

EDUCATORS' REASONINGS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON SUCCESSFUL ATTAINMENT OF CURRICULUM GOALS

M. A. Makumane

Languages and Social Education

National University of Lesotho

Maseru, Lesotho

e-mail: makhulum@yahoo.co.uk or 216076795@stu.ukzn.ac.za / <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7904-4177>

S. B. Khoza

Education and Curriculum Studies

University of KwaZulu-Natal

Durban, South Africa

e-mail: khozas@ukzn.ac.za / <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7153-2990>

ABSTRACT

It has been suggested that the curriculum development process should focus on three factors: people, programmes and process in order to achieve the idealised goals. In other words, for a curriculum to be successfully enacted, it should encompass societal needs (social reasoning), facts as representative of a specific discipline (professional reasoning) and the unique strategies adopted by the educator to attain desired goals (personal reasoning). These three factors are driven and influenced by educators' reasoning (social, professional and personal), which drive and have an impact on their practice. The purpose of this article is to explore three propositions of educators' reasoning. Such reasoning is divided into personal, social, and professional reasonings, and their effects on successful attainment of curriculum goals. Using an interpretive qualitative case study, 20 participants were selected using purposive sampling: with two selected using convenience sampling for the reported study. Data were generated using reflective activities and one-on-one semi-structured interviews. The findings demonstrate that being grounded in either social or professional reasoning, while disregarding the other, may hamper the attainment of goals. Thus, this article recommends integration and alignment of the three propositions of reasoning (personal, social, and professional) in order to successfully attain curriculum goals.

Keywords: curriculum development, personal reasoning, professional reasoning, strategies, social reasoning

INTRODUCTION

Educators' backgrounds, whether personal, social, and/or professional, contribute immensely to their reasoning and subsequent actions during practise (Berkvens, Van den Akker and Brugman 2014; Khoza 2015). In other words, educators are influenced, mostly subconsciously, but sometimes consciously, by their environment. Educators' environment is largely informed

by learners; their cognitive knowledge, which is dependent on their factual (professional) understanding of the subject matter; and their identity. Such environment has a personal meaning attached to it, as shaped by educators' unique teaching and learning experiences. Educators' reasoning is thus important as it influences and affects everyday practice; either promoting or hindering attainment of curriculum goals. This article is based on the premise that reasoning is categorised into three propositions: personal reasoning, social reasoning and professional reasoning (Khoza 2015; Schiro 2013). Awareness of these propositions helps educators constantly reflect on their practise therefore make favourable choices during the enactment stage of the curriculum (Mpungose 2016). The scope of this article covers social reasoning and professional reasoning. The reported study sought to establish how being inclined to either during the enactment process affects the attainment of goals presented in the intended curriculum. This article is reliant on the belief that personal reasoning is formed by either social reasoning or professional reasoning. However, in other cases it is formed by both social and professional reasoning(s). This assertion suggests that an individual's identity and unique understanding of their environment (personal) helps educators manage their teaching activities as they see fit. Educators' choices could be predominantly inclined either to social or professional reasoning. The implication here therefore is that educators interpret the curriculum in light of their own beliefs and experiences (Remillard 2005). This assumption indicates that educators using the same curriculum may apply different categories of reasoning when enacting the same curriculum. According to Hunsander and Thompson (2014), differences in the enactment of the curriculum may impact the goals for which a curriculum was designed; and some reasoning(s) may potentially undermine the curriculum goals. Thus, this article seeks to explore educators' social reasoning vis-à-vis professional reasoning; and how each affects the successful attainment of curriculum goals. It is noteworthy that this article is part of a broader study which sought to establish educators' enactment strategies of the Secondary School French integrated curriculum in the Lesotho context; and how these strategies influenced the attainment of prescribed goals.

LITERATURE: REASONING AND ITS EFFECTS ON GOALS

Reasoning as a concept has generally been defined by some authors (Dowden 2019 Walton 1990; 2005 as individual thinking that results in inferences perceived to represent reality. In other words, reasoning is a rational view point that stems from prior knowledge; and depicts an individual's cognitive, personal, and social processes. This definition serves the context of the current study. This study aims at exploring educators' reasoning, understanding which reasoning influences successful attainment of curriculum goals. Reasoning, in this article, is premised on three propositions of reasoning: personal, social, and professional. Personal

