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Abstract

Curriculum in Public Management has been under-theorised in terms of sociological perspectives particularly those addressing the social nature of how curriculum choices are made, the types of knowledge and social relations that curricula reflect, the identities of the civil servant graduates that are privileged through these relationships and the implications of these choices for both student and staff identity and student progress.

Providing evidence from a single qualitative case study this thesis examines and analyses the development of a Masters curriculum in Public Management in South Africa designed to educate public servants for a post-apartheid civil service during the years 1993-2005. This curriculum was developed by recontextualising content from various disciplines and by reference to the field of practice. This study examines various attempts to overcome fragmentation in the curriculum, the logics that were seen as being potentially integrating and difficulties experienced in using these logics as a basis for integrating curriculum contents. It draws on concepts and models developed by Basil Bernstein theorising regions, recontextualisation and integrated curriculum types.

This study enables an analysis of the difficulties experienced in successfully implementing a curriculum in the under-examined area of taught, conversion-type, postgraduate Masters degrees in higher education. The findings show that each of the integrating logics that were appealed to were not able to adequately fulfil an ‘integrating’ function. Curriculum developers struggled to shape a curriculum that was coherent where criteria for progress were clear and shared. Curriculum developers drew on integrating ideas that were sometimes contradictory and proved difficult to turn into principles for developing strong and explicit relationships between an idea (or ideal) and what was taught. By not examining curriculum in terms of its key role in classifying educational knowledge and blurring boundaries between different knowledge forms this curriculum did not take into account the various roles that different boundaries play for structuring progression and shaping both learner and staff identities. Attempts to combine practice and the theoretical without explicit engagement with their
differences and the implications of these for curriculum and pedagogy resulted in neither the 'academic' nor the 'professional' being strengthened over time.
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Language conventions used

In this study I alternate between the use of public administration and public management naming them as cited by authors and interviewees. The terms ‘public administration’, ‘public management’ and ‘public governance’ became part of academic discourse in that order and are sometimes used interchangeably in literature. I use upper case Public Administration (or Public Management) to refer to the disciplinary field of intellectual inquiry and its study, and I use lower case for the practice or activity of public administration, public management or government by civil servants, following Waldo’s distinction (Waldo, 1968:1).

It is impossible to talk about South African higher education without reference to the apartheid-era racial categories that are still enshrined in South African legislation. I use these categories, where necessary, to distinguish between South Africans categorised as White, African, Coloured (mixed race) and Asian. I use Black African to refer to all people not classified as White, or to people who use this label to refer to themselves or others.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEL</td>
<td>Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPAM</td>
<td>Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Tech.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-based organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Tech.</td>
<td>The Doctor of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoL</td>
<td>Department of Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSA</td>
<td>Department of Public Service and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETDP</td>
<td>Education, Training and Development Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEAR</td>
<td>Growth, Employment and Redistribution Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUPMET</td>
<td>Joint Universities of Public Management Education Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGSETA</td>
<td>Local Government Sector Education &amp; Training Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM PDM</td>
<td>Masters of Management in Public and Development Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Master of Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPAA</td>
<td>National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHE</td>
<td>National Commission on Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPI</td>
<td>National Public Administration Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQF</td>
<td>National Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ</td>
<td>National Vocational Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;DM</td>
<td>Graduate School of Public and Development Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPM</td>
<td>Professional Certificate in Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma in Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDA</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma in Public Policy and Development Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Public Services Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSETA</td>
<td>Public Service Education and Training Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Reconstruction and Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPL</td>
<td>Recognition of Prior Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAQA</td>
<td>South African Qualifications Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETA</td>
<td>Sector Education and Training Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGB</td>
<td>Standards Generating Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>Senior Management Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wits</td>
<td>University of the Witwatersrand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background

This thesis examines and analyses the development of a Masters curriculum in Public Management in South Africa designed to educate public servants for a post-apartheid civil service during the years 1993-2005. This period follows the end of apartheid and covers the first decade of South Africa's transition to democracy. It is a case study of a specific curriculum - the Masters of Management in Public and Development Management (MM PDM) curriculum taught at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg – and draws on sociological perspectives on higher education and, more particularly, on the sociologies of education and knowledge. The conceptual framework used for analysis in this thesis locates the broader phenomenon of curriculum as what counts as valid knowledge (Bernstein, 1975b). My focus is on analysing the MM PDM curriculum from a perspective of the principles, rules or structures that regulate how and why a particular form of curriculum comes about, how and why some forms of knowledge become privileged in curriculum over others, and what the implications of this may be for the student identities that are promoted by this curriculum.

The development of the MM PDM curriculum was part of a broader social and political project in South Africa that aimed to drive and support public service change through the education of civil servants at higher education institutions. The challenges facing those academics in higher education, who would take on a major role in the education and training of the civil service in the post-apartheid context, were several. There was a need to develop a curriculum to drive the development of a new cohort of civil servants with appropriate knowledge and values to play a part in legitimating the post-apartheid civil service and with improved competence to deliver on the democratic and developmental goals of the new state. Public Administration curricula that had existed prior to 1994, and the accompanying disciplinary field in South Africa, were critiqued by new curriculum developers as being inappropriate for the new civil service and democratic, post-apartheid project for several reasons. I use the term ‘field’ in the
sense (as used by Bourdieu) of a system of intellectual or cultural practices over which there are struggles and which structure reality for those who occupy positions in the field (Jenkins, 1992).¹ There was a backlash against a type of Public Administration that was seen as being decontextualised, atheoretical and ‘neutral’ in its administration of the policies of the apartheid state. There was antipathy towards ‘administration’ (and bureaucracy itself) and the way it had been applied to create an apartheid civil service that loyally delivered on the policies of a closed, and increasingly militarised, apartheid elite. Trust in existing curricula and their claims to objectivity had been broken. An envisaged future curriculum would have to prepare civil servants to engage more strongly with accountability of the civil service to the citizens who had voted a democratic government into power for the first time.

A grouping of academics, activists, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), trades unions and potential new civil servants argued that this would require a different type of curriculum, a different type of Public Administration disciplinary field in South Africa and the socialisation of a different type of civil servant. This new ‘public manager’ would have to be able to lead and manage change in the civil service in order to meet developmental objectives of the state while promoting and enacting efficient government for all citizens. In determining the orientation of new post-apartheid curricula, they drew mainly on thinking within the incoming dominant ruling party (the African National Congress (ANC)), NGOs, trades unions and other civil society groupings in terms of the needs of a new public service. In 1992, the ANC had set up a pilot team to investigate priorities for education and training for the civil service under Zola Skweyiya (later to become the first post-apartheid Minister of Public Service and Administration). Documents reflecting the views of some within the ANC at this time indicated a preference for a shift from a traditional ‘civil service’ administrative orientation towards a conception of ‘development management’ within a framework of equity and non-racialism in the public service (Picard, 2005). The civil service was envisaged to become the means by which a developmental state agenda would

¹ I initially refer to Public Administration as a `disciplinary’ field before introducing debates and complexities about the naming and classification of the field from both Public Administration and sociology of curriculum perspectives.
be driven. There was acknowledgement of the lack of experience of the ANC in terms of civil service administration, and development of new civil servants was referred to as ‘bridging’ training which was envisaged to take the form of short courses as the primary mode of delivery (Picard, 2005). Inherent in these assumptions of the appropriateness of ‘bridging’ approaches to education and training was a belief that there were sufficient skilled, Black Africans who had developed capacity outside of the civil service through work in civil society, political organisations and professions, and that ‘bridging’ training would be the most efficient way to respond rapidly to pressures for demographic transformation of the public service.

This ‘bridging’ or ‘fast-tracking’ discourse would continue to define curriculum developments beyond initial, short, training courses. A number of universities began to talk of new postgraduate degrees and diplomas as well as short courses to meet this demand. Some academics cautioned against adopting a rapid “training versus education” approach (Marais, 1994:119), but it is probably true to say that these voices were a minority and certainly discredited in the eyes of the incoming regime due to their association with public administration teaching and the previous state. Dominant teaching approaches and practices in South African Public Administration were rejected as not being participatory, not allowing for the development of reflective and critical thinking, dominated by theoretical knowledge and out of touch with the needs of practitioners who were seen as key in driving change in the civil service (Fitzgerald, 1992a; McLennan & Fitzgerald, 1992b; NPAI, 1992).

Following the unbanning of political parties and a return of exiles and political party activists to South Africa, a loose grouping of academics, activists, NGOs, donors and practitioners began to explore education and training options for a post-apartheid civil service. Liberty Life (a large South African insurance group) funded a ‘Co-ordinating and Consulting Working Conference on the Teaching of Public Administration in South Africa’ in February 1990. The conference addressed the nature of change in the civil service, likely scenarios for civil service reform after the election of the next government and implications for prioritising civil service training. Driven by a grouping of returned exiles with some exposure to international developments in the disciplinary field of Public Administration and participation in pre-1994 ANC think tanks, the next formal
move towards attempting to influence curriculum development in South African schools of public administration post-1990 came in the form of the National Public Administration Initiative (NPAI) and the Mount Grace 1 Conference in 1991.

The NPAI came to strongly reflect a rejection of the pre-1994 dominant approach to teaching Public Administration in technikons and higher education institutions, and pressure for a shift to development-oriented and ‘efficient’ public management. This movement represented antipathy towards the concept of Weberian administration itself, particularly in the way it had been applied under the apartheid regime with its “bogus neutrality” (McLennan, 1992:11) where “the civil service became increasingly regarded as a controlling function, or a transmission belt to deliver on policies which were usually formed within a closed, bureaucratised and latterly militarised elite” (Cawthra, 2000:61).

The NPAI was described by its architects as a “process, an initiative, a concept and a commitment to change” (McLennan & Fitzgerald, 1992b:5) and by others as a “call to arms’ [rather] than a rigorous analysis of the discipline” (Cameron, 2008:47). In common with broader developments in South African education at the time, this curriculum renewal project was explicitly a project of challenge and change referred to as requiring a ‘paradigm shift’ in both the orientation and content of the disciplinary field and in approaches to education and skills. The Mount Grace Resolution adopted by the NPAI reflected this dual nature. Key to any curriculum arising from this process would be the balance it tried to strike in merging a focus on participatory and sustainable development with rationalist values of “efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, accountability, responsibility and responsiveness” (NPAI, 1992:23). The new graduate school formed in 1993 at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, the Graduate School of Public and Development Management (P&DM), adopted the Mount Grace Resolution as its guiding curriculum rationale. Its staff at the time were instrumental in shaping the conference and the resolution. The Mount Grace Resolution thus became the guiding vision informing the development of degrees

Former polytechnics which were either incorporated into then existing traditional universities in South Africa to form Comprehensive Universities or became Universities of Technology in the period from 2000-2006.
and short courses at P&DM, including the MM PDM degree analysed in this thesis.

The NPAI had an ambiguous relationship with government, educational policymakers and South African tertiary institutions. It was initially driven from outside government by academics and activists (including returned exiles), and although they clearly expressed that the future government would determine the direction, structure and orientation of the civil service, the NPAI was in fact an attempt to shape the direction and content of training of civil servants post-apartheid and, by implication, influence the ideological trajectory of society. The NPAI’s make-up reflected people with personal and historical links to the emerging government, with some academics being on policy advisory bodies, acting as consultants to government, and being ANC supporters and former cadres. This close relationship would influence the shaping of a preferred civil servant identity.

At the same time, there were tensions within the South African Public Administration academic community, between the drivers of the NPAI and its messages and those lecturers at universities and technikons who had been dominant in public sector education and training prior to 1994. The Mount Grace Resolution condemned existing teaching and practice as being insufficiently analytical, predictive and explanatory (NPAI, 1992). A strong view was that “where the present system controls and restricts, a future one should enable, facilitate and empower” (McLennan & Fitzgerald, 1992b:6). Critiques of Public Administration curricula in the decades leading up to the 1994 elections were both ideological and related to their content. The dominant approach before the 1990s was viewed as outdated because of insufficient engagement with the international field, and particularly how the international field had engaged with the influence of private sector management on what came to be referred to globally as New Public Management (NPM). Critics of the status quo in South African Public Administration teaching at the time of the Mount Grace deliberations broadly agreed on the inappropriateness of exiting paradigms, approaches, training and the lack of preparedness of the existing civil service for government. The agenda for change reflected in the NPAI was described by its proponents as “a move from a descriptive academic approach which emphasises processes and procedures to a value-oriented public management approach” (McLennan & Fitzgerald, 1992b:8) that was more in tune with a context of
transition and change. These reactions to previous curricula and the existing civil service shaped the thinking around the development of not only the MM PDM curriculum and an envisaged new civil service but also the disciplinary field of Public Administration in South Africa.

1.2 Research problem

The developers of the MM PDM curriculum attempted to develop a curriculum in the disciplinary field of Public Management based primarily on, and held together by, an ideological vision of a new type of ideal civil servant, a socially conscious public manager. The development of this curriculum thus began with a vision of an ideal civil servant and a broad notion that such an identity could be moulded through this particular curriculum and that the curriculum could be held together based on this vision.

This presented several tensions. Key to the MM PDM curriculum would be the balance it attempted to find in trying to merge a focus on participatory and sustainable ‘development’ with ‘hard skills’ needed for efficient and accountable ‘management’, while simultaneously widening access to include significantly larger numbers of Black African students and according a stronger voice to practitioners. This process of curriculum reform, it was argued, could be driven by combining values of “efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, accountability, responsibility and responsiveness” (NPAI, 1992:23). Curriculum and its development and implementation was seen as part of an ideologically-driven attempt to contribute to the shaping of an envisaged future society (Fitzgerald, 1992a). However, the development of the curriculum examined in this thesis was not only a project to develop a new postgraduate curriculum suitable for shaping the identity of the ideal civil servant but also an attempt to shape a new disciplinary field, that of Public (and Development) Management in a South African context. The knowledge bases of existing curricula in South Africa were viewed as out of touch with debates occurring internationally around civil service reform particularly in terms of the growing influence of generic management over administration. In line with the political climate of redress and equity in South Africa at the time, there was a concern to widen access to higher education to include greater numbers of Black African students and a concern to promote curricula that were value-oriented in order to support the democratic, social development and black empowerment objectives of the new state.
The search for an appropriate curriculum to shape the identity of this new civil servant raised a number of questions and tensions for curriculum developers. What was the most appropriate type of curriculum that could be developed to meet these objectives, how could it be structured and what kind of knowledge would be viewed as appropriate? Further, on what basis could a coherent curriculum be developed and held together to enable the production of competent, postgraduate students? On what basis was rational morality and accountability to be shaped through curriculum in a context where key aspects of rational bureaucracy were challenged? What forms of authority could be put forward as alternatives? How could the new civil servant be shaped through curriculum and what type of curriculum would best suit this task and the field of practice of public administration? How would the principles of NPM in other countries (particularly the United Kingdom (UK), New Zealand, the United States of America (USA) and Australia) and their emphasis on private sector solutions to problems of efficiency and accountability be reconciled with the developmental objectives of the South African state?

To answer these questions and to develop a curriculum appropriate for delivering on the key curriculum objective of shaping the ideal civil servant graduate, the P&DM curriculum developers turned to examining curricula both outside and inside South Africa in the disciplinary fields of Public Administration, Management and the Social Sciences. They also engaged with educational discourses influencing South African educational policy more generally (and higher education policy specifically) and with debates about ways of teaching in professional and continuing education. They did not, however, have an explicit theory of curriculum, particularly one that could analyse the nature of the ‘applied, disciplinary field’ of Public Management and the principles by which knowledge (workplace, disciplinary and everyday) is recontextualised (Bernstein, 2000) to become knowledge for teaching, or educational knowledge. Located in higher education (more specifically in postgraduate higher education) the MM PDM curriculum looked towards, and was accountable to, the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) and the regulation of its disciplines as well as to the field of practice (the South African civil service). The development of this curriculum during the time period 1993-2005 reflects an attempt to reconcile its academic and vocational orientations and the knowledge forms that underpin each of these
within a context of growing influence of market and state, reflected in both educational and economic policies at the time, locally and globally.

Examining these different influences on curriculum and understanding the nature of the MM PDM curriculum that emerged requires a study of this particular curriculum from the perspective of social theory, more particularly from perspectives drawn from the sociologies of education and knowledge. To explore this I turn to insights from sociology, and more particularly from a tradition within the sociology of education and curriculum, drawing on the theories of Basil Bernstein (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000) and on researchers working with perspectives based on and extending his work in South Africa and elsewhere.

1.3 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework that I use in this thesis locates the broader phenomenon of curriculum within an understanding of curriculum as what counts as valid knowledge (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000). This perspective on curriculum focuses attempts to understand what is intrinsic to curriculum, how it “encode[s] the patterns of social relations, mediate[s] and reinforce[s]” (Douglas, 1996:iix) them while recognising the dominant preoccupation in sociology of education with the external and how curriculum reflects power relations and reproduces societal inequality. Drawing on perspectives of curriculum as “socially organised knowledge” (Young, 1998:14) that in turn draw on Bernstein involves understanding the principles, ‘rules’ or structures that regulate how and what forms of knowledge become privileged in curriculum over others and, in the case of this thesis, what this implies for student progress and the shaping of professional identities.

Some initial brief explanation of the conceptual framework that underpins my thesis and its title is necessary in this introductory chapter in order to elaborate the purpose of the research and research questions that it gives rise to, although the detailed explanation of this theoretical tradition lies in Chapter Three.

In Bernstein’s terms, locating curriculum as a social phenomenon and symbolic form requires an understanding of the pedagogic device, which is his theory of how pedagogic discourse is constructed or how knowledge is transformed into pedagogic communication (Bernstein, 2000:25). It involves considerations about how knowledge is organised in curriculum and about how curriculum choices are
made within the context of social, political and economic influences of a particular time. Developing a curriculum involves *recontextualising* knowledge or selecting knowledge from its original context of production (e.g. a discipline, workplace practice and even ‘the everyday’) and organising it in a form to be transmitted through teaching. This process of recontextualisation, according to Bernstein, takes place in keeping with principles developed through the direct and indirect influence of a range of agents (lecturers, curriculum developers, professional bodies and government).

The curriculum I examine in this thesis was not only a challenge to the disciplinary field of Public Administration in South Africa in the early 1990s but also a challenge to, and an expression of ambivalence towards, various social, political and epistemic *boundaries* related to education, curriculum, social organisation and knowledge. Curriculum architects envisaged the MM PDM curriculum to enable a “paradigm shift” (McLennan, 1992:11) in relation to thinking about the appropriate organisational form of the South African public sector (a shift from *bureaucracy* to a post-bureaucratic form), appropriate approaches to pedagogy (a shift from *traditionalism* to *progressivism*), appropriate knowledge and knowledge forms for social progress (a shift from *disciplinarity* to *multi-/interdisciplinarity*) and moving from a dominance of theoretical to practical knowledge or knowledge derived from workplaces. This curriculum was also a challenge to boundaries that shaped access and exclusion in South African higher education in the apartheid years. ‘Boundary-crossing’ in the context of social, political and educational change was implicitly seen as providing possibilities for radical change to the local disciplinary field of Public Administration, the curriculum for teaching it, the civil service and to supporting change in the nature of the state.

