

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Ms H Sidiropoulos
32 Deutzia Rd.
Primrose Hill
1401

Fax: (011) 453 3177
E-mail: hsidiropoulos@saheti.co.za

Mr. Brown
Superintendent-General: Education
Gauteng Province
PO Box 7710
Johannesburg
2006

Dear Mr. Brown

Permission to conduct research in schools for PhD studies

I am studying towards a PhD in Policy Studies at the University of Pretoria. The focus of my study is implementing policy in a reforming, developing country context such as ours. The specific policy that is the focus of my study is the new Mathematical Literacy policy. As part of the research I need to collect data from schools. The data collection in two schools will involve questionnaires for Grade 10 mathematical literacy educators, interviews with these educators, observing their classrooms and document analysis. The results will inform both policy and practice. I have discussed this with some school principals who have given in-principle support. I therefore seek your permission to collect data from two schools as part of my doctoral studies. I promise to abide by the principles of anonymity and confidentiality.

Saheti School in Senderwood, Gauteng employs me as Head of Department Administration and Subject Head in Mathematics and Additional Mathematics.

Thank you,
Yours sincerely

Appendix B

Ms H Sidiropoulos
32 Deutzia Rd.
Primrose Hill
1401

Fax: (011) 453 3177
E-mail: hsidiropoulos@saheti.co.za

Dr. J. Kruger
Principal: FET High School
Gauteng Province

Dear Dr. J.Kruger

Permission to conduct research in schools for PhD studies

I am studying towards a PhD in Policy Studies at the University of Pretoria. The focus of my study is implementing policy in a reforming, developing country context such as ours. The specific policy that is the focus of my study is the new Mathematical Literacy policy. As part of the research I need to collect data from schools. The data collection in your school will involve a Grade 10 mathematical literacy educator answering structured questionnaires, my observing the said educator's classroom and interviewing the said educator. I will also need to look at records/documents of the educator and learners with regard to mathematical literacy. The results of the research will inform both policy and practice.

I therefore seek your permission to collect data from your school and educator from the 31 July to the 25 August 2006, and the week of the 9th of October 2006. I promise to abide by the principles of anonymity and confidentiality.

Thank you,

Yours sincerely

H.Sidiropoulos

Appendix C

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Research Questions:

1. What do teachers understand to be the purposes, problems and possibilities contained in the mathematical literacy curriculum?
2. How do teachers proceed to implement the mathematical literacy curriculum in their classrooms?
3. Why do teachers implement this curriculum in the ways they do? In other words, what explains the implementation pathways followed by the mathematical literacy curriculum in real classroom contexts?

Table of Contents:

Summary of critical research questions, propositions and methods

Summary of the value of the methods to the research questions

Questionnaire I - schedule A

Questionnaire II - schedule B

Interview I- schedule C (pre-classroom observations)

Interview II- schedule D (post-lesson observations)

Classroom observation protocol - schedule E

Document analysis I -schedule F

Document analysis II -schedule G

Document analysis III - schedule H

Contextual information on the school - schedule I

Researchers journal-schedule J

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODS

The propositions are used as informative lenses for the data collection but may be refined and replaced depending on the data generated during the study. The relationship between the propositions and questions is theoretical and will be tested in this study.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS	PROPOSITIONS	METHODS
1) What do teachers understand to be the purposes, problems and possibilities contained in the mathematical literacy curriculum?	Teachers may not have a deep understanding of the purposes, problems and possibilities contained in the mathematical literacy curriculum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Semi-structured interview with classroom teachers before classroom observation (Schedule C)○ Questionnaire containing both open and closed ended questions (Schedule A)○ In- depth document analysis of curriculum and related guidelines (Schedule G)○ Researchers journal (Schedule J)○ Theoretical analysis

<p>2) How do teachers proceed to implement the mathematical literacy curriculum in their classrooms?</p>	<p>Teachers implement the mathematical literacy curriculum in their classroom using beliefs and pedagogies that are already entrenched in their practice.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Questionnaire containing both open and closed ended questions (Schedule B)○ Analysis of teacher and pupil documents and records (Schedule F)○ Classroom observation protocol (Schedule E)○ Researchers journal (Schedule J)○ Theoretical analysis
--	---	---

<p>3) Why do teachers implement this curriculum in the ways they do? In other words, what explains the implementation pathways followed by the mathematical literacy curriculum in real classroom contexts?</p>	<p>Teachers implement mathematical literacy, as an alternative to mathematics, only because it is a mandatory subject, and in so doing avoid sanctions.</p> <p>Teachers do not embrace the 'spirit' of the reform.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Interview with teachers after the lesson (Schedule D)○ Document summary form (Schedule H)○ Questionnaire containing both open and closed ended questions (Schedule B)○ Researchers journal (Schedule J)○ Theoretical analysis
---	--	---

SUMMARY OF THE VALUE OF THE CHOSEN METHODS TO THE RESEARCH

CRITICAL QUESTION	METHOD	VALUE
<p>1) What do teachers understand to be the purposes, problems and possibilities contained in the mathematical literacy curriculum?</p>	<p>Questionnaire schedule (survey)</p>	<p>This will provide me with information on how teachers understand the mathematical literacy curriculum, with respect to purposes, problems and possibilities.</p>
	<p>Interview schedule</p>	<p>The in-depth interview will enable me to elicit teachers' understanding of the curriculum. The open-ended questions will allow for the flexibility required in pursuing the 'gems' of information they may provide. The information elicited will also provide a basis for further refinement of the data instruments.</p>
	<p>Document analysis schedule (e.g. policy documents)</p>	<p>This information gathered will allow me to establish a comparison between the curriculum intentions and the teachers' understanding thereof.</p>
	<p>Researchers journal</p>	<p>The journal will be used to record my own views, perceptions and feelings, and in so doing provide me with a platform for reflection. It will also be used to capture non-verbal cues and emergent themes that can inform my design for subsequent interviews or observations.</p>
	<p>Theoretical analysis</p>	<p>Validating data by testing it against theoretical perspective.</p>

2) How do teachers proceed to implement the mathematical literacy curriculum in their classrooms?	Questionnaire schedule	This will provide me with information on how teachers claim to implement mathematical literacy in their classrooms. It will capture the teacher's instructional practice, beliefs, and changes made
	Classroom observation protocol	This will provide me with direct evidence on the curriculum enactment in the classroom. This information will allow me to corroborate, refute and augment the evidence from the other sources.
	Document analysis schedule (e.g. lesson plans, learning programme guidelines)	This will allow me to gather evidence on the extent to which changes can be observed in the classroom practices.
	Researchers journal	The journal will be used to capture any critical incidents that occur in the classroom with respect to implementation that are not provided for in the interviews and questionnaires. Furthermore it will provide me with a record of my own bias on which I can reflect.
	Theoretical analysis	Validating data by testing it against theoretical perspective.
3) Why do teachers implement this curriculum in the ways they do? In other words, what explains the implementation pathways followed by the mathematical literacy curriculum in real classroom contexts?	Interview schedule	To gather information on why teachers pursue particular modes of curriculum implementation, and the 'spirit' of their instruction. This will be used to inform the explanation of the curriculum implementation pathway in the classroom.

	Document summary	These documents will reveal the discussions that took place prior to implementation. The information will reflect the decisions made and the reasons for these.
	Questionnaire schedule	This will allow me to gather evidence in order to establish why implementation occurred, and if these reason impact on the pathway followed by mathematical literacy in the context of the classroom.
	Researchers journal	To capture my perceptions of the 'spirit' of the lesson and the subject as enacted in the classroom.
	Theoretical analysis	Validating data by testing it against theoretical perspective.

SCHEDULE A

Questionnaire I

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about teachers' understanding of the Mathematical Literacy curriculum and some background information.
The information you supply will be treated with absolute confidentiality and will be used for research purposes only.