reasoning is viewed as a unique individual inference that is constructed through inimitable experiences with the environment (Khoza 2016). This suggests that personal reasoning is unique to each individual; each person attaches a personal significance, and identity, to their experiences. Implicit in this latter assertion is that educators, in using their personal reasoning, offer a pragmatic curriculum. Such a curriculum comprises knowledge and skills that help them to handle any type of curriculum they are faced with during practice. When a curriculum is defined as a plan for teaching, it must be driven by professional reasoning, which is driven by prescribed subject content (Makumane 2018). This type of curriculum is known as a performance curriculum: subject content is prescribed to drive the very structured systems of this curriculum. However, when it is defined as a plan of teaching and learning, a curriculum is driven by social reasoning, which is driven by achievement of learning outcomes (Khoza 2018). This type of curriculum is known as competence-based curriculum, which aims to promote specific social skills. A combination of these types of curricula produces a pragmatic curriculum, which is driven by teachers' personal reasoning. A pragmatic curriculum is of paramount importance in empowering educators to handle the various types of curricula. This is supported by a study conducted by Khoza (2016, which suggests exploring new ways of finding solutions that can ameliorate the effects on educators who feel overwhelmed by these types of curricula. One such solution is ensuring that the curriculum is based on the educators' and learners' needs (personal reasoning). Essentially, personal reasoning should drive the curriculum, so that educators will develop sufficient knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes to facilitate their understanding of the multiplicity of curricula. In this way, educators may be able to effectively enact any of the types of curricula in order to achieve the set goal.

Social reasoning is highly influenced by societal opinions that are usually non-factual and oral; largely dependent on implicit interpretations common in a particular society. This reasoning is described by Bernstein (1999) as horizontal because it applied as unstructured, common-sense knowledge, that is not necessarily factual. This suggests that competence-based (also known integrated) curriculum is applicable to this type of reasoning, knowledge being fabricated horizontally (unstructured) from local known sources (Khoza 2016; Bernstein 1999). Professional reasoning stems from a factual or disciplinary perspective. Here the cognitive domain plays an instrumental part in determining the reality. This suggests that professional reasoning is influenced by prescribed subject content or factual knowledge and metacognition development: educators are informed by reading different sources based on specific disciplines or professions (Berkvens et al. 2014). Bernstein (1999) terms this type of reasoning as vertical, because knowledge builds upon already existing information to make inferences (structured). This type of reasoning, therefore, is relevant in the use of performance or vertical curriculum,

which requires the application of the cognitive domain. In a vertical curriculum, each subject is taught in isolation; and has its own concepts or topics. Accordingly, educators who use professional reasoning teach the same body of knowledge from the lowest to the highest levels (Khoza 2015). Notably, both social and professional reasoning is shaped by an individual's personal reasoning. Thus, a person's unique reasoning determines an inclination either to social or professional reasoning.

Goals and the three propositions

Reasoning in curriculum enactment has, ostensibly, an impact on goals. Kennedy, Hyland and Ryan (2006) and Khoza (2015) classify goals into aims, objectives, and outcomes. Essentially, aims are overall guidelines that outline what is to be personally achieved. This implies that aims are long-term, as they are aligned to the educators' personal vision on which educational goals are based (Harden 2002a; Khoza 2016). Therefore, aims are outlined in the enacted curriculum (second layer of curriculum after intended curriculum), which is the pragmatic curriculum that puts educators' experiences into practise (Hoadley and Jansen 2013; Kurz 2011; Kurz et al. 2010; Schiro 2013). This denotes that educators devise aims that would guide them on how to effectively achieve objectives, and support learners to achieve outcomes. Thus, educators (curriculum designers and teachers) use their unique interpretation of curriculum expectations or intentions, designing their aims aligned with this interpretation (personal reasoning) (Hoadley and Jansen 2013; Hunsander and Thompson 2014; Okoth 2016). Consequently, aims are habitual, being unique and representative of each individual's interpretation of the curriculum vision. Therefore, to design aims, educators would need to apply personal reasoning, thereby representing their inference in a way that they deem effective in the attainment of aims, objectives, and ultimately, outcomes (Bernstein 1999; Khoza 2016). Put differently, each educator uses a unique understanding of the context as well as personal beliefs and experiences in interpreting the curriculum and its aims. It has been argued, however, that individual reasoning, in terms of curriculum enactment, might threaten the attainment of the desired outcomes (Durukan and Saglam-Arslan 2015; Hoadley and Jansen 2013; Okoth 2016; Remillard 2005).

