigm must serve as a basis of professional practices as envisioned by the new conceptual framework guiding the teacher education programmes. However, studies have shown that it is not easy to debunk these deeply entrenched and tacit preconceptions and beliefs, learned over long schooling experiences (Calderhead and Robson, 1991; Freeman, 1993; Powell, 1996). According to these studies teachers carry in their heads, theories of what the enterprise of teaching is like. These theories are a basis of all their perceptions and understanding of the world of teaching and learning, the source of all hopes and fears, motives and expectancies, reasoning and creativity. Teachers make sense of the teaching world by interpreting their interactions with it in the light of these theories. These theories, according to Smith, (1982), become their 'shields against bewilderment' (p. 57).

In the light of this discussion, it is hoped that the literature reviewed provides a comprehensive conceptual framework of issues and concepts the study seeks to explore. It is this conceptual framework which informs the research questions which provide a careful breakdown of the study research topic. This literature review underpins and illuminates the central issues that will be examined in the study.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter presents a literature review of research in teachers'/lecturers' beliefs and belief systems. The review also touches on the nature of teachers'/lecturers' beliefs; and how these beliefs impinge on their pedagogical practices such as learning, teaching and assessment. A review of whether these beliefs can be changed is also presented. Literature to inform the discussion and interpretation of the findings was also reviewed; and is also presented here. The next chapter will present the rationale for methodological approach chosen; and the methods used to generate data.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3. 1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research questions which were first stated in section 1.5. It also provides a detailed explanation of the methodological, ontological, and epistemological stance that influenced the choice of methods. It continues by proving a rationale for the multiple methods used to generate data. The limitations of the chosen approaches are also discussed. Ethical issues that relate to the study are also considered. The last section discusses how data were analyzed and interpreted.

3.2 Research questions.

The overall aim of the study is to explore, understand and explain lecturers' beliefs that inform their pedagogical practices; and how these beliefs influence lecturers in the way they model the College's conceptual framework. The research questions (Section 1.5) are informed by contemporary literature in teacher education, personal experience, as well as the context in which the study was conducted. They also provide a focus; and set boundaries for what the study can and cannot explore (Bryman, 2008; Yin, 2003). The research questions are:

1. What beliefs do lecturers hold about teaching, learning and assessment?

2. What beliefs inform lecturers' actual pedagogical practices?

3. What pedagogical approaches do lecturers employ to meet the goal of the College's conceptual framework?

4. How do lecturers link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices?

3.3 Positionality and philosophical stance

3.3.1 Positionality

I worked at this research site (The Teachers College) for twelve years as a teacher educator; and I rose through the ranks to become a senior lecturer in charge of Professional Studies (P S) area. I then left the institution to go to U. K. to pursue further studies. Ten years later I returned to the same institution to do my fieldwork as an 'ex-insider' researcher.

My 'ex-insider' positionality arises from the fact that, having worked at this institution for more than a decade, I had some 'inside' knowledge of how the institutions operated; how to navigate the administrative corridors of power, accessing relevant gatekeepers. A long stay in an educational institution invariably tends to generate a multitude of biases reflected in the professional, cultural and personal filters through which the researcher approaches the research site. Obviously perceptions of me (by both gatekeepers and participants) as a researcher and as former college lecturer or colleague were bound to influence my access to the site. The different perceptions ascribed to me by participants determined the extent to which I was allowed to enter

their world. For example, I was perceived as (i) a former lecturer in charge of Professional Studies (PS) area; (ii) the researcher from some university in UK; (iii) the colleague and partner in teacher education. These perceptions might have had a significant influence on my interactions with gatekeepers, the quantity and quality of data generated. For example, the perspective from which data was collected and reported and the degree of access allowed by gate keepers might also have largely been influenced by these perceptions of me. These perceptions might have also impacted significantly, not only on the quality of data generated, but also on the quality of my interactions with gatekeepers and all participants. This is because individual perceptions of the researcher give expression to the way each of the gatekeepers and participants relate to the researcher, especially during interviews, as it generates different atmospheres (Rubin and Rubin, 1995; Labaree, 2002). For example, with former colleagues interviews were conducted in a more relaxed and friendly atmosphere whereas with new lecturers, the atmosphere was more business-like and formal, following professional principles. As an 'ex-insider' I personally felt the difference in the bond of trust between the former colleagues and new lecturers, especially so in the quality of exchange of personal and confidential information. For example, while my interactions with my former colleagues were more personal and intimate in nature, (evidence of the level of confidence that had accrued during my stay as lecturer at the institution), those with new lecturers tended to be more tentative and fleeting; and their trust in me relied on strictly agreed ethical principles of conducting research.

My biographical history, especially my personal attachment to the topic as a practitioner-researcher meant that my researcher's bias constantly influenced, and was equally influenced by the phenomenon (topic), how I studied it and why I studied it. It was inevitable that personal biases, opinions, beliefs and values would permeate the entire research process. My responsibility as a researcher was to guard against my biases and subjectivity to influence my data collection procedures. The temptation was to see data that only fitted or confirmed my propositions. I had to be acutely aware of the possibility of seeing and guarding against placing the participants' responses out of context in an attempt to reach a preferred conclusion; or reading too much into respondents' remarks as long as they helped me answer my research questions (Denzin, 1989; Berg and Smith, 1988). Similarly, I had to guard against imposing my own interpretations of findings.

Returning to the same institution ten years later, nothing much appeared to have changed since my departure to overseas, save for a few new lecturers who joined the institution after I had left. Four out of eleven new lecturers were my former students at this same college. They were very pleased to see me, just as much as I was, to meet them again, although in our new positions. They were now lecturers and I was now a student-researcher. Talk of swapping roles, a very interesting situation!

Before the start of my fieldwork, I communicated by phone with the college Principal who was my Head of Department at the time I was a lecturer at this college. The

subject of our discussion was about my intention to come back and do my research at the college. After I had explained to him about the purpose and objectives of the research study, the Principal was happy about it and agreed to host me as a researcher. The finer details were to be discussed when I presented him with my formal letter requesting for permission and access to the research site.

When I arrived at the site, I had a very fruitful conversation with the Principal about my proposed research. I presented him with my letter, making a formal request to access the site. After our conversation the Principal asked his Vice Principal to facilitate further negotiations to access departments where I would meet the Heads of Departments (HODs).

The meetings I had with HODs were amicable meeting and productive. As a former lecturer of this institution I had very cordial and professional relationship with all of them. From then on, the Heads of Departments (HODs) facilitated my meetings with lecturers in their department. The fact that I was one of them not too long ago generated a lot of interest in the type of research I was doing. This made it easy for me to meet with other lecturers who also became so much interested in my research. As a result it was easy for me to get volunteers to participate in the research study.

The account above places me in an “insider-outsider” position as a researcher (Merton, 1978; Labaree, 2002; Lofland and Lofland, 1984). ‘Insiders’ are known by

gatekeepers and/or at least, are familiar with the culture of the people and the site where research is to be conducted. They have shared affinities and are privy to the most intimate or naturally occurring information since they understand the meanings, values and beliefs of the people in the chosen site having been socialized into their social milieu- the context (Banks, 1998).

3.3.2 My philosophical stance

While researchers operating in the positivist paradigm believe that what they study has no personal significance, those operating in the interpretivist paradigm believe that the researchers' personal beliefs and values are reflected, not only in the choice of the topic, but also in the methodology and interpretation of the research findings (Bryman, 2008; Durant-Law, 2005; Cohen et al, 2002). Denzin (1986:12) asserts that "Interpretive research begins and ends with the biography and self of the researcher". Essentially this means that the researcher's self or personal orientation influences the researchers' work or research interests. As a practitioner researcher (I am investigating phenomenon in my professional field of work), in conducting this study, I am driven by my professional and social backgrounds and; most importantly by the fact that I feel a personal connection to the topic I have chosen.

While I am inspired by the interpretive approach and current literature that advocates for "a new mode of knowledge creation; producing both new and hybrid forms" (Lee, et al, 2000), in Garrick and Rhodes (2000:5), my personal

philosophical stance also draws from the African Philosophy as captured in the following statements:

(Mkabela, 2005:12):

- “No one has a monopoly of knowledge
- There are many roads to the same goal
- All roads lead to the marketplace/home
- One hand cannot clap
- Hands wash each other
- A person is a person because of other persons”.

The worldview conveyed by these philosophical statements permeates all African societies. These statements are fossilized in their languages and literature genres (song, folktales, proverbs, praise names, drama and poetry). A closer analysis of the six statements above shows that the African worldview ontologically recognizes and calls for the complexity of reality, arguing for recognition of and vouches for a multiplicity of truths (realities). Epistemologically, this worldview argues for recognition and legitimizing of knowledge accessed through a diversity of methods and accessed from multiple sources. Mkabela, (2005) observes that Africans are renowned for their strong orientation to collective values, collective sense of responsibility. Enmeshed in this philosophy (one hand cannot clap, hands wash each other) is the centrality of axiological assumptions that must underpin collaborative research initiatives. Reciprocity between the researcher and the researched is valued and becomes central in the research process.

From the African perspective, intersubjectivity plays a pivotal role in knowledge creation. This is the personal stance that guided me in conducting this study. So my

philosophical stance, positions me in the interpretive research paradigm. Given the resonance of my philosophical stance with interpretive philosophical assumptions, this alignment offered the advantage of a more holistic strategy as the data was examined from both the lecturers' and my own worldviews; proving a rich and deeper insight into the phenomenon under investigation.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1994) the interpretivist approach's philosophical assumptions recognize that "there exist a multiple of realities which are constructions existing in the mind of people" p.81. Mine is also one of these multiplicity realities. This study, therefore, embraces the notion of subjective and multiple realities (Freebody, 2003; Cohen et al, 2002; Pring, 2000; Crotty; 1998; Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). I saw my role as a researcher as one to observe these multiple realities, interpret, articulate and reconstruct them in an attempt to have a deeper insight, and thus derive some understanding and meaning from them.

3.4 Methodology rationale

A Case Study approach, underpinned by the interpretivist philosophical assumptions, was chosen to guide this study. This methodology influenced methods of data generation. Researchers argue that methods chosen for any research are expected to be appropriate for the purposes and context of the study; and such methods must be credible and confirmable (Pring, 2000; Cohen et al, 2002).

After the data had been generated, using multiple methods, a systematic inductive approach was used to analyze and interpret the data. This inductive process provided a credible and dependable interpretation of the phenomena under investigation. The research process was as important as the phenomena being researched.

3.4.1 Why I chose the Case Study approach

Defining a case a study is can be problematic, precisely because there no one definitive definition of it. Ayres argues that, in fact, there are as many definitions of a case study as there are researchers conducting a case study enquiry (Ayres, 2014). Yin, (2003) defines a case study as ‘an empirical inquiry that investigates contemporary phenomena within its real life context’ pp. 13-14. He contends that case study research is useful in developing theoretical awareness and understanding of a complex issue; and extends experience to what is already known. (Stake, 1995) contends that one type of a case study is a holistic case study which seeks to “capture the essentials of a group of ‘particular’ professionals” p. 2. This study is a holistic case study described by Stake (1995).

My ‘Study’ is a ‘Case’ of 8 lecturers (Table 1.1) drawn from the eight core academic subjects offered at the College (Section 1.7.2). Researchers concur that it is such a huge challenge for, not only fledgling researchers but also seasoned ones, to determine a ‘Case’ in their case studies ((Ayres, 2014; Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier, 2012; Baxter and Jack, 2008). The 8 lecturers in this study

constitute a ‘case’ because they are a “phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (the College) Miles and Huberman,1994). This group of 8 lecturers form a unit of analysis; and they constitute what I will analyse. Miles and Huberman (1994) argue that “in effect, your unit of analysis is ….what you analyse is your case” p.25. The 8 lecturers are, therefore, a ‘case’; (and not 8 invidual cases), bounded by context and time and form and entity i.e. a unit of analysis. This study was, therefore, an exploratory, holistic case study, that elicited and analysed the 8 lecturers’ responses as a unit of analysis, where every aspect of their beliefs were analysed.

The 8 lecturers were purposively selected to ensure that every subject area was represented. The purpose of the study was to explore and gain deeper insight into lecturers’ beliefs about their pedagogical practices in their real life context, the College. The case study approach, as defined by Yin (2003), was, therefore, appropriate.

However, Stake (2003) has a different view of the case study. He argues that the case study ‘is defined by the interest in individual cases, and not by the methods of inquiry used’ p.134. By their very nature case studies provide a complete picture of the issues under investigation because they provide thick descriptive data. As case studies allow different interpretations of the data to emerge, they increase

researcher's understanding of the various perspectives in which reality has been experienced (Sarandakos, 2005; Guba and Lincoln, 1985).

In order to be credible case studies ought to meet certain criteria. These include researching phenomena that are naturally occurring (section1.6); description and justification of the criteria used to select the case (Section 1.7); description and comparison of the significant features with those to be found elsewhere in similar contexts; identification of a case as a particular instance of a type of a social phenomenon; description of the boundaries to the case and the consideration of their implications; giving careful consideration to the issue of transferability of knowledge generated to similar contexts elsewhere; and ensuring that the research makes appropriate use of multiple methods and multiple sources of data.

3.4.2 Limitations of Case Study approach

The strengths of a case study outweigh its limitations. However, despite its wide use, across the social sciences, there is a continuing stereotype of it as a weak research approach (Sarantakos, 2005; Yin, 2003; Stake 2003). Issues of reliability, validity and generalisability of case studies are considered as problematic. Critics argue that case studies lack representativeness; lack rigour in the generation of data; and in the construction and analysis of research material (Merriam, 2009; Gobo, 2004; Robson, 2002; Hamel, 1993). As a result, they contend, the case study approach has a low credibility.

In relation to generalisability, Flyvbjerg, (2006) argues that single case studies both human and natural sciences can be advanced by a single case, citing single cases and experiences of Galileo, Newton, Einstein, Darwin and Freud. Flyvbjerg further argues that formal generalizations based on large samples are overrated in their contribution to scientific progress.

However, the proponents of qualitative case studies counter these views; arguing that their strength is that they account for and include uniqueness of cases and contexts: the differences in ideology, epistemology methodology; and most importantly they account for these differences humanly (Shields et al, 2006; Flyvbjerg, 2006; Yin, 2003; Stake, 1993). Case studies, they contend, do not attempt to simplify what can not be simplified. They include paradoxes and acknowledge that there are no simple answers.

Facing fledgling researchers like me is the challenge that Yin, (2003:11) identifies as the biggest challenge presented by case study approach: which is 'the need for a high quality practice and procedures in the production of robust and valid research or the ability to do a good case study'. For fledgling researchers, it is difficult to be equally skilful or good at all varieties of research methods; and yet the case study research demands of researchers, to use multiple data collecting methods. The case study approach emphasizes that the sensitivity and integrity of the researcher is called for as s/he is the primary instrument of data generation and analysis. This becomes a disadvantage to aspiring researchers since training in observation,

interviewing, use of multiple methods and data analysis techniques is not readily available to them. The researcher is left to rely on his or her own instincts and abilities through out the research process (Merriam, 2009). For that reason, lack of research methods and data analysis expertise by the fledgling researcher, the case study research becomes a limitation. However, for me to counter this challenge, I needed to do a good job by staying and sticking to the interpretivist case study approach that informs the entire research process.

One other limitation of the case study is that concerning ethics. Guba and Lincoln (1981) contend that an unethical researcher could select, from available data, only that s/he wishes to illustrate. This element of bias can affect the findings; and is unethical.

Not withstanding the criticisms levelled against case studies, this study is a 'case' study. The rationale for the choice of case study approach was given in section 3.3.1. In this study a group of eight lecturers is a single-case study; and indeed a small sample. It is a single case study of a group of 8 lecturers chosen from one target site, the College (Section 1.7.4). This raises questions about how well the findings can be generalized from one single case (Sarandakos, 2005). While, the notion about transferability is problematic, because of the narrowness of a case, Yin, (1993) contends that, regardless of size, transferability is acceptable provided the boundaries of the study are acknowledged.

The interpretivist case study approach that I chose does not need to generalize across to other similar contexts. The interpretivist case study seeks to explore, understand and explain lecturers' beliefs in so far as they impinge upon their pedagogical practices and their ability to model the College's conceptual framework (Section 1.3). Therefore, as a single-case study, this study sought not to provide statistical generalization, but rather analytical generalization (Bassey, 1999; Yin, 2003). This case study, therefore, was just an exploratory tool; meant to capture a full picture and provide deeper understanding about the case and the context.

Another concern which appears to weaken the case study approach is the confusion created by different uses and interpretations. For example , in some instances case study is frequently used as a teaching method, which of course, is distinct from the overarching research strategy that both Yin, (2003) and Stake, (2003) have described. There is lack of clarity as to what constitutes case study research, hence the need to justify why the study is a case study. The confusion is caused by what Flyvbjerg (2006) calls misunderstandings about case study research.

Another limitation of the case study research is the difficulty experienced in gaining access to the research site. Gatekeepers may deny access because they do not trust the researcher. Sometimes, even when access has been granted, accessing research material such as documents may be very difficult or even denied outright. Accessing multiple sources of data is particularly difficult (Robson, 2002; Rubin and Rubin, 1995; Creswell, 1994).

The sustained engagement with the case and the context creates an issue of subjectivity and bias. This is one of the criticisms of the interpretive case study approach. However, the interpretivist case study approach, because of its philosophical assumptions, is characterized by a subjective research process, where the researcher interacts with participants. The entire process is therefore value-laden; as the researcher is part and parcel of the knowledge construction process (Miles and Huberman, 1994). The interpretive case study approach requires that the researcher recognizes and acknowledges his/her own biases. In this study I acknowledged personal beliefs and values (Section 3.2.2) which were reflected, not only in the choice of methodology (Section 3.2) and interpretation of findings, but also in the choice of the topic. To limit possible personal biases, I listened carefully to participants' responses which, after transcribing them, I cross-checked with them to make sure I did not misrepresent their views (Appendix N). Also the transcripts were read by colleagues to eliminate any personal biases.

The requirement for sustained engagement with participants on the site(s) may make the researcher's overstay unwelcome; and therefore, may create unnecessary resentment by participants or gatekeepers (Sarantakos, 2005; Silverman, 2000). While this is another limitation of the case study approach, it is, however, not limited to case studies only.

Another limitation of case study research is that it tends to infringe on participants' time. Getting them to work within the researchers' plan and time schedule is very difficult. There is a need, therefore, for the researcher to be flexible to maintain rapport with participants (Rubin and Rubin, 1995).

In the context of this study however, the case study approach is used to shine a spotlight on a particular context: the College. On the basis of its findings case study research can be conducted in the form of larger and perhaps more multiple or collective case studies. For now this case study is just a tool to provide deeper understanding into lecturers' beliefs, in so far as they impinge upon their pedagogical choices and practices.

3.5 The Case Study approach I chose

The Case Study approach I chose is the naturalistic approach (Guba and Lincoln, 1985). As I had to study the 'case' in its natural setting- the College site, a naturalistic case study approach was therefore an appropriate methodology. This approach is underpinned by the interpretivist epistemological, ontological and axiological assumptions which argue for multiple realities or truths. Unlike animals or physical objects, human beings make interpretations of these realities. The humans attach meanings to these realities i. e. the events and phenomena that surround them. It is from these interpretations and perceptions that humans select meaningful courses of action upon which they are able to reflect and create knowledge. The interpretivist philosophical assumptions, informing the methodology of this study,

underpin and support a social interaction and knowledge-construction process. The aim of the human interpretive processes is to understand how people make sense of their social world. Therefore human values are an inextricable component of the research process. The interpretivist approach is therefore, essentially value-laden (Hammersley, 1992; Crotty, 1998; Pring, 2000; Bryman, 2008).

Considering the nature of the topic and the research questions, the naturalistic case study was deemed to be the appropriate methodological approach. That being so, therefore, to investigate educational phenomena, as defined by the nature of the research questions (Section 1.5), I required a methodology approach that was responsive to multi-perspectives of addressing human action; and that approach is the naturalistic Case Study approach.

3.6 Why I did not choose the positivist Case Study

Researchers using the positivist approach, claim to use a scientific method where knowledge is created through an objective process. They believe that, for the research process to be objective, the researcher and the researched ought to be separated. The researchers' entire research process is, therefore, characterized by control, operational definition, replication and hypothesis testing (Gill and Johnson, 2002; Pring 2000; Burns, 1999; Crotty, 1998; Griffiths, 1998). They believe that this process is value-neutral; and by using such a rigorous process, to discover a single truth or reality 'out there' it is possible to create knowledge that is independent of the

researcher; and therefore uncontaminated. This process, they claim, is a scientific research process of creating knowledge (Gill and Johnson, 2002).

The positivist philosophical assumptions are diametrically opposed to those of the interpretivist approach that I chose. The positivist approach's epistemological prescriptions reduce human action to the status of automatic responses triggered by external stimuli. I argue here that educational practice can not be reduced to a scientific laboratory experiment so as to regulate educational practice because the fundamental issues in the social world are not the same as those in the natural world (Griffiths, 1998, Crotty, 1998).

Research underpinned by the positivist tradition seems to imply that phenomena in the social world are the same as those in the natural world. They are not. Positivist approach's philosophical assumptions ignore the subjective dimension of human action; and the internal logic and interpretive process by which action is created. The scientific method which the positivist researchers espouse is linear. First, it starts with a theory/hypothesis formulation. Second, the hypothesis is operationalized, translating abstract concepts into observable indicators or measures. Third, hypothesis is tested, through observation of empirical world or data. Fourth, if confirmed, generalization is made. However if it is not confirmed the hypothesis is discarded. Universal laws about the phenomenon under investigation are formulated, and knowledge is created (Pring, 2000; Gill and Johnson, 2002).

Phenomena in the social world do not conform to universal laws; they are contextually unique.

Educational research, invariably, investigates the human action. Explaining this human action has direct methodological implications for the research process. The positivist philosophical assumptions, like those of the interpretivist tradition, have particular epistemological prescriptions. The tradition reduces human action to the status of automatic responses triggered by external stimuli. This tradition reduces education to a science so as to regulate educational practice. This highlights one of the fundamental issues facing researchers. Are educational phenomena in the social world the same as the phenomena in the natural world?

The scientific method (of the positivist approach) reduces the human action to measurable observable indicators. It fails to capture human action which does not lend itself ready to universal laws or generalisability across contexts. For example cultural and linguistic behaviours are not independent of human values, power dynamics and political ideology. Clearly the positivist 'scientific method' fails to meaningfully capture the human dynamic flow of human discourse.

This argument highlights one of the fundamental issues that positivists are missing; and that is, the challenge of understanding the contextual nature of professional knowledge guiding practice. Bassey, (1999:39), puts the issue succinctly when he expresses his views about the essence of educational research:

> Educational research is a critical inquiry aimed at informing educational judgements and decisions in order to improve educational action. This is the kind of value-laden research that should have immediate relevance to teachers and policy makers, and is itself educational because of its stated intention to "inform". It is the kind of research in education that is carried out by educationists.

Extrapolating from Bassey's views above, educational research underpinned by positivists' assumptions would be inadequate. Educational researchers are part of the social process which they set out to investigate. In process they participate in identity-formation as they deliberately interact with their subjects of research. The language and methods used in investigating phenomena in the social world, especially in education, must be different from those used in the natural world.

As central to this study were lecturers' beliefs and practices, their individual experiences, the meanings and interpretations they attached to these experiences, an interpretivist approach enabled me to gain insight into these experiences. The use of the interpretivist approach was therefore, crucial in order to understand the meanings of these experiences as they related to the lecturers` professional practices in the areas of teaching, learning and assessment of pre-service teachers.

This study involved fieldwork. To embark on the fieldwork I thought through all the necessary steps to take to ensure that the fieldwork was a success. The process

started with revisiting the research questions; thinking about possible propositions; choosing the methodology; choosing the methods; thinking about how participants will be selected. This process culminated in the development of a comprehensive research plan (Appendix B). The research plan was, however flexible, responsive to the participants' work schedule and other events on the ground. In developing the research plan I was guided by the aim and objectives of the study (Sections 1.7; 1.8); my knowledge and experience of the research site. For example, it was important that I think through each event and carefully consider how I would work through it. For example, I had to think carefully about how I would negotiate access to the site; select the participants; access the documents; organize lesson observations and in-depth interviews; and how I would organize focus group discussion (Creswell, !994).

3.7 Sampling procedure

The 8 lecturers were purposively selected so that every subject area had someone participating in the study. The assumption was that participants would benefit from participating; and therefore it was only proper that all subject areas benefit. The criteria used to select participants constitute what Miles and Huberman, (1994) call "a concise boundary of the case; indicating, the context, time, what will be studied" p.26 i.e. the breadth and depth of the study. The implication was that the findings of the study would relate to the 'case' and 'the context' where the research was conducted. I need to stress here that the sample of the selected lecturers was not a

representative sample. Participation in the study was by invitation; and this means, only those lecturers who volunteered participated.

These 8 lecturers, therefore, comprise a 'single case', rather than '8 individual cases' (Sections 1.7.6 and 3.3.1) because the group is, "bound by time and place"; "time and activity", and by "definition" and "context", according to Creswell, (2003) and Miles and Huberman, (1994) respectively, in Baxter and Jack, (2008: 548). Baxter and Jack, (2008: 550) contend that a single case study is a collective study that may involve a group; where each of the members of the group becomes a sub unit of the larger unit of analysis. Data generated from each sub unit is,

> "---analysed separately but within the larger unit: the case. This study is, therefore, a single-case study (and not a multiple case study). The analysis is therefore within case analysis".
>
> (Parenthesis, my own).

Most of the lecturers who volunteered to participate, expressed their hope to learn something by participating, especially those who were already doing their part-time Masters degrees (M. Ed) with some local universities. Asked if I could include their biographical information, they declined, arguing that the confidentiality of their identity might be compromised.

The other lecturers, who were not participants, were very important informants, as they were part of the context within which participants operated. The data they provided were recorded in the field journal and formed part of the data sets that

constituted the database. The rapport that I created with these lecturers provided a favourable research environment that enabled me to interact freely with them and the participants.

Before selecting the participants, I first consulted and discussed my purposive recruitment plan with the HODs in each subject area. They provided very helpful insights: giving me their suggestions as to how to approach the participants and how to avoid obstacles. Their contribution was invaluable in facilitating the recruitment process. The insights provided necessitated a revision of my initial sampling plan.

To select research participants in this study I used a purposive or targeted sampling technique (Bryman, 2008; Robinson, 1993). Although participants were drawn from all eight core subject areas, they were not a representative sample. My intention though was that all subject areas benefit by having one of their number participating in the study. I selected one lecturer from each subject area on a volunteer basis: first volunteer first selected. Eight lecturers were therefore selected to participate. I had a problem, though, when more lecturers wanted to participate in the study. I had to be diplomatic and professional in my conversation with them to convince them that I had enough volunteers already. I was very happy when they professionally accepted my explanation.

In consultation with HODs I selected those lecturers I considered to be in a position to provide critical information (Burns, 1999; Burns and Grove, 2005). I selected eight lecturers (one female and seven males), all of whom were very enthusiastic to participate in the study.

The participant lecturers had varying experiences as teacher educators at the College; ranging from four to twenty years of continuous service. As already indicated above, the participants were subject specialists who would be consulted when subject syllabuses were developed. Therefore, their responsibilities included, among others, developing course outlines for teaching purposes and the assessment guides for their respective subject content.

3.8 Ethical issues

In consideration of ethical issues, my obligation was to ensure that the research was conducted with honesty, integrity, minimal possible risk to participants and me; and with cultural and political sensitivity. I recognized that the case study research was a potentially high-risk research; and for that reason my ethical approach involved proper recognition of, and preparation for risks and their possible management. Intrinsic to ethical conduct in case study research is the need by researchers for being risk aware (BERA, 2004; Oberle, 2002).

All the participants were asked to volunteer to participate in this study. Full consent was obtained from them; and they indicated their willingness to participate by signing the consent form. I explained to them before signing that they were free to

withdraw at any time if they felt their rights were being violated. My supervisors' contact details were given on the form so that they could contact them if they felt the conduct of the study was becoming unethical. More about this will be discussed in the relevant section.

There were some lecturers who volunteered some very critical information; but were not part of those selected participants. These lecturers gave very useful verbal information. With respect to ethical issues, these volunteer informants were treated exactly the same with those selected to participate; ensuring that chances of their traceability were, as far as possible, minimised. In fact, deliberate efforts to ensure non-traceability, within the College, of all lecturers who participated in one way or another, were prioritized. I did this by making sure that the way I presented their testimonies made it hard, if not impossible, for anyone to indentify or detect who they were.

I asked participants if the other biographical information such as age, gender, and experience as lecturers could be included, they declined, arguing that the confidentiality of their identity might be compromised. This was in spite of me telling them that their names would be anonymised. It had to do with power dynamics and College politics at play. Participants expressed concern that in the event the study became controversial they may be subject to victimizations and even being ostracized. Having worked at the same College myself, I understood perfectly well

why they declined to provide this information. However, the lack of biographical data did not impact negatively on the research process and the research findings.

In conducting the case study research I guarded against potential damage to professional relationship and knowledge construction by upholding professional behaviour by ensuring that no falsification of data took place. As knowledge developed in case studies depends on accurate and careful data generation procedures, thorough analyses and unbiased reporting, I had to ensure that there was no fabrication of data and no selective reporting as these could be directly harmful to participants' self and professional esteem and the site's (College's) reputation .

After explaining to them the purpose and procedure of my research and the ethical issues involved, I asked them to fill in the right of consent form. I emphasized that I would maintain strict confidentiality by observing ethical conduct as articulated in the BERA, (2004) Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research. I pledged to uphold their anonymity in all their responses. Where names were necessary to be included, I would use anonimised names instead. I explained to the participants why I did that. This was well appreciated by all the participants. As the ground rules, I impressed upon the participants to also respect each other's anonymity and privacy themselves by not revealing the identities of other participants; and by avoiding telling others outside the group about who said what during the research process.

3.9 Data generation methods

Research questions were used to focus data generation methods; and the interview questions that were asked were informed by these research questions (Yin, 1994; Baxter and Jack, 2008).

A research method, according to Bryman, (2008) is a technique for generating data.

The choice of research methods and data generation techniques used in the study was influenced by my philosophical stance which is aligned to the interpretivist approach.

As already stated above, the case study approach chosen for this study requires multiple data generation methods. This study, therefore, is invariably characterized by a search for multiple perspectives.

In this study I used a combination of individual in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. The data generated constituted the primary data that were used to answer research questions. Data generated by other research methods were very crucial as they were used to inform the primary data analysis and interpretation. The use of multiple methods, apart from generating data from multiple perspectives, was to ensure that limitations of each method were minimized and strengths were maximized.

Table 3.1

Data generation methods and rationale

Method	How	Rationale
Participant Observation **(Data set 1)**	Take part in the College work: mingle with staff; take notes of dialogues, conversations, behaviours.	Allows for insight into context , relationships, behaviour; To gain confidence of participants; To develop rapport with gatekeepers; To identify suitable informants. (Bryman, 2008; Rubin and Rubin, 1995).
One Class/lesson observation per participant. **(Data set 2)**	Select participants using convenience Sampling procedure. Negotiate with participants to allow one class observation and video recording; Observe and video record lessons;	To observe the pedagogy they apply in class. To understand why they teach the way they do.
In-depth individual Interviews **(Data set 3)**	Select participants using purposive sampling technique; Negotiate with participants suitable times and rooms for interviews; Using semi-structured guide, interviews are conducted and audio recorded; Reponses transcribed immediately after.	It is an appropriate technique for eliciting individual experiences, feelings, addressing sensitive topics; It elicits in-depth responses; It gets at the participant's interpretive perspective i.e. The connections and relationships a participant sees between events, phenomena, and beliefs (Silverman, 2000, Rubin and Rubin, 1995)
One focus group discussion for about an hour. **(Data set 4)**	Focus group discussions follow after conducting in-depth individual interviews. Book room for the interview; negotiate suitable times with participants; explain the process; Conduct and audio-record discussions using a voice recorder. Responses are transcribed immediately after.	Provides greater opportunity for participants to articulate their perceptions, their feelings, thoughts and beliefs than other methods; Suitable technique to investigate a particular situation, phenomenon or event; Better placed technique for participants to express culturally held beliefs or views than in other methods (Robson., 2002, Rubin and Rubin, 1995).
Documents	i) Examine, syllabuses,	To identify the lecturers' emphasis as to whether they

Method	How	Rationale
(Data set 5)	ii) Marked assignments: examining comments	view the syllabus as a product or a process of a curriculum as a statement of intent (Grundy, 1987). To identify lecturers' purposes of assessment. To understand its underpinning philosophy.

3.9.1 Multiple data sources

The sole intention of using multi-methods to generate data was to minimize the weaknesses and maximize the strengths of each method (Robinson, 1993; Bryman, 2008). While some data were contextual, others served to triangulate what pedagogy was in place; for example, data generated through participant-observation and assessment of documents were used to find out if they matched what lecturers espoused.

Figure 3.1 above summarizes the data generation methods used and their advantages and limitations. In this section I give a detailed description of the data sets and how the data were generated in the process.

The next stage of this study focuses on the how the multiple methods worked out in practice to generate data from different sources.

3.9.1.1. Data set one: Participant observation

One of the methods I used to generate the data was the 'participant-observation' method. This method is sometimes called the naturalistic method because it tends to be associated with interactionist perspective (Bernard, 2006). My purpose for

employing this method was to attempt to understand the motives and meanings of lecturers' behaviour from their perspective. As a participant observer, my main objective was to participate in a social group (lecturers) while at the same time employing the insights and understanding of a sociological observer (Kvale, 2007; Rubin and Rubin, 1995). The point was; therefore, to observe and experience the world of the participants as participant observer, while returning an observer's eye for understanding, analysis and explanation (DeWalt, and DeWalt, 2011). Participant Observation is therefore, primarily interpretive.

In order to generate data effectively using this method I asked for permission from the Principal to take part in some College activities. As a former member of the College, the Principal was happy to grant me that permission. He reassuringly said 'For the duration of your fieldwork research, I grant you the freedom of the College' (10th June, 2011).

The lecturing staff had no problem interacting with me because, as their former colleague, I had very good working relationship with them. It was, therefore, easy for me to embed myself among the staff; and to freely interact and mingle with them. For example, I attended two graduations ceremonies. I also attended a staff development workshop on 'Conducting College-based Collaborative Research' sponsored by the Department of Teacher Education (DTE). I was also part of the College staff on the official launch of the Open Distance eLearning (ODeL)

programme sponsored by University of Zimbabwe's Department of Science Education.

I also met lecturers, almost everyday, in the staffroom during the morning break, where we had tea together. I joined in the casual conversations that characterized such gatherings. I also met lecturers in their offices or in their department staff rooms. As their former colleague, lecturers were happy to host me and discuss a wide range of topics: ranging from the research I was doing; to other educational issues and social topics (Appendices C.1 – C.6). For example, in one such meeting, which I recorded, (using a voice recorder I carried around with me) a very insightful conversation regarding assessment took place. I must make it clear here that this was not an interview but rather an impromptu conversation. I took advantage, and posed some questions as I participated in the conversation. The point to emphasize here is that I did not merely observe, but participated in the conversation. I also need to make it clear here that the conversation excerpts, of themselves, are not important at this stage, even though they are significant. Here I am merely giving an example of the method used to generate data i.e. how responses were elicited. The conversation went like this:

Figure 3.1

An example of a casual conversation captured during the participant observation process.

Data sourc (A Casual Conversation) 15/10/ 11	**Setting:** A casual discussion in the African Languages staff room/office	**Context**: Lecturers commenting on coursework grades/marks.
P O (Participant observation) Scenario 5	**1.PO**: Why do you make students write all these assignments; but only select 6 for final assessments? -- And how many assignments do you give them altogether? **2.Thandi:** Throughout the two years of their course we give them more than 12 assignments. **3.PO:** Are you sure they all individual written assignments? **4. Thula:** Yes, they are. **5.PO:** No group assignments? Are you sure they are all individual assignments? **6. PO:** None whatsoever? **7. PO:** What do you think about group assignments? **8. Thandi:** Group marks are not Acceptable for final assessment. What is needed is student's performance; and not group performance. Assessment? **9. PO**: What is assessment for, then? Why group	**10. Thula**: For evaluating students; to see what they are worth. **11. Thandi:** Essentially to see if they are ready to be certified as trained teachers. **12. PO** Does assessment have any a role to play in your teaching? **13. Thula**: Well, not in the sense that we use assessment for teaching purposes. Our assessment practice here is such that all assessment is summative and counts towards final assessment at the end of the course. **14. PO.** Are you happy with that? **15. Thula:** No, that's why I'm complaining about it. **16. Thandi**: That's how it is. It's a Requirement by College and the certificate awarding institution Department of Teacher Education

Data sourc (A Casual Conversation) 15/10/ 11	**Setting:** A casual discussion in the African Languages staff room/office	**Context**: Lecturers commenting on coursework grades/marks.
		of the University of Zimbabwe. **17. PO:** And you can't change that? **18. Thula:** No. That is policy; we cannot change policy that.

Participant-observation method aims at helping researchers learn the perspectives held by the study populations (Kvale, 2007; Rubin and Rubin, 1995). My rationale for using this method was that I wanted to listen to multiple perspectives among the participants about pedagogical issues and participants' practices. I was interested in finding out what those perspectives and understanding were and how they played out in practice. For me the best way to achieve this was to build trust and relationships by embedding myself in the context and having daily contact with lecturing staff; becoming one of them and then observing their daily activities. I was on the site for a sustained period of eight months.

During the period of observation, I recorded relevant information as my fieldwork notes. I vetted the information, leaving out what I considered to be extraneous. I also interacted and held conversations with other lecturers at an informal level. The information collected helped me to check it against participants' subjective account

of what they believe and do (Kvale, 1996). This method was particularly helpful in gaining an insightful understanding of the social and economic dynamics: the physical, social, cultural and the economic context in which participants lived; especially the relationships among and between lecturers, ideas, norms and events; and people's behaviours and activities i.e. what they did, how often and with whom.

The participant observation method also enabled me to develop a familiarity with the cultural milieu that proved to be invaluable throughout the fieldwork research process; as it provided a subtle understanding of context that could only be provided by observing and interacting with lecturers in their natural setting. No other method could have enabled me to understand the breadth and complexities of participants' experience (Silverman, 2000; Rubin and Rubin, 1995).

The other reason why I chose this method was that it enabled me to uncover important factors that illuminated the research problem; the factors which were not known when the research was first designed. For example, the fact that the College policy on assessment (evaluation-oriented) was, in fact, a constraining factor that created some tension in lectures' efforts to use alternative forms of assessments that were integral to the teaching/learning process.

The information gathered during participant observation informed the design of the questions that were asked when conducting in-depth interviews and focus group discussions; and indeed, when examining documents such as syllabuses and

marked assignments. The notes that I compiled were kept in a fieldwork journal where I also recorded casual dialogues and discussions that I held with other lecturers who were not among those who were selected purposively. However, their views were equally valuable as they represented the context i.e. the college community's shared views on pedagogical issues under investigation. Their views were gathered through a direct participant observation method. For each conversation scenario I articulated the setting or context to enable an appropriate interpretation.

As a former member of staff at this College it was easier for me to relate to every member the staff. This insider positionality gave me the advantage to easily interact with colleagues who felt confident in my presence. As an embedded researcher it became easier for me to negotiate my way as I was making observations. I interacted freely with staff and students formally and informally. I was able to record my observations and comments unimpeded.

In using this ethnographic technique, as already mentioned above, I immersed myself in the life of the participant lecturers and students, and sought to obtain a holistic picture of the group, setting or situation in order to contextualize the phenomena I was investigating (Silverman, 2000; Miles and Huberman, 1994). I placed premium on observation and documenting or capturing everyday relevant experiences of the individuals and their context.

It was important to capture lecturers' shared and individual meanings of the phenomena under investigation. I sought not only the understanding of, but also the consensus and the desensus about, linking contemporary thinking (theory) to practice in the area of teaching, learning and the assessment of preservice teachers. I tried to capture and portray the multiple voices and perceptions about lecturers` beliefs and personal theories with regards to linking cotemporary thinking or theory to practice. I paid special attention and focused on how they interpreted and translated The College's conceptual framework guiding teacher preparation programmes into the practice of teaching, learning and the assessment strategies. For example, in one of the conversations, (Appendix B.4) in the staff room lecturers had this to say; making some reference to the College's conceptual framework (Popularly known as the Mission Statement.):

Figure 3.2

An example of a casual conversation captured during the participant observation process.