PART A

EDUCATOR INFORMATION

PLEASE FILL IN OR CROSS (X) THE APPROPRIATE OPTION

1. Designation of educator

Teacher	Head of Department	Deputy principal	Principal	Other (specify)

2. Teaching subject area

Mathematics	Mathematical Literacy	Additional Mathematics	Other (specify)

3. List any other academic responsibilities

4. List duties other than academic

5. Age

Under 25	25-29	30-34	35-40	40-49	50-59
----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

6. Teaching experience in years

0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20 or more
-----	------	-------	-------	------------

7. Gender

Male	Female
------	--------

8. Formal qualifications

2 year diploma	3 year diploma	Degree only	Degree and diploma	More than one degree	Other (Specify)
----------------	----------------	-------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------

9. Type of school

Primary	Secondary	Combined
---------	-----------	----------

11. Description of the school

Urban	Rural	Other (specify)

11. Does streaming (differentiation according to ability) occur in Mathematics classes?

Yes	No
-----	----

12. Explain

PART B

The Mathematical Literacy curriculum in the Further Education and Training Band, Grade 10 came into effect in 2006.

The questions that follow inquire about the information available to you about the Mathematical Literacy curriculum, and two other related documents.

PLEASE FILL IN OR CROSS (X) THE APPROPRIATE OPTION

1. Are you aware of the Mathematical Literacy curriculum?

Yes	No
-----	----

2. Was the document made available to your school?

Yes	No
-----	----

3. If yes, please state how?

Workshop	Circular	Conference	Other (specify)

4. Do you have a personal copy of this curriculum statement?

Yes	No
-----	----

5. How did you first become aware of the Mathematical Literacy curriculum?

I read the curriculum document	
I was informed about it by my Head of Department	
I was told by the principal	
I was invited to a workshop	
It was discussed at a staff meeting	
Other (specify)	

6. To what extent do you understand the Mathematical Literacy curriculum?

Not familiar	To some extent	To a large extent	Totally familiar
--------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------

7. Does it provide guidelines for implementation?

Yes	No	Not sure
-----	----	----------

8. Does it allow for flexible implementation?

Yes	No	Not sure
-----	----	----------

9. Are you aware of the Learning Programme Guidelines for Mathematical Literacy?

Yes	No
-----	----

10. Do you have a personal copy of this document?

Yes	No
-----	----

11. To what extent do you understand the Learning Programme Guidelines for Mathematical Literacy?

Not familiar	To some extent	To a large extent	Totally familiar
--------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------

12. Does it provide guidelines for implementation?

Yes	No	Not sure
-----	----	----------

13. Does it allow for flexible implementation?

Yes	No	Not sure
-----	----	----------

14. Are you aware of the Assessment Guidelines for Mathematical Literacy?

Yes	No
-----	----

15. Do you have a personal copy of this document?

Yes	No
-----	----

16. To what extent do you understand the Assessment Guidelines for Mathematical Literacy?

Not familiar	To some extent	To a large extent	Totally familiar
--------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------

17. Does it provide guidelines for implementation?

Yes	No	Not sure
-----	----	----------

18. Does it allow for flexible implementation?

Yes	No	Not sure
-----	----	----------



PART C

What are your views about each of the following statements with regard to the Mathematical Literacy curriculum?

PLACE A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BLOCK

	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. The curriculum must be viewed in relation to the larger agenda of transformation					
2. The curriculum is mandatory because of political reasons					
3. The curriculum is mandatory because of the low levels of numeracy in the country					
4. It is a 'watered down' version of the more abstract Mathematics curriculum					
5. Is similar to the previous Standard Grade Mathematics curriculum in nature					
6. Is similar to the previous Standard Grade Mathematics curriculum in level of difficulty					
7. Is similar to the previous Standard Grade Mathematics curriculum in teaching					
8. Provides learners with an awareness and understanding of the role that mathematics plays in the modern world					
9. Allows for life-related applications of mathematics					
10. Enables learners to become numerically self-managing persons					
11. Enables learners to become contributing workers to society.					
12. Empowers learners with democratic participation					
13. Supports critical thinking					
14. Supports creative thinking					



PLACE A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BLOCK

	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
15. Delays formal methods (algorithms) in favor of extended opportunities to engage mathematics in diverse contexts					
16. Is suited to dealing with issues related to human rights, environmental and social justice					
17. Values indigenous knowledge systems					
18. Is credible in quality					
19. Supports only low order skills and knowledge					
20. Allows for no real abstract thinking only practical application					
21. Encourages team work in problem solving					
22. Respectfully considers and allows for diversity					
23. Favours process and context over content					
24. Conceptual knowledge is minimum					
25. The outcomes are of central importance to the attainment of the Critical and Developmental outcomes					
26. Is easy to implement					
27. Has resulted in anxiety and stress for you					
28. It is an opportunity for you to re-define your thinking about the nature and teaching of mathematics					
29. Informs and improves your teaching					
30. Allows for the development of knowledge, skills, values and attitudes					

PART D

How often do you use the following methods, tools and techniques in the teaching of Mathematical Literacy?

PLACE A CROSS (X) IN THE APPROPRIATE BLOCK

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
1.Charts					
2.Tables					
3.Data from media					
4.Textbooks					
5.Scientific calculators					
6.Spread sheets					
7. Newspaper articles					
8.Computer software:					
▪ Autograph					
▪ Geometers Sketchpad					
▪ Other (specify)					
9.Debates					
10.Reflection					
11.Learner chosen contexts					

PART E

It is claimed that effective Mathematical Literacy teachers possess the following traits and behavior.

PLACE A CROSS (X) ON THE RESPONSE YOU CONSIDER MOST APPROPRIATE

	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.Have high but realistic expectations of all learners					
2.Promote and value learner effort					
3.Focus on key mathematical ideas					

PLACE A CROSS (X) ON THE RESPONSE YOU CONSIDER MOST APPROPRIATE

	Strongly agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
4. Modify teaching as a result of lesson reflection					
5. Believe that mathematics teaching and learning should be enjoyable					
6. Are confident in their own knowledge of mathematics					
7. Vary their roles as teachers					
8. Connect mathematics ideas to various contexts					
9. Make the mathematical focus clear to the learners					
10. Use teachable moments as they occur					

PART F

WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MAIN REASONS WHY THE MATHEMATICAL LITERACY CURRICULUM HAS BEEN INTRODUCED IN OUR SCHOOLS?

Please write clearly.

PART G

WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE TERM MATHEMATICAL LITERACY?

Please write clearly.

PART H

DO YOU BELIEVE THAT TEACHING MATHEMATICAL LITERACY IS DIFFERENT TO TEACHING MATHEMATICS?

Please write clearly.

PART I

WHO DO YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE TEACHING MATHEMATICAL LITERACY?

Please write clearly.

PART J

WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE TO BE THE 'SPIRIT' OF THIS NEW REFORM IN MATHEMATICS? THAT IS WHAT ITS BROADER PURPOSE IS?

Please write clearly.

SCHEDULE B

Questionnaire II

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about how teachers practice Mathematical Literacy in their classrooms.

PART A

PLEASE READ EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS BELOW WITH REGARD TO YOUR CURRENT TEACHING PRACTICE WITH RESPECT TO MATHEMATICAL LITERACY AND PLACE A CROSS ON THE NUMBER OF THE RESPONSE YOU CONSIDER MOST APPROPRIATE.

How does your current teaching practice match each of the following statements?

	Mirrors the statement	Room for improvement	Does not mirror the statement
1.Teaching is sensitive to indigenous knowledge systems			
2.Engages with real-world problems			
3.Various contexts are used			
4.Integrate lessons with other disciplines (subject areas)			
5.Entrepreneurial skills are targeted and developed			
6.Lessons engage learners critically			
7.Lessons engage learners creatively			
8.Basic mathematical skills are extended			
9.High levels of numerical skills are afforded			
10.Addresses issues of social justice			
11.Attitudes and values are developed			
12.Use technology			
13.Calculators used			
13.Reflection takes place (educator & learner)			
14.Pupils work in groups or pairs			

How does your current teaching practice match each of the following statements?