Educators thus would need to rely on their use of professional reasoning, as they do in presenting objectives. In this way, objectives come in handy. Objectives influence educators to go by the book, thereby using their professional reasoning (Khoza 2015; 2016). Objectives, contrary to aims, are specific statements that clearly outline what is intended to be taught by the educator (Evtyugina et al. 2016; Yamanaka and Wu 2014). As stated by Yamanaka and Wu (2014), objectives form part of lesson planning, while taking into consideration intended outcomes of learners. Yamanaka and Wu (2014) further posit that objectives, as influenced by

professional reasoning, are key to selecting appropriate materials and activities. Objectives also prompt educators' creativity in ensuring alignment between intended aims, objectives, and learning outcomes. Along the same line of thought, Evtyuginaa et al. (2016) declare that objectives should ultimately correspond with the attainment of learning outcomes, and essentially, the educational aims stipulated. This implies that objectives should be aligned with aims that allow for a solid basis for assessment of learning. In line with this assertion, Evtyuginaa et al. (2016) conducted a study whose findings showed that setting obtainable and measurable objectives is one of the most essential themes in pedagogy. In addition, the findings also allude to the need to take into account prescribed aims when designing objectives that would ultimately allow learners to be active participants in their learning. This would allow proper alignment of aims, objectives, and desired learning outcomes.

The latter findings are supported by Marken and Morrison (2013), who proclaim that application of teaching objectives is a key attribute to a well-organised educational design. This suggests that objectives are seen as a tool that permits educators to organise teaching/learning in a way that would favour desired outcomes. Essentially, objectives are designed/interpreted by the educator in the enactment stage of the curriculum. Consequently, as Remillard and Heck (2014) articulate, the intended curriculum changes form once it is handed down to educators. Remillard and Heck (2014) further posit that educators use their cognitive interpretations (professional reasoning) and decisions to produce a plan of instruction that addresses set objectives. In addition, Remillard and Heck (2014) assert that the enacted curriculum is the most difficult to access, most of such existing in detail in the mind of the educator. This denotes that interpretations vary from educator to educator being influenced by contexts within which they find themselves (Raselimo and Wilmot 2013; Spillane, Reiser and Reimer 2002). However, objectives are usually presented in writing and educators are expected to enact them as they were intended. This summons professional reasoning: educators rely on their schooled knowledge to effectively enact desired objectives, in view of ultimately achieving the desired outcomes. Consequently, the enactment of objectives has an effect on desired learning outcomes. In this way, objectives can inform learning outcomes.

A learning outcome, as defined by several scholars (Donnelly and Fitzmaurice 2005; Harden 2002a; Kennedy et al. 2006; Khoza 2013; 2015; 2016 Moon 2002), is a statement that outlines what a learner is supposed to know, understand, and be able to do at the end of a given period. Stated differently, a learning outcome demonstrates knowledge that learners acquire through learning experiences proposed by the educator during the enactment process. Remillard and Heck (2014) suggest that learning experiences influence learner attitudes, interests, and perceptions, which are displayed through learning outcomes. The above authors further, argue that learning outcomes are mainly influenced by the assessed curriculum, which allows for

Figure 1 demonstrates the three stages of curriculum, aims, objectives, and outcomes being correlated; and with the three propositions or reasonings (personal, social, and professional).

RESEARCH AIM/OBJECTIVE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this article is to explore educators' reasonings and how this affects attainment of curriculum goals. The findings of this article may help educators understand which reasoning is suitable for a specific prescribed curriculum and thus use it appropriately to effectively enact the curriculum. The study therefore aims at responding to the following questions:

1. What are educators' reasonings?
2. How do educators' reasonings influence attainment of curriculum goals?

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This article presents an interpretive qualitative case study of two secondary school French language educators. An interpretive qualitative case study permits an in-depth review of an existing or a new phenomenon while maintaining meaningful characteristics of real-life events (Yin 2009). Therefore, this methodology helped us to cognitively make meaning from multiple data through interacting with participants. From the multiple realities, we were able to understand the influences of the various types of reasoning. Such realities helped us to identify reflective activities, and semi-structured interviews as the relevant methods for interacting with the participants to generate and interpret the data.

Sampling

Purposive sampling was used to select participants involved in the teaching of French. In this type of sampling, as the name suggests, participants were deliberately selected according to their ability to elicit authentic and trustworthy information relevant to addressing research objectives and questions (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2011). Kumar (2012, 207) asserts that this type of sampling is ideal when attempting to "describe a phenomenon or develop something about which little is known". The initial main project purposely selected twenty educators of French at secondary level. These twenty participants were supported (per consultation where there was the need) by the National University of Lesotho in the teaching of French. This current study could not subsume all twenty narratives of the participants into this article. Of the twenty participants, two were mostly interested in continuing with the issues of exploring reasoning as their life style. Their interests motivated us to conveniently select the narratives of these two most accessible participants. Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2005) assert that convenience

sampling involves selecting as participants the most readily available individuals to fit the criteria of the study. Thus, to establish and understand in-depth educators' reasonings, two participants were conveniently selected, based on specified criteria: the participants should have at least three years' French language teaching experience; they should be easily accessible to the researcher; they should be willing to participate in the study, delivering authentic data. Procedurally, informed consent was sought, as it enlightened the participants on the purpose, and objectives of the study. It provided them with as much information as they needed, to partake in the study (Bryman and Bell 2007). Moreover, participants were also informed that they could withdraw from participating should they, at any point, feel uncomfortable or unwilling to participate any further. In addition, pseudonyms were used to protect the participants' identities.

