

NQF SUPPORT LINK
READER FOR MODULE 2

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the use of the following extracts and thank the publishers and authors for making them available:

Module 1: Implementing the NQF

Van Schaik Publishers, Pretoria: Coetzee, M (2002) Getting your Accreditation. The quality assurance and assessment guide for education, training and development providers.

Module 2: The NQF and Strategic Governance

Reading 3: De Clerq, F. (2002). Decentralisation of Authority to Districts: Search for District development and/or Control? Wits School of Education, Johannesburg (Presented at the International Conference on Education and Decentralisation, African Experiences and Comparative Analysis).

Reading 4: Maclennan, A. C., Education Governance and Management in South Africa. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Reading 5: Day, Professor C. (1999) Professional Development and Reflective Practice: purposes, processes and partnerships. In *Pedagogy, Culture & Society* 7 (2), pp. 221-233.

Toolkit 4 and Toolkit 6: Pearson Education, Edinburgh: Adapted from Koch, R. (2000) The Financial Guide to Strategy: How to create and deliver a useful strategy.

Module 3: The NQF and Learning Programmes

Reading 2: Juta Academic Publishing: "Definitions of Curriculum" from Angelis, D., & Marock, C (2001). Curriculum implication for FET. In Angelis, D., Lolwana, P., Marock, C., Matlhaela, P., Mercorio, G., Tsolo, S. & Xulu, S. The further education and training institutional readiness handbook: making learning work.

Toolkit 8 – Listening Techniques Listening Exercise from Hope, A. & Timmel, S. (1988). Community Workers' Handbook 2. South Africa: The Grail, Lumko Missiological Institute and the Federation of Dominicans of Southern Africa (FEDOSA).

Module 4: The NQF and Assessment

Readings 1-4: LGWSETA Code of Conduct

Reading 5: Falmer Press: Gipps, C. (1994) Beyond Testing, pp3-4.

Reading 6: Slippery Rock University: Governing Principles for Assessment of Student Learning.

Reading 7: Vivlia Publishers: Kramer, D. (1999) OBE Teaching Toolbox, pp. 58-63,

Reading 8: Pahad, M. Approaches to Assessment and Evaluation. Wits/IEB Coursebook, pp. 34-37.

Reading 9: Bulman, F. Peer Assessment in Groups. Portland State University Center for Academic Excellence (web site)

Module 5: The NQF and Learnerships

Readings 27-30: Knowledge Resources: Hattingh, S. Extracts from the ROADMAP Series to Learning and Skills Development, pp. 12-13.

Reading 31: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH: Extracts from Heitmann, W. "The action-oriented learning approach for promoting exemplary job performance and employability" (Unpublished article).

Readings CS 1-CS35: Charlene d'Hotman, Unpublished case study, Central Johannesburg College and Tshwane North College.

Readings 1 and 2

For these readings, please refer to:

Hyden, G. and Court, J. (2002) *Comparing Government Across Countries and over Time: Conceptual Challenges*. Kumarian Press, Bloomfield, USA.

Reading 1: pp. 13-19

Reading 2: pp. 19-25

Reading 3

**De Clercq, F., *Decentralisation of Authority to Districts: Search for District Development and/or Control?* Wits School of Education, Johannesburg, June 2002.
(Presented at the International Conference on Education and Decentralisation, African Experiences and Comparative Analysis)**

The problem of poor bureaucratic efficiency and performance has made a lot of policy and management scholars reflect on governance systems and the advantages and disadvantages of centralisation and decentralisation of powers and authorities. In governance systems, different functions can be allocated in different ways to different levels for different reasons and this is why the organisation, governance and management of education systems must not be seen in a uniform and static manner but rather as part of an evolutionary flexible process which tends to be reviewed and changed over time. How does one assess whether the governance system and the trend towards decentralisation are suited and beneficial to the context?