	Mirrors the statement	Room for improvement	Does not mirror the statement
15.Outcomes are linked to the Critical Outcomes			
16.Outcomes are linked to the Developmental outcomes			
17.Outcomes are the main objective of the lesson			
18.Outcomes overlap			
19.Process and context are the main elements of the lesson			
20.Content is the focus of the lesson			
21.Educator is confident			
22.Educator is motivated			
23.Assessment is integrated with teaching			
24.Feedback is integrated with teaching			

PART B

DO YOU THINK YOU HAVE THE NECESSARY KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO IMPLEMENT THE MATHEMATICAL LITERACY CURRICULUM? PLEASE GIVE REASONS.

Please write clearly.

PART C

ARE RESOURCES IN TERMS OF TIME, MATERIALS AND HUMAN CAPACITY SUFFICIENT AT YOUR SCHOOL TO IMPLEMENT THE CURRICULUM? PLEASE EXPLAIN.

Please write clearly.

PART D

WHAT CHANGES WITH RESPECT TO YOUR TEACHING METHODS DID YOU MAKE IN IMPLEMENTING THE NEW CURRICULUM?

Please write clearly.

PART E

HAS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF TEACHING MATHEMATICS CHANGED SINCE IMPLEMENTING THE NEW CURRICULUM?

Please write clearly.

PART F

HAVE YOUR BELIEFS WITH RESPECT TO WHO CAN DO MATHEMATICS CHANGED AS A RESULT OF MATHEMATICAL LITERACY?

Please write clearly.



PART G

WHAT DIFFICULTIES HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED IN THE IMPLEMENTING OF MATHEMATICAL LITERACY?

Please write clearly.

PART H

IN YOUR OPINION HOW CAN THESE BE OVERCOME?

Please write clearly.

PART I

HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY TRAINING OR SUPPORT IN IMPLEMENTING MATHEMATICAL LITERACY? EXPLAIN.

Please write clearly.

PART J

IS MATHEMATICAL LITERACY ABOUT GAINING ACCESS TO MATHEMATICS OR ABOUT ACCESSING MATHEMATICS? EXPLAIN.

Please write clearly.

SCHEDULE C

Interview I (Pre-classroom observations)

1. What is your understanding of the Mathematical Literacy curriculum?
2. Why do you believe this subject was introduced?
3. Why do you think it was made compulsory?
4. Which of your students do Mathematical Literacy?
 - How was this decided upon?
 - Describe these pupils with respect to mathematical proficiency.
5. In your opinion can all learners do Mathematical Literacy?
6. What do you think is the status of the subject with respect to mathematics?
 - Do the pupils of the school share this view?
 - Do the parents of the school share this view?
 - Do your colleagues share this view?
7. What is your definition of mathematical literacy?
 - How did you arrive at the definition?
8. What in your opinion are the essential elements of mathematical literacy?
 - Why?
9. What do you think are the goals of the Mathematical Literacy curriculum?
10. How is your definition of mathematical literacy consistent with these goals?
11. What do you believe that being numerate requires?
12. What do you understand by the following terms:
 - acquiring mathematical methods
 - establishing mathematical understanding
 - establishing mathematical connections?
13. Do you think you have a role to play in this mathematics reform?
 - What role?
14. What are the advantages of offering Mathematical Literacy?
15. What are the disadvantages of offering Mathematical Literacy?
16. Why did you introduce Mathematical Literacy at your school?
17. How does the Mathematical Literacy curriculum differ from the new Mathematics curriculum?
18. How does the Mathematical Literacy curriculum differ from the old Standard Grade Mathematics curriculum?
19. How does teaching the Mathematical Literacy curriculum differ from teaching the new Mathematics curriculum?
20. How does teaching the Mathematical Literacy curriculum differ from teaching the old Standard Grade Mathematics curriculum?
21. Do you believe that Mathematical Literacy will improve numeracy levels in your school?
 - Why?
22. Do you believe that Mathematical Literacy will improve numeracy levels in the country?
 - Why?

23. Do you feel confident with respect to teaching Mathematical Literacy?
 - Why?
24. Are you motivated to teach this subject?
25. How did you go about implementing this new curriculum?
 - Did you have any support?
 - Did you receive training?
26. What difficulties have you experienced with the implementation process?
27. What difficulties do you think teachers nation wide have experienced in the implementation process?
28. Have you had to change any of the following:
 - teaching style
 - teaching methods
 - beliefs with respect to the nature of mathematics?
29. What are your short-term goals with respect to teaching Mathematical Literacy?
30. What are your long-term goals with respect to teaching Mathematical Literacy?

SCHEDULE D

Interview Schedule II (Post-lesson observation)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to briefly collect information about how teachers perceive the nature of the lesson they have just delivered.

1. What was the purpose of this lesson?
2. In your view was this a successful lesson? Why?
3. Do you believe that the pupils acquired the knowledge and skills you expected of them before the lesson? Explain.
4. In future would you do anything differently? Explain.

SCHEDULE E

Classroom Observation Protocol

(4 weeks continuously of 1-hour lessons followed by one more week after 6 weeks)

Teacher:

School:

Date:

	Lesson ____		Lesson ____		Nature of use/Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
1.Purpose of lesson explained to learners					
2.Pre-knowledge determined					
3.Teaching supports learners to take ownership of mathematics					
4.Context obscures mathematics					
5.Use of authentic contexts					
6.Context familiar to learners					
7.Contexts used are a priori					
8.Contexts used are inductive					
9.Guided discovery of algorithms					
10.Learners encouraged to seek mathematical understanding					
11.Solution process varied and rich					
12.Mathematical 'life skills' taught					
13.Mathematical reasoning (justification) encouraged					
14.Reflect on solutions - awareness only					
15.Reflect on solutions-consensus generation					
16.Adaptive/differentiated instruction					
17.Instructional expectations of learners high					
18.Development of attitudes and values					

	Lesson ____		Lesson ____		Nature of use/Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
19. Teaching practice (pedagogy) promotes self-regulated learning					
20. Consolidate basic skills					
21. Extend basic skills					
22. Critical analysis of problems					
23. Critical engagement with regard to mathematical arguments					
24. Creativity in solving allowed for					
26. Lessons afford depth					
26. Lessons afford breadth					
27. Indigenous mathematics problems/examples used					
28. Communicates using various methods					
29. Variety of teaching resources used					
30. Multiple forms of representation (e.g. tables, diagrams)					
31. Computational tools used					
32. Space, shape & measurement using design/art/geography/other					
33. Functional relationships (rate of change)					
34. Numbers & operations in various contexts					
35. Data handling-awareness of data manipulation					
36. Data handling-critical analyses					
37. Learners pose/identify problems					
38. Recognition provided					
39. Reinforcement given					
40. Motivational strategies used					
41. Positive attitude towards all learners					



University of Pretoria etd - Sidiropoulos, H (2008)

	Lesson ____		Lesson ____		Nature of use/Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
42.Informed feedback given					
43.Outcomes focused					
44.Content focused					
45.Teacher -centered					
46.Learner-centered					
47.Collaborative problem solving					
48.Instructional match (needs to instruction matched)					
49.Order of lesson-review previous material, demonstrate how to solve problems for the day, practice similar problems					
50.Responsibility/sensitivity to broader societal concerns					
51.Career opportunities discussed					
52.Entrepreneurial success discussed					
53.Learners reflect on lesson					
54.Teacher reflects on lesson					
55.Assessment integrated in instructional practice					
56.Process and context interrelated with content					
57.Ownership of curriculum					
58.Relates mathematics to other learning areas					

SCHEDULE F

Document analysis I

PART A

Analysis of Learner Documents and Records

Criteria	Books/notes	Portfolios	Reports of learners	Comments
Purpose of lesson obvious				
Real-world problems				
Variety of contexts used				
Contexts chosen by teacher				
Evidence of learner context choices				
Focus is on content				
Focus is on process				
Evidence of issues related to human rights, environmental, social justice				
Reflects indigenous knowledge systems				
Conceptual knowledge developed				
Individuals needs catered for				
Lesson integrates with other disciplines				
Various methods of communication				
Use of calculators				
Estimation				
Use of technology				
High knowledge problems set				
High skills problems set				



PART B

Analysis of Educator Documents and Records

Criteria	Subject framework	Work schedule	Lesson plans	Departmental minutes	Staff development documentation	Comments
Philosophy and policy						
NCS principles						
Conceptual progression						
Integration of LOs & ASs						
Resources-learning & teaching						
Inclusivity & diversity						
Assessment						
Contexts & content						
Teaching methodology						
Learning methodology						

SCHEDULE G

Document analysis II

Three documents i.e., National Curriculum Statement Mathematical Literacy, Learning Programme Guidelines Mathematical Literacy, an Subject assessment Guidelines Mathematical Literacy, will be analyzed with respect to purpose, principles, scope and opportunity.