We applied the four principles of trustworthiness (credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability), in order to make sure that the quality of data was not compromised by the deduced number of participants. Trustworthiness was addressed in terms of credibility (audit trail and tape recorder: truth value), dependability (direct quotations from the participants: consistency), confirmability (the participants knew the nature of the study and were aware of the issues of ethics: neutrality), and transferability (sufficient details were provided of the relevant context: applicability).

Data generation and analysis

Reflective activities and one-on-one semi-structured interviews were used. These methods, according to Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2005), were applicable to the reported study. These methods allowed for flexibility of versatile questions that accommodated the various individuals, while still resonating with the main research questions and objectives. Interviews, which lasted between 15 and 25 minutes, were conducted and audio-recorded for the purpose of easy transcription and accuracy of conveyed information. Along the same lines, reflective activities were used, with each participant presenting one reflective journal. A guided analysis method was used to analyse the generated data. Samuel (2009) posits that this type of analysis allows the researcher to determine themes before the generation of data, being able to modify those themes while analysing data, if unfathomed themes emerge. Therefore, during the data-generation process, reasonings and goals were part of the *a priori* themes that were scrutinised.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Findings are presented in the form of a narrative approach. According to Sandelowski (1991), this approach outlines the concept of truth: it displays a direct insight into ways in which

participants describe their reality as they see it. Findings in this study are classified into two themes: reasonings (personal, social and professional), and goals (aims, objectives, and outcomes). The results of each of the two phases are presented independently for each theme.

Theme 1: Reasoning

Notwithstanding the contribution of the other method of data generation used in this reported study, in-depth data on reasonings were gathered using semi-structured interviews. This is because interviews helped gain perspective into participants' attitudes, beliefs, and experiences in using the curriculum during their practise. Such perspectives were difficult to deduce from the other data-generation methods used. Thus, through the use of interviews, the researcher was able to gather information on the choices that educators made with regard to their practise, which were influenced by the environment in which they found themselves. The quotations that are presented were extracted from one-on-one interviews with each participant.

Participant 1: Saucy

“I’ve taught French from early 2013, and in 2014, I went to La Reunion, the French island, for a month for a workshop. When you travel, you gather so much information, how other people live and then you come and compare with your own people. And then you discover that sometimes you don’t value very valuable things in your society, and well in that way, you know how to appreciate and be grateful for what we have. First of all, I want to pass on the love I have for French to [my learners], I want them to excel in French, by speaking like the French and by being fluent. I teach them how to say this and that in French in order for them to live French, and I teach them the French culture so that they know it is different from their culture. I do not prepare lesson plans, I don’t like lesson plans. I don’t really like writing that much. I am influenced by the needs of the learner when teaching. If I know that they need to learn one, then I should go and teach one, and if tomorrow they need two, then I should go and teach two. They need to pass the examination yes, but at the same time, they also need to be able to speak French outside the examination. That is why I don’t do the spiral form of teaching as I think it wastes time. For example, learners will be eager to learn a 1000 and then you are restricting their ability to learn numbers at a certain time. So basically, I teach learners what they want and need to know, and my topics might change according to what comes up in class, as long as what comes up is remotely related to the topic that I had planned to teach.”

From the above assertions by Saucy, it is evident that he was guided by personal and social reasonings during his practice. The personal reasoning is implicit in that the participant is driven by his love for the language, and by his desire to impart such love to his learners. This denotes that the personal significance attached to the language influenced Saucy to come up with his own unique (personal) curriculum that he uses to convey skills (social) to his learners (Khoza 2016). The social reasoning is embedded in that the participant was influenced by the environment and the society (where learners came from). For instance, the participant seemed