Educational governance and management refers to the processes by which authority and responsibilities are mediated in the education system, from the level of the ministry to the school. In simple terms, it is about who has the power to do what and who is accountable to whom for what. Decentralisation means different things, depending on what is decentralised, how and to whom. A decentralised system distributes authority and/or powers to lower levels of governance, whether local authorities and/or school organizations. In practice, governance systems are always a combination of decentralised and centralised functions. Decentralisation and centralisation are not mutually exclusive but part of a continuum as many different functions and decision-making areas can be both centralized and decentralised. Decentralisation does not imply automatically less national/central powers as there is no zero sum of intergovernmental power in which the growth of influence and control by one level of government necessarily results in an equal opposite diminishing influence and control by another.

Recently, the international trend has been to transfer greater education authority and/or responsibility to the local levels (local authorities and/or institutions) as a reaction to a rather inefficient, undemocratic, unaccountable central bureaucratic system. In fact, there is a history of pendulum swings between educational centralisation and decentralisation: as soon as the system reveals problems of administrative efficiency and/or educational effectiveness, the government blames it onto the degree of decentralisation or centralisation of the system. But, as Elmore (1993a) argues, there is rarely a serious examination of whether these moves towards greater or less decentralisation have a significant impact on quality delivery and school support.

The case for decentralisation to districts

How does one assess the advantages and disadvantages of education decentralisation to lower authorities? To start with, it is important to remember the broad mandates and challenges which an education governance system faces as it struggles to address the conflicting demands of making the system operating more efficiently and effectively to provide basic education for all while at the same time developing strategies for greater democracy and the redressing of gross inequities in the system. Many authors (Monk, 1990) have argued that the allocation of responsibility between different levels of government should be guided by whatever arrangements will minimize the trade offs between these educational goals of equity, efficiency and democracy. He argues that, once responsibilities and accountabilities are defined and distributed, the different levels must work inter-dependently in a semi-federal arrangement and/or in partnership with other non state organisations to ensure that the best balance of social goals is achieved.

The rationale often put forward for decentralisation is that local levels of educational authority are closer to the point where the impact is supposed to be felt and are therefore in a better position to take appropriate and timely decisions. Apart from the managerial efficiency advantage of decentralisation to local authorities, it is argued that decentralisation will widen access and participation in educational decision-making as well as promote democracy and control by the lower levels. However, many have

shown that such form of decentralisation is often symbolic and not with little real gains, as there is little evidence of increased local participation and deepened democratisation through decentralisation (Winkler, 1985, Fiske, 1996). Broadly speaking, the liberal rationalist perspective has been criticized for looking at an ideal situation and ignoring the political interests involved in decentralisation.

In contrast, the political/marxist perspective on decentralisation argues that the modern (European) state uses decentralisation in a manipulative manner, to cope with its sometimes contradictory functions: to promote capital accumulation and, at the same time, ensure some kind of state legitimisation from the rest of society (Weiler, 1990). In other words, the central state ensures that it retains control over its main core functions and services while decentralizing some minor powers or authorities to foster legitimacy of its rule and contain conflicts. Decentralisation is perceived to be less about a surrendering of central powers than a window dressing change and shift in the form and nature of centralized powers

Against the instrumentalist view of the political perspective, other authors have argued that, even though states try and use decentralisation to achieve control over other groups within society, oppositional groups can also struggle for decentralised governance to further their own interests (McGinn and Street, 1986, Samoff and Jansen, 1988, Lauglo and McLean, 1990). The argument is that, providing social and institutional forces fight and strategize around it, decentralisation can expand the scope and depth of democracy and citizen participation by giving political access to subordinate/previously excluded groups or levels of government (Heller, 2000). Genuine administrative and/or political decentralisation is not the result of a top down decision but the outcomes of forces within the state and in civil society pushing for decentralisation and giving it their meaning, commitment, capacity and support.

In other words, the advantages or disadvantages or impact of decentralisation are context-specific and, as Elmore (1993a) argues, the successes and failures of decentralised governance will differ, depending on how the lower authority levels assume, exercise and use their powers and space, given their resources, capacity and leadership to realise the decentralisation goals.