Data source	***Setting:*** *Casual conversation in the Senior common room.*	***Context:*** *Talking about a newspaper article about a teacher alleged to have beaten up one of his students so badly, causing serious injuries.*
P O (Participant Observation) ***Scenario 4*** *(10/9/11)*	**1. Dunga:** This is disgusting! Is he a teacher, qualified teacher? **2.Tshuks:** This is horrible. Where has professionalism gone? **3.Duba:** Surely this is not the kind of teacher we are producing here? (Everybody shaking their heads in disgust) **4. PO:** What's the problem, Duba? **5. Duba:** This teacher badly assaulted his student. **6. Nyambose**: What kind of teacher are you producing here Tshuks? (Laughing). **7. Tshuks:** (also laughing), --- certainly not this kind of a teacher. He has no morals. He is not a professional.	**Duba:** That's what our Mission Statement or conceptual framework says anyway. **11.PO:** Is that what the College Conceptual framework says, Tshuks?---- to produce critical and reflective teachers? **12.Tshuks:** Do I know what it says? Here we seek to produce competent; highly skilled professional teachers. This is our responsibility. That is what I was taught at college during my training as a teacher. (Everybody laughing). **13.PO:** So you don't use it to guide

Data source	***Setting:*** *Casual conversation in the Senior common room.*	***Context:*** *Talking about a newspaper article about a teacher alleged to have beaten up one of his students so badly, causing serious injuries.*
	8. Dunga: Here we produce teachers Who uphold very high moral standards and who are highly professional. **9. Duba:** Yea, teachers who are critical and reflective. **10. Tshuks:** I'm not sure if we produce that kind of teachers (laughing). (Everybody laughing in apparent agreement)	you about the type of teacher you are producing here? **14.Tshuks:** I simply follow what I was trained to do at college--- not what the College's conceptual framework says. **15.Nyambose**: Actually it is not for us—it's for Admin; and it's just used for PR purposes. **16. PO:** Really? **17**. **Dunga**: Yeah---at least that is the general understanding. **18. Duba:** The culprit teacher must be locked up for the rest of his life. They must just lock him up in jail and throw away the keys. (Everybody laughing)

In my analysis of data (Section 4.2), I quoted verbatim and extensively the responses of participants; thereby capturing their voices. For example, in the focus group discussion, here is what Charlie, Keith and James had to say about the College's conceptual framework:

I need to point out here that, at this stage, the focus is not so much on the responses of participants, but rather on the method of eliciting these responses. The responses will be discussed in the appropriate sections in the next chapter; considering the significance of these responses.

Capturing what participants said in their own words was to ensure that I did not misrepresent their views. In order to understand the contextual meaning of their personal theories, as expressed in their voices, I attempted to be fully open and receptive to the participants' ideas and responses (Charmaz, 2003). The interpretive techniques (interacting with participants, and listening to their voices, and complete emersion in the context) that I used provided opportunities for me to try and elicit the perceptions, meanings, and experiences of my participants and provided rich description of these.

One of the strengths of the participant observation method, as already mentioned above, was that it provided me with a comprehensive perspective of the context and relevant issues that illuminated phenomena under investigation; making possible a deep and rich understanding of how lecturers perceived the link between theory and practice in preparing preservice teachers and why they struggled to link theory to practice. The technique also enabled me to detect nuances that could have easily been missed with other methods (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003). For example, the fact that lecturers did not share the vision of the College about the type of teacher they sought to produce (Appendix C.2).

The ethical issue related to this method is that some participants may not want to be audio recorded. They may feel very uncomfortable. I tied to overcome this problem by informing the participants that I was going to record the conversation. In the majority of cases participants allowed me to audio record

them, especially where a group participated. Permission was however denied, where an individual participant was involved.

Limitations

However, this technique had some limitations. It was characterized by high researcher subjectivity, making the study highly susceptible to researcher bias. To minimize researcher bias I tried to avoid it by 'sifting and vetting' information (Creswell, 1994). This subjective restraint to discriminate data made it even more difficult to eliminate researcher bias as I had to remove what I considered to be extraneous information. For example, in the conversations such the one above, I was only interested in what lecturers said about the conceptual framework; and so I discarded what they said about the 'disgusting' 'horrible' teacher. There is a lot that lecturers said about the teachers' moral standing, his background, the schools system in which he operated; the need for retraining teachers and other things. I was not interested in these; so I sifted and removed this extraneous information.

The other limitation of this method, compared to methods used to generate quantitative data, was that it was time-consuming, as I had to spend a considerable amount of time on the research site. The other attendant challenge was that of documenting the data: writing down very important information while I was in the act of participating and observing. I had to use a reflective approach; relying on my memory, personal commitment and diligence to write down and

expand my observations shortly after observing. I was however cautious not to let my subjective bias influence what I wrote

3.9.1.2 Data set two: Lesson observations

Before doing lesson observations, I discussed with each participant what the purpose of lesson observation was. I told them that the purpose of lesson observation was to develop an understanding of the pedagogic and assessment approaches they used i. e. how they applied pedagogy in the classroom. I also told them that after lesson observation I would conduct in-depth individual interviews, during which I would seek to understand their rationale for using the teaching approaches they used in the lessons. I would also seek to develop an understanding of their views about other pedagogical issues such as learning and assessment.

We then discussed suitable times for observing the lesson. The agreed times took into account the participants' busy schedule that included teaching practice (TP) supervision visits out in the schools. Pre-lesson conversations were held to try and build rapport by accommodating the participants' perspectives, being friendly, using relaxed body language and using pleasant tone of voice (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2011; Bernard, 2006; Rubin and Rubin, 1995). I requested for the permission to video-record the lessons; and the permission was granted. I need to point out here that there was no need for a consent form for the lessons to be audio recorded as the

consent form had already been signed earlier for the participants to participate in the entire study.

As already stated above, the purpose of lesson observation was to develop an understanding of the pedagogic and assessment approaches; how the participants handled the classroom dynamics. Before conducting lesson observations, I formulated a guide. This was a proforma that I used in all the lessons that I observed (Appendix D). The guide articulated three phases of the lesson: the lesson introduction phase, the lesson development phase and the lesson conclusion phase. The rationale for dividing the lesson into these three phases was to make it easier for me to analyze how the lesson was presented by the lecturer.

The guide presents a framework for developing an understanding of how lecturers introduced their lessons; how they developed and organized learning activities; and how they concluded them. In the introduction phase, for example, what techniques or strategies they used to introduce their lessons. In the lesson development phase, how they designed and organized learning tasks; how they treated student talk; the interplay between teacher talk and student talk; how they handled student questions; what type of questions they asked and how they were distributed. I was also interested in developing an understanding of whether there were any teaching approaches that participants preferred and why: whether they preferred direct instruction or interactive approaches. For example, I wanted to understand whether they used collaborative approaches such as student-led seminar presentations,

peer-teaching, group presentations and group projects or direct instruction approaches such as lectures. I was also interested in understanding how participants treated students' previous knowledge; whether there was evidence of considering students' learning styles; and whether there was evidence, also, of integrating their teaching with assessment. In the conclusion phase, I wanted to understand how they concluded their lessons and why they concluded them the way they did.

The overarching aim was that lesson observations would throw some valuable insights into the participants' classroom practices; and identify practices that would be used as a basis for questions to be used in interviews. The focus group discussions would then be used to explore some insights gained during lesson observations and as triggers to reveal participants' beliefs about teaching, learning and assessment; thereby help to answer research questions.

All the lessons were video-recorded. After the observation, both the lecturer and me analyzed the videos; looking at the three phases of the lesson; with lecturers explaining why they did what they did in their lessons. Using the evidence of the lessons observed and the proforma (Appendix D) as a basis, I then formulated questions that were to be used in the in-depth interviews (Appendix M). In-depth individual interviews followed soon after the lesson observation.

Limitations

The limitation of the lesson observation method was that lecturers' teaching behaviours were contrived to meet what they thought I was looking for in their lessons**.** For example when I asked Khoza why he used a lecture method, he said, "I thought you wanted to see and hear me teach". So, some of the information and practices observed were not the 'usual' ones. My presence created artificial conditions; and in the case of Khoza, the quality of the data generated might have been compromised. However what was important in his response was his belief about what teaching is. However I did not get the impression that the seven other participants "taught in order for me to see and hear them teach".

3.9.1.3 Data set three: In-depth interview

I wish to point out here that the in-depth interviews were not focusing only on what was observed during lesson observation, but also on other aspects of pedagogy. However, what was observed during lesson observations formed the basis of the in-depth interview (Appendix D). For that reason, therefore, it should not confuse or surprise that the discussion on lesson observation is also dealt with during in-depth interviews.

Table 3.3a

An example of lessons observed

Lesson observed	Teaching Approaches	Teacher role	Student role
Subject: Mathematics **Duration**: 45 mins. **Topic**: Projectiles on an inclined/ horizontal surface **Aim:** To help students understand Projectiles on an inclined/ horizontal surface. .	**Teaching Approach used**: e. g. **1.**Lecture or talk-and-chalk method. **2**.Group or pair work; pair i.e. students work out the problem (posed by the lecturer in groups or pairs).	**Direct** and **indirect:** e. g. **1.**Exposes/ explains new concepts i.e. telling/ giving new knowledge to students. **2.** Gives group tasks; goes round checking groups working on tasks **3.** Teacher intervenes to correct mistakes and points out misconceptions.	Both **none- interactive** and **interactive:** e. g. **1.**Students answer questions; at times giving chorus answers. **2.** Take down notes; **3**. Work out examples on the chalk-board with the teacher (lecturer). **4.** Work in groups. **5**.group/pair presentations of tasks they have been working on.

The in-depth interview method is considered to be a technique that is potentially very effective in eliciting a vivid picture of the participant's perspective on the chosen topic (Silverman, 2000; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Rubin and Rubin, 1995; Kvale, 1996). I used this method after the lesson observations (Section 3.8.1.2). In the process of interviewing I considered the respondent an expert; and myself, the learner (Kvale, 1996). I conducted eight lesson observations, which I video-recorded. I then showed and discussed the lessons with participant lecturer concerned soon after; asking about things I observed soon after. It was not possible to conduct an in-depth interview concurrently with viewing and discussing the lesson because of time constraint. In–depth interviews were, therefore conducted a little later on.

Table 3.3b

An example of in-depth interviews conducted after lesson observation

In-depth interview questions		
Question about teaching	**Questions about Assessment**	**Questions about the College's conceptual Framework**
1.What is the topic of the lesson you were teaching? Is this a totally new topic altogether? **2.**Your teaching method was predominantly a lecture method, why was that so? **3.**Why did you not give the students a problem to solve in groups or pairs right at the beginning of the lesson? **5.** What is your opinion about students teaching each other?	**6.** How often do you assess your students? **7.** What mode of assessment do you use? **8.** Do you sometimes allow students to assess each other? **9.** Do you; yourself believe in students assessing each other? Why? **10.** What is your understanding of group assessment i.e. assessing and giving a group mark to each member of the group?	**11.** What kind of a mathematics teacher do you wish these student teachers to become? **12.** Are you familiar with the College's conceptual framework or the Mission Statement? And the kind of teacher the College seeks to produce?

In-depth interview questions		

Before conducting the in-depth interviews, I negotiated the venue for the interview and the participants allowed the use of their offices as they felt more at home in their offices than in any other room or venue. In conducting the in-depth interviews I used an interview guide (Appendix M.1). Some questions were formulated before conducting the interviews using the proforma guide; together with the evidence of what I saw during lesson observation using the proforma as guide (Appendix D). The questions, therefore, were informed partly by what I observed during the lesson observations and partly by the research questions (Section 3.1). Some questions were developed during the observation; and others during the interviews as follow-up questions, seeking clarification on what I had observed during lesson observation (Appendix M.2.) Among some these questions, others were prompting and probing questions; for more information or seeking for further explanation from the respondent in order for me to gain deeper understanding of why they the lecturers did what they did during the lesson. The intention was to encourage the participant to share with me everything about the phenomenon under investigation. In this respect there are certain questions that were developed during the in-depth interview process. For example, in one of the interviews I used this interview guide:

Figure 3.3

An example of one of the in-depth interviews

An example of the questions developed during the in-depth interviews
1. Would you like to explain a bit--- what do you understand by assessment?
2. Who prepares these assessment criteria you are talking about?
3. Do students have some input in coming up with these?
4. Why are you not happy with the College's assessment culture? Is it the way assessment is done at this College that you are not happy with? Why?
5. In your view does assessment have a role to play in the teaching/learning process?
6. Do you have any views that you feel strongly about teaching, learning and assessment?
7. What kind of a teacher are you seeking to produce at this College?
8. Can you explain what you mean by 'a reflective' teacher?
9. How do you prepare such a teacher?
10. Is there any philosophy or conceptual framework that guides you in preparing this type of a teacher?
11. Are you aware that the College has a conceptual framework or Mission Statement that is supposed to guide you as to what kind of teacher you should produce?

Some questions were, however, developed during the in-depth interview process, seeking further explanation or elaboration on the responses given by the respondent (Appendix M.2). As already indicated above, the in-depth interview is considered to be a very useful technique of eliciting the respondents' perspectives on the chosen research topic. I used this method after the lesson observations.

The questions asked during the interviews were related to the research questions of the study in that they sought to elicit responses that would ultimately answer the research questions. During the interviews I used open-ended questions; and one question at a time. The intention was to encourage the participant to share with me everything about the phenomenon under investigation. I was careful to pose the questions in a manner that did not influence the participant's responses. I listened very attentively to participants' responses. To get some clarifications and further explanations I asked follow-up questions; and used probes, prompts, redirection, pause and some body language as interrogating techniques. I was cautious not to ask questions that would, in anyway, lead participants to any preconceived notions nor encourage them to provide particular responses. I guarded against any gestures or body language that implied approval or disapproval of responses provided. Throughout the interview process I listened with a sympathetic ear, and, using appropriate questioning techniques of probing, redirecting, prompting and pause, I encouraged the interviewees to clarify or elaborate their responses. I was cautious not to be seen to be influencing their responses in anyway. The intention was to try and give the conversation a natural flow, while maintaining the principle of viewing the participant as expert in the subject of the interview (Kvale, 1996; 2007).

To document the interview responses, initially, I intended to use a voice-recorder, but when the first participant raised some concerns, I then discussed the issue with the other participants who also felt uncomfortable. I then decided against the idea. The interviewees felt their confidentiality would be compromised should the

recording device, by dint of misfortune, fall into the wrong hands. While this may seem strange, given that they gave me permission to video-record their lessons, I could not, on ethical reasons, insist. However, I thought I understood why. It had to do with the 'politics' of the College. The 'politics' of the College is such a sensitive issue that it is taken seriously, especially since the fieldwork was conducted during a very 'sensitive' political situation in the country, characterized by mistrust and insecurity. The mood of the respondents was therefore fickle, depending on the political atmosphere on a day-to-day basis. I had to tread on this ground very carefully. Not doing so would have caused serious ethical breach. I therefore made hand notes; quoting actual words they said. This way, I was able to record their responses verbatim (Sections 4.1 to 4.5). After the interviews, I transcribed the interview responses and gave them back to interviewees to confirm them as correct record of the interview conducted with them (APPENDIX N). Essentially this was to guard against personal bias and subjectivity by misrepresenting and misinterpreting participants' voices. After the participants had confirmed the transcripts, and corrections made, and the responses were then saved into the computer data file.

Limitations

The greatest challenge was to maintain the rapport in order to gain confidence and trust of the interviewee (Bryman, 2008; Silverman, 2000; Rubin and Rubin, 1995). To calm down the nerves of the interviewees I started the interview sessions with discussing general issues before zeroing down to the real interview. This technique helped a lot to relax the interviewee.

Another challenge was that lecturers appeared to be busy all the time, making it difficult to stick to appointment dates agreed to earlier. I had to be flexible with my scheduled plan to meet them to avoid unnecessary perfunctory responses. I was, however, able to go round this problem by renegotiating and changing the times to suit the lecturers. This required some measure of adeptness and tact. The other disadvantage was that , because I had worked at this College before, I could have missed out on some vital data that would have made some significant difference to the understanding of the phenomena under investigation, had I been there as an outsider. My insider knowledge might have positioned me in such way that that I could not see any thing unusual about the situation. That was a fish and bowl situation (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) in the sense that I had got so used to the situation that I might have failed to critically interrogate issues.

1.9.1.4 Data set four: The focus group discussion

The other method that I used to generate data was the focus group discussions. The group was made up all the eight participants who participated in lesson observations and in-depth interviews mentioned above. The purpose of the focus group discussion was to follow up on some issues that came up during individual in-depth interviews. The focus group discussion aimed at eliciting and capturing participants' beliefs as individuals on one hand; and as members of the teaching community, at the College, on the other.

Focus groups are a method of generating qualitative data that is effective in helping researchers to learn the social norms of a community or subgroup (Kvale, 2007; Silverman, 2000; Bryman, 2008). It also helps to capture the wide range of perspectives that exist within that community or subgroup. Essentially, focus group discussion seeks to illuminate group opinion. While one advantage of the focus group method is effective for accessing a broad range of views on a specific topic and achieving group consensus, the major advantage is that it can yield large amounts of information over a relatively short space of time (Rubin and Rubin, 1995). However, for obvious reasons, the focus group method is not suited for discussing or acquiring highly personal and politically or socially sensitive topics or information (Miles and Huberman, 2003).

The focus group method strength lies in its ability to invoke and galvanize group dynamics which stimulate conversations and reactions. Another strength of this method is that it helps create a complete picture of how a given issue affects a community of people; contributing to a broad understanding by providing authentic data on social and cultural issues, especially the pervasive nature of those issues within that community (Mirriam, 1999; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Rubin and Rubin, 1995).

Once again, I asked the participants for their permission to allow me to voice-record the session; and to my great relief and pleasant surprise, permission was granted.

This time they agreed to be audio recorded may be because they felt more secure in a group than as individuals. One can only guess that it could well have been a case of “safety in numbers”? Before the start of the session I restated the purpose of the study in general, and that of the focus group discussion, in particular. I also articulated the objectives of the study to participants. I reiterated that pseudonyms would be used.

My role in the focus group discussion was that that of a moderator. Before the day of the focus group discussion, I made sure I reminded the participants of the time and venue. I did so again on the day of the focus group discussion, just to make sure nobody missed the day, venue and time. Use of a mobile phone to contact participants came in handy as I did not have to ‘hunt’ each participant all over College. I demonstrated my commitment by arriving early at the venue and making last minute phone calls to remind the participants. I re-arranged furniture, in a circular shape so that participants would have a good view of each other.

During the session I posed questions specified in the focus group question guide (Appendix P). Initially open –ended question were asked, followed by a mixture of open-end and closed questions to seek clarifications and/or deeper understanding of issues the group raised. The type of questions asked required that discussants provide in-depth responses. Since the group permitted me to use a voice recorder, I did not have to worry about taking down some detailed notes, save for brief notes to remind me what follow up questions I would ask to guide the flow of the discussions. I encouraged group dynamics by cultivating a positive atmosphere to foster a

productive end engaging discussion, yielding rich data (Silverman, 2000; Rubin and Rubin, 1995). I kept track of the questions I asked making sure I did not repeat them unnecessarily.

I asked focused on three pedagogical areas of teaching, learning and assessment. For instance, the guiding questions were:

1. How do teaching approaches or methods influence the way students learn?
2. Why do you use the teaching strategies that you use when teaching?
3. In your view, how do students learn? i. e. how do they acquire knowledge?
4. What do you consider to be the purpose of assessment?

I asked a lot more supporting questions to prompt the participants to say more during the discussions (Appendix O). In some cases I asked questions prompting the participants to think more deeply about their responses and say more to clarify the statements. All participants were given an opportunity to give their views and give each other time to speak (Section 4.5). Other participants were invited to respond. As I had already built some rapport with the participants, they were free to express a wide range of perspectives; some raising points of disagreements and others points of agreement, my role was to encourage every one to get involved in the discussion. The focus group discussion lasted for one hour fifteen minutes. At the end of the session I reminded participants not discuss the detail of the discussions with anyone outside the room when they leave; and that they should

respect each other by not discussing with any one what they said in the discussion. Soon after the focus group discussions, I transcribed the discussion. The transcript was given back to participants to make their comments.

Limitations

The limitation of this method was that, at the start of the discussions, some participants wanted to dominate the discussions. It appeared to me that my attempts to involve others as well may have appeared like I was trying to snub those who wanted to dominate the discussions. I had to try and maintain a delicate balance to try and involve everybody in the discussions. However, as the discussions progressed, everyone actively and meaningfully participated in the discussions.

3.9.1.5 Data set five: Analysis of policy Documentation

i) Syllabuses

While some aspects of this section may sound like evaluation, the focus here is on method of generating data. The purpose of analysing syllabuses was not to evaluate them but to try and understand how they may inform lecturers' pedagogical beliefs and practice.

The fifth method of generating data was the document analysis of syllabuses (Appendix P) and the College's conceptual frame work. Underpinning the hermeneutic technique in this study is the philosophy of interpreting the meaning of the text or a context. Hermeneutics as a research technique is primarily concerned with the meaning of a text or text-analogue (Bryman, 2008; Hammersley, 1992). An

example of a text-analogue is an organization such as the College- the site where I conducted this study.

Syllabuses at the College are policy documents developed by senior managers (the HODs), using guidelines from the Department of Teacher Education (DTE) of the University of Zimbabwe; which provides quality assurance services to all affiliated colleges. After the syllabuses have been developed at the College, they are sent to DTE for approval. The Syllabuses, therefore, reflect both DTE and College thinking behind what level of content should be taught; and how it should be taught and assessed. It is policy, therefore, for all lecturers to keep and follow the syllabus document in their teaching. However, it is the interpretation of the syllabus document by each lecturer that is influenced by the lecturers' beliefs about pedagogical matters.

The purpose of examining syllabuses was to try and understand the philosophy or pedagogical thinking behind the formulation of these syllabuses. I paid particular interest on the preamble, the aims and objectives; together with the content and teaching approaches. I was particularly interested in how the teaching approaches were aligned to assessment strategies articulated in the syllabuses. To do this I used the syllabus analysis framework (Table 3.3):

Table 3.3

Syllabus analysis framework

Elements of a syllabus	**The essence of syllabus elements**
Course description	- Description of target group i.e. students taking the course. - Explanation of what the course entails. -Specification of knowledge, abilities and -Activities to assist students grow professionally.
	Listing of topics to be taught.

Elements of a syllabus	The essence of syllabus elements
Course content	-Sequencing of topics: logical and scaffolded. Considering students' significant learning e.g. foundational knowledge; application; learning how to learn; caring; human dimension; integration. -Knowledge to be gained. Objectives of each topic -Reading references for each topic
Course objectives	-Linking to the general goal of the course - Linking to an action or outcome. -Learning outcomes stated from instructor's point of view. -Learning objectives stated from students' point of view. - Based on higher order thinking skills; basic academic success skills; discipline-specific knowledge and skills. -Reflect academic values; work and career preparation; personal development.
Instructional strategies	- Reflect a mix of strategies. - Emphasize learner-centred approach: students taking responsibility of their own learning. -Indicate challenging and supportive course environment; building students' interests, encourage students' involvement and lifelong learning. -Characterized by learning activities that involve students in sustained intensive work, both individually and in groups.
Assessment strategies	-Assessment regime demonstrates multiple ways to present knowledge; -Individual and group assessments; -Formative and summative assessments.

Accordingly, I analyzed the assessment strategies to be used to assess students in terms of whether there was any link between teaching approaches and assessment strategies. I also examined what assessment strategies were to be used to find out whether they were an integral part of the teaching/learning process; or whether the

assessment of students was believed to be an appendage at the end of the course programme (Boud and Flachikov, 2006).

My interest in the syllabus is drawn from the view that, as the curriculum of the College, the syllabus is an attempt to communicate the essential principles and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical scrutiny and capable of effective translation into practice (Stenhouse, 1975). I was interested in understanding whether the syllabus is viewed, in this college, as a product or process (Grundy, 1987). In simple terms a syllabus which is viewed as a "product" focuses on the final product and not on the "process" of producing that product. For instance a syllabus might state that it seeks to produce critical thinkers (product); but its instructional methods and teaching strategies (process) section does not state how such a product is produced. I consider this to be critical as it helps illuminate the rationale for professional and pedagogical practices.

ii). Marked assignments

The purpose for analyzing lecturers' comments on assignments was to try and establish their thinking about the purpose of assessment. The point was to see whether or not the comments provided feedback that was helpful to students; to see if students could learn from these comments. For example whether the assessment scheme and criteria were made clear to the students; whether comments, among other things, indicated areas that needed attention; and whether or not they encouraged the students. I was particularly interested in finding out whether

assessment was seen as an integral part of teaching or as an evaluative measurement-oriented instrument (Carless, 2003; Gibbs, 1999). Five lecturers allowed me to review their marked assignments and three did not. I reviewed two assignments from each of the five who allowed me to review their marked assignment; making a total of ten reviewed assignments. To review the assignments I used a framework (Table 3.4):

Table 3.4

A framework for analyzing marked assignments.

Essential features Of assessment	What is expected of assessment
Assessment principles	- Judge performance, measured against learning outcomes. -Determine whether progression to the next level is appropriate. - Provide useful feedback which indicates attainment and areas of improvement. -Identify what has not been understood to inform evaluation teaching methods and approaches.
Assessment task	-The appropriateness of assessment task i.e. whether related to preceding teaching and learning process. - Purposeful and helping students to benchmark current level of knowledge or/and skills; -Identify areas for improvement, enabling students to judge overall progress made. -Intellectually challenging enough to engage students in learning that is academically beneficial.

Essential features Of assessment	What is expected of assessment
Assessment scheme	-Made clear to all students. -Based on realistic set of expectations of students' performance. -Based on clear performance criteria. -Credible, reliable, fair and understandable and, therefore, acceptable. -Measurers alignment of assessment task with programme aims, learning outcomes and method of assessment.
Assessment criteria	-Made clear to all students. -Cover content understanding, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. -Articulate expectations: organization, coherence, accuracy, word limit, deadline, grading. -Set benchmarks for the level of performance achieved within each area.
Assessment feedback	-Students understand purpose of assessment in a particular course; understand what the assessment criteria are; and how marks/grades are arrived at. -Apply criteria and marking scheme fairly to all students. -Provide feedback in a form and at a level suited to the individual student. -Give positive comments first; specific guidance about what the student could do next; end with positive comments to encourage students.

Limitations

While some lecturers allowed me to review their marked assignments, others could not, claiming that they did not have any as they were given back to students. Obviously this impinged on the quality of data generated. No doubt, a full picture could have been give by a review of all requested marked assignments.

3.10 Researcher bias and subjectivity

In this section I need to acknowledge that my role as a researcher was part and parcel of the knowledge construction process (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Bryman

(2008) contends that the qualitative researcher is “implicated in relation to the observed and through the ways in which an account is transmitted in the form of a text” p. 682. Essentially, this is because all researchers are shaped by their socio-historical locations which include the values and interests that their locations confer upon them (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995).

In qualitative research, Miles and Huberman (1984: 230) argue, the researcher is viewed as:

> … a human instrument a one- person research machine: defining the (research) problem, doing the sampling, designing the instruments, collecting the information, reducing the information, analyzing it, interpreting it, (and) writing it up.

In the quantitative research perspective, this stance faces criticisms “that the work is unreliable, invalid, and generally unworthy of admission into the magic circle of science” Robson, 1997: 402). For the sake of transparency, qualitative researchers are, therefore, encouraged to recognize and explain their biases and make efforts to keep them in check so that they do not influence the research process.

In this study, recognizing and acknowledging my bias was essential to contextualize my research. My personal beliefs and values were reflected not only in the choice of methodology and interpretation of findings, but also in the choice of topic. As a researcher, conducting research in my professional field (teacher education), I considered myself, in a way, a practitioner-researcher. As a teacher educator, I had (and still have) a personal connection with the topic and the field. This means that

subjectivity (imbued in my bias as a researcher), was inescapable as it was imposed at all the stages of the research process. It started from the choice of the topic; through the choice of the research site; the questions that I asked during interviews and those that that I did not ask; participants that I purposively selected and those that I did not select; right up to data analysis and interpretation of findings (Hertz, 1997). All these were influenced by me, the researcher, and hence, the process, (it can be argued), was subjectivity-driven.

3.10.1 Ontological, epistemological and axiological assumptions

This study was underpinned by the interpretivist paradigm (Section 3.5). The interpretivist paradigm is located in the qualitative tradition. Theorists and researchers who are proponents of this tradition are termed ‘interpretivist’. This tradition espouses an alternative view of the research enterprise; different from that of the quantitative or scientific tradition which argues for single reality or truth out there, waiting to be discovered (Pring, 2000; Griffiths, 1998; Johnson and Duberley, 2003). Operating in the interpretive research paradigm calls for a constant awareness of, and reflection on, the researcher’s contribution and influence on research and consequent findings. In this reflective account I wish to share with my readers the underlying assumptions that inform the research process. Drawing from an African philosophy that there is no ‘one best way’ of arriving at some truth i. e. all roads leads to the market (Mkabela, 2005). This proposition is, however, fraught with uncertainties. The reflexive account helps me deal with them as increasingly

complex questions are raised concerning the biases, status, credibility, and the authority of knowledge claims (Mauthner and Doucet, 2003).

My epistemological assumptions are that knowledge construction is a social interaction process. Therefore, human values are an inextricable component of the research process (Gitlin and Russell, 1994). My stance is that any research enterprise is value-laden (Hammersley, 1992; Crotty, 1998; Pring, 2000; Bryman, 2008). In this study I am the story teller and my 'voice' and 'finger prints' permeate the entire research process. Benjamin (1992: 91-92) argues that in qualitative research "--- traces of the story teller cling to the story the same way hand prints cling to the clay vessel". Essentially this means that who I am, determines what I want to study and how I want to study it.

3.11 Conclusion

This chapter presented the rationale for the interpretivist methodology used to conduct this study. Research questions were also presented, showing how they were appropriate for the methodology chosen. I also articulated my philosophical research orientation which aligns with the interpretivist assumptions. This chapter also discussed the issues of positionality, bias and subjectivity and; how they impact on the process and findings; as they all relate to the methodology chosen. The issues of bias and subjectivity were discussed in relation to the sampling procedure, methods of generating data, the context and the researcher's positionality; and in the consideration of the attendant ethical issues.

Strengths, limitations and constraints were also discussed with respect to the methodology chosen, data generation methods used, and challenges experienced in general. The next chapter will discuss how data were analyzed and interpreted.

Chapter 4

Analysing the data and reporting the findings

4 .1 Introduction

This chapter presents an account of how data was analysed, discussed and interpreted; and it also reports the research findings. The findings are used to answer the research questions.

The chapter begins by re-stating the research questions (Sections 1.5) and goes on to give an account of the inductive process used to analyse the data. Participants'

responses are presented, discussed and interpreted. Subsequent sections discuss the findings; which are then used to answer the research questions.

In the previous chapter (Section 3.9) the data generation process was discussed and research questions were used (section 3.2) to focus data generation methods including the interview questions (3.9.1.3) that were asked (Yin, 1994; Baxter and Jack, 2008). The choice of research methods and data generation techniques used in the study was influenced by my philosophical stance which is aligned to the interpretivist approach.

The case study approach chosen (Section 3.4) for this study, requires multiple data generation methods. This study, therefore, is invariably characterized by a search for multiple perspectives.

4.2 Research questions

The overall aim of the study (Section 1.3) was to explore, understand and explain lecturers' beliefs that inform their pedagogical practices and how these beliefs influence lecturers in the way they model the College's conceptual framework (Appendix A). The study sought to understand why lecturers held those kinds of beliefs. The research questions were informed by contemporary literature in teacher education, personal experience, as well as the context in which the study was conducted (Section 1.8; 2.4; 3.2). They provide a focus and set boundaries on what

the study can and cannot explore (Bryman, 2008; Yin, 2003). The research questions are:

1. What beliefs do lecturers hold about teaching, learning and assessment?

2. What beliefs inform lecturers` actual pedagogical practices?

3. What pedagogical approaches do lecturers employ to meet the goal of the College's conceptual framework?

4. How do lecturers link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices?

As stated in the previous chapter (Section 3.4.1) in this study I used a case study methodology, in which the data generation process was characterized by triangulation- the collection of data using multiple methods. The use of multiple methods, apart from generating data from multiple perspectives, was to ensure that limitations of each method were minimized and strengths were maximized. Table 3.1 in the previous chapter (Section 3.9) summarizes the approach and the data generation methods used; and the rationale for choosing them.

4.2.1 General questions

During the in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, general questions were used (Sections 3.9.1.3 and 3.9.1.4). These questions were a basis of further questions that were posed to clarify; to elaborate and to elicit more information from respondents (Interview schedule: Appendix M.1). Some questions were however changed or modified to elicit more information from participants.

During the focus group discussions, four general questions were also used to start off the discussions (Section 3.9.1.4). The questions focused on three pedagogical areas: teaching, learning and assessment. The purpose of these questions was to elicit more information about lecturers' pedagogical views; and more importantly, to find out whether participating lecturers shared the views that were raised during the individual in-depth interviews.

4.3 Data analysis, presentation, discussion and interpretation

In the data analysis process I used the inductive approach, where authentic themes would emerge from the data. Actual evidence, relevant to the study was explored carefully. This inductive process was therefore characterised by systematic categorisation of data from all the five data sets (Table 3.1). These data were scrutinised, sifted and compared before they were put into categories for further analysis.

The process of data analysis and interpretation, of the five data sets, was a continuous and reiterative process, i.e. from the start when data were generated to the end of the data analysis and interpretation process, throughout this research study. The overarching activity was that, while the primary data sets were the in-depth interviews and the focus group discussions; data from all the five data sets were checked against each other. This process was part of the whole process of

sifting and winnowing of data, to remove extraneous pieces of information (Creswell, 1994; Silverman, 2000; Miles and Huberman, 2003).

Firstly, I read each data set (starting from data set 1 to data set 5) record, line- by-line to identify relationships across all data that were generated. Secondly, I searched for and prioritized their significance, making connections across data sets in order to see if there were any emerging themes. Through careful and repeated reading of field notes, observation records, interview transcripts (Section 3.8), I paid particular attention to any preliminary recurring patterns. I made a record of the codes in the margins as I read through each data set. Through this reiterative process, authentic themes emerged which were further categorised and given codes (Silverman, 2000).

In this inductive process, a provisional list of categories or codes was made. These categories were based on data from all the data 5 data sets (Sections 3.9.1.1 to 3.9.1.5). The analysis involved identification of words, phrases, and sentences from each of the data sets that contained the same meaning. These were then grouped together and given a label. For example words, phrases and sentences that indicated participants' preference of a particular teaching approach were given the label (VATA) i.e. views about teaching approach. Those about participants' preferred learning and assessment approaches were labelled (VALA) and (VAAA) respectively i.e. views about learning and assessment approaches. I read the

transcripts repeatedly, searching for further categories and sub categories that might emerge from the data.

Gradually, I compared and modified the categories across data sets. For example I compared what participants said during in-depth interviews and during focus group discussions (Tables 4.3 to 4.6) with what I observed and heard as a Participant Observer (Appendices C.1 to C.6 ; D, E and F).

I did this to capture participants` voices in their contexts in a manner that provided a sense of context, illustrating the themes being described (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Creswell, 1994).

During this inductive analytical process, data within each category were subjected to intense scrutiny for further information about similarities and dissimilarities, considering the advantages and disadvantages of my inside knowledge of the research context. A reiterative and discursive process of visiting and revisiting data across date sets enabled some categories to evolve: new ones emerged and merged with others while some were renamed. This recursive, reiterative process started at preliminary level and guided subsequent data collection and analysis (Creswell, 1994; Gorard, 2001; Walford, 2001).

Using codes or categories that are attached to words, phrases or sentences, I identified and tentatively named the conceptual categories, putting them into groups

of observed phenomena. The goal was to create descriptive categories which formed preliminary framework for analysis. I did this by grouping categories that appeared to be similar, into the same broad theme using codes or labels. In analysing the data, I came up with categories and codes:

Table 4.2

Example of categories and codes used (from interviews, Focus group discussions, Lesson observation)

Category/ Code	**Words, phrases, sentences found in the transcript text. Acronyms used: Teacher (tr), Students (stdnts)**
BATA (Beliefs about teaching Approaches)	. …Well planned lecture: step by step;.....business-like; researches; ...thorough planning;.....delivers knowledge; direct teaching approaches;.....lecture method very popular;....tr gives students notes;.....tr responsive to stdnts needs; ..... contingent approaches; .....adapting classroom demands;.....approaches that motivate stdnts;.....good delivery of knowledge;.....stdnts participate in the learning process.
BARL (Beliefs about role of Teacher)	Tr gives notes;.....third world country;....tr source of knowledge;....but not only source of knowledge;....tr to provide knowledge;.....tr can also learn from stdnts;.. ...studnts can also be source of knowledge;... to deliver current knowledge;.....facilitate learning;....but traditionally tr's business to provide knowledge;.....tr must monitor closely.
BAL (Beliefs about learning)	Stdnts learn in different ways;....by participating;.....through discussions;.....by interacting;.....sharing ideas;.....by observing and practice;.....by reading;.....by inquiring, internalising and applying knowledge from tr and books; through exposition by tr;.....stdnts learn from many sources;...but tr. .is major source.
BARLC	. …Consruct knowledge?.....no stdnt can do that;....yes they can but our System does not allow that;....stdnts read..... consolidate knowledge;.....gaps

Category/ Code	Words, phrases, sentences found in the transcript text. Acronyms used: Teacher (tr), Students (stdnts)
(Beliefs about role Of learner in the Classroom)	and distortions in knowledge;.....therefore stdnts cant teach eacg other;.... stdnts can learn from each other during presentations;.....stdnts receive knowlede;... .participate/involve in learning process;.....stdnts do not have sufficient knowledge.
BAA **(**Beliefs about Assessment**)**	. ...purpose .... to evaluate;.....assessment after a long time;.....assess once a term;.... use assignments, tests and examination;.....not formative;.....no self- or group, no peer assessment;....our system does not allow that;.....yes assessment can be for learning; group work marks not acceptable; .....stdnts do not take them seriously.
BACCF (Beliefs about College's conceptual framework**).**	.....doubt if everybody knows about College's conceptual framework;.....do not Know it in its totality;...do not think it is for us;.....it is meant to be a public relations stunt;.....it's not something we can lose our sleep over....(laughter).

The full set of categories and examples are included in appendices P.1 to P.5.

The themes emerged from the inductive process of reading and rereading each category of responses; noting key words, phrases or/and sentences. In this reiterative process, I was able to identify similar and dissimilar texts by juxtaposing them; and in doing so, I was able to see overlaps and contradictions (Silverman, 1994; Straus and Cobin, 1990). The process was very useful as it helped to provide some answers to some of the research questions.

I identified significant and less significant comments; considering all data as very crucial and critical, regardless as to whether or not they were contradictory. In the process, I guarded against misrepresenting and misinterpreting participants' voices by referring my transcripts back to them for feedback as to whether I had captured

their voices in a way that that they wanted them to be heard (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2008; Yin, 2003; Baxter and Jack, 2008).

During the entire critical data analysis process I re-examined the categories in the preliminary framework, determining how they were linked. In the process I compared and combined the data from the five different data sets (Sections 3.9.1.1 to 3.9.1.5) to build up a bigger picture. This process provided illuminating insights into the lecturers` personal theories underpinning their professional practice. I was able to explore practices contributing to deeper understanding of phenomena. Gradually I was able to build a conceptual model for determining the strength of data to support my interpretation of the link between theory and practice. I must however add here that the processes of data collection and analysis happened simultaneously in a recursive manner.

During the course of my fieldwork I also subjected the research process, the findings and tentative conclusions to academic scrutiny. Lecturers, who were my colleagues at the time I was working at this College and academic researchers, also my former colleagues who now hold Doctorate degrees and are now lecturers at a local university, were involved in sustained checks and cross-examinations. This process was crucial as it enabled me to explore aspects that might have been implicit in my mind. As a result of these checks and cross-examinations I was able to go back to individual participants and checked out conclusions and corroborated what I had observed and captured.

In the last stage of the data analysis process I tried to translate the bigger picture- the conceptual model- into a story or a report that was presented to lecturers and researchers for their close perusal and scrutiny.

4.3.1 How data is presented

In the data analysis and presentation process, I adopted and maintained an open minded stance; in an attempt not to leave the audience (participants, reader, and other researchers) in the dark. For example, if I were to choose to change a method or a strategy or modify earlier articulated approaches, I would have to communicate this to the relevant audience. This was crucial so as to build trust between the participant, the reader and other researchers, on one hand; and me, as a researcher, on the other. I hoped this would afford the audience ample chance to subject the study to a scholarly criticism in judging the quality of the data analysis and presentation process (Robson, 2007; Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Silverman, 2000).

In this section of the study, data is being presented in its natural form, that is, in quotes or excerpts from the transcribed data. Essentially, data is presented in a way or shape that captured the phenomena under study. The emphasis here is to present data in ways that would make it easy for readers or other researchers to follow. To this end, data is presented in a carefully considered sequence; keeping in mind the need for coherence and smooth flow of the research activities and data analysis process. In this section, this is very crucial and significant as it serves to

contextualize the data. This, it is hoped, helps the readers or other researchers to draw some meaning from the data.

To facilitate understanding, for example, I moved from the simple to the complex; starting with the simplest exemplar I found. The complexity of exemplars would increase gradually, giving the reader the opportunity, not only to follow the story, but also to be able to build a bigger picture of research context and meaning of the data (Silverman, 2000; Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

As I engaged in this meta-cognitive process of exploring attendant concepts, the direction in which I was to travel started to emerge.

4.3.2 Discussing and interpreting the findings

This section presents participants' responses to in-depth interview questions and focus group discussions**.** In the discussion of the findings, the terms "teachers" and "lecturers" will be used interchangeably. In the context of this study, and indeed in the context of Zimbabwe, lecturers are qualified teachers who were promoted to teach at Teacher Training Colleges. In Zimbabwe, a lecturer is not permitted to teach or lecture at any Teacher Training College unless they have worked in the schools system as a qualified teacher for at least five years. Where appropriate, the terms "participants" and "respondents" will also be used interchangeably instead of "teachers" or "lecturers".

The data presented and processed were generated from the 8 participants and other lecturers whom I interacted with during participant observation. The names used in the tables are not real names but just pseudonyms to conceal participant lecturers' identity. During the data generating process views about teaching were identified. In Table 4.2 some of these views from different data sets are grouped together. Other views about teaching are discussed in relevant sections.