to be informed by emerging needs in determining what was suitable to convey to his learners. In other words, the participant used inferences perceived as reality (Dowden 2019) that he deduced from the society. He then passed this reality on to the learners in order for them to function as individuals and to be able to address real-life challenges (MOET 2009). Thus, the participant's personal reasoning shaped the way he imparted skills to his learners, whilst being influenced by the needs of the society (Davids et al. 2013). In this way, Saucy was creatively using what Khoza (2013; 2019) terms ideological-ware. The educator uses their ideological-ware resources, that is, resources that exist in their minds, controlling teaching or actions, to achieve the outlined goals. Notably, the participant went to class without lesson plans because they were not part of his personal curriculum. This suggests that he went to class with what to teach in mind, orally presenting to his learners in a manner that was context-dependent and specific (Bernstein 1999). Saucy's reasoning was more inclined to a competence-based curriculum that produced a pragmatic curriculum (driven by personal reasoning), whereby knowledge is presented segmentally and horizontally (unstructured) as influenced by learners in a specific context (Bernstein 1999; Khoza and Biyela 2019). The implication of this latter assertion is that the participant, during practise, altered the curriculum to fit his understanding. Such might cause a disconnect between an intended curriculum and an assessed curriculum as the first and last layers of curriculum, respectively (Okoth 2016; Penuel, Phillips and Harris 2014). Consequently, the participant's personal and social reasonings might not necessarily resonate with what has been prescribed (performance curriculum driven by professional reasoning). Such dissonance might have a negative impact on the prescribed goals of a national curriculum if driven by professional reasoning. This assertion thus points to the need for applying the three types of reasoning as a taxonomy of teaching. Such an application would accommodate the three types of curriculum with a view to ensuring a smooth and effective transformation from conception to enactment.

Participant 2: Lerato

"I have been teaching French for five years now. I learned French since high school, so there was a way that I preferred the teacher to do things. I am trying to be that type of teacher that I felt I needed when I was in high school. I want my learners to know how to express themselves in French. Therefore, I need them to understand the language and have deep knowledge of it as the language opens professional doors for them. So, we do a lot of written French, I give instructions of what they should do and they carry out the instructions. I use [prescribed] books that we are supposed to use with them, for example, *Et toi*. Some of the other material I download from the Internet, and some of them come from the textbook, *Et toi*. The content I teach is influenced by textbooks and the syllabus, they are the ones that prescribe what we teach depending on the level we are teaching."

The above affirmations by Lerato indicate that she was driven by personal and professional reasonings when enacting the curriculum. This suggests that the educator was more inclined to the facts as presented by the discipline. Lerato draws from her cognitive knowledge to teach content hierarchically, that is, from the lowest point, gradually building up to the highest point (Schiro 2013). This is referred to by Hoadley and Jansen (2013), as schooled knowledge. Schooled knowledge is influenced by professional facts in drawing content from conceptual and theoretical knowledge (grammar and phonology) in order to disseminate such knowledge to learners. This is indicated in the assertion that Lerato used the prescribed textbook in teaching the required knowledge. The quotation also suggests that the participant was largely influenced by her personal reasoning. Such personal reasoning was informed by the performance curriculum. Lerato's background of learning French had had a profound influence on how she taught the language to her learners. Her teaching identity (personal reasoning) appears to be informed by structured environment in which all activities are prescribed for teachers and learners (Makumane 2018). In other words, Lerato's former French teacher(s) and learning environment seem to have shaped her identity as an educator. This shaping translated into the way she perceived the reality of teaching (Khoza 2016). Thus, Lerato's personal reasoning appeared to have had an impact on her professional reasoning, with her being more inclined to performance or vertical curriculum, in which the cognitive domain of learners is privileged (Bernstein 1999). Professional reasoning, in this sense, adopts a technical and systematic design, which advocates for adherence of hierarchical knowledge construction. Such implies that the participant built on learners' already existing knowledge in order to help them improve their cognitive knowledge (Tyler 1949). In this concept, the educator is seen as the depositor of knowledge, and learners as depositories. The educator therefore fills learners with information that they (learners) receive, memorise, and repeat. Thus, the use of professional reasoning, that is, cognitive and subject-matter insights, without the inclusion of issues relevant to the societal needs and trends, risks jeopardising the quality of education (Berkvens et al. 2014).

Theme 2: Goals

This theme was categorised with the express intention of understanding the type of reasoning participants used with goals (aims, objectives and outcomes). Data on this theme were generated using interviews and reflective activities.

Participant 1: Saucy

“Well, I think I have aims not objectives. I just want to see someone being able to speak, being able to travel, being able to use French, not necessarily having to go step-by-step. I just teach whatever I feel like teaching. Imagine someone, somewhere in France wants to know how to say 50 Euros in French. Then I wouldn't start with 1 and then move to 2, I'll just move to 50, and tell them how to say 50 Euros in French. That is how many people learn. Out there we have people who don't go to school, but who learn different languages and just excel in those languages without having gone through step-by-step ways of learning. So, if at the end of the day, or at the end of a 3/5 year period this learner is able to speak French, then it's an outcome for me. That's what I need at the end of the day, for that person to be able to speak to me in French. I think my way of teaching should enable the learner to ask more from the outside, learn anything on their own, not necessarily come to me for a lecture.”

The above excerpt was extracted from the interview. In the reflective activity, the participant wrote:

“Promote the learning of French in Lesotho; equip learners with language acquisition skills; facilitate learners' competitiveness in the market that requires knowledge of French; be one of the top French educators in the world.”