The documents will be explored and summarized according to the following criteria:

1. What is the purpose of the document?
 - What is the rationale for the document?
 - What are the goals and objectives of the document?
 - What principles is the document based on?
 - What are the implied intentions of the document?
2. How is the document related to transformation?
3. What is the 'theory of action'?
4. Which themes emerge?

SCHEDULE H

Document analysis III

The purpose of this summary form is to collect any additional information pertinent to this study from auxiliary (subject files, vision statement for implementation, timetable etc.) educator documents.

Site: _____

Document number: _____

Date received or picked up: _____

Name or description of document:

EVENT OR CONTACT, IF ANY, WITH WHICH DOCUMENT IS ASSOCIATED:

SIGNIFICANCE OR IMPORTANCE OF DOCUMENT:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF CONTENTS:

SCHEDULE I

Contextual Information on the School

The purpose of this checklist is to collect contextual information on the school in order to compile a vivid and rich description of the case study school for the narrative of this research.

To be completed by the researcher/teachers in the school

PLEASE FILL IN OR PLACE A TICK IN THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN

1. Type of building

a) Building designed as school	
b) Prefab	
c) Teacher training college	
d) Other (specify)	

2. School building

a) Number of blocks	
b) Number of storeys	

3. Condition of school and furniture

	Type of structure: Specify (e.g., brick wall, tile roof, etc)	No maintenance needed	Need maintenance	Need maintenance & structural repair	Beyond repair
a) Roof					
b) Windows					
c) Doors					
d) Walls					
e) Furniture					
f) Floors					
g) Toilets					
h) Ceilings	Fitted	Not fitted			
i) Other (specify)					

4. Number of toilets for teaching/administrative staff

a) Male staff	
b) Female staff	
c) Out of order	

5. Number of toilets for learners

a) Males	
b) Females	
c) Out of order	

6. Power and energy supply

a) Wired & supplied with electricity	
b) Wired but not supplied with electricity	
c) Not wired and/or & no electricity available	
d) Generators	
e) Other (specify)	

7. Overall condition of building

Very weak (not suitable for occupation)	Weak (structure needs attention)	Needs paint & minor repairs	Good condition	Excellent, no foreseeable repairs

8. Safety

a) Building is completely fenced with security at the entrance	
b) Building is completely fenced without security at the entrance	
c) Building has been fenced but fence is damaged	
d) No fence	
e) Other (specify)	

9. Office space

	Adequate	Inadequate	None	Estimated shortfall number
a) Offices for management				
b) Offices for admin staff				

SCHEDULE J

Researchers Journal

<u>Date:</u>
<u>Day:</u>
<u>Time:</u>

RESEARCHER REFLECTIONS

REFERENCES

Adler, J. 2004. Research and Maths Teacher Education. In Buffer, A & Laugksch R.C. (Eds.). *Ten Years of SAARMSTE: Trends and Challenges*.

Adler, J., Slonimsky, L. & Reed, Y. 2002. Subject focused inset and teachers' conceptual knowledge in practice. In Adler, J. & Reed, Y (Eds.). *Challenges of teacher development: an investigation of take-up in South Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik, pp. 135-152

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

Allen, S. 2005. *The Missing Link in Alternative Certification: Teacher Identity Formation*. http://www.umbc.edu/llc/llcreview/2005/The_Missing_Link.pdf

Amit, M. & Fried, M.N. 2002. Research, reforms and times of change. In English (Ed.) *Handbook of international research in mathematics education: Directions of the 21st Century*. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 355-381.

Angelo, T. 1999. *Doing academic staff development as though we valued learning most: transformative guidelines from research and practice*. Milperra, NSW: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia. <http://www.herdsa.org.au/branches/vic/Cornerstones/authorframeset.html>

Angula, N. & Grant Lewis, S. 1997. Promoting democratic processes in educational decision-making: reflections from Namibia's first 5 years. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 17(3): 222-249

Askew, M., Brown, M., Rhodes, V., Johnson, D., & William, D. 1997. *Effective teachers of numeracy: Final report*. London: King's College.

Australian Association of Mathematics Teachers Inc. 1997. *Numeracy=Everyone's Business, Report of the Numeracy Education Strategy Development Conference*, AAMT, Adelaide.

Ball, D.L. 1988. Unlearning to teach mathematics. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 8(1): 40-48.

Ball, D.L. 1990. Prospective elementary and secondary teachers' understanding of division. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 21:132-144.

Ball, S. 1994. *Education reform*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Ball, D.L. 1997. Developing mathematics reform: What don't we know about teacher learning-But would make good working hypotheses. In Friel, S.N & Bright, G.W. (Eds.)

Reflecting on our work: NSF teacher enhancement in K-6 mathematics. Lanham, M.D: University Press of America.

Bascia, N. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). 2000. *The sharp edge of educational change: Teaching leading and the realities of reform.* London: Routledge -Falmer.

Battista, M.T.1994.Teacher belief and the reform movement in mathematics education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, February, 462-470.

Beeby, C.E.1969.Educational Quality in Practice: Statement by the Minister of Education of Ruatoria.*Qualitative Aspects of Educational Planning.* Paris: UNESCO and IIEP.

Bernstein, B.1971.On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In Young MFD (Ed.) *Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education.* London: Collier Macmillan, pp. 47-69.

Berry, R.Q.2005.Introduction: Building an infrastructure for equity in mathematics education. *The High School Journal*, April/May

Bishop, A.J. & Volmink, J.2002.Values and policy: Bridging the gap in mathematics education. In Malcolm, C. & Lubisi, C. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Conference of the Southern African Association for Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education Research.* University of Natal, South Africa, pp. 22-26.

Black, P. & Atkin, J.M. (Eds.) 1996.*Changing the Subject; Innovation in Science, Mathematics, and Technology education.* London: Routledge.

Boaler, J.1993.The *Role of Contexts in the Mathematics Classroom: do they make mathematics more real?* Retrieved at <http://www.stanford.edu/~joboaler/FLM1993%20paper.doc>

Bogdan, R., & Bilken, S.1982.*Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bopape, M. & Volmink, J.1998. 'A conceptual framework for school based INSET (SBINSET) for mathematics teachers'. In N.Ogude, N. & Bohlmann, C. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the sixth annual meeting of the Southern African association for Research in Mathematics and Science Education.* University of South Africa Pretoria, pp. 77-78

Borasi, R.1990.The invisible hand operating in mathematics students' conceptions and expectations. In Cooney, T.J. (Ed.) *Teaching and learning mathematics in the 1990's* (1990 Yearbook). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, pp. 174-182

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J-C.1977.*Reproduction in Education.* Society & Culture. London-Sage.