4.3.2.1 Beliefs about teaching approaches Lecturers' views about teaching approaches

Table 4.3

Category/ codes	What was observed/ Lecturers' own words.
BATA	**What was observed** - Teacher-cantered approaches mainly e. g. -Mainly Lecture method. - Talk and chalk (i.e. question and answer).

Category/ codes	What was observed/ Lecturers' own words.
(Beliefs about teaching approaches) (Beliefs about teaching) approaches) **L O** (Lesson observation) (Appendix H.)	- Explaining and demonstrating, - Class discussion - Learner-centred approach (two cases).
IDI (In-depth interviews)	**Lecturers' own words** **James:** Well, good teachers deliver knowledge to the learner. I prefer approaches that are easy and simple to follow --- a well planned lecture, for instance, a teacher does some research and prepares thoroughly before delivering lesson. **Bongani:** Good teaching means a teacher manages, directs and controls the process and sees to it that learning is meaningful. He uses strategies that ensure good delivery of knowledge to the learner. **Newman**: Good teaching should be businesslike. A teacher manages, directs and controls the learning process. **Charlie**: Good teaching involves students in the lesson. The teacher uses approaches where students also participate in the lesson. **Ignatius:** Good teaching is being responsive to students' needs and the demands of the context. I therefore prefer contingent teaching approaches. **Keith:** Good teaching is when a teacher has the adaptability of a chameleon i.e. adapting his teaching approaches *to the demands of the learning situation*. **Khoza:** Good teaching also implies thorough planning and preparation by the teacher before delivering the lecture---every step of the lesson must be planned. He must use approaches that motivate learners. **Marko:** Good teaching is when a teacher responds to the needs of the learner; tailoring his methods so that students learn effectively in the classroom.
FGD (Focus Group Discussion)	**Marko:** Yes, the teacher ought to be a source of knowledge; otherwise he /she has no business being in the lecture room. **Newman:** Yes, traditionally, the teacher is and must be the source of knowledge.

Category/ codes	What was observed/ Lecturers' own words.
P O (Participant observation) (Appendix C.1 to C.6) (Appendices E.1 to L.1)	**Lamb:** It's because they (teachers of today) are very weak in content knowledge. They simply can't deliver knowledge to their learners. Otherwise they are not teachers if they can't deliver the knowledge to learners. -Teaching as telling/ conveying knowledge to learners --Direct teaching/ lecture method -- Students taking down notes --- students' questions not invited ----Assessment not linked to teaching and learning ----Not making use of students' previous knowledge/experiences

I analysed the responses and categorized them according to emerging themes, informed by literature (Sections 2.4.2; to 2.6.2). The responses from all data sets (Appendices P.1 to P.5) have been grouped under the categories indicating the themes as in Table 4.3.

According to literature, teachers'/lecturers' pedagogical views indicate their beliefs (Sections 2.4.2.1 and 2.4.2.2); and that these beliefs are informed by years of personal experiences: from the time they (teachers) were students (Lortie, 1975; Kennedy; 1999). Teachers/ lecturers draw these views from either the traditional, teacher-centred or contemporary, learner-centred perspectives about teaching and

learning (Felder and Brent, 2009; Blumberg and Everett, 2005; Weimer, 2002). The proponents of the later perspective argue that this perspective is progressive and enhances deep, conceptual learning (Maclellan, 2005; Prosser and Trigwell, 1999).

This study seeks to find out participants beliefs about pedagogy. In this section I am now going to present and analyse all the data generated by the 5 data sets (Sections 3.8.1.1 to 3.8.1.5) to unpack the participants' pedagogical beliefs in order to answer the research questions (Section 1.5). Participants' views are expressed in Tables 4.4a and 4.4b.

Table 4.4a

Lecturers' views about the role of the lecturer/teacher in the learning process.

Category / code	Question: What role should a teacher play in the classroom?
BARL **(Beliefs about the role of the teacher in the Classroom)** **LO (Lesson Observation) (Appendices E. to L.)**	**What was observed/lecturers' own words** **-very active role: lecturers lecture/talk while students listen and take down notes.** **-lecturers dominated: asked questions; wrote Students' responses on chalkboard; provided explanations.** **- out of 8 lessons observed, only 2 cases of students playing active role: group work and group presentations.** **-**
IDI **(In –depth interview)**	**Lecturers' own words** **James: A very active and critical role. No, not any more. In the past, yes- Teachers used to be the only source of knowledge, but not any more. Actually the teacher can learn from her/his students.** **Keith:** Teaching is the process of delivering knowledge. The role of the teacher is, therefore, to deliver that knowledge to the learner; and the learner is expected to

Category / code	Question: What role should a teacher play in the classroom?
	receive that knowledge. So, do I believe the teacher is the source of knowledge? Yes. **Charlie:** His role is to deliver knowledge. **Khoza:** In the context of a third world country, yes, and the teacher should be the Source of knowledge. His role is to teach and deliver knowledge to students. Honestly, what choice does a teacher have where the library is poorly equipped, with only a few copies of books available?—very old books for that matter. His role is to deliver current and relevant knowledge to students. **Ignatius:** I don't believe students have sufficient knowledge and that is why they need a teacher to give them the knowledge they need to pass their course. The role of the teacher is, therefore, to provide that knowledge.

Table 4.4b

Lecturers' views about whether the teacher should be the source of knowledge in the learning process in the classroom.

DATA SOURCE & Category /code	Question: Should the teacher be the source of knowledge in the learning process in the classroom?
FGD (Focus group discussion)	**Ignatius:** What it means is that a teacher is a source of knowledge; and that knowledge is conveyed to the learner through the teacher. **Newman:** You imply that knowledge flows along the conduit i. e. the teacher to the learner? **Newman:** You imply that knowledge flows along the conduit i. e. the teacher to the learner? **Ignatius:** That's correct. If you remove the conduit- the teacher- knowledge acquisition is seriously compromised. So you see a teacher plays a key role. He is the manager of the learning situation. He directs students where they can get the information. **Bongani:** Traditionally it was expected that the teacher should be the source of knowledge which he should deliver to the learners. That is why the lecture method was, and still is, very popular at this College. Personally I believe the teacher must not be the only source of knowledge. He can also learn something from her/his students. **Charlie:** Yes and no. Yes, because I, as a teacher, I do thorough research on the topic I am going to be teaching and deliver the lecture to students. His role is to deliver knowledge role. No, because students can also be the source of knowledge when they research on that topic. The teacher's role becomes that of facilitation. **Ignatius:** I don't believe students have sufficient knowledge and that is why they need a teacher to give them the knowledge they need to pass their course. **Marko:** Yes, the teacher ought to be a source of knowledge; otherwise he /she has no business being in the lecture room. **Newman:** Yes, traditionally, the teacher is, and must be the source of knowledge.

DATA SOURCE & Category /code	Question: Should the teacher be the source of knowledge in the learning process in the classroom?
P O (Participant Observation) : (Casual discussion in the staffroom -Appendix C.6)	**N.B. Metaphors that convey the role of the teacher** **Ignatius:** A teacher is like a farmer who goes into the classroom to saw seeds; some will fall on hard ground and wither, others on good soil and- - - **Dubs:** As teachers, we are like this Biblical farmer, we are all familiar with. We preach our gospel- the knowledge- some students will receive it and others will not. Those who receive it will pass; and those, on hard ground will not receive it and so, will not pass at the end of the course. **Khanye:** I've come across many of these metaphors: 'a teacher is a hen', a driver', 'a good shepherd' and- - - **Dubs:** Well, they (metaphors) reflect our personal philosophies; our views about pedagogical issues don't they? **Ignatius**: Some of these metaphors, we sort of, inherited them from our teachers during our school days. **Dubs:** A teacher is 'a builder' 'a gardener' 'a tour guide' a teacher is --- what you believe you are like.

What is evident from these responses is that 5 participants (Keith, Ignatius, Marko, Khoza, Dubs), believe the teacher should play a very active role in the teaching/learning process. Charlie's views are, however, inconsistent. He believes the role of the teacher is both to deliver knowledge and to facilitate learning. It seems that at some other time he sees a teacher as the only source of knowledge; where "His role is to deliver knowledge" (IDI); and at some other time, he sees

him/her as not the only source of knowledge, because when asked whether the teacher should be the only source of knowledge, he says:

> "No, because students can also be the source of knowledge when they research on that topic. The teacher's role becomes that of facilitation" (FGD).

He does not explain why he sees the role of the teacher being both to 'deliver knowledge' and to be a 'facilitator' at the same time. For example, he does not say in what contexts or circumstances a teacher should be the source of knowledge or the facilitator of learning. However, Bongani and James hold a different view. They do not see the teacher as the only source of knowledge; although in Table 4.3 they believe the role of the teacher ought to be that of delivering knowledge, managing, directing and controlling the learning process.

The view of the teacher held by Ignatius, Keith , Marko, Khoza and Dubs, as literature shows, are traditional beliefs about the role of the teacher in the classroom (Prichard, 2009; Phipps and Borg, 2009; Muijs, 2007). What is even clearer is that these participants' beliefs about the teacher and how students learn are not consistent. For example, the participants (Bongani, James Keith, Newman) who earlier on (Table 4.3) expressed traditionalist teacher-centred views about the role of the teacher and of how students learn, later on expressed the contemporary, progressive learner-centred views (FGD). For example, on Table 4.3, the participants (Khoza, Keith, Marko, and Newman) believe that the teacher should

play an active and controlling role, but during the focus group discussion (Table 4.5) they expressed the contemporary, progressive learner-centred views.

A closer look, however, at their responses in both the in-depth interview (IDI i.e. Appendices E .1 to L.1) and focus group discussions (FGD i.e. Appendix FGD) these 5 participants consistently see the teacher as expert who must deliver knowledge; and the students are to receive it. Marko seems to emphasise that view when he says:

> **"**We are lecturers—and so we lecture i.e. our teaching is characterized as lecturing. Yes, the teacher ought to be a source of knowledge; otherwise they have no business being in the lecture room". (FGD)

> "Well, the telling part comes when the information they need is not readily available to them. We give them that information by telling them what it is i. e. by lecturing. However, when we give students information about reading materials and sources, we are facilitating learning. Otherwise, we simply lecture (FGD)

Khoza concurs with his colleagues and, in terms of percentages he says, "70% Telling and 30% facilitation".

Here, again, Khoza does not say what contexts or circumstances justify the "70% telling" and "30% facilitation". This, again, is evidently different from what was expressed earlier on at the start of the focus group discussion (FGD). Here, these participants appear to believe that teaching is a teacher-centred activity; and in that activity the teacher is the expert source of that knowledge. His role is to teach and deliver knowledge to the learner. According to participants, teaching is seen,

therefore, as a process of telling or delivering knowledge to the learner. In this regard, the teacher should, therefore, be the source of knowledge.

This is a traditional, teacher-centred perspective of a teacher role. However, in Figure 4.4 (IDI) only two: James (IDI) and Bongani (FGD) indicated that the participants held the contemporary, progressive learner-centred beliefs about the role of the teacher in the classroom. For example, (Bongani) says:

> "----the teacher must not be the only source of knowledge; since s/he too can also learn from his students" (FGD).

Since lecturers' beliefs about teaching/learning are central in this study, I persisted on trying to have participants clarify further their views about this issue in the interviews. I then posed a question to find out the participants' beliefs about learner-centred teaching strategies. I asked them about whether students can actually teach each other; and be able to learn, in a meaningful way, from such teaching. While there was some consensus on this, some participants (Ignatius, Khoza, and Newman) appeared not entirely convinced that students can actually teach each other. They expressed some doubts if that was a good thing to do as students did not have adequate knowledge.

Participants' views about learners and learning were also reflected in what was observed during Participant Observation (PO). At certain times I moved around lecture rooms; watching and listening to what was going on. I made notes of what I saw and heard.

4.3.2.2 Participants views about learning

Table 4.5 shows participants' views as reflected during Participant Observation (PO), Lesson observation (LO), In-depth interviews (IDI) and Focus group discussions (FGD).

Table 4.5

Participants' views about learning/ learners

Category	What was observed/lecturers' own words
B A L (Beliefs about learners and learning)	**What was observed** -The majority of lecturers used **a lecture method**: Walking along the lecture rooms I could hear 'teacher talk' mostly. 'Students' talk' i.e. students' voices were rarely heard. -The majority of lecturers emphasized 'teacher-centred' teaching approaches. -During the lesson students sat quietly and took down **lecture notes.** -Lecturers **did not invite** students to ask questions; and rarely did students, themselves, ask questions. -Lecturers provided **lecture notes handouts.**
P O (Participant Observation**)** NB When I moved around lecture rooms observing and listening to going on. This was not formal Lesson Observation.	
L O (Lesson observation)	-Six lecturers used a 'teacher-centred' approach i. e. a lecturer method. -Only two lecturers used 'learner–centred' approach i.e. interactive Learning activities that involved learners, either in pairs or groups Learners were encouraged to engage in productive learning and to take responsibility of their own learning through further reading and research; where the lecturer facilitated the learning process. -In 6 of the observed cases, lecturers did not encourage learners to take Responsibility of their own learning. -Most of the learning tasks given to students did not intellectually Challenge learners to think and be critical as articulated in the syllabus' objectives

Category	What was observed/lecturers' own words
IDI /FGD (In-depth interview)	**Bongani:** Students learn in many different ways; like participating during The lesson. **Newman***:* students sometimes learn through organized discussions in the learning situation. **James***:* I think students also can learn a great deal by interaction: talking to teach other; sharing ideas. **Keith**: Students also learn by observation; they watch the action or activity or skill and practise it after observing it being performed by someone: a teacher or a peer. **Ignatius***:* To me, learning simply means acquiring new knowledge and Internalizing it. **Marko***:* Students learn from the teachers' exposition; and in this case a teacher becomes the source of knowledge. **Khoza:** students learn best when they are motivated. **Charlie:** Students learn in many different ways through a variety of learning activities. Students can also learn from each other. The problem is that they don't take what they learn from their peers seriously.

About whether students can actually teach each other; and meaningfully learn from that experience, participants had mixed views. Some had doubts; others believed students could, but had misgivings about the value of such knowledge; while others thought the approach was helpful.

Table 4.6

Lecturers' views about whether students can teach each other in the classroom.

DATA SOURCE & category/code	**Question:** **In your view, do you think students can teach each other in the Classroom?**
IDI (In-depth Interviews)	**Responses excerpts**
	Marko*:* Yes, but there is a limit as to how far they can do that--- One has to guard against distortions and misrepresentation of ok knowledge. **Keith:** Yes, It is indeed very helpful. That is, in my view, the only way to learn from others. However, it (peer teaching) tends to be time consuming. **Newman**: Yes, very much so. Students can teach each other during presentations —and they get encouraged by peers so they try and emulate their teacher. Besides it improves their levels of confidence --- they are not afraid to express themselves or to ask question; and they find communication is easier with peers. Ho teacher must monitor and approve the concepts being taught. **Bongani**: Yes they can, but I don't normally give them that opportunity because I need to cover the Syllabus in good time so that I can prepare them for examination. Accountability demands that I cover the syllabus; and students pass the course. **Khoza:** Yes, I believe they can teach each other, but I doubt if they have mastered enough content knowledge to be able to teach each other something meaningful. Although they make presentations sometimes, I have to correct them when they present distorted information. **Charlie:** Yes, they can teach each other, but this tends to waste a lot of time; and besides some students do not take what they are taught by their peers that seriously. **James:** Yes, time allowing, I would give students chance to teach each other,

DATA SOURCE & category/code	**Question:** **In your view, do you think students can teach each other in the Classroom?**
	but then I need to cover the syllabus in time for examinations. When they fail I am held accountable. **Ignatius:** Yes, students can learn from each other, especially during peer teaching, when they prepare for teaching practice. To be honest I don't give them that opportunity to teach each other except only when they prepare for teaching practice.

In Table 4.6, lecturers' responses show that, while some participants believe students can, in fact, teach each other, (and learn from one another) they do not think students can benefit much from it. Four participants (Keith, Bongani, Charlie, James) believe peer teaching wastes a lot of time, and as they need to cover the syllabus and prepare for examinations. The other four participants (Marko, Newman, Khoza, Ignatius), while they believe learners can teach each other, they do not see it as an effective pedagogical approach. This seems to imply that teaching should or must be a process where knowledge is delivered through a lecture method which saves time. This claim may explain why, in their lessons, there were no cases of students teaching each other except in James's and Bongani's classes where I saw peer- teaching and group presentations respectively.

Literature has shown that teachers` choice of teaching approaches is closely linked to their beliefs about pedagogical issues (Norton et al, 2009; Phipps and Borg, 2009; Nespor, 1987; Munby, 1982). Pedagogical issues are generally underpinned by philosophies of epistemology and the assumptions about the learner i.e. about the learner acquires knowledge.

The findings here confirm that. In the traditional teacher-centred perspective, learners are expected to accumulate knowledge of the natural world. The role of the teacher is to transmit that knowledge. Teaching approaches underpinned by this perspective are largely transmissions, instructionist, passive and teacher controlled. In contrast, in the learner-centred perspective, learners are expected to construct knowledge through active involvement in the learning process, utilizing their mental structures or schemata to form new concepts. Teaching approaches underpinning these approaches are largely interactionist and collaborative (Prichard, 2009; Kroll, 2004; Rainer and Guyton 1999; Saljo, 1979). While the “teacher-centred” teachers’ pedagogical practice can incorporate both the traditional teacher-dominated and the progressive learner-centred approaches, the findings suggest participants preferred the traditional, teacher-centred approach (lecture method) either to save time or because they believed it to be the most effective way of teaching: i. e. delivering knowledge to the learner.

4.3.2.3 Participants' beliefs about how learners acquire knowledge

Table 4.7

Participants' views about how learners acquire knowledge.

DATA SOURCE & Category/code	**Question:** **How do students learn, that is, how do they acquire knowledge?**
FGD **(**Focus group Discussions**)**	**Responses excerpt**
	Bongani*:* They learn in many different ways; like participating during the lesson. **Newman**: Students sometimes learn through organized discussions in the learning Situation. **James***:* I think they can also learn a great deal by interaction: talking to teach other; sharing ideas. **Keith**: Also by observation; they watch the action or activity or skill and practise it After observing it being performed by someone: a teacher or a peer. **Ignatius**: I totally agree with my colleagues; and would like to add that students also Learn by reading. They can read books and learn something from them. **Keith**: We shouldn't forget that, for students to engage in all these learning activities, they need to be motivated and willing to learn. I think motivation is a crucial factor in the learning process. **Ignatius***:* To me, learning simply means acquiring new knowledge and internalizing it. **Bongani***:* Yes acquiring new knowledge and being able to apply it when and where it's needed. Um – yes, obviously from the teacher. **Marko**: Yes--- a teacher teaches isn't it so? Then students learn from that. **Keith**: Also by observation; they watch the action or activity or skill and practise it after observing it being performed by someone: a teacher or a peer.

DATA SOURCE & Category/code	Question: How do students learn, that is, how do they acquire knowledge?
	Ignatius: I totally agree with my colleagues; and would like to add that students Also Learn by reading. They can read books and learn something from them. **Keith**: We shouldn't forget that, for students to engage in all these learning activities, they need to be motivated and willing to learn. I think motivation is a crucial factor in the learning process. **Ignatius***:* To me, learning simply means acquiring new knowledge and internalizing it. **Bongani***:* Yes acquiring new knowledge and being able to apply it when and where it's needed. Um – yes, obviously from the teacher. **Marko**: Yes--- a teacher teaches isn't it so? Then students learn from that exposition by their teacher; and in this case a teacher is a source of knowledge. We are lecturers— and so we lecture i.e. our teaching is characterized as lecturing. **Chair:** Telling students? **Marko***:* Yes--- telling them. **James**: We've already said students learn in many different ways by engaging in a variety of activities. In a way we are saying students acquire knowledge from many sources and a teacher is just one of those sources

In the focus group discussion, participants were asked to give their views about how students acquire knowledge. The purpose of this question was to enable me to compare the participants' responses with other responses given in other data generation methods shown on Table 4.4.

All of the responses (James, Newman, Bongani, Keith) except 2 (Marko, Ignatius), suggest that, in the main, the participants hold both teacher-centred and learner-centred views about how the learner acquires knowledge. The learner must be an active participant in the learning process. According to their responses (Table 4.7) participants believe that students learn better when they learn from each other; sharing knowledge.

What is interesting, though about these responses is that participants do not use the "interactionist language". For example, they did not mention 'interactive activities' that learners should engage in to enhance learning; they did not mention 'group work'; 'seminar presentation'; 'learning from peers' when they do 'collaborative tasks'; 'sharing' their 'previous knowledge' on a particular subject; doing 'group projects'; 'criticizing' and 'marking each other's work'.

However, one participant, (Khoza) when asked about what teaching methods should be used to make students active participants in the learning processes, the response was:

> *"*The teacher must use modern methods of teaching---- well, I mean learner-centred approaches and not teacher-centred approaches where the teacher is the only source of knowledge" (Khoza, IDI).

This sounds like Khoza understands the value of the learner-centred approach. He thinks student must be involved; by making them play an active, participatory role in the learning process. The approach allows learners to interact, share ideas,

collaborate and learn from each other. This is a learner-centred view about learning, "where the teacher is not the only source of knowledge" (Khoza, IDI). However, when probed further as to whether he uses these approaches at times; and why he did not use them in this particular lesson. His response was:

> **"**I use them at times, especially when I think I have time on my side. Why I did not use them in this particular lesson is because I thought you wanted to see me teach, that's why I gave a straight lecture. As you might be aware, lecturing is the norm at this level of schooling; and students learn by listening and taking down notes" (Khoza, IDI).

This response is incompatible with the learner-centred view of learning. In the teacher-centred or lecture method approach, the students simply write down, as lecture notes, what the teacher tells them. In this case the lecturer is delivering knowledge to the learner. Teaching is essentially, telling. While he thinks a teacher must use learner-centred approaches, he himself does not use them; although he professes to use them at times. It seems he believes teaching is lecturing. This is evident in his response when he says: "I thought you wanted to see me teach, that's why I gave a straight lecture" (Khoza, IDI).

I interpreted this response to mean that "teaching is where a teacher actively 'tells' students what s/he wants them to learn/know in that lesson". I found myself in a rather difficult position here because to ask him to teach any differently, he would have interpreted that to mean I did not like the way he presented or taught his lesson. I therefore did not ask him to prepare another lesson and teach differently.

What I did then was to ask him, (during the in-depth interview) questions about teaching approaches.

In the lesson I observed, however, the learning process was characterized lecturing, explaining and illustrating concepts on the chalkboard, while students listened and took down some lecturer notes. The learning process was definitely not a social enterprise; but rather a teacher-centred one. In broad terms the learner-centred view of learning hold that learning ought to involve mental or cognitive construction in which learners combine their previous experiences and knowledge with new information to create meaning (Blumberg, 2008; Fosnot, 1996). However in the learner-centred view of learning, the emphasis is on learners' interactions and performance-based understandings resulting from collaborative and co-operative learning activities (Felder and Brent, 2009; Blumberg and Everett, 2005; Weimer, 2002; Rainer and Guyton, 1999). However, in the lessons that I observed, only two teachers, out of eight, used the interactive teaching strategies. The rest used direct instruction, with students taking notes; and students' participation coming only in "talk and chalk" or question and answer approach of teaching. As participants' beliefs about learning are central in this investigation, I felt I needed to explore them further in the focus group discussions. For the time being I have to move on and explore participants' beliefs about assessment.

Participants seem to agree that students learn in many different ways; i. e. through engaging in many different activities, such as participating in class discussions,

interaction: talking to each other, or by observation. They also concurred in that students also learn by reading books. They all agreed that the crucial factor driving students to learn is motivation.

Now, if that is the way students learn, i. e. by being active participants in the learning process, surely participants ought to hold certain views about what learning is. Thus to enable learners to learn effectively, lecturers ought to use appropriate or the best teaching methods or strategies that maximize learning. During focus group discussions, prompted to explain, in their own words what learning was, Ignatius and Bongani respectively said:

> "To me, learning simply means acquiring new knowledge and internalizing it" (FGD)
>
> "*Yes*, acquiring new knowledge and being able to apply it when and where it's needed" (FGD).

By their body language, the group appeared to share this definition of learning. When asked how exactly students acquired this knowledge; whether they received it from a particular source or created it themselves. The participants appeared to agree that, while students can acquire knowledge from other sources, the teacher was the main source. The implication here is that the teacher gives knowledge to the learner and the learner receives that knowledge from the teacher. This is a behaviourist view of learning. Participants seemed to share this view. What is clear from the evidence is that participants' apparent learner-centred views are not

consistent. To further explore and elicit participants' beliefs about what learning is, I posed a question about how learners learn or acquire knowledge.

Literature has shown that teachers' beliefs about how students learn do influence their instructional practices (Prichard, 2009; Phipps and Borg, 2009; Pickering, 2002). Such beliefs i.e. teachers/lecturers' beliefs about learning underpin how they plan and execute all learning activities in the classroom. They also shape their entire pedagogical and professional practices (Vernava-Marouchou, 2010; Pickering, 2002; Calderhead and Robson, 1992; Pajares, 1992; Nespor, 1987; Tabachnik and Zeichner, 1984; Lortie, 1975).

In this study I was interested in finding out what participants had to say; and what their beliefs were about how students learn. In the focus group discussion I brought up the question about how learners acquire knowledge; and whether or not they are capable of constructing or creating knowledge themselves.

Table 4.8

Participants' views about whether or not learners can construct or create knowledge

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	**Question: What are your views about students constructing or creating knowledge?**
FGD (Focus group Discussion)	**Responses excerpt**
	Charlie: What do you means, by 'construct'? ---To construct knowledge? **Bongani**: To come up with their own knowledge. **Charlie:** Oh yes, they are able to construct their own knowledge; because they can interact with a number of setups or situations to create knowledge. **James***:* But does our system allow students to construct knowledge? This Is because our system provides for transfer of knowledge from a source; and for students to receive that knowledge. In the generality of cases, there are no opportunities provided for students to construct knowledge. **Ignatius**: Our students don't create or construct knowledge; they simply regurgitate it. **Bongani***:* --- and with the advent of IT they simply 'cut' and 'paste.' **Ignatius**: As far as construction of knowledge is concerned, they can't do it. **Khoza***:* I agree with you Ignatius. These students can't construct knowledge; they are not able to construct knowledge. **Keith***:* They simply don't have the necessary tools.

The responses show that participants are not comfortable with the idea of student 'creating' or 'constructing' knowledge. Some felt that such knowledge (that students create) was not valuable knowledge at all, and, besides, as 3 of the participants claim:

> "Students do not have necessary tools with which to construct or create knowledge" (FGD)

Ignatius and Khoza, respectively concur:

> "As far as construction of knowledge is concerned, they can't do it" (FGD).

> **"**I agree with you Ignatius. These students can't construct knowledge; they are not able to construct knowledge. They simply don't have the necessary tools (FGD).

From the responses it appears all participants, except one (Charlie), do not believe that learners can actually create or construct knowledge themselves. They concur that students just do not have the appropriate skill to construct knowledge. Participants blame this on the College system of instruction; the culture of teaching that the College is practicing. In Table 4.8, James raised a poignant question:

> **"**But does our system allow students to construct knowledge? This is because our system provides for transfer of knowledge from a source; and for students to receive that knowledge. In the generality of cases, there are no opportunities provided for students to construct knowledge" (FGD).

I appreciated what James said. I thought the onus was with the lecturers to create opportunities where students play a very active role in the learning process, engaging in interactive learning activities. Maybe it is because the College

emphasises traditional teaching approaches rooted in the behaviourist perspective. If students do badly in an exam, lecturers are held accountable. This appears to create some tension between what some lecturers believe are the appropriate teaching approaches to use in the classrooms and those that the College wants to be used. It appears, according to the participants, the College culture of teaching is one that encourages the use of a lecture method; where knowledge is transferred from the teacher to the learner. The lecturer is the source of knowledge and students are expected to receive that knowledge. In their responses participants appear to share this belief. This is corroborated by the type of metaphors that they use in the discussion in Table 4.9:

Table 4.9

Participants' views about the function of a school used as a metaphor

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	**Metaphors:** **i) A school is a factory of skill and knowledge.** **ii) A school is a place of learning for both teacher and the learner**
FGD (Focus group discussions)	**(Responses excerpt)**
	Ignatius*:* To me the school is a factory of skill and learning. That's where the learner goes to learn and not a teacher. So, the second metaphor does not appeal to me. If anything, the teacher learns very little. The school, therefore, is a place where the teacher goes to impart knowledge to the learners; and for learners to learn and write exams and pass. We tend to say both the teacher and the student are learning but it is the learner who learns more than the teacher. I don't know whether it is an attempt to win the confidence of the learner to say we are both learning. **James***:* The first metaphor appeals to me. That is where the product, the student, is processed and passed on to the consumer- the society- to use. **Charlie***:* The school is like a big machine where the factory worker, the teacher, uses the raw materials- the learners as inputs. S/he processes them to have a final product- the qualified learner which is then used by the consumer- the society. So the school functions as an input-output system**.**

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	Metaphors: i) A school is a factory of skill and knowledge. ii) A school is a place of learning for both teacher and the learner
B A T A (Beliefs about teaching approach)	**Bongani***:* I remember using one of these metaphors; the second one. What I meant was that, while the responsibility of the teacher is to teach, s/he too learns covertly by gaining experience but not learning the content because as a teacher he already has strong content knowledge. So, for that reason I identify with the second metaphor; it appeals to me. **Keith**: The teacher's responsibility is simply to teach i.e. process and add value to the product- the learner- so that it is marketable to the consumer -the society.

To me these metaphors suggest the implicit beliefs that the participants hold about how students acquire knowledge. I then chose a "school as a factory" metaphor as one of the most common metaphors that teachers use in their conversations. In fact the "function of school as a factory" used as a metaphor had come up quite often in the discussion. To clarify their

beliefs I then probed, more by a hypothesized scenario where a "school" is viewed as a "factory".

The views articulated by participants in (Table 4.9) about the metaphors seem to confirm my earlier observation that most of the participants (6) hold the traditional

views or beliefs about learners, learning and teaching. As these beliefs are central in this study, it was crucial that I probed more and sought participants' clarifications about these propositions. The participants' responses do illuminate their beliefs about teaching and learning. For example, Ignatius discounts the notion that both the teacher and the students do learn in the classroom.

He believes the teacher does not learn anything in the school, but the students do. His (the teacher) role is to impart knowledge to the learner. He says to say the teacher learns as well as the students, is just a ploy to win students' confidence.

Charlie appears to share these views. He believes the school is 'an in-out-put system'; and the students are 'raw materials' which need processing. The picture painted here is one where the student is a passive learner, a pliable object, a product to be passed on to the consumer after processing. In this scenario the teacher plays a very active role, controlling the learning process.

Only one participant, (Bongani) believed a student ought to be an active learner; and the teacher also learns as s/he gains experience (not content knowledge) in the learning process.

The participants' responses do illuminate their beliefs about teaching and learning. So, I probed further and put it this way to the participants: "Well, if the

school is the “factory”, what then is “learning”? In Table 4.10 Participants express their views about what they think learning is.

Table 4.10

Participants' views about what learning is.

DATA SOUCE & Category / code	**Question:** **In the light of what you have been saying so far about how students learn, I now want you to give your views about the following 3 statements: These statements are taken from literature about the learning process in the classroom. Which of these three statements about the learning process appeals to you? Which one fits your belief about the learning process?** *i*) Learning is consensus building. ii) Learning is the construction of knowledge. iii) Learning is receiving knowledge. **(**Fosnot, 1996; Muijs, 2007; Prichard, 2009).
FGD **(**Focus group Discussion**)**	**Responses excerpt**
	Bongani: Learning is consensus building. This one appeals to me because I believe learning is for both learner and teacher. Every time a teacher walks into the classroom they meet a new situation; and they are learning something from these situations all the time. **Ignatius***:* I'm reminded here of my former teacher. He was so knowledgeable. In the classroom situation, it is the student who is supposed to learn and not the teacher. But for public relations, perhaps, we always want to say the teacher and the student interact; and that interaction makes both equal and that both are learning. **Bongani***:* But are you not a better teacher now than you were 5 years ago or when you started teaching? I believe you are; and it's for the fact that, as a teacher, you learn together with your students.

DATA SOUCE & Category / code	**Question:** **In the light of what you have been saying so far about how students learn, I now want you to give your views about the following 3 statements: These statements are taken from literature about the learning process in the classroom. Which of these three statements about the learning process appeals to you? Which one fits your belief about the learning process?** *i*) Learning is consensus building. ii) Learning is the construction of knowledge. iii) Learning is receiving knowledge. **(**Fosnot, 1996; Muijs, 2007; Prichard, 2009).
	Charlie: In my view, the teacher is always a source of theoretical knowledge. Students receive knowledge from him. So for me, learning is receiving knowledge. But when it comes to applying that knowledge by the teacher he/she uses a variety of strategies. **Marko***:* The last statement 'Learning is receiving knowledge' does not appeal to me. **James:** I don't believe learning is receiving knowledge. I believe learning is the construction of knowledge; because both teacher and student are learning in the process. Learning is, to me, construction of knowledge. **James**: (cont.) I'm not sure about learning being 'a consensus building'- whether it means that we, both teacher and student, reach an agreement. I think the school is a place where we develop in a certain direction- so a school is a place where we come to realize our differences and appreciate them; and I'm not sure whether that can be termed consensus building. Well, to say learning is receiving knowledge is very dangerous. It implies that learners just sit there, passively in the classroom, and receive knowledge from the teachers. I personally do not believe that's how students learn. I don't subscribe to it. **Ignatius***:* I want to say, look all what we say or teach is not our own creation; but it's through exposure that we have had; and that exposure can be in form of a teacher who imparted ideas. Through this process we learnt a lot. To me this process is not 'knowledge construction' but 'knowledge receiving'. The backbone of all learning is being exposed to literature or sources of information; and that is why I want to insist that it's all about 'telling' and learners receiving knowledge.

DATA SOUCE & Category / code	**Question:** **In the light of what you have been saying so far about how students learn, I now want you to give your views about the following 3 statements: These statements are taken from literature about the learning process in the classroom. Which of these three statements about the learning process appeals to you? Which one fits your belief about the learning process?** *i*) Learning is consensus building. ii) Learning is the construction of knowledge. iii) Learning is receiving knowledge. **(**Fosnot, 1996; Muijs, 2007; Prichard, 2009).
	Generally what people say they do, is not what they actually do in the Classroom in practice. **Newman:** Learning is receiving knowledge. How else can learners learn? Group: (laughing) **Newman**: Seriously, if a learning situation does not result in learners Receiving knowledge, then there is no learning at all. We may use different techniques or strategies of teaching but the end result is that students receive knowledge. **Khoza**: I agree with Newman. Whatever we do as teachers in the classroom; the aim is to make students learn; and they do that by receiving knowledge. I want to say, and say it emphatically, is that when students do not want to receive the knowledge I give them, they fail. Period. (Group laughing).

The 3 statements to which the participants responded are general statements from literature (Fosnot, 1996; Russell, 2007; Muijs, 2007; Prichard, 2009) about how students learn i.e. whether they learn through active interactive activities or passively; by receiving knowledge from the expert teacher. The first two reflect the interactive, learner-centred view about learning; and the third statement represents

a skewed or flawed view of what learning is. According to some proponents of the progressive, interactive, learner-centred perspective of learning (Felder and Brent, 2009; Rainer and Guyton, 2004; Russell, 2002), the third statement represents a misconception of what learning is. Learning is not simply receiving knowledge from the expert teacher.

The views articulated by participants (Table 4.10) confirm my earlier observation that participants appear to hold traditional or non-interactive views about how students learn.

The responses indicate that participants do not believe knowledge is a social construct i.e. it is acquired through an interactive and collaborative learning process. The active participation by learners, through interactive and collaborative activities in the classroom is a social process of constructing or creating that knowledge. This is the progressive, interactive perspective of how learners learn and create knowledge. The learning process is therefore an active one defined by learner-centred, collaborative, participatory activities where learners are active social participants, sharing and re-adjusting their understanding (Prichard, 2009; Muijis, 2007; Fosnot, 1996; Rainer-Dangel, 2002).

In Table 4.10, four participants (James, Ignatius Khoza, Keith) do not share this view.

Their responses suggest that their epistemological beliefs are informed by the traditional, non- interactive view of how students learn (Phipps and Borg, 2009). This appears to contradict some participants' earlier views which indicated that they hold learner-centred beliefs about teaching. These views appear incompatible; proving the inconsistency in learner-centred views expressed earlier in the discussions. Could this be a case of a paradox in point? At times grappling with a paradox is very crucial in gaining a deeper understanding of phenomena. This, to me, is a case of implicit personal theories about pedagogical views which participants hold, that inform their practice. Put in another way; participants' articulated beliefs are at variance with implicit core beliefs which inform practice (Tann, 1993; Handal and Lauvas, 1988; Argyris and Schon, 1974).

In their own words, (Table 4.10) four participants believe knowledge is an accumulation of ideas; unknown truth out there, waiting to be discovered: the content we teach from the syllabus.

This is a traditional, curriculum-centred belief of how knowledge is acquired (Blumberg, 2008; Allen, 2004; Weimer, 2002; Grundy, 1987). To clarify their views about how students acquire knowledge, I then asked participants to define or describe what they understand "knowledge" to be: What is knowledge?

Table 4.11

Participants' views about knowledge.

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	**Question:** **How would you describe or define knowledge, using your own words?**
FGD (Focus group Discussions)	**Responses excerpt**
	Marko*:* Knowledge is an accumulation of ideas. **Khoza***:* It is the accumulation of unknown truth. **Bongani***:* Yes, that's what we read in books. **Keith***:* In our case,-that is- in our context, knowledge is the content we Teach from our syllabuses. **Charlie:** I agree with you, Keith. Without the syllabus, there is nothing to teach, and therefore no knowledge to impart. **James**: Are we saying knowledge is embedded in the syllabus? (Chorus answer): Yes! **Khoza***:* We then give it to our students, through the lectures that we conduct, and, at the end of the , course we assess to see if students are now knowledgeable. **Newman**: I have always known knowledge to be out there, waiting for le learners, especially scientist or researchers to discover it. **Ignatius***:* That's precisely what we have been told when we were students. For me that has not changed. It still holds true. **Newman***:* Knowledge is hidden somewhere out there in the universe. The learners have to discover it. Our responsibility as teachers is to make students learn this knowledge by teaching to cover the syllabus. **Keith***:* Yes, someone has to expose it to the learner. To me, then knowledge Is New information that you receive from some one: the teacher, from books or from the environment**.** That's why I believe learning is receiving

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	Question: How would you describe or define knowledge, using your own words?
	knowledge. **Bongani**: Knowledge is information accumulated, but not necessarily by being told or from books. People acquire knowledge from life experiences. These can be contrived experiences such as classrooms or events that we come across in life. **Ignatius**: Knowledge is what has been imparted to you. In the context of a school or college, knowledge is what teachers impart to their students. It is the information that students need to produce or use to pass an exam. So, knowledge is what we teach so that students pass their examinations. **James**: I agree with what colleagues have said. But I want to add that Knowledge is information that makes us function in our communities and in the society of nations at large. We acquire this knowledge through interaction in various ways; ranging from family, school, community environments and the media such as print and electronic. **FGD Chair: If that is the way you see knowledge to be, surely this Must influence the way you teach, don't you think so?** **James**: Yes, it does. If knowledge is the accumulation of the truth; the Teacher becomes the source of that truth. So her/his teaching approaches will be characterized by telling i.e. lecturing. Knowledge is revealed by telling students what this knowledge is. **Ignatius**: Knowledge is all about the concept acquisition---you accumulate Concepts the higher you go in your studies or education. You start from Simple concepts to abstract ones; but you only understand an abstract Concept through exposure i e. the teacher exposes these abstract concepts to you as a learner. Which means, essentially, a teacher is a major conduit for delivering knowledge to the learner. **James:** I think we need to appreciate where we are coming from. I think Our system simply does not allow facilitation in a teaching/learning process. We are coming from a tradition; we are a product of a tradition of teaching where the teacher is expected to teach; she or he has to deliver the goods, come exam time.

In Table 4.11 participants express epistemological views which suggest, that their beliefs are informed by the traditional, non-interactive learning perspective. Their

views about knowledge suggest that the participants hold traditional, curriculum-centred beliefs about how students acquire knowledge. For example, Marko believes *"*Knowledge is an accumulation of ideas" Khoza believes knowledge" is the accumulation of unknown truth" and Newman has "always known knowledge to be out there, waiting for learners, especially scientist researchers to discover it"

It is evident from the excerpt of the discussions (FGD) that the participants share a common belief about what knowledge is: "it is accumulated information or ideas" to be given to the learner through the process of teaching (Table 4.11). In their context, that knowledge is embedded in the syllabus. This, according to literature, is the traditional, teacher-centred perspective of knowledge. The progressive, learner-centred view of knowledge is that it is multiple and context-bound; it is not fixed i.e. it keeps on changing as new realities emerge (Kroll, 2004, Fosnot, 1996). According to learner-centred advocates, knowledge is a social construct and, therefore, the learning process ought to be a social enterprise; with the role of the teacher being that of facilitation (Felder and Brent, 2009; Rainer and Guyton, 2004).

The participants believe the College culture does not allow them to be facilitators of learning but conveyers of knowledge. James puts it succinctly when he says:

> **"**I think we need to appreciate where we are coming from. I think our system simply does not allow facilitation in a teaching/learning process. We are coming from a tradition; we are a product of a tradition of teaching where the teacher is expected to teach; she or he has to deliver the goods, come exam time" (FGD).