Saucy's outline of his goals, which, based on his account, were made up of aims and outcomes, displays the use of personal and social reasonings. Saucy appears to flaunt a conscious disregard for professional reasoning, which is systematic, and requires application of schooled knowledge (Bernstein 1999; Jansen 2001). This statement “I just teach whatever I feel like teaching,” overlooked uniformity and order that professional reasoning, and the curriculum, strive to maintain. However, as Pinar (2013) states, professional reasoning is rigid: it limits contextualisation of knowledge to suit learners' needs. It would seem that this participant preferred flexibility for both his learners and himself; and denied himself the stringency of systematic teaching. This threatened to undermine the attainment of curriculum goals: disregarding prescribed objectives may have adverse outcomes. However, the participant admitted to consulting the French curriculum to determine what needed to be taught, and from this, he devised his aims and outcomes. This is evidenced by his statement, “there's a teaching syllabus, there's an exam syllabus, and then there's what learners need. Those three help me to build my plan.” This affirmation indicative that the participant did, to a certain extent, refer to his professional reasoning: he was aware of prescribed objectives that were mandatory for desired outcomes. Nevertheless, he was more inclined to supply his learners' learning needs (social). Saucy used his personal reasoning (pragmatic curriculum) as informed by his everyday experiences, hence he identified more with these two reasonings (personal and social). However, as knowledge constructed by the participant is contextualised, Saucy may miss what

is currently predominant in the international sphere in terms of global knowledge; a function of performance curriculum (driven by professional reasoning). The competence-based curriculum privileges achievement of outcomes based on local everyday knowledge. This may result in learners who are only conversant with local knowledge, serving merely to respond to their immediate needs, and thus neglecting intellectual knowledge. In line with this argument, Montouri (2006) cautions that giving educators unrestrained control in the teaching and learning processes and allowing strictly contextualised knowledge promotes what he terms a narcissistic approach to education. According to him, this approach entitles learners to experiences and personal positioning(s) as a source of knowledge over cognitive knowledge. This results in neglect of personal reasoning. To remedy this, Acevedo et al. (2015) suggest the integration of learner needs with critical thinking, to situate learners in the society, and in the scholarly community. Thus, this positioning incorporates the competence-based or integrated curriculum, in that it confronts and addresses learner needs, while upgrading their knowledge, allowing them to contribute to their society.

Participant 2: Lerato

“I feel like the world is becoming one, so learning French or having French as a skill opens doors for them. When I prepare a lesson plan, I always have to have my objectives in place, while keeping in mind the aim that I want their lives to be better, especially since I feel like the world is becoming one. So, in using the recommended textbooks, I deduce objectives, and these help in preparing the lesson of the day and in helping learners be able to express themselves.”

This participant indicated in her reflective activity: “I want to teach them to be able to express themselves in French, both spoken and written”.

The above quotations indicate that the participant wanted her learners to be able to communicate using French in various contexts. These affirmations mirror aims stipulated in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy (CAP) document. One such aim is to “develop acquisition and understanding of linguistic skills necessary for effective communication in different contexts” (MOET 2009, 18). Therefore, it would seem that the participant was aligning her unique interpretation of aims (personal) with those in the CAP document of Lesotho. The participant also addressed objectives as part of her reflection on goals in teaching French. In other words, professional reasoning was used in the preparation of her lessons, to build knowledge onto that which already exists. This denotes that the participant was following the vertical form of curriculum, which is driven by facts and schooled knowledge (Bernstein, 1999). Thus, in using goals, the participant was driven by personal reasoning (aims) and professional

reasoning (objectives). Khoza (2015) asserts that aims and objectives indicate and highlight the educator's intentions. The implication of the latter assertion is that the participant's lessons were steered by what she perceived to be appropriate and relevant; enabling her learners to express themselves as per the subject matter. This denotes that learners' needs may not be addressed because aims and objectives are educators' goals for teaching; whereas learners' needs are addressed, by the achievement of learning outcomes (Hoadley 2018). Devlin (2006) posits that educators must heed learners' needs as this allows the voice(s) of society to influence the choices made in the classroom. This calls for social reasoning, which is influenced by societal opinions, and allows for incorporation of real-life experiences in the classroom. However, in Lerato's case, social reasoning was overlooked, which suggests that learners' needs were not considered. This might result in learners possessing knowledge that is not necessarily applicable to their context and real life situations.