In the period examined in this thesis (1993-2005) there were successive attempts to develop, revise, adapt and implement the MM PDM curriculum. I examine two key phases in the development of this curriculum: the period between 1993 and 1999, where the pioneering curriculum was developed, and the period between 2000 and 2005 where it was substantially revised. In both time periods curriculum developers attempted to develop an *integrated curriculum* (Bernstein, 1975b) that could produce practitioners able to drive the change that was seen as necessary to achieve the goals of the aspirant developmental state.
Curriculum coherence and integration are seen in different ways by South African curriculum developers and policy-makers in relation to schooling and higher education, but in analysing the MM PDM curriculum I adopt particular understandings of these concepts (explained more fully in Chapter Three). As Chapters Five and Six will show, curriculum developers and academic staff involved with this curriculum conceived of integration in different ways and I attempt to understand their explicit and more implicit conceptions of what integration meant. In its broadest sense, I use curriculum coherence in this thesis to refer to how a curriculum holds its various contents together in order to enable students and staff to see the ‘whole’ that lies beyond the different parts and to enable student learning and progression. In my analysis I refer to curriculum integration and coherence specifically with reference to both horizontal linkages between ‘subjects’ (or disciplines) and vertical linkages between ‘levels’ within a degree.

Bernstein’s earlier work involved theorising different curriculum types and the educational ‘codes’ that underpin them. The ideal type construct of an integrated curriculum introduced by Bernstein is a curriculum that tries to integrate its various components on the basis of overarching logics that are not disciplinary. For Bernstein, different curriculum types are seen as symbolic systems of boundaries where the strength of the various boundaries differ (Douglas, 1996:ix). Bernstein’s early perspectives on different curriculum types, particularly in relation to attempts to create curricula based on integrated codes (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000), have mainly been applied to the domain of schooling. More recently, there has been research using various of his theories and conceptual tools to examine curricula, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences, in relation to ‘integration’ (Case, 2011; Ensor, 2001; McNamara, 2008; Moore, 2004b; Vorster, 2011). There has been less application of his insights to disciplinary fields referred to as ‘fourth generation professions’ (Muller, 2009) – a growing area of university studies in South Africa and internationally that draw on several disciplines and are linked to the workplace and ‘the world’ in various ways. These new areas of study in higher education are neither ‘ideal-type’, established academic disciplines, nor established, certified professions with links to an accepted knowledge domain and identity as accredited, certified or registered practitioners. In higher education these types of studies are increasing visible as modular undergraduate degrees or ‘conversion’ Masters degrees that
combine coursework and research. They are referred to as contemporary or new "regions" (Bernstein, 2000) or as "soft applied fields" (Biglan, 1973a; Biglan, 1973b; Neumann, Parry, & Becher, 2002). Some examples are Business Studies, Tourism, Journalism and Sport.

Although not a ‘new’ region (certainly, Public Administration as a disciplinary field is not ‘new’ and neither is being a civil servant) the disciplinary field of Public Management has similarities to some of these contemporary new regions (as Chapter Two will outline and discuss).

1.4 Research purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore the development of the MM PDM curriculum in the field of Public Management at the University of the Witwatersrand from the curriculum's inception in 1993 until the year 2005, and to analyse it drawing on sociological perspectives on curriculum and the theoretical and conceptual framework developed by Bernstein. I employ a single case study approach where my focus is on this attempt to create an integrated curriculum driven by an ideological vision in an applied field or ‘region’ in higher education that sits at the interface between work and academic studies.

My research explores the following research questions in relation to this case. What was the nature of the curriculum that was seen as appropriate for producing the ideal civil servant? What was the preferred identity or specialised consciousness that this curriculum tried to privilege in the civil servant? What were the specific orderings of knowledge in the curriculum that were privileged for bringing about this preferred identity and with what consequences?

1.5 Structure and organisation of this thesis

Following this brief introductory chapter, in Chapter Two I examine debates within the disciplinary field that were influential in the design and content of Public Administration/Management curricula (particularly in South Africa, the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA) leading up to the period examined here. This provides the background for understanding the process of recontextualisation in the MM PDM curriculum. I examine the knowledge disciplines and traditions that were drawn on and endorsed by curriculum developers in the development of this curriculum, and also the approaches to
instruction that were favoured. Chapter Two explores the disciplinary field outside South Africa at the time the MM PDM curriculum was developed and the debates that were influencing curriculum decisions. It also examines debates in the disciplinary field of Public Administration in South Africa occurring at the time, and how ‘old’ Public Administration was rejected because of its association with apartheid and its perceived ‘datedness’ in relation to alternative Public Administration/Management approaches elsewhere, new developmental priorities in South Africa and influential, ideological options for civil service reform like NPM, the disciplinary field of Public Administration and Public Administration education.

In Chapter Three I outline and discuss the conceptual framework that I draw on to analyse the MM PDM curriculum. I begin by attempting to locate the disciplinary field of Public Administration or Public Management in relation to other disciplines and professional fields, and examine how disciplinary fields have been distinguished from each other in specific sociological, anthropological and higher education literatures. I outline the difficulties in locating and understanding the MM PDM curriculum in relation to these literatures and the typologies that they have generated. I then argue that understanding and analysing this particular curriculum requires a social theory of curriculum and a related set of concepts for analysis. A social theory of curriculum allows for an examination of a curriculum in terms of what counts as valid knowledge and for an understanding of the principles which regulate why and how certain forms of knowledge are privileged. An integrated curriculum involves a blurring of boundaries not only between the different subjects or disciplines that are drawn on but also, and more importantly for scholars working in this tradition, between different forms of knowledge. I elaborate a theory-driven, conceptual framework drawing on the work of Bernstein (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000) and others working within this tradition of sociology of education in order to examine the MM PDM curriculum as an attempt to create an ‘integrated curriculum’. In the latter half of this chapter, I introduce concepts that enable a theoretical consideration of the nature of these various boundaries and possible implications of their blurring for the acquisition of knowledge and shaping of professional identities.

Chapter Four presents the research design and methodology used in this thesis. I employ a single case study design where the case study is designed as a
qualitative enquiry into the development of a curriculum in a Masters degree in a particular field of higher education - the field of Public Management. The case study in this thesis is used to gain an in-depth insight into the development of a particular curriculum and curriculum type within a particular local and global context. The unit of analysis is the construct of curriculum and the MM PDM curriculum specifically in the period 1993-2005. This chapter begins with a rationale for the choice of a single case study as an appropriate qualitative research type for this thesis. I then explore issues related to the reliability and validity of case studies – specifically in regard to the position of the researcher – as well as issues related to the selection of a single case and the location of the case study within a particular theoretical framework. I go on to outline the approach to fieldwork that I have adopted, the methods of data collection that I have used, and how data collection and analysis were approached to try and enhance reliability. Finally, I explain the procedures that I applied for analysis and for relating data to my analysis.

Chapters Five and Six present data that tell the story of MM PDM curriculum iterations, drawing on published sources, archival documentary sources and interview data and examining the curriculum in two distinct periods. The first period spans 1993 to 1999 where the ‘pioneer’ curriculum was developed and amended at P&DM (Chapter Five). The second period spans 2000 to 2005 where a curriculum revision took place with changes to the integrating, relational logics. These changes occurred in response to market-driven demands, difficulties in implementing the first curriculum iterations and the changing nature of staff and students (Chapter Six). The purpose of Chapters Five and Six is to provide a rich description of the case in order to identify and outline the approach to developing a curriculum that curriculum developers adopted. I explore the aspirant integrating logics employed in the MM PDM curriculum and the assumptions that were made about how these logics could work in terms of holding together curriculum contents to enable learning and progression and the shaping of the identity of the ideal civil servant.

In Chapter Seven I analyse the MM PDM case, exploring why each of these integrating logics that were appealed to were not able to provide an adequate basis for overcoming the fragmentation of the curriculum or provide sufficient guidance to inform selection, pacing and sequencing of curriculum contents to
enable progression or a common sense of purpose for staff and students. I argue that this was both because of the difficulties involved in setting up a strong, integrating curriculum rationale, and because of a failure to engage with the key role played by boundaries in the curriculum.

In the final Chapter, I reflect on the nature of the curriculum that was seen as appropriate for producing the ideal civil servant for the context of the time, the preferred identity or specialised consciousness that this curriculum tried to privilege in the ideal civil servant and the specific orderings of knowledge in the curriculum that were privileged for bringing about this preferred identity within the social, political and economic context of the time. I also reflect on the strengths and limitations of the theoretical framework that I employed in this thesis. I conclude by making some observations on this particular case and what it may highlight for consideration in relation to other attempts at developing integrated-type curricula in postgraduate studies.

As well as being a sociological study of the case of the MM PDM curriculum, this thesis is also a historical study of this curriculum as the period in which this (still-existing) degree emerged and was developed was between the years 1993-2005, a period of heightened political and social change in South Africa. In the next chapter, I begin by locating the MM PDM curriculum in this particular time period by examining the disciplinary field of Public Administration and approaches to Public Administration education at the time in South Africa and in other countries whose experiences influenced discussions in South Africa in relation to Public Administration and Public Administration education.
Chapter Two: Public Administration and curriculum

2.1 Introduction and overview

The development of the new MM PDM curriculum examined in this thesis was a reaction to a previous, apartheid-era curricula, civil service and civil servant identity. Under apartheid, a focus on bureaucracy and its, procedures and processes in public administration curricula was seen as having supported a naturalised acceptance of the idea of apartheid in the bureaucracy, even though some civil servants tried to maintain themselves as separate from politicians and follow administrative rules efficiently and with professional dedication (Posel, 1999:37). The classic model of public administration, with its distinction between professional and political activity, its rule-governed nature and minimal discretionary space allowed to civil servants, was discredited in the eyes of the new politicians. In South Africa, by the late 1980s, conceptions of civil service neutrality, separation of politics and administration, and civil service legitimacy, values and efficiency were being questioned, years after the quite different challenges had begun in the international realm in the form of NPM. P&DM curricula drew on the promise of a new form of ‘neutrality’ represented by generic Management as opposed to Administration. Thus, the content of the disciplinary field of Public Administration, the values the discipline represented and the ways it was taught came under scrutiny in South Africa post-1994.

Public Administration as an existing disciplinary field in South Africa was seen as ill-prepared for improving both quality and numbers in undergraduate as well as postgraduate education and for preparing a new cohort of potential civil servants. The development of the curriculum examined in this thesis took place in a South African context of dominant and contested discourses of redress, equity and transformation where even the nature of ‘transformation’ was disputed and seen differently in terms of addressing the racial demographics of the civil service, or the culture of the civil service, or both (Cargill, 1991).

In this chapter I examine debates within the disciplinary field that were influential in the design and content of Public Administration/Management curricula (particularly in South Africa, the UK and the USA) leading up to and during the period 1993-2005. This provides the background for exploring the discourses that
were bought into relationships with each other in the process of recontextualisation for their transmission as pedagogic discourse. I examine the knowledge disciplines and traditions that were drawn on and privileged by curriculum developers in the development of the MM PDM curriculum and also the approaches to instruction that were favoured.

The first part of the chapter explores the teaching of Public Administration in the USA and UK (the greatest external influences on the design of P&DM curriculum), debates influencing the international disciplinary field of Public Administration/Management and what the same disciplinary field globally saw as key tensions and practical issues to be addressed in curriculum development. This provides a perspective on how key issues for public management education and the curricula that were developed were seen from within the disciplinary field of Public Administration/Management outside South Africa.

The second part of this chapter analyses the academic field of Public Administration in South Africa, the curricula it gave rise to and the identity of civil servants that it tried to promote prior to 1994. The curriculum developed by P&DM was a reaction to prior public administration curricula adopted in South Africa and based on a selective recontextualisation of critiques of the bureaucratic administrative organisational form under apartheid in order to support a shift to an orientation to management. I draw on extensive, secondary documentary sources to briefly outline historical attempts to develop curricula for the teaching of public administration in South Africa, from the first attempts at a rational-bureaucratic state in the colonial era in South Africa until 1910 and further developments of bureaucracy until 1948 under the Union of South Africa. The main focus in this second section, however, is on public administration curricula and civil servant identity during the years 1948 to 1990, covering the period of the apartheid state, its rise, collapse and demise.

This historical background provides an understanding of the nature of the ‘region’ of Public Administration/Management within higher education and key debates from inside the disciplinary field that have shaped how curriculum development was seen in relation to the curriculum examined in this thesis. This background informs my analysis later in this thesis of how and what forms of knowledge are pedagogised or recontextualised into educational knowledge (Bernstein, 2000) in
the MM PDM curriculum, and how curriculum developers approached ‘integration’ in relation to this curriculum.

2.2 Public Administration and curriculum outside South Africa

This section examines how the disciplinary field of Public Administration outside South Africa saw key issues relating to curriculum during the 1993-2005 period. I have drawn specifically on literatures that give a sense of how an appropriate curriculum was seen from within the disciplinary field of Public Administration. Curricula influenced by traditions of Public Administration education in the UK, USA, Australia and New Zealand are drawn on here since these had the most influence on the curriculum reviewed in this thesis during the 1993-2005 period.

In the USA, UK and parts of Europe, the disciplinary field of Public Administration in the modern period has been characterised by a search for theoretical unity and periodic identity crises post-1950 (Rutgers, 2010). Rutgers argues that the ‘modern period’ of Public Administration (from the 1650s to the 1950s) reflects a search for unity in a fragmented disciplinary field through a theory or some unifying system. The contemporary period since the 1950s, however, reflects greater plurality and possibly more fragmentation because of the multi- or interdisciplinary nature of the disciplinary field (Rutgers, 2010). This period has seen on-going debates about the relevance of public administration to society, its disciplinary status and knowledge core, its identity and standing in academia, its relationship to private sector management, and its core teaching methodologies (Bourgon, 2007; Boyne, 1996; Lynn, 2006; Raadschelders, 1999; Raadschelders, 2005a; Raadschelders, 2005b; Rhodes, Dargie, Melville, & Tutt, 1995; Rutgers, 2010).

A key question is: what is Public Administration or Public Management when viewed from within higher education? Definitional enquiry reveals little agreement above some level of consensus that Public Administration is to be regarded as neither a profession nor a discipline. It is variously referred to as a “semi-profession” (Etzioni, 1969), an “interdisciplinary field” (Gaspar, 2000; Gaspar, 2001) and an “emerging discipline” (Rodgers & Rodgers, 2000). It is not ‘disciplinary’ in the sense of having a strong notion of community, shared modes of inquiry, common professional languages, shared socialisation practices and common modes of communication (Becher, 1989; Bernstein, 2000). Key to
disciplinarity in this view is some consensus around foundational scholarly literature, conceptual structures, methodologies informing inquiry and some agreement on a parent discipline. It is argued that it is this disciplinary core that provides a sense of academic identity and boundaries for disciplines (Becher, 1989). Public Administration is also not a traditional profession like law or medicine which have structures controlling licensure, codes of ethics and entry conditions, nor is it a profession in Abbot’s preferred sense of “exclusive occupational group[s] applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases” (Abbott, 1988:8).

Periodic identity crises in Public Administration have been seen in different ways from within the field throughout its contemporary history (see Mainzer, 1994; Rutgers, 1998; Rutgers, 2010; Waldo, 1968). Academic crises relate to the appropriate content and study of the discipline, its epistemological status, and to relationships between practice and scholarly enquiry. Its existential crises centre on its credibility, public confidence, and its relationship to private sector management (Raadschelders, 1999). Resolutions of these identity crises have been attempted by constructing a unified or integrated framework, either through a reconceptualisation of ‘administration’ (or more recently of ‘management’), or through a common methodology to unify divergent approaches. Underlying this search for an integrative framework, Rutgers argues, is a belief that public administration can only become a respected field or discipline by gaining (or regaining) a paradigm or meta-theory that unifies the field (Rutgers, 1998). A contrary view, however, is that Public Administration is forced to continuously integrate relevant knowledge from different disciplines and from the civil service field of practice. From this perspective, in becoming an integrated field or discipline, it is argued that it could lose its relevance (Rutgers, 1998).

Finally, there are those who argue that unity in the field should be seen in terms of it being multi- or interdisciplinary. Gaspar, for example, argues that Public Administration is best conceived of as an “interdisciplinary field” (Gaspar, 2000; Gaspar, 2001). Here, it is seen in similar ways to a field like Urban and Regional Planning, which aspires to become both a profession and an academic discipline. Gaspar argues that a coherent body of disciplinary knowledge is not necessarily a prerequisite for research, and that the development of the disciplinary field as policy-oriented research, for example, “cannot wait for eventual discipline-gained
knowledge” (Gaspar, 2001:6). Debates about the multi- or interdisciplinary nature of the field of Public Administration have been central to its search for identity, to informing the contents recontextualised in curriculum and to research, particularly in policy-related fields. Curricula in different countries have attempted to resolve these ‘crises’ in different ways.

2.2.1 Public Administration and curriculum in the USA

In the USA, there has been contestation around jurisdiction in the academic field, which has resulted in different curricula being adopted by different academic communities operating in different schools and departments at universities. Students in the USA usually complete an undergraduate degree in a range of disciplines and then immediately afterwards enter graduate\(^3\) studies. Lynn calls Public Management in the USA a “domain of scholarship and teaching within two academic communities: public administration and public policy” (Lynn, 1996:1). The use of the term public management in the USA began as a way of expressing jurisdiction by ‘new’ graduate programmes in a field that had traditionally been ‘owned’ by public administration (Lynn, 1996). Public Management in the USA is a domain that is divided between graduate programmes in policy analysis and management associated with the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM), and the training of career executives and managers in Public Administration programmes associated primarily with the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), which also accredits the curricula of its members. This division reflects contestation within the academic field over jurisdiction and power to control knowledge base and entry criteria (Lynn, 1996) in the absence of a joint professional body.