This evidence suggests that the College system, in its practice, is driven by traditional views about teaching and learning. This system has become lecturers' frames of reference (Kennedy, 1997; Cochran-Smith, 2001). Participants' beliefs have been influenced and reinforced by the College system: a system that is, apparently, still rooted in the academic tradition (Liston and Zeichner, 1990) informed by behaviourist perspective. It appears from the evidence that the academic tradition, which prizes teacher-centred teaching approaches, appeals to lecturers; as it provides for a quick fix, clear-cut thinking and straightforward means of making pedagogical choices (Phipps and Borg, 2009; Muijs, 2007).

The analysis of participants' responses in Tables 4.4 to 4.11, show that some participants' beliefs (Ignatius, Khoza, Charles, Newman) about pedagogy are informed by the traditional teacher-centred, perspective. However, other lecturers' beliefs (James, Keith, Bongani) about pedagogy seem to be informed by the progressive, interactive perspective.

The traditional teacher-centred perspective is characterized by assumptions that learners are passive recipients of knowledge; and the teacher is an expert, who pours knowledge into the empty heads of learners (Allen, 2004; Prichard, 2009; Muijs 2007). The teacher manipulates the classroom environment to elicit appropriate responses from the learners. At the end of a lesson, learners are expected to exhibit the required behaviours, and if they do not, then the learners are

not good enough, but if they do, then the teacher is indeed a good teacher (Phipps and Borg, 2009; Schunk, 2003; Rainer-Rangel, 2002; Murphy, 2000).

Teaching approaches underpinned by this traditional perspective are based on the philosophical assumptions that knowledge is absolute, static and separate from the learner. According to this school of thought the learner is viewed as an empty vessel or blank slate to be filled with knowledge. The analysis shows that while participants (5) shared this view, others (3) did not (IDI; FGD).

What is significant about these findings is that while lecturers may want to adopt progressive, interactive teaching approaches, they were constrained by the College tradition which does not allow them to be facilitators of learning but deliverers of knowledge. This came out very clearly in the FGD; was succinctly put by James (FGD). My interpretation of this was that the College culture, (which emphasises the traditional teacher-centred and non-interactive lecture method), was a constraining factor that did not allow them to use learner-centred approaches.

4.3.2.4 Lecturers' beliefs about assessment

Now I want to present, analyse and interpret data about participants' beliefs about assessment. According to research literature, different teachers' pedagogical beliefs lead to different assessment practices (Gibbs, 1999; Boud and Flachikov, 2003; Brown and Glasner, 1999). To illuminate lecturers' beliefs about assessment; and to

explore how, at this College, the theoretical and practical assessment issues influence lecturers' own assessment practices; I will use excerpts of participants' views about assessment.

Table 4.12

Participants' views about assessment.

Data source & Category /code	Questions and Responses
POC (Participant observation conversation)	**Excerpts of responses** **Q. 1 How often do you assess your students*?*** **Marko**: I do it after a long time---not like in schools where teachers are expected to give an immediate feedback to learners. **Charlie**: I assess my students as and when coursework marks are required by the Head of Department (HOD). Actually we have a calendar that guides us when marks s should be ready. **Ignatius**: I would like to assess regularly--- but because of time constraints I only assess once a term. **Q. 2 What is your view about the notion that assessment ought to play a big role in the process of teaching And learning?** **James**: In theory we assume that assessment plays a role in the classroom, but, in practice, we do not assess for teaching or learning purposes. How will that type of assessment count towards final assessment? That is the problem. To me assessment is meaningless unless it counts towards a final mark that determines whether or not the student passes the course. **Keith**: Informally, yes it should play a role. But our system of assessment discourages classroom assessment. Only assessment that generates a mark that counts at the end of the course. --- Oh yes, students can assess themselves or assess each other. This, of course, is for learning purposes. However such assessment has no room in our system. **Newman**: In a way it can play a role. But the system of assessment at this College Is such that both lecturers and students are not interested in assessment that counts for nothing. They want assessment that will count towards passing the course.

Data source & Category /code	Questions and Responses
	Q. 3 What is your view about self-assessment, peer assessment and group assessment? **Keith***:* Yes, but the mark they award themselves would not count towards their Final passing mark at the end of The course---- that's where the problem is. **Bongani**: Self-assessment is not effective as students may not be honest. It is the same with peer-assessment. Group assessment is unfair to those students who do all the work; and, besides, that does not count towards Final assessment is what we are interested in. **Chair (Probing): Who prepares assessment criteria? And can students possibly have an input in formulating assessment criteria?** **Keith***:* Yes, but the mark they award themselves would not count towards their Final passing mark at the end of The course---- that's where the problem is. **Bongani**: Self-assessment is not effective as students may not be honest. It is the same with peer-assessment. Group assessment is unfair to those students who do all the work; and, besides, that does not count towards final examination. Final assessment is what we are interested in. **Chair (Probing): Who prepares assessment criteria? And can students possibly have an input in formulating Assessment criteria?** **Marko:** No, not at all. Students do not have deep knowledge of the subject, so How can they meaningfully assess each other. I believe no educational value Would be derived from such assessment. **Newman:** It is always done by the lecturers who set the assignments or Whatever assessment instrument used to assess students. **Charlie:** I prepare them myself, but they are then approved by the Department of Teacher Education (D T E) of the University of Zimbabwe which awards the Diplomas to qualifying students. Students have no input whatsoever in these criteria.

Data source & Category /code	Questions and Responses
	James: The practice at this College is that lecturers set assessment instruments, be they assignment or tests. So the answer to your question is, I do. So to whether students can have an input in formulating assessment criteria, my answer is 'no'. I have not seen or heard about it before. **Ignatius:** I do. Sometimes it is my other colleagues. Students cannot have an input because they do not know the correct answers. **Keith:** I do. No, students cannot be involved, because they do not know what to Look for in the answers given.

The evidence from these responses is that alternative assessment, which plays a crucial role in the teaching and learning process (Aikenhead, 1997; Black, and Wiliam, 1998), is not done at this College. Participants believe that the traditional assessment practice at the College is not compatible with alternative forms of assessment. They believe the assessment should be appended at the end of a topic or a term.

These responses suggest that, to the participants, assessment for teaching and learning purposes is, therefore, not a priority. James thinks that to say assessment ought to play a role in the teaching and learning process is merely being theoretical:

> **"**In theory we assume that assessment plays a role in the classroom, but, in practice, we do not assess for teaching or learning purposes. How will that type

> of assessment count towards final assessment? That is the problem. To me assessment is meaningless unless it counts towards a final mark that determines whether or not the student passes the course" (FGD).

James' use of 'we' in his statement is significant. The impression given is that he articulates what is common practice at the College. From what James is saying, it seems to me that assessment at this College is done to evaluate the 'worth' of the student i.e. whether or not the student justifies the continued stay in the course. James appears to decry this situation; and, like his colleagues, is made to conform to the College practice of summative, quantitative assessment (Carless, 2003; McKellar, 2002; Aikenhead, 1997), where grades or marks are compiled every term to determine "whether or not the student passes at the end of the course"

James' view appears to be shared by Keith who says:

> **"**Informally, yes it should play a role. But our system of assessment discourages classroom assessment. Only assessment that generates a mark that counts at the end of the course. --- Oh yes, students can assess themselves or assess each other. This, of course, is for learning purposes. However such assessment has no room in our system" (IDI)

This evidence suggests that the College's traditional assessment (summative) practice is a constraining factor as it emphasises marks or grades. It does not allow lecturers to use assessment as an integral part of the teaching/learning process. Both James's and Keith's views are shared by other 6 participants (Table 4.12.). The participants, however, feel that this traditional assessment practice, because it places so much emphasis on marks that students score during the course of study,

discourages the use of formative assessment. James forcefully expresses his feelings when he says:

> "--- to me (and to students perhaps) assessment is meaningless unless the mark counts towards a final mark that determines whether or not the student passes the course" (IDI).

Evidently, the emphasis placed on marks makes it difficult for lecturers at this College to make alternative assessment an integral part of their teaching and learning processes; as lecturers (and presumably, students too) would feel that it is a sheer waste of time to use any form of assessment that does not generate a mark that would count towards a final passing mark. Khoza and Bongani concur with James and Keith on how they viewed the alternative forms of assessment (Table 4.12)

These responses suggest that participants are not in favour of alternative forms of assessment. Instead they favour the traditional 'pencil and paper' summative assessment which generates a mark to evaluate a student. The functions of this traditional form of assessment; is to judge and evaluate the worth of the student (Carless, 2003; McKellar, 2002; Aikenhead, 1997). Essentially such assessment is measurement oriented, whose function is to evaluate and judge the worth of a student; a view expressed by Ignatius (IDI).

These lecturers are evidently not happy with the College's traditional assessment practice. They feel, because of the emphasis the College places on traditional form of assessment, alternative forms of assessment have no place at the College.

Table 4.13

Participants' views about forms of assessment.

Data source & Category/ Code	Questions and responses	Questions and responses
P O C (Participant Observation Conversation)	1. **PO:** Why do you make students write all these assignments; but only select 6 for final assessments? -- And how many assignments do you give them altogether? **2.Thandi:** Throughout the two years of their course we give them more than 12 assignments. **3.PO:** Are you sure they are all individual written assignments? **4.Dubs:** Yes, they are. **5.PO:** No group assignments? Are you sure they are all individual assignments? **6.Tshuks:** No **7.PO:** None whatsoever? **8.Thula:** No. None at all. **9.PO:** What do you think about group assignments? **10.Khanye:** Group marks are not acceptable for final assessment. The College requires marks that show individual performance that are a true reflection of an individual student's performance; and not group performance. **11.PO:** But what's assessment for then? Why do you give group assignments? **12. Thula**: For evaluating students; to see what they are worth.	**13. Thandi:** Essentially to see if they are ready to be certified as trained teachers. **14. PO:** Does assessment have any a role to play in your teaching? **15. Rose:** Well, yes but not in the sense that we use assessment for teaching purposes. Our assessment practice here is such that all assessment is summative and counts towards final assessment at the end of the course. **16. PO**: Are you happy with that? **17. Rose:** Of course not. **18. Thula:** No, that's why I'm complaining about it. **19. P O:** Is that the feeling of everyone? **20. Thandi:** That's how it is. It's a requirement by College and the certificate awarding institution: The Department of Teacher Education of the University of Zimbabwe. **21. PO:** And you can't change that? **22. Thula:** No **23. Thandi:** No. **24. Kelvin:** We can't change it. Can we? That is policy; and we cannot change policy. Our responsibility is to implement it. **25. PO:** Thanks for your time guys. We'll chat again later.

In Table 4.13 other lecturers, (apart from the 8 participants) also express what they feel about the assessment practice at this College. They evidently feel frustrated that alternative assessment techniques have no place in the College's assessment system; and that since the traditional (summative) assessment practice is policy; they cannot change it (Table 4.13). From the participants' responses I get the impression that the prevailing traditional assessment practice appears to be a constraining factor that stands in the way of alternative assessment techniques and practice; and especially that lecturers feel powerless to influence any changes to it (PO).

During the course of my fieldwork (Participant observation) I also observed that lecturers did not hold feedback sessions with students after marking assignments (Section 3.8.1.5, Table3.4.). Students are expected to read the lecturers' comments on the assignment, and that is it. I had an opportunity to read some of the comments lecturers make on students' assignments. The in-text comments appear to indicate grammatical and spelling mistakes. In some cases they indicate repetition of ideas or lack of coherence in their presentation. However, in most of the assignments, the overall comments are very brief and do not state, in specific terms, what was wrong or good about the assignment as a whole (Aikenhead, 1997; Black, and Wiliam, 1998). The comments do not indicate the strengths or the weaknesses of the assignments. It is only the grade or mark which indicates the assignment was good or not. Such a feedback is not helpful to the students, as they learn nothing from it (Boud and Flachikov, 2006; McKellar, 2002). Perhaps this explains why, as soon as

students know their assignment grade they do not bother about collecting the assignment from the lecturer. Literature suggests that, unless alternative forms of assessment are made to count towards the final passing grade or mark; and unless emphasis is placed on assessment for teaching/learning, both lecturers and students will continue to despise alternative forms of assessment (Boud, 2000; Brown and Glasner, 1999; Black and Wiliam, 1998).

It appears the assessment practice at this College has a big influence in the teachers' beliefs about the role of assessment in teaching and learning. Apparently, participants now believe, because of this rigid traditional assessment practice, alternative assessment plays an insignificant part (if any) in the teaching and learning process (Table 4.12 and 4.13). This is in spite of the fact that, about 20 years ago, this traditional perspective of summative, measurement oriented assessment started to be contested and decried by educational researchers and reformers pushing for the alternative forms of assessment (Carless, 2003; MacKellar, 2002; Black and Wiliam 1996; Gibbs, 1999; Boud, 1995).

What I glean from participants' concerns about the nature of traditional assessment (i.e. summative, measurement-oriented assessment) at this College (Table 4.12 and Table 4.13) is that they unconsciously learn that the only acceptable form of assessment is one that yields a grade that counts towards passing the course. The students too, may unwittingly learn this (McKellar, 2002). As a result they might not value any assessment that does not give a grade that counts towards their passing

of the course. So, the summative assessment or measurement-oriented assessment practices pervasive in the system of assessment at this College become the hidden curriculum that both lecturers and students unconsciously learn (Carless, 2003; McKellar, 2002).

I also observed during teaching practice (TP) assessment; both lecturers and students were more interested in the mark or grade than in the pre-observation and post-observation conferences. Pre-observation and post-observation conferences are conversations that both college supervisor (C S) and student teacher (ST) engage in. In these conversations the CS clarifies the purpose of the observation and identifies the specific goals s/he is planning to accomplish. The ST also clarifies the goals s/he has identified and aims to achieve (Hopkins and Moore, 1993) In these discussions the ST lesson plans are examined; and the CS takes this opportunity to clarify questions, discuss specific issues about the lesson content; or help ST reflect on particular students in the upcoming class. At this point the CS may offer suggestions or modifications to the lesson (Rogers and Keil, 2007).

In some cases these conferences were never held. Both the C S and the S T were concerned with the mark generated during the observation. This demonstrates that, assessment feedback, as a tool to enhance learning, is not valued; not only by the lecturers, but by the students, as well. In a large measure this reflects the College practice of assessment which emphasises the grade that the student must score, more than the deep learning and professional growth of the student; enhanced by

alternative forms of assessment practice where students engage in experiential learning and reflective activities such as carrying out action research, group projects, continuous professional development (CPD) portfolios (Brookfield, 1995; Carr and Kemmis, 1986; Mc Niff, 1986).

The purposes of traditional assessment are well documented in literature (Boud and Flachikov, 2006; Carless, 2003; Black and Wiliam, 1998). Though different terminology is used by different writers, there is considerable concurrence in the purposes served by the traditional, summative, measurement-oriented assessment practice, as experienced by participants in this study. According to McKellar, (2002) and Lambert and Lines ((2000), (2002) assessment has three purposes. Firstly, it is designed to support and, therefore enhance learning; secondly it measures progress, and thirdly, as a form of accountability mechanism, it provides quality assurance to stakeholders.

It is evident; however, from the lecturers' responses that the traditional perspective of assessment influences their assessment practices. Their frustration with the traditional practice of assessment is evident in Table 4.13, where lecturers lament the fact that, while they believe alternative assessment can play a role in their teaching, to enhance students' learning, they cannot change the prevailing situation.

4.3.2.5 Lecturers' views about the College's conceptual framework

The College has a conceptual framework that, ostensibly, guides teacher educators in their pedagogical and professional practices. In the context of this study the College's conceptual framework is popularly known as the Mission Statement (Appendix A). In this study, I then sought to find out about participants' thinking and understanding about the College's conceptual framework. During in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, I therefore asked participants if they were indeed guided by the College's conceptual framework to prepare new teachers. In their responses lecturers acknowledged its existence, while others professed ignorance, not to mention ever seeing it at all. Generally, participants were dismissive and did not appreciate its educative value. They were frank and open minded about what they thought was its role in the practice of preparing new teachers. Some participants dismissed it as an unimportant document, others referred to it as a public relations stunt meant for administrators, while others professed ignorance about its existence. Here is what participants had to say about the College's conceptual framework:

Table 4.14a

Lecturers' views about the College's conceptual framework

DATA Source & Category/ code	**Question : Are you aware of the College's conceptual framework, and what are your views about**
	Responses
IDI **(Indepth direct interview)**	**Bongani:** Yes, I am aware of it. But I never studied it to understand what it says. I know that every institution ought to have one, but I'm not very sure what its purpose is, other than just saying what the institution seeks to do. **Charlie**: No. I have never seen it. Is it that college motto written in Latin? --- (laughter). To be honest, I don't know about it. **Keith***:* I know it exists but I have never thought it has anything to do with me? **James**: Yes, I'm aware of it. I know it exists. I remember vaguely what it says but not in its totality. I do not think that conceptual framework or Mission Statement is meant for us lecturers. I think it is meant to be a public relations stunt. It's not something we can lose our sleep over--- (laughter). **Marko***:* Yes, I am aware of it, but just can't remember what it says about the type of teacher The college seeks to produce. --- I think it says something like ---- producing reflective teachers, ---innovative teachers--- well something of the sort--- I can't really remember. **Ignatius**: I know there is a college Mission Statement, but I have never bothered to find Out what it says. Now that you have mentioned it, I will have a look at it. **Newman**: Well, I know that every institution ought to have one but, as a new lecturer at this college, I have yet to see one for this institution. **Khoza:** I have never read it. I have seen it hanging on the Admin Office and corridor walls. We are never told about it. I think it does not concern us. No it's not for us. I don't know what it is for. Maybe it is for visitors?

Table 4.14b

Lecturers' views about the College's conceptual framework

DATA SOURCE & Category/code	Question : Are you aware of the College's conceptual framework, and what are your views about it?	
P O C & FGD **(Participant Observation conversation** **& Focus group Discussion)**	**1.Tshuks:** Do I know what it (the conceptual framework) says? Here we seek to produce competent; highly skilled professional teachers. This is our responsibility. That is what I was taught at college during my training as a teacher (Everybody laughing). **2. PO:** So you don't use it to guide you about the type of teacher you are producing here? **3. Tshuks:** I simply follow what I was trained to do at college--- not what the College's conceptual framework says. **4. James:** Well, I doubt if everybody knows about the College's conceptual framework. Even those who may claim to know it they do not know it in its totality. **5. Khoza:** I do not think that Conceptual framework or Mission Statement meant for us lecturers. I think it is meant to be a public relations stunt. **6. Newman:** The College's Conceptual framework. Is it meant for us, anyway? It's not something we can lose our sleep over--- (laughter). **7. Charlie:** No. I have never seen it. Is it that College motto written in Latin? --- (laughter). To be honest, I don't know about it.	**8. Nyambose:** Actually it is not for us— it's for Admin just used for PR purposes. **10. PO:** Really? **11. Dunga:** Yea--- at least that is the general understanding (- - laughter). **12. Marko:** Well, I'm aware of it but can't just remember what it says. I can't really remember. Well, it says in part, -- to produce a reflective teacher—well, something of the sort---. **13. Ignatius:** Yes, I am aware of it, But just can't remember what it says about the type of teacher the college seeks to produce. **14. Bongani:** I think it says Something like ---- producing reflective teachers, ---innovative teachers--- well, to be honest, I have never studied it. **15. Keith:** No, it is not for us. I don't know what it is for. Maybe it is for visitors. I've always seen it hanging in the admin block?

Some participants (Khoza, Keith) think the conceptual framework is not meant to be used by lecturers, and others (James, Marko, Ignatius, Bongani), while they know

the conceptual framework exists, do not take it seriously. In fact, Newman trivialises it when he says:

> "The College's conceptual framework? Is it meant for us, anyway? It's not something we can lose our sleep over." (FGD)

The conclusion I draw from the responses in Table 4.14 is that the participants' (IDI; FGD) and other lecturers' (P O) pedagogical practices are not guided by the College's conceptual framework; and evidently this means that, consequently, they do not align their pedagogical practices with the College's conceptual framework.

Evidence shows that there is a disconnect between the conceptual framework and lecturers' practices as their pedagogical practices are not informed by the College's conceptual framework.

This begs the questions: If lecturers' pedagogical practices are not informed by the College's conceptual framework, how then are they meeting the expectations of their teacher education programme? What then guides the lecturers in their preparation of new teachers? It seems to me that what guides the lecturers in their preparation of new teachers is tradition, common sense, and intuition (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Pepper and Hare, 1999; Hopkins, 1996).

According to literature (Lapsley, 2002), the purpose of the conceptual framework is to ensure coherence of teacher education programmes. It represents a shared

vision by faculty based on their beliefs about the best ways of preparing effective teachers.

4.3.2.6 Participants' views about the kind of teacher they seek to prepare or produce

The responses of the participants and other lecturers (Table 4.14) about the College's conceptual framework makes it difficult for me to understand what kind of teacher they seek to prepare at this College. I then asked them, specifically, to tell me what kind of a teacher they were seeking to produce; and if that kind of teacher was the same one the College envisaged to produce, as articulated by its conceptual framework.

Table 4.15a

Participants' views, as teacher educators, about the kind of teacher they are seeking to produce.

DATA SOURCE & Category/ code	Question: What kind of a teacher are you producing at this College?
	Responses excerpts
IDI (In-depth interviews)	**Marko:** A reflective teacher--- a teacher who can look back, analyze and find alternative ways of teaching concepts i. e. a teacher who can use different methods to his/her ideas across. ----- I want to produce teachers who accept students` ideas--- who consider teaching as sharing of knowledge by the learners? ---- Teachers who consider their roles in the learning process as that of a facilitator--- providing conducive environment for learning. **Charlie:** I want them to be dynamic teachers--- able to cope with the dictates of the time i.e. engage modern ways of teaching; --- they should be able to use modern methods of teaching? **Ignatius***:* I want to produce a competent and reflective teacher i.e. a teacher who is a hard worker and innovative. **Keith:** A very dynamic teacher who keeps abreast with music development around the world of music. The teacher should be able to instil the love of music to his/her students. **James:** I am aiming at producing a professional, competent and knowledgeable teacher. **Newman:** A teacher who is practically oriented; I want them to be real-life or real-world teachers i. e. teachers who can produce things for use in their communities. The teacher must be able to invent useful things to be used by the community. **Khoza:** They must be teachers who pursue self-development to improve themselves. They must embrace life-long learning principle. This is good for them so that they sharpen their skills and broaden their knowledge.

DATA SOURCE & Category/ code	Question: What kind of a teacher are you producing at this College?

Table 4.15b

Participants' views, as teacher educators, about the kind of teacher they are seeking to produce.

DATA SOURCE & Category / Code	Question: What kind of a teacher are you producing at this College?	
	Responses excerpts	
POC **(**Participant Observation Conversation**)**	**1.. Nyambose**: What kind of teacher are you producing here Tshuks? (Laughing). **2. Tshuks:** (also laughing), --- certainly not this kind of a teacher. He has no morals. He is not a professional. **3. Dunga:** Here we produce teachers who uphold standards and who are highly professional. **4. Duba:** Yea, teachers who are critical and reflective. **5. Tshuks:** I'm not sure if we produce that kind of teachers (laughing). (Everybody laughing in apparent agreement)	**6.. Duba:** That's what our Mission Statement or conceptual framework says anyway.----- **7. PO:** IS that what it says---- the College conceptual framework, Tshuks---- to produce critical and reflective teachers? **8. Tshuks:** Do I know what it says? Here we seek to produce competent; highly Skilled professional teachers. This is our responsibility. That is what I was taught at college during my training as a teacher (Everybody laughing). **9.. PO:** So you don't use it to guide you about the type of teacher you are producing here? **10. Tshuks:** I simply follow what I was Trained to do at college--- not what the College's conceptual framework says. **PO:** I see everyone is rushing to their

DATA SOURCE & Category / Code	Question: What kind of a teacher are you producing at this College?	
		lectures. Nice to chat with you guys. We'll meet again later. Thank you for your time.

These responses show that participants do not have a shared vision of the kind of teacher they were seeking to produce. What is also evident from these responses is that there seems to be a contradiction between what participants say is the kind of teacher they want to produce (Marko, Ignatius, Khoza, Duba) and the means (the teaching strategies) by which they want to produce this teacher. During lesson observations and participant observation there was no evidence of how they support the development of a reflective teacher. While these responses show that participants hold the view of a teacher that has currency in teacher education literature (Fosnot, 1996; Brooks, 1995; Muijis, 2007; Prichard, 2009) their pedagogical practices seemed to contradict what they said. This is in spite of a College conceptual framework which envisages a reflective teacher. Essentially, the College uses a reflective model to prepare its pre-service and in-service teachers. According to Valli (1990), reflection requires active thinking and putting knowledge to use; and as such, it involves not simply a superficial treatment, but is a way of thinking or philosophy that implies a more conscious examination of alternatives and

courses of action. Carr and Kemmis (1986) refer to this as praxis. Essentially, the College conceptual framework is underpinned by this philosophy. That being the case, lecturers ought to use the College conceptual framework as a guide to prepare new teachers i.e. the reflective teachers.

4.3.2.7 The shared vision of participants

The participants' responses (Table 4.14 and 4.15) show that participants did not use the College conceptual framework to guide their pedagogical practices; consequently, they seem not to have a shared vision of the kind of teacher they seek to prepare or produce as teacher educators.

As already stated, the conceptual framework in this College is popularly known as **a Mission Statement** (Appendix A). The essence of any conceptual framework of an institution such as a teacher education institution is to guide teacher educators and inform all their pedagogical practices. It should articulate the philosophy underpinning all programmes run by the institution. I assume that the College's conceptual framework represents a shared vision by faculty based on their beliefs about the best ways of preparing effective teachers. This is borne by the fact that it is carried by the College's Prospectus, the Five Year development Plan, and the graduation booklet with the names of graduating students. The conceptual framework, therefore, ought to guide and underpin all teacher educators` practices. Essentially, it is theory underpinning teacher preparation to be linked to the practice of preparing new teachers. For that reason lecturers ought to model it (Cochran-

Smith, 2001; Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1990; Rainer and Guyton, 1999).

In the context of this case study, naturally, I expected lecturers to be guided by the college conceptual framework; informing them as to what kind of a teacher they sought to produce. As the responses above show, some lecturers do not even know that it exists and others think it does not concern them. It seems to me that even new lecturers, who join the College, are not made aware of the College's conceptual framework when they are inducted. So what it means is that every lecturer is seeking to produce the kind of a teacher s/he believes would be an effective teacher. This appears to be a case of a teacher education programme that lacks research-based knowledge to inform and develop pedagogical and professional practice.

While the conceptual framework carries the vision and organizes the very mission of the teacher education institution- providing a guidepost for programme development and benchmarks for its evaluation, it is not easy for all members of faculty to implement it. In this study, the findings show that lecturers are not implementing the College conceptual framework. May be this is because the conceptual framework envisions teaching approaches different from those that lecturers are used to. The new conceptual framework emphasizes conceptual teaching and learning approaches i.e. approaches whose content of interest is concepts and strategies rather than facts and procedures (Kennedy, 1997). At the core of these approaches

is the method of teaching that involves a lot of student participation in examining, reasoning, evaluating and debating about, these concepts and strategies. For teacher educators, this new conceptual framework guiding teacher education programmes becomes new learning.

The data analysis shows that lecturers' practices are not guided by the College's conceptual framework. As teacher educators, participants are not using any particular model to guide their practice to train new teachers. The big question now is, as teacher educators, what philosophy guides them in producing new teachers? If they do not have the shared philosophy to guide them, which means, essentially, they are following the tradition of how things are done here; or just using their common sense of how things ought to be done here. They are using personal theories in their heads to guide them. It is the 'personal theories' (Handal and Lauvas, 1988; Argyris, and Schon, 1974) grounded in their core beliefs, from which they draw the "tradition, common sense and intuition" that seem to guide their practice as teacher educators (Pepper and Hare, 1999).

4.4. Conclusion

This chapter re-stated the research questions. This was done to focus and put into context the data analysis, discussion and interpretation accounts presented in the subsequent sections of this chapter. Data from all the 5 data sources were analysed and discussed. The analysis of participants' responses showed the interplay of their

beliefs about teaching, learning and assessment; and how their beliefs align with the College's conceptual framework. It is these data which I used to answer the research questions.

The next chapter is the conclusion. A brief account of the rationale and context of the study will be given. In its subsequent sections the next chapter will show what knowledge this study contributed and how it will be disseminated for use by stakeholders and other researchers and scholars. The limitations of the study will be acknowledged; as well as discussing the implications of the findings.

Chapter 5

Conclusion and recommendations

5.1 Outline of the chapter

This chapter provides a brief summary of the rationale and context of the study. The aim and objectives of the study are re-stated. The chapter also restates the research questions and the approaches used to generate and analyse the data. The philosophical assumptions underpinning the methodology will also be discussed. The findings and the themes that emerged from the study are summarized in subsequent sections of this chapter. These themes support and contribute to the body of contemporary knowledge in teacher education. This knowledge relates to how best to prepare new teachers using a reflective model. Consideration is given to the limitations of the knowledge claims made in relation to its trustworthiness and transferability to similar contexts elsewhere. How research findings will be shared and disseminated to inform future research will be reviewed in the final section of this chapter.

5.2 Rationale and context of the study

My long experience and immersion in teacher education matters was the driving force behind pursuing this study (Section 1.8). In the twelve years that I was involved in teacher preparation I developed a passion for teacher education. As a lecturer, I interacted, at various forums, with fellow teacher educators. During this period, I developed an assumption or perception that my colleagues' pedagogical practices were somewhat incompatible with current thinking and incongruous with

contemporary issues in teacher education. This assumption inspired me to investigate why this appeared to be so. I then decided to conduct this study.

5.3 The research questions, aim and objectives

The overall aim of the study (Section 1.4) was to explore, understand and explain lecturers' beliefs that inform their pedagogical practices and how these beliefs influence lecturers in the way they model the college's conceptual framework.

Derived from the overall aim of the study were objectives (Section 1.5) seeking to understand what these beliefs were and how they played out in practice, in the lecturers' choices of approaches and strategies of teaching, learning and assessment; to explain how these beliefs influenced the way lecturers modelled the College's conceptual framework; to understand how Teacher Education lecturers at this College link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices; and to share the findings with teacher educators and researchers at local, regional and national levels, with the view to improving teacher preparation practices.

To investigate and understand the interplay between lecturers' beliefs about teaching, learning, assessment and the college's conceptual framework, the following research questions were formulated.

5.3.1 Research questions

1. What beliefs do lecturers hold about teaching, learning and assessment?
2. What beliefs inform lecturers' actual pedagogical practices?

3. What pedagogical approaches do lecturers employ to meet the goal of the college conceptual framework?
4. How do lecturers link their personal theories with their professional practice?

The study sought to investigate and find out what beliefs lecturers held about teaching, learning and assessment. This was crucial in understanding lecturers' pedagogical practices, especially how they link theory with practice. What was more important was to understand why lecturers held those beliefs. As shown by literature (Northcote, 2009, Pajares, 1992; Nespor,1987) that lecturers' beliefs influence their pedagogical choices it was crucial to understand precisely what pedagogical approaches lecturers employed to meet the goal or vision of the college's conceptual framework. Every teacher or lecturer carries some theory in their heads; regardless as to whether they know it or not. This is the implicit theory that informs practice (Handal 2003; Handal and Lauvas, 1988; Argyris and Schon, 1974). In this study it was critical that lecturers' beliefs, manifested in their theory-in-use or practice, were investigated and understood so that those that were maladapted could be confronted and examined with the view to changing them.

5.3.2 The aim of the study

The overall aim of the study was to explore, understand and explain lecturers' beliefs that inform their pedagogical practices and how these beliefs influence lecturers in the way they model the college's conceptual framework.

Derived from the overall aim of the study are the following objectives:

5.3.3 Objectives of the study

1. To understand what these beliefs are and how they play out in practice, informing lecturers' choice of approaches and strategies of teaching, learning and assessment;
2. To explain how these beliefs influence the way lecturers model the college's conceptual framework.
3. To understand how lecturers link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices
4. To share the findings with teacher educators and researchers at local, regional and national levels, with the view to improving teacher preparation practices.

The thrust of this study was to investigate lecturers' pedagogical beliefs. Understanding what beliefs lecturers held, was crucial to appreciate lecturers' choice of teaching approaches and assessment strategies they used. Ideally, modelling of the college's conceptual framework by lecturers demonstrates their understanding of the philosophy underpinning it. In this study, it was essential to find out how lecturers' beliefs impinged on lecturers' ability to model the college's conceptual frame work. Not all the objectives set out above were met (Objective 4 is still to be met). However, the rest were met, giving a deeper understanding of lecturers' pedagogical and professional practices at this College.

As a practitioner researcher, (I am researching my professional field of work) I have a personal connection with the topic; and these propositions are therefore driven by what I want to understand about lecturers' beliefs about pedagogical issues: whether lecturers' pedagogical choices are informed by their beliefs about how students learn; the College's bureaucratic culture may be a constraining factor for lecturers to implement contemporary pedagogic practices and whether lecturers use assessment for learning purposes (Section 3.7.3. ; Table 3.4).

The research questions were used as a framework to guide the study. They were arrived at as a result of my personal experience of over ten years as a lecturer and subsequently as a leader of Professional Studies subject area (Section 1.7). As a teacher educator lecturer, I reviewed a wide array of literature in teacher education; trying to understand issues in teacher education. It is this prolonged engagement with both the context and literature that inspired and provided a basis for generating the research questions. The research questions were derived later after a long period of engagement with the context and of trying to grapple with the broad research questions:

1. What is the link between lecturers' beliefs and their pedagogical practices?

2. How do lecturers align their pedagogical practices with policy in respect of a mandated curriculum approach?

The research questions sought to address pertinent phenomena under investigation: what beliefs do lecturers hold about teaching, learning and assessment? Why do lecturers hold such beliefs that inform their actual pedagogical practices? What pedagogical approaches do lecturers employ to meet the goal of the College conceptual framework? (and) How do lecturers link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices?

5.4 Methodology and methods

The methodology chosen for this study is the interpretivist; and the methodological approach chosen is the naturalistic Case Study. The methodology and the approach which I chose, therefore, position this study in the qualitative tradition. Both the methodology and the approach are appropriate as they take into consideration the challenges related to investigating and eliciting lecturers' beliefs.

The interpretivist paradigm recognizes that 'there exist a multiple realities which are, in the main, constructions existing in the mind of people' (Guba and Lincoln, 1988, p.81). This study, therefore, embraced the notion of subjective and multiple realities (Freebody, 2003; Cohen et al, 2002; Pring, 2000; Crotty; Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). My role as a researcher was to observe these multiple realities, interpret, articulate and reconstruct them in an attempt to have a deeper insight, and thus derive some understanding and meaning from them.

Since central to this study were lecturers' beliefs and practices, the experiences of individual lecturers, the meanings and interpretations they attached to these experiences, an interpretivist approach made it possible to gain insight into these experiences. Therefore, the use of the interpretivist approach was crucial in order to understand the meanings of these experiences as they related to the lecturers` pedagogical practices.

A research method, according to Bryman, (2008) is a technique for generating data. According to literature all methods are valuable if used appropriately, and that research can, in fact, include elements of both interpretivist and positivist approaches (Bryman, 2008; Creswell, 1994). My immediate concern, however, was that the research methods must enable me to generate appropriate data to answer the research questions; and thereby test my theoretical propositions.

Multiple methods were used to generate the data. The sole intention of using a triangulation of methods to generate data was to minimize the weaknesses and maximize the strengths of each method (Robinson, 1993; Bryman, 2008). The synergy of methodological triangulation serves to enhance the credibility of the study. I used a diverse of methods, seeking to capture a wide array of teachers' beliefs: the phenomena under investigation in this study. The use of multiple methods to generate data enhanced not only the truthfulness and therefore credibility, but also the trustworthiness of the research findings (Creswell, 1994; Yin, 1994; Stake; 1994; Baxter and Jack, 2008; Bryman, 2008).

A summary of methods used to generate the data and their advantages and limitations is given in Section 3.6. This study has provided rationale and explanations to the research questions. The methods used were appropriate for the purpose of the research. The analysis and interpretation of data was methodologically suited for the context under consideration and the methods of generating data were confirmable, credible, dependable and transferable (Guba and Lincoln 1985).

In both capturing and interpreting the participants' responses I was careful to authentically represent their voices. To do this, a rigorous process of categorising and coding the views of the respondents was followed (Section 4.2; Table 4.1). Other researchers' views were also sought to critically challenge my own assumptions and philosophical stance. This proved to be crucial as it nudged me to focus on the appropriateness of my interpretation.

The interviews and focus group discussions that I conducted were my primary data sources. The data generated from these sources provided a very strong and authentic body of database for the analysis and interpretation of participants' responses. Participants' own words provided deep insights which served as a lens through which I was able to see a vivid picture of the participants' experiences. The advantage with interviews and focus group discussions was that I was able to use a probing technique to follow up on certain responses and to pose some questions to

clarify some responses. This yielded rich data from the participants that informed the interpretive and the inductive process appropriate to this kind of a study.

Other data generated from other data sets were primarily used to inform the interpretation of the primary data as they provided breadth, depth and, therefore, richness to the data. Not withstanding the fact that the interpretive approach was challenging, I found it to be intellectually rewarding. May be this was because of its alignment with my African philosophy (Section 3.4.1). In my next research project in the field, I will certainly use the interpretive approach. This study has given me some measure of confidence.

5.5 Contribution to knowledge

Today, one of the challenges that Teacher Education institutions face in the developing world in general, and in Zimbabwe in particular, is to take aboard new ideas and philosophies that are currently informing teacher education programmes at global level. It appears, at the moment, that some teacher education programmes are not underpinned by current research theory. Instead they seem to be underpinned by tradition. In such a situation teacher educators simply follow tradition, and use intuition and common sense to guide their activities (Doyle, 1990 in Pepper and Hare, 1999). This is not because these new ideas are contextually undesirable, but simply because lecturers have not been exposed to them; and

hence their apparent failure to adequately conceptualize the new theoretical framework needed to underpin teacher education programmes. Standing in the way are lecturers' beliefs about teaching, learning and assessments (Kennedy, 1997; Cochran –Smith, 2001; Tabachnik and Zeichner 1986). A study such as this one provides research-based knowledge which could be used to inform lecturers' practice when training new teachers. In Zimbabwe, especially in the area of Teacher Education, the culture of research in is still developing. This means that research knowledge is not robust enough to galvanize lecturers to appreciate the academic value of research. This study makes a valuable contribution to research knowledge in teacher education, especially at the chosen College, in its efforts to pursue the reform agenda to train teachers for the 21st century.

Every teacher education programme is underpinned by a philosophy or a conceptual framework that guides it and informs all professional practices. The philosophy must, however, change in response to new challenges and in the light of new research knowledge. Research has shown that it is not easy to change a philosophy that has become a "world-view" of the teacher education system (Northcote, 2009; Blenkin, 1992; Fullan, 2000; Cochran-Smith, 2001). To change this philosophy, the fixed paradigms (world-views) need to be explored, confronted, and deconstructed. The themes that have emerged in the analysis and interpretation of data (Sections 4.2 and 4.3) in this study are critical as they impinge on the mandated curriculum change. The College's conceptual framework must be seen in this light i.e. as an attempt to reorient lecturers towards the current new

thinking that drives teacher preparation programmes (Ballantyne, 2005; Norton et al, 2005; Barnard et al, 1997; Pepper and Hare, 1999). This knowledge will empower and galvanise lecturers to debate the desired reform agenda. In the process of that debate, teacher educators will clarify their beliefs and confront those that are incompatible with new thinking in teacher education. The deconstruction of maladaptive beliefs is a slow process (Fullan, 2000; Hargreaves, 1998). The knowledge generated by this study will initiate that process of change through sharing the findings of this study. Lecturers' beliefs exposed by this study will be brought to the fore for examination and clarification. This study was therefore an attempt to provide a springboard to that deconstruction process in an effort to reorient lecturers at the chosen College. This is done in the background underpinning of teacher education reforms at global level.

Within the global agenda teacher education reforms seek to reorient teacher education programmes so that they take on board new theoretical propositions and practices informed by current research literature. The knowledge generated in this study seeks to highlight how the current mandated curriculum change envisaged by the College sits within the global agenda; and illuminates lecturers, beliefs that need immediate attention within the local context i.e. the Zimbabwean local context agenda if the envisaged curriculum change is to be achieved.

Preparing teachers for the 21st century demands that Teacher Education institutions embark on reform agendas that seek to prepare new teachers in the best way

possible. Accordingly, mandated curricula will define these agendas. It is in this context that this study was carried out to investigate phenomenon that impinged on the ability of the College to successfully implement the mandated curriculum change. As lecturers are expected to be the implementers of the new curriculum innovation; in this case, the College's conceptual framework, this study therefore, targeted their beliefs in order for me to understand and be able to explain lecturers' pedagogical practices with respect to implementing the mandated curriculum change.

This study suggests that lecturers' beliefs need to be clarified and be realigned with current thinking in teacher education with regards to preparing new teachers. It further suggests that in formulating a conceptual framework to underpin all teacher education programmes in the College; and to guide lecturers in their pedagogical practices, lecturers should be involved so that they take ownership of this new curriculum innovation- the conceptual framework. This prepares lecturers, not only to successfully implement the mandated curriculum, but also to engage lecturers in the process of professionalisation. As professionals lecturers will be able to continue learning throughout their career, deepening knowledge, sharpening skills, enriching their sense of judgement, staying abreast of important developments in the field and experimenting with innovations that promise improvements in practice (Sachs,1997).