It is with this post-structuralist perspective on decentralisation that the paper proposes to examine how the attempts by the new South African educational governance system at decentralising greater managerial and budgetary powers and authorities to *districts (and not to schools)* do and/or can work. After reviewing the potential and limitation of district authorities, the paper will analyse the educational governance system in South Africa and the tensions that develop as the national, provincial and district educational authorities assume and exercise their responsibilities, opportunities and challenges in promoting greater educational equity, efficiency, democracy and quality. It will then examine how SA districts in one of the more advantageous province, Gauteng, have responded to the opportunity and challenge of decentralised powers and what need to be done to ensure they make the best of their powers and authorities to promote greater democracy and quality policy and service delivery.

Potential and limitations of districts

District or local education authorities have in theory a few comparative advantages that can complement other levels of governance. Apart from streamlining administrative functions and shortening lines of accountability, districts have the potential to be more effective nexus of school change and improvement because they are closer to the schools and can tailor policy implementation and support to the schools' context, needs and conditions.

On the question of equity and redress, districts have the potential to redress resource imbalances because they are close to schools and can recognise their differentiated needs but far enough removed to effect redress and reform. They have the potential to provide a focus of redress around which the community can rally to take responsibility for local problem-solving (Coombe and Godden, 1996). They can give people broader access to information, a locus for sharing experience, mobilising resources and accessing skills, technical support, infrastructural equipment. Access to these benefits will obviously depend on the competences, capacities and resources of districts and, in situation of great social and educational inequities, special attention and support will have to be given to disadvantaged districts.

On the question of managerial efficiency and educational effectiveness, Elmore (1993b) argues that districts have the potential to provide a means of mobilizing local energy and resources for school support

at a level where the impact is most immediate. They can be a source of practical new ideas and innovations, protect schools against shifts in national policies. As an important administrative link between national policy goals and school-level practices, districts can be a valuable buffer between the central department and the schools by ensuring that the former is not overwhelmed by day-to-day practical institutional problems and that the latter get adequate customised delivery and professional support services.

But many preconditions must be in place for districts to play these roles and functions. What is the state of affairs in SA educational governance and what is needed for the districts to make the best of their decentralised powers?

Research methodology

The research study focuses on the district educational authorities of one provincial department in SA, the Gauteng Department of Education (thereafter, GDE). The information was gathered through participant observation of the GDE head office and districts as well as through primary and secondary sources. The author used her insights accumulated through commissioned work for the GDE and the Gauteng Institute of Curriculum Development (GICD) in terms of conference reporting (GDE district development conferences of 1999 and 2001), training workshops and research projects on the development and/or assessment of district capacity and performance (GDE, 2001 and GICD/CEPD, 2001 and 2002). Having established a good informal working relationship with various GDE officials, valuable information was also gathered through individual interviews about the complexities and tensions in the provincial decision-making processes and the ongoing struggle by head office and districts to improve organisational effectiveness and performance. Information was finally derived from secondary sources, such as various external departmental evaluations, and primary sources, such as GDE internal reports and research findings.

Tensions and challenges of SA educational governance

It is first important to contextualise the study by giving a brief overview of the governance situation in SA education. Following the negotiations which led to a compromise between different positions, a three-tiered system was agreed upon in the Constitution, with educational powers, responsibilities and finances divided among the national, provincial and institutional levels. The national and provincial governments share concurrent educational powers. The national level is responsible for developing policy frameworks, norms and standards across the system with monitoring and quality assurance powers over policy implementation and the quality of education. The provincial level has also policy-making powers, which should not contravene the national legal framework but assist in fulfilling its main responsibility of policy implementation and service delivery. The provinces have delegated some administrative authority to sub-units, districts or regions, with the provincial head office responsible for the coordination of policy implementation, post allocations, personnel and finances, and the districts in charge of school support and provisioning. On the whole, this new educational governance system represented a fragile institutional equilibrium with tensions and conflicts, which was to evolve.

Reading 4

McLennan, A.C., *Education Governance and Management in South Africa*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, pp. 50-54.

1.5 Defining Education Governance and Management

Goran Hyden (1992) develops a useful and detailed conception of governance which can be used as a starting point and framework for understanding the complex sets of debates which comprise the relationships between management and governance in education. Hyden argues that the concept of governance is an umbrella concept which is able to define an approach to comparative politics (Bratton and Rothchild, 1992). In particular, he is concerned to draw attention not to the performance of government *per se*, but to the social and relational nature of legitimate authority. Governance is a useful concept because it does not prejudice the locus or character of public decision making.