Positions taken in relation to an appropriate knowledge base for public administration/management or public policy teaching reflect whether the field is seen more strongly as science, art or profession (Lynn, 1996). My summary of the debates in relation to these different orientations during the 1993-2005 period draws predominantly on the work of Lynn, Pollitt and Bouckaert (Lynn, 1996; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000). American schools of public administration have

---

\(^3\) I talk about graduate studies in the USA and postgraduate studies in the UK, reflecting the dominant terminology in each country.
traditionally focused on the occupational category of the civil servant with tenure and on a search for an appropriate scientific knowledge base. This focus was initially based on Taylorist (Taylor, 1912 [1992]) scientific management principles in the 1950s and later on intellectual developments in the social sciences, particularly influenced by political science. Schools of public administration historically had a strong functionalist, structural orientation with an emphasis on practice within the profession. The Public Administration community made its territorial claim on the basis of a focus on policy and implementation, and on an emphasis on management, especially the politics of management. It focused on the roles of career civil servants and their organisations with the goals of achieving competent administration and well-functioning bureaucratic organisations. Tensions within Public Administration curricula pertain to how to work in interdisciplinary ways and how to reconcile a need for higher order abstraction and conceptual reasoning with a practical orientation.

Graduate schools of public policy in the USA mounted a challenge to the academic field of Public Administration and introduced new forms of professional education for analytical and executive decision-making, targeting practising senior officials, aspirant public sector leaders and policy analysts who did not necessarily see themselves as career civil servants. This reflected a shift in focus from the profession and the institutions or functions within the teaching field, to the actor (the leader, manager, policy advisor) (Lynn, 1996). Early public policy schools in the USA in the 1970s reacted against what they saw as public administration’s descriptive approach, institutional focus and lack of interdisciplinarity. Initially these public policy schools had a strong quantitative focus and analytic orientation (Lynn, 1996). Later public policy schools became more diverse and some began to focus more on executive development programmes framed within a ‘best practice’ discourse and adopting an experiential learning emphasis (Barzelay, 1993) aimed at practising civil servants. They became associated with the case method of teaching and a breaking down of distinctions between practitioners and scholars. Lynn argues that there was an orientation in some public policy schools to privileging “best practice approaches over specialised knowledge [and] weak theory building” (Lynn, 1996:163).

The situation remains diverse in the USA with Masters of Public Administration (MPA), Masters of Public Affairs and Masters of Public Policy programmes, each
emphasising different disciplinary bases and having different foci in terms of foregrounding a theoretical or practitioner tradition (Koven, Goetzke, & Brennan, 2008). Concerns remain about relationships between theory and practice (and gaps between them) and between academics and practitioners that, it is argued, leave public servants without an integrated theory to direct their actions, particularly as the limitations of NPM became more evident (Bourgon, 2007; Pollitt, 2007).

2.2.2 Public Administration and curriculum in the UK

In the UK, Public Administration was taught in higher education within a social sciences base from the 1960s. The disciplinary base was usually politics, sociology, law and economics within an orientation that was academic but typically involved a work placement or internship. The identity of civil servants was shaped within views of the role of the welfare state. It is argued that a shift in the discipline from Social Sciences to Management was influenced by the ideological and intellectual redefinition and influence of ‘New Right’ politics and theories of public choice. Public choice theory uses analytical methods and tools developed in economic theory and applies them to the terrain of politics and government sectors. It attempts to explain institutional interactions in the government sector (Buchanan & Tollison, 1984:12). By the 1980s, Public Administration in the UK was more often taught within public policy or public management programmes, frequently in business schools with a stronger orientation towards Business and Management and increasingly less towards Social Sciences, although Economics and Politics still remained as important subjects (Greenwood & Robins, 1998). By the 1990s, in common with earlier developments in the USA, the academic field had split into programmes focused on either public policy or public management, with both being taught in increasingly credit-based modular curriculum frameworks which, it is argued, progressively blurred the subject and its concerns (Greenwood & Robins, 1998). These programmes were often located in business schools or faculties of business or business studies and aimed at higher-level leadership positions in the civil service.

Multi-disciplinary, vocational undergraduate programmes were taught mostly in further education colleges and aimed at lower-level administrative jobs in the civil service. A key influence on vocational curricula from the early 1980s in the UK
was a shift in educational philosophy towards a view of ‘common skills’ and outcomes as the most appropriate way to prepare civil servants for practice. This skills orientation was reflected in Business Technology Education Council (BTEC) courses in the former polytechnics. The late 1980s saw attempts to link skills development to the acquisition of competence through the competence-based model developed by the UK National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ). This resulted in the development of generic management guidelines and competency frameworks for National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) that were seen as applicable to all sectors (e.g. health or education) and to all job roles in the civil service regardless of level. Although NVQs did not dominate vocational qualifications (Grugulis, 2003), these developments were strongly critiqued by academics in the UK, particularly for de-emphasising knowledge as an explicit category within the curriculum through collapsing distinctions between knowledge and performance and increasingly undermining public administration under the influence of a generic concept of management (Greenwood & Eggins, 1995). Although some universities offered a dual accreditation track (leading to the possibility of an NVQ as well as a university degree), the promised portability between the two tracks has been limited, with the weak knowledge base of NVQ graduates being cited as an obstacle (Canning, 1997; Wilkins, 2002). There appears to have been limited take-up of higher-level NVQs generally (Swailes & Roodhouse, 2003) and limited use of them for progression into postgraduate programmes in management (Quayle, 1997). While the competence frameworks championed by NVQs claim greater relevance to workplace practice and greater transparency in describing managerial work than traditional qualifications, Management NVQs have been critiqued for failing to accurately describe managerial work and for not displaying claimed advantages over other traditional vocational qualifications (Grugulis, 1997).

Postgraduate qualifications lead to management diplomas and degrees with a management studies or public sector management orientation (e.g. Master of Science) (Bellamy, 1999) and Master of Business Administration (MBAs) or Master of Public Administration (MPAs). Postgraduate offerings reflect concerns about appropriate approaches to pedagogy for practising managers in the public service with teaching and learning focusing on using action learning approaches, case teaching, flexible participant and educator roles, and experiential learning. It
is argued that learning, research and reflective capacities are strengthened through these processes (Bennington, Hartley, Nielsen, & Notten, 2008).

Rhodes argues that under the political influence of the New Right and its preferred doctrines of managerialism and public choice, by the 1990s, the discipline of Public Administration in the UK was losing an institutional base in universities and was facing an uncertain future (Rhodes, 1996) as it was gradually being displaced by Public Management. What this ‘new’ disciplinary field of Public Management was and what it became is widely debated but in essence management became associated with a new type of activity that was contrasted with an older activity called administration (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000) and described as a new way of doing ‘administration’ with a different emphasis and style (Dunleavy & Hood, 1994).

However, as NPM became the dominant approach to administration adopted by the public sector in Anglophone countries (especially in the UK, Australia and New Zealand and in the USA), the academic field both globally and locally responded in various ways. Curricula in Public Administration and Public Management globally, including the MM PDM curriculum under discussion in this thesis, would be shaped in relation to this tension between administration and management, and attempts to address – through curriculum – enduring controversies influencing the identity of civil servants or public managers. I first discuss these controversies and how they have been perceived in relation to the identity of the disciplinary field itself and the identity promoted for civil servants. I then examine how key issues for public administration curricula have been framed when viewed from within the disciplinary field of Public Administration or Public Management.

2.3 Key issues for Public Administration education and the identity of civil servants

In the absence of an agreed body of knowledge or commonly accepted means of professional oversight and jurisdiction, how has the broad disciplinary field of Public Administration seen the key issues or ‘big questions’ that shape its research and teaching? These issues have been widely debated (see Behn, 1995; Raadschelders, 1999; Rutgers, 1998; Rutgers, 2010) and are viewed from differing perspectives. However, there are key recurrent issues or “founding dichotomies” (Rutgers, 2003:xv) that have historically characterised the academic
field of Public Administration. These are distinctions and tensions between public/private, administration/politics and state/society (Rutgers 2001). Changes in the ways that public officials are expected to act in relation to ‘resolving’ these tensions, and the behaviours that their attempted ‘resolution’ requires, have implications for the dispositions that are privileged in curriculum for the identity of public servants and for the approaches to the study of Public Administration that are adopted. NPM, and its particular ‘resolution’ of these tensions, for example, was but one of on-going cycles of reform of public administration that has involved an intervention to change the identities and meanings of being a public servant (Van Bockel & Noordegraaf, 2006). I add a fourth dichotomy to the three summarised by Rutgers above – one that is often referred to as a theory/practice tension. I discuss each of these dichotomies in turn and draw out tensions that their ‘resolution’ presents for developers of a curriculum for teaching.

2.3.1 Administration/politics and the pursuit of rationality in ‘management’

The relationship between politics and administration is one of the key theoretical tensions characterising the field. This has been seen in terms of questions of governance, who should decide on how government functions and what its priorities should be. Historically, a resolution to this problem was reflected in early arguments for separation of impersonal administration from politics in the USA (Wilson, 1887 [1992]) and earlier in Weber’s distinction between ‘administrative’ officials and ‘political’ officials (Weber, 1991). Operationalisation of a separation between administration and politics has been viewed as one key aspect of professionalisation of the public service (Kearney & Sinha, 1988).

‘Management’ was put forward as the alternative to ‘administration’ and often portrayed a set of objectives, generic techniques and tools for delivering any policy efficiently. The turn to management (away from both politics and administration) to provide leaner, more efficient and more accountable alternatives to bureaucracy was most visible in a particular form that became known as NPM. In the case of NPM the challenge was against Public Administration as “proponents of New Public Management have often used the old public administration as a foil, against which the principles of entrepreneurship can be seen as clearly superior” (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000:551). NPM and its notions of post-bureaucratic control (Barzelay, 1992 [2007]; Hood & Peters, 2004) has been associated with a blurring of politics and
administration that, it is argued, may have created negative consequences for accountability and ethics (Argyriades, 2006) and weakened notions of public good (Van Bockel & Noordegraaf, 2006).

Although not often expressed as such in management education literatures, these debates about relationships between politicians and public servants, and associated issues of relationships between efficiency and accountability, are underpinned by differing notions of rationality. In Weber’s work, the pursuit of rationality is seen as necessary for the development of Western society and this development is premised on its ideal type form: bureaucracy. In characterising the practice of bureaucracy distinctions are made between the objectives of goal-oriented (substantive), “formal” (Giddens, 1971) or “procedural” (Van Bockel & Noordegraaf, 2006) rationality and that of value-rationality. Value-rationality is an orientation to a specific value (ethical, aesthetic or religious) and goal-rationality an orientation to goals, means and effects (Rutgers, 1999). Applying formal rationality to the objective of reaching goals (through bureaucracy) has the consequence of undermining creativity and independent action leading to being trapped in Weber’s ‘iron cage’ (Giddens, 1971). Weber argued that there cannot be a separation between these two forms of rationality and emphasised that there is always a need for bureaucratic discretion operating within an administration that is rule-bound (Schreurs, 2003). How to make this happen in practice is a key unresolved tension in the practice of public administration and a key issue for Public Administration as an academic field.

### 2.3.2 Public/private and New Public Management

A second dichotomy relates to the realms of public and private. NPM management reforms had implications for collapsing distinctions between ‘public’ and ‘private’ sectors in various ways. Some notable examples are privatisation of public industries, contracting out and reliance on public-private partnerships (Pollitt, 2003). An assumption of NPM is that management is generic and there is little or no difference between public sector management and private sector management (or their ‘managers’). Pollitt identifies two strands in the public administration literature on distinctions between public and private sectors (Pollitt, 2003:16). One is a normative strand focusing on what ‘should be’, primarily seen in relation to concerns about diminishing ‘publicness’ in public service (Haque, 2001) and fears about its consequences. The other is an approach that is
descriptive and focuses on what empirical evidence reveals about similarities and differences in public and private sectors. Studies indicate that there are some differences that are significant (Boyne, 2002; Rainey, Backoff, & Levine, 1976; Rainey & Bozeman, 2000), or at least were significant at the time these studies were conducted. These differences relate to environmental factors (e.g. public sectors operating in a non-market environment, consideration of political concerns and influences, and legal constraints), different organisational transactions (e.g. public goods, public scrutiny, greater expectations of accountability) and different organisational roles, structures and processes (Rainey, et al., 1976). Pollitt argues that these studies see ‘publicness’ as multifactorial and visible to different extents in different jobs and organisations, with some public sector jobs being more a public/private ‘hybrid’ than others which are more ‘public’. However, he argues, it is the ‘publicness’ and the trade-offs between efficiency and public trust (or legitimacy) which rest more on the concept of effectiveness that are perhaps most distinctive in public as opposed to private management. Despite the differences between public and private sectors identified above, NPM was influential in some public sector contexts at the time and in shifts from administration to management reflected in curricula prior to and at the time the MM PDM curriculum was developed.

The academic field accounts for the influence of NPM on public sectors in several ways. NPM is essentially associated with a set of practices or “administrative doctrines” (Hood, 1991:3) which look to private sector practices and approaches from business as the most appropriate solutions to running the public sector. Denhardt and Denhardt argue that NPM had two strands (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000) in the USA. One strand was associated with ‘reinvention’ of government to make it more cost-effective and efficient, associated with the ideas promoted by Osbourne and Gaebler (Osbourne & Gaebler, 1992). A second strand was associated with theories of public choice.

A related way of understanding NPM’s emergence is to see it in terms of a merger of two different streams of thought. One stream is built on ‘new institutional economics’ and associated theories of public choice and transactions cost analyses and a second stream was on managerialism in the public sector (Hood, 1991) the latter being linked to the scientific management movement discussed earlier in this chapter (Pollitt, 2003). Doctrines associated with the
former were user choice and incentive structures and with the latter reforms based on ideas of management expertise as being a portable, technical expertise that overrode context and that had discretionary powers to produce results for better organisational performance (Hood, 1991:6). NPM was associated with this managerialist orientation in its application in the UK, New Zealand and Australia. Managerialism or “the belief that every political problem has a managerial solution” (Mc Court, 2001:109) became the advocated approach to creating government that was envisaged to be more efficient in terms of service delivery while costing less (Pollitt, 2003).

Pollitt summarises the ‘package’ of NPM as involving a number of ‘ingredients’ that vary across countries. These include a shift in efforts and systems from inputs (processes) to outputs (efficiency questions); a shift towards more measurement and quantification (especially in relation to standards and indicators); preference for organisational forms that are ‘lean’ and ‘flat’; a shift to contracting out rather than formal hierarchical relationships; greater employment of market mechanisms for delivery of public services; redefining citizens as discerning consumers of services; blurring of boundaries between public, market and voluntary sectors; and a shift in values from equity and security to efficiency and individualism (Pollitt, 2003:27-28).

One of the claims of NPM is that it is universal in application and an inevitable consequence of neo-liberal policies and globalisation. Pollitt argues that it is hard to see direct connections between economic policy and the creep of NPM in the West. Despite the global influence of neo-liberalism and associated policies, some governments were reluctant to take on NPM (e.g. Germany and Japan) and other countries have been more selective in terms of which bits of the NPM package they have adopted (Denmark, Canada and the Netherlands) (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000). Research in UK healthcare in the second half of the 1990s, for example, has indicated that while it was relatively easy to see the application of organisational forms and mechanisms associated with new neo-liberalism as a political approach, it was harder (at least at that point in time) to find evidence of permanent cultural shifts (Ferlie, Ashburner, Fitzgerald, & Pettigrew, 1996). Where NPM has been adopted, it has sometimes been at the level of discourse, rather than adoption of working practice. A key observation is that while forms of NPM have been adopted, this has not always lead to changes in practice. NPM
“talk” and “NPM-type decisions” are often more evident than NPM practices (Pollitt, 2003:37) and, where it has been implemented, it has been done so selectively and in a limited way, particularly in developing countries where it has been contested (Baker, 2004).

NPM impacted on transitional democracies in developing countries in ways that have not always been positive (Manning, 2001), particularly in relation to democracy and democratic values (Baker, 2004). It is argued that NPM requires a strong administrative platform for integration. However, it is questionable whether a classical public administrative platform was ever in place before NPM in many developing world contexts (Manning, 2001; Neuman, 2006), particularly where a one-party state bureaucracy was based on loyalties (e.g. ethnic affinities) rather than neutrality (Monteiro, 2002). A second claim that is made in relation to NPM is that it is politically neutral and similar to a modernised form of traditional public administration. NPM claims to deliver a set of tools for application to deliver whatever goals may have been set by the civil service. Whether it has delivered on promises to cost less and deliver more is contested (Pollitt, 2003), but questions have been raised about its effects on public service honesty, accountability, professionalism and integrity (Argyriades, 2006). NPM assumes a culture of public service honesty (Hood, 1991) and an identity of a public servant, and the removal of some of the mechanisms for achieving this idea of public service (e.g. career tracks, fixed salaries, tenure, clear division between public and private, and restraints on the power of line management) may have impacted on value systems (Green, 2004; Hood, 1991).

Nevertheless a feature of NPM has been its embrace by both centre-left governments and the New Right. Pollit and Bouckaert argue that NPM has been ‘chosen’ (rather than caused) by a range of governments, be they New Right, centre-left or social democrat/labour. It has been ‘chosen’ by practitioners, (politicians and civil servants), with some influence from academics and management consultants, in response to urgent pressure to solve practical problems. It is argued that NPMs ideas are fairly simple and accessible to those not trained in organisational theory and design, and that it promised to save money through downsizing and efficiency gains (Pollitt, 2003:37). There was also an element of copying from one context to another as NPM was promoted by management consultancies and some influential governments and international
organisations, e.g. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the World Bank (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000).

2.3.3 Relationships between state and society

A third dichotomy concerns relationships between state and society. I confine my comments to concerns that played out in the South African terrain at the time the MM PDM curriculum was developed. A key issue is the extent and nature of interventions from the state and how these are actualised through administration or management. In notions of the ‘developmental state’, these perspectives imply a strong linking of ‘public administration’ with state. Shifts in South African state policy from ‘reconstruction’ to ‘delivery’ to a ‘developmental state’ (McLennan, 2007b) implied different expectations of a civil service, shifting relationships with the development sector (NGOs, community-based organisations (CBOs) and other civil society groups) and changes in the identity of civil servants. These shifting relationships play out in Public Management curricula in terms of how interpretations of public administration and public management relate to the context of the state in which they operate and how ‘development’ is conceptualised.

2.3.4 Theory/practice in public administration education and curriculum

A recurrent issue for education and curriculum in Public Administration concerns relationships between practitioners and theorists, and between practical and theoretical knowledge. This is often expressed in Public Administration literatures through debates about a theory/practice dichotomy or divide, the relative importance of theory vs. practice, the nature and type of theory that is useful for practitioners (Bourgon, 2007; Pollitt, 2006), a need for better ‘integration’ of the respective bodies of knowledge (Franklin & Ebdon, 2005; Raadschelders, 2005a), and what the most appropriate pedagogies and teaching technologies for public administration education are (Argyris, 1980; Bennington, et al., 2008; Denhardt, 2001).