5.6 Limitations to the claims made

While concerted and conscious efforts were made to minimize limitations to the research process, some limitations, however, are expected to still exist. For example, the typicality of the case study approach (Section 3.2.1.2), despite its wide use across the social sciences, there is a continuing stereotype of it as a weak research approach (Yin, 2003; Stake 2003). Its lack of generalisability is considered its major weakness (Bassey, 1999). This limitation, however, is offset by the fact that, for those in similar contexts and with similar issues, case studies provide, illuminating and meaningful insights (Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier, 2013). Since this study used the interpretivist framework, the limitation of the case study approach used is in respect of its subjective nature in the context; and the relationship between the researcher and the researched that lead to the accusations of bias. As a fledgling researcher it was difficult to be equally skilful or good at all varieties of research methods; and yet the case study research demands of researchers, to use multiple data collecting methods. For that reason, my lack of research methods expertise makes the case study approach a limitation.

Sustained engagement with participants on the site might have made my overstay unwelcome; and therefore, creating unnecessary resentment by participants or gatekeepers. This might have compromised the quality of data collected (Sarandakos, 2005; Silverman, 2000) and; consequently, the knowledge claim.

Another limitation to the knowledge claim relates to the limitation of the research methods used in this study. For example, the use of participant observation method

(Section 3.11.1) was characterized by high researcher subjectivity, making the study highly susceptible to researcher bias. To minimize researcher bias I tried to avoid it by 'sifting and vetting' information (Creswell, 1994). This subjective restraint to discriminate data made it even more difficult to eliminate researcher bias as I had to remove what I considered to be extraneous information. In the process of sifting and vetting, useful knowledge may have been unwittingly overlooked. The net effect of this was a limitation of the knowledge claims made.

.

In conducting in-depth interviews (Section 3.11.3), and focus group discussions (Section 3.11.4), the rhetorical nature of the interview discourse made it possible for participants to give me responses which they thought I wanted to hear; instead of those that reflected the issues under investigation; as the information that the participants provided could not be verified. As it was not possible to verify the information given, the effect of this was that the 'inappropriate' information given might have compromised the quality of data generated, and therefore impacted on the knowledge claim made, limiting it.

The small size of the sample (Section 3.10) means that I generated limited information. As a qualitative approach this study does not 'discover the truth'. This may be seen as a limitation to knowledge claim the study makes. However, the cumulative views of the participants; and my own interpretation of these views, provided deep insights into participants' experiences. This is the 'truth'- the reality

provided by the study. I am confident, therefore that the information provided is a true reflection of the picture of the context in which the case study was conducted.

5.7 Recommendations

In light of the findings, I wish to make recommendations. As a case study, this study research findings and the knowledge will be shared with the College- a site where this study was conducted. The moral aspect of this research study is that the case study site, the College, should benefit from findings and knowledge contributed by the study. It is hoped that the case study site, the College, will take these recommendations on board in their attempts to improve the preparation of pre-service and in-service teachers so that they are better able to meet the 21st century a challenges. I therefore recommend that:

5.7.1 The College, through their college-based staff development programme, should revisit **and** reflect on their conceptual framework (The Vision and Mission Statement) with the view to engaging lecturers in examining their beliefs in an effort to align them with the goal of the College's conceptual framework that guides all their programmes. This is crucial as the conceptual framework is the guiding and underlying structure of the teacher preparation programme. It sets forth a vision of the programme and provides theoretical and empirical foundation for the direction of programmes, courses, teaching, candidate performance, faculty scholarship and service and department accountability. It is a declaration of what the College faculty believe in, their philosophy of teacher education, what they are

trying to achieve in the preparation of teachers. It provides a guidepost for programme development and benchmarks for programme evaluation; reflecting the College's shared vision of professional competence in teacher education.

5.7.2 In the revision of the College's conceptual framework, all staff should be involved so that they can identify with, and claim ownership of, the conceptual framework; and thereby, take responsibility to model it. Studies have shown that mandated curriculum is problematic for implementers (Fullan, 2000; Day et al, 2000; Hargreaves, 1998). Therefore, if the conceptual framework is mandated, chances are high that not all lecturers will readily implement it; while others may even resist its implementation, as the findings of this study showed. This explains why mandated curriculum innovations often wax and wane.

5.7.3 The College and staff, through the on-going in-house staff development programmes, review and debate pedagogical issues, including instructional methods and strategies that have currency in research literature. For example, the debate can focus on the review of current research literature about how students learn. It is hoped the process will galvanise lecturers and stimulate debate about pedagogical issues. The rationale for this is that lecturers, as practitioner professionals, are life-long learners who should make use of research knowledge to underpin their professional and pedagogical practices; thereby linking theory to practice. Lecturers' professional and pedagogical practices can be examined with the view to aligning them with current trends in teacher education at global level.

This can be done through the College's on-going staff development programme by mounting of bespoke workshops to explore and clarify lecturers' educative values, beliefs, principles and professional practices. The College examine and confront any systemic factors and challenges that might constrain lecturers' efforts to align their professional and pedagogical practices with demands of research knowledge currently driving reforms in teacher education.

5.8 Dissemination of knowledge

Firstly, the findings will be shared with the College Principal when I brief him about this study. Since this was a Case Study, the moral imperative is that the site i.e. the College should benefit from this study**.** I will take this opportunity of briefing the Principal to suggest that the findings should also be shared with the rest of the faculty through workshops or/and staff development session that are a common feature of the College calendar. Sharing the findings with lecturers will be a very crucial and significant step in initiating a discourse around pedagogical issues in particular, and research agendas in general at local level.

Secondly, the findings will also be presented at other fora such as local and regional conferences on teacher education. For example, The University of Zimbabwe's Department of Teacher Education (DTE), mounts regular workshops in which all Associate Teacher Education Colleges participate. It is in one of such workshops at which I will have the opportunity to present a research paper about this study.

Thirdly, the findings will be published in the Zimbabwe Bulletin of Educational Research Journal. The journal is run by DTE and publishes research papers and academic articles in the area of education. I will take advantage of the 'Call for Papers' invitation by the Editors to submit my research paper about this study for review and publication.

Fourthly, the research findings will be presented at the Southern Africa Research in Maths, Science and Technology Education (SARMSTE) workshops and conferences. I have participated in these workshops and conferences before; and I know for certain that this study will generate a lot of interest, because of its interpretivist underpinning methodological assumptions; considering that most of the research studies presented at this forum, so far, used the methodology underpinned by the positivist assumptions.

Lastly, the findings will be presented and discussed at regional and international research conferences and symposiums. These are often sponsored by universities and stakeholders in Education in general; and in Teacher Education in particular.

While the dissemination of the research findings will be done at various academic fora, I wish to point out here that, it is important that I try and strike a balance between just presenting the findings; and actually trying to have lecturers examine their values and beliefs; and then confront those that that are not aligned with current literature with regards to pedagogical and professional issues. In my opinion,

the best way to do this is to do it at an in-house workshop. My assumption here is that the contextual relevance of such a workshop will enhance and facilitate the desired change of those beliefs.

5.9 Transparency of the research process

5.9.1 Trustworthiness

According to Creswell (1994) trustworthiness relates to how researchers (and readers) determine if they (researchers) got it right. This means that, as a researcher, I must satisfy my readers that the entire research process, including the findings, is credible and "worth paying attention to" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 290). Trustworthiness of my research was defined by rigour through detailed specifications of research procedures: a systematic collection of data using 'theoretically sensitive' and appropriate research framework (Straus and Cobin: 1990: 42); and subjecting the procedures and findings to scrutiny by others (Sections 3.9.1.3 and 3.9.1.4). In addressing the issue of trustworthiness Creswell (1994) recommends using at least two among many strategies: reflexivity, prolonged field experience, triangulation, member checking, peer examination and others. In this study I used all of them (Sections 3.9.1.1 to 3.9.1.5). These strategies have been described in appropriate sections of this study.

5.9.2 Credibility

‘Credibility’ refers to how truthful research findings are (Guba and Lincoln, 1985). Since the qualitative researcher assumes the presence of multiple realities; and in her/his attempt to represent these realities s/he is expected to represent them truthfully. S/he therefore needs to pass the test of credibility (Guba and Lincoln; 1985 Bryman, 2008)). To enhance credibility, researchers suggest several techniques such as prolonged involvement and sustained stay at the research site, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing and member checks (Patton, 1990; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). In this study I used triangulation: using multiple methods of data generation; creating 5 data sets (Sections 3.9.1.1 to 3.9.1.5). Other strategies that I used to enhance credibility include; multiple participant perspectives, peer debriefing and corroboration of interview transcripts and findings with participants (Appendix O); member checks and critical scrutiny of not only the research process but also the interpretations of data to arrive at conclusions. I have described these techniques in the relevant sections of the study (Sections 4.3).

5.9.3 Dependability

‘Dependability’ refers to how researcher can be sure that their findings are consistent and can be replicated, if need be (Bryman, 2008). Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that there is no credibility without dependability; implying that credibility is essential for dependability to hold. He contends that “Since there can be no credibility without dependability, a demonstration of the former is sufficient to establish the latter” p.42. Essentially, this means that a study that is shown to be credible is also dependable. In his argument Guba, (1981) advocates for the need

for researchers to aim at achieving credibility with the assumption that dependability will follow from that.

In this study, multiple strategies that enhance credibility have been described. The passing of the credibility test (through the use of these strategies) means that the study also passes the dependability test. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) observe, “No credibility without dependability” p.316. Some of these strategies such as: multiple triangulations of data sources, member checking or participants debriefing, and peer scrutiny of the research process and findings have been dealt with in relevant sections (Sections 3.9.1.1 to 3.9.1.5; 4.3). .

5.9.4 Transferability

This construct, ‘transferability’, refers to how applicable or generalisable the research findings are to another setting or group (Bassey, 1999; Baxter and Jack, 2008; Bryman, 2008). While the nature of my study (a case study) is such that findings are not generalisable across geographical and group settings, my task and “ responsibility was to provide the database that made transferability judgements possible on the part of potential users or appliers” (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 316). While the lack of generalisability of case study findings is viewed as a limitation, in this study, that limitation is offset by the fact that, the findings shine a spot light on their on contexts; proving, what Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier, (2013) termed “a resonance for those in similar contexts, with similar issues” p. 145.

I provided a detailed description, specifying everything that the stakeholders (readers, policy makers, College authorities, and staff) may need to know. This

includes being transparent about the entire research process. For example, I described I describe the context of the study and positionality (Section3.2), articulating my personal stance. I also gave a clear justification of the methodology used (Section 3.3); for example, not only did I justify why a Case Study was chosen, but also why an 'anti-positivist' Case Study was chosen(Sections 3.5 to 3.6).

In pursuit of transparency, I also specified the sampling procedure that I used; giving the rationale for its use (Section 3.7) Ethical issues are not only a factor in the sampling process (Section 3.8), but also during the entire research process; and that is why I addressed these ethical issues throughout the research process in relevant sections, for example during the data generation process (Sections 3.9.1 and 4.3).

The purpose of being transparent was to help stakeholders (readers, researchers, College authorities, and government ministry authorities, Department of Teacher Education) to determine the utility of the findings; and for College authorities, whether or not to adopt the recommendations I made. For example, the College authorities could use the study to engage in staff development programmes which seek to confront lecturers' exclusionary beliefs that serve as barriers to adopting and enacting new pedagogical ideas and practices that promote student learning; and the development of new teachers who are ready to face the challenges of the 21st century. Studies have shown that there is need for teachers to engage in values and

beliefs clarifications in order to align them with current literature and research theory to guide their pedagogical practices (Fullan, 1991; Argyris, 1993; Atkin, 1996). It is crucial that lecturers debunk maladaptive beliefs acquired over many years of schooling through ‘apprenticeship of observation’ (Lortie, 1975); ‘received wisdom’ (Kennedy, 1996) and ‘socialization’ (Tabachnik and Zeichner, 1986; Bruner, 1999). It is only when lecturers collaboratively engage in value and beliefs clarifications that they can be able to link theory with practice (Atkin, 1996).

5.9.5 Confirmability

The construct ‘confirmability’ refers to how neutral the findings are (Straus and Cobin, 1990; Bryman, 2008; Yin, 1994). While quantitative research relies on conventional wisdom that prizes value-free and, therefore objective measures, this study is informed by a qualitative tradition which relies on interpretations that are value-bound, and therefore subjective. From the perspective of the quantitative tradition, subjectivity leads to results that are both unreliable and invalid. This makes qualitative research, pitted against quantitative research, fraught and fragile; and therefore comes up against trenchant criticism from positivist scholars (Patton, 1990; Eisner, 1991). However, Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue against the notion of a value-free research process, especially, calling into question the notion of objectivity in statistical measures, and indeed, the possibility of ever achieving pure objectivity at all.

In this study I strove to remain ‘neutral’ in so far as I did not influence the findings. I ensured that the findings were derived from and informed by the data (Sections 4.3.2.1 to 4.3.2.8; and not by my bias. I kept my biases in constant check as I consistently reflected on my subjective stance. I empathetically listened to different perspectives from participants; and considered even those perspectives that were contrary to my propositions (Patton, 1990; Bassey, 1999). Actual words spoken by participants were used to avoid subjectivity (Sections 4.3.2.1 to 4.3.2.8). This helped to enhance, not only of the authenticity and conformability of the findings but also the credibility and dependability of the research process; rendering it trustworthy.

5.10 Future research

My immersion into the research process has inspired me to take my research initiative to the next level. I now intend to conduct research and publish the findings in educational journals run by local universities. The research will be focusing on teacher education issues.

5.10.1 About teaching and learning

Research findings of this study show that the area of teaching and learning needs to be researched (Section 4.3.2.1). The findings of this study demonstrate that there is need; not only to investigate lecturers’ pedagogical beliefs but also to investigate their knowledge about how best can students learn.

Literature shows that at heart of lecturers' pedagogical choices and practices lay their beliefs about how students learn (Biggs and Tang, 2007; Kimber, 1998). In this study the research findings show that lecturers, while they appreciated that student learn in many different ways; and that they can acquire knowledge from other sources other than the lecturer; it was the lecturer who was the main source of knowledge (Sections 4.3.2.2 and 4.3.2.3). Essentially, this means that the teacher gives knowledge to the learner and the learner receives that knowledge from the teacher. This is a traditional, teacher-centred, and possibly, a behaviourist view of learning (Prichard, 2009; Muijis' 2007). Participants shared this view. There is need, therefore, for future research, to target, not only lecturers, beliefs, but also their knowledge that supports students' learning. The future research that I intend conducting will focus on lecturers' understanding of the learning theories continuum; and how, equipped with this understanding, lecturers can support students learning.

The research findings (Section 4.3.2.1) showed that while lecturers' teaching approaches and pedagogical practice can incorporate both the traditional teacher-centred and the interactive, leaner-centred approaches, participants preferred the traditional teacher-centred approach (lecture method) either to save time or because they believed it was the effective way of teaching: delivering knowledge to the learner. The implication here is that, maybe lecturers are not equipped with current research knowledge, not only about learning theories continuum, but also about how best students learn.

For example, the views about the teacher held by Ignatius, Keith , Marko, Khoza and Dubs, as literature shows, are traditional beliefs about the role of the teacher in the classroom (Prichard, 2009; Phipps and Borg, 2009; Muijis, 2007). What is even clearer is that these participants' beliefs about the teacher and how students learn are not consistent. For example, the participants (Bongani, James Keith, Newman) who earlier on (Table 4.3) expressed traditionalist teacher-centred views about the role of the teacher and of how students learn, but later on expressed the contemporary, progressive learner-centred views (FGD). For example, on Table 4.3, the participants (Khoza, Keith, Marko, and Newman) believe that the teacher should play an active and controlling role, but during the focus group discussion (Table 4.5) they expressed the contemporary, progressive learner-centred views.

Future research, it is hoped, will help fill an existing knowledge gap about lectures' understanding of learning theory continuum. Before this study, no other study was conducted at the site to explore and find out about the link between lecturers' understanding of the learning theory continuum; and how best lecturers can use this knowledge to support student learning.

5.10.2 Assessment for teaching and learning in teacher educations colleges.

In this study, (Section 5.6.1.1.3) what stood out very clearly is the need for lecturers to understand purposes of assessment; and to link the new knowledge about

alternative forms of assessment to their pedagogical practices. Lecturers' understanding of the essence of assessment, as articulated by current research literature, is very crucial if assessment practices are to support student learning (Carless, 2003; McKellar, 2002; Aikenhead, 1997).

This evidence from this study (Sections 5.6.1.1.3) suggests that the College's traditional assessment (summative) practice is the preferred form of assessment. Although participant some lecturers were aware of alternative forms of assessment that can support student learning, others appeared to lack the understanding that assessment ought to be an integral part of teaching and learning. Those who appreciated that assessment can play a significant role in the teaching and learning process were adamant that College authorities and other stake holders would not support the idea of alternative forms of assessment.

Participant lecturers' views are succinctly articulated:

> **"**Informally, yes it should play a role. But our system of assessment discourages classroom assessment. Only assessment that generates a mark that counts at the end of the course. --- Oh yes, students can assess themselves or assess each other. This, of course, is for learning purposes. However such assessment has no room in our system" (Keith; IDI)

> "--- to me (and to students perhaps) assessment is meaningless unless the mark counts towards a final mark that determines whether or not the student passes the course" (James; IDI).

In my future research I will target the College culture of assessment, with the view to using the evidence to reinvigorate or re-boot (Kaplan and Owings, 2013) it so that it

embraces new knowledge about alternative forms of assessment that improve and support student learning. It is critical that both lecturers, college authorities, parents and other stakeholders understand new knowledge, principles and purposes of assessment. My future research will, therefore, target the current assessment system, to investigate whether it a fair system for all students.

The research will also investigate how teacher educators can, collaboratively and actively, be involved in developing of the assessment system that improves and supports student learning. The research will also investigate how the broad education community, drawing from their knowledge, can be involved in developing this kind of assessment system. In my future research, I intend to also investigate ways of how the assessment reports or feedback can be communicated, not only regularly but also clearly to students, parents and other stakeholders. This research will also seek to develop mechanisms of how the assessment system can be evaluated or reviewed and improved so that; in the face of changing circumstances and new knowledge, the system can adapt.

5.10.3 The tension between the College's culture and new research knowledge

The other area that I will target in my further research is the College culture as a constraining factor to embracing new research knowledge. Evidence from this study shows that, while lecturers would want to do things differently, (Sections 4.3.2.1 to 4.3.2.5); for example: use learner-centred approaches in the classroom; and make

assessment an integral part of a teaching learning process, but, the College culture was a constraining factor. During focus group discussion, one participant, James, put it this way:

> **"**I think we need to appreciate where we are coming from. I think our system simply does not allow facilitation in a teaching/learning process. We are coming from a tradition; we are a product of a tradition of teaching where the teacher is expected to teach; she or he has to deliver the goods, come exam time" (FGD).

According to James, in concurrence with his participant colleagues, the College culture is a barrier, standing in the way of pedagogical practices informed by research knowledge. My future research will, therefore, seek to investigate how the College culture can be reinvigorated and reshaped so that it is responsive to new research knowledge that supports students' learning. According to Kaplan and Owings (2013: 4) the organization's culture;

> "May be understood as a holistically transmitted cognitive framework of shared but taken-for-granted assumptions, values, norms, and actions- stable long-term beliefs and practices about what organization members think is important."

It is this culture which gives the College its identity i.e. its persona. My future research will seek to unmask the College's persona; with the view to discussing it with lecturers, college authorities and other stakeholders. My research will seek to explore and understand those aspects of College culture that stand in the way of improving students' learning. Using "action research approach"; the process of unmasking the college's culture through active involvement of all stakeholders is crucial because, as culture is the persona of the organization, it affects

relationships, expectations, and practices among all stakeholders (Hoy, 1990). Unless lecturers and College administrators, in particular; and other stakeholders, in general, through active involvement, closely examine, clarify and redefine their assumptions and beliefs, in the light of new research knowledge, reinvigorating college culture will be “an exercise in futility and frustration” (Reeves, 2006: 90). Meaningful and enduring college cultural change begins with lecturers, administrators, students and other stakeholders (Christensen et al, 2006). My future research, will therefore, engage all stakeholders in the process of consciously and deliberately identifying their underlying assumptions and beliefs; examining publicly (through workshops) how their assumptions and beliefs and practices support or hinder new research knowledge that improve students’ learning. The research will seek to challenge those assumptions, beliefs and practices that are incompatible; and replace them with those that are compatible.

5.10.4 Lecturers’ professional practice

In this study, research findings also show that lecturers lack the ability to link new research knowledge with practice (Section 4.3.2.6).It is my considered view, arising from conducting this study, that future research should be conducted, also, to focus on professional practice of lecturers; investigating how teacher educators can engage research knowledge to inform professional practice. As the issue of linking theory to practice remains problematic in teacher education, (Korthagen, 2001; Korthagen and Kessels, 1999), such studies can initiate active debate on how to address this problematic area.

5.10.5 Trailblazing and embracing reform agendas

My immersion in the research process stimulated a feeling in me that future research needs be conducted to find out how college Principals, as chief executives of teacher education colleges, together with Heads of departments, can proactively lead reform agendas that focus on professional practice; and be open-minded to embrace research knowledge that will inform professional practice; and improve students' learning. My future research will, therefore, target this area; investigating how, as educational leaders, teacher education administrators, can take the lead and responsibility to reinvigorate the culture of their college. It is hoped that such a research study can stimulate debate of how best, not only to link research knowledge or theory to professional practice to enhance students' learning, but also to professionalize teacher education.

5.11 Concluding remarks

The completion of this study, for me, marks the beginning of yet another long journey of research. The late President of South Africa, Nelson Mandela, once said in one of his many timelessly inspirational statements: "When you climb a mountain and reach its peak, it is only then that you realize there are other mountains that you haven't climbed" (Televised Obituary of Nelson Mandela's funeral, January, 2014). To me the completion of this study is like reaching the peak of the 'academic' mountain. I now realize that there are other 'academic' mountains to be climbed:

there is so much to research about in education, in general; and in teacher education, in particular.

REFERENCES

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998) Constructivism In Teacher Education: Considerations For Those Who Would Link Practice To Theory. ERIC Digest Clearing House on 'Teaching And Teacher Education'. Washington.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1997) A Framework For Reflecting On Assessment And Evaluation. Paper presented at the Globalization of Science: International Conference on Science Education, pp. 195- 199. Seoul, Korea. May 26-30, 1997.

Akerlind, G. S. (2004) A New Dimension To Understanding University Teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education,* 3(9), pp. 363-375.

Allen, M. J. (2004) Assessing Academic Programs In Higher Education. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

American Council on Education, (1999) To Touch The Future: Transforming The Way Teachers Are Taught: An American Agenda For Colleges And University Presidents. ACE Fulfilment Service: Washington.

Anderson, J. R. (2000) Cognitive Psychology And Its Implications. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

Arenas, E. (2009) How Teachers' Attitudes Affect Their Teaching Approaches To Teaching International Students. *Higher Education Research And Development,* 28(6), ppp. 615-618.

Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0729436093208096

[Accessed: 15/05/10]

Argyris, C. and Schon, D. (1974). Theory In Practice. Increasing Professional Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C. (1993) Knowledge For Action. A Guide To Overcoming Barriers To Organizational Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ashcroft, K. and Griffiths, M. (1989). Reflective Teachers And Reflective Tutors: School Experience In An Initial Teacher Education Course. *Journal Of Education For Teaching*, 15(1), pp. 35-52.

Ashworth, P. and Lucas, U. (2000) Achieving empathy and engagement: a practice approach to the design, conduct and reporting of phenomenographic research*. Studies in Higher Education, 25, 295-308.*

Atkin, J. (1996) From Values And Beliefs About Learning To Principles And Practice.

Available at: www.learningtolearn.sa.edu.au./tfel/files/links/atkins_valuesbeliefs.pdf

[Accessed: 20/03/13]

Ayres, D. (2014). Defining Case Study Research.

Available at http://danieljayres.blogsspot.co.uk/

[Accessed: 18/05/16.]

Ballantyne, J. (2005) "An Analysis Of Current Reform Agendas In Preservice Teacher Education in Queensland". In E. McWilliam; S. Danby and J. Knight (Eds*). Performing Educational Research: Theories, Methods And Practices.* Post Pressed, Flaxton, Queensland, Australian, pp. 265-276.

Bandura, A. (1986) Social Foundation Of Thought And Action: A Social Cognitive Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997) Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Banks, J. A. (1998) The Lives And Values Of Researchers: Implications For Educating Citizens In A Multicultural Society. *Educational Researcher*, 27, pp. 4-17.

Barnard, K., Muthwa-Kuen, T. and Grimmet (1997) Getting The Question Right: Reforming Teacher Education in America. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Barnett, R. (1994) The Limits Of Competence. Buckingham: SRHE.

Barry, C. A. (1998) Choosing Qualitative Data Analysis Software: Atlas And Nudist Compared. London: Sage.

Bassey, M. (1999) Case Study In Educational Settings. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Baxter, P. and Jack, S. (2008) Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design And Implementation For Novice Researchers. *The qualitative Report* 13, (4) pp. 554-559.

Becker, H. J. and Riel, M. M. (1999) Teacher Professionalism And The Emergence Of Constructivist-compatible Pedagogies. (Teaching, Learning And Computing-1998) National Survey, Special Report.) Centre For Research On Information Technology And Organizations, University Of California, Irvine.

Benjamin, W. (2002.) The Arcades Project. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Harvard.

Bennet, N., Dunne, E. and Carre, C. (1999) "Patterns Of Core And Generic Skill Provision In Higher Education". *Higher Education,* 37(1), pp. 71-93.

Available at http://www.bera.ac.uk/blog/category/publications/guidelines/ [Accessed: 15/12/13]

Berg, D. N. and Smith, K. K. (Eds.). (1988) The Self In Social Inquiry: Research Methods. Newbury Park, CA: sage.

Berger, P. L. and Luckman, T. (1967) The Social Construction Of Reality: A Treatise In The Sociology Of Knowledge. New York: Anchor Press.

Bernard, H. R. (2006) Research Methods In Anthropology. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Biggs, S. and Tang, C. (2007) Quality Teaching For Quality Learning At University. Berkshire, England: Open University.

Bingimlas, K. and Hanrahan, M. (2010) "The Relationship Between Teachers' Beliefs And Their Practice: How The Literature Can Inform Science Education reformers and researchers". In M. F. Tasar and G. Cackmakci (Eds.). *Contemporary Science Education Research: international perspectives* (pp.415-422).

Black, P. and Wiliam, D. (1998) Assessment And Classroom Learning. *Assessment in Education,* pp. 5 (1) 7-74.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B. and Wiliam, D. (2003) Assessment for Learning: Putting it into practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blenkin, G. M. (1992) Change And The Curriculum. London: Paul Chapman.

Bloomberg, L. D. and Volpe, M. (2008) Completing Your Qualitative Dissertation: A Roadmap From Beginning To End. USA: Sage Publications.

Blumberg, P. (2008) Developing Learner-Centred Teachers: A Practical Guide For Faculty. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Blumer, H. (1969) Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bogdan, R. and Biklen, S. K. (1982) Qualitative Research For education: An Introduction To Theory And Methods. Boston: Allan and Bacon.

Borg, M. (2004) 'The Apprenticeship Of Observation' *ELT Journal*, 58(3), pp.274-276. Oxford University Press.

Borg, S. (2011) 'The Impact In-service Teacher Education On Language Teachers' Beliefs'. *System,* 39: 370-380.

Borg, S. and Al-Busaidi, S. (2011) 'Teachers' Beliefs And Practices Regarding Learner Autonomy', *ELT Journal*, 59(4), pp 100-108.

Available at: www.doi:10.1093/elt/ccr065

[Accessed: 10/09/11]

Borko, H. and Shavelson, R. J. (1983) 'Speculations On Teacher Education: Recommendations From Research On Teachers' Ccognitions'. *Journal of Education For Teaching.* 9(3), pp.210-224.

Boud, D., Keogh, R. and Walker D. (1985) Reflection: Turning Experience Into Learning. London: Cogan Page.

Boud, D. and Flachikov, N. (2006) 'Aligning Assessment With Long Term Learning', *Assessment And Evaluation In Higher Education,* 31 (4), pp.399-413.

Boud, D. (1995) Enhancing Learning through Self-Assessment. London: Kogan Page.

Boud, D. (2000) Sustainable Assessment, Rethinking Assessment For The Learning Society. London: Kogan Page.

Boulton-Lewis, G. M. (2004) 'Conceptions Of Teaching And Learning At School And University: Similarities, Differences, Relationships And Contextual Factors'. *European Journal of school psychology,* 21(1-2), pp.. 19-38.

Bransford, J.; Brown, A. and Cocking, A. (1999) How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, And School.

Available at: http://stills.nap..edu/htm/howpeoplel/
[Accessed: 03 /06/12].

Briggs, J. (1970) Never In Anger: Portrait Of An Eskimo. Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press.

British Educational Research Association (2004) 'Revised Ethical Guidelines For Educational Research'.

Broadfoot, P. M. (1996) Education, Assessment And Society: A sociological Analysis. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Brookfield, S. (1995) Becoming A Critically Reflective Teacher. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Brooks, J. G. and Brooks, M. (1993) In Search of Understanding: The Case For Constructivist Classroom. VA: ASCD.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., and Duguid, P. (1989) 'Situated Cognition And The Culture Of Learning'. *Educational Researcher*, *8, p. 321- 42.*

Brown, S. and Glasner, A. (eds). (1999) Assessment Matters In Higher Education: Choosing And Using Diverse Approaches. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University.

Brownlee, J. (2003) 'Paradigm Shifts In Pre-service Teacher Education Students: Case Studies Of Changes In Epistemological Beliefs'. *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 3, pp. 1-6.

Bruner, J. (1999) 'Folk Pedagogies'. In Leach, J. and Moon, B. (eds) *Learners and Pedagogy.* Open University Press/ Chapman.

Bryman, A. (2008) Social Research Methods (3rd edn). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buchberger, F.; Campos, B. P.; Kalklos, J. and Stephenson, J. (eds.), (2000) Green Paper on Teacher Education in Europe: High Quality Teacher Education And Training. Thematic Network On Teacher Education In Europe. Umea, Sweden.

Burns, N. and Grove, S. K. (2005) The Practice Of Nursing Research: Conduct, Critique, And Utilization. (5th edn) USA: Elsevier Saunders.

Burns, R. (1999) Introduction To Research Methods (4th edn), London: Sage.

Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological Paradigms And organizational Analysis: Elements Of The Sociology Of Corporate Life. London: Heinemann.

Calderhead, J. (1981) 'Stimulated recall: A Method of Research on Teaching'. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *51, pp. 211-217.*

Calderhead, J. (1991) 'The nature and growth of knowledge in student teaching'. *Teaching and teacher education*, 7(1), pp.1-8.

Calderhead, J. and Gates, P. (1993) Conceptualizing Reflection In Teacher Development. London: Falmer Press.

Calderhead, J. and Robson, M. (1992) 'Images Of Teaching: Student Teachers' Early Conceptions Of Classroom Practice'. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7(1)* pp.*1-8.*

Calderhead, J. (1996) 'Teachers's Beliefs And Knowledge'. In D. C. Berliner and R. C. Calfee (eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology (pp. 709-725)*. New York: Simon & Shuster.

Cannella, G.S. & Reiff, J.C. (1994) 'Individual Constructivist Teacher Education: Teachers As Empowered Learners'*. Teacher Education Quarterly*, 21 (3), pp.27-38.

Carless, D. (2003) Learning-oriented Assessment. Paper presented at the Evaluation and Assessment Conference, Adelaide, South Australia, November 24-25, 2003.

Carr, W, and Kemmis, S. (1986) Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge And Action Research. London: Falmer Press.

Carter, C. (1990) 'Teachers' Knowledge And Learning To Teach': In W. R.Houston, *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York: MacMillan.

Casebeer, A. L. and Verhoef, M. J. (1997) 'Combining Qualitative And Quantitative Research Methods: Considering The Possibilities For Enhancing The Study Of Chronic Diseases'. *Chronic Diseases in Canada*, 18(3), pp. 1-11.

Available at; Http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/cdc-mcc/18-3/d-e.html [Accessed: 1/6/2009]

Charmaz, K. (2003) 'Grounded Theory: Objectivist And Constructivist Methods'. In N.K.Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials, pp.*249-291. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Checkland, P. and Scholes, J. (1990) Soft Systems Methodology In Action. Chichester: Wiley and Sons.

Chivore, B. R. S. (1992) Preservice Education At A Distance: The Case Of Zimbabwe. In P. Murphy and A. Zishiri (eds). Distance Education In Anglophone. Africa: Experience With Secondary Education And Teacher Training. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Christensen, C., Marx, M., and Stevenson, H. H. (2006) 'The Tools Of Cooperation And Change'. *Harvard Business Review,* 84(10), pp. 72-80.

Clandinin, D. J. and Connolly, F. M. (1987) 'Teacher's Personal Knowledge: What Counts As Personal In Studies Of The Personal'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *19(6), pp. 487-500.*

Clark, C. M. (1988) 'Asking The Right Questions About Teacher Preparation: Contributions Of Research On Teacher Thinking'. *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), pp. 5-12.

Clark, C. M. and Peterson, P. L. (1986) 'Teachers' Thought Process'. In M. C. Wittrock (ed), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. New York: Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). 'Reforming Teacher Education: Competing Agendas'. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(4), .pp. 263-265.

Cohen, L. Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) Research Methods In Education. (5th edn), London: Routledge Falmer.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2002) Research Methods In Education. London: Routledge.

Coll, R. K. and Chapman, R. (2000) Choices Of Methodology For Cooperative Education Researchers. *Asia-Pacific Journal Of Cooperative Education*, 1(11), pp. 1-8.

Available at: http://www.apjce.org/volume-1/volume-1-1-pp-1-8.
[Accessed 20/09/07].

Collins, A., Brown, J. S. and Holum, A. (1991) Cognitive Apprenticeship: Making Thinking Visible: 21st Century Learning Initiative.

Available at: http://www.21learn.org.
[Accessed: 04/21/08].

Coupal, L. V. (2003) 'Resolving The Ethical Dilemmas Of Practitioner-Researchers'. Draft paper for submission to *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research.*

Cousins, C. (2002) 'Getting To The "Truth"'. Issues In Contemporary Qualitative Research'. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning,* 42, pp.192-204.

Cresswell, J. W. (1994) Research Design: Qualitative And Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Cresswell, J. (2005) Educational Research: Planning, Conducting And Evaluating Quantitative And Qualitative Research. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Crotty, M. (1998) The Foundations Of Social Research: Meaning And Perspective In The Research Process. London: Allen and Unwin.

Cuban, L. (1993) How Teachers Taught: Constancy a
And Change In American Classrooms: 1880-1990. New York: Teachers Colleges Press.

Cunningham, J.B. (1993) Action Research And Organisational Development. London: Praeger.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990) 'Instructional Policy Into Practice: The Power Of

The Bottom Over The Top'. *Educational Evaluation And Policy Analysis.* , 12(3),

pp. 233-241.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995) 'Changing Conceptions Of Teaching And Teacher Development'. *Teacher Education Quarterly, Fall 1995.*

Available at: www.teqjournal.org/backvols/1995/22_4/F95_darling%20hammond.pdf

[Accessed: 05/11/12]

Darling-Hammond, L., Ancess, J., and Falk, B. (1995) Authentic a Assessment In Action: Studies Of Schools And Students At Work. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dart, L. and Drake, P. (1993) 'School-based Teacher Training: A Conservative Practice*?'* *Journal of Education For Teachers.* 19(2), pp. 175-189*.*

Day, C. (1999) Developing Teachers: Challenges Of Lifelong Learning. London: Falmer Press.

Day, C., Fernandez, A., Hauge, T., Moller, J. (eds), (2000). The Life And Work Of Teachers: International Perspectives In Changing Times. London: Falmer.

Day, C. and Sachs, J. (Eds) (2004). International Handbook On Continuing Professional Development Of Teachers. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Davies, C. (1999) Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide To Researching Selves And Others. London: Routledge.

Davis, J. (2001) 'Conceptual Change'. In M. Orey (ed): *Immerging Perspectives On Learning, Teaching And Technology.*

Available at: http://www.coe.uga.edu/epltt/conceptual change.htm.
[Accessed: 06/09/08]

Davis, O. L. (2003) 'Does Democracy In Education Still Live?' *Journal Of Curriculum And Supervision*. 19(1), pp. 1- 4.

Dove, L. A. (1986) Teacher And Teacher Education In Developing Countries. London: Groom Helm.

DE Jong, J., Korthagen, F. and Wubbels, T. (1998) 'Learning From Practice In Teacher Education'. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 4(1), pp.47-64.

Denicolo, P. and Pope, M. (1990) 'Adult Learning- Teachers Thinking'. In C. Day, M. Pope and P. Denicolo (eds), Insight *Into Teachers' Thinking and Practice*. London: Falmer.

Denicolo, P. and Pope, M. (2001) Transformative Professional Practice: Personal Construct Approaches To Educational Research. London: Whurr.

Denscombe, M. (1998) The Good Research Guide For Small-Scale Social Research projects. Philadelphia, Open University.

Denzin, N. K. (1986) Interpretive Biography. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1994) Handbook Of Qualitative Research. London: Sage.

Denzin N. K. and Lincoln, Y S. (2003) The Landscape Of Qualitative Research. London: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2011) The SAGE Handbook Of Qualitative Research. London: Sage.

Desforges, C. (1995). 'How Does Experience Affect Theoretical Knowledge For Teaching?' *Learning and instruction*, 5, pp. 385-400.

DeWalt, K. and DeWalt, B. (2011) Participant Observation: A Guide For Fieldworkers (2nd edn.). Lanham. M D: Altamire Press.

Dilts, R. B. (1999) Sleight Of Mouth: The Magic Of Conversational Belief Change. Capitola, CA: Meta Publications.

Dube, E. S. (ed) (2011) 'Hillside Teachers' College: Five (5) Year Development Strategic Plan' (2011-2014).

Durant-Law, G. (2005) 'Soft Systems Methodology And Grounded Theory Combined: A Knowledge Management Research Approach*?' Journal of Knowledge Management*, 2(1) p.1-22. Proceedings of the act KM Sixth Annual Conference, 2005:

Available at: www.actkm.org
[Accessed: 17/10/13

Eisner, E W. (1991) The Enlightened Eye: Qualitative And The Enhancement Of Educational Practice. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Eisenhart, M. A.; Shrum, J. L.; Harding, J. R.; and Cuthbert, A. M. (1988) 'Teacher Beliefs: Definitions, Findings, And Directions'. *Educational Policy,* 2(1), pp.51-70.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989) 'Building Theories From Case Study Research'. *Academy of Management Review*, 444 (4) pp. 532- 550.

Elbaz, F. (1983) Teacher Thinking: A Study Of Practical Knowledge. London: Croom Helm.

Ennis, C. (1994) 'Knowledge And Beliefs Underlying Curricular Expertise'. *Quest*, 46 (2), pp.164-175.

Entwistle, N. J. and Entwistle, D. M. (2001) The Interplay Between Memorizing And Understanding In Preparing For Examination. Paper presented at the 9th Conference of the European Association for Research into Learning and instruction. Fribourg, Switzerland.

Ewert, G. D. (1991) 'Habermas And Education: A Comprehensive Overview Of The Influence Of Habermas In Educational Literature'*. Review Of Educational Research,* 61, pp. 345-378.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990) 'Conceptual Orientation In Teacher Education'. In W. R. Houston (ed), *Handbook of Research On Teacher Education*. New York: Macmillan.

Feiman-Nemser and Floden, R. (1986) 'The Cultures Of Teaching'. In M. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook Of Research On Teaching* (pp. 505-526). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Feiman-Nemser, S., McDiarmid, G., Melnick, S. and Parker, M. (1987) 'Changing Beginning Teachers' Conceptions: A Description Of An Introductory Teacher Education Course'. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Felder, R. M. and Brent, R. (2009) 'Active Learning: An Introduction'. *ASQ Higher Education Brief, August, 2009.*

Fenstermacher, G. T. (1994) 'The Knower And The Known: The Nature Of Knowledge In Research On Teaching'. In L. Darling-Hammond, (ed), *Review of Research in Education*, 20, (pp. 3- 56).

Festinger, L. (1957) A Theory Of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fielding, N. G. and Lee, R. M. (1991) Using Computers In Qualitative Research. London: Sage.

Fish, D. (1989) Learning Through Practice In Initial Teacher Training: A Challenge For The Partners. Great Britain: Arnold.

Fitts, P.M. and Posner, M. I. (1967) Human Performance. Belmont, CA: Brooks Cole.

Fives, H. and Buehl, M. M. (2008) 'What Do Teachers Believe? Developing A Framework For Examining Beliefs About Teachers' Knowledge And Ability'. *Contemporary Educational Psychology,* 33(2), pp. 60-71.

Flachicov, N. (2005) Improving Assessment Through Student Involvement. London: Routledge.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006) 'Five Misunderstandings About Case Study Research'. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 12(2), pp.219-245.

Fogelman, K. (2002) 'Surveys And Sampling'. In M. Coleman and A. Briggs *Research Methods In Educational Leadership And Management*. London: Sage.

Fosnot, C. T. (1996) 'Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning'. In C. T. Fosnot (ed), *My Account Constructivism: Theory, Perspectives, And Practice*. New York: Teachers College.