Brodi, K.2004.Re-thinking teachers' mathematical knowledge: a focus on thinking practices. *Perspectives in Education*, 22(1): 65-80.

Brombacher, A.2004.*Mathematics Options for Grade 12-A critical perspective*. Paper commissioned by the FET-HE Task Team of SAUVCA following the HE sector-DoE seminar on 29 June 2004.

Broomes, D.1989.The Mathematical Demands of a Rural Economy, in UNESCO (1989).In Keitel, C., Damerow, P., Bishop, A.& Gerdes, P. (Eds.) *Mathematics Education and Society*. United Nations Educational Scientific: Paris.

Brown, C.A. & Baird, J.1992.Inside the teacher: Knowledge, beliefs and attitudes. In Wilson, P.S (Ed.) *Research ideas for the classroom: High school mathematics*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, pp. 245-249.

Brown, C.A. & Borko, H.1992.Becoming a mathematics teacher. In Grouws, D. (Ed.) *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning*. New York: Macmillan, pp.209-239.

Burril, G.2003.*Quantitative Literacy-Implementation through Teacher Inservice*. Retrieved at http://www.stat.auckland.ac.nz/niase/publications/18/BOOK/1_A1-2.pdf

Bush, W.1986.Prospective teachers' sources of decision in teaching secondary mathematics. *Journal for research in Mathematics Education*, 17(1): 21-30.

Carraher, T.N., Carraher, D.W. & Schliemann, A.D.1985.Mathematics in the Streets and in Schools. *British Journal of Development Psychology*, 3(21):21-29.

Carson, T.2005.Beyond Instrumentalism: The Significance of Teacher Identity in Educational Change. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 3(2): 1-8.

Chimombo, J., Dlamini, E., Kulpoo, D., Moyo, G., Murimba, S., Nassor, S.M., & Nkamba, M.1994.A *project plan for the Southern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality*. (Vols.I and II). Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.

Chisholm, L.2000.A *South African curriculum for the 21st century*. Report of the Review committee on Curriculum 2005.Pretoria.

Clandinin, D., and Connelly, F.1995. Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: Secret, sacred, and cover stories. In F. Connelly, F. & Clandinin, D (Eds.) *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 1-15.

Coburn, C.2003.Rethinking Scale: Moving Beyond Numbers to Deep and Lasting Change. *Educational Researcher*, 32 (6): 3-12.

Cockcroft, W.H.1982.*Mathematics Counts Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Teaching of Mathematics in Schools*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Cohen, D.K.1990.A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs. Oublier. *Educational evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(3): 327-345.

Cohen, P.C.2001.The Emergence of Numeracy. In Steen, L.A (Ed.) *Mathematics and Democracy: The Case for Quantitative Literacy*. Princeton, NJ: National Council on Education and the Disciplines, pp. 23-30.

Cohen, R. M. 1994. *The ordeal of change: A true story of high school reform*. Teachers College Record, 96(2):148-166.

Cohen, D.K. & Ball, D.L.1990.Relations between policy and practice: a commentary. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(3): 249-256.

Cohen, D.K., & Hill, H.C.2000.Instructional Policy and Classroom Performance: The Mathematics Reform in California. *Teachers College Record*, 102 (2): 294-343

Cohen, D.K. & Hill, and H.C.2001.*Learning Policy: When State Education Reform Works*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Cohen, L., Marrion, L. & Morrison, K.2000.*Research Methods in Education*. Fifth edition. London: Routledge Falmer.

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., Mc Portland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, F.D. & York, R.L.1966.*Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Collins, J.2001.*Good to great*. New York: Harper Collins.

Cook, C.1995.*Critical Issue: Implementing Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Standards in Mathematics*. Retrieved at [http:// www.ncrel. org/ sdrs/ areas/ issues/ content/ cntareas/ math/ma600.htm](http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/content/cntareas/math/ma600.htm).

Cousins-Cooper, K.M.2000.Teacher expectations and their effects on African American students' success in mathematics. In Strutchens, M.E., Johnson, M.L. & Tate, W.F. (Eds.) *Changing the faces of mathematics: Perspectives on African Americans*.Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Cross, M., Mungadi, R. & Rouhani, S.2002.From Policy to Practice: curriculum reform in South African education. *Comparative Education*, 38 (2): 171-178.

Cuban, L.1984.*How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms*. New York: Longman, 1890-1980.

D'Ambrosio, U.2003.The Role of Mathematics in Building a Democratic Society. In Madison, B.L. & Steen, L.A *Quantitative Literacy Why Literacy matters for Schools and Colleges*, 235-238.<http://www.maa.org/ql/qltoc.html>

Darling-Hammond, L.1997.*The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L.1998.Policy and change: getting beyond bureaucracy. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M & Hopkins, D. (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Change*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 642-667.

Davis, E.A. & Krajcik, J.S.2005.Designing Educative Curriculum Materials to Promote Teacher Learning. *Educational Researcher*, 34 (3): 3-14.

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B. & Thoreson, A.2001.Does teacher certification matter? Evaluating the evidence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23:57-77.

Department of Education.1995 *White Paper on Education and Training*. Pretoria, Government Printers.

Department of Education.1997.*The Further Education and Training (FET) Act* (Act No. 98 of 1998). Pretoria, Government Printers.

Department of Education.1998. *Green Paper on Further Education and Training*. Pretoria, Government Printers.

Department of Education.2001.*National Strategy for Mathematics, Science and Technology Education in General and Further Education and Training*. Pretoria, Government Printers.

Department of Education, 2003.*The Review of the Financing, Resourcing, and Costs of Education in Public Schools*. Pretoria, Government Printers.

Department of Education. 2003a *National Curriculum Statements. Grades 10-12 (General)*. Pretoria, Department of Education.

Department of Education. 2003b *National Curriculum Statements. Grades 10-12 (General) Mathematical Literacy*. Pretoria, Department of Education.

Department of Education.2003c *Qualification and Assessment Policy Framework. Grades 10-12 (General)*. Pretoria, Department of Education.

Department of Education, 2004.*The Development of Education. Country Report of South Africa*.47th International Conference on Education 8-11 September 2004.

Department of Education.2005.*National Curriculum Statements. Grades 10-12 (General) Learning Programme Guidelines Mathematics and Mathematical Literacy*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education .2006. *National Curriculum Statement Grades 10-12 Teacher Guide Mathematical Literacy*. Pretoria, Department of Education.

Department for Education and Employment, UK.1998.The *Implementation of the National Numeracy Strategy: The Final Report of the Numeracy Task Force*, DfEE, and London.

Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs Commonwealth of Australia.2000.*Numeracy, a Priority for All: Challenges for Australian Schools*.JS Mc Millan Printing Group.

Dewey, J.1931."American Education Past and Future," The Later Works. In Boydston, J.A. (Ed.)."*American Education Past and Future," The Later Works*. Southern Illinois University Press, 6: 1931-1932.

Dilts, R.B.1999. *Sleight of Mouth: The Magic of Conversational Belief Change*. Capitola, CA: Meta Publications.

Diniz-Pereira, E.J.2003.The social construction of teachers' individualism: How to transcend traditional boundaries of teachers' identity? *Paper presented at the American association of Colleges for Teacher Education*. New Orleans, LA. ERIC Accession No.ED471561.

Doll, W.E. 1993. *A Post-modern Perspective on Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Donovan, M., Bransford.J, & Pellegrino, J. 1999. *How People Learn: Bridging Research and Practice* .Washington, D.C: National Academy Press.

Dossey, J.A., Mullis, I.V.S., Lindquist, M.M. & Chambers, D.L.1998.*The mathematics report card: Trends and achievement based on the 1986 national assessment*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Drake, C.2002.Experience Counts. *Educational Policy*, 16(2).

Drake, C., Spillane, J.P., & Hufferd-Ackles, K.2001.Storied identities: Teacher learning and subject matter context. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 33(1): 1-23.

Elbaz, F.1991.*Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge*. London, England: Croom Helm.