There are extensive literatures on approaches to pedagogy and debates on the most appropriate ways of teaching for improving practice. A related issue concerns lack of clarity on the meta-goals of public administration curricula (i.e., who curricula are or should be intended for). Different curricula approach this differently, either seeing their role as development and training of practitioners to
carry out administration, development of specific technical, analytic and managerial skills or assisting existing practitioners with self-renewal (Denhardt, 2001).

Some of these debates point to differences between Anglo-American and continental European approaches to Public Administration, which have been summarised in terms of whether theory or practice is the starting point for organising the disciplinary field. In some views, continental European traditions are seen as more deductive and Anglo-American traditions as more inductive (Raadschelders, 1999). In other views, a resolution to a theory/practice divide is sought by pursuing greater understanding of what makes ‘knowledgeable action’ and in pursuing greater theoretical understanding of public affairs through research and knowledge generation focus (Ventriss, 1991) or by seeing resolutions to engaging with particularly types of theory and their relationship to practice as lying in particular approaches to pedagogy and teaching approaches in curriculum (Argyris, 1980; Christensen, Garvin, & Sweet, 1991; Smith, 1987). The appeal of competency-based education and vocational curricula and the assumptions about skill and performance that underpin them, has also influenced both public administration and management education (Hyland, 1994).

These debates would also come to feature in the design of new Public Administration curricula in South Africa. In common with international concerns in the Public Administration disciplinary field, curriculum development in South Africa involves choices about possible curricular relationships between practice and theory (or knowledge) reflected, for example, in the structuring of internships, continuing professional education and on-the-job training. As will be discussed in the outlining of a conceptual framework for analysis in Chapter Three, it also involves – often implicit – theoretical positions underpinning assumptions about the nature of practical and theoretical knowledge that are less discussed in Public Administration education literatures.

When public management and management education literatures engage with knowledge, it is often in terms of debates about the ideal knowledge base to inform the study of public administration. There is less discussion about knowledge as knowledge i.e. as a category independent of knowing or visible performance. Such a distinction is necessary to enable an understanding of the
implications of calls for ‘resolutions’ to the practical/theoretical dichotomy through greater ‘integration’, and, particularly, what this may imply for curriculum.

Raadschelders identifies four different approaches to the study of Public Administration that he broadly categorises as “scientific knowledge”, “practical experience”, “practical wisdom” and “relative existence” (or postmodernism) (Raadschelders, 2005a:608). Each approach is underpinned by different knowledge ideals, different sources of knowledge seen as appropriate to these ideals, and different methodologies. He argues that these different approaches are adopted by the different specialisations within the study of Public Administration and also the disciplines that study government from within their disciplinary fields. His categorisation of these ideal approaches (or abstractions of groups of theories) goes beyond the theoretical/practical dichotomy often present in discussion of public administration curricula as it identifies the different sources of knowledge that underpin these approaches and highlights a lack of interaction and knowledge-sharing between them, which he sees as a weakness in the disciplinary field of Public Administration.

This view that a lack of interaction between these approaches (and the types of knowledge they endorse) creates problems for advancement in the disciplinary field of Public Administration is shared by others (Franklin & Ebdon, 2005). A widely shared view is that this lack of interaction inhibits greater collaboration and learning between practitioners and academics (Cunningham & Weschler, 2002; Ospina & Dodge, 2005). The resolution to this lack of interaction is variously seen as greater collaboration, different methodologies for conducting collaborative practitioner/academic research (Ospina & Dodge, 2005), ‘codifying’ practical wisdom (or tacit knowledge) (Mulder & Whiteley, 2007), building bridges between practice and science (Franklin & Ebdon, 2005) and ethnographic research on what practitioners do (Rhodes, ’t Hart, & Noordegraaf, 2007). These ‘resolutions’ do not, however, engage with the implications for public administration education and its curricula of these calls for greater elaboration and integration. These implications involve ‘combining’ different types of knowledge, and more centrally for this thesis, different forms of knowledge, as I will discuss in Chapter Three.

The development of the MM PDM curriculum analysed in this thesis took place with strong reference to international trends in the disciplinary field of Public
Management and to public service restructuring in the countries reviewed in the early 1990s to mid-2000s. However, it also took place in response (and in reaction) to existing approaches to curriculum and Public Administration education and curricula in South Africa pre-1994.

2.4 Public Administration education and curricula in South Africa pre-1994

In this section I locate the development of the MM PDM curriculum which I analyse in this thesis within the context of previous curricula and the disciplinary field of Public Administration, from the time of the introduction of bureaucracy to deliberations on civil service education and training just prior to the election of the first democratic government in 1994. Understanding key features of this context is central to understanding the pedagogic identity promoted by the MM PDM curriculum, constructed in part by recontextualising selected features from the past to sanction proposed future identities of the graduates of this curriculum. The curriculum discussed in this thesis was a reaction to prior public administration curricula adopted in South Africa and based on a selective recontextualisation of critiques of the bureaucratic-administrative organisational form under apartheid in order to support a shift towards a management orientation.

2.4.1 The colonial period and the Union of South Africa (1870-1910)

The first attempt at a rational-legal bureaucratic structure on a large scale in South Africa is associated with Lord Milner, the British High Commissioner and Governor of the Cape and Transvaal (1897-1905) (Hyslop, 2005). Milner was intent on modernising the administration to enable the formation of a unitary, capitalist state within the British Empire and to provide a state capable of meeting the demands of the growing mining industry in the Transvaal (Marks & Trapido, 1979). He recruited young British bureaucrats for senior positions in the administration, who came to be known as 'Milner’s Kindergarten' because of their youth and recent graduation from Oxford. The British civil service education model worked on the assumption that extensive degree studies (usually in the humanities) and socialisation into the dispositions of a particular class nurtured leadership and abilities required for senior administration and leadership in any civil service.
The Union of South Africa was set up in 1910, and in the period between 1910 and 1948 there was a strong presence of British or Anglophone officials who remained at senior levels and ensured continuity with the Milner era (Hyslop, 2005). There seem to have been some successes in keeping corruption levels low during this period, although patronage networks within the Afrikaner Broederbond (a secret society with the aim of furthering Afrikaner nationalism and maintaining cultural and economic control of the state) emerged and these networks supported the National Party in coming to power in 1948, and its remaining in power until 1994.

Between the World Wars, training programmes in South Africa were connected to other British colonial administration courses (Rich, 1984:59). South African universities participated in training programmes in *Native Law and Administration* (established as an undergraduate course in 1918), with complete courses and academic programmes in *Native Administration* being established at the Universities of the Witwatersrand, Potchefstroom, Pretoria and Stellenbosch by the 1930s (Picard, 2005). Programmes in *Native Administration* were strongly influenced by dominant views in social anthropology at the time, particularly aspects that supported a segregationist paradigm. By 1945, liberal South Africans had developed arguments for a planning focus based on the application of technology that was positioned as neutral in order to modernise the state and raise living standards (Picard, 2005:195). This planning focus became the basis of the subject of *Development Administration* (sometimes called *Development Studies*) as the academic field in South Africa came to be called at this time.

The nature of the state changed after the election of the National Party government in 1948 towards a larger, more interventionist, centralist and regulatory state to drive industrial progress and pursue the project of “modernising racial domination” (Posel, 1999:103). This in turn required a more efficient and larger public service with greater discretionary powers to regulate state policy. In essence, this was a stronger administrative state with many

---

4 Hyslop distinguishes between rent-seeking, patronage and corruption with *corruption* involving illegal or unprocedural activity (i.e. a breach of laws or regulation), while *rent-seeking* involves providing incomes higher than the minimum that would have been accepted under alternative circumstance. *Patronage* involves familial links and ideological and institutional loyalties (Hyslop, 2005).
legislative functions being performed by institutions and administrative officials (Posel, 1999:102).

2.4.2 The apartheid years (1948-1990)

The size of the central state expanded dramatically from the late 1930s onwards, growing by 144% between 1939 and 1958\(^5\) (Posel, 1999:104). Data for the civil service alone\(^6\) were difficult to disaggregate but indicate a similar trend with rapidly expanding staff numbers and numbers of government departments (Posel, 1999). This expansion occurred alongside changes in the composition of the civil service. Post-1948, the state pursued a strong practice of affirmative action and Afrikanerisation of the civil service, with active recruitment and promotion of White Afrikaans-speaking civil servants into higher positions as well as lower echelons of the bureaucracy. The minimum requirement for permanent grade posts in the civil service was a matriculation (school leaving certificate), but the numbers of Afrikaners obtaining this qualification was relatively low (Posel, 1999:106). Staff shortages were widely reported and lack of capacity in quantitative terms was compounded by poor performance, low productivity and inefficiency across the job hierarchy (Posel, 1999). Hyslop argues that there is little evidence of overt corruption in the top ranks of the bureaucracy before the 1980s, which he attributes to the legal formalism with which the business of the bureaucracy was conducted (Hyslop, 2005:781). The forms of patronage that existed seemed to have been aimed at achieving the strategic goals of Afrikaner nationalism rather than involving personal gain and individualised relationships (Lodge, 1998:64). By the 1980s, however, political corruption was common in government departments and homeland\(^7\) administrations (Lodge, 1998).

Despite the policy of job reservation for Afrikaans-speaking Whites, there were large numbers of Black African civil servants in lower-level jobs. By 1970, there were 302,648 Black African civil servants, compared to 247,216 White (Seegers,

\(^5\) These data did not include the large numbers of temporary employees (Posel, 1999:99-119).
\(^6\) As distinct from the public service which includes teachers, nurses, police and other professionals in state employment.
\(^7\) ‘Homelands’ (also referred to as known as black/ Bantu homeland or black states were set up as ‘self-governing’ territories for different Black ethnic groups in South African under apartheid.
1994:42), and this number excluded the homeland administrations, which were mostly staffed by Africans. There was little in the way of co-ordinated training for the civil service. Degrees in public administration were offered mainly at the Afrikaans universities, particularly the University of Pretoria, and aimed at White civil servants. The universities situated in the homelands trained the homeland administrators.

Education for public administrators at the technikons and universities in the period 1965 to the late 1980s was dominated by what was variously called (in South Africa) the “administrative process approach” (Marais, 1988), “generic approach”, “traditional approach or “generic administrative process” approach (Schwella, 1999) or sometimes called POSDCORB (Planning, Organising, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting) in American literatures (Gulick, 1992 [1937]). The approach was introduced in the dominant Afrikaans public administration text of the time, Inleiding tot die Publieke Administrasie [Introduction to Public Administration] published in 1967 (Cloete, 1981). Although referred to as “Cloete’s processes” (Marais, 1994:174) in South Africa, the origins of this approach to Public Administration lie in the work of American scholars of Management and Public Administration – for example, in the principles of management studies and identified classic functions of management exemplified in the work of Fayol (Fayol, 1949), and in the influence of scientific management principles as exemplified in the work of, amongst others, Taylor, Gulick and White (Gulick, 1992 [1937]; Taylor, 1912 [1992]; White, 1926 [1992]). These origins do not seem to have been clearly acknowledged in teaching in South Africa (Marais, 1988). The administrative process approach was a functional approach (one that was focused on espoused classic management functions) aimed at goal realisation (and goal-rationality) as exemplified in the following quote. “Administration can be compared with the fuel and the oil in the engine of a moving motor vehicle […] Administration is not an end in itself, but always remains a means to an end” (Cloete, 1981:1).

The main features of this approach were its descriptive focus and its reduction of the practice, and to some extent, the taught knowledge base of Public Administration to six administrative processes (policy-making, organising, financing, personnel, work methods and procedures, and controlling) (Cloete, 1986). The nature of what was considered generic in this approach varied. What
made this approach generic in some views was its claims to being a ‘universal’
approach to public administration (Marais, 1994) and that its processes “are
generic to all institutionalised group behaviour” (Roux 1975:79). These
administrative processes were also seen as generic to enabling the running of
political, judicial and administrative processes, as well as being applicable to the
professions. It was argued that the focus on administration dominated the study
of public administration, almost achieving a reified status to the exclusion of
normative criteria and policy conflicts (Marais, 1988). Public administration
curricula at the time involved “a repetition of undergraduate studies at higher
levels” (Marais, 1994:109) or little distinction between what was studied at
undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Although normative criteria or guidelines
were developed, they were viewed as being added as an “afterthought” (Marais,
1994:109) and the focus in public policy was on how policy was made, i.e. policy
processes and structures, with little attention to policy analysis and critique.
Marais argues that the normative guidelines that were taught (in relation to public
responsibility, social values, efficiency and economy) were based on “political
deference” (Marais, 1994:109) to the ruling party. Schwella argues that a close
alliance existed between academics and government and this relationship
influenced the discipline and change or lack of change within it (Schwella, 1999).

Public Administration was not the only disciplinary field engaged in the training of
civil servants. A parallel, and mostly non-interacting disciplinary field of Native
Administration (later renamed Development Administration in the 1970s and
1980s), also existed. There were tensions between these two fields in relation to
jurisdiction, personalities, the place (and meaning) of the concept of development
in curricula and their separate claims to status as disciplines. Public
Administration and Development Administration/Studies operated independently
of each other and independently of the discipline of Political Science (Kotze,
1977). However, both Public Administration and Development Administration
were influenced by dominant South African social anthropology at the time, with
its variant of social Darwinism and essentialist notions of ‘culture’ as a key
concept (Picard, 2005).

What was termed Development Administration or Development Studies was the
main approach to introducing social and political change after the National Party
government took power in 1948. Development Administration in South Africa was
traditionally a study of the administration of development, with ‘development’ being administrative management of people (particularly Black people) within the policy of separate development that located Black people physically and administratively as ‘citizens’ of ‘homelands’ separate from South Africa. *Public Administration* referred to the administration of the White, voting population. It was not until the late 1980s and 1990s that there was a stronger move in universities towards strengthening *Development Studies* as an interdisciplinary field with a stronger socio-political emphasis and identification of problems of developing societies (Cloete, 1992; De Beer, 2003). The focus of the curriculum in the field of *Development Studies* in South Africa from this point on became analysis of the practical and policy implications of various bodies of knowledge from disciplines related to the Third World, more in line with dominant approaches to *Development Studies* adopted internationally at the time. These examples illustrate the historical baggage with which the terms ‘development’ and ‘development management’ come laden in South Africa and the complexity associated with their use in post-1994 South African curricula.

### 2.5 Identity of South African civil servants

In theory, apartheid-era bureaucrats wielded considerable power, and public concerns were expressed about separation of power from accountability (Posel 1999, citing *Sunday Times*, 1976). In practice, however, there appears to have been low morale amongst these bureaucrats and dissatisfaction with wage determination in a system that had no collective bargaining (Posel, 1999) and by the 1970s had adopted a practice of appointing senior civil servants from outside the bureaucracy to promote ‘reform’, thus undermining the practice of promotion based on length of service and seniority (Posel, 1999). The Public Services Commission (PSC)\(^8\) operated as a professional staff association, avoiding political engagement and operating in a “diffident and polite” (Posel, 1999:117) manner in accordance with the colonial public service ethos. It was largely ignored by government. Posel argues that this was a key paradox for the identity of White civil servants. On the one hand, they were the beneficiaries of privilege and power, with the ability to control the state machinery from a protected position as White civil servants. However, they also experienced the

---

\(^8\) The body representing White public servants at the time.
disempowering effects arising from this dependency. Being beneficiaries of the patronage of Afrikaner nationalism, they were always conscious of possible consequences of their dissent for their employment stability (Posel, 1999).

Under apartheid, public administration had attempted to legitimate its operations through the adaptation of a classic model of public administration. Although the model as applied in the South African context deviated from the ideal type bureaucracy described by Weber (particularly in relation to non-merit based appointments and a limited conception of the ‘public’ who were to be served), for the most part the ideal civil servant seems to have functioned as the rational, procedural bureaucrat upholding normative standards and projecting an ethic of neutrality (albeit within a system that was structurally based on discrimination and inequality) (Posel, 1999). The ideal apartheid civil servant, influenced by colonial notions of public service, dutifully served the ‘elected’ government. There is some evidence that senior civil servants operated in this way at least until the late 1970s with corruption being somewhat constrained by what was described as the “legal fetishism” (Hyslop, 2005:781) of Afrikaner nationalist ideology and of bureaucracy operating in a formalistic, authoritarian, patriarchal and increasingly militarised way. However, by the 1980s there was evidence of more widespread corruption in both central government and the homeland administrations (Republic of South Africa Commission of Inquiry into Development Aid, 1992). The absorption of administrative officials from the homeland administrations into a single public service, along with new avenues conducive to corruption (e.g. tendering principles and ‘affirmative action’ appointments) began to contribute to new types of corruption post-1994 (Lodge, 1998).

The identity of civil servants and the nature of public service itself came under intense scrutiny in the run-up to the first democratic elections in 1994. New critics of the existing curricula and approach to public administration applied the label of ‘generic’ pejoratively to critique the ‘neutrality’ within which Public Administration was taught as divorced from a social, political or economic context (Fitzgerald, 1990). The existing approach was also criticised for reductionism, reification of constructs and concepts, and for its irrelevance for a post-apartheid administration, particularly its basis in internal aspects of bureaucracy and its lack of connection to its social environment (Schwella, 1999). Schwella argues that the systematic and uncritical nature of the ‘generic’ approach had “provided a
safe house for the discipline of Public Administration in highly turbulent times” (Schwella, 1999:335) allowing it to avoid ideology and engagement with the nature of the apartheid state.

The legacy of decisions made and actualised in the apartheid civil service relating to relationships between administration and politics lead to a particular backlash against the concept of ‘neutrality’ in the post-apartheid civil service era. This sharply highlighted the incompatibility that Weber identified between the spread of formal rationality (the degree to which conduct is based on rational principles that eliminate orientations to particular values as modelled in the ideal typical form of bureaucracy) and the attainment of substantive rationality (the type of decision making subject to particular values or ethics). For Weber this incompatibility cannot be resolved under conditions of modern capitalism (Giddens, 1971). A backlash against the notion of a ‘neutral’ bureaucrat or public servant would shape this curriculum for the ‘new’ civil service and its teaching of the next generation of civil servants post 1994.

2.6 Discussion

In a context of political transition and an existing civil service that lacked legitimacy in the eyes of the new South African electorate, the soon-to-be ruling party and sections of the academic community in the disciplinary field of Public Administration in higher education looked to establish new curricula to develop a new tradition of public service and new public servants. In common with some other schools of public administration in South Africa, P&DM aimed to establish a new type of curriculum with a suitable teaching approach and knowledge base to produce a new public servant.