Freebody, P. (2003*)* Qualitative Research In Education: Interaction And Practice. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Freebody, P. (2003) Qualitative Research In Education. London: Sage.

Freeman, D. (1993) 'Renaming Experience/Reconstructing Practice: Developing New Understanding For Teaching'. *Teaching And Teacher Education,* 9(5-6), pp. 485-497.

Fullan, M. (1991) The New Meaning Of Educational Change, London: Cassell.

Fullan, M. (1997) The Challenge Of School Change. Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.

Fullan, M. (2000) 'The three stories of education reform'. *Phi Delta,* 81 (8), pp. 581-590.

Furlong, J. and Maynard, T. (1995) Mentoring Student Teachers: The Growth Of

Professional Knowledge. London: Routledge.

Garrick, J. and Rhodes, C. (2000) 'Legitimizing knowledge at work'. In J. Garrick, and C. Rhodes, (2000) (eds), Research and Knowledge at Work:

Perspectives, Case-Studies And Innovative Strategies, *(pp 1-7).* London: Routledge .

[Accessed through the UoN Online Catalogue].

Geertz, C. (1988) Works and Lives: The Anthropologist As Author. Cambridge: Polity.

Gibbons, T. and Sanderson, G. (2002) 'Contemporary Themes In The Research Enterprise'. *International Education Journal*. 3,(4), pp. 1-21

Gibbs, G. (1999) 'Using assessment strategically to change the way students learn'. In S. Brown and A. Glasner (eds), *Assessment Matters In Higher Education: Choosing And Using Diverse Approaches.* Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Gibson, J. J. (1979) The Ecological Approach To Visual Perception. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gillham, B. (2000) Case Study Research Methods. London: Continuum.

Gill, J. and Johnson, P. (2002*)* Research Methods For Managers (3rd edn), London: Sage.

Gitlin, A. and Russell, R. (1994). 'Alternative Methodologies And The Research Context'. In A. Gitlin (Ed), *Power and Method. Political activism and educational research* (pp 181-202), London: Routledge.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992) Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction. New York: Longman.

Gobo, G. (2004) 'Sampling, Representativeness, And Generalisability'. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium and D. Silverman (eds) *Qualitative Research Practice* (pp.435-456). London: Sage*.*

Godden, D. R. and Baddeley, A. D. (1975) 'Context-Dependent Memory In Two Natural Environments: On Land and Under water'. *British Journal Of Psychology, 66, pp. 325-331.*

Golafshani, N. (2003) 'Understanding Reliability and Validity In Qualitative Research'. *The Qualitative Report,* 8(4), pp. 597-607.

Available at: http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-4/golafshani.pdf
[Accessed: 13/08/12]

Golombek, P. R. (1998) 'A Study Of Language Teachers' Personal Practical Knowledge'. *TESOL Quarterly,* 32(3), pp.447-464.

Goodlad, J. I. (1992) 'Democracy, Education And Community'. In R. Soder (ed). *Democracy, Education, and the Schools*. (pp. 87- 124). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990) Teacher For The Nation's Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodman, J. (1988) 'Constructing A Practical Philosophy Of Teaching. A Study Of Preservice Teachers' Professional Perspectives'. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 4, pp. 121-137.

Gorard, S. (2001) Qualitative Methods In Educational Research: The Role Of Numbers Made Easy. London: Continuum.

Gore, J. M. and Zeichner, K.M. (1991) 'Action Research And Reflective Teaching In Preservice Teacher Education: A Case Study From The United States'. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 7(3), pp. 119 -136.

Grenfell, M. (1994) 'Alternatives To The Traditional Practicum: The Advent Of School-Based Teacher Preparation'. In B. Driscoll and W. Holloway (eds), *Building Bridges In Teacher Education.* Armidale: University of New England Printery.

Griffin, T. D. and Ohlsson, S. (2001) Beliefs vs. Knowledge: A Necessary Distinction For Predicting, Explaining And Assessing Conceptual Change. A paper presented at the 23rd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society: Edinburgh, Scotland.

Available at: http://tigger.uic.edu/~tgriffin/:
[Accessed: 15/09/,08.]

Griffiths, M. (1998) Educational Research For Social Justice: Getting Off The Fence. Buckingham.

Grimmett, P. P. and Mac Kinnon, A. M. (1992) 'Craft Knowledge And The Education Of Teachers', *Review of Research in Education.* 18, (pp. 385-456).

Grundy, S. (1987) Curriculum Theory: Product Or Praxis. Lewes: Falmer.

Guba, E G. (1981) 'Criteria For Assessing The Trustworthiness Of Naturalistic Inquiries', *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29, pp. 75-92.

Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Habermas, J. (1972) Knowledge And Human Interests (2nd edn). London: Heinemann.

Hamel, J. (1993) 'Case Study Methods'. *Qualitative Research Methods, Volume* 32 pp. 120-130. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hamilton, L. (2011) Case Studies In Educational Research. *British Educational Research Association.*

Available at: http://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/case-studies-in-educational-research.pdf
[Accessed: 07/05/13

Hamilton, L. (2013) Silence Does Not Sound The Same For Everyone: Student Teachers' Narratives Around Behaviour Management In Scottish Schools. London: Sage.

Hamilton, L. and Corbett-Whittier, C. (2012) Using Case Study In Educational Research. London:Sage.

Hamilton, P. (1973) Competence-Based Teacher Education. Melno, CA, Stanford Research and Statistics.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1995) Ethnography: Principles In Practice. London: Tavistock.

Hammersley, M. (1992) 'Deconstructing the qualitative-quantitative divide'. In J. Brannard (Ed), *Mixing methods: Qualitative And Quantitative Research*. Hants, England: Avebury Press.

Handal, B. (2003) 'Teachers' Mathematical Beliefs: A review'. *The Mathematics Educator,* 13(2), pp. 47-57.

Handal, G. and Lauvas, P. (1988) Promoting Reflective Teaching: Supervision Counselling. London: Sage.

Hargreaves, A. (1998) Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work And Culture In The Post-Modern Age. London: Casell.

Hertz, R. (1997) Reflexivity And Voice. London: sage.

Hill, H. C., Ball, D. L., and Schilling, S. G. (2008) 'Unpacking Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Conceptualizing And Measuring Teachers' Topic-Specific Knowledge Of Students'. *Journal for Research in Mathematic Education,* 39(4), pp. 372-4000.

Hinds, P. J., Patterson, M. and Pfeffer, J. (2001) 'Bothered By Abstraction: The Effect Of Expertise On Knowledge Transfer And Subsequent Novice Performance'. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 52(10), pp. 1115-1124.

Hitchcock, G. and Hughes, D. (1995) Research And The Classroom. London: Routledge.

Hopkins, D. (1996) 'New Rules For The Radical Reform Of Teacher Education'. In *Exploring Future in Initial Teacher Education*. London: Sage

Howe, R., and Lewis, R. (1993) A Student Guide To Research In Social Science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoy, W. K. (1990) 'Organizational Climate And Culture: A Conceptual Analysis Of The School Workplace'. *Journal Of Educational And Psychological Consultation,* 1(2), pp. 149-168.

Hunzicker, J, (2004) The Beliefs-Behaviour Connection: Leading Teachers Toward Change.

Available at: www.naesp.org
[Accessed: 03/ 06/ 08]

Hyland, T. (1995) 'Behaviourism And The Meaning Of Competence'. In P. Hodkinson and M. Issit (eds). *The Challenge Of Competence*. London: Cassell.

Jasman, A. (2002) 'Initial Teacher Education: Changing Curriculum, Pedagogies And Assessment'. Paper presented at the Challenging futures: Changing agendas in teacher education. Armidale.

Jegede, D., Taplin, M. and Chan, S. (1993) 'Trainee Tachers' Perceptions Of Their Knowledge About Expert Teaching'. *Educational research*, 42(3), pp. 287-308.

Jessup, G. (1991) Outcomes: NVQs And The Emerging Model Of Training. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Johnson, B. R. and Onuegbuzie (2004) 'Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come'. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), pp.14-26.

Johnson, P. and Duberley, J. (2003) Understanding Management Research: An Introduction To Epistemology. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Johnson, S. D. (1992) A Framework For Technology Education Curriculum Which Emphasizes Intellectual Processes. *Journal of Technology Education.* 3(2) pp. 35-52.

Kagan, D. M. (1992) 'Professional Growth Among Preservice And Beginning Teachers'. *Review of Educational Research*, 62, pp.129-169.

Kaplan, L. S. and Owings, W. A. (2013) Culture Re-Boot: Reinvigorating School Culture To Improve Students' Outcomes. London: Sage.

Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452277974.n1
[Accessed: 20/05/16]

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996) 'Using Attitude Scale To Investigate Teachers' Attitudes To The Communicative Approach'. *ELT Journal*, (50), pp. 187-198.

Kelly, G. (1995) The Psychology Of Personal Constructs. New York: Norton.

Kember, D. and Kwan, K. (2000) 'Lecturers' Approaches To Teaching And Their Relationship To Conceptions Of Good Teaching'. *Instructional Science. Special Issue: Teacher Thinking, Beliefs And Knowledge In Higher Education,* 28(5-6), pp. 469-490.

Kember, D., Kwan, K. and Ledesma, J. (2001) 'Conceptions Of Good Teaching And How They Influence The Way Adults And School Leavers Are Taught'. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 20(5), pp. 393-404.*

Keeves, J. (2002) Research In Education: Nature Impact, Needs And Priorities. London: Sage.

Kennedy, M. M. (1997) Defining An Ideal Teacher Education Program. Michigan: Michigan State University Press.

Kennedy, M. M. (1999) 'The Role Of pre-service Teacher Education'. In L. Darling-Hammond and G. Sykes (eds). *Teaching As The Learning Profession: Handbook of Teaching and Policy*. (pp. 54-86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kerry, T. and Mayes, A. S. (eds) (1995) Issues In Mentoring. London: Routledge.

Kimber, D. (1998) 'Teaching Beliefs And Their Impact On Students' Approaches To Learning'. In B. Dart and G. Bolton-Lewis (eds). *Teaching and learning in higher Education.* Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council For Educational Research.

Kinchloe, J. (2004) 'The Knowledge Of Teacher Education: Developing A Critical Complex Epistemology'*. Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), pp.49-66.

Koetting, R. and Malisa, M. (1998) 'Philosophy, Research And Education'. In W. C. Ayers and J. L. Miller (Eds*). A light In Dark Times: Maxine Green And The Unfinished Conversation.* New York: Teacher College Press.

Koetsier, C. P. and Wubbels, T. J. (1999) 'Bridging The Gap Between Initial Teacher Training And Teacher Induction'. *Journal of Education For Teaching: International Research And Pedagogy*. 21(.3) pp.333-346.

Kolb, D. and Fry, R. (1975) 'Towards An Applied Theory Of Experiential Learning'. In C. L. Cooper (ed.) *Theories Of Ggroup Processes*. New York: Wiley.

Kolb, D. (1985) Experiential Learning: Experience As A Source Of Learning And Development (2nd edn.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Korthagen, F. A. J. and Kessels, J. P. A. M. (1999) 'Linking Theory And Practice: Changing The Pedagogy Of Teacher Education'*. Educational Researcher*, 28(4), pp. 4-17.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2001) 'Linking Practice And Theory: The Pedagogy Of Realistic Teacher Education'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seatle, April, 2001.

Kreuger, R.A. (1988) Focus Groups: A Practical Guide For Applied Research. London: Sage.

Kreuger, R. A.; Casey, M. A. (2009) Focus Groups: A Practical Guide For Applied Research (4th edn). London: Sage.

Kroll, L.R and LaBosky, V.K. (1996) 'Constructivism: Constructivism In Teacher

Education'. *Action in Teacher Education,* 18 (2) pp.63-72.

Kroll, L. R. (2004) 'Constructing Constructivism: How Student Teachers Construct Ideas Of Development, Knowledge, Learning And Teaching'. In *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice.* 10(2), pp.160-172.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970) The Structure Of Scientific Revolutions, (2nd edn). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuzborska, I. (2011) 'Links Between Teachers' Beliefs And Practices And Research On Reading'. *Reading in Foreign Languages*, 23(1), pp. 102-128.

Kvale, S. (2007) Doing Interviews. Carlifonia:Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kvale, S. (1996) An Introduction To Qualitative Research Interviewing. London: Sage.

Kynigos, C. and Argyris, M. (2004) 'Teacher Beliefs And Practices Formed During An Innovation With Computer-Based Exploratory Mathematics In The Classroom'. *Teachers And Teaching: Theory And Practice, 1(3) June 2004.*

Labaree, R. V. (2002) 'The Risk Of "Going Observationalist": Negotiating Hidden Dilemmas Of Being And Insider Participant Observer'. *Qualitative Research*, 2, (1), pp. 7-122.

Lambert, D. and Lines, D. (2000) Understanding Assessment: Purposes, Perceptions, Practice. New York: Routledge

Landasheere, G. de (1999) 'History Of Educational Research'. In J.P. Keeves and G. Lamkomiski (eds), *Issues In Educational Research*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Lanier. E. and Little, J. W. (1986) 'Research On Teacher Education'. In M. C. Wittrock (ed.) *Handbook of Research On Teaching*. London: Macmillan.

Lapsley, D.K. (2002) Expert Engagement In Context: A Conceptual Framework For Professional Education. Executive Summary.

Available AT: http://www.bsu.edu/edpsych/article
[Accessed: 10/10/11]

Lau, J. and Chan, J. (2004) What Is Critical Thinking And Why Is It Important?

Available at: http://philosophy.hku.hk/think/critical/ct.php.
[Accessed: 15/05/08]

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) Situated Learning: legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leatham, K. (2006) 'Viewing Mathematics Teachers' Beliefs As Sensible Systems'. *Journal of Mathematics, Teacher Education* 9(2), pp. 91-1.2.

Lee, A., Green, B. and Brennan, M. (2000) 'Organizational Knowledge, Professional Practice And Knowledge At Work'. In J. Garrick and C. Rhodes (eds). *Research And Knowledge At Work: Perspectives, Case Studies And Innovative Strategies*. London: Routledge.

Leinhardt, G. (1988) 'Situated Knowledge And Expertise In Teaching. In J. Calderhead (ed). *Teachers' Professional Learning*. London: Falmer Press.

Leinhardt, G. (1992) 'What Research On Learning Tells Us About Teaching?' *Educational Leadership,* 49(7), pp. 20-25.

Lincoln, Y, and Guba, E. (1985) Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Linn, R. and Gronlund, N. (1995) Measurement And Assessment In Teaching. (7th edn). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Liston, D. P. and Zeichner, K.M. (1990) 'Reflective Teaching And Action Research In Preservice Teacher Education'. *Journal of Education for Teaching,* Vol.16(3), pp.235-254.

Lofland, J. and Lofland, L. H. (1984) Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide To Qualitative Observation And Analysis (2nd edn.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth publishing Co.

Lomax, P. (2002) 'Action Research'. In M. Coleman and A. Briggs. *Research Methods In Educational Leadership And Management*. London: Sage

Lortie, D. (1975) School Teacher: A Sociology Study. London: University of Chicago Press.

Lucas, C.J. (1997) An Essay Review Of Teacher Education In America: Reform Agendas For The Twenty-First Century. New York: St Martin's Press.

Luckett, K. and Sunderland, L. (2000) 'Assessment Practices That Improve Teaching And Learning'. In I. Makoni (Ed.) *Teaching And Learning In Higher Education: A Handbook For Southern Africa.* Johannesburg. Witwatersrand Press:

Lumpe, A.T., Haney, J. J. and Czeniak, C. M. (2000) 'Assessing Teachers' Beliefs About Their Science Context'. *Journal for Research in Science Teaching*, 37, pp. (275-292).

Lyle, J. (2003) 'Stimulated Recall: A Report On Its Use In Naturalistic Research'. *British Educational Research Journal,* 29 (6) pp. 861- 878.

Maclellan, E. (2005) 'Conceptual Learning: The Priority For Higher Education'. *British Journal Of Educational Studies, 53(2), pp. 129-147.*

Magolda, M. B. and Terenzini, P. (1998) 'Learning And Teaching In The 21st Century: Trends And Implications For Practice'. In C. Johnson and H. Cheatham (eds). *Higher Education Trends For The Next Century: A Research Agenda For Student Success.*

Available at: http//www.acpa.nche.edu/seniorscholars/trends/trends.htm [Accessed: 15/04/10]

Maingay, P. (1988) 'Observation For Training, Development, Or Assessment?' In T. Duff, (ed.). *Exploration In Teacher Training*. London: Longman.

Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) Research Methods In Education (5th edn). London: Routledge Falmer.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., and McNulty, B.A. (2005) School Leadership That Works: From Research To Results. Alexandria, VA: *Association For Supervision And Curriculum Development.*

Mauthner, N. S. and Doucet, A. (2003) 'Reflexive Accounts And Accounts Of Reflexivity in Qualitative Data Analysis'. *Sociology,* 37 (3). pp.150-162.

Maynard, T. (Ed) (1997) An Introduction To Primary Mentoring. London: Redwood.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1990) 'Challenging Prospective Teachers' Beliefs During Early Field Experience. A Quixotic Undertaking'. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), pp. 12-50.

McGregor, J. and Williamson, K. (2005) 'Appropriate Use Of Information At The Secondary School Level: Understanding And Avoiding Plagiarism'. *Library And Information Science research.* 27(4), pp. 496-512.

McNiff, J. (1986) Reflective Practice: From Transmitter Of Knowledge To Mediator Of Learning. London: Routledge.

McNiff, J. (1986). Personal And Social Education: A Teacher's Handbook. London: Routledge

McKellar, E. J. K (2002) Change Our Assessment Practices? Why Should We? The Theory Behind Assessment Practices. Paper presented at the Learning Communities and Assessment Cultures Conference organized by the EARLI Special Interest Group on Assessment and Evaluation, University of Northumbria, 28-30 August, 2002.

McWilliam, E. (2004) 'W(h)ither Practitioner Research?' *The Australian Educational Researcher,* Vol. 31(.2), pp.113-126.

Mehra, B. (2002) 'Bias In Qualitative Research: Voices From Online Classroom'. *The Qualitative Report*, 7 (1), pp. 210-220.

Merton, R. K. (1978) 'Insiders and outsiders: A Chapter In the Sociology of Knowledge'. *American Journal Of Sociology*, 78, pp.9-48.

Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., and Kendall, P.L. (1990) The Focused Interview: A Manual Of Problems And Procedures. (2nd edn). London: Collier MacMillan.

Miles, M. and Huberman, A. M. (1994) Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (2003) Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Source Book (2nd edn). Thousand oaks, CA: Sage.

Milne, C. and Taylor, P. (1995) 'Metaphors As Global Markers Of Teachers' Beliefs About The Nature Of Science'. *Research In Science Education*, 25 (1), pp. 39- 49.

Mirriam, S. B. (1988) Qualitative Research And Case Application In Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mirriam, S. B. (1999) Qualitative Research In Case Application In Education: Revised And Expanded From Case Study Research In Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mirriam, S. B. (2009) Qualitative Research: A Guide To Design And Implementation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mkabela, Q. (2005) 'Using The Afrocentric Method In Researching Indigenous African Culture'. *The Qualitative Report,* 10(1), pp. 178-189.

Morgan, D. L. (2007) 'Paradigms Lost And Pragmatism Regained: Methodological Implications Of Combining Qualitative And Quantitative Methods'. *Journal Of Mixed Methods Research,* 1(148), pp. 56-60.

Available at: http://mmr.sage.com/cgi/content/abstract/1/148
[Accessed: 02/02/09].

Morgan, D. L. (1997) Focus Groups As Qualitative Research. London: Sage

Morrison, M. (2002) 'What Do We Mean By Educational Research?' In M. Coleman and A. R. J. Briggs, (2002) (eds*).* R*esearch Methods In Educational Leadership And Management.* London: Paul Chapman.

Muijs, D. (2007) 'Understanding how pupils learn: Theories Of Learning And Intelligence'. In V. Brooks; I. Abbott and L. Bills (eds). *Preparing To Teach In Secondary Schools: A Student Teacher's Guide To Professional Issues In Secondary Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Munby, H. (1982) 'The Place Of Teachers' Beliefs In Research On Teacher Thinking And Decision Making, And An Alternative Methodology'. *Instructional science,* (11), pp. 201-225.

Munby, H. (1984) 'A Qualitative Approach To The Study Of A Teacher's Beliefs'. *Journal Of Research In Science Teaching, 21(1), pp. 27-38.*

Murphy, E. (2000) Strangers In A Strange Land: Teachers' Beliefs About Teaching And Learning French As A Second Or Foreign Language In Online Learning Environments. Unpublished PhD, Universite Laval, Quebec. (verified 12 July 2009).

Available: http://www.nald.ca/fulltext/stranger/cover.htm
[Accessed: 31/08/09

Murray, L. and Lawrence, B. (2005) Practitioner-Based Inquiry: Principles For Postgraduate Research. London: Falmer.

Muwanga-Zake, J. W. F. (2004) Experiences Of Power Of Discourse In Educational Research: A Need For Transformation In Educational Research Africa. A paper presented at the Southern Africa Association for Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education conference, Durban, Republic of South Africa.

Muyambelo, C. and Nyambe, J. (1999) Critical Inquiry Into Pre-Service Teacher Education. In K. Zeichner and L. Dahlstrom*, Democratic Teacher Education Reform In Africa: The Case Of Namibia.* Boulder: West View Press.

Myers, M. D. (1999) Ethnography Research Methods In Information Systems. London: Chapman Hall.

Nabudere, D. W. (2002) The Epistemological And Methodological Foundations For An All- Inclusive Research Paradigm For "Field Building" And Intersubjective Accommodation. Cape Town: Butterworth Press.

Nespor, J. (1987) 'The Role Of Beliefs In The Practice of Teaching'. *Journal Of Curriculum Studies,* 19(4) pp. 317-328. A Paper prepared for presentation at the field building workshop by Africa Study Centre, Mbale, in collaboration with the

Social Science Research Council, New York and the Harry Frank Guggeinheim Foundation, New York, USA.

Neuman, W. L. (2000) Social Research Methods: Qualitative And Quantitative Approaches. London: Allan and Bacon.

Norman, D. A. (1988) The Psychology Of Everyday Things. New York Basic Books.

Northcote, M. (2009) 'Educational Beliefs Of Higher Education Teachers And Students: Implications For Teacher Education'. *Australian Journal Of Teacher Education*, 34(1), pp. 69-81.

Norton, L., Richardson, J. T. E., Hartley, J. Newstead, S. and Mayes, J. (2005) 'Teachers' Beliefs And Intentions Concerning Teaching In Higher Education'. *Higher Education*, 50, p. 537-571.

Novik, L. R. (1988) 'Analogical Transfer Problem, Similarity, And Expertise'. *Journal Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, And Cognition*. 14(3), pp. 510-520.

Nuttal, D. (1987) 'The Validity Of Assessments'. *European Journal Of Psychology Of Education,* 11(2), pp. 109-118.

Oberle, K. (2002) 'Ethics In Qualitative Health Research'. *Annals RCPSC, 35(8) pp. 563-566.*

Olesen, V. (1979) 'Reform Of Professional Practice'. In G. Grant, P. Elbow, T. Ewens, Z. Gramson, W. Kohli, W. Neuman, V. Olesen, and D. Reisman (eds). *On Competence*. London: Jossey-Bass. pp. 199-223.

Pajares, M. F. (1992) 'Teachers' Beliefs And Educational Research: Cleaning Up A Messy Construct'. *Review of Educational research*, 62(3), pp. 307-332.

Pajares, F. (1993) 'Preservice Teachers' Beliefs: A Focus For Teacher Education'. *Action in Teacher Education,* 15(2), pp. 45-54.

Patton, M. Q. (1990) Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2002) Qualitative Research And Evaluation Methods (3rd edn). London: Sage.

Paul. R. (1990) Critical Thinking: What Every Person Peeds To Survive In A Rapidly Changing World. Fonhreart Park, CA: Centre for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, Sonoma State University.

Pecore, T. L. (2013) 'Beyond Beliefs: Teachers Adapting Problem-Based Learning To Preexisting Systems Of Practice'**.** *Interdisciplinary Journal Of Problem-Based Learning, 7(2), pp. 8-26.*

Pepper S. K. and Hare, D. (1999) 'Establishing Research-Based Knowledge In Teacher Education'. *Journal Of Research And Development in Education, 32 (2) pp.120 -130.*

Perkins, D. N. and Grotzer, T. A. (1997) 'Teaching Intelligence'. *American Psychologist,*. 52(10), pp.1115-1124.

Perkins, D. N. (2006). 'Constructivism And Troublesome Knowledge'. In J. H. F. Meyer and R. Land (eds). *Overcoming Barriers To Student Understanding: Threshold Concepts And Troublesome Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Perlberg, A., Kremer, L. and Lewis, R. (1979) 'Towards New Teacher Education Models'. *British Journal Of Teacher Education*, 5(3), pp.263-281.

Peterson, P. L., Fennan, E., Carpenter, T. P. and Loef, M. (1989) 'Teachers' Pedagogical Content Beliefs In Mathematics'. *Cognition and Instruction*, 6 (1) pp. 1-40.

Phipps, S. and Borg, S. (2009) 'Exploring Tensions Between Teachers' Grammar Teaching Beliefs And Practices'. *System,* 37(3), pp. 380-390.

Pickering, A. M. (2002) Becoming A University Lecturer: An Exploration Of The Pedagogic Beliefs And Practices Of Four Novice University Lecturers Enrolled On An In-Service Teaching Development Programme. Unpublished Ed. D. Thesis, Kings College, University of London.

Pickering, A. M. (2003) Factors Influencing The Pedagogic Development Of Novice University Lecturers: Findings From Research. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference. Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, 11-13 September, 2003.

Pintrich, P. R. (1990) 'Implications Of Psychological Research On Student Learning And College Teaching For Teacher Education'. In W. R. Houston (ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education (pp.826-857).* New York Macimillan.

Pope, M. and Denicolo, P. (2001) Transformative Education: Personal Construct Approaches To Practice And Research. London: Whurr.

Popper K. R. (2002) The Logic Of Scientific Discovery. London and New York (NY): Routledge.

Powell, R.R. (1996) 'Epistemological Antecedents To Culturally Relevant And Constructivist Classroom Curricula: A longitudinal Study Of Teachers' Contrasting World Views'. *Teaching And Teacher Education, 12(4), pp. 365-384.*

Prichard, A. M. (2009) Ways Of Learning: Learning Theories And Learning Styles In The Classroom' (2nd edn), London: David Fulton.

Pring, R. (2000) Philosophy Of Educational Research. London: Continuum.

Prosser, M. and Trigwell, K. (1999) Understanding Learning And Teaching. London, Society for Research Into Higher Education.

Pryor, C. R. (1998) Mentor Teacher/Student Teacher Response To European/American Influence On Democratic Practice: A Case Study Of A Professional Development School. Best paper award, Arizona Educational Research Organization, presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Rainer-Dangel, J. (2002) Constructivist Theory And Teacher Education: Programmatic Efforts And Effects. Paper presented at the Annual conference of the Association of Constructivist Teaching, Houston, TX.

Rainer, J. D. and Guyton, E. (2004) 'An Emerging Picture Of Constructivist Teacher Education'. *The Constructivist Fall,* 15(1), pp. 1-35.

Rainer, J. D. and Guyton, E. (1999) 'Democratic Practices In Teacher Education And The Elementary Classroom'. *Teaching And Teacher Education*, 15(9), pp. 121-132.

Rainer, J .D. and Guyton, E. (1999) 'From Issues To Action: Changing To A Constructivist Teacher Education Program'. *Journal Of Professional Studies*, 10(6), pp. 125-145.

Ramsey, G. (2000) Quality Matters. New South Wales. Department of Teacher Education and Training.

Raths, J. (1990). Teachers' Beliefs and Teaching Beliefs.

Available at: www.academia.edu./4562733/Teachers_Beliefs_

[Accessed: 21/03/11]

Raths, J. (2001) 'Teachers Beliefs And Teaching Beliefs'. *Early Childwood Reseach And Practice, 3(1), pp. 1-10.*

Available at:http://crp:uniuc.edu/v3n1/raths.html.

[Accessed: 05/10/01]

Raturi, S. and Boulton-Lewis, G, (20014) 'Shaping Lecturers' Beliefs About Teaching And Learning In Higher Education In The Pacific'. *Issues In Educational Research, 24(1), pp. 67-84.*

Available at: http://www.iier.org.au/iier24/raturi.html

[Accessed: 11/06/10]

Ravitz, J. L., Becker, H. J., Wong, Y. T. (2000) 'Constructivist-Compatible Beliefs And Practices Among U. S. Teachers'. *Teaching, Learning, and Computing: (1998) National Survey". Report No. 4.* Center for Research on Information Technology and Organizations: California.

Reeves, D. (2006) 'Leading To Change: How Do You Change School Culture*?' Educational Leadership, 64(4) pp. 92-94.*

Available at: www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/dec06/Vol

[Accessed: 24/05/16.]

Rennert-Ariev, P. (2005) 'A Theoretical Model For The Authentic Assessment Of teaching'. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation,* 10(2), pp. 1-11.

Review of Teacher Education in NSW (2000) Teacher Standards And Competencies: Issues Of Significance Canvassed In Submissions To New South Wales Review Of Teacher Education (as at February, 2000)

Available at: https://www.det.nsw.edu.au./teachrev/submiss/teachta.htm

[Accessed: 17/05/2008].

Richards, J. C.; Gallo, P. B.; Renandya, W. A. (2001) Exploring Teachers' Beliefs And The Processes Of Change. SEMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore.

Richardson, V. (1996) 'The Role Of Attitudes And Beliefs In Learning To Teach'. In Sikula, J., Buttery, T. and Guyton, E. (eds*). Handbook Of Research On Teacher Education.* (2nd edn), (pp. 102-119). London: Prentice Hall.

Richardson, V. (1999) 'Constructivist Teaching And Teacher Education: Theory And Practice'. In V. Richardson (ed). *Constructivist Teacher Education: Building New Understandings*, pp3-14. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Robson, C. (2002) Real World Research. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Robson, C. (2007) How To Do A Research Project. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Roberts, J. (1998) Language Teacher Education. London: Kogan Page.

Robertson, J. (2002) 'Reflexivity Redux: A Pithy Polemic On Positionality'. *Anthropological Quarterly,* 75, (4) pp. 785- 792.

Roehler, L. R., Duffy, G. G., Herrman, B. A., Conley, M.' and Johnson, J. (1988) 'Knowledge Structures As Evidence Of The 'Personal': Bridging The Gap From Thought To Practice'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 20, pp. 159-165.

Roesken, B. (2011) Hidden Dimensions In The Professional Development Of Mathematics Teachers. London: Sens Publishers.

Rokeach, M. (1968) Beliefs, Attitudes, And Values: A Theory Of Organization And Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rosaldo, R (2000) 'Grief And Headhunter's Rage'. In R. Jon McGee and R. L.Warms (eds) *Anthropological Theory* (2nd edn.) (pp. 521-535). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Rubin, H. J. and Rubin, I. S. (1995) Qualitative Interviewing: The Art Of Hearing Data. London: Sage.

Russell, T. (2007) 'How Experience Changed My Values As A Teacher Educator'. In T. Russell and N. Loughran (eds), *Enacting Pedagogy Of Teacher Education: Values, relationships and practices* (pp.182-191). London: Sage.

Sachs, J. (1997) 'Reclaiming The Agenda Of Teacher Professionalism: An Australian Experience'. *Journal of Education For Teaching: International Research And Pedagogy,* 23(3), pp. 263 -276.

Sachs, J. and Groundwater-Smith, S. (1999) 'The Changing Landscape Of Teacher Education In Australia'. *Teaching And Teacher Education,* 15, pp. 215-227.

Salzman, P. (2002) 'On Reflexivity'. *American Anthropologist*, 104 (3) pp.11-21.

Scholte, B. (1972) 'Towards a Reflexive and Critical Anthropology'. In D. Hymes (ed.) *Reinventing Anthropology*. pp. 430- 457. New York: Jossey-Bass.

Saljo, J. (1979) Learning In The Learner's Perspective. Gothenberg: University Press.

Samuelowicz, K. and Bain, J. (2001) 'Revisiting Academics' Beliefs About Teaching And Learning'. *Higher Education*, 41, pp. 299-325.

Samuelowicz, K. and Bian, J. (2002) 'Identifying Academics' Orientation To Assessment Practice'. *Higher education*, 43(2), pp. 173-201.

Sarantakos, S. (2005) Social Research (3rd edn). Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Schoenfield, A, H. (1998) 'Towards A Theory Of Teaching-In-Context'. *Issues In Education*, 4(1), pp. 1-94.

Schon, D. A. (1987) Educating The Reflective Practitioner: Toward A New Design For Teaching And Learning In The Professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schunk, D. (2003) Learning Theories: An Educational Perspective (4th edn). New York: Merrill.

Scott, G. (2003) 'Effective Change Management In Higher Education'. *EDUCAUSE review, November/December 2003, pp. 1-11.*

Scott, D. and Usher, R. (1999) Researching Education: Data Methods and Theory in Educational Enquiry. London: Continuum.

Shields, L. M., Pratt, J. and Hunter, J. (2006) 'Family-Centred Care: A review Of Qualitative Studies'. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* (15), pp. 1317-1323.

Shulman, L. (1986 'Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth In Teaching'. *Educational Research Review*, 57(1), pp. 4-14.

Shulz, R. (2005) 'The Practicum: More Than Practice'. *Canadian Journal Of Education,* 28(1&2), pp. 147- 167).

Shumba, O. (2004) Handbook Of The Department Of Teacher Education. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Press.

Silverman, D. (1993) Interpreting Qualitative Data. Methods For Analyzing Talk, Text And Interaction. London: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2000) Doing Qualitative Research. London: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2006) Interpreting Qualitative Data-Methods For Analyzing Talk, Text And Interaction (3rd edn). London: sage.

Siyakwazi, B. J. (1986) Report On The Teacher Education Review Committee. Harare: University of Zimbabwe.

Skinner, B. F. (1974) About Behaviourism. New York: Random House.

Smith, F. (1982) Understanding reading. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Wilson.

Smith, M. K. (2000). 'Curriculum Theory And Practice' *The Encyclopaedia Of Informal Education.*

Available at:www.infed.org./biblio/b-curric.htm.

[Accessed: 05/04/11]

Spakes, A. (1998) 'Reciprocity In Critical Educational Research? Some Unsettling Thoughts'. In G. Shacklock. and J. Smyth. (1998) (eds*). Being Reflective In Critical Educational And Social Research* (pp 67-82). London: Falmer.

Spradley, J. P. (1979) The Ethnographic Interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stake, R. E. (1995) The Art Of Case Study Research. London: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (1994) Case Studies. In N.K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincon (eds). *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.

Stake, R E. (2003) 'Case Studies' . In N. K. and Y. Lincoln, (eds.). *Strategies Of Qualitative Inquiry* (2nd edn) pp.134-164. London: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2005) Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.). *The Sage Handbook Of Qualitative Research* (3rd edn), pp.443-466. Thousand Oaks, CA: sage.

Steel, C. (2009) 'Reconciling University Teacher Beliefs To Ccreate Learning Designs For LMS environments'. *Australian Journal Of Educational Technology,* 25(3), pp. 399-420.

Available at: http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet25/steel.html

[Accessed: 15/11/11.]

Steffe, L. P. and Gale, J. (eds) (1995) Constructivism In Education. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stenhouse, L. (1975) An Introduction To Curriculum Research And Development. London: Heinemann Educational.

Stewart, D.W. and Shamdasani, P.N. (1990) Focus Groups: Theory And Practice. London: Sage.

Stones, E. and Morris, S. (1972) Teaching Practice: Problems And Perspectives. London: Methuen.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) Basics Of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures And Techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998) Basics Of Qualitative Research: Techniques And Procedures For Developing Grounded Theory (2nd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tabachnik, B. R. and Zeichner, K. (1984) 'The Belief Systems Of University Supervisors In An Elementary Student Teaching Programme'. *Journal Education For Teaching*, 8 (1), pp. 34-34.

Tabachnik, B. R. and Zeichner, K. (1986) 'Teacher Beliefs And Classroom Behaviours: Some Teacher Responses To Inconsistency'. In M. Ben-Peretz, R. Bromme, R. Halkes (eds). *Advances Of Research On Teacher Thinking,* pp 84-96.

Taft, R. (1988) Ethnographic Research Methods. In J. Keeves (ed). *Educational Research, Methodology, And Measurement: An International Handbook* (pp. 59-63). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Tann, S. (1993) 'Eliciting Student Teachers' Personal Theories'. In J. Calderhead and P. Gates (eds). *Conceptualizing Reflection In Teacher Development*. London: Falmer.

Tashakori, A. and Teddlies, C. (1998) Mixed Methods: Combining The Qualitative And Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks: CA Sage.

Tisher, R. (1995) 'Readjustments, Reorganization Or Revolution?' In M. F.Wideen, and P. Grimmett (eds). *Changing Times In Teacher Education: Restructuring Or Reconceptualisation*. Washington: Falmer.

Tobin, K. G. (1990) Ethical Concerns And Research In Science Classrooms: Resolved And Unresolved Dilemmas. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Francisco.

Tomlinson, P. (1995) Understanding Mentoring: Reflective Strategies For School-Based Teacher Preparation. London: Open University Press.

Tubin, K., Tippins, D. and Gallard, A. (eds) (1994). Handbook Of Research On Science Teaching And Learning. New York: Macmillan.

Tyler, W. (1949) Basic Principles Of Curriculum And Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Usher, R. and Byant, I. (1989) Adult Education As Theory, Practice And Research. The Captive Triangle. London: Routledge.

Valli, L. Ed. (1990) Reflective Teacher Education: Cases And Critiques. Albany: State University of New York.

Varnava-Marouchou, D. (2007) Can Faculty Conceptions Of Teaching Influence Faculty Professional Development? Unpublished Thesis.

Verschuren, P. (2003) 'Case Study As A Research Strategy: Some Ambiguities And Opportunities'. *International Journal Of Social Research Methodology,* 6 (2), pp. 121-139.

Villegas-Reimers, E. (2003) Teacher Professional Development: An International review of Literature.

Available at: www.unesco.org/iiep

[Accessed:30/05/10]

Volante, L. and Earl, L. (2002) 'Teacher Candidates' Perceptions Of Conceptual Orientations In Their Preservice Program'. *Canadian Journal Of Education*, 27 (4) pp. 419-438.

Von Glasersfield, E. (1989) 'Learning As A Constructive Activity'. In P. Murphy and B. Moon (eds). *Development In Learning And Assessment.* London: Holder and Stoughton.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) Mind and Society: The Development Of Higher Mental Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walford, G. (2001) Doing Qualitative Educational Research. London: Continuum.

Wallace, M. J. (1991) Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, M. and Poulson, L (Eds.) (2003) Learning To Read Critically In Educational Leadership And Management. London: Sage.

Wideen, M. F. and Grimmett, P. P. (1995) Changing Times In Teacher Education: Restructuring Or Reconceptualisation. Washington: Falmer Press.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J, and Moon, B. (1998) 'A Critical Analysis Of The Research On Learning To Teach: Making The Case For The Ecological Perspective On Inquiry'. *Review Of Educational Research*, (6892), pp. 130-178.

Weeden, P., Winter, J. and Broadfoot, P. (2002) Assessment: What Is In It For Schools? Routledge Farmer: London.

Wehling, L. and Charters, W. (1969) 'Dimensions Of Teacher Beliefs About The Teaching Process'. *American Research Journal*, 6(1), pp. 7-29.

Weidemann, G. (2013) 'Opening Up To Big Data: Computer Assisted Analysis Of Textual Data In Social Sciences': *Qualitative Social Research*, 14(2), pp. 13-24.

Weimer, M. (2002) Learner-Centred Teaching, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weinstein, C. S. (1989) 'Teacher Education Student` Preconceptions Of Teaching'. *Journal For Teacher Education,* 40(2), pp. 53-60.

Weinstein, C. S. (1990) 'Prospective Elementary Teachers' Beliefs About Teaching: Implications For Teacher Education'. *Teaching And Teacher Education,* 6(3), pp. 279-290.

Wellington, J. (2000) Educational Research: Contemporary Issues And Practical Approaches. London: Sage.

Wesslink, R., Moulder, M., and Biemans, H. (2003) Competence-Based Education: An Example From Vocational Practice. Paper ECER 2003, VETNET, Harmburg, Germany.

Wiliam, D. and Black, P. J. (1998) 'Assessment And Classroom Learning'. *Assessment In Education: Principles, Policy & Practices,* 5 (1) pp. 1-10.

Wiliam, D. and Black, P. J. (1996) 'Meanings And Consequences: A Basis For Distinguishing Formative and Summative Functions Of Assessment?' *British research Journal*, 22, pp 537-548.

Wolf, D., Bixby, J., Glenn, J. and Gardner, H. (1991) 'To Use Their Minds Well: Investigating New Forms Of Student Assessment'. *Review Of Research In Education,* 17: pp. 31-74

Wolf, D.and Baron, J. R. (1996) Performance-Based Student Assessment: Challenges And Possibilities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Woods, D. (1996) Teacher Cognition In Language Teaching: Beliefs, Decision-Making And Classroom Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woods, P. (1979) The Divided School. London: Routledge and Paul Kegan.