Elmore, R.1996.'Getting to Scale with Good Educational Practice'. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1): 1-26.

Ernest, P.1989.The Impact of Beliefs on the Teaching of Mathematics'. In Ernest, P. (Ed.) *Mathematics Teaching: The State of the Art*. London and Falmer Press, pp. 249-254.

Farber, B.1991. *Crisis in Education*.San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ferrini-Mundy, J. & Johnson, L. 1997. Highlights and Implications. In Ferrini-Mundy, J. & Schram (Eds.) *The recognizing and recording reform in mathematics education project: Insights, issues, and implications*. JRME Monograph No.8, Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, pp.111-128.

Foucault, M.1983. The subject and power. In Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. (Eds.) *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 208-226.

Frykholm, J.A.1996.Pre-service teachers in mathematics: Struggling with the Standards. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 12(1): 665-682.

Fullan, M.G.1982.The *meaning of educational change*. New York: Colombia University Press.

Fullan, M.G.1991.The *New Meaning of Educational Change, 2nd ed.* Teachers College Press, New York.

Fullan, MG. 1993a. *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M.G.1993b.Why Teachers Must Become Change Agents. *Educational Leadership* 50 (6): 3.

Fullan, M.G.2002.Principals *as Leaders in a Culture of Change*. Retrieved at http://www.michaelfullan.ca/articles_2002.htm

Fullan, M.G.2003.Core *Principles as a Means of Deepening Large Scale Reform*. Retrieved at http://www.michaelfullan.ca/articles_2003.htm

Fullan, M. 2004a. Education Analyst-Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education. Retrieved at http://www.michaelfullan.ca/articles_2004.htm

Fullan, M.G.2004b.*System Thinkers in Action: Moving Beyond the Standards Plateau*. Retrieved at http://home.oise.utoronto.ca/~changeforces/articles_2005.htm

Fullan, MG. 2005a.*Leadership and sustainability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press; Toronto: Ontario Principal's Council.

Fullan, M.G.2005b.*Tri-LevelDevelopment: It's the System*. Retrieved at [http:// home.oise.utoronto.ca/~changeforces/articles_2005.htm](http://home.oise.utoronto.ca/~changeforces/articles_2005.htm)

Fullan, M.G.2005c.*Resiliency and Sustainability*. Retrieved at [http:// home.oise.utoronto.ca/~changeforces/articles_2005.htm](http://home.oise.utoronto.ca/~changeforces/articles_2005.htm)

Fullan, M.G.2005d. *Professional Communities Writ Large*. Retrieved at http://home.oise.utoronto.ca/~changeforces/articles_2005.htm

Fullan, M.2006. *Effective District-wide strategies to raise student achievement in literacy and numeracy*. Retrieved at http://www.michaelfullan.ca/articles_2006.htm

Fullan, M., Campbell, C. & Glaze, A.2006. *Unlocking the Potential for Learning Case Study Report. The Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat Ministry of Education Ontario* Retrieved at http://www.michaelfullan.ca/articles_2002.htm

Fullan, M; Bertani, A & Quinn, J. 2004. *New Lessons for Districtwide Reform. Educational Leadership*, 61(7): 42-46

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. 1991.*What's Worth Fighting for in Your School?* Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation; Andover, Mass: The Network; Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press; Melbourne: Australian Council of Educational Administration.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). 1992. *Teacher development and educational change*, in *Teacher Development and Educational Change*. London, Falmer Press.

Fuller, B., & Snyder, C.W.1990.Colourful variations in teaching practices. In Snyder, C.W. & Ramatsui, P.T. (Eds.) *Curriculum in the Classroom Contexts of Change in Botswana's Junior Secondary School Instruction Programme*.Gabarone: Macmillan, pp. 57-71.

Glenn Commission .2000.*Archived: America Counts: National Commission on Mathematics and Science teaching for the 21st century*. Retrieved at <http://www.ed.gov/nits/Math/glenn/toc.html>

Goodenough, W.1963. *Cooperation and change*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Government Gazette (25 September 1998). *Education White paper 4-A Programme for the Transformation of Further Education and Training*, 399 (19281).

Greenstein, R.1997 *Education, identity and curriculum policies, in the New South Africa*. In: Kallaway, P., Krauss, G., Donn, G. & Fataar, A. (Eds.) *Education after Apartheid: South African education in transition*. Cape Town, UCT Press, pp. 127:142.

Gross, N., Giacuinta, J. & Bernstein, M. 1971. *Implementing organizational innovations; a sociological analysis of planned educational change*. New York: Basic Books.

Hargreaves, A. 1994. *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture on the postmodern age*. London: Cassell.

Hargreaves, A. 1998. The Emotions of Teaching and Educational change. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Change*. Great Britain: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 558-575.

Hargreaves, A; Lieberman, A; Fullan, M & Hopkins, D. 1998. Introduction .In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Change*. Great Britain: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 1-7.

Harley, K. & Parker, B. 1999. Integarting differences: Implications of an outcomes-based national qualifications framework for the role and competencies of teachers. In Jansen, J. & Christie, P. (Eds.). *Changing curriculum: Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa*. Kenwyn, South Africa: Juta & Co, pp. 181-200.

Harvey, D. 1989. *The condition of postmodernity. An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Havelock, R.G. & Huberman, A.M. 1977. *Solving Educational Problems*. UNESCO.

Heneveld, W. & Craig, H. 1996. *Schools Count: World Bank Project Designs and Quality of Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa*. World Bank Technical Paper, number 303.

Hill, L. 1997. Just tell us the rule: Learning to teach elementary mathematics. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48: 211-221.

Hill, H.C., Rowan, B., Ball, D.L. 2004. *Effects of Teachers' mathematical Knowledge for Teaching on Student Achievement*. Retrieved at <http://www.personal.umich.edu/~dball/HillRowanBallMay04>

Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M. & West, M. 1994. *School Improvement in an Era of Change*. London: Cassell Education Limited.

Howie, S. & Plomp, T. 2002. Mathematical literacy of school leaving pupils in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational development*, 22(6): 603-615.

Howie, S. 2005. Contextual factors at the School and Classroom Level related to Pupils'. *Educational Research an Evaluation*, 11 (2): 123-140.

HSRC. 1998. *TIMSS: SA matrices fared worst in international maths and science study*. Media release-24 February 1998. Retrieved at <http://www.hsrc.ac.za/media /1998 /2/19980224.html>.

Humenberger, H.2000.Applicable mathematics in Mathematical Education. *International Journal for Mathematics Teaching and Learning*. Retrieved at <http://www.cimt.plymouth.ac.uk/journal/default.html>.

ILEA. 1983. *Mathematics in Context A handbook for Teachers*. ILEA: London.

Jansen, JD.1999."A Very Noisy OBE". The implementation of OBE in Grade 1 Classrooms. In: Jansen, J. & Christie, P. (Eds.) *Changing the Curriculum: studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*. Juta Academic Publishers: Cape-Town, South Africa, pp. 145-156.

Jansen, J.D., & Christie, P.1999.*Changing Curriculum: Studies of Outcomes Based Education in South Africa*.Juta Academic Publishers: Cape-Town, South Africa.

Jansen, J.D. 2001.Image-ining teachers: Policy images and teacher identity in South African classrooms. *South African Journal of Education* 21(4): 242-245.

Kahn, M.2005.A class act-mathematics as filter of equity in South Africa's schools. *Perspectives in Education*, 23 (3): 139-152.

Keiser, J.M., & Lambdin, D.V.1996.The clock is ticking: Time constraint issues in mathematics teacher reform. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 90(1): 23-31.

Kitchen, R.2003.Getting real about mathematics education reform in high-poverty communities. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 23:16-23.

Kyriacou, C., Manowe, B., Newson, G.1999.Active learning of secondary school mathematics in Botswana. *Curriculum*, 20(2): 125-130.