‘Old’ Public Administration in South Africa was rejected because of its association with apartheid and its perceived ‘datedness’ in relation to alternative Public Administration/Management approaches elsewhere, new developmental priorities in South Africa and influential, ideological options for public service reform, such as NPM. In attempting to implement a curriculum to give effect to an ideological vision of a civil servant committed to implementing the developmental and societal goals of the liberation movement and the new dominant ruling party, the P&DM curriculum developers explored how other curricula had been developed in the field of Public Administration elsewhere and how these had conceived of
the key issues facing the academic ‘discipline’ of Public Administration and Public Administration education.

When viewed from within the disciplinary field of Public Administration, key curriculum issues were seen through several lenses.

One lens was the contested, unclear and shifting nature of the ‘discipline’ of Public Administration itself and what knowledge is taught in curriculum. Being neither a discipline nor a profession, the field of Public Administration internationally is seen as having faced periodic crises of identity (Rutgers, 1998) since the 1950s as it has tried to decide what the purpose of its educational offerings are, who is being targeted and what type of civil servant it wants to develop. The disciplinary field, particularly in the USA, became divided in terms of “practice versus academic” and “research versus educational ideals” resulting in the formation of schools of either public policy or public management (Rutgers, 2010). This resulted in different fields of study addressing different students, working from different knowledge bases, approaching relationships between theory and practice differently, and adopting different approaches to the study of Public Administration. These developments influenced the choices made in relation to the MM PDM curriculum examined in this thesis.

A second lens is to examine the tensions inherent to the field, as curricula are inevitably shaped by attempts to explore and ‘resolve’ some of these enduring tensions and in so doing, endorse particular attitudes and knowledge that have implications for civil servant identity, bureaucracy and notions of professional conduct. In the case of NPM, the challenge was against Public Management which became used to define “any new stream in public administration that reacts against the conventional shape” of the field (Gaspar, 2000:182). The field of public administration is characterised by these shifts that reflect reactions to the weaknesses or shortcomings of previous orthodoxies (Hood, 1995; Rutgers, 1998).

A third lens is how Public Administration education internationally deals with relationships between its theoretical and practical orientations, both in terms of what type of knowledge it endorses and promotes through curriculum, and how it brings together its academic and practitioner groups. Debates about the nature and role of theory (and what type of theory) in curriculum, the nature of
appropriate research in the disciplinary field, the competence and performance of public officials as well as appropriate approaches to pedagogy are reflected in discussions about appropriate curricula across the international disciplinary field.

These historical and comparative perspectives enable me to position my case in the local and international disciplinary field of Public Administration/Management, and provide the background for exploring the discourses that were bought into relationships with each other in the process of recontextualisation. They do not, however, provide a conceptual framework for a sociological analysis of curriculum that accounts for what it is possible and not possible for a curriculum to achieve, its necessary structure and the role of boundaries in relation to shaping the identity of learners and enabling their educational progress. In Chapter Three I thus present the conceptual framework that I draw on in my analysis of the case of the MM PDM curriculum.
Chapter Three: Theoretical Models of Curriculum in Higher Education

3.1. Introduction and background

In Chapter Two I examined how issues relating to the study of Public Administration and curriculum are seen from within the broad disciplinary field of Public Administration/Management. This brief exploration highlighted both the debates within the disciplinary field and the wider developments in society that were occurring in relation to the practice of public administration at the time the MM PDM curriculum was developed. I also indicated the recurrent debates in the disciplinary field that have influenced choices about the knowledge and discourses that were privileged and bought into relationships with each other as pedagogic discourse in curriculum in various contexts. While the literature suggests that Public Administration has not found an identity as a discipline, and while there have been strong arguments against it doing so, various scholars have seen its multi- or interdisciplinary nature as a strength in terms of the multiple insights that this gives into the problems with which theorists and practitioners are confronted. However, these perspectives from within the disciplinary field of Public Administration do not address differences between the different disciplinary fields and the workplace knowledge that they draw on, or the kinds of constraints these differences impose on curriculum development when recontextualised as knowledge for teaching.

In this chapter, in an attempt to understand the curriculum examined in this case, locate the disciplinary field of Public Administration/Management in relation to other similar disciplines or professional fields and examine how disciplinary fields have been distinguished from each other from within specific sociological, anthropological and higher education literatures. These various literatures have examined relationships between the subject matter that is drawn on and the social structure and identity of academic ‘units’ and provide insights into understanding curriculum development and the identities of academics and students. I attempt to locate Public Administration/Management within this literature and draw out some of the problems in doing so, particularly as they relate to Public Administration’s multi-disciplinary orientation. I argue that while
the classifications I draw on are useful as heuristic devices, they have limitations in terms of their analytic potential to explain the emergence of a curriculum, such as the MM PDM curriculum discussed in this thesis. This particular curriculum is located in a disciplinary field with a long history that draws on and reconfigures or recontextualises content from a range of disciplines and from the workplace under influences of both market and state in an attempt to shape the professional identity of students.

I go on to argue that understanding and analysing this particular curriculum requires a social theory of curriculum and a related set of concepts for analysis that can explore and explain these dynamics. The phenomenon of curriculum, as viewed from within Public Administration/Management, has been under-theorised in terms of sociological perspectives, particularly those exploring curriculum in relation to the types of knowledge and social relations that curricula reflect and in terms of the identities of the civil servant and graduates that are privileged through these relationships in the curriculum.

In the second half of this chapter, I elaborate a theory-driven, conceptual framework drawing on relevant aspects of the work of Bernstein (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000) and others (for example Moore, 2011; Muller, 2009; Wheelahan, 2010; Young, 2008a) working within sociology of education and engaging with Bernstein’s work. When located within this conceptual framework, developing and maintaining a curriculum in Public Administration/Management can be examined in terms of attempts to create an integrated curriculum where curriculum designers have to look to logics or “relational ideas” (Bernstein, 1975b:854) outside disciplines as means of providing curriculum cohesion or integration of curriculum contents. This type of curriculum involves a blurring of boundaries, not only between the different subjects or disciplines that are drawn on but, more importantly for scholars working in this tradition, between different forms of knowledge and their links to pedagogic and professional identities. I present a conceptual framework that enables a theoretical consideration of the nature of these boundaries and possible implications of their blurring for acquisition of knowledge and shaping of professional identities.
3.2. Conceptualising applied fields in higher education

In this section I examine how various disciplines have been classified and described in literature engaging with the organisation and teaching of disciplines in higher education. There have been various attempts at classifying disciplines through the use of typologies. These typologies reflect two historical and “enduring fault lines” (Mueller, 2009:210) or divisions in the development of disciplines. One is a division between those disciplines where the focus is on ‘practice’ and those which focus on ‘pure’ abstraction and theorising (discussed in terms of an applied/pure distinction). The second division is between ‘science’ disciplines and ‘humanities’, a distinction referred to metaphorically as ‘hard’ or ‘soft’. These divisions are shown in Figure 1. Although these typologies represent concepts and not empirical cases (Bailey, 1994), they are useful as heuristics to form the basis for initial comparison between disciplines.

Driven by an interest in relationships between subject matter and research, Biglan elaborated on a classificatory framework dividing subjects according to how subject areas operate in relation to their orientations towards either a dominant single paradigm or multiple paradigms (hard vs. soft), their concerns with application or abstraction (pure vs. applied research) and their relationship to influences on their teaching and research from outside the university (Biglan, 1973a; Biglan, 1973b). He concluded that particular characteristics of the subject matter in disciplines (or their epistemological properties) are related to the organisation and social structure of academic departments. Similarly, Kolb also divided disciplines into four main clusters although his starting point was a concern with learning styles. His naming of the clusters reflected this, i.e. ‘abstract and concrete reflective’ and ‘abstract and concrete active’ (Kolb, 1981).

Biglan’s classification distinguishes between disciplinary areas through analysis of their academic subject matter characteristics, departmental organisation and relationships between subject matter and departmental organisation (Biglan, 1973a; Biglan, 1973b). Becher drew on these typologies in his investigation of academic cultures (or “tribes”) and the knowledge they produce (their “territories”) (Becher, 1996). In Becher’s initial work, “tribes” or disciplinary communities in departments had a strong sense of being a community based on particular modes of inquiry, common professional languages, common socialisation practices and modes of communication (Becher, 1989). Recognising
oneself as a member of one of these “tribes” and their “territories” involves some consensus around foundational scholarly literature, common conceptual structures, common methodologies informing inquiry and some agreement on a parent discipline. Similar to Biglan, Becher’s conclusion was that the social nature of disciplinary clusters and their cognitive structures influence the production of knowledge and the kinds of knowledge that is deemed important within the particular disciplinary field.

While Becher argued that it is this disciplinary core that provides a sense of professional identity and enables the establishment and maintenance of boundaries between disciplines (Becher, 1989), later research showed the importance of contextual factors in moderating the influence of structural factors related to epistemology (Becher & Trowler, 2001). In this later research, Becher and Trowler noted that types of knowledge produced in disciplines were influenced by social characteristics of disciplines as well as market pressures, globalisation, managerialism, and relationships with business and industry (Becher & Trowler, 2001).

Figure 1 : Main Disciplinary Groupings
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(Source: Becher, 1989; Biglan, 1973a; Biglan, 1973b)

While varying in their foci, each of these analyses have added to a classificatory frame that allows for a description of clusters of disciplines in terms of their epistemological characteristics, which are both knowledge-related (cognitive purpose, curriculum and assessment) and socially-related (pedagogy and characteristics of teachers). Drawing on these typologies and classificatory
frames of the disciplines and applying them to undergraduate teaching, Neumann, Parry and Becher argue that disciplines within the same cluster tend to have similar characteristics in relation to teaching, learning, supervision and the type of research produced by academics (Neumann, et al., 2002). Table 1 briefly summarises some of these differences in relation to their structure, culture and research supervision practices.
Table 1: Typology of Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping of disciplines</th>
<th>Examples of disciplines</th>
<th>Structure (or “cognitive style”)</th>
<th>Culture or “social connectedness”</th>
<th>Research and supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard pure</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Concerned with universals, simplification and with a quantitative emphasis Knowledge viewed as cumulative and atomistic</td>
<td>Collaboration in teaching and research Large group lectures and problem-based tutorials or laboratories Competitive High scholarly status and usually well-funded</td>
<td>Supervision in own individual specialist areas Prioritisation of research – either patents or publications (dependent on ‘pure’ or ‘applied’ orientation) Research often prioritised over teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard applied</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Control of physical environment and concern with products and techniques</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Concern with patents and consulting or contracts Immersion in simulated or professional work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft pure</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Contrastive, reiterative, holistic Concerned with particulars and often have a qualitative bias Interpretative</td>
<td>Seminar and tutorial-based work Individualistic Loose organisation</td>
<td>Teaching preparation is time intensive (especially at undergraduate level) Supervision hours are high (as not usually done in specialist areas) Less publication and research output than hard pure disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft applied</td>
<td>Education Management Studies</td>
<td>Focus on enhancement of professional practice Development of protocols and procedures.</td>
<td>Inclusion of experienced practitioners Low publication rates Concerns to establish and defend status in academia</td>
<td>Less collaboration in research Prioritises teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping of disciplines</td>
<td>Examples of disciplines</td>
<td>Structure (or “cognitive style”)</td>
<td>Culture or “social connectedness”</td>
<td>Research and supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Works off a base of multiple paradigms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarised from (Muller, 2009; Neumann, et al., 2002).
Although not an accurate fit, Public Administration/Management comes closest to the ‘soft applied’ category in these typologies. Working within the assumptions and limitations of typologies, in these classificatory frameworks ‘applied’ fields, particularly ‘soft applied’ fields, have certain ideal type characteristics that relate to both accumulation of knowledge and curriculum.

I summarise the following broad characteristics attributed to “soft applied” fields from (Biglan, 1973a; Biglan, 1973b; Muller, 2009; Neumann, et al., 2002). In ‘soft applied’ fields, accumulation of knowledge is largely shaped by practice-based knowledge (often synthesised into ‘best practice’ guidelines) and procedures, with less attention to progressive mastery of techniques as compared to ‘hard applied’ disciplines (e.g. Engineering). There are thus fewer requirements regarding accuracy and precision. Assessment is often more project-based and essay-driven, with an assumed or direct (through a practicum or work placement) relationship to professional practice. The difficulty of specifying practical skills leads to more ambiguity in marking and assessment than in ‘pure applied’ fields where techniques and required knowledge are more clearly specified and shared. While these ‘soft applied’ fields are often oriented to particular or generic job roles, they are also more focused on, often implicit, development of intellectual and personal growth than on problem-focused and practical skills as compared to the hard applied disciplines. In terms of their social characteristics, teaching is emphasised over research and contact hours with students are often higher to cover both theoretical and practical knowledge. There is inclusion of practitioners in teaching processes (working practitioners are often part-time lecturers or presenters) and a focus in teaching on broad problem-solving abilities, rather than the solving of specific (sometimes technical) problems. These disciplines tend to focus on producing practitioners, rather than research-oriented graduates. Consequently, they tend to produce more research that is practical and orientated towards ‘usefulness’ or consultancy-related output, rather than peer reviewed research (Biglan, 1973b). They also tend to produce more unpublished and less publishable, practice-oriented, research (Muller, 2009).

While these classifications are useful as heuristic devices they have limitations in terms of their explanatory and analytic potential for academic fields (and curriculum in fields) such as Public Management and for the curriculum examined in this thesis. Some of these limitations are highlighted by those developing and
extending Biglan’s framework. Becher and Trowler, for example, see limitations in terms of the sub-disciplines located within each category not all being equally as ‘hard’ or ‘soft’. Economics, for example, is a “border discipline” (Becher & Trowler, 2001:186) in terms of being on the harder end of the soft category, and Biology, another example, is on the softer end of the hard category. Becher and Trowler also point to differences within disciplines themselves, e.g. differences between physical and human geography in terms of hardness or softness. Under the influences of global changes in higher education, massification, marketisation and regulatory state interventions, differences between sub-disciplinary groups and parent disciplines may have become more visible and practices within the ‘tribes’ may have changed. At the time the MM PDM curriculum was developed, these debates in South Africa were most visibly reflected in the Mode 1/Mode 2 knowledge thesis of Gibbons, Etzkowitz and others (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000; Gibbons et al., 1994). They argue that global trends in the production and dissemination of knowledge are moving universities away from Mode 1 science (associated with knowledge production in the disciplines) towards Mode 2 knowledge that is changing the nature of knowledge production (Gibbons et al., 1994). Mode 2 knowledge production is not restrained by disciplinary structures and Mode 2 is problem-centred knowledge that is trans-disciplinary, produced in application and mostly produced outside of academia by specialists in environments oriented to application. I discuss this point further in relation to interdisciplinarity in Chapter Seven.

I argue that neither the literature on Public Administration education that I drew on in Chapter Two, nor these typologies of disciplines in higher education are sufficient to provide a framework for analysis of the public management curriculum examined in this thesis. Firstly, neither has an explicit theory of curriculum that helps to explain how a curriculum emerges in a particular disciplinary field located in a particular context and time, the nature of the various influences on it, and how it was maintained or changed over time. They also do not present ways of understanding the nature of a curriculum in ‘semi-disciplines’ (or ‘semi-professions’ (Etzioni, 1969)) that is developed from a range of disciplines and professions. Public Administration (and its newer variant, Public Management) as a disciplinary field (and the lecturers who teach and research under its umbrella) can straddle the ‘soft applied’ category (Management and Education), the ‘soft pures’ (Politics, Sociology and Psychology) the ‘hard pures’
(Statistics and Economics) and even the ‘hard applied’ professions (e.g. Engineering and Medicine). This situation places different and sometimes contradictory demands on both cognitive structure and social coherence in the curriculum, and also on how different lecturers and disciplinary traditions conceive of their core academic conceptual knowledge base and its relationship to the field of practice (the public service in this case).

While acknowledging the broad impact of influences from outside the department or school on both cognitive structure and social structure of disciplines (Becher, 1994), a different set of lenses is needed to try and explain and understand the relative influences of curriculum designers (lecturers and disciplinary groupings), employers, ‘market’ and state. The sometimes contradictory demands that these place on curriculum ultimately intersect in complex ways in the “pedagogic pallet” (Bernstein, 2000:56) of curriculum and teaching. This seems to be particularly so in the growing number of postgraduate, taught, ‘conversion-type’ Masters degree programmes, which are becoming the main means of delivering continuing education in the professions (Drennan & Clarke, 2009). These taught Masters degrees involve various ways of sequencing courses and different relationships between coursework and research that do not usually involve a seamless, linear transition between undergraduate and postgraduate study. An analysis of the MM PDM curriculum, which draws on ‘soft’, ‘soft applied’ and ‘hard applied’ disciplines and recruits from them to try and develop a new disciplinary structure while being influenced by demands from its field of practice, needs a different understanding of curriculum that is able to address the social nature of how choices are made about what constitutes curriculum and the implications of these choices for both student identity and progress.

In the next section I introduce a set of curriculum tools to analyse and explain relationships between particular curriculum structures, for example, those in applied disciplines or fields, and the types of knowledge and social relationships that these curricular forms produce.

### 3.3 Perspectives on curriculum from the sociology of education

Within sociology of education there have been related attempts to examine the nature of curriculum. Durkheim provided some of the foundations for thinking about education in sociological terms, particularly by relating educational forms
and educational culture to the structure of society. Durkheim’s analysis accounts for how educational form (and the development of that form through curriculum) occurs. Within structuralist traditions, curriculum is viewed as socially produced by particular relations that pattern consciousness, and these patterns of consciousness are related to the social division of labour in society (Gamble & Muller, 2010:505). This perspective enables analysis of how curriculum structures (and the types of knowledge they privilege) relate to issues of control and authority. Put differently “studying curriculum choices is a question of examining more broadly social change” (Stavrou, 2009:22) and about understanding attempts to pattern consciousness and shape identity.