CONCLUSION

Samuel (2009) argues that the enactment of curriculum in order to affect learners as envisaged, whether successful or unproductive, rests heavily on educators' shoulders. Consequently, educators, using their reasonings, are viewed as experts who are responsible for the successful enactment process that responds to the demands of the curriculum, and results in an idealised attained curriculum. Berkvens et al. (2014) place emphasis on educators' knowledge, skills, and experiences in translating the curriculum into a comprehensible entity. Such a curriculum grants learners the opportunity, throughout the course of their learning experience, to effectively deal with diverse real-life challenges. Accordingly, educators are tasked with matching prescribed materials and chosen strategies to the characteristics and needs of the learners, while adhering to the prescribed content knowledge. This is achieved in order to ensure effective and suitable transmission of relatable knowledge, attaining curriculum goals. For this to happen, educators should be grounded in facts as per the discipline (professional reasoning). Educators should have the competence to convey facts comprehensibly, satisfying learners' needs (social reasoning). Educators using their unique experiences with the environment (personal) would be in a position to equip learners with such skills. The findings of this article thus highlight the importance of educators understanding curriculum visions and goals the way they were intended, as a pertinent starting point in promoting quality teaching and critical thinking. Furthermore, the findings suggest that an incorporation of the three propositions of reasoning while using the curriculum is advisable. Leaning towards either social or professional reasonings, both grounded in personal reasoning, seems to have adverse effects on the successful attainment of goals. As evidenced by the findings, alignment of the three

propositions is imperative, as educators' unique understanding of their environment helps them to design their own personal curriculum. The personal curriculum of the educator, together with their cognitive knowledge and societal opinions, will foster achievement of learners.

REFERENCES

- Acevedo, S. M., M. Aho, E. Cela, J.-C. Chao, I. Garcia-Gonzales, A. MacLeod, ... and C. Olague. 2015. Positionality as knowledge: From pedagogy to praxis. *Integral Review* 11(1): 28–46.
- Berkvens, J., J. van den Akker and M. Brugman. 2014. *Edited by addressing the quality challenge: Reflections on the post-2015 UNESCO Education Agenda*. England: Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO.
- Bernstein, B. 1999. Vertical and horizontal discourse: An essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20(2): 157–173.
- Bryman, A. and E. Bell. 2007. *Business research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, L., L. Manion and K. Morrison. 2011. *Research methods in education*. 7th Edition. London: Routledge.
- Davids, K., D. Araujo, L. Vilar, I. Renshaw and R. Pinder. 2013. An ecological dynamics approach to skill acquisition: Implications for development of talent in sport. *Talent Development & Excellence* 5(1): 21–34.
- Devlin, M. 2006. Challenging accepted wisdom about the place of conceptions of teaching in university teaching improvement. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 18(2): 112–119.
- Donnelly, R. and M. Fitzmaurice. 2005. Designing modules for learning. In *Emerging issues in the practice of university learning and teaching*, ed. G. O'Neill and S. Moore, 99–110. Dublin: AISHE.
- Dowden, B. H. 2019. *Logical reasoning*. California State University Sacramento: Sacramento, CA.
- Durukan, U. G. and A. Saglam-Arslan. 2015. The analysis of the understanding levels of teacher candidates in different about basic astronomy concepts. *Participatory Educational Research (PER)* 2(2): 28–46.
- Evyuginaa, A. A., I. I. Hasanovaa, S. S. Kotovaa, A. N. Sokolovaa and I. A. Svetkinab. 2016. Communicative, educational, pedagogical objectives and planning in Russian language teaching. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education* 11(15): 8293–8302.
- Harden, R. M. 2002a. Learning outcomes and instructional objectives: Is there a difference? *Medical Teacher* 24(2): 151–155. doi: 10.1080/0142159022020687.
- Harden, R. M. 2002b. Developments in outcome-based education. *Medical Teacher* 24(2): 117–120.
- Hoadley, U. and J. Jansen. 2013. *Curriculum: Organising knowledge for the classroom*. 3rd Edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.
- Hoadley, U. 2018. *Pedagogy in poverty: Lessons from twenty years of curriculum reform in South Africa*. London and New York: Routledge – Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hunsander, P. D. and D. R. Thompson. 2014. Influence of mathematics curriculum on student achievement. In *The enacted mathematics curriculum: A conceptual framework and research needs*, ed. D. R. Thompson and Z. Usiskin, 47–73. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Jansen, J. D. 2001. Image-ining teachers: Policy images and teacher identity in South African classrooms. *South African Journal of Education* 21(4): 242–246.
- Kennedy, D., A. Hyland and N. Ryan. 2006. *Writing and using learning outcomes: A practical guide*. Bologna: European Higher Education (EHEA).
- Khoza, S. B. 2013. Learning outcomes as understood by “publishing research” facilitators at a South