Lampert, M.1986.Teachers' strategies for understanding and managing classroom dilemmas. In Ben-Peretz, M & Bromme, R. (Eds.). *Advances of research on teacher thinking*. Den Haag: Swits & Zeitlinger, pp. 234-260.

Lampert, M.1990.When the problem is not the question and the solution is not the answer: mathematical knowing and teaching. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27(1): 29-63.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G.1985.*Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lockheed, M.E. & Verspoor, A.M.1991.*Improving primary education in developing countries*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lubienski, S.2002.A closer look at Black-White mathematics gaps: Intersections of race and SES in NAEP achievement and instructional practices data. *Journal of Negro Education*, 71(1): 269-287.

Macnab, D.S. 2003. Implementing change in mathematics education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(2): 197-216.

Madison, B.L. & Steen, L.A.2003. QUANTITATIVE LITERACY Why Literacy Matters for Schools and Colleges. *Proceedings of the National Forum on Quantitative Literacy held at the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C. on December 1-2, 2001*. Retrieved at <http://www.maa.org/ql/qltoc.html>.

Manouchehri, A.1998.Mathematics curriculum reform and teachers: what are the dilemmas? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49:276-286.

Manouchehri, A.2003.Factors motivating reform: Learning from teachers' stories. In N.Pateman, B.J.Dougherty, &J.T.Zilliox (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 15th PME International Conference*: 3,221-228.

Matthews, L.E.2005.Towards Design of Clarifying Equity Messages in Mathematics Reform. *The High School Journal*, April/May.

McCulloch, G.1998.Curriculum Reform, Educational Change and School Improvement. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. &Hopkins, D. (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Change* .Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 1203-1215.

McLaughlin, MW.1987.Learning from experience: Lessons from policy implementation. *Educational Evaluation and policy Analysis* 9:171-178.

McLaughlin, MW.1998.Listening and learning from the field: tales of policy implementation and situated practice. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Change*. Great Britain: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp.70-84.

McLaughlin, M.W.1990.The Rand change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. *Educational Researcher*, 19(9): 11-16.

McLaughlin, M.L. & Marsh, D.D.1978.Staff development and school change. *Teachers College Record*, 80:69-94.

Merriam, S.B.1998.*Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S.B.2002.*Qualitative Research in Practice Examples for Discussion and Analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, M.R.1991.equity: The missing element in recent agendas in mathematics reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 66(2): 6-21.

Michelsen, C.2005. Expanding the Domain-Variables and Functions in an Interdisciplinary Context between Mathematics and Physics. In Beckmann, A., Michelsen, C. & Sriraman, B (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium of Mathematics and its connections to the Arts and Sciences*. The University of Education, Schwabisch, Germany, pp.201-214

Ministry of Education.1959.*15 to 18: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education*. England, HMSO, London.

Monk, D.H.1994.Subject area preparation of secondary mathematics and science teachers and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 13(2): 125-145.

Morrison, K.R.B.1993.*Planning and Accomplishing School-centered evaluation*. Norfolk: Peter Francis Publishers.

Moses, R.P.2001.*Radical equations: Math literacy and civil rights*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mwakapenda, W.2002.The Status and Context of Change in Mathematics Education in Malawi. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 49: 251-281

Naidoo, D. & Parker, D.2005.The implications of mathematics teachers' identities and official mathematics discourses for democratic access to mathematics. *Perspectives in Education*, 23(1): 53-67.

National Foundation for Educational Research and The Basic Skills Agency.1998.*Family Numeracy Adds Up. Lessons from the Family Numeracy Pilot Programme*. The Basic Skills Agency, London.

NCTM.1980. *Agenda for action: Recommendations for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

NCTM.1989.*Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

NCTM.2000.*Principles and standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Newmann, F. 1998.Shared understanding and commitment to high level outcomes for all students. In Hawley, W. (Ed.). *Keys to Effective Schools*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Nieto, S.1998.Cultural Difference and Educational Change in a Sociopolitical Context. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Change*. Great Britain, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 418-439.

Niss, M.1994. Mathematics and Society. In Biehler, R., Scholz, R., Straesser, R. & Winkelmann, B (Eds.) *Didactics of Mathematics as a Scientific Discipline*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp.367-378.

Niss, M. 2001.Quantitative Literacy and Mathematical Competencies. In Steen, L.A (Ed.) *Mathematics and Democracy: The Case for Quantitative Literacy*. Princeton, NJ: National Council on Education and the Disciplines, pp.215-220.

O'Sullivan, MC.2002.Reform Implementation and the Realities within which Teachers Work: a Namibian case study. *Compare*, 32(2): 219-237.

Oakes, J.1990.Opportunities, achievement, and choice: Women and minority students in science and mathematics. *Review of Research in Education*, 16:153-222

Odden, A. & Kelley, C.2002.*Paying Teachers For What They Know And Do: New And Smarter Compensation Strategies To Improve Schools*. Corwin Press, California.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). 1995. *Literacy, Economy, and Society: Results of the First International Adult Literacy Survey*. Paris: OECD.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development .1999. *Measuring Student Knowledge and Skills: A New Framework for Assessment*.Paris: OECD.

Orrill, R.2001.Mathematics, Numeracy, and Democracy. In Steen, L.A (Ed.) *Mathematics and Democracy: The Case for Quantitative Literacy*. Princeton, NJ: National Council on Education and the Disciplines, pp. xiii-xx.

Pabable, M.F. &Dekkers, P.2003. Science teachers' views on outcomes-based education: Partial evaluation of UNIN's advanced certificate in education programme. In Putsoa, B., Dlamini, M. &Kelly, V. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Conference of the Southern African Association for Research in Mathematics Science and Technology Education*. Mbabane: University of Swaziland, pp.734-740.

Pajares, M.F.1992. *Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning Up a Messy Construct*. Review of Educational Research, 62 (3):307-332.

Pandor, N, MP, Minister of Education.2005.*Speech, introducing the debate on the education budget, vote 15*. National Council of Provinces, 18 May 2005. Pretoria: DoE.

Papert, S.1993.*The Children's Machine: Rethinking School in the Age of the Computer*. Basic Books: New York.

Parsons, C. & Bynner, and J.1997.'Numeracy and Employment', *Education and Training*, 39(2): 43-51.

Patton, M.Q.1990.*Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.)*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pennell, J.L.1996.*Re-forming teachers: The movement to create constructivist-informed teachers in California and Vermont*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, and New Brunswick.

Pennell, J.L., & Firestone, W.A.1996.Changing classroom practices through teacher networks: Matching program features with teacher characteristics and circumstances. *Teachers College Record*, 98(1): 48-75.

Peterson, P.L. 1998.Teachers and students' cognitional knowledge for classroom teaching and learning. *The Educational Researcher*, 17(5): 5-14.

Peterson, P.L., & Clark, C.M.1978.Teachers' report of their cognitive processes during teaching. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15:555-565.

Pfeffer, J. & Sutton, R. 2000. *The knowing-doing gap*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

PISA.23.More about USA 52 South Africa 275 Average (38 nations) 487. Retrieved at <http://nces.ed.gov>

Plowden Report.1967. Retrieved at <http://www.dial.pipex.com/plowden01.shtml>

Price, J.N. & Ball, D.L. 1997. 'There's always another agenda': marshalling resources for mathematics reform. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29(6): 637-666.

Quinn, R.1996.*Deep Change: Discovering the Leader Within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Republic of Botswana-Ministry of Education.2005.*Redesigning the Botswana National Literacy Programme*. Retrieved at <http://www.moe.gov.bw/dnfe/courses/entry.html>

Rogan, J.M.2003a.Out of the frying pan...?: The implementation of Curriculum 2005.In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual Conference of the Southern African Association for Research in Mathematics Science and Technology Education*. Mbabane. University of Swaziland, pp. 740-748

Rogan, J.M.2003b.Towards a theory of curriculum implementation with particular reference to science education in developing countries. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25 (10): 1171-1204.