Radical critiques of the curriculum in schooling the UK in the late 1960s and 1970s were an initial basis for examination of the university curriculum in terms of Sociology’s broader concerns about social inequality and policy interventions to widen access (Gamble & Muller, 2010; Karabel & Halsey, 1977). A focus within these works was on understanding education as a vehicle for social reproduction (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977) and its role in reproducing class, race and gender inequalities. This view of education as social reproduction, combined with social and political concerns to mitigate its effects through policy interventions, strongly influenced one strand of what became known as the new sociology of education (Young, 1971). This strand turned to political and cultural explanations for persistent poor achievement and exclusion of particular social categories of students based on gender, class and race. These explanations provided sociology of education (and sociology of curriculum) with an approach to curriculum and change that seemed emancipatory (Young, 2008a). A critique of the new sociology of education at this time centred on its rejection of epistemology, its privileging of ‘voice’ and standpoint theories and its emphasis on experience over science and expertise (Moore & Muller, 1999). This presented a dilemma for a social theory of curriculum (and particularly for an understanding of the place of knowledge in curriculum). Within this logic, either the curriculum is cast in stone and is a product of neo-conservative and traditionalist notions of what counts as valid knowledge (a position rejected by progressive educationalists), or it is a consequence of power struggles where various standpoints compete for ascendency (Young, 2008a). Both imply a rejection of a place for a conception of knowledge as existing outside of the standpoints of its various and competing constructors.
There are other theoretical positions within sociology of education that run counter to dominant theories of reproduction. One of these is associated with the work of Bernstein. Drawing on Durkheim, Bernstein’s contribution, particularly in his earlier work, lies in attempting to explain how society’s valued knowledge is distributed and also how the regulation of knowledge is related to the structure of society (Bernstein, 1975b). *Curriculum* for Bernstein is about defining what counts as valid knowledge and involves a conflict over differing conceptions about what the social order should be. Curriculum in this view is “intimately bound up with patterns of authority and control” (Bernstein, 1975b:81). The concern in Bernstein’s work is to examine education as a site of both societal and cultural reproduction and as a site for the production of knowledge (Moore, 2004a). Drawing on and extending the tradition of Bernstein, views of *curriculum as socially organised knowledge* (Young, 1998) focused on knowledge itself, how knowledge is conceptualised in curriculum and the social character of knowledge and its production (Moore, 2004a). These perspectives raised sociological questions about the curriculum and how knowledge is organised and selected for curriculum purposes. Ideas become knowledge when they are systematically connected to each other through schemes of classification and it is in this sense that knowledge is seen as intrinsically social (Muller, 2000).

Underpinning these debates on curriculum is theoretical disagreement about what counts as knowledge. A broadly constructivist or *social constructivist* position on knowledge sees knowledge as arising from meaning making in the mind of an individual (Crotty, 1998) and therefore as something that is individually constructed. Knowledge in these constructivist positions is viewed as being constructed individually and in the head. All forms of knowledge (curriculum being one) are contested and seen as representing particular interest groups or being representations of particular standpoints or of the perspectives and knowledge of ‘knowers’ who have the power to define the curriculum. Knowledge is viewed as either being a result of shared social practices or as the differing perspectives of individuals based on their particular location and experiences in society. An extension of this analysis is that a wider range of ‘stakeholders’ (not just the elite and the powerful) are seen as significant for defining curriculum, as they construct different ‘ways of knowing’ (rather than ‘knowledge’) and also have the status of ‘knowers’. Given South Africa’s apartheid history, it is hardly surprising
that these more inclusive perspectives were influential in the transformation of the schooling curriculum and in broader educational policy interventions post-1994.

Particular versions of constructivism, specifically those associated with situated learning, emphasise the social, material and cultural roots of cognition and the social nature of both the knowledge and the practices of different practice base ‘communities’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991). A key argument arising from this perspective, as summarised by Gamble, is that knowledge gained in formal education (theoretical, subject or discipline-based knowledge) and knowledge gained from workplace and life experience can and should be integrated as a form of situated knowing (Gamble, 2009). This view of ‘integration’ came to be endorsed and reflected in the South African Higher Education Qualifications Framework (DoE, 2007), particularly in its promotion of the notion of integrated assessment (SAQA, September 2005).

By contrast to a social constructivist position, others argue that adopting a social realist approach to knowledge allows for a way of resolving a central dilemma in curriculum by giving context-independent knowledge a key place in curriculum without it being reduced to the knowledge of particular interest groups (Wheelahan, 2010; Young, 2008a). The social in social realist (in common with some constructivist positions) recognises the role of human agency in the production of knowledge (drawing on Durkheim, Vygotsky and Marx, for example) while the realist extends this to argue for a place for knowledge that recognises context-independent characteristics of knowledge, and for the recognition of differences and discontinuities between ‘common sense’ and knowledge that has an objective existence beyond what is socially constructed or experienced. Social realist positions see these differences as real conditions and not as problems to be overcome or ignored. Critiques of social realist assumptions as being deterministic are refuted as the goal is to understand how “social mechanisms ‘structure’ but do not determine, outcomes” (Manicas, 2006:3).

3.3.1 Recontextualising or pedagogising knowledge

In this thesis I use a theory-driven conceptual framework drawing on the work of Bernstein and others researching and working in this particular tradition within sociology of education. Bernstein’s theory constructs ‘models’ that describe the “social space of a field” (Moore, 2013:126) and generates concepts from the
theory that can be refined through empirical investigation in actual cases. I use particular concepts generated from Bernstein’s elaborate theory of the pedagogic device to understand the development of the MM PDM curriculum, and to analyse and explain the structural constraints it grapples with in terms of student progress and student identity.

In the next section I explain the key elements of Bernstein’s conceptual framework that are most relevant to both a description and analysis of the MM PDM curriculum.

My conceptual framework locates the broader phenomenon of curriculum within a particular understanding of curriculum as what counts as valid knowledge (Bernstein, 1975b) and within a particular interest in understanding the principles, ‘rules’ or structures that regulate how and why some forms of knowledge in the curriculum become privileged over others. In Bernstein’s terms, this requires an understanding of his theory of the pedagogic device which is the theory of how pedagogic discourse is constructed (Bernstein, 2000). The pedagogic device is the relay by which the knowledge of a particular discipline, subject profession or vocation is converted into educational knowledge (what gets taught and recognised in teaching and instruction). The pedagogic device is comprised of the three ‘fields’ reflected in the Table 2 below. These are the fields of production, recontextualisation and reproduction. The main theoretical focus of this thesis is on the field of practice, which Bernstein calls recontextualisation (highlighted in Table 2). Developing a curriculum involves recontextualising knowledge or selecting knowledge from its original context of production and organising it in a form to be transmitted, or turning it into educational knowledge for teaching. This takes place according to principles developed through the direct and indirect influence of a range of agents (lecturers, curriculum developers, professional bodies and government) and is reflected in curriculum policy, course outlines and learning materials.
Table 2: The Arena of the Pedagogic Device

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of practice</th>
<th>Production (the production of knowledge)</th>
<th>Recontextualisation (the conversion of knowledge into educational knowledge or what is teachable)</th>
<th>Reproduction (what is taught and evaluated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form of regulation</td>
<td>Distributive rules</td>
<td>Instructional and regulative discourse</td>
<td>Evaluative rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recontextualising ‘rules’ – related to the classification and framing of educational knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinds of symbolic structure</td>
<td>Knowledge structure</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Pedagogy and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principle concepts</td>
<td>Hierarchical (vertical) and horizontal discourse</td>
<td>Collection and integrated curricular codes and curricula</td>
<td>Visible and invisible pedagogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical sites</td>
<td>Research papers</td>
<td>Curriculum policy, textbooks, learning aids, course outlines, reading lists, syllabus descriptions, assessment tasks</td>
<td>Classrooms and examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laboratories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>Pedagogic recontextualising field</td>
<td>Official and pedagogic recontextualising fields</td>
<td>Pedagogic and official recontextualising field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Maton & Muller, 2007:18) from Bernstein, with own additions).

In the remainder of this chapter, I elaborate on the concepts reflected in this table that relate to the field of recontextualisation.

An alternative to seeing Public Administration as a ‘soft applied’ discipline is to see it as a knowledge structure called a *region* by Bernstein. Within higher education, the dominant form of curricular organisation has traditionally been a type of knowledge structure, knowledge relation or theoretical concept that Bernstein calls *singulars*, which have historically been represented by the disciplines. Singulars (or disciplines) are specialised discourses with strong
boundaries regulating the knowledge base, entry, central texts and socialisation practices. Bernstein distinguishes singulars from another knowledge structure, a region, which is created by combining a selection of singulars into bigger units in relation to a field of practice. Regions, for Bernstein, are “the interface between disciplines (singulars) and the technologies they make possible” (Bernstein, 2000:52). They face inwards to the academic disciplines from which they draw and outwards to the professions or workplaces where graduates are employed. The ‘classic’ regions would be, for example, Medicine, Engineering and Architecture. Management, Tourism Studies and Journalism could also be seen as ‘new’ or more contemporary regions, and as examples of a fast-growing space in the higher education landscape. Public Administration or Management can thus be conceived of as a region with the particular characteristic of being an interface between a field of production of knowledge (the various disciplines and regions that inform it) and a field of practice (the practice of administering or managing the public sector). The resolution of demands from both fields creates particular tensions for curriculum development and change.

A region is established through a process Bernstein calls recontextualisation (Bernstein, 2000). Developing or changing the curriculum in regions involves a process of recontextualising knowledge where disciplinary knowledge from a singular (discipline) is relocated to become educational knowledge (i.e. something that is teachable and reflected in curriculum and syllabus documents). Others refer to Bernstein’s concept of recontextualisation as “transforming the subject matter” (Deng, 2007:279) or ‘conversion’ (Bruner, 1996). A practical example of this occurs in school curricula when Physics is removed from its practice and its disciplinary base and recontextualised into something teachable called the subject of ‘Natural Science’ or school Physics in the schooling curriculum or pure Physics is recontextualised as ‘Physics for Engineers’ in the university curriculum. It becomes a new subject operating according to different principles of selection, context and practice (Muller & Taylor, 2000b). In the school system, different ‘domains’ influence curriculum in this process of recontextualisation, the primary ones being academic (the disciplines), the educational bureaucracy, everyday life and the state (Muller & Taylor, 2000a). In the context of applied fields or regions in higher education, the workplace, the profession and the state are key domains that influence curriculum. Curriculum emerges out of a struggle for symbolic control across these domains.
Recontextualisation is thus a discursive procedure that is marked by stronger influence from ‘outside’ the disciplinary field, usually from market, state and policy (referred to by Bernstein as the official recontextualising field (ORF)). As an intellectual field that draws on many disciplines, Public Administration/Management is faced with a process of making selections from disciplinary knowledge teachable as subjects for the purpose of teaching Public Administration/Management. This process of selecting and pedagogising knowledge from disciplines and creating, for example, Public Administration subjects, has been referred to as “pedagogic recontextualisation” (Barnett, 2006:146). However, there is also a second recontextualisation process involved in professional and vocational curricula. This is the process of recontextualising disciplinary knowledge into relationships with organisational, job and professional requirements and practitioner knowledge. This process of “reclassificatory recontextualisation” (Barnett, 2006:146-147) involves the creation of a “toolbox” of applicable knowledge derived from practice. In the case of Public Administration, this process of recontextualisation involves ‘de-locating’ different forms of knowledge from the field of production and the disciplines (in this case, various disciplines and the public administration/management field of practice) and ‘re-locating’ it in the region of public administration/management in higher education and, in the process, privileging certain types of knowledge and particular pedagogic identities and professional identities.

Exploring the processes of recontextualisation thus involves a study of curriculum as it is reflected in curriculum policy, discussion documents, syllabi, teaching guidelines and teaching materials. The curriculum process model of Schmidt and others (Schmidt, McKnight, Valverde, Houang, & Wiley, 1997) distinguishes between the curriculum as intended, implemented and attained. The main focus in this thesis is on the curriculum as intended (Taylor, Muller, & Vinjevold, 2003), and not curriculum as achieved or attained (and as evidenced in analysis of assessment and assessment tasks, for example). It also involves analysis of how pedagogic discourse is produced by complex interactions and struggles between lecturers, curriculum developers, research supervisors, journals, research foundations (referred to Bernstein’s work as the pedagogic recontextualising field) and the official recontextualising field (Bernstein, 2000) in the form of educational authorities, the state, professional bodies and employers. Their relative strengths and how much autonomy they have to operate
independently of each other influence the construction of pedagogic discourse and its contents.

This thesis employs a case study design to explore what happens when a particular curriculum, the MM PDM, is put together through a process of recontextualisation, particularly when it involves bringing together several domains of knowledge and workplace practice. Bernstein's work provides two key sets of concepts to discuss the curriculum in this thesis. These concepts enable a way of thinking about relationships between the curriculum (and what is taught and known) and the identity that the curriculum attempts to shape in its graduates. One set of concepts describes the organisation of curriculum in terms of classification and framing. Curriculum and its 'contents' (or academic discourses (Ensor, 2001)) is referred to as classification and what may or may not be transmitted as educational knowledge is referred to as framing in Bernstein's work (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000). These concepts of classification and framing allow for conceptualising two ideal types or models of curricula: collection types and integrated types. Both the concepts of classification and framing and the concepts of integrated and collection-type curricula are underpinned by notions of boundary strength or weakness which are key to establishing identities and enabling learner progress in Bernstein's work and to the theoretical traditions on which he draws. The concepts of classification and framing both refer to 'degrees' of boundary maintenance, between contents in one case and between teacher student relationships in the other (Bernstein, 1975b:88-89). This makes allowance for both variation and change within the models of curriculum and his use of 'weak' and 'strong' to characterise aspects of classification and framing need to be read in this light.

Below, I begin with an examination of the concepts of integrated and collection codes and the curricula they give rise to as a way of locating the MM PDM curriculum within this conceptual framework.

3.3.2 Integrated and collection codes and curricula

Bernstein introduced the ideal type models of integrated and collection-type curricula to distinguish between two curriculum types which, he argues, entail different principles whereby knowledge, and educational knowledge in particular,
are brought into different relationships with each other (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000).

Curriculum development in the applied field of Public Administration or Public Management is faced by structural and theoretical challenges that are similar to those of some new knowledge regions (Bernstein, 2000) or “fourth generation” (Muller, 2009) professions in higher education (for example Business Studies and Tourism) where disciplines and disciplinary knowledge are drawn on selectively to prepare students for practice, or to further develop existing practitioners. Regions are often faced with attempting to create versions of an integrated-type curriculum.

An *integrated-type* curriculum is explicitly contrasted with a *collection-type* curriculum, the latter being associated with a formative, undergraduate degree structure where a curriculum is comprised of subjects or disciplines that are strongly insulated from each other (e.g. Politics, Sociology, Economics or Physics).

*Collection*-type curricula are often associated with disciplinary structures where the selection and sequencing of educational knowledge, the pacing of instruction and emphases in evaluation are to a greater extent shaped by particular (and shared) conceptions of authority and order that may arise from socialisation into a common disciplinary identity. In a *collection*-type curriculum, strong boundaries are maintained between different disciplinary components, i.e. they stand in a “closed” (Bernstein, 1975b) relationship to each other and can be thought of as a series of “vertical pillars” without a strong relationship to each other (Ensor, 2001:110). The logic of how knowledge is brought together in a *collection*-type curriculum either relate to a “vertical spine” (Gamble & Muller, 2010:509), or notion of vertical progression through particular knowledge sequences (in the case of the pure sciences), or through development and accumulation of particular methods, theoretical areas, methodological approaches or “languages” (Bernstein, 2000) as in the case of the Humanities or Social Sciences. In structuralist terms, it is socialisation into these knowledge logics and progression through increasing complexity within them that shapes a specialist or professional and their particular dispositions (e.g. the professional, graduate, educated person) (Beck & Young, 2005; Bernstein, 2000:49).
By contrast, integrated-type curricula look to overarching logics, relational ideas or supra content concepts (Bernstein, 1975b:83) outside of individual disciplines to which the contents of a course, subject or module are subordinated in order to reduce the isolation between them. Boundaries between subjects are weakened in the process of subordinating content to an integrating idea as selections of educational knowledge for teaching are made. Boundaries between subjects, courses (or disciplines in this case) and the field of practice are also weakened, and the curriculum looks elsewhere for coherence by seeking some relational idea or concept that is not based on the logics of the separate disciplines that inform the curriculum. It may be a new area of study, e.g. Development Studies (Ensor, 2002) or a “holding discourse” (Moore, 2004b:219), such as a policy imperative. Consequently, in the process of recontextualisation and the development (or redevelopment) of curriculum, there may be a search for an integrating logic at both a macro- or external level (e.g. an appeal to an overarching logic from outside the various disciplines) as well as a search for ways of transforming relevant disciplinary or workplace subject matter to develop the different subject areas in the new region.

As discussed in Chapter Two, although Public Administration has existed as a disciplinary field in higher education since the early 1900s, it has not had an established and agreed body of knowledge or a discipline-specific, theoretical base. It is not a ‘discipline’ as such. In many contemporary Public Administration/Management curricula there is not a single unified disciplinary structure but a variety of ways in which ‘bits’ of content are combined according to particular orientations towards either administration, management, policy or governance. Curricula comprise either disciplines (e.g. Politics, Economics), components or selected ‘bits’ of disciplines (e.g. disciplinary sub-courses organised according to themes) or recontextualised disciplines/subjects brought together to constitute new subject areas not easily identifiable with any particular discipline. (e.g. a course like Strategy and Leadership). Curriculum developers at postgraduate level in Public Administration/Management are thus faced with trying to develop a particular type of integrated curriculum.

However, attempts to adopt an integrated-type curriculum and institutionalise it raise several difficulties for curriculum developers. In Bernstein’s terms, for an integrated curriculum to ‘work’ (i.e. for staff and students to have a common
“sense of place, time or purpose” (Bernstein, 1975b:84) that reduces their isolation from each other) several conditions have to be in place. I briefly summarise Bernstein’s theorising of these conditions and his hypotheses about possible consequences of attempts at ‘integration’ without these conditions being in place.

Firstly, the relational idea or integrating logic has to be explicit and shared (Bernstein, 1975b). This implies that an integrated-type curriculum has to develop and define a shared integrating idea or discourse to function as the ‘glue’ that will hold together a number of disciplines (or components from within disciplines) and recontextualised components from disciplines as well as workplace practices in order for shared aims and objectives to be maintained over time. Bernstein theorises that curriculum developers attempting to develop strong integrated codes face particular problems in relation to issues of coherence, at the level of the organisation (the university department or school) and at the level of the individual identities of staff and students. Without the shared subject or disciplinary loyalties associated with collection code curricula, the logic adopted in an integration code curriculum has to provide the basis for building and maintaining identities for both academics and students.