- African university. *Mevlana International Journal of Education* 3: 1–11.
- Khoza, S. B. 2015. Can Turnitin come to the rescue: From teachers reflections? *South African Journal of Education* 35(4): 1–9.
- Khoza, S. B. 2016. Is teaching without understanding curriculum visions and goals a high risk? *South African Journal of Higher Education* 30(5): 1–16.
- Khoza, S. B. 2018. Can teachers' reflections on digital and curriculum resources generate lessons? *Africa Education Review* 1(2018): 1–16.
- Khoza, S. B. 2019. Lecturers' reflections on curricular spider web concepts transformation strategies. In *Transformation of higher education institutions in post-apartheid South Africa*, ed. E. N. Ivala and C. L. Scott, Vol. 1, 15–26. New York: Routledge – Taylor & Francis Group.
- Khoza, S. B. and A. T. Biyela. 2019. Decolonising technological pedagogical content knowledge of first year mathematics students. *Education and Information Technologies* 2019(2): 1–15.
- Kumar, R. 2012. *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Kurz, A. 2011. *Opportunity to learn the Intended curriculum: Measuring key instructional indicators and examining relation to achievement for students with disabilities*. Graduate School of Vanderbilt University. Nashville, Tennessee.
- Kurz, A., S. N. Elliott, J. H. Wehby and J. L. Smithson. 2010. Alignment of the intended, planned, and enacted curriculum in general and special education and its relation to student achievement. *The Journal of Special Education* 44(3): 131–145. doi: 10.1177/0022466909341196.
- Makumane, M. 2018. Educators' enactment strategies of the French integrated curriculum in Lesotho: An action research. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of KwaZulu Natal.
- Marken, J. and G. Morrison. 2013. Objectives over time: A look at four decades of objectives in the educational research literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology* 4(1): 1–14.
- Ministry of Education and Training. 2009. *Curriculum and Assessment Policy Education for Individual and Social Development*. Maseru: Ministry of Education and Training.
- MOED *see* Ministry of Education and Training.
- Montouri, A. 2006. The quest for a new education: From oppositional identities to creative inquiry. *ReVision A Journal of Consciousness and Transformation* 28(3): 3–20.
- Moon, J. 2002. *The module and programme development handbook*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Mpungose, C. B. 2016. Rationale of teaching physical sciences curriculum and assessment policy statement content: Teachers' reflections. *Int J Edu Sci* 14(3): 256–264.
- Nuthall, G. 2012. Understanding what students learn. In *Understanding teaching and learning: Classroom research revisited*, ed. B. Kaur, 1–40. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Okoth, T. A. 2016. Challenges of implementing a top-down curriculum innovation in English language: Perspectives of Form III English language teachers in Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice* 7(3): 169–177.
- Penuel, W. R., R. S. Phillips and C. J. Harris. 2014. Analysing teachers' curriculum implementation from integrity and action-oriented perspectives. *J. Curriculum Studies* 46(6): 751–777.
- Pinar, W. 2013. Plagiarism and the "Tyler rationale". *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* 9: 1–13.
- Raselimo, M. and D. Wilmot. 2013. Geography teachers' interpretation of a curriculum reform initiative: The case of the Lesotho Environmental Education Support Project (LEESP). *South African Journal of Education* 33(1): 1–15.
- Remillard, J. T. 2005. Examining key concepts in research on teachers' use of mathematics curricula. *Review of Educational Research* 75(1): 211–246.
- Remillard, J. T. and D. Heck. 2014. Conceptualizing the curriculum enactment process in mathematics education. *ZDM The International Journal on Mathematics Education* 46(5): 705–718.

- Samuel, M. 2009. On becoming a teacher: Life history research and the force field model of teacher development. In *Life history research: Epistemology, methodology and representation*, ed. R. Dhunpath and M. Samuel, 3–18. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Sandelowski, M. 1991. Telling stories: Narrative approaches in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* 23(3): 161–166.
- Schiro, M. S. 2013. *Curriculum theory: Conflicting visions and enduring concerns*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers, Inc.
- Spillane, J. P., B. J. Reiser and T. Reimer. 2002. Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research* 72: 387–431.
- Tyler, R. W. 1949. *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walton, D. 1990. What is reasoning? What is an argument? *The Journal of Philosophy* 87(8): 399–419.
- Walton, D. 2005. *Fundamentals of critical argumentation*. 1st Edition. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Welman, C., F. Kruger and B. Mitchell. 2005. *Research methodology*. 3rd Edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Yair, G. 2000. Reforming motivation: How the structure of instruction affects students' learning experiences. *British Educational Research Journal* 26(2): 191–210.
- Yamanaka, A. and L. Y. Wu. 2014. Rethinking trends in instructional objectives: Exploring the alignment of objectives with activities and assessment in higher education – A case study. *International Journal of Instruction* 7(2): 75–88.
- Yin, R. K. 2009. *Case study research: Design and methods*. 4th Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage