

Gender Equality and Curriculum 2005**For session on THE POLITICS OF IMPLEMENTING POLICY FOR GENDER EQUALITY**

Linda Chisholm

Presented at University of London Institute of Education Seminar: Beyond Access: Curriculum for Gender Equality and Quality Basic Education in Schools

16 September 2003

The working title for this paper is relatively complex, and so I will unpack it into its component parts to provide a framework for evaluating gender equality and the curriculum. But before this, I need to give some background to C2005 and how I am situated in relation to it.

Curriculum revision since 1994 has occurred in three main stages or waves: the first was concerned with the language of representation of race and gender in the curriculum and involved the 'cleansing' of the curriculum of its racist and sexist elements in the immediate aftermath of the election. The second is generally considered as introducing a more fundamental overhaul of the existing curriculum through the implementation of outcomes-based education through C2005. In this phase, representational issues were subordinated to pedagogical principles such as learner-centredness and the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills, knowledge and values linked to citizenship. The principles upon which C2005 is based explicitly emphasised anti-discrimination, human rights, inclusivity, democracy, common citizenship, nationhood and redressing injustices of the past. This framed the approach taken in the third phase. In the third phase, C2005 was reviewed and revised and the National Curriculum Statements were produced (Jansen, 1999; Cross, 2002; Chisholm, 2003a). This third wave saw a strong emphasis on strengthening the rights-based elements of the curriculum which had implications for how gender would be addressed.

I was chair of the Committee to review C2005 and I also headed the processes of revision and creation of the RNCS. I had a direct role in the process I am describing. As such, I am reflecting on the experience rather than presenting a paper based on the usual accoutrements of research. I have also written several accounts of this experience and with each effort I try to develop more distance and greater understanding, each time confronting what were particularly difficult aspects of the process. I am grateful for this opportunity to reflect on the gender aspects of the process.

My first efforts reflecting on the process were a response on the one hand to the campaign against the National Curriculum Statements by the religious right and on

the other to Jonathan Jansen's arguments about the essentially symbolic nature of policy and curriculum change. Here my concern was with the complex interplay of the material and symbolic in the struggles around what becomes policy and curriculum. After that I began to grapple with questions of voice and representation. Foucaultian notions of power and authority informed a subsequent effort to reflect on the multiple and heterogeneous voices and interests at work in and around the shaping of the curriculum and the non-linear relationship between presence of voice and outcome (Jansen, circa 2001; Chisholm, 2003b, forthcoming)

The last paper I did was more concerned with the dominant voices that influenced the overall shape of the curriculum (2003; see also Chisholm and Fuller, 1996; Unterhalter, 1998). Here I argued that whereas business and labour were dominant in giving birth to the National Qualifications Framework, outcomes-based education and C2005 in the immediate post-apartheid period, education-based constituencies were more influential in the latter phase of revision in which I was involved. These included the education wings of the African National Congress inside and outside government, the teacher unions (including the South African Democratic Teachers Union, National Association of Professional Teachers Organisations in South Africa and the Suid Afrikaanse Onderwysers Unie) and university-based intellectuals. The positions they took on key issues and how they shaped the broad, rather than specific, curriculum outcomes are highlighted. Together they ensured a pragmatic, outcomes-based, secular curriculum that has a core component that was not previously there.

In these papers I have argued that there was no simple relationship between interests and broad outcomes; that curricular outcomes were themselves multiple, shaped in their minutiae and broad outline by multiple and dominant players and that even as physical presence is no guarantee of inclusion in the curriculum, so absence does not signify exclusion from the curriculum. What is significant is the social power exercised by social actors in specific conjunctures. Here the question of South Africa's 'stakeholder driven politics' becomes significant. Like other writers such as Elaine Unterhalter I question the utility of stakeholder politics. As a form of representative democracy it gives formal voice to significant constituencies, but does not guarantee that conditions are established for the realisation of real gender equality. (Unterhalter, 1998). The question now is: how was gender equality manifested in this new phase of curriculum review and revision. It was not a stakeholder-driven process, but social constituencies nonetheless played an important role within it. These questions need to be contextualised in terms of an analysis of the politics of curriculum change in relation to questions of gender.

This paper looks first at policy for gender equality in South African education and argues that despite the monumental work of the Gender Equity Task Team in 1996, and commitments by the national department in this regard, policy for the achievement of gender equity is not supported by authority or resources. What exists is the inscription of gender within broader policy frameworks and legislation. At the level of policy, gender appears as mainly symbolic: there are no regulations or procedures with legislative force to achieve gender equity. The paper then uses a seven point framework provided by Truscott (1992) for transforming curriculum to evaluate gender equality and the curriculum. It argues that a rights-based approach was infused through the curriculum and informed the overall approach to gender. A rights-based approach could have but did not have the substantive effect of diffusing

gender issues. In the absence of a gender in education network and gender in education 'watchdogs', it did enable gender-sensitive decision-making structures, the development of a core curriculum which problematises notions of masculinity and femininity, takes up health, sex and reproductive education and provides the basis for recasting syllabi (learning programmes) and rewriting textbooks. What it does not guarantee is gender-sensitive pedagogical processes either in teacher education or in schools or the production of learning support materials and texts that are not only gender-sensitive, but also sensitive to the gender-inflected oppressions of class, race, age, disability and sexual orientation.

The paper ends with a call for the development of a gender in education network as proposed by Truscott which can research and analyse the curriculum in use, and support and facilitate development of curriculum-related gender-based materials and pedagogical processes and practices for teacher education and classrooms in diverse settings. In order to address these questions and the broader challenges raised by the GETT, it proposes a comprehensive analysis of what has happened since the GETT report in 1996.

Policy for gender equality in South African education

Policy for gender equality in South African education was first mooted two years after the elections in 1994. In 1996 the Department of Education established a Gender Equity Task Team to make recommendations on how gender equity could be achieved. The Team recommended a wide-ranging set of issues that could be taken up through the establishment of a Gender Equity Unit and a gender equity machinery in the national and provincial Departments of Education (DoE, 1997). In terms of curriculum and course content it recommended that:

- A position paper on Gender Equity in Curriculum 2005 be drawn up to provide a comprehensive framework for teachers, parents and learners to understand the full meaning of gender equity issues in the curriculum
- A working party be established as soon as possible to interrogate all aspects of Curriculum 2005 to ensure that gender equity issues and attendant problems identified in the report are addressed (p. 14)

GETT underlined the responsibility of government in generating steps to deal with gendered violence in a systemic rather than individualized manner. It proposed that government should take legal measures to raise consciousness and provide 'a framework of legal accountabilities for preventing such activities in education institutions.' (p. 225) Specifically it recommended legislation (226-8) which would, amongst others:

- Make explicit legal responsibilities of education authorities in relation to the upholding of rights of all students to be free from discrimination and harassment
- Make education authorities accountable for actively planning to prevent all forms of discrimination and harassment and take positive steps to redress the effects of discrimination and promote a human rights environment
- Clarify the meaning of direct and indirect discrimination

- Define gender and sex-based harassment and make it unlawful in educational settings
- Provide pro-active steps towards promoting a strong human rights environment in educational settings

In addition, GETT recommended that the national Department of Education should take on, as a priority, the development of:

- A training package for educational managers – including school governing boards, teachers and caretakers – on their responsibility to prevent discrimination, including gendered violence and harassment
- Curriculum packages for various institutional types which include resources to enable educators to incorporate learning about gender and violence into the curriculum at all levels of education (228).

GETT provided the most comprehensive and sophisticated report that South Africa has yet seen on gender and education, with a range of recommendations on what needs to be done to effect gender equity. Consistent with the views of the time, there was a strong belief that the establishment of appropriate structures within government and drafting of requisite legislation would ensure that gender equity issues are addressed at institutional levels.

Seven years later, what has happened? A gender equity directorate was established within the national department of education. It has a broad brief that echoes some of the recommendations of GETT. The directorate has taken up questions of sexuality in education and gender violence and is supporting a Girls Education Movement. The goals of the Girls Education Movement include equal access, improved quality, gender-responsive curricula, safe learning environments, abolition of harmful cultural practices and life skills training to empower girls against sexual abuse, exploitation and HIV/AIDS.

But the full gamut of gender focal machinery that GETT envisaged for the national department of education was not set in place. The gender focal machinery that was put in place in the provinces in education after the election was arguably gradually dismantled and disempowered (Chisholm and Napo, 1999; Chisholm, 2001). A recent analysis of the gender discourse in educational legislation concludes that policy is mainly symbolic with regard to gender, and has little procedural or regulatory force. (Moorosi, 2003) The launch of the Girls Education Movement in March 2003 represents a potentially valuable new step.