Xiong, Z. (2016) 'The Impact Of Teacher Education On In-Service English Teachers' Beliefs About Self'. *Journal Of Language Teaching And Research, 7(3), pp.519-526.*

Xu, L. (2012) 'The Role of Teachers' Beliefs In Language Teaching-Learning Process'. *Theory and Practice In Language Studies. 2(7), pp. 1397-1402.*

Availableat: http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.7.1397-1402

[Accessed: 12/08/15]

Yero, J. L. (2002) Teaching In Mind: How Teacher Thinking Shapes Education. Hamilton: Mind Flight.

Yin, R. K. (1994) Case Study Research. London: sage.

Yin, R. K. (2003) Case Study Research: Design And Methods (3rd edn). London: Sage.

Young, M. (1998) 'Rethinking Teacher Education For A Global Future: Lessons From The English'. *Journal Of Education For Teaching*, 24(2), pp.130-145.

Zeichner, K. (1983) 'Alternative Paradigms Of Teacher education'. *Journal Of Teacher Education,* 34(3), pp.3-9.

Zeichner, K. and Liston, D. P. (1990) 'Theme: Restructuring Teacher Education'. *Journal Of Teacher Education*, 41(2), pp. 3-20.

Zeichner, K. and Liston, D. (1996) Reflective Teaching. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zeichner, K. M. and Liston, D. (1987) 'Teaching Student Teachers To Reflect'. *Harvard Educational Review,* 57(1), pp. 23-48.

Zeichner, K. M. and Tabachnik, B. R. (1981) 'Are The Effects Of University Teacher education 'washed out' by school experience?' *Journal Of Teacher Education,* 32(3), pp. 7-11.

Zeni, J. (2001) Ethical Issues In Practitioner Research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Zheng, H. (2009) ‘ A Review Of Research On EFL Pre-Service Teachers’ Beliefs And Practices’*. Journal Of Cambridge Studies, 4 (1), pp. 73-81.*

Zuber-Skerrit, O. (1982) Action Research In Higher Education. London: Kogan.

List of Figures

Figure 3.1

An example of a casual conversation captured during the participant observation process.

Data source (A Casual Conversation) 15/10/ 11	**Setting:** A casual discussion in the African Languages staff room/office	**Context**: Lecturers commenting on coursework grades/marks.
P O (Participant observation) Scenario 5	**1.PO**: Why do you make students write all these assignments; but only select 6 for final assessments? -- And how many assignments do you give them altogether? **2.Thandi:** Throughout the two years of their course we give them more than 13 ssignments. **3.PO:** Are you sure they all individual written assignments? **4. Thula:** Yes, they are. **5.PO:** No group assignments? Are you	**10. Thula**: For evaluating students; to see what they are worth. **11. Thandi:** Essentially to see if they are ready to be certified as trained teachers. **12. PO** Does assessment have any a role to play in your teaching? **13. Thula**: Well, not in the sense that we use assessment for teaching purposes. Our assessment practice here is such that All assessment is summative and counts towards final assessment at the end of the

Data source (A Casual Conversation) 15/10/ 11	**Setting:** A casual discussion in the African Languages staff room/office	**Context**: Lecturers commenting on coursework grades/marks.
	sure they are all individual assignments? **6. PO:** None whatsoever? **7. . PO:** What do you think about group ssignments? **8. Thandi:** Group marks are not acceptable for final assessment. What is needed is student's performance; and not group performance. Assessment? **9. PO**: What is assessment for, then? Why group	course. **14. PO.** Are you happy with that? **15. Thula:** No, that's why I'm complaining about it. **16.Thandi:** That's how it is. It's a requirementby College and the certificate awarding institution Department of Teacher Education of the University of Zimbabwe. **17. PO:** And you can't change that? **18. Thula:** No. That is policy; we cannot change policy that.

Figure 3.2

An example of a casual conversation captured during the participant observation process.

Data source	***Setting:*** *Casual conversation in the Senior common room.*	***Context:*** *Talking about a newspaper article about a teacher alleged to have beaten up one of his students so badly, causing serious injuries.*
P O	**1. Dunga:** This is disgusting! Is he a teacher, qualified teacher?	**Duba:** That's what our Mission Statement or conceptual framework says anyway. **11.PO:** Is that what the College

Data source	***Setting:*** *Casual conversation in the Senior common room.*	***Context:*** *Talking about a newspaper article about a teacher alleged to have beaten up one of his students so badly, causing serious injuries.*
(Participant Observation) ***Scenario 4*** *(10/9/11)*	**2.Tshuks:** This is horrible. Where has professionalism gone? **3.Duba:** Surely this is not the kind of teacher we are producing here? (Everybody shaking their heads in disgust) **4. PO:** What's the problem, Duba? **5. Duba:** This teacher badly assaulted his student. **6. Nyambose**: What kind of teacher are you producing here Tshuks? (Laughing). **7. Tshuks:** (also laughing), --- certainly not this kind of a teacher. He has no morals. He is not a professional. **8. Dunga:** Here we produce teachers who uphold very high moral standards and who are highly professional. **9. Duba:** Yea, teachers who are critical and reflective. **10. Tshuks:** I'm not sure if we produce that kind of teachers (laughing). (Everybody laughing in apparent agreement)	Conceptual framework says, Tshuks?---- to produce critical and reflective teachers? **12.Tshuks:** Do I know what it says? Here we seek to produce competent; highly skilled professional teachers. This is our responsibility. That is what I was taught at college during my training as a teacher. (Everybody laughing). **13.PO:** So you don't use it to guide you about the type of teacher you are producing here? **14.Tshuks:** I simply follow what I was trained to do at college--- not what the College's conceptual framework says. **15.Nyambose**: Actually it is not for us— it's for Admin; and it's just used for PR purposes. **16. PO:** Really? **17**. **Dunga**: Yeah---at least that is the general understanding. **18. Duba:** The culprit teacher must be locked up for the rest of his life. They must just lock him up in jail and throw away the keys. (Everybody laughing)

Figure 3.3

An example of questions developed during the in-depth interviews

An example of the questions developed during the in-depth interviews
1. Would you like to explain a bit--- what do you understand by assessment?

An example of the questions developed during the in-depth interviews

2. Who prepares these assessment criteria you are talking about?

3. Do students have some input in coming up with these?

4.Why are you not happy with the College's assessment culture? Is it the way assessment is done at this College that you are not happy with? Why?

5. In your view does assessment have a role to play in the teaching/learning process?

6. Do you have any views that you feel strongly about teaching, learning and assessment?

7. What kind of a teacher are you seeking to produce at this College?

8. Can you explain what you mean by 'a reflective' teacher?

9. How do you prepare such a teacher?

10. Is there any philosophy or conceptual framework that guides you in preparing this type of a teacher?

11. Are you aware that the College has a conceptual framework or Mission Statement that is supposed to guide you as to what kind of teacher you should produce?

List of Tables

Table 1.1

Participants' biographical information

Participants	Teaching experience in the schools	Teaching experience at College	Academic qualification	Professional qualification
Keith	10 yrs	25 yrs	B. Ed.	Dip. Ed.
Ignatius	11 yrs	16 yrs	B.A. Hons.;	Cert. in Ed.
James	15 yrs	10 yrs	B. A. Hons.	Grad. C. E.
Marko	8 yrs	5 yrs	B. Ed.	Dip. Ed.
Bongani	13 yrs	3 yrs	B. A. ; M Ed.	Grad. C. E.
Khoza	15 yrs	4 yrs	B. A.	Grad. C. E.
Charlie	13 yrs	6 yrs	B.Sc.	Dip. Ed.
Newman	14 yrs	5 yrs	B. Sc.	Dip. Ed.

Table 4.2

Example of categories and codes used (from interviews, Focus group discussions, Lesson observations)

Category/ Code	Words, phrases, sentences found in the transcript text. Acronyms used: Teacher (tr), Students (stdnts)
BATA (Beliefs about teaching Approaches)	. …Well planned lecture: step by step;.....business-like; researches; ...thorough planning;.....delivers knowledge; direct teaching approaches;.....lecture method very popular;....tr gives students notes;.....tr responsive to stdnts needs; ..... contingent approaches; .....adapting classroom demands;.....approaches that motivate stdnts;.....good delivery of knowledge;.....stdnts participate in the learning process.
BARL (Beliefs about role of Teacher)	Tr gives notes;.....third world country;....tr source of knowledge;....but not only source of knowledge;....tr to provide knowledge;.....tr can also learn from stdnts;.. ...studnts can also be source of knowledge;... to deliver current knowledge;.....facilitate learning;....but traditionally tr's business to provide knowledge;.....tr must monitor closely.
BAL (Beliefs about learning)	Stdnts learn in different ways;....by participating;.....through discussions;.....by interacting;.....sharing ideas;.....by observing and practice;.....by reading;.....by inquiring, internalising and applying knowledge from tr and books; through exposition by tr;.....stdnts learn from many sources;...but tr. .is major source.
BARLC **(**Beliefs about role Of learner in the Classroom)	. …Consruct knowledge?.....no stdnt can do that;....yes they can but our System does not allow that;....stdnts read..... consolidate knowledge;.....gaps and distortions in knowledge;.....therefore stdnts cant teach eacg other;.... stdnts can learn from each other during presentations;.....stdnts receive knowlede;... .participate/involve in learning process;.....stdnts do not have sufficient knowledge.
BAA **(**Beliefs about Assessment**)**	. ...purpose .... to evaluate;.....assessment after a long time;.....assess once a term;.... use assignments, tests and examination;.....not formative;.....no self- or group, no peer assessment;....our system does not allow that;.....yes assessment can be for learning; group work marks not acceptable; .....stdnts do not take them seriously.

Category/ Code	Words, phrases, sentences found in the transcript text. Acronyms used: Teacher (tr), Students (stdnts)
BACCF (Beliefs about College's conceptual framework**).**	.....doubt if everybody knows about College's conceptual framework;.....do not Know it in its totality;...do not think it is for us;.....it is meant to be a public relations stunt;.....it's not something we can lose our sleep over....(laughter).

An example of one of the in-depth interviews

Table 4.3

Lecturers' views about teaching approaches

Category/ codes	What was observed/ Lecturers' own words.
BATA (Beliefs about teaching approaches) (Beliefs about teaching) approaches) **L O** (Lesson observation) (Appendix H.)	**What was observed** - Teacher-cantered approaches mainly e. g. **-**Mainly Lecture method. **-** Talk and chalk (i.e. question and answer). **-** Explaining and demonstrating, **-** Class discussion **-** Learner-centred approach (two cases).
IDI (In-depth interviews)	**Lecturers' own words** **James:** Well, good teachers deliver knowledge to the learner. I prefer approaches that are easy and simple to follow --- a well planned lecture, for instance. A teacher does some research and prepares thoroughly before delivering a lesson. **Bongani:** : Good teaching means a teacher manages, directs and controls the process and sees to it that learning is meaningful. He uses strategies that ensure good delivery of knowledge to the learner.

Category/ codes	What was observed/ Lecturers' own words.
	Newman Good teaching should be businesslike. A teacher manages, directs and controls the learning process. **Charlie**: Good teaching involves students in the lesson. The teacher uses approaches where students also participate in the lesson. **Ignatius:** Good teaching is being responsive to students' needs and the demands Of the context. I therefore prefer contingent teaching approaches. **Keith:** Good teaching is when a teacher has the adaptability of a chameleon i.e. adapting his teaching approaches *to the demands of the learning situation*. **Khoza:** Good teaching also implies thorough planning and preparation by the teacher before delivering the lecture---every step of the lesson must be planned. He must use approaches that motivate learners. **Marko:** Good teaching is when a teacher responds to the needs of the learner; tailoring his methods so that students learn effectively in the classroom.
FGD (Focus Group Discussion)	**Marko:** Yes, the teacher ought to be a source of knowledge; otherwise he /she has no business being in the lecture room. **Newman:** Yes, traditionally, the teacher is and must be the source of knowledge.
P O (Participant observation) (Appendix C.1 to C.6) (Appendices E.1 to L.1)	**Lamb:** It's because they (teachers of today) are very weak in content knowledge. They simply can't deliver knowledge to their learners. **Lamb:** Of course. Otherwise they are not teachers if they can't deliver the knowledge to learners. -Teaching as telling/ conveying knowledge to learners --Direct teaching/ lecture method -- Students taking down notes --- students' questions not invited ----Assessment not linked to teaching and learning

Category/ codes	What was observed/ Lecturers' own words.
	----Not making use of students' previous knowledge/experiences

Table 4.4a

Lecturers' views about the role of the lecturer/teacher in the learning process.

Category / code	Question: What role should a teacher play in the classroom?
BARL **(Beliefs about the role of the teacher in the Classroom)**	**What was observed/lecturers' own words** **-very active role: lecturers lecture/talk while students listen and take down notes.** **-lecturers dominated: asked questions; wrote Students' responses on chalkboard; provided explanations.** **- out of 8 lessons observed, only 2 cases of students playing active role: group work and group presentations.** **-**
LO (Lesson Observation) (Appendices E. to L.)	
IDI (In –depth interview)	**Lecturers' own words** **James: A very active and critical role. No, not any more. In the past, yes- Teachers used to be the only source of knowledge, but not anymore. Actually the teacher can learn from her/his students.** **Keith:** Teaching is the process of delivering knowledge. The role of the teacher is, therefore, to deliver that knowledge to the learner; and the learner is expected to receive that knowledge. So, do I believe the teacher is the source of knowledge? Yes. **Charlie:** His role is to deliver knowledge.

Category / code	Question: What role should a teacher play in the classroom?
	Khoza: In the context of a third world country, yes, and the teacher should be the Source of knowledge. His role is to teach and deliver knowledge to students. Honestly, what choice does a teacher have where the library is poorly equipped, with only a few copies of books available?—very old books for that matter. His role is to deliver current and relevant knowledge to students. **Ignatius:** I don't believe students have sufficient knowledge and that is why they need a teacher to give them the knowledge they need to pass their course. The role of the teacher is, therefore, to provide that knowledge.

Table 4.4b

Lecturers' views about whether the teacher should be the source of knowledge in the learning process in the classroom.

DATA SOURCE & Category /code	**Question:** **Should the teacher be the source of knowledge in the learning process in the classroom?**
FGD (Focus group discussion)	**Ignatius:** What it means is that a teacher is a source of knowledge; and that knowledge is conveyed to the learner through the teacher. **Newman:** You imply that knowledge flows along the conduit i. e. the teacher to the learner? **Newman:** You imply that knowledge flows along the conduit i. e. the teacher to the learner? **Ignatius:** That's correct. If you remove the conduit- the teacher- knowledge acquisition is seriously compromised. So you see a teacher plays a key role. He is the manager of the learning situation. He directs students where they Can get the information. **Bongani:** Traditionally it was expected that the teacher should be the source of knowledge which he should deliver to the learners. That is why the lecture method was, and still is, very popular at this College. Personally I believe the teacher must not be the only source of knowledge. He can also learn something from her/his students. **Charlie:** Yes and no. Yes, because I, as a teacher, I do thorough research on the topic I am going to be teaching and deliver the lecture to students. His role is to deliver knowledge role. No, because students can also be the source of knowledge when they research on that topic. The teacher's role becomes that of facilitation. **Ignatius**: I don't believe students have sufficient knowledge and that is why they need a teacher to give them the knowledge they need to pass their course. **Marko**: Yes, the teacher ought to be a source of knowledge; otherwise he /she Has no business being in the lecture room. **Newman:** Yes, traditionally, the teacher is, and must be the source of knowledge. **N.B. Metaphors that convey the role of the teacher**
P O (**Participant**	**Ignatius:** A teacher is like a farmer who goes into the classroom to saw seeds; some will fall on hard ground and wither, others on good soil and- - -

DATA SOURCE & Category /code	**Question:** **Should the teacher be the source of knowledge in the learning process in the classroom?**
Observation) : (Casual discussion in the staffroom -Appendix C.6)	**Dubs:** As teachers, we are like this Biblical farmer, we are all familiar with. We preach our gospel- the knowledge- some students will receive it and Others will not. Those who receive it will pass; and those, on hard ground will not receive it and so, will not pass at the end of the course. **Khanye:** I've come across many of these metaphors: 'a teacher is a hen', a driver', 'a good shepherd' and- - - **Dubs:** Well, they (metaphors) reflect our personal philosophies; our views about pedagogical issues don't they? **Ignatius**: Some of these metaphors, we sort of, inherited them from our teachers during our school days. **Dubs:** A teacher is 'a builder' 'a gardener' 'a tour guide' a teacher is --- what you believe you are like.

Table 4.5

Participants' views about learning/ learners

DATA SOURCE & Category/ code	What was observed/lecturers' own words
B A L (**Beliefs**: learners / learning) **P O C** (Participant Observation conversation **)** **NB** When I moved around lecture rooms observing what was going on; listening and having casual conversations). .	**What was observed / heard / talked about** -The majority of lecturers used **a lecture method**: Walking along the lecture rooms I could hear 'teacher talk' mostly. 'Students' talk' i.e. students' voices were rarely heard. -The majority of lecturers emphasized 'teacher-centred' teaching approaches. -During the lesson students sat quietly and took down **lecture notes.** -Lecturers **did not invite** students to ask questions; and rarely did students, themselves, ask questions. -Lecturers provided lecture notes handouts.
L O (Lesson observation)	-Six lecturers used a 'teacher-centred' approach i. e. a lecturer method. -Only two lecturers used 'learner–centred' approach i.e. interactive learning activities that Involved learners, either in pairs or groups. -Learners were encouraged to engage in productive learning and to take responsibility of their own learning through further reading and research; where the lecturer facilitated the learning process.-In 6 of the observed cases, lecturers did not encourage learners to take responsibility of their own learning. -Most of the learning tasks given to students did not intellectually challenge learners to think and be critical as articulated in the syllabus' objectives

DATA SOURCE & Category/ code	What was observed/lecturers' own words
IDI &FGD (In-depth interview & Focus group discussions)	**Bongani:** Students learn in many different ways; like participating during the lesson. **Newman***:* students sometimes learn through organized discussions in the Learning situation. **James***:* I think students also can learn a great deal by interaction: talking to teach other; Sharing ideas. **Keith**: Students also learn by observation; they watch the action or activity or skill And practise it after observing it being performed by someone: a teacher or a peer. **Ignatius***:* To me, learning simply means acquiring new knowledge and internalizing it. **Marko***:* Students learn from the teachers' exposition; and in this case a teacher becomes the Source of knowledge. **Khoza:** students learn best when they are motivated. **Charlie:** Students learn in many different ways through a variety of learning activities. Students can also learn from each other. The problem is that they don't take what they learn from their peers seriously.

Table 4.6

Lecturers' views about whether students can teach each other in the classroom.

DATA SOURCE & category/code	**Question:** In your view, do you think students can teach each other in the Classroom?
IDI (In-depth Interviews)	**Responses excerpts**
	Marko: Yes, but there is a limit as to how far they can do that--- One has to guard against distortions and misrepresentation of ok knowledge. **Keith:** Yes, It is indeed very helpful. That is, in my view, the only way to learn from others. However, it (peer teaching) tends to be time consuming. **Newman**: Yes, very much so. Students can teach each other during presentations —and they get encouraged by peers so they try and emulate their teacher. Besides it improves their levels of confidence --- they are not afraid to express themselves or to ask question; and they find communication is easier with peers. However the teacher must monitor and approve the concepts being taught. **Bongani:** Yes they can, but I don't normally give them that opportunity because I need to cover the Syllabus in good time so that I can prepare them for examination. Accountability demands that I cover the syllabus; and students pass the course. **Khoza:** Yes, I believe they can teach each other, but I doubt if they have mastered enough content knowledge to be able to teach each other something meaningful. Although they make presentations sometimes, I have to correct them when they present distorted information. **Charlie:** Yes, they can teach each other, but this tends to waste a lot of time; and besides some students do not take what they are taught by their peers that seriously. **James:** Yes, time allowing, I would give students chance to teach each other, but then I need to cover the syllabus in time for examinations. When they fail I am held accountable. **Ignatius:** Yes, students can learn from each other, especially during peer teaching, when they prepare for teaching practice. To be honest I don't give them that opportunity to teach each other except only when they prepare for teaching practice.

Table 4.7

Participants' views about how learners acquire knowledge

DATA SOURCE & Category/code	**Question:** **How do students learn, that is, how do they acquire knowledge?**
FGD **(**Focus group Discussions**)**	**Responses excerpt**
	Bongani*:* They learn in many different ways; like participating during the lesson. **Newman**: Students sometimes learn through organized discussions in the learning Situation. **James***:* I think they can also learn a great deal by interaction: talking to teach other; sharing ideas. **Keith**: Also by observation; they watch the action or activity or skill and practise it After observing it being performed by someone: a teacher or a peer. **Ignatius**: I totally agree with my colleagues; and would like to add that students also learn by reading. They can read books and learn something from them. **Keith**: We shouldn't forget that, for students to engage in all these learning activities, they need to be motivated and willing to learn. I think motivation is a crucial factor in the learning process. **Ignatius***:* To me, learning simply means acquiring new knowledge and internalizing it. **Bongani***:* Yes acquiring new knowledge and being able to apply it when and where it's needed. Um – yes, obviously from the teacher. **Marko**: Yes--- a teacher teaches isn't it so? Then students learn from that. **Keith**: Also by observation; they watch the action or activity or skill and practise it after observing it being performed by someone: a teacher or a peer. **Ignatius**: I totally agree with my colleagues; and would like to add that students Also learn by reading. They can read books and learn something from them. **Keith**: We shouldn't forget that, for students to engage in all these learning activities,

DATA SOURCE & Category/code	Question: How do students learn, that is, how do they acquire knowledge?
	they need to be motivated and willing to learn. I think motivation is a crucial factor in the learning process. **Ignatius***:* To me, learning simply means acquiring new knowledge and internalizing it. **Bongani***:* Yes acquiring new knowledge and being able to apply it when and where it's needed. Um – yes, obviously from the teacher. **Marko**: Yes--- a teacher teaches isn't it so? Then students learn from that exposition by Their teacher; and in this case a teacher is a source of knowledge. We are lecturers— and so we lecture i.e. our teaching is characterized as lecturing**.** **Chair:** Telling students? **Marko***:* Yes--- telling them*.* **James**: We've already said students learn in many different ways by engaging in a variety of activities. In a way we are saying students acquire knowledge from many sources and a teacher is just one of those sources

Table 4.8

Participants' views about whether or not learners can construct or create knowledge

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	**Question: What are your views about students constructing or creating knowledge?**
FGD (Focus group Discussion)	**Responses excerpt**
	Charlie: What do you means, by 'construct'? ---To construct knowledge? **Bongani**: To come up with their own knowledge. **Charlie:** Oh yes, they are able to construct their own knowledge; because they can interact with a number of setups or situations to create knowledge. **James**: But does our system allow students to construct knowledge? This is because our system provides for transfer of knowledge from a source; and for students to receive that knowledge. In the generality of cases, there are no opportunities provided for students to construct knowledge. **Ignatius**: Our students don't create or construct knowledge; they simply regurgitate it. **Bongani**: --- and with the advent of IT they simply 'cut' and 'paste.' **IgnatiuS**: As far as construction of knowledge is concerned, they can't do it. **Khoza**: I agree with you Ignatius. These students can't construct knowledge; They are not able to construct knowledge. **Keith**: They simply don't have the necessary tools.

Table 4.9

Table Participants' views about the function of a school used as a metaphor

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	**Metaphors:** **i) A school is a factory of skill and knowledge.** **ii) A school is a place of learning for both teacher and the learner**
FGD (Focus group discussions)	**Responses excerpt**
	Ignatius*:* To me the school is a factory of skill and learning. That's where the learner goes to learn and not a teacher. So, the second metaphor does not appeal to me. If anything, the teacher learns very little. The school, therefore, is a place where the teacher goes to impart knowledge to the learners; and for learners to learn and write exams and pass. We tend to say both the teacher and the student are learning but it is the learner who learns more than the teacher. I don't know whether it is an attempt to win the confidence of the learner to say we are both learning. **James***:* The first metaphor appeals to me. That is where the product, the student, is processed and passed on to the consumer- the society- to use. **Charlie***:* The school is like a big machine where the factory worker, the teacher, uses the raw materials- the learners as inputs. S/he processes them to have a final product- the qualified learner which is then used by the consumer- the society. So the school functions as an input-output system.
B A T A (Beliefs about teaching approach)	**Bongani***:* I remember using one of these metaphors; the second one. What I meant was that, while the responsibility of the teacher is to teach, s/he too learns covertly by gaining experience but not learning the content because as a teacher he already has strong content knowledge. So, for that reason I identify with the second metaphor; it appeals to me. **Keith**: The teacher's responsibility is simply to teach i.e. process and add value to the product- the learner- so that it is marketable to the consumer -the society.

Table 4.10

Participants' views about what learning is.

DATA SOUCE & Category / code	**Question:** **In the light of what you have been saying so far about how students learn, I now want you to give your views about the following 3 statements: These statements are taken from literature about the learning process in the classroom. Which of these three statements about the learning process appeals to you? Which one fits your belief about the learning process?** *i*) Learning is consensus building. ii) Learning is the construction of knowledge. iii) Learning is receiving knowledge. **(**Fosnot, 1996; Muijs, 2007; Prichard, 2009).
FGD **(**Focus group Discussion**)**	**Responses excerpt**
	Bongani: Learning is consensus building. This one appeals to me because I believe learning is for both learner and teacher. Every time a teacher walks into the classroom they meet a new situation; and they are learning something from these situations all the time. **Ignatius***:* I'm reminded here of my former teacher. He was so knowledgeable. In the classroom situation, it is the student who is supposed to learn and not the teacher. But for public relations, perhaps, we always want to say the teacher and the student interact; and that interaction makes both equal and that both are learning. **Bongani***:* But are you not a better teacher now than you were 5 years ago or when you started teaching? I believe you are; and it's for the fact that, as a teacher, you learn together with your students. **Charlie**: In my view, the teacher is always a source of theoretical knowledge. Students receive knowledge from him. So for me, learning is receiving knowledge. But when it comes to applying that knowledge by the teacher he/she uses a variety of strategies. **Marko***:* The last statement 'Learning is receiving knowledge' does not appeal to me. **James:** I don't believe learning is receiving knowledge. I believe learning is

DATA SOUCE & Category / code	**Question:** **In the light of what you have been saying so far about how students learn, I now want you to give your views about the following 3 statements: These statements are taken from literature about the learning process in the classroom. Which of these three statements about the learning process appeals to you? Which one fits your belief about the learning process?** *i*) Learning is consensus building. ii) Learning is the construction of knowledge. iii) Learning is receiving knowledge. **(**Fosnot, 1996; Muijs, 2007; Prichard, 2009).
	The construction of knowledge; because both teacher and student are learning in the process. Learning is, to me, construction of knowledge. **James**: (cont.) I'm not sure about learning being 'a consensus building'- whether it means that we, both teacher and student, reach an agreement. I think the school is a place where we develop in a certain direction- so a school is a place where we come to realize our differences and appreciate them; and I'm not sure whether that can be termed consensus building. Well, to say learning is receiving knowledge is very dangerous. It implies that learners just sit there, passively in the classroom, and receive knowledge from the teachers. I personally do not believe that's how students learn. I don't subscribe to it. **Ignatius***:* I want to say, look all what we say or teach is not our own creation; but it's through exposure that we have had; and that exposure can be in form of a teacher who imparted ideas. Through this process we learnt a lot. To me this process is not 'knowledge construction' but ' knowledge receiving'. The backbone of all learning is being exposed to literature or sources of information; and that is why I want to insist that it's all about 'telling' and learners receiving knowledge. Generally what people say they do, is not what they actually do in the classroom in practice. **Newman:** Learning is receiving knowledge. How else can learners learn? Group: (laughing) **Newman***:* Seriously, if a learning situation does not result in learners Receiving knowledge, then there is no learning at all. We may use different techniques or strategies of teaching but the end result is that students receive knowledge. **Khoza**: I agree with Newman. Whatever we do as teachers in the classroom; The aim is to make students learn; and they do that by receiving knowledge. I want to say, and say it emphatically, is that when students do not want to receive the knowledge I give them, they fail.

DATA SOUCE **&** **Category / code**	**Question:** **In the light of what you have been saying so far about how students learn, I now want you to give your views about the following 3 statements: These statements are taken from literature about the learning process in the classroom. Which of these three statements about the learning process appeals to you? Which one fits your belief about the learning process?** *i*) Learning is consensus building. ii) Learning is the construction of knowledge. iii) Learning is receiving knowledge. **(**Fosnot, 1996; Muijs, 2007; Prichard, 2009).
	Period. (Group laughing).

Table 4.11

Participants' views about knowledge

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	**Question:** **How would you describe or define knowledge, using your own words?**
FGD (Focus group Discussions**)**	**Responses excerpt**
	Marko*:* Knowledge is an accumulation of ideas. **Khoza*:*** It is the accumulation of unknown truth. **Bongani*:*** Yes, that's what we read in books. **Keith*:*** In our case,-that is- in our context, knowledge is the content we teach from our syllabuses. **Charlie:** I agree with you, Keith. Without the syllabus, there is nothing to teach, and therefore no knowledge to impart. **James:** Are we saying knowledge is embedded in the syllabus? (Chorus answer): Yes! **Khoza*:*** We then give it to our students, through the lectures that we conduct, and, at the end of the , course we assess to see if students are now knowledgeable. **Newman:** I have always known knowledge to be out there, waiting for learners, especially scientist or researchers to discover it. **Ignatius*:*** That's precisely what we have been told when we were students. For me that has not changed. It still holds true. **Newman*:*** Knowledge is hidden somewhere out there in the universe. The learners have to discover it. Our responsibility as teachers is to make students learn this knowledge by teaching to cover the syllabus. **Keith*:*** Yes, someone has to expose it to the learner. To me, then knowledge Is new information that you receive from some one: the teacher, from books or from the environment**.** That's why I believe learning is receiving knowledge. **Bongani:** Knowledge is information accumulated, but not necessarily by being told or from books. People acquire knowledge from life experiences. These can be contrived experiences such as classrooms or events that we come across in life.

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	**Question:** **How would you describe or define knowledge, using your own words?**
	Ignatius: Knowledge is what has been imparted to you. In the context of a school or college, knowledge is what teachers impart to their students. It is the information that students need to produce or use to pass an exam. So, knowledge is what we teach so that students pass their examinations. **James:** I agree with what colleagues have said. But I want to add that Knowledge is information that makes us function in our communities and in the society of nations at large. We acquire this knowledge through interaction in various ways; ranging from family, school, community environments and the media such as print and electronic. **FGD Chair: If that is the way you see knowledge to be, surely this Must influence the way you teach, don't you think so?** **James***:* Yes, it does. If knowledge is the accumulation of the truth; the Teacher becomes the source of that truth. So her/his teaching approaches will be characterized by telling i.e. lecturing. Knowledge is revealed by telling students what this knowledge is. **Ignatius***:* Knowledge is all about the concept acquisition---you accumulate Concepts the higher you go in your studies or education. You start from simple concepts to abstract ones; but you only understand an abstract concept through exposure i e. the teacher exposes these abstract concepts to you as a learner. Which means, essentially, a teacher is a major conduit for delivering knowledge to the learner. **James:** I think we need to appreciate where we are coming from. I think our system simply does not allow facilitation in a teaching/learning process. We are coming from a tradition; we are a product of a tradition of teaching where the teacher is expected to teach; she or he has to deliver the goods, come exam time.

Table 4.12

Participants' views about assessment.

Data source & Category /code	**Questions and Responses**
POC (Participant observation conversation)	**Excerpts of responses** **Q. 1 How often do you assess your students*?*** **Marko:** I do it after a long time---not like in schools where teachers are expected to Give an immediate feedback to learners. **Charlie*:*** I assess my students as and when coursework marks are required by the Head of Department (HOD). Actually we have a calendar that guides us when marks should be ready. **Ignatius*:*** I would like to assess regularly--- but because of time constraints I only assess once a term. **Q. 2 What is your view about the notion that assessment ought to play a big role in the process of teaching and learning?** **James:** In theory we assume that assessment plays a role in the classroom, but, in practice, we do not assess for teaching or learning purposes. How will that type of assessment count towards final assessment? That is the problem. To me assessment is meaningless unless it counts towards a final mark that determines whether or not the student passes the course. **Keith:** Informally, yes it should play a role. But our system of assessment discourages classroom assessment. Only assessment that generates a mark that counts at the end of the course. --- Oh yes, students can assess themselves or assess each other. This, of course, is for learning purposes. However such assessment has no room in our system. **Newman:** In a way it can play a role. But the system of assessment at this College is such that both lecturers and students are not interested in assessment that counts for nothing. They want assessment that will count towards passing the course. **Q. 3 What is your view about self-assessment, peer assessment and group assessment?** **Keith*:*** Yes, but the mark they award themselves would not count towards their final passing mark at the end of The course---- that's where the problem is. **Bongani:** Self-assessment is not effective as students may not be honest. It is the same with peer-assessment. Group assessment is unfair to those students who do all the work; and, besides, that does not count towards Final assessment is what we are interested in. **Chair (Probing): Who prepares assessment criteria? And can students**

Data source & Category /code	Questions and Responses
	Possibly have an input in formulating assessment criteria? **Keith:** Yes, but the mark they award themselves would not count towards their Final passing mark at the end of The course---- that's where the problem is. **Bongani:** Self-assessment is not effective as students may not be honest. It is The same with peer-assessment. Group assessment is unfair to those students who do all the work; and, besides, that does not count towards final examination. Final assessment is what we are interested in. **Chair (Probing): Who prepares assessment criteria? And can students possibly have an input in formulating Assessment criteria?** **Marko:** No, not at all. Students do not have deep knowledge of the subject, so How can they meaningfully assess each other. I believe no educational value would be derived from such assessment. **Newman:** It is always done by the lecturers who set the assignments or whatever assessment instrument used to assess students. **Charlie:** I prepare them myself, but they are then approved by the Department of Teacher Education (D T E) of the University of Zimbabwe which awards the Diplomas to qualifying students. Students have no input whatsoever in these criteria. **James:** The practice at this College is that lecturers set assessment instruments, Be they assignment or tests. So the answer to your question is, I do. So to whether students can have an input in formulating assessment criteria, my answer is 'no'. I have not seen or heard about it before. **Ignatius:** I do. Sometimes it is my other colleagues. Students cannot have an input because they do not know the correct answers. **Keith:** I do. No, students cannot be involved, because they do not know what to look for in the answers given.

Table 4.13

Participants' views about forms of assessment.

Data source & Category/ Code	Questions and responses	Questions and responses
P O C (Participant Observation Conversation)	1.**PO:** Why do you make students write all these assignments; but only select 5 for final assessments? -- And how many assignments do you give them altogether? **2.Thandi:** Throughout the two years of their course we give them more than 12 assignments. **3.PO:** Are you sure they are all individual written assignments? **4.Dubs:** Yes, they are. **5.PO:** No group assignments? Are you sure they are all individual assignments? **6.Tshuks:** No **7.PO:** None whatsoever? **8.Thula:** No. None at all. **9.PO:** What do you think about group assignments? **10.Khanye:** Group marks are not acceptable for final assessment. The College requires marks that show individual performance that are a true reflection of an individual student's performance; and not group performance. **11.PO:** But what's assessment for then? Why do you give group assignments? **12. Thula**: For evaluating students; to see what they are worth.	**13. Thandi:** Essentially to see if they are ready to be certified as trained teachers. **14. PO:** Does assessment have any a role to play in your teaching? **15. Rose:** Well, yes but not in the sense that we use assessment for teaching purposes. Our assessment practice here is such that all assessment is summative and counts towards final assessment at the end of the course. **16. PO:** Are you happy with that? **17. Rose:** Of course not. **18. Thula:** No, that's why I'm complaining about it. **19. P O:** Is that the feeling of everyone? **20. Thandi:** That's how it is. It's a requirement by College and the certificate awarding institution: The Department of Teacher Education of the University of Zimbabwe. **21. PO:** And you can't change that? **22. Thula:** No **23. Thandi:** No. **24. Kelvin:** We can't change it. Can we? That is policy; and we cannot change policy. Our responsibility is to implement it. **25. PO:** Thanks for your time guys. We'll chat again later.

Table 4.14a
Lecturers' views about the College's conceptual framework

DATA Source & Category/ code	**Question : Are you aware of the College's conceptual framework, and what are your views about**
	Responses
IDI **(Indepth direct interview)**	**Bongani:** Yes, I am aware of it. But I never studied it to understand what it says. I know that every institution ought to have one, but I'm not very sure what its purpose is, other than just saying what the institution seeks to do. **Charlie**: No. I have never seen it. Is it that college motto written in Latin? --- (laughter). To be honest, I don't know about it. **Keith*:* I** know it exists but I have never thought it has anything to do with me? **James**: Yes, I'm aware of it. I know it exists. I remember vaguely what it says but not in its totality. I do not think that conceptual framework or Mission Statement is meant for us lecturers. I think it is meant to be a public relations stunt. It's not something we can lose our sleep over--- (laughter). **Marko*:*** Yes, I am aware of it, but just can't remember what it says about the type of Teacher the college seeks to produce. --- I think it says something like ---- producing Reflective teachers, ---innovative teachers--- well something of the sort--- I can't really remember. **Ignatius:** I know there is a college Mission Statement, but I have never bothered to Find out what it says. Now that you have mentioned it, I will have a look at it. **Newman:** Well, I know that every institution ought to have one but, as a new lecturer at This college, I have yet to see one for this institution. **Khoza:** I have never read it. I have seen it hanging on the Admin Office and corridor walls. We are never told about it. I think it does not concern us. No it's not for us. I don't know what it is for. Maybe it is for visitors?

Table 4.14b

Lecturers' views about the College's conceptual framework

DATA SOURCES & Category/code	Question : Are you aware of the College's conceptual framework, and what are your views about it?	
P O C & FGD (Participant Observation conversation & Focus group Discussion)	**1. Tshuks:** Do I know what it (the conceptual framework) says? Here we seek to produce competent; highly skilled professional teachers. This is our responsibility. That is what I was taught at college during my training as a teacher (Everybody laughing). **2. PO:** So you don't use it to guide you about the type of teacher you are producing here? **3. Tshuks:** I simply follow what I was trained to do at college--- not what the College's conceptual framework says. **4. James:** Well, I doubt if everybody knows about the College's conceptual framework. Even those who may claim to know it they do not know it in its totality. **5. Khoza:** I do not think that Conceptual framework or Mission Statement meant for us lecturers. I think it is meant to be a public relations stunt. **6. Newman:** The College's Conceptual framework. Is it meant for us, anyway? It's not something we can lose our sleep over--- (laughter). **7. Charlie:** No. I have never seen it. Is it that College motto written in Latin? --- (laughter). To be honest, I don't know about it.	**8. Nyambose:** Actually it is not for us —it's for Admin just used for PR purposes. **10. PO:** Really? **11. Dunga:** Yea--- at least that is the general understanding (- - laughter). **12. Marko:** Well, I'm aware of it but can't just remember what it says. I can't really remember. Well, it says in part, -- to produce a reflective teacher—well, something of the sort---. **13. Ignatius:** Yes, I am aware of it, but Just can't remember what it says about the type of teacher the college seeks to produce. **14. Bongani:** I think it says something like ---- producing reflective teachers, --- innovative teachers--- well, to be honest, I have never studied it. **15. Keith:** No, it is not for us. I don't Know what it is for. Maybe it is for visitors. I've always seen it hanging in the admin block?

Table 4.15a

Participants' views, as teacher educators, about the kind of teacher they are seeking to produce.

DATA SOURCE & Category/code	Question: What kind of a teacher are you producing at this College?
	Responses excerpts
IDI (In-depth interviews)	**Marko:** A reflective teacher--- a teacher who can look back, analyze and find alternative ways of teaching concepts i. e. a teacher who can use different methods to his/her ideas across. ----- I want to produce teachers who accept students` ideas--- who consider teaching as sharing of knowledge by the learners? ---- Teachers who consider their roles in the learning process as that of a facilitator— - providing conducive environment for learning. **Charlie:** I want them to be dynamic teachers--- able to cope with the dictates of The time i.e. engage modern ways of teaching; --- they should be able to use modern methods of teaching? **Ignatius***:* I want to produce a competent and reflective teacher i.e. a teacher who Is a hard worker and innovative. **Keith:** A very dynamic teacher who keeps abreast with music development around the world of music. The teacher should be able to instil the love of music to his/her students. **James:** I am aiming at producing a professional, competent and knowledgeable teacher. **Newman:** A teacher who is practically oriented; I want them to be real-life or real-world teachers i. e. teachers who can produce things for use in their communities. The teacher must be able to invent useful things to be used by the community. **Khoza:** They must be teachers who pursue self-development to improve themselves. They must embrace life-long learning principle. This is good for them so that they sharpen their skills and broaden their knowledge.

Table 4.15b

Participants' views, as teacher educators, about the kind of teacher they are seeking to produce.

DATA SOURCE & Category / code	**Question: What kind of a teacher are you producing at this College?**	
	Responses excerpts	
POC **(**Participant Observation Conversation**)**	**1.. Nyambose**: What kind of teacher are you producing here Tshuks? (Laughing). **2. Tshuks:** (also laughing), --- certainly not this kind of a teacher. He has no morals. He is not a professional. **3. Dunga:** Here we produce teachers who uphold standards and who are highly professional. **4. Duba:** Yea, teachers who are critical and reflective. **5. Tshuks:** I'm not sure if we produce that kind of teachers (laughing). (Everybody laughing in apparent agreement)	**6.. Duba:** That's what our Mission Statement or conceptual framework says anyway.----- **7. PO:** Is that what it says---- the College conceptual framework, Tshuks---- to produce critical and reflective teachers? **8. Tshuks:** Do I know what it says? Here we seek to produce competent; highly Skilled professional teachers. This is our responsibility. That is what I was taught at college during my training as a teacher (Everybody laughing). **9.. PO:** So you don't use it to guide you about the type of teacher you are producing here? **10. Tshuks:** I simply follow what I was trained to do at college--- not what the College's conceptual framework says. **11. PO:** I see everyone is rushing to their lectures**.** Nice to chat with you guys. We'll meet again later. Thank you for your time.