For example, it does not imply, as *government* does, that real political authority is vested somewhere within the formal-legal institutions of the state. Nor does it imply, as the term *leadership* does, that political control necessarily rests with the head of state or official political elites. It enables us to suspend judgement about the exact relationship between political authority and formal institutions in society (1992, p.6).

In Hyden's view then, governance is about is about the normative "rules of the game" which govern state-civil society interactions in the public realm. Hyden defines the public realm as comprising both the state and civil society, but excludes the private realm. Defining the line between public and private is of course difficult to do and has been the subject of debate over many years. Feminists, in particular, challenge this conceptualisation by arguing that the definition of the public realm in most political theory excludes historical female experience, relegating it to the private sphere of domestic duty. The limits of public action would not only apply to women, but arguably to excluded groups whose voices are not recognised as part of the "game" of political exchange. This has implications for development also, because it is often disempowered groups, who lack voice, that are excluded from state-initiated development activities.

It is the relational nature of this concept of governance which is interesting and which is further developed by Andrew Dunsire (1993) and Torben Beck Jorgensen (1993). Dunsire argues that notions of government by regulation, whether hierarchical or market-based, assume linear models of change. The hierarchical mode is implementation- and enforcement-intensive while the market-based model is more cost-effective. He argues, however, that it is foolhardy to believe that social systems need to be governed constantly. In line with Archer, he suggests that social systems tend to persist, with the same parts in the same relationships with much the same boundaries, regardless of government's efforts to steer the direction of change. Using notions of dynamic, organic systems, he argues that governance can be understood as a process of collibration, which "conveys the process of strengthening one force or weakening another in a polydynamic arena so as to alter the outcome without superseding the tensions altogether" (1993, p. 29). Collibration, therefore, refers to a type of statecraft where groups do not regard themselves as being governed but as following their own free choice. This statecraft involves maintaining a balance between conflicting interests through manipulating the precarious balance between social groups to achieve government objectives. The essence of collibration is to identify what antagonistic forces exist, what stand-off patterns presents themselves and what interventions would create a more desirable position. Building on the notion of the tendency of social systems to preserve themselves, Jorgenson (1993) suggests that changes in modes of governance seem to be rationally planned but may also reflect a shift in political or administrative ideologies and, therefore, may be more symbolic.

The approach to governance in education adapted by the South African government reflects a combination of these strategies. On one level, it is a normative and symbolic attempt to include and recognise the social groups who fought the struggle against apartheid at great social and personal cost. This is evident in the attempt to develop governing structures which represents all these different players. However, on another level, it is an attempt to collibrate, through various managing and governance discourses, the conflicts and tensions which characterise the educational arena as a consequence of the

apartheid struggle. In this context, education governance is broadly about the extent to which the decision-making structures and systems which define education development enjoy respect and legitimacy. A consequence of effective governance would be legitimacy or social capital, that is, the engagement of education actors in public deliberation about education provision. This brings the notion of education governance face to face with the conundrum highlighted earlier.

Education is required to create the conditions for social development and democracy, but at the same time requires democratic relationships in the form of social capital to sustain education development. It is this tension which highlights the limits of education governance and management in the South African context. The educational arena in education is characterised by a range of relationships and conflicts which are embedded in the governing and management technologies of the apartheid period. These have to a large extent undermined inter-group cohesion at the school level. There are a range of education actors whose identities, formed during the apartheid period, are premised on notions of struggle and resistance. These continue to operate in the field of education governance as interest groups competing for scarce resources. In addition, the management systems and processes which control distribution and delivery, continue to develop and sustain identities more suited to hierarchical or market-based forms of organisation. This further undermines the process of participatory democracy and development and has the effect of privileging those social groups who are able to access resources through the traditional means.

Swilling *et al* (1997), argue that the formal governance and development prescriptions of the 1990s assert the primacy of the market as an alternative to the organisational principles of hierarchy. Both of these approaches ignore the relational webs which characterise economic and political productivity. They therefore suggest a need to focus on how institutions are activated by the way people-in-relations realise procedures and activities. In this activating work, an organisation is connected to, and embedded in, the web of relations, a social economy which forms the social environment of the various participants (Swilling *et al* 1997, p.22).

They argue that ignoring the relational nature of urban communities in Southern Africa results in the imposition of market-based or hierarchical modernities which amplify local conflicts, violence and dissonance. Democratic governance, in these contexts, is more likely to be achieved by using the relational capital implicit in local communities, than by attempting to regulate or change it.

In this thesis, the concept of governance will be used to capture the complexity and challenge of these newly forming political and institutional relationships in education. Hyden (1992) argues that governance involves power relationships characterised by conflict and compulsion. These are characterised by forms of exchange and reciprocity. Exchange is viewed primarily as a mutually rewarding and beneficial relationship, although this is debatable in economic terms. However, it is the basic productive relationship in a market based model. Reciprocity also involves mutually productive transfers but characterises continuing relationships among or between people. At its heart is the concept of authority or legitimate power, that is the voluntary acceptance of an asymmetrical relationship. While this characterises a sovereign notion of power, adding the concept of power as a relation extends this notion of reciprocity to include the social mechanisms of subjugation and compliance. Governance then involves relationships of power, authority, reciprocity and exchange. Hyden views structures, another aspect of governance, as the normative frameworks, rules or regulations, within which people pursue social, economic or political ends. He suggests that they comprise the "rules of the games" for governance interactions and are characterised by relationships of trust, compliance, accountability and innovation. These structures are better understood as the institutional context which determines patterns of interaction and distribution.

Governance can therefore be understood as a combination of political and institutional power to ensure the effective management of resources for development. Governance is fundamentally concerned with institutional relationships between people in the form of individuals, interest groups, stakeholders and organisations. The nature of these relationships is determined in a postmodern sense by shifting social interactions and discourses which pattern institutional contexts. Policies provide the context and framework for governance relationships. They are important because they tend to frame the structural ways in which people operate. They relate not only to the "who decides" question, but to the process of

deciding. Power determines the nature of relationships. Power operates through notions of “truth” and is dependent on dominant social paradigms which define “the way things are”. Empowerment is then not only about the distribution of power, from the powerful to the powerless, but about challenging perceptions and developing new models of social organisation. In summary then, governance can be understood as the collibration of complex political, socio-economic and institutional relationships between people (the stakeholders of any particular sector), policy (structural, normative and regulatory frameworks) and power (the distribution and utilisation of power and authority networks) in order to legitimate resource distribution and development in education.

Management forms part of this process as the mechanism through which compliance and service delivery is achieved. Education management broadly can be categorised into three broad areas - strategic, pedagogic and operational. Strategic management can be understood as the process of defining the normative and regulatory frameworks which will facilitate the effective structuring and planning of education through the allocation of resources. The strategic management function is critical to the establishment of effective relationships between stakeholders and the levels of education management because it establishes the framework for the long term, dynamic process of managing for change. Pedagogical management involves those issues related to the nature and objectives of the educational process. These are translated into the curriculum and teaching and learning practices of the staff of the education management system. Operations management refers to the managing of daily operational processes involving policy, planning and co-ordination, human resource management and financial management. It is, in fact, the day-to-day administrative process and management system which has an impact on delivery in the education system overall. All of these areas are interdependent and form part of an overall system of education management. Management, in this context, is not perceived as a neutral or technical process of delivery, but as a complex set of institutional practices, discourses and relationships which produce forms of compliance, self-discipline and modes of organisation. Public management is, therefore, related to governance. Both are premised on notions of social regulation.

Reading 5

Day, C., *Professional Development and Reflective Practices: Purpose, Processes and Partnerships*, University of Nottingham, England, undated, pp. 1-5.

It is generally agreed that reflection in, on and about practice is essential to building, maintaining and further developing the capacities of teachers to think and act professionally over the span of their careers. Whilst much has been written about the different purposes, processes and outcomes of reflection there remains a lack of clarity about its practices, in particular how it may lead to change. Most of the writing is by academics, and those publications by teachers, whether alone or in collaboration with academics, are the result of attendance on courses for the purpose of accreditation. In short, whilst the evidence of the benefits and costs of engaging in reflective practice is voluminous, it seems to represent the work of a small minority of teachers. Whether most teachers engage in systematic reflection which contributes to their development and capacity to improve the quality of learning opportunities for students remains an open question. Deliberative processes of reflection at least seem still to be 'the exception rather than the rule' (Dreyfus and Dreyfus 1986, p 28). The reasons for this are well rehearsed: i) conditions of service for most teachers mean that little time is available; ii) most teachers' learning is incidental, occurring in the classroom; iii) teachers' learning lives are characterized by fragmentation and discontinuity; iv) direct classroom experience seems to be the principle means for learning; and v) few schools or individual teachers routinely plan for intervention by others into their natural learning lives for the purpose of peer assisted learning. Yet there are opportunities even within the intensity and business of teachers' working lives. This paper argues that there are choices to be made and attempts to clarify those which all teachers have in relation to determining the purposes and orientations of reflective processes in which they engage. It discusses different kinds of partnerships necessary, it is argued, for the capacities to reflect upon thinking and practice to be enhanced and the qualities and skills necessary to participate successfully in these.

The Nature and Purposes of reflection

Essentially, reflection involves the participant in a critique of practice, the values which are implicit in that practice, the personal, social, institutional and broad policy contexts in which practice takes place, and the implications of these for improvement of that practice. It is, then, about the past, the present and the future; it is about 'problem posing' as well as 'problem solving' (Mezirow, 1991, p, 1 05); and it is essential to building and maintaining the capacity of all professionals whose work focuses upon the care and development of children, young people and adults - whether in advantaged or disadvantaged in changing circumstances - to maintain their effectiveness.

Because the reflective process is a dialectic between thought and action, theory and practice (Pedretti, 1996, p.325) it has been conceived as **praxis** through which change occurs:

In praxis, the ideas that guide action are just as subject to change as the action itself. Therefore, only through a fundamental shift in our beliefs, values and feelings about teaching and learning, will we be effective in bringing about significant change in our practice. Creating a culture of critical reflection enhances our educative potential, and provides practitioners with opportunities to deconstruct conventional.....practices.
(Carr and Kemmis, 1986, p33)

What is particularly interesting in this perspective is that these authors introduce the notions of i) a link between reflective practice and 'emancipation' from the limitations of 'conventional' practices. This implies the ability to exercise autonomy in developing a repertoire of practice; and ii) the necessity for 'fundamental shifts in beliefs, values and feelings' if change is to occur. Whilst this focus is an essential part of reflective practice, it does not recognise that change itself may be evolutionary or additive rather than radical, depending upon circumstance and disposition. Its authors, like other writers on reflection (e.g. Schon 1983), do not pay enough attention to the importance of the emotional self (Goleman, 1995), preferring instead the high ground of rationality and cognition. So to engage in reflection, creates

opportunities for choices which relate to values as well as purposes, contexts and change. Whatever the orientation, however, its use presents possibilities for self evaluation. It is:

a model of a teacher who, given particular circumstances is able to distance himself, from the world in which he is an everyday participant and open himself to ... influence by others.
(Day 1991, p.49).

This model of the teacher as systematic inquirer is essential to the concept of 'reflective practitioner' and affects the nature of the research relationships between school teachers, university academics and those who shape policy,

Various writers have coined the terms reflection-**in**-action, reflection-**on**-action, reflection **about**-action and reflection-for-action which involves forward planning. (Schon 1983, Zeichner 1993). Recently there have been critiques about the notion of reflection-in-action which, it is claimed, is impossible in practice because there is insufficient time at a conscious level (Eraut, 1995). Reflection-on-action occurs when reviewing the action from outside its setting; reflection-about-action occurs when reviewing the broader personal, social, economic and political contexts in which the action occurs. It is often accompanied by a desire to achieve social justice, emancipation or improvement. It has been suggested, however that, even when the circumstances for reflection are favourable, most teachers reflect principally at the 'PI' level of practice and do not, therefore, concern themselves with reasons or ethical justifications for their teaching (Handal and Lauvas, 1987). This is partly to do with the busyness cultures in which they work and partly the traditional 'practicality ethic' of the teaching profession. It has also been suggested by some that governments are now using 'reflective practice' as a means of promoting technical proficiency, thus developing a new 'technicist' teaching culture which further exacerbates the perceived theory-practice gap between the academy and schools, academics and school teachers; and, more importantly, diminishes the capacity of teachers to act effectively in using their discretionary judgement which is seen as central to their professionalism (Hargreaves and Goodson, 1996).

Kinds of Reflection

Using van Manen's (1977) conceptual framework, Grimmitt *et al.* (1990) in Canada, proposed three modes of reflection:

- Technical (as an instrument to direct or control practice. This may be used to improve the efficiency of the 'delivery' of existing prescribed curricula but not to question its value)
- Deliberative (as a means of choosing from a range of alternative views and practices of teaching)
- Dialectical (as a means of transforming by reconstructing practice within concepts of social justice and emancipation)

More recently, others have located learning through reflection within the context of fundamental values and beliefs about education. Five "orientations" of reflective practice have been proposed: the immediate, the technical, the deliberative, the dialectic and the transpersonal:

Immediate orientation: emphasis on 'pleasant survival' ... tendency to focus upon immediate demands or task in hand, pedagogy often eclectic, but shallow.

Technical orientation: emphasis on development and perfection of teaching methodology and efficient delivery of prescribed results. Typically emphasises behavioural techniques.

Deliberative orientation: emphasis on discovery, assignment and assessment of personal meaning within an educational setting. Accept given ends but negotiate process and content.

Dialectic orientation: emphasis upon political emancipation, questioning educational ends, content and means. Tendency to focus upon political and social issues. Pedagogy involves continual questioning, revision and internal validation, stressing empowerment and personal responsibility.

Transpersonal orientation: emphasis upon inner self development and relationship of internal to external.

(Wellington and Austin, 1996)

It may be, however, not only a matter of choice, for not all teachers are at a stage of readiness to engage in all of these reflective orientations. Indeed, the culture of the school in which they work may discourage them from doing so. However it is important that teachers engage in each of these forms of reflection during their career lives at times which are appropriate to the maintenance and development of commitment, knowledge, expertise, and personal and professional health. This suggests a continuum rather than a hierarchy of reflective practice. The dilemma is which to choose and when. Reflecting about the action is a form of reflection which demands particular attention in current national contexts since it focuses upon tensions between policy and practice and the struggle for supremacy between different interest groups' definitions of 'professionalism'. (See Hargreaves and Goodson 1996 for a valuable discussion of different forms of professionalism). Behaving as professionals clearly involves reflection not only in and on, but also about the action - it involves critical inquiry into the moral, ethical, political and instrumental issues embedded in teachers' everyday thinking and practice. Reflection of this kind is a means for professionals both to exercise responsibility and accountability for the decisions that they make in their teaching and to maintain the broader perspectives of the inter-relationships between contexts, purposes, practices and outcomes which inform their views of what it means to be and grow as a professional. My view is that no single form of reflection is necessarily 'better' than another, but that teachers must be involved in all during the course of a career. The different kinds of reflection may, therefore, be conceived as being parts of a **continuum of reflective practice**, rather than different levels in a hierarchy. However, if teachers want to avoid bureaucratic and technical conceptions of their role that have historically been given to them, and if they are going to become technically competent and reflective, then it is reasonable to suggest that they must seek to maintain a broad vision about their work and not just look inwardly at the efficiency of their own practices within externally imposed agendas, however well-intentioned they may be:

'Teachers cannot restrict their attention to the classroom alone, leaving the larger setting and purposes of schooling to be determined by others. They must take active responsibility for the goals to which they are committed, and for the social setting in which these goals may prosper. If they are not to be mere agents of others, of the state, of the military, of the media, of the experts and bureaucrats, they need to determine their own agency through a critical and continual evaluation of the purposes, the consequences, and the social context of their calling'.
(Zeichner and Liston, 1996 p 1 1).