These developments have occurred against a wider backdrop of the simultaneous weakening of the women's movement in South Africa and heightened gender violence in schools and families.

What then of the curriculum? How can the curriculum in South Africa address gender equality and what has been achieved through this latest round of revision?

Gender equality and the curriculum

There is a great deal of scope in contemporary South Africa to deal with the legacy of apartheid. Kate Truscott outlined in great detail both the legacy of apartheid education

for boys and girls and what could be done.(1992) Together her work and that of GETT in 1996 provide a framework to evaluate what has and has not been achieved.

Apartheid education was notoriously based on minimum literacy and numeracy for African boys and girls on the assumption that boys would become 'hewers of wood and drawers of water' while girls would become low-skilled, domestic and agricultural workers. A much wider range of subjects was available to white boys and girls than African. Gender-specific vocational education was mainly available at a number of African schools: boys took woodwork/metalwork and technical drawing and girls did subjects like needlework/housecraft/typing. There were no major differences between boys and girls studying languages, mathematics and science: what was significant here was not enrolment as much as low overall achievement. Gender bias was prevalent in all subjects where the experience of the white male was valorized. White men were also the main figures of authority, featuring as managers, school principals and curriculum developers. Not surprisingly, pedagogy was gendered. Schools, dominated as they were by 'the ethos of Christian National Education which underpins apartheid, are extremely authoritarian, hierarchical and paternalistic' (Truscott, 49). Corporal punishment was the norm, and the levels of sexual harassment and rape widespread. Girls did housework at home before and after school, and were also responsible for sweeping schools and keeping them clean. They participated less in student organizations than boys and where they did, played different roles from those that boys did.

The curriculum, both formal and hidden, is critical in giving boys and girls a sense of their life chances. Much of the general literature has focused on female under-representation and performance, particularly in maths and the physical sciences, the gap between school performance and work and how the curriculum shapes these processes through subject content, physical provision, the gendered construction of knowledge, classroom interaction and appropriate assessment methods. GETT provided path-breaking analyses in the South African context of what girls are accessing at schools and institutions of higher education. Then, as now, the evidence shows that even as girls may stay longer in school and perform better than boys overall as well as in highly competitive subjects at the top end of the spectrum, the reasons for this are poorly understood and do not occur across all contexts (Perry, 2003). There is substantial evidence that gender violence in schools against girls has a negative impact on their performance (HSRC, 2001). There is also continuing evidence of significant barriers in the workplace (see for example Subotzky, 2003). Achievements in school do not appear to translate into higher education or the labour market.

Recently, gender in curriculum studies has been less concerned with the need for girls to change and recruiting girls into traditionally male fields than with the curricular constructions of male and female subjectivities and identities by curriculum. (Smith, 2000; Hughes, 2001) Little of this kind of analysis exists in South Africa. For Kate Truscott, the main issues in ensuring gender-sensitive curriculum development were (52-56):

- Gender-sensitive decision-making structures
- Gender in Education 'Ombudspersons'
- Gender in Education Network

- Recasting of Syllabi and Re-writing of Textbooks
- Gender-sensitive pedagogical processes
- A core curriculum
- Health, sex and reproductive education

Five years later, GETT made similar recommendations but also gave more specific content to what should be in the curriculum. At the time that GETT presented its report, Curriculum 2005 had just started to be implemented. GETT lauded the goals of the curriculum and acknowledged that Curriculum 2005 seeks explicitly 'to develop critical thinking skills and the rational processes to challenge sexism and racism,' (98) but also drew attention to the need to upgrade teachers' qualifications, provide materials and negotiate inclusion within the curriculum of issues which would assist in confronting the complexities of abuse, violence and sexual violence.

The GETT report assumed the existence of an active Gender Equity Unit which would ensure inclusion of gender issues in the curriculum. It anticipated this as involving inclusion in the curriculum of issues dealing with 'the meanings of what constitutes masculinity and femininity,' the 'underlying meanings and social constructions that characterize the normative notion of masculinity and femininity' (98/9) and 'the mechanisms of sex, the emotional aspects around this and what constitutes sexuality. This is particularly important, not least because of alarming rates of AIDS and the threat of even greater numbers of people falling victim to the disease.' (99). In addition, it proposed career guidance to counteract the hidden messages of the curriculum in ways that 'open up for examination, rather than obscure, the interconnections between public and private spheres of work, and explore the way allocations of power, resources and life options are structured through these naturalized divisions.' (103)

Its recommendations on curriculum were directed at the national, provincial and school levels. At the national level, recommendations included:

- A position paper to be drawn up by the GEU on Gender and Equity in Curriculum 2005
- The establishment of a training team to work within current in-service training initiatives to promote teachers' understandings of gender equity perspectives in the curriculum
- A position paper on each learning area to guide teachers in developing learning outcomes for gender equity
- School codes of conduct which emphasise both human rights and distinguish between sex, gender and sexual orientation
- Curriculum development processes to stimulate student learning on gender
- Commissioned teacher resources
- Gender input into teacher training programmes
- Revision of Life Orientation learning area
- Support on work education programmes
- Development of guidelines for the depiction of paid and unpaid work in textbooks

Using Truscott's framework, it is possible to look at the politics of Curriculum 2005 and the extent to which things are different ten years after she produced her study.

The politics of Curriculum 2005

Recommendations

The Review Committee of 2000 made a number of recommendations for improvement of:

- the structure and design of the curriculum
- training, orientation and development of teachers
- learning support materials
- national, provincial and district-level support of curriculum processes
- the pace and scope of implementation with reference to grades 4 and 8.

Gender issues were prominent in what the Committee argued should drive curriculum revision. This was framed within the context of a rights discourse. It argued that:

Human Rights education and education for civic responsibility should be infused through all learning areas. Issues of anti-discrimination, anti-racism, anti-sexism and special needs require particular and enhanced attention throughout the curriculum. The implications of this for all learning areas should be prioritised and spelt out (91)

In its argument for simplifying the curriculum structure and design it argued that:

A universal concern of research reports, submissions and interviewees has been the terminology in which Curriculum 2005 is framed.... For those who struggle to find a place and a voice within the schooling environment – children with special needs, second-language English speakers, female teachers, girls, poor and hungry scholars in rural and urban areas, illiterate parents - the impact is doubly exclusionary. They should not be expected to struggle with an obscure curriculum vocabulary as well as those hidden and invisible conditions and practices which push out and marginalise people within schools. Instead it should be the task of curriculum shapers to create curricula that are inclusive at all levels, including the linguistic (2000, 15/6).

The gender recommendations of the Review Committee were thus framed within a rights discourse.

When the time came for revision on the basis of its recommendations, a Human Rights and Inclusivity working group was established alongside the learning area working groups in order to ensure that the implications of 'anti-discrimination, anti-racism, anti-sexism and special needs' were spelt out. The group was led by Andre Keet of the Human Rights Commission and included Nazir Carrim and Muzunga Farisani who was specifically appointed to ensure take-up of gender and HIV/AIDS issues in the curriculum. The working group developed a framework and specific strategies for a human rights-based curriculum. The approach was to infuse a rights-

based approach through all learning areas rather than have a separate subject. (Volmink, 2001). Rather than provide specific orientations on, for example, gender, race, disability or other forms of discrimination, a broad, anti-discriminatory and inclusivist approach focused on all discriminations, was pursued (Carrim, 2002). Thus:

The focus in this area is the ways in which discrimination is constructed socially, understanding the ways in which they violate human rights and the effects they have on people. It is important to note that the focus here is very wide, including the range of identities mentioned in the South Africa Constitution, international human rights instruments and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Racism, sexism, homophobia, multiculturalism and xenophobia, among others, receive specific attention in this dimension of Human Rights and Inclusivity Education. Alternatives to forms of discrimination should also receive coverage. So ways of combatting sexism and racism, for example, are also explored

In sum, then, human rights is foundationally anti-discriminatory, inclusivist, about citizenship, peace, a conducive and healthy environment and centrally about working in democratic ways within democratic contexts. (Carrim, 2002, p. 4)

A broad framework thus guided revision of the curriculum but did not guarantee gender-sensitivity. This depended on the actual people writing as well as the influences on them from outside the process. Using Truscott's framework, how did gender play out in:

- Gender-sensitive decision-making structures
- Gender in Education 'Ombudspersons'
- Gender in Education Network
- A core curriculum
- Health, sex and reproductive education
- Recasting of Syllabi and Re-writing of Textbooks
- Gender-sensitive pedagogical processes

Gender-sensitive decision-making structures

To what extent were the decision-making structures of the Review Committee and the process for creating the Revised National Curriculum Statement gender-sensitive? To what extent did the Committees to revise the curriculum include women and people who are conscious of gender inequalities in the curriculum? Here I will be looking at both the Review Committee of 2000 as well as the structures and working groups established to revise the curriculum according to its recommendations.

Women were equally represented on the structures for the revision of C2005. Roughly half of all people involved were women and a woman led the process. Five out of the 11 people on the Review Committee were women as was the Chair. Five out of the 9 people on the Ministerial Project Committee were women and 5 out of 12 coordinators of learning area working groups were women.

The learning area working groups were all constituted on the basis of equal representivity of race, gender, and region. In addition, the Review Committee had recommended a Human Rights and Inclusivity working group which cut across all the working groups and whose aim was to ensure the infusion of human rights throughout the curriculum.

The human rights working group argued strongly for not singling out gender above any other form of discrimination. The main approach was anti-discriminatory in its broadest sense and encompassed race, ethnicity, gender, language, sexual orientation and disability. The dominant approach in the group was not gender-insensitive, but gender was not a primary focus. A paper was not specifically prepared on gender, which was seen as co-relational and not more or less important than other forms of discrimination based on, for example, race, sexual orientation or disability.

Gender in Education 'Ombudspersons' or Watchdogs

Given the approach mentioned above, gender 'ombudspersons' were not appointed at each level where curriculum was designed and developed. The approach taken to appointment of people to revise the curriculum and produce the Revised National Curriculum Statement was governed in the first instance by the need for equal representation of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' and in the second by representivity of race. The selection of curriculum developers was made on the basis of an essentialist approach to race and gender rather than one which was concerned with how racial and gender issues would be taken up in the curriculum. The selection process was, however, informed by criteria which included gender sensitivity; several people with a gender consciousness were appointed to the committees. While there was a human rights 'watchdog,' there was not a gender 'watchdog' per se. Instead, the revision process relied on the consciousness and sensitivities of the people who had been appointed to the task as well as the human rights and inclusivity working group.

Gender in Education Network

Although there are gender networks, there is not a specifically gender and education network consisting of educationalists, teachers, researchers, students, writers of textbooks, etc. This is a priority.

A core curriculum

Curriculum 2005 did away with gender-specific vocational education. It introduced a core curriculum for learners in Grades R-9. The learning areas for all learners include:

- Languages
- Mathematics
- Natural Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Arts and Culture
- Economic and Management Sciences
- Technology
- Life Orientation

The Revised National Curriculum Statement (2002) specifies minimum requirements for all learners in each of these learning areas in terms of outcomes and related assessment standards. When the Revised National Curriculum Statement was made available for public comment, the chair of GETT expressed concern about the removal from the curriculum of subjects such as home economics and woodwork which it was argued taught necessary and important skills.

The issue was debated within the Ministerial Project Committee tasked to revise the curriculum. It was felt that both boys and girls need to be exposed to an integrated Technology learning area, which now includes generic design, processing and problem-solving elements applied to various technologies, including food, clothing, hydraulic and pneumatic systems. The Technology learning area for Grades R-9 currently includes subjects that were previously gender-specific.

The wider issue is not one of gender, however, but of the availability of teachers and materials to teach the subject. Many schools will have either one or the other teacher and may or may not have the necessary resources or knowledge to teach the subject as it requires knowledge which previously was organised in gender-specific ways. This learning areas will be one of the biggest curriculum changes.

Health, sex and reproductive education

This is included in the Life Orientation curriculum, but it is also the subject which created a furore within the Christian right. The Life Orientation curriculum for Grades R-9 has five outcomes related to: health promotion, social development, personal development, physical development and orientation to the world of work. The learning area addresses issues related to nutrition, what it calls 'diseases including HIV/AIDS and STDs, safety, violence, abuse and environmental health. The curriculum is based on a notion of conceptual progression which assumes that ever more complex ideas are dealt with from phase to phase.

How to deal with sexual abuse forms part of the curriculum from Grade 1 where learners are to be taught how to recognize and say no to sexual abuse and develop a sense of self-esteem. From Grade 3, children are to be taught how to cope with challenging emotions, including people living with disease and illness. In the Intermediate Phase, from Grades 4 – 6, the curriculum emphasizes children's health rights and responsibilities as well as causes and cures of communicable diseases. This is integrated with an emphasis on recognition of gender stereotyping, sexism and abuse in personal and social relationships. In the Senior Phase, education relating to HIV/AIDS continues to include critical evaluation of health resources and treatment options, including relating to HIV/AIDS and learning how to counter gender stereotyping and sexism. The draft National Curriculum Statement for Grades 10-12 includes core content relating to gender inequality. It includes: 'concepts of masculinity and femininity, stereotypical views of gender roles and responsibilities, influence of gender inequality on well-being, eg sexually transmitted infections including HIV/AIDS' (p. 31). Stereotyping is also dealt with in relation to career choice. Grade 11 includes content on abuse in different contexts and their relation to power and power relations.

When first released for public comment, the Christian right reacted violently to the inclusion of sexuality education in public education. The curriculum was painted in lurid colours as promoting sex education of babes hardly out of swaddling clothes, unseemly practices amongst boys and girls and abortion. Gross misrepresentations and distortions were touted in the media in order to show that this was an ungodly curriculum which was forcing South Africa's children into amorality and paganism. This was one instance where a strong patriarchal voice had little impact on the ultimate shape of the curriculum.

Recasting of Syllabi and Re-writing of Textbooks

Truscott stresses that the revision of syllabi and textbooks needs more than simply adding 'great women' to the history of great men, or women scientists and writers to the lists of male scientists and writers. It is about revealing the role of both ordinary and powerful women and men in the process of societal change over time. (54) The extent to which the curriculum outcomes are gender-sensitive varies from learning area to learning area. On the whole, however, gender issues are treated co-equal with other forms of discrimination and rights. It is thus hidden within the overarching, universalist language of rights. Nonetheless, examples can be picked out of how gender-sensitivity is built into the curriculum.

What this means is that learning programmes, teacher guides, textbooks and other learning support materials become more significant. A full analysis is needed of the curriculum, as well as the learning programmes and textbooks in existence.

Gender-sensitive pedagogical processes

There is little work in South Africa on whether particular pedagogies are more gender-sensitive than others. The shape of C2005 and the Revised National Curriculum Statement both assume the use of a wider repertoire of pedagogies than the 'chalk and talk' encouraged under apartheid. They give scope to innovative teachers. Much more work is needed on both analysing existing pedagogies and modeling alternative teaching approaches in teacher education institutions.

Conclusion

Despite the substantial inclusion of gender issues in the proposed Revised National Curriculum Statement, an assessment of whether South Africa's curriculum has achieved gender equality on the basis of these criteria can ultimately demonstrate only partial success. In the absence of a gender equity policy, an organised gender in education network and influence on the curriculum-making process, the overall rights-based approach was important in guiding the process of curriculum development. It ensured the establishment of gender-sensitive decision-making structures, a core curriculum dealing with gender and inclusion of health, sex and reproductive education. But the absence of gender watchdogs and a gender network will probably be more telling in the process of implementation. How gender issues in the curriculum are dealt with in the classroom will depend on teachers and on the textbooks and learning support materials they use. The absence of a gender and education network linked to structures in government militates against decisive action in this area. Much remains to be done. Even in the absence of policy, appropriate

legislation, a well-resourced and authoritative Gender Equity Unit and gender education network it is possible to begin work which would address some of the more specific issues raised in the Gender Equity Task Team relating to teacher education and teacher resources.

This paper has argued that:

- Policy for gender equality is largely symbolic and neither procedural nor regulative
- Criteria and conditions to assess gender equality and the curriculum reveal that while there have certainly been major strides since 1994, the process of ensuring gender equality through the curriculum has been partial and that major challenges remain, particularly with regard to pedagogy, learning programmes, assessment practices, teacher education and learning support materials.

What this suggests is the need for a core set of research and development strategies which would ensure:

- Development of a network of educators focused on gender and working in close liaison with the Girls Education Movement
- Analysis of the curriculum in use as well as curricular outcomes for girls and boys
- Analysis of assessment practices in relation to girls
- Analysis and development of textbooks and learning support materials for use in teacher education and classrooms to support the curriculum
- Examination of pedagogical processes in terms of gender
- Following through on some of GETT's recommendations, such as the development of:
 - A training package for educational managers – including school governing boards, teachers and caretakers – on their responsibility to prevent discrimination, including gendered violence and harassment;
 - Curriculum packages for various institutional types which include resources to enable educators to incorporate learning about gender and violence into the curriculum at all levels of education (GETT, 1996, 228).

These issues are important not only to ensure that girls have access to meaningful forms of education, but are empowered through it to alter their conditions of life.

As such, the questions raised by GETT remain and the much bigger question of what has happened since GETT poses a profound challenge to all South Africans in education. If the picture in curriculum is a mixed one, what is the picture in the areas identified in GETT? Together, they form a palimpsest of what it is that girls do or do not have access to: early childhood development, schooling, further education and training, higher education and training, adult basic education and training and educational management. There is very little knowledge of progress in gender equity in these areas. Here, as in curriculum, the question is not simply access but also the quality and content of the educational experience, as well as who controls it, how and with what effects on the choices that girls face and can make.

REFERENCES

- Department of Education (1997) *Gender Equity in Education: Report of the Gender Equity Task Team* (Pretoria)
- Department of Education (2002) *Revised National Curriculum Statement Grades R-9 (Schools)* (Pretoria)
- Department of Education (2002) *National Curriculum Statement Grades 10-12 (Schools)* (Pretoria)
- Nazir Carrim, 'The Principles and Framework of Human Rights Education' (presented at the Launch and Briefing Workshop: Streamlining and Strengthening C2005 held by the Ministerial Project Committee with the Task Team, Working Groups and Reference Group at Pretoria, January 2001).
- Linda Chisholm and Vernet Napo, 'Gender Equity in Education: Policy and Practice' *Agenda*, 41 (1999), pp 32-38.
- Linda Chisholm 'Gender and Leadership in South African Educational Administration', *Gender and Education*, 13, 4 (2001).
- L Chisholm et al (2000) *A Curriculum for the Twenty First Century: Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005* (presented to Prof Kader Asmal, Minister of Education, 31 May 2000)
- L. Chisholm, 'The State of Curriculum Reform in South Africa: The Issue of Curriculum 2005' in J Daniel, A Habib and R Southall, (eds) *State of the Nation* (HSRC, Pretoria, 2003a)
- L. Chisholm, 'The Politics of Curriculum Revision in South Africa' (presented at Oxford Conference, September, 2003b)
- L. Chisholm (forthcoming) 'The Making of South Africa's Revised National Curriculum Statement', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*
- Cross M, Mngadi R and Rouhani S 'From Policy to Practice: Curriculum reform in South African Education' *Comparative Education*, 38, 20, 2002, 171-187.
- Gwyneth Hughes, 'Exploring the Availability of Student Scientist identities within Curriculum Discourse: An Anti-Essentialist Approach to Gender-Inclusive Science' *Gender and Education*, vol. 13, No. 3 (2001): 275-290
- Jansen, J. (1999) *The School Curriculum since Apartheid: Intersections of Politics and Policy in the South African Transition* *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 31 (1) 57-67
- Human Sciences Research Council, CYFD (2001) *A Study of School Responses to Violence and Harassment of Girls*, Pretoria.
- Pontso Moorosi, 'The Discourse of Gender Equity in South African Policy' (Anglo-American Winter Colloquium for Spencer Fellows, Drakensberg, 13 August 2003)
- Helen Perry, 'Female Performance in the Senior Certificate Examination: Excellence Hiding behind the Averages' *Edusource Data News*, No. 39 (May 2003)

Catherine R Smith, 'Notes from the Field: Gender Issues in the Management Curriculum: A Survey of Student Experiences' in *Gender, Work and Organisation*, vol. 7, no. 3, July 2000: 158-167

George Subotzky, 'Addressing Equity and Excellence in Relation to Employment in Higher Education' *Edusource Data News*, No. 38, January 2003

E Unterhalter (1998), 'Economic Rationality or Social Justice? Gender, the National Qualifications Framework and Educational Reform in South Africa, 1989-1996' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 28 (3): 351-368

J. Volmink, 'Human Rights, Values and Democracy in the National Curriculum Statement' (produced for the Launch and Briefing Workshop: Streamlining and Strengthening C2005 held by the Ministerial Project Committee with the Task Team, Working Groups and Reference Group at Pretoria, January 2001).