List of appendices

Appendix **Page**

Appendix A

Hillside Teachers College Conceptual framework
The Teachers College in association with the University of Zimbabwe

Vision
To be the leader in the development of competitive Secondary Education teachers in the region and the world at diploma and degree levels.

Mission
To develop professional, committed, competitive and reflective teachers for the Middle and Upper Secondary Schools in Zimbabwe and beyond.

CORE VALUES
Patriotism
Multicultural Tolerance
Ubuntu
Integrity
Versatility
Entrepreneurship
Professionalism

FIVE- YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN: 2011-2015

The Key Result Areas for The Teachers' College in the next five years, bearing in the core function of the Institution, will be:

a) **Quality of instruction**
b) **Manpower development**
c) **Teacher Education**
d) **Revenue collection**
e) **Assessment**
f) **Infrastructure development**
g) **Super ion**
h) **Research and curriculum development**
i) **Administration**

The Ranked and Prioritised Results Areas

1.Teacher Education 2.Research and development
3.Curriculum development 4.Administration
5.Infrastructure, plant and equipment.

APPENDIX B

Fieldwork Research Plan

Specific aim

To explore and understand the interplay between lecturers' beliefs about teaching and learning, assessment; and the College's conceptual framework.

Research questions

1. What beliefs do lecturers hold about teaching, learning and assessment?

2. Why do lecturers hold such beliefs that inform their actual pedagogical practices?

3. What pedagogical approaches do lecturers employ to meet the goal of the College conceptual framework?

4.How do lecturers link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices?

Sequencing of research activities

Step	Time when	Activities
1.	June, 2011-	**Meeting with gatekeepers** and (re)negotiating access to site and departments; and explaining the proposed study; Meeting (informally) with former colleagues; explaining the purpose of the visit .
2.	July,2011-September, 2012.	**Participant observation** (by embedding/immersion into daily activities of College staff). N.B. Goes on all the time; and field notes will be recorded in research journal .
3.	January, 2012-March, 2012	6 **Lesson observations** (to see how lecturers applied pedagogy In class.) Volunteers selected through purposive sampling from different subject areas.
4.	Between June, 2012 and September, 2012.	**In-depth interviews**
5.	Between July, 2012 and August, 2012.	**Focus group interviews**: Conveniently selected sample- one from each of the 8 Subject areas (but not a representative sample).

Specific aim

To explore and understand the interplay between lecturers' beliefs about teaching and learning, assessment; and the College's conceptual framework.

Research questions

1. What beliefs do lecturers hold about teaching, learning and assessment?

2. Why do lecturers hold such beliefs that inform their actual pedagogical practices?

3. What pedagogical approaches do lecturers employ to meet the goal of the College conceptual framework?

4.How do lecturers link their personal theories with their pedagogical practices?

Critical Events in the research fieldwork

Event	Time when	Activity
1.Meeting HODs and Subject Heads.	Sept., 2011 to November, 2011.	Discussing the research project to be conducted.
2.*Lesson observations begin*:	January, 2012– July, 2012.	1. Negotiate lesson observation times. 2. Observe lessons at agreed times.
3.In-depth interviews	January, 2012 – August, 2012	**1.** In-depth interviews begin soon after lesson observation. **2**.As feedback, in-depth interview transcripts are discussed with participants .
4. Focus group discussions	Between July, 2012 and September, 2012.	**1.** Focus group discussions are conducted. **2.** Focus group transcripts, as feedback, are discussed with participants.

APPENDIX (C.1)

Scenario 1

Date: 04/07/12

Casual conversation*: Lecturers' views about teachers in general.*

Setting: *Music Office*

Context: *Casual conversation about the teacher* of today, compared to the teacher of yesteryear.

NB.PO*. refers to me, the Participant Observer, doing fieldwork research.*

1.PO: You have been teaching for quite some time now; what is the difference between teachers of today and those of yesteryear

2.Lamb: Today's teachers, especially new teachers, follow things strictly. But when they get old and have gained experience they change and do things their way.

3. Moyo: You see, with me I always plan my lessons. Planning has become my second nature.

4. Lamb: Here at College, you know, I believe in being positive with students. They learn from me and I learn from them. I'm always approachable and accessible. This is a belief which has become my philosophy. That's what teachers of today ought to be.

5. PO: What is your belief about the learner in the classroom?

6. Moyo: The learner is like clay in the hands of the teacher. The teacher has to mould the learner for the future.

7. Lamb: The learner is like a hunter hunting for knowledge; and the teacher is a guide, guiding the learner and leading him in the direction of knowledge.

8. Moyo: Actually, the teacher is the provider of that knowledge.

9. PO: So, what then is the difference?

10. Lamb: Well, teachers of yesteryear were dedicated and very knowledgeable**.**

11. Moyo: Teachers of today can't teach, they can't lecture.

12. Lamb: It's because they have very weak content knowledge. They simply can't deliver knowledge to their learners.

13. PO: You mean they are not good sources of knowledge.

14. Moyo: Absolutely, and---

15. Lamb: Of course! Otherwise they are not teachers if they can't deliver the knowledge to learners.

16. **Moyo:** --and teachers ought to have a very strong content knowledge. be sources of knowledge

17. PO. You both agree that the teacher ought to be the source of knowledge. What about learners?

18. Lamb: Of course, they ought to be; and learners must be prepared to absorb that knowledge.

19. Moyo: Yea, for them to learn learners ought to receive that knowledge from their teacher.

20. PO: It's been nice chatting with you guys. Will chat again later.

21. Lamb: Ok, will meet again later.

22. Moyo: Thanks see you later then.

APPENDIX (C.2)

Scenario 2 **Date: 15/07/12**	**Setting:** Professional Studies office **Context:** Casual conversation about teaching approaches
1.PO: Gatsha, you are shaking your head, what's the matter? Anything wrong? **2. Gatsha:** This student! I'm marking an assignment and this student just puts one quotation after another; no analysis what so ever. **3. Kums:** Did you teach her how to be analytical? **4. Gatsha:** I did. I gave a lecture on how to review literature and how to reference sources, but now I get this? **5. PO:** Probably, she missed that lecture. **6. Gatsha:** Or she was not listening at all. **7. Kums:** As for me, I insist in all my lectures that everybody has to listen and write notes. **8. Gatsha:** That's the thing, but does everybody listen? She obviously was not listening when I delivered that lecture. **9. Tom:** They better do, because if they don't, they are definitely going to fail. **10. PO:** Maybe she prefers a different learning style—or teaching method; and not a lecture. **11. Gatsha:** Well, with the large groups that we have, no other teaching approach other than the lecture method can do.	. **12. PO:** But can't you divide them into smaller groups for tutorials as a way to follow up on the lecture; and perhaps that could maximise deep learning through interactive learning activities? **13. PO:** so you prefer lecture method because it serves time. Is that everybody's view? **14. Kums:** The lecture method is "The Method" at this College. **15. Tom:** In fact lecturing is the culture of how we all teach here. **16. P O:** So you all lecture in your classrooms? **17. Gatsha:** That's the traditional way of teaching. We're all expected to lecture at this College. **.** After all we are lecturers. Aren't we? (everybody laughs) **18. James:** Today, though, a teacher can also **L**earn from their students; and students can also be source of knowledge; because they hold relevant previous knowledge that's essential for the teacher to use to facilitate learning in the classroom.

APPENDIX (C.3)

<u>Scenario</u> 3 **Date: 01/08/12**	**Setting**: Casual conversation outside, next to the library. **Context: Casual conversation** After tea break. Lecturers stand in the sunshine, chatting; a spontaneous conversation ensued about learning and assessment. **N.B. PO** refers to me, the Participant Observer, doing fieldwork research.
1. Vusi: Look at that human being? Why he is walking on the turf, he's not supposed to. Why doesn't he follow the footpath? **2. Tshili**: Well, the student is not a 'human being'; he has a name. Doesn't he? (Whole group laughing). **3. Vusi**: Of course not; but animals also have names and, like humans, they can learn, can't they? **4. Tshili**: Students can listen while I teach; but animals can't. Students can follow instructions given to them--- and - - - **5. PO:** Animals can also follow instructions. And so what's the difference? **6. Kums**: Learners have knowledge; they have experiences they can tell you about; and animals don't. **7. Ellen**: Well, even if they have knowledge, that's not the kind of knowledge, we want. As teachers, our duty is to give them the correct knowledge. We have to correct their distorted knowledge by telling them or teaching them the correct knowledge. (Everybody laughing in apparent agreement and dispersing) **8. Tshili:** We can assess our students but we can't assess animals; that's another difference.	**9. PO:** But animal trainers do also assess the animals they train, don't they? **10. Ellen:** Yea, but we are talking about assessing through assignments, tests and examinations. **11. Vusi:** You're right, animal trainers keep records of how their animals perform during training. It's like us here; we keep the assessment marks which we use to determine whether students pass or fail the course. **12. PO:** Even animal trainers use the performance records of their animals to enhance their training; and at times to come up with new training strategies. Can't you do the same with the assessment marks you give to your students? **13. Kums:** No. We use the marks to evaluate the student. I agree with Vusi. **14. PO:** Is that how everybody feels about assessment at this College? **15. Ellen:** Yea, generally. Isn't that's the purpose of assessment? **16. Tshili:** Absolutely. **17. PO:** It's been nice chatting with you guys. Thank you.

APPENDIX (C.4)

Scenario 4 **Date:** 10/09/12	**Setting:** Casual conversation Senior common room (Staffroom) during morning tea break time. **Context:** Talking about a newspaper article about a teacher alleged to have beaten up one of his students so badly, causing some body injuries. **N.B. PO:** refers to me, the Participant Observer, doing fieldwork research
1. Dunga: This is disgusting! Is he a teacher, qualified teacher? **2. Tshuks:** This is horrible. Where has professionalism gone? **3. Duba:** Surely this is not the kind of teacher we are producing here? **4. PO:** What's the problem, Duba? **Duba:** This teacher badly assaulted his student. **Nyambose**: What kind of teacher are you producing here Tshuks? (**6. Tshuks:** (also laughing), --- certainly not this kind of a teacher. He has no morals. He is not a professional. **7. Dunga:** Here we produce teachers who uphold very high moral standards and who are highly professional. **8. Duba:** Yea, teachers who are critical and reflective. **9. Tshuks:** I'm not sure if we produce that kind of teachers (laughing). (Everybody laughing in apparent Laughing). **10. Duba:** That's what our Mission Statement or conceptual framework says anyway	**11. PO:** Is that what it says---- the College conceptual framework, Tshuks---- to produce critical and reflective teachers? **12. Tshuks:** Do I know what it says? Here we seek to produce competent; highly skilled professional teachers. This is our responsibility. That is what I was taught at college during my training as a teacher (Everybody laughing). **13. PO:** So you don't use it to guide you about the type of teacher you are producing here? **14. Tshuks:** I simply follow what I was trained to do at college--- not what the College's conceptual framework says. **15.** Nyambose: Actually it is not for us—it's for Admin just used for PR purposes. **16. PO:** Really? **17**. **Dunga**: Yea--- at least that is the general understanding. **18. Duba:** The culprit teacher must be locked up for the rest of his life. They must lock him up in jail and throw away the keys. (Everybody laughing). **PO:** Nice to chat with guys> We'll meet again alter. Thank for your time.

APPENDIX (C.5)

Scenario 5 **Date: 15/10/12**	**Setting:** African Languages staff room/office **Context: casual conversation** Lecturers commenting on coursework grades/marks. **N.B.: P O** refers to me, the Participant Observer, doing fieldwork research.
1. **PO:** Why do you make students write all these assignments; but only select 6 for final assessments? -- And how many assignments do you give them altogether? 2. **Thandi:** Throughout the two years of their course we give them more than 12 assignments. **3. PO:** Are you sure they all individual written assignments? **4. Thula:** Yes, they are. **5. PO:** No group assignments? Are you sure they are all individual assignments? **6. Thandi**: No **7. PO:** None whatsoever? **8. Thula: No.** None at all. **9**. **PO:** What do you think about group assignments? **10. Thandi:** Group marks are not acceptable for final assessment. The College requires marks that show individual performance that are a true reflection of an individual student's performance; and not group performance **11. PO:** But what's assessment for then? Why do you give group assignments?	**12. Thula**: For evaluating students; to see what they are worth. **13. Thandi:** Essentially to see if they are ready to be certified as trained teachers. **14. PO** Does assessment have any a role to play in your teaching? **15. Thula**: Well, not in the sense that we use assessment for teaching purposes. Our assessment practice here is such that all assessment is summative and counts towards final assessment at the end of the course. **16. PO.** Are you happy with that? **17. Thula:** No, that's why I'm complaining about it. **18. Thandi:** That's how it is. It's a requirement by College and the certificate awarding institution: Department of Teacher Education of the University of Zimbabwe. **19. PO:** And you can't change that? **20. Thula:** No **21**. **Thandi**: No. **22. Thula:** That is policy; we cannot change policy. Our responsibility is to implement it. **23. PO:** Thanks for your time guys. We'll chat again later.

APPENDIX (C.6)

Scenario 6 **Date: 05/ 11/12**	**Setting:** Senior common room, during one of the lunch breaks. **Context:** A relaxed moment; I was chatting with a few former colleagues about metaphors that teachers often use in their teaching or conversations. **NB: PO** refers to me, the Participant Observer
1. **PO:** Hey, Dubs do you sometimes stop to think about the metaphors we often use as teachers? **2. Dubs**: No, why? **3. PO:** Some of them are very fascinating, aren't they? **4. Dubs:** Such as? **5. PO:** Ignatius, you should know some of them, surely. **6. Ignatius**: 'A teacher is like a farmer who goes into the classroom to saw seeds; some will fall on hard ground and wither, others on good soil and---- **7. Khanye**: That's a nice one. I'm not surprised you come up with that metaphor; you are a church pastor, a preacher. **8. Dubs**: That's a very interesting metaphor. As teachers, we are like this Biblical farmer, we are all familiar with. We preach our gospel- the knowledge.	**9.** Dubs: Actually, more than that. They reflect our personal philosophies as teachers. Every teacher carries a philosophy in their head, whether they are conscious of it or not. **10. Ignatius**: Some of these metaphors, we sort of, inherited them from our teachers during our school days. **11. PO:** Do you remember what metaphors you yourselves have used? **12. Dubs:** 'a builder' 'a gardener' 'a tour guide' a teacher is --- **13. Rose**: (Walks in) what's the topic for discussion. You all seem to enjoy the conversation. **14. Ignatius:** Rose, tell us. As a teacher are you 'a tour guide' or what? **15. Rose:** Why 'a tour guide'? I'm 'a leader'. I lead the way. **16. Khanye**: A leader in the classroom? **17. Rose:** Yea, why not? I'm the leader and the manager. (Everyone is laughing and leaving the common room, talking about metaphors that teachers use).

APPENDIX D

Lesson observation proforma

The proforma saves as a guide for things that are expected from the lesson being observed.

To facilitate analysis of what goes on during the lesson, the lesson is divided into three

phases: the introduction, the development and conclusion phases.

Lesson introduction:	**Lesson development**	**Lesson conclusion**
Type of introduction: e.g. -linking lesson topic to previous related topic. - linking students' previous knowledge with the new topic - Lecturers' exposition in the case of a completely new topic - any lecturer/student activity appropriate to introduce the new topic e.g. a short drama performance, a song, a simulation of something, a short story related to the new topic or a visual of something related to the new topic, etc.	**Lecturer activities/class organisation** -lecturers' clear instructions of what needs to be done - Clear and logical explanations -organizing student activities -questioning technique (distribution of questions, pausing after asking a question; recasting/rephrasing questions; redirecting questions) - the nature of the questions asked (high or low order questions; and why) -inviting students' questions -handling of student answers -assigning group work/project work -giving assignment feedback; and using it as integral part of the learning process. ***Student activities:*** - Group work, pair work -students' presentations (e.g. group presentations) -seminar presentations and critiques -peer teaching: students teaching each other -formulation of assessment criteria -marking of peer work -critiquing peer work -collaborative project work -Student talk :(e.g. student-to-student talk; student-to-class talk; student-to-lecturer talk) -use of drama and simulations	**Type of conclusion: e. g.** ***1. Summative closure*** -recap of main points of the lesson. -inviting questions from students. -giving out of handouts on the topic taught. ***2. Forward looking closure*** - linking the lesson topic with the next topic. -identifying/providing references for further reading.

APPENDIX E.1

Lesson Observed

Subject: Mathematics **Topic:** Projectiles on an inclined surface

Teaching Approach used: Deductive approach: chalk and talk / lecture method
E.g. Work out examples on the board first; transfer to new examples_ students must be able to work out/solve new problems.

Pair work- to apply new knowledge gained from the teacher's expose' i.e. Students work out the problem posed by the teacher in pairs or groups while teacher goes round to check students `solutions – where students make errors the teacher corrects them by giving very detailed explanations. The gives final answers or solutions.
Students` presentations: students write out their solutions on chalkboard and discuss it with the rest of the class. Teacher intervenes to correct mistakes and points out misconceptions.

Students` response: chorus answers; taking down notes; working out examples on the board with the teacher (lecturer)

Teacher role: Expose/ explain new concepts i.e. convey knowledge to students

Student role: Take down notes; imbibe new knowledge; expected to transfer new knowledge to new situations i.e. apply new knowledge to solve similar problems.

APPENDIX E.2

Post lesson observation in-depth interview.

Lesson observed	Teaching approaches	Teacher role	Student role
Subject: Maths **Duration:** 45 mins. **Topic**: Projectiles on an inclined/ horizontal surface **Aim: To** help students understand Projectiles on an inclined/ horizontal surface; and be able to work out examples on their own.	**Teaching Approach used**: 1.Lecture or talk-and-chalk method 2. Group or pair work; pair i.e. students work out the problem posed by the lecturer in groups or pairs)	**Direct** and **indirect** 1. Exposes/ explains new concepts i.e. telling/giving new knowledge to students. 2. Gives group tasks; goes round checking groups working on tasks. 3. Teacher intervenes to correct mistakes and points out misconceptions.	Both **none- interactive** and **interactive** *e. g.* *1*. Students answer questions; at times giving chorus answers. 2. Take down notes; 3. Work out examples on the board with the teacher (lecturer). 4. Work in groups. 5. group/pair presentations of solutions to worked tasks.

In-depth interview questions		
Questions about Teaching and learning	***Questions about assessment***	***Questions about the College Conceptual framework***
1. What is the topic of the lesson you were teaching? 2. Is this a totally new topic altogether? 3. Your teaching method was predominantly a lecture method, why was that so? 4. Why did you not give the students a problem to solve in groups or pairs right at the beginning of the lesson? 5. What is your opinion about students teaching each other?	6. How often do you assess your students? 7. What mode of assessment do you use? 8. Do you sometimes allow students to assess each other? 9. Do you; yourself believe in students assessing each other? Why? 10. What is your understanding of group assessment i.e. groups of students assessing other groups, for instance assessing group presentations?	11. What kind of a mathematics teacher do you seek or wish to produce in these student teachers? 12. Are you familiar with the College's conceptual framework or the Mission Statement? And the kind of teacher the College seeks to produce?

APPENDIX F

Lesson Observation 2

Subject: Physical Education
Topic: Long Jump: Executing approach in long jump
Year Group: First Years, Post A Level
Aims: To practice modern approach to long jump: Linking theory to practice.
Teacher role: Was to explain the theory behind the skill of long jump.
Student role: Listen and then try and put into practice what the theory (teacher) says.

Post lesson observation in-depth interview.

Lesson observed	**Teaching approaches**	**Teacher role**	**Student role**
Subject: Physical Education **Duration:** 60 mins. **Topic**: Long Jump: Executing the modern approach in long jump. **Year Group**: First Years, Post A Level **Aims:** To practice modern approach to long jump: Linking theory to practice.	**1.**Lecturemethod **2.** Question and answer method **3.** Demonstrating the skill.	Both **Direct** and **facilitative:** e. g. **1.** Explaining the theory behind the skill of long jump. **2.** Supervise groups practising the skill. **3.** Intervenes to correct students' errors.	Both n**one-interactive** and **interactiv**e e.g. **1.**Listening and taking down notes **2.** Practise the skill in turns i. e. they try to put theory to practice. **3.** Comment on each other's performance.

In-depth interview questions		
Questions about Teaching and learning	***Questions about assessment***	***Questions about the College Conceptual framework***
1. In your view how should good teaching be like? 2. What, in opinion, should the teacher's role be in a teaching/learning process? 3. What do you think should be the role of the	*Assessment:* 6. How do you are assess your students? 7. Who prepares assessment criteria? Why? 8. What is your view about students taking part in	*Conceptual framework* 13. What kind of teacher are you seeking to produce at this College? 14. Are you aware of the college conceptual framework, or the mission statement?

learner or student in the learning/teaching process? 4. What, in your view, is the value of learner-centred teaching approaches? 5. What is your view about the notion that the teacher ought to be the facilitator of learning in the classroom?	formulating assessment criteria? 9. Are you happy with the current assessment practice at this college? Why? 10. Do you believe in students assessing themselves? Why? 11. What is your view about peer assessment? 12. Do you think assessment has a role to play in teaching and learn	

APPENDIX G

Lesson Observation 3

Subject: Geography
Topic: Schemes of work
Aim: To help students make their own schemes of work.
Year Group: First Years Post A Level

Teaching approach: Mainly Lecture method i.e. chalk and talk; and question and answer
Students` responses: good and well thought out answers responses. However, some students tended to 'chorus' their responses. Lecturer discouraged this.

Post lesson observation in-depth interview.

Lesson observed	**Teaching approaches**	**Teacher role**	**Student role**
Subject: Geography **Topic**: Schemes of work **Aim**: To help students make their own schemes of work. **Year Group**: First Years Post A Level	**1.L**ecture method. **2.** Talk and chalk (i.e. question and answer).	1.Telling students about schemes of work. 2.asking questions 3.Explaining concepts.	1. Taking down notes. 2. Answering questions; (good and well thought-out answers/responses). While some students tended to 'chorus' their responses, the lecturer discouraged this.

In-depth interview questions		
Questions about Teaching and learning	***Questions about assessment***	***Questions about the College Conceptual framework***
1. In your opinion, what would you say is good teaching? 2. What is the role of a good teacher in the learning process? 3. What role should students play in a learning process? 4. In your view, should	7. In your view does assessment have a role to play in the teaching/learning process? 8. How often do you assess your students? 9. How do you assess your students? 10. What is your view about	13. What kind of a teacher are you seeking to produce in this programme? 14. How do you prepare such a teacher? 15. Is there any philosophy or conceptual framework that guides you in preparing this type of a teacher?

teaching at college level be any different from that in the school level? 5. Your teaching approach was mainly lecture or teacher dominated; why? 6. Do you value students` previous or existing knowledge and experiences; and do you make use of them in your teaching	students assessing themselves? 11. How about peer-assessment--- where students assess each other? 12. Do you have any views that you feel strongly about teaching, learning and assessment?	16. Are you aware that the college has a conceptual framework or Mission Statement that is supposed to guide you as to what kind of teacher you should produce?

APPENDIX H

Lesson Observation 4
Subject: Music
Topic: Teaching a new piece of music
Aim: To help students teach a new piece of music for the first time.
Year Group: First Years
Teaching approach: Talk and chalk; demonstration; discussion.
Teacher role: explaining; demonstrating; posing questions
Student role: taking down notes; answering questions; discussing in groups

Post lesson observation in-depth interview.

Lesson observed	**Teaching approaches**	**Teacher role**	**Student role**
Subject: Music **Duration:** 45 mins. **Topic**: Teaching a new piece of music **Aim**: To help students teach a new piece of music for the first time. **Year Group**: Post A level, First Years.	**1. L**ecture method. **2.** Talk and chalk (i.e. question and answer). **3**. Explaining and demonstrating on music instruments. **4.** Discussion.	Both **direct** and **indirect**: e.g. **1.** Telling students types of music. **2.** Asking questions. **3.** Explaining music concepts. **4.** Demonstrating on the music instruments. **5.** Leading and directing class discussion.	Both **interactive and none-interactive: e. g.** **1.** Taking down notes. **2.** Answering questions. **3.** Discussing in groups. **4.** Practicing singing the music piece

In-depth interview questions		
Questions about Teaching and learning	***Questions about assessment***	***Questions about the College Conceptual framework***
1. When teaching music what do you consider to be the role of the teacher in the teaching/learning process? **2.** Do you believe that students, when given a new	**5.** How often do you assess your students? Why? **6.** Do you think assessment can be linked to teaching? How? **7.** What is your view about students	**11.** What kind of a music teacher do you seek to produce at this college? **12.** Are you aware of the college Conceptual framework or Mission Statement which

music piece, can learn to sing it own their own without the teacher's assistance? **3.** Do you sometimes allow students to teach each other; and if so why? If not, why not? **4.** Do you think teaching of music is different from teaching any other subject, say Geography, for instance?	assessing each other and assessing themselves? **8.** In your view do you think assessment has a role to play in teaching in the classroom? **9.** What type of assessment do you use often? Why? **10.** Are you happy with this college's culture of assessment? Why?	stipulates the kind of teacher the college programmes ought to produce?

APPENDIX I

Lesson Observation 5

Subject: History
Topic: The decline of the Great Zimbabwe State.
Aim: To help students identify and discuss the causes of the decline of the Great Zimbabwe State.
Year Group: First Years Post 'A' Level
Teaching Approach: Learner centred approaches.
Teacher role: Facilitation of learning process.

Lesson observed	**Teaching approaches**	**Teacher role**	**Student role**
Subject: History **Duration:** 45 mins. **Year Group**: First Years **Topic**: The decline of the Great Zimbabwe State **Aim**: To help students identify and discuss the causes of the decline of the Great Zimbabwe State	1.**Interactive methods**: Group work, and presentations, and discussion	**Facilitative e.g.** **1**. Organises students' activities **2.** Gives students tasks. **3.** Challenges students' responses. **4.** Leads and direct discussions.	**Active and interactive:** e.g. **1. W**ork on tasks in groups. **2. M**ake presentations of their tasks. **3.** Discuss other groups' presentations. 4. Give a critical appraisal of other groups' presentations.

In-depth interview questions		
Questions about Teaching and learning	**Questions about assessment**	**Questions about the College Conceptual framework**
1. In your lesson you used interactive approaches, what are your views about such teaching approaches? 2. Do you think students, working in groups, can actually construct knowledge? 3. How important, do you think, are students' previous knowledge and experiences in the teaching/learning process? 4. What do you consider to be the role of the teacher and that of the learner in a teaching/ learning process?	6. Do you think assessment has any role to play in the teaching/learning process? If so how? 7. How often do you assess your students; and what exactly do you assess? 8. What do you think about students assessing themselves or each other? 9. In your opinion do you think the College culture of assessment needs changing? If so why; and if not, why not?	10. Are you aware of the college Conceptual Framework or Mission Statement? 11. Would you like to explain the philosophy that guides you in preparing new teachers, if you have any?

APPENDIX J

Lesson Observation 6

Subject: Biology
Topic: The reproduction of plants
Aim: To help students describe, compare and analyse the processes of reproduction in plants.
Year Group: First Years Post 'A' Level
Teaching Approach: Lecture method
Teacher role: Knowledge exposition, Talk and chalk, explaining concepts
Students role: Taking down notes; asking questions

Post lesson observation in-depth interview.

Lesson observed	**Teaching approaches**	**Teacher role**	**Student role**
Subject: Biology **Duration:** 45 mins. **Topic**: The reproduction of plants. **Aim:** To help students describe, compare and analyse the processes of reproduction in plants. **Year Group**: First Years Post 'A' Level	**1.**Lecture method. **2.** Question and answer. **3.**Talk and chalk.	**Direct** e.g. **1.** Lecturing. **2.**Explaining concepts. **3.**Writing notes on the board. **4.**Asking questions.	**None-interactive** e.g. **1**.Listening **2.** Taking down notes. **3.** Answering questions.

In-depth interview questions		
Questions about Teaching and learning	***Questions about assessment***	***Questions about the College Conceptual framework***
1. What, in your view, is bad teaching? **2.** What do you think the role of the teacher and that of the learner should be in a teaching/learning process? **3.** What is your comment about the view that the teacher must be a source of knowledge?	**6.** How often do you assess your students? Why? **7.** How do you assess your students? Why? **8.** What do you think about self-assessment and peer assessment? **9.** In your opinion, do you think assessment has a role to play in	**10.** What kind of a teacher do you want these students to be when they complete their course? **11.** Are you aware of the College conceptual framework or Mission Statement? **12.** What philosophy guides you in your teaching?

4. What are your views about students teaching each other in class? **5.** In your opinion, how important are the students` previous knowledge and experiences in learning?	the process of teaching and learning in the classroom?	

APPENDIX K

Lesson observation 7

Subject: English Literature
Topic: (The Setting/ Context and Characterization:)
Aim: To help students find out and understand the setting/context and the role of the main and minor characters in the novel "Far From the Madding Crowd".
Year Group: First Years Post `A` Level
Teaching approaches: Teacher exposition; Group presentations; discussion; question and answer,
Teacher role: facilitator; instruct and expose knowledge
Student role: participants; taking notes.

Lesson observed	**Teaching approaches**	**Teacher role**	**Student role**
Subject: English Literature. **Duration:** 45 mins. **Topic**: Characters in the novel: the main and minor characters and their roles. **Aim:** To help students understand characters and their roles in the novel "Far From the Madding Crowd". **Year Group:** First Years Post `A` Level	**1.** Lecturing. **2.**Group presentations. **3.** Discussion. **4.**Question and answer.	Both **direct** and **facilitative** e.g. **1.**Lecturing. **2.**Writing notes on chalkboard **3**.Organising group activities. **4.** Facilitating and leading class discussion.	Both **none-interactive** and **interactive** e. g. **1**.Listening **2.** Taking down notes. **3.** Working and presenting tasks in groups. **4**. Asking questions.

In-depth interview questions		
Questions about Teaching and learning	***Questions about assessment***	***Questions about the College Conceptual framework***
1. What are your views about the use of interactive learning approaches in class? 2. How important do you think students` presentations are in the learning process? 3. What is your comment	7. How often do you assess your students? Why? 8. In your view, how can assessment play a role in the teaching/learning process? 9. Which type of assessment do you prefer, and why?	11. Are you aware of the college Conceptual Framework or Mission Statement? 12. Do you know what its purpose is? 13. Can you explain any philosophy that guides you in

about the view that knowledge is socially constructed, more so in the classroom context? 4. What, in your view, should the role of the teacher be in a teaching/learning process? 5. Do you think that the teacher, in the learning process, should be the source of knowledge? Why? 6. Do you think teaching at college level should be any different from that at school level? Why?	10. What is your comment about the college's assessment practice? Are you happy with it?	your teaching?

APPENDIX L

Lesson Observation 8

Subject: SiNdebele/Zulu.
Topic: Uluhlu lwezifundo (Schemes of Work).
Aim: To help students understand how to write schemes of work.
Year Group: First Years Post `A` Level.
Teaching approach: Lecture method, Question and answer.
Teacher role: Lecturing, explaining, and posing questions.
Student role: Taking down notes and answering questions.

Post Lesson Observation in-depth Interview.

Lesson observed	**Teaching approaches**	**Teacher role**	**Student role**
Subject: SiNdebele/Zulu. **Duration:** 45mins. **Topic:** Uluhlu lwezifundo (Schemes of Work). **Aim:** To help students understand how to write schemes of work. **Year Group:** First Years Post `A` Level.	**1.**Lecture method. **2.** Question and answer. **3.** Talk and chalk; explaining concepts.	***Direct and dominant*** e.g. **1.** Lecturing. **2.** Writing notes on chalkboard. **3.** Explaining concepts. **4..** Asking questions.	***Passive*** e.g. **1.** Listening. **2.** Taking down notes. **3.** Answering questions.

In-depth interview questions		
Questions about Teaching and learning	***Questions about assessment***	***Questions about the College Conceptual framework***
1. In your view what is good teaching? 2. In your lesson you used a lecture method through out. Why was that so? 3. Would you agree with the view that teaching is delivering knowledge by the teacher to learners during the teaching/learning process? 4. How important do you think students` own previous knowledge and experiences are in a teaching /learning processes? 5. Do you think that students can teach each other? Why?	6. How often do you assess your students? Why? 7. What is your view about group assignments i. e. making students do assignments as a group? 8. Suppose you make your students do a group assignment and you mark it and give a grade or mark should this type of an assignment grade i. e. the group assignment-count towards the final passing mark at the end of the year? Why? 9. What is your view about students assessing each other and/or themselves? 10. What is your view about the college culture of assessment	11. What kind of teachers do you want your students to be when they leave this college? 12. Do you know what the College conceptual framework or Mission Statement says about the type of teacher you are expected to produce at this College?

APPENDIX M.1

In-depth interview schedule (An example)

Questions developed before the in-depth interview.		
These questions were formulated before the interviews as guide questions to generate data that was used to answer research questions. During the actual observation I used a proforma to guide me (Appendix D).		
Questions about teaching and learning.	**Questions about assessment.**	**Questions about the College's conceptual framework.**
About teaching **1.** What, in opinion, should the teacher's role be in a teaching/learning process? **2.** What is the topic of the lesson you were teaching? **3.** Do you believe that students can teach each other? ***About learning*** **4.** What do you think should be the role of the learner or student in the learning/teaching process? **5.** Do you value students` previous or existing knowledge and experiences; and do you make use of them in your teaching? **6.** Do you think students, working in groups, can actually construct knowledge? **7.** Do you think teachers should be the source of knowledge in the classroom? **8.** What are your views about the use of interactive learning approaches in class? **9.** What is your comment about the view that knowledge is socially constructed, more so in the classroom context? **10.** Would you agree with the view that teaching is delivering knowledge by the teacher to learners during the teaching/learning process? **11.** What, in your view is the value of group assignments?	11. What**, in your** view, is the value of assignments? **12.** How often do you assess your students? **13.** How do you are assess your students? **14.** Do you believe in students assessing themselves? **15.** What is your view about peer-assessment, i.e. students assessing each other? **16.** What mode of assessment do you use? **17.** Do you sometimes allow students to assess each other? **18.** What is your understanding of group assessment i.e. groups of students assessing other groups, for instance assessing group presentations? **19.** In your view does assessment have a role to play in the teaching/learning process?	**20.** Is there any philosophy or conceptual framework that guides you in preparing this type of a teacher? **21.** Are you familiar with the college Conceptual Framework or the Mission Statement? And what it says about the kind of teacher the college seeks to produce? **22.** What kind of teachers do you want your student to be when they complete their teacher training course? **23.** Do you know what the purpose of the College's conceptual framework is?

APPENDIX M.2
In-depth interview guide.

Questions developed during the in-depth interview process.

These questions where developed during lesson observations or during the interview process, where they were used as follow-up questions seeking clarification or more understanding**.** The questions were posed to different interviewees.

Questions about teaching and learning.	**Questions about assessment.**	**Questions about the College's conceptual framework.**
About teaching **1.** Is this a new topic altogether? **2.** In your opinion, what is good teaching? **3.** Your teaching method was predominantly a lecture method, why was that so? **4.** You gave a group task right at the end of the lesson, why did you not give it in the middle or beginning of the lesson? **5.** What role should students play in a learning process? **6. Can** you name some of these modern methods of teaching you are talking about? **7.** In your lesson you used interactive approaches, what are your views about such teaching approaches? **8.** I observed your students doing group presentations. How important do you think students` presentations are in the learning process? **9.** In your view, should teaching at college level be any different from that in the school level? **About learning** **10.** In your view, how do students learn? **11.** Do you have any views that you feel strongly about teaching, learning and assessment? **12.** How important, do you think are students' previous knowledge and experiences in the teaching/learning process? **13.** What is your comment about the view that the teacher must be a source of knowledge? **15.** Why do you think group assignments are important in the learning process?	**16.** Would you like to explain a bit--- what do you understand by assessment? What is your idea of assessment? **17.** Do you; yourself believe in students assessing each other? And do you think it has any educational value? **18.** Who prepares these criteria? Do students have some input? **19.** If you had it your way would you like students to be involved in formulating these assessment criteria? **20.** Are you happy with the current assessment practice at this college? **21.** Why are you not happy with the current college assessment practice? **22.** Is there anything you can do about the current assessment practice at this college? **23.** Do you think assessment can be linked to teaching? **24.** In your view, should the group assignment grade/mark- count towards the final passing mark at the end of the year?	**25.** What kind of a teacher do you seek or wish to produce in these student teachers? **26.** How do you prepare such a teacher? i.e. a reflective teacher you are talking about? **27.** What philosophy guides you in preparing new teachers? **28**. Are you aware that the college has a conceptual framework or Mission Statement that is supposed to guide you as to what kind of teacher you should produce? **29.** You say the College's conceptual framework does not concern you, whom, then is it for?

APPENDIX N

Focus group discussion questions

Focus group discussion questions (before and during discussions)

Questions formulated before the focus group discussion

1. How do teaching approaches or methods influence the way students learn?

2. Why do you use the teaching strategies that you use when teaching?

3. In your view how do students learn? i.e. how do they acquire knowledge?

4. What do you consider to be the purpose of assessment?

5. How do you assess your students; and what do you assess?

Questions developed during the focus group discussion

1. How do students learn; and how would you describe learning?

2. How would you then define or describe learning? What is learning?

3. How do they acquire it: by receiving from a source, -- a teacher, would toy say?

4. What views about learning do you identify with?

5. Do you think students are able to construct knowledge?

6. Do you think students are able to construct knowledge?

7. Researcher: That's interesting. But where are the tools? And who should give them these tools with which to construct knowledge?

8. So, how then would you characterize your teaching methodology? How would you describe the way you teach your students in

19. Fine, now what is your comment about these metaphors teachers sometimes use to describe what goes on in their schools? You might have come across them too:

i) ***"A school is a factory of skill and knowledge"***

ii) ***"A school is a place of learning for both teacher and the learner".***

20. In light of what we have been saying I now want us to give our views about the following 3 statements:

(Muijis, 2007)

- ***"Learning is consensus building".***
- ***"Learning is the construction of knowledge".***
- ***"Learning is receiving knowledge***".

21. From what we have been saying so far about teaching and learning; how then would you describe knowledge?

22. In your view, what then is knowledge?

23. Where is this unknown truth? Does it exist

the classroom? **9**... --- telling students? **10**. --- and not facilitating learning? **11**. In your teaching, how much is telling and how much is facilitation, percentage wise? **12.** Is that the case with all of you? **13**. The message I'm getting is that, generally, you teach for exams. Is that correct? **14.** What is the reason for setting your exams that early? 3 years in advance? The target candidates will not have even enrolled on the course, surely? **15.** Does that then influence your teaching approach, generally? That at the end of the year your students will have to write exams, does that influence the way you teach? **16.** Well, can you tell us more about how you teach to prepare students for examination? **17.** Do you mean you do not link these theories to your practice? **18.** Which view of learning then appeals to you?	somewhere? **24.** If that is the way you see knowledge to be, surely this must influence the way you teach, and don't you think so? **25**. I want you to explain that metaphor. What do you mean "--- a teacher is a major conduit"? **26**. So, Bongani, you are saying learning can take place where there is no teacher. **27**. Who should bring about this change? **28.** Do you think that's the way to go? **29.** In your syllabuses you state what kind of teacher you want to produce. For instance you say: 'a professional', 'a competent teacher', 'a critical teacher', 'a creative teacher', 'a problem-solver'; 'a reflective teacher' and 'a life-long learner', and so on and so forth. My question is: how do you produce such a teacher? **30.** Is that the general feeling? **31**. What do you think is the purpose of assessment? **32.** Does assessment have a role to play in the learning process in the classroom?

Appendix O.1

Participants' letter of invitation to participate in the study.

University of Nottingham
School of Education
Jubilee Campus
NG8 1BB
29 September, 2009.

Dear Lecturers

I am a research student from the above mentioned University. May I kindly invite you to be one of the participants in this research study.

The purpose of the study is to investigate Lecturers' beliefs about their pedagogical practice in teaching, learning and assessment. It is hoped that by participating, as professional, you will benefit from the research process. I certainly look forward to learning a lot from you and the other participants.

I want to assure you that the highest ethical standards will be upheld during the entire research process; ensuring that your privacy, confidentiality and identity will be protected. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time should you feel strongly that you want to do so. You can ask for my supervisors' contact details should you want to discuss something with them or if you feel there is something unethical about the research process.

To indicate your consent to participate in the study, please sign the Consent Form that I will provide you with.

I wish to thank you sincerely in anticipation for agreeing to participate in the study.

Best regards,

.Albert Malaba Dlamini.

Appendix O.2

Consent Form

Name---------- Subject Area----------

Gender---------- Department----------

The researcher has fully explained to me the purpose of his research study. I have been assured that my identity and responses will be treated with the strictest of confidentiality, remaining anonymous at all times. I fully understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study at any time should I feel my privacy and anonymity are being violated or compromised. I, therefore, willingly give my consent to participate in the study.

Signed---------- Date:----------

Appendix O.3

Ethics letter of approval (missing)

Appendix O.4

British Educational Research Association (BERA) ethics guidelines (13 pages document).

www.BERA.org.uk