Collection codes, by contrast, create and maintain these identities through socialisation into subject (or disciplinary) identities or loyalties that have historically entailed maintenance of strong boundaries in relation to influences from outside the discipline, both from other disciplines and from external influences, such as market, policy imperatives of the state and broader society. Disciplines, such as Engineering or Medicine, which can be considered examples of integrated curricula can draw on their established disciplinary bases in the Natural Sciences (and on subjects like Physics or Maths based on collection codes) as well as on a clear sense of professional purpose (e.g. mechanical, civil or aeronautical in the case of engineers) to organise and ‘hold together’ a sense of purpose in their integrated curricula. In contrast, what Bernstein refers to as the ‘weak’ classification and ‘weak’ frames of integrated codes in integrated curricula in, for example, Tourism, Business and Management may mean that it is more difficult for the organisational structure to be the basis for cohesion and the shaping of identities. Bernstein argues that this requires either an explicit, closed, shared ideology or a strong social network (or both) to maintain
organisational cohesion and coherence. The staff who are part of designing and implementing an integrated curriculum have to be part of a strong social network (Bernstein, 1975b) with agreement about a shared task or vision. This will require explicit socialisation of both staff and students into the vision. Studies in South Africa have examined how academics across disciplines (and disciplinary sub-fields) have been brought together in relation to specific programme development projects, and the difficulties they have faced in establishing and maintaining a shared loyalty (Moore, 2000; Vorster, 2011).

Secondly, Bernstein theorises that the relational logics also have to be developed into a set of curriculum principles that can guide the development of each course or module so that there are explicit relationships between courses or subjects and the overarching logic.

Thirdly, Bernstein argues that evaluation criteria are likely to be less explicit than those of a collection-type curriculum (because of the lack of shared methodology or disciplinary base), possibly requiring greater collaboration between staff and perhaps greater explicitness to students. This in turn may require greater explicitness about the forms of assessment and what is to be assessed.

Lastly, Bernstein predicts that there are likely to be unclear, multiple criteria for assessment, with students possibly being (tacitly) assessed more against the dominant ideology than on the basis of “cognitive attributes” (Bernstein, 1975b:109).

However, Bernstein’s early theorising of the above conditions as necessary for an integrated curriculum to be successful are based on early attempts in the 1960s and 1970s to institutionalise integrated codes in the schooling system, particularly in secondary science education in the UK. In the context of primary and secondary education, there have subsequently been many case studies of various types of integrated-type curricula and the conditions limiting or underpinning their success (see for example Hamilton, 1975; Hayes, 2010; Naidoo, 2009; Venville, Wallace, Rennie, & Malone, 2002; Wallace, Sheffield, Rennie, & Venville, 2007). While there have been studies of undergraduate curricula in higher education drawing on Bernstein’s theorising of integrated curricula (see for example Case, 2011; Ensom, 2001; Greig, 2012; Moore, 2000; Wolff & Luckett, 2013), few have examined postgraduate curricula in higher
education, particularly from the perspective of examining attempts at ‘integration’ across courses in relation to an integrating logic and experiences of developing and trying to sustain integrated curricula within diverse postgraduate curricula.

Some professions (e.g. Engineering) can be considered as a type of integrated curricula where disciplines are brought together by reference to an applied field of practice (e.g. chemicals or manufacturing), and to a historically strong and established profession. Its professional bodies engage in protecting the interests and values of the profession, have some influence what contents are brought together and play quality assurance roles. Being a professional engineer provides the integrating logic. The challenge for a field like Public Administration/Management is that it has not been able to set itself up as a profession (in the classical sense of control over a body of knowledge, entrance criteria, professional practice and certification). There is not always strong agreement within this field on academic or professional standards and requirements, even with the influence of the promise of ‘standardisation’ offered by competency-based frameworks (Grugulis, 2000).

For Bernstein, a ‘strong’ integrated curriculum (i.e. one that is not merely a set of loose themes without clear organising principles (Ensor, 2001)) seems to need an integrating logic that is explicit and shared by curriculum developers and by those teaching it, and it needs to be translated into principles that guide the integration of its various contents in a principled way and into consensus around assessment practices and criteria. This involves having to make selections about what to teach, in what order and at what level in relation to an overarching ideal or logic. It also involves consideration of the role of boundaries in enabling student progress and establishing the identities of learners. Two concepts that are central to understanding and exploring these processes of selection and boundary strength are the concepts of classification and framing (Bernstein, 2000), which I discuss in the next section.

### 3.3.3 Making selections and boundary maintenance

In Bernstein’s theory of pedagogic discourse (or the ‘code’ by which educational knowledge is transmitted), the code is realised by two principles which Bernstein calls classification and framing. Classification refers to the relationship between categories of knowledge and contexts and, particularly, the strength of boundary
relationships between them. Classification is concerned with how knowledge is organised in curriculum. It talks to how knowledge is ‘divided up’, how boundaries between different types of knowledge are set up and maintained, or in other words, it speaks to the organisational aspects of pedagogy (Hoadley & Muller, 2010). The primary boundaries that classification refers to are those between disciplines (or the teaching subjects that are recontextualised from them) and between educational knowledge and everyday knowledge, in the contexts of home, school and work. In a collection-type curriculum, strong classification refers to a situation where contents (subjects or disciplines) are “insulated” from each other. When these boundaries or this insulation is weakened (as in the case where a new disciplinary sub-field or interdisciplinary field develops) there is more interpenetration of domains of knowledge (e.g. relationships between Economics and Biology in the field of Bioeconomics). Curricula, in Bernstein’s terms, will exhibit varying degrees of classification, from strong to weak. It is argued that strong classification creates and maintains strong academic identities (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000).

In a Public Administration curriculum, a key boundary for consideration is the relationship between theoretical or academic knowledge and the situated knowledge of everyday practice. A second boundary is that between disciplines and the recontextualised disciplinary knowledge that is taught in curriculum. Discussions about the knowledge appropriate for underpinning a curriculum in Public Administration as well as distinctions between practical and theoretical knowledge and between disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity are discussions about classification. In examining questions relating to classification, a key focus of any analysis is the relative strength of boundary insulation between knowledge forms and the possible consequences of weakened boundaries for educational progress and identity.

Bernstein introduces the concept of framing to analyse the forms of communication that take place in pedagogic practice itself. Framing is made visible in the development of courses and learning materials, in teaching and in the form of course outlines, assessment requirements and teaching tasks. “Framing is about who controls what” (Bernstein, 2000:12) or about the locus of control within contexts and categories (Moore, 2013). In examining framing, one is analysing the rules which regulate sequencing, pacing and selection of
educational knowledge (or *instructional discourse*) and how they are embedded in the *regulative discourse*, i.e. the discourse that shapes order and meaning in society and projects a particular morality and identity (Bernstein, 2000:32). Thus, framing involves two sets of relations. One is about expectations around appropriate behaviour and values, and the other is about expectations in relation to the sequencing, pacing, and selection of curriculum content and messages as well as relationships between students and lecturers in terms of making these decisions. Where framing is referred to as strong, sequencing and pacing of knowledge acquisition is controlled by examination boards, universities, certifying occupational bodies and teachers. Where it is weak, the student has greater control over sequencing, e.g. in open learning or modular syllabi. In practice, there is a continuum from degrees of weak to degrees of strong.

Some of the implications of weak framing for curricula have been well-documented. Pedagogy that is implicit (i.e. exhibits weak framing) has been shown to exclude learners from non-dominant educational groupings. Implicit pedagogy, which is often associated with progressivist approaches to teaching, makes assumptions that all students are able to read the often implicit understandings of what constitutes good performance, appropriate behaviour and progress in formal educational terms. The exclusion that is associated with implicit pedagogic practices is referred to in class terms in Bernstein’s work and that of others in this tradition (Bernstein, 1975a; Hoadley, 2007; Wheelahan, 2007). Learners may struggle to interpret the implicit (or weakly framed) requirements concerning pacing and criteria for performance in assessment. By contrast, explicit pedagogy makes expectations about sequencing and pacing of learning clear and indicates assessment criteria and ways of measuring performance. Discussions about the scope and duration of courses and how knowledge is sequenced, paced, assessed and divided up in curriculum and roles of teachers and learners are discussions about framing.

Weakened classification between subjects and between theoretical knowledge and what is known from practice and everyday life has implications for what counts as valid knowledge in curriculum. Talking about the knowledge forms that are privileged in curriculum requires a conceptual language for distinguishing between forms of knowledge that Bernstein developed in his later work.
In the next section, I elaborate on these distinctions between *horizontal* and *vertical* discourse and between types of knowledge structures.

### 3.4 Knowledge forms, knowledge relations and their implications for curriculum and professional identity

Bernstein developed a distinction between two discourses, through which different forms of knowledge are realised (Bernstein, 2000), termed *horizontal* and *vertical* discourses (Bernstein, 2000). The distinction between these discourses echoes a broad concern and theme running through the Social Sciences that distinguishes between “the worked-up shapes of studied, and the rough-cast ones of colloquial, culture” (Geertz, 1983:74-75). This is a distinction between knowledge acquired through formal education and that which is acquired through a dimension of culture called ‘common-sense’ (Geertz, 1983). In Linguistics, a related distinction is conceptualised in differences between written and oral codes. Through the Social Sciences there are attempts to either argue for the basis of a principled distinction between the concepts or to collapse the distinction (as for example in some postmodernist arguments).

Bernstein distinguishes between *vertical discourses* (formal knowledge) and *horizontal discourses* (everyday, informal and practical knowledge) (Bernstein, 2000). Explained very simply *horizontal discourse* is everyday, common sense knowledge and it has features that are context-dependent, tacit, oral and multi-layered. *Vertical discourse*, by contrast, has an explicit knowledge structure that is organised hierarchically (as in the pure sciences) or takes the form of specialised ‘languages’ to be acquired (as in the Social Sciences). Vertical discourse is knowledge that is theoretical or abstract and is generalisable. A vertical discourse enables explicit connections or generalisations between ideas and the empirical world and is acquired through ‘experts’ who can elaborate the meanings (Moore, 2013). A horizontal discourse makes connections by reference to applicability to a specific context and is acquired though modelling by “adepts” (Moore, 2013:77) who can display the competence. Meanings generated by horizontal and vertical discourse are “only available to those who have mastered the principles that organise such symbolic meaning” (Gamble, 2012:6).

Bernstein distinguishes between two forms of vertical discourse – *hierarchical knowledge structures* and *horizontal knowledge structures* (Bernstein, 2000). *Horizontal knowledge structures* “take the form of a series of specialised
languages” (Bernstein, 2000:161) with particular specialised methodologies of interrogation and requirements for the production of specialised texts. For example, learning Sociology may involve accumulation of the ‘languages’ of functionalism, post-modernism and others, as well as learning particular methods for conducting enquiry. Bernstein distinguished between languages associated with horizontal knowledge structures that are capable of being precise and of generating models and descriptions which he calls strong grammars (e.g. Logic, Economics, Linguistics and some parts of Psychology) and those with weak grammars i.e. those capable of less precision (e.g. Sociology and Cultural Studies). Hierarchical knowledge structures, by contrast, have a form of knowledge that creates propositions and theories where knowledge develops by moving towards greater integration of propositions and higher levels of abstraction (i.e. Maths and Physics). Development of knowledge in these examples is seen as the development of theory that is more integrating and explanatory than what was before.

An implication of Bernstein’s distinctions for the development of any curriculum relates to the restrictions that different knowledge forms place on pedagogic transmission (Gamble, 2004b). These implications have been explained by reference to a distinction between curricula that exhibit ‘contextual’ coherence and those that exhibit ‘conceptual’ coherence (Muller, 2009). These binary, ideal-type analytic categories distinguish between contextual and conceptual organisation of knowledge. This is also reflected in the distinction that Posner and Strike make between “concept” curricula and “utilization-related” curricula (Posner & Strike, 1976:679). Put very briefly, curricula that base their sequencing and organisational logic on the “epistemological core” (Parry, 2007) of certain disciplines and work with sequencing of content in terms of levels of abstraction and conceptual difficulty exhibit conceptual coherence. Curricula that exhibit contextual coherence approach sequencing and selection of content by reference to the context of application and tend to be connected through segments, with each segment being related to the particular context of application (Muller, 2009). One implication for curriculum is that sequencing matters more in a curriculum and in subjects that are organised around ‘conceptual’ coherence than where coherence in relation to context is more important as an organising principle (Muller, 2009).
Horizontal and vertical knowledge structures, however, “do not describe different types of knowledge” (Young, 2008b:190). Verticality provides principles for integrating meaning so that it becomes more condensed or conceptualised at higher levels (Moore, 2013), and it is a feature to some extent in all types of knowledge (Young, 2008b). In practice all curricula exhibit both conceptual and contextual qualities (Gamble, 2006) to a greater or lesser extent and thus these qualities of contextual and conceptual function as analytic categories. However, it is clear that horizontal and vertical discourses have different expectations in terms of what constitutes growth or development (in students' intellectual development and in their knowledge). Both contain different recognition rules i.e. rules that signal being able to “classify legitimate meanings” (Shalem & Slonimsky, 2010:771) according to the particular knowledge context they are in and different realisation rules (to enable production of legitimate performance or text, for example through assessment). Expectations and indicators of progress towards those expectations must be explicit, as without explicitness learning and progression are at risk (DoE, 2000).

In higher education, particularly in the Social Sciences, the influence of progressivist pedagogies are seen in curricula that endorse or reflect more contextual, local and cultural experience (Cope & Kalantziz, 1993) and privilege experiential discourses. In schooling and in higher education, this can be seen in moves to draw on students’ everyday experiences as resources to access vertical discourses. For Bernstein, a consequence of recontextualisation of horizontal discourses into curriculum can be that vertical discourses are reduced to a set of strategies or resources for allegedly improving performance in horizontal discourse. Horizontal discourses are also used as a resource for challenging the elitism of vertical discourse, e.g. in giving ‘voice’ and confessional narratives a privileged place in literature and Social Sciences. Bernstein notes, in some of his final work, that some opposing elements of horizontal discourse are being inserted into vertical discourse, particularly where they are allocated to marginal groups or knowledge or ways of knowing that are seen as marginalised in mainstream education. Here, he issues a caution.

The shift in equity from equality (‘of opportunity’) to recognition of diversity (of voice) may well be responsible for the colonisation of Vertical discourse or the appropriation by Vertical discourse of Horizontal discourse. This, in turn, raises an interesting question of the implications for equality by the recognition and institutionalisation of diversity. There
may be more at stake here than is revealed by attacks on the so-called elitism, authoritarianism, alienations of Vertical discourse (Bernstein, 2000:170).

The blurring or de-emphasising of distinctions between knowledge discourses have implications for curriculum and for progress in knowledge acquisition. The ‘more at stake’ that Bernstein alludes to in this quote is increasingly explored in relation to knowledge acquisition and to student performance. Where differences between these knowledge forms are not acknowledged in curriculum design and/or where attempts are made to substitute the one for the other, the effects are increasingly clear: It is the most disadvantaged learners (in class and race terms) who are excluded from access to these knowledge forms and to successful achievement (Breier, 2004; DoE, 31 May, 2000; Naidoo, 2009; Wheelahan, 2007).

A key assertion from a social realist perspective is that there is a difference in the structure that underpins these forms of knowledge and that this structure is embedded in the social processes and the ‘codes’ (or social, political and cultural ‘messages’) through which they are acquired. A key argument is that these knowledge forms are different and that this difference restricts or places limits on pedagogic transmission or how knowledge is reproduced through curriculum (Gamble, 2004b). This is an argument for curriculum differentiation (Young, 2008a). Awareness of boundaries and possible consequences of blurring them is a central issue for curriculum development.

When examining curricula that speak to professional practice (either because they educate people into an established profession, or because they aspire to professionalise or acquire professional status) there are further implications of boundary blurring between forms of knowledge.

What are referred to as traditional or “pure” (Noordegraaf, 2007) models of professionalism (e.g. Law and Medicine) have historically been based, in part, on control over an abstract knowledge base (Abbott, 1988) – sometimes one associated with a discipline or disciplines – and control over professional practice by professionals through institutions (Abbott, 1988; Fournier, 1999; Freidson, 2001). The idea of professions having a distinctive knowledge base, and sometimes even the idea of a distinctive profession and the idea of professional and specialist knowledge itself, is increasingly challenged (see Fournier, 1999;
Young argues that Bernstein’s theorising of the knowledge forms of singulars and regions are useful for considering the implications of these challenges to professional knowledge (Young, 2008a). The argument is that there are relationships between how knowledge is organised and the shaping of professional identities (Beck, 2010; Beck & Young, 2005; Bernstein, 2000; Young, 2008a). In Bernstein’s work, it is the knowledge structure of singulars that shapes an identity associated with ‘inner dedication’. The roots of this theorising lie in Durkheim’s sense of the ‘sacred’ (Durkheim, 1912 [2001]) that is in part shaped by knowledge and the structure of knowledge and not by contemporary market, economic or political forces (Bernstein, 2000; Moore, 2013). As summarised by Young, within this perspective “professional commitment and its accompanying sense of dedication originates, at least in part, in the separation of ‘word’ and ‘world’” (Young, 2008b:154). In Bernstein’s terms, a weakening of relationships between singulars and fields of practice implies a loss of control over the shaping of professional identities and ‘inner dedication’, which are increasingly under pressure from the market. These developments are reflected more positively by, for example, Gibbons and others who argue that global trends in the production and dissemination of knowledge are moving universities away from ‘Mode 1’ science (associated with knowledge production in the disciplines) towards ‘Mode 2’ science which is changing the nature of knowledge production (Gibbons et al 1994). Mode 2 knowledge production is not restrained by disciplinary structures. It is problem-centred, trans-disciplinary, produced in application (mostly outside academia by specialists in environments oriented to application) (Becher & Trowler, 2001:7), and offers possibilities for knowledge that is oriented towards productivity and thus seen by education policy makers as more relevant. Bernstein is somewhat sceptical about these developments, particularly in terms of their implications for professional identity. He warns that resultant identities are increasingly likely to be shaped by the “short termism” (Bernstein, 2000:58) of the market, with education taking on the role of fostering generic abilities to continuously remould or shape identities and dispositions according to the demands of market. The new disposition of what he terms ‘trainability’ that is required of graduates is increasingly reflected in curricula in the form of generic modes associated with generic skills.

While increasingly rejecting aspects of the conservatism and elitism of traditional models of professional knowledge, applied disciplinary fields or new regions
(including Public Management (Noordegraaf, 2007)) still look to some notion of ‘professionalism’ in order to claim legitimacy in both academia and the world of work and, in the case explored in this thesis, attempt to shape this professionalism through curriculum, perhaps in different ways. A key question for regions or applied disciplinary fields becomes what these new modes of present day professionalism are (Noordegraaf, 2007) and, more importantly, how can conditions for the development of professionalism and the production of knowledge that is “autonomous” of the market be created in the current global, educational context (Young, 2008a:158)

3.5 Discussion

In this Chapter I have drawn on literatures that locate the disciplinary field of Public Administration or Public Management within various typologies to draw out relationships between subject matter, social structure and the identity of academic ‘units’, and how these influence what is taught and how it is taught. While these typologies are useful as heuristic devices, they do not adequately account for the location of a field like Public Administration/Management that does not have a history as a profession, a coherent occupation to which it refers, or a base in a particular or limited number of disciplines. In order to be able to explore the kind of curriculum that emerges in these circumstances, and the identities that are privileged in relation to the MM PDM curriculum that I analyse in this thesis, I introduced a conceptual framework that allows for an analysis of curriculum from a sociological perspective. The theory of Bernstein and the concepts it generates allows for a perspective on curriculum in terms of relationships between particular curriculum structures and the types of knowledge and social relationships that these curricular forms produce. This framework in turn enables a theoretical consideration of the nature of boundaries and the possible implications of their blurring for acquisition of knowledge and shaping of professional identities.