Romberg, T.A.1985. *Toward Effective Schooling: The IGE Experience*. Washington, D.C: University Press of America.

Romberg, T.A.1997.'Mathematics in context'. In Fennema, E. & Nelson, B. (Eds.) *Mathematics Teachers in Transition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.Publishers, New Jersey, pp. 357-380.

Ross, E.W., Cornett, J.W., & Mc Cotcheon, G.1992.*Teacher personal theorizing*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ross, V.2004. A story of reform: Math, Science, and Technology Investigations (MSI) in Room 34 at Bay Street Community School. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(5): 587-603.

Rousseau, C.K., Powell, A.2005.Understanding the Significance of Context: A Framework to Examine Equity and Reform in Secondary Mathematics. *The High School Journal*, April/May.

Rowan, B., Chiang, F.S. & Miller, R.J.1997.Using research on employee's performance to study the effects of teachers on student achievement. *Sociology of Education*, 70:256-284.

SAARMSTE *Proceedings from 1992 to 2004*. Retrieved at [http:// www.hsrapress.ac.za/user_uploads/tbl/PDF/2034_end_Researching_Mathematics_Education ~ 04022005101041AM. pdf](http://www.hsrapress.ac.za/user_uploads/tbl/PDF/2034_end_Researching_Mathematics_Education~04022005101041AM.pdf)

SACMEQ II.2000. Retrieved at <http://www.unesco.org/iiep>

SAICA-The South African Institute of Chartered Accountants.2005.*Thuthuka Maths and Science Development*. Retrieved at <http://www.saica.co.za>

Sanders, M., Kasalu, L.2004.Lack Of Understanding Of Policy As A Factor Affecting The Theory-Practice Gap In Implementing. In Buffler, A. & Laugksch, R.C. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Conference of the Southern African Association for Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology*.Durban: SAARMSTE

Sarason, S.B.1995.*School change: The personal development of a point of view*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schifter, D. (Ed.) 1996.What's *happening in math class? Vol.2.Reconstructing professional identities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sergiovanni, T.1998.Market and community as strategies for change. In Hargreaves, A., Lieberman, A., Fullan, M. & Hopkins, D. (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Change*. Great Britain: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp.576-595

Shavelson, R.J.1976.Teachers' decision making. In Gage, N.L. (Ed.) *The psychology of teaching methods*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp.145-169.

Shavelson, R.J. & Berliner, D.C.1988.Erosion of education research infrastructure: A reply to Finn. *The Educational Researcher*, 17(1): 9-12.

Shulman, L.S. & Grossman, P.1988.Knowledge growth in teaching: *A final report to the Spencer Foundation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Shulman, L.S. & Sherin, M.G.2004.Fostering communities of teachers as learners: disciplinary perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36 (2): 135-140.

Sherin, M.G.2002.When Teaching Becomes Learning. *Cognition & Instruction*, 20(2): 119-150.

Sherin, M.G., Mendez, E.P. & Louis, D.A.2004.A discipline apart: the challenge of 'Fostering a Community of Learners' in a mathematics classroom. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(2): 207-232.

Shulman, L.1986.Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Research*, 15 (2): 4-14.

Skemp, R.1971. *The Psychology of Learning Mathematics*. Penguin.

Skovsmose, O.1998.Critical mathematics education. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Congress on Mathematics Education*. Alsina, C., Alvarez, J.M., Niss, M., Perez, A., Rico, L. & Sfrad, A. (Eds.). Seville: S.A.E.M. Thales.

Skovsmose, O. & Valero, P.2001. 'Breaking political neutrality: The critical engagement of mathematics education with democracy'. In Atweh, B. & Forgasz, H. (Eds.) *Sociocultural research on Mathematics education: An International Perspective*. Lawrence Erlbaum, New Jersey, pp. 37-55.

Soreide, G.E.2007.The public face of teacher identity-narrative construction of teacher identity in public policy documents. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22 (2): 129-146.

Spillane, J.1999.External reform initiatives and teachers' effort to reconstruct their practice: The mediating role of teachers' zones of enactment. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 31(2): 142-175.

Spillane, J.P.2000.Cognition and Policy Implementation: District Policymakers and the Reform of Mathematics Education. *Cognition & Instruction*, 18(2): 141-179.

Spillane, JP; Reiser, BJ & Reimer, T.2002.Policy Implementation and Cognition: Reframing and Refocusing Implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3): 387-431.

Spillane, J.P. & Zeuli, J.S.1999.Reform and teaching: Exploring patterns of practice in the context of national and state mathematics reforms. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(1): 1-27.

Steen, L.A.1997.Achieving numeracy in the information age. *Pythagoras*, 51: 34-36.
Steen, L.A.2000.Why *Numbers Count: Quantitative Literacy for Tomorrow's America*. New York, NY: The College Board.

Steen, L.A.2001. *Mathematics and Democracy: The Case for Quantitative Literacy*. Princeton, NJ: National Council on Education and the Disciplines.

Stiff, L.V.2002.*Beliefs and Expectations*. Retrieved at <http://www.nctm.org/news/pastpresident/2002-0102president.htm>

Strutchens, M.E.2000.Confronting beliefs and stereotypes that impede the mathematical empowerment of African American students. In Strutchens, M.E., Johnson, M.L & Tate, W.F. (Eds.) *Changing the face of mathematics: Perspectives on African Americans*.Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Sutton, J., & Krueger, A.2002. *EDThoughts: What we know about mathematics teaching and learning*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Talbert, J., & McLaughlin, M.1993.Understanding teaching in context. In Cohen, D., McLaughlin, M. & Talbert, J. (Eds.) *Teaching for understanding: Challenges for policy and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, pp. 167-206.

Tate, W.2004.*Access and opportunities to learn are not accidents: Engineering mathematics progress in your school*. Tallahassee, FL: SERVE.

Taylor, N. & Vinjevold, P. (Eds.). 1999. *Getting Learning Right*. Report of the President's Education Initiative Research Project. Joint Education Trust, South Africa.

The Expert Panel on Student Success in Ontario.2004.*Leading Math Success-Mathematical Literacy Grades 7-12*.2004.The Expert Panel on Student Success in Ontario: Mathematical Literacy, Grades 7-12. Retrieved at <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/reports/numeracy/>

The SAQA Act (No.58 of 1995)-Republic of South Africa, Government Gazette No. 1521 (4 October 1995), Pretoria.

Thompson, A.G.1984.*Educational Studies in Mathematics*, pp.105-127.

Thompson, A.G, Philip, R.A., Thompson, P.W., & Boyd, B.A.1994.Calculation and conceptual orientations in teaching mathematics. In Aichile, D.B. & Coxford, A.F. (Eds.) *Professional development for teachers of mathematics, 1994 Yearbook*.Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, pp.79-92.

TIMSS. 2004. Highlights From The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) 2003. Retrieved at <http://nces.ed-gov>.

UNESCO.2000.*The Dakar framework for action*. ED-2000/WS/27.Paris: UNESCO.

Verspoor, A.1989.*Pathways to Change. Improving the Quality of Education in Developing Countries*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Verwoerd, H.F.1953.*House of Assembly Debates*. August -September, 78: 3585.

Webb, L., Webb, and P.2004.Eastern Cape teachers' beliefs of the nature of mathematics: Implications for the introduction on in-service mathematical literacy programmes for teachers. *Pythagoras*, 60:13-19.

Weiss, L.1994.*A profile of science and mathematics education in the United States: 1993*.Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

Weiss, I., Lawrenz, F. &Queitzsch, M.L.1996.The elementary and secondary learning environment. In Suter, L. (Ed.) *Indicators of Science and Mathematics Education*. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, pp. 33-71.

Wenger, E.1998.*Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wideen, M.F.1992.School-based teacher development. In Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.) *Teacher Development and Educational Change*. London, Falmer Press.

Yin, R.K.2003.*Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Sage: London