In attempting to design an integrated curriculum and establish a ‘region’ for Public Administration, curriculum designers have to look to logics or “relational ideas” (Bernstein, 1975b:854) outside of disciplines as means of providing curriculum cohesion or integration of curriculum contents. In developing curricula that are not directly associated with disciplinary structures, and where strong boundaries are maintained between different disciplinary components and their
respective disciplinary organisational logics, curriculum developers in disciplinary fields such as Public Administration/Management have to seek an integrating logic or way of selecting, sequencing and ordering curriculum content from elsewhere.

The development of curriculum on the basis of an integrated code presents particular theoretical and practical problems for curriculum developers. In Chapters Five and Six I explore these problems and present the broad integrating rationales that I argue are drawn on in the case of the MM PDM curriculum in an attempt to resolve these problems. I argue that several logics are appealed to to try and hold curriculum contents together and that each of them present practical problems for curriculum and for student progression and the shaping of student identity.

I employ a single case study design to study and explore how curriculum developers attempted to develop an integrated curriculum. This examination of the development of a particular curriculum at a particular point in South Africa’s history allows for an in-depth, evidence-based, investigation of the ways in which curriculum developers look to various possible logics and the difficulties that these logics present for trying to create an integrated curriculum. The conceptual framework presented in this chapter and the sociological ideas on which it is based allows for analysis of the logics adopted and for analysis of the implications of some of their outcomes in terms of educational progression and identity. In the next chapter I present my rationale for selecting a single case study research design and the methodology used in this study.
Chapter Four: Methodology

4.1. Introduction

This chapter begins with a rationale for the choice of a single case study as an appropriate qualitative research type for this research. I then explore particular issues related to the reliability, validity of case studies (specifically in relation to the position of the researcher), the selection of a single case and the location of the case study within a particular theoretical framework. I go on to outline the approach to fieldwork that I adopted, the methods of data collection I used and how I approached data collection and analysis to engage with issues of validity, reliability and ethics. Finally, I explain the procedures that I employed for analysis and for relating data to my analysis.

4.2. Case study approach

In this research, I apply a single case study design within the qualitative tradition to study the development of a particular Masters degree curriculum in the field of Public and Development Management, namely the MM PDM curriculum as taught at the University of the Witwatersrand. A qualitative approach allows for the collection and analysis of naturalistic data to be understood in relation to a particular social context and setting. Through the selection of a single curriculum case in the region of Public Management and its description and analysis of this curriculum in terms of a particular conceptual framework, this study enables an explanation of the difficulties experienced in successfully implementing such curricula and may contribute to emerging insights into curricula in postgraduate applied fields, especially when read in relation other curriculum studies within a similar theoretical tradition.

4.2.1 Case study design

The study was designed as a single case study in the qualitative tradition. The employment of a single case can be used to extend, challenge or confirm a particular theory and may contribute to theory building (Yin, 2009). My rationale for choosing a single case study design to explore an attempt to develop an integrated curriculum is based on the insights it may give into the complexities of designing and implementing an integrated curriculum. A single case study design
is appropriate for this investigation because of the possibilities that such a design offers for exploring and analysing the development of a complex social phenomenon like curriculum in depth. A case study design is suited to answering my research questions which focus on understanding recontextualisation in Public Administration curriculum through an in-depth examination of one curriculum, the MM PDM curriculum. It enables a rich description of a particular curriculum and may offer insights that are able to inform analyses of other similar curricula in Public Management and in other regions.

While there are widely debated differences between approaches to qualitative research, in essence they all share several common characteristics or are guided by some common principles. I draw on Silverman’s “prescriptions” for qualitative or field research (Silverman, 1993:29) in arguing why a qualitative research approach is appropriate for this study. A qualitative research approach is appropriate for a theoretically-driven study that attempts to problematise or examine curriculum in ways that differ from dominant ways of seeing curriculum within the disciplinary field of Public Administration or Public Management. In qualitative research there is also a methodological preference for working with data that occur as part of or related to ‘normal business’ in a particular setting, as is the case of the documentary data examined in this thesis.

The concept of a case and case study are interpreted differently in the literature, so below I outline how I have used the concept of a case in this research.

Different theorists locate themselves differently in relation to what they emphasise in deciding what a case study is. Yin, for example, locates his definition of a case study predominantly in terms of method, seeing a case study as “an empirical inquiry” (Yin, 2003:13) where a phenomenon is investigated within a particular real-life context.

I use the notion of a case study in the sense of a qualitative research approach that takes a particular form, that of the case (Merriam, 2009). In this sense a case study is a strategy of qualitative inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Here, the case is not defined by the methods used to collect and analyse data but by its focus on a particular unit of analysis (Willig, 2008) – in this thesis, the phenomenon of curriculum. Merriam argues that disagreements arising in relation to defining the nature of the case or a case study stem from conflations of the process of doing
the study, the unit of study (or the case) and the end product of the investigation (Merriam, 2009). In this thesis I draw on a tradition in theorising about case studies that sees the case as bounded (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2005), as a “system” (Stake, 2005:444) or as a phenomenon “occurring in a bounded context” (Miles & Huberman, 1994:25). What this emphasises in relation to the definition of a case is the ability to set limits on the object of study or the unit of analysis. In the case in this thesis, the limits are set through the focus on the development of a particular curriculum for a degree in a particular time period (1993-2005). The case of the MM PDM curriculum is thus finite and bounded.

Boundedness does not, however, suggest that the case or the unit of analysis is closed to interactions with the broader social, political and economic context, nor to the shaping of structuring influences or principles. ‘Boundedness’ in this view explicitly recognises that the “boundaries between the phenomenon and the context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2009:18) or that activity is “patterned” within a system (Stake, 2005:444). The case study in this thesis – aside from being bounded and finite – is used to gain an in-depth insight into a particular curriculum situation and context. The unit of analysis is the construct of curriculum and the MM PDM curriculum specifically. The view of curriculum adopted in this study is explicitly a view where the structuring influences of the broader social, political and economic context are embedded in the principles by which contents are brought together to fill particular periods of instructional time (i.e. curriculum) (Bernstein, 1975b). These espoused principles are explicitly connected to and shaped by the curriculum developers and lecturers who teach the curriculum, as well as the influences of education policy, the market and the priorities of the state. As with all research methods, my choice of method has some limitations. These are mostly related to the relative strengths and limitations of the particular qualitative research design and to considerations relating to the reliability and validity of the study are examined in relation to the selection, management and analysis of data in Section 4.4. I address issues of validity in the next section.

4.2.2 The role of the researcher in a qualitative case study

In a qualitative case study the researcher is the main instrument for the selection and collection of data and its analysis. This inevitably raises specific concerns in relation to what is usually referred to as internal validity, particularly where the
researcher is, or has been, involved in the context that is been studied. Validity, as used in this study, is interpreted in relation to the assumptions of qualitative methodologies. In this sense, validity refers to the plausibility and trustworthiness of the analysis (Merriam, 1998; Silverman, 1993) and the extent to which the account accurately reflects the phenomenon to which it refers (Hammersley, 1990:57).

One strategy that is advocated for attempting to enhance internal validity is that of researcher reflexivity (Merriam, 2009; Willig, 2008). Alvesson refers to the role of a researcher engaged in studies where s/he has natural access as an active participant as being an "observing participant" (Alvesson, 2003:174) rather than a participant observer. In the case of an observing participant participation often precedes observation occurring in a focused research sense. Alvesson refers to this approach as a akin to self-ethnography where a researcher has natural access to a cultural setting as an equal participant (Alvesson, 2003). As is the case in this thesis, many qualitative research studies do not start off as ‘planned’. In Henning, Mamiane and Pheme’s enquiry into how their Community Education Masters students developed what they described as an emergent scholarship, they describe the design of such an enquiry as “several case studies that together constituted a single and larger descriptive and analytical case [...] and in hindsight, serving the purpose of action research” (Henning, Mamiane, & Pheme, 2001:116). For part of the period covered by the second curriculum iteration discussed in this thesis (the years late 1999-2004) I was an ‘observing participant’ as a lecturer at P&DM. During this time, I was involved in teaching on the MM PDM degree, engaged in staff development activities with academic colleagues and, together with colleagues, researched and published studies on student learning (Hewlett, 2006; Hewlett, 2007) and student performance (Hewlett & Muller, 2002) in relation to the MM PDM curriculum. Together with other staff, I was also involved in teaching on this and other Masters degrees, supervision of Masters students and engaged with curriculum and quality issues related to P&DM more broadly. I remain a member of P&DM staff at the time of writing this thesis.

Alvesson talks of the constraints for a researcher in such a position in terms of how to avoid “staying native" (Alvesson, 2003:198), specifically in the context of research in universities and other settings such as organisations, with which the
researcher is highly familiar. However, as Alvesson points out, personal involvement does not rule out enquiry and it can be a resource as well as a liability (Alvesson, 2003). The potential strength of such a researcher positions is the capacity to work with empirical material that may be difficult for an outsider to obtain and interpret.

Alvesson suggests several ways of creating distance between the observing participant and the frameworks, cultures and ways of seeing the phenomenon that are often shared within an organisation (Alvesson, 2003). One way is to embrace a position of irony in stepping back and seeing the unit of study in different ways to what it itself projects. A second is to use theories that challenge common sense views of the unit of study and to read empirical data in ways in which it is not commonly read within the disciplinary field where the unit of study is located. I adopt both approaches. The strength of the theoretical framework used in this study is that it allows me to present a view of a specific curriculum not usually presented in the disciplinary field of Public Administration or in existing studies of this particular curriculum. Rather than adopting the more common focus in education studies on how knowledge is transmitted and acquired (or learned) through curriculum, the perspective I take allows for a focus on relationships between knowledge structures and curriculum. The focus of my thesis is also not on the more frequently researched issues of quality ‘evaluation’ of a curriculum and its successes and limitations reflected in management literature, but on a sociological analysis framed within conceptual tools associated with a particular theoretical framework. Adoption of a particular conceptual framework not only assists with questions of validity in framing the relationship between researcher and data, but also in terms of enhancing the possibilities of generalisability of a case over time. Validity for Hammersley means that an empirical account must take cognisance of the amount and type of data presented to be considered valid (Hammersley, 1992:69). It must fully represent what it is intended to describe, theorise or explain. By adopting a “subtle form of realism” (Hammersley, 1992:50) validity can also be enhanced. Reality is taken as being independent of claims made by researchers about it and representing the existence of an external reality which can be studied by scientists. This accords with the social realist position that I have adopted in relation to viewing knowledge in this research and is discussed further in Section 4.3.
4.2.3 The single case and generalisability

I selected a single case study to provide an opportunity to explore an existing ‘ideal type’ theory – the concept of an integrated curriculum – in a context that has been under-researched within this theoretical tradition, i.e. an applied field that has neither a strong disciplinary base, nor status as a profession. Critiques of a single case study as a scientific method are often oversimplified, focusing too narrowly on questions of theory, reliability and validity (Flyvbjerg, 2001; Flyvbjerg, 2011). A single case study is critiqued as being limited in terms of its generalisability (or external validity in qualitative terms) because of its focus on one particular instance that may not be comparable, particularly when viewed from quantitative perspectives. In an experimental design, it is theoretically possible to predict similar outcomes in other related curricula. This, however, is not the aim in this study, although careful attention to my choice of case and working within a particular theoretical framework with a set of conceptual tools that have been used to explore other curricula does allow for a common lens through which to see and analyse data across studies. Nevertheless, although the social realist theoretical framework I have employed has a structuralist orientation, it is not deterministic and does not have to imply determinism, as the goal is to understand how “social mechanisms ‘structure’ but do not determine, outcomes” (Manicas, 2006:3). A realist assumption is that there is an external reality that is separate from the researcher’s descriptions of it.

Through extensive use of documentary sources I have attempted to produce a ‘thick description” (Geertz, 1983) of the curriculum, its context of production over time, the issues curriculum developers engaged with and the decisions they made. This may give researchers working with this theoretical framework the opportunity to judge the relevance and transferability of my insights to other studies.

In a single case study, there is a tension between searching for the elements of particularity of a case and attempts to enhance its generalisability. The reasons for the selection of a case and the purpose of its selection become important in enhancing generalisability. The case study in this thesis can be seen as an “instrumental” case (Stake, 2005:445) in that the case was chosen to provide insight into a particular concept and more general phenomenon (the attempt at developing an integrated curriculum). In this sense, the external interest of the
case (my interest in understanding an attempt to produce an integrated curriculum) is prioritised over the particularity of the case, as would be the situation in the selection of a case for an *intrinsic* case study. In other words, the choice of this case is to enable a better understanding of something outside of the case (Stake, 2005). This case study can thus be seen as heuristic. The case itself plays a supportive role in assisting to understand a concept outside of the case.

I have also employed peer debriefing as a strategy throughout the study, with supervisors and academic colleagues. Both my supervisors are familiar with the phenomenon under investigation and bring different insights. One, Prof. Badenhorst, was highly familiar with the context, data and setting of the curriculum I investigated as a former staff member at P&DM. The other, Prof. Young, is a widely published academic in the fields of sociology of education and sociology of knowledge who is familiar with and has been involved in educational debates in South Africa. Throughout the study they have both challenged my assumptions and interpretations and asked the difficult but necessary questions about my methods and analysis. Semi-structured interviews with peers familiar with this curriculum have also allowed for testing my understanding of the context and confirmation of data. The interpretation of data, however, is my own.

I also adopted triangulation of data sources as an approach to enhance both validity and reliability. This is discussed further in Section 4.4.

One of my key strategies for improving the possibility of generalisability is the location of this study within a particular theoretical framework. I elaborate on and discuss this further in Section 4.5.

### 4.3. Theoretical framework and methodological issues

The methodology adopted in this thesis is informed by a particular epistemological position informing the objectives of the research and the knowledge that it aims to produce, as outlined in Chapter Three. This position can be broadly termed ‘realist’ in the sense that its ontological position is that of understanding events or relationships as being generated by underlying structures, and in terms of seeing the aims of theory as being to “provide an understanding of the processes which jointly produce the contingent outcomes of experience” (Manicas, 2006:1). As noted in the previous section, a realist
assumption is that there is an external reality that is separate from the researcher’s descriptions of it.

Bernstein’s work and the Durheimian tradition on which his work on curriculum draws has been seen as structuralist (Sadovnik, 1991), although Bernstein felt that this label excluded the influence of other frameworks (Bernstein, 2000:124). Gamble and Muller suggest that Bernstein’s search for structures (‘codes’ and a theory of knowledge structure) or generative mechanisms to explain the nature or modalities of pedagogy and its effects can also be seen as ‘realist’ (Gamble & Muller, 2010).

More specifically, in relation to analyses of knowledge within curriculum, this epistemological position has been seen as a social realist position (Moore, 2009; Wheelahan, 2010; Young, 2008a). As explained in Chapter Three, the social in social realist recognises the role of human agency in the production of knowledge (drawing on Durkheim, Vygotsky and Marx, for example) while the realist recognises that there are context-independent characteristics of knowledge, one of which is differences between ‘common sense’ and knowledge that has an objective existence beyond what is socially constructed. A theoretical problematic here is that of knowledge “being both objective and in history” (Young, 2003:56). The position taken by researchers in this tradition is that knowledge exists as a category that is independent of knowing and that the social nature of knowledge (its collective mode of production) enables greater objectivity rather than being a limitation. These differences are viewed as real conditions and not only as problems to be overcome or ignored, particularly in curriculum.

Within the literature on qualitative research there are varying views about what constitutes a theoretical framework in relation to qualitative research (Anfara & Mertz, 2006). My use of the concept of a theoretical framework in relation to this research is that of “any empirical or quasi-empirical theory of social and/or psychological processes, at a variety of levels (e.g. grand, mid-range, and explanatory), that can be applied to the understanding of a phenomena” (Anfara & Mertz, 2006:xxvii). This understanding of a theoretical framework is similar to Miles and Hubermann’s “set of analytic categories [...] to analyse a pattern of relationships” (Miles & Huberman, 1994:17) and to Merriam’s “underlying structure, the scaffolding or frame” of the study, derived from the particular “orientation or stance” a researcher brings to the study (Merriam, 2009:66).
In this research, I use a theory-driven, conceptual framework drawing on the work of both Bernstein and others who have further developed his work through research and work within this particular tradition of sociology of education. I draw on the theory of the pedagogic device, elaborating how pedagogic discourse is constructed through the messages of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Bernstein’s theory of classification and framing and their relative strengths allows for examining the various “articulations” (Moore, 2013:14) of types of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. An integrated curriculum is one type of curriculum represented by weak classification and framing.

This theoretical framework and my case study enable me to examine concrete instances of what curriculum developers do when they try to develop a curriculum of an integrated type. I then use this to reflect back on the theoretical framework and the explanatory potential of the concepts employed. The use of this theoretical framework also makes it possible to read my case study alongside other studies of curriculum (particularly in higher education) that employ a similar conceptual framework, and my research may therefore produce explanations that can potentially be applicable to new or future cases (Willig, 2008). In so doing, and combined with my selection of an instrumental case study design, my research may, over time, contribute to insights specifically into the development of integrated type curricula in contemporary postgraduate studies.

4.4. Methods of data collection and sources of evidence

The main sources of evidence used in this case study are documentary sources (published and unpublished). These are supplemented by primary data in the form of seven in-depth, semi-structured interviews conducted with colleagues who taught on this degree during the period 1993-2005 and my personal field notes taken during the period 2000-2005.

The documentary data corpus for this research consisted of all the available documents related to curriculum and teaching at P&DM that I was able to locate during the time I researched and wrote this thesis. The data corpus included a range of published (publically available) and unpublished (organisational) documents related to curriculum and course development, teaching, academic staffing, publicity, financing of courses, commissioned external reports, internal reviews and published sources in the period from 1993-2005 (see Table 3 and
Appendix A). From this *data corpus* a *data set* was extracted that was used specifically for analysis. My selection of this *data set* was guided by the conceptual categories and theoretical framework framing this study and my particular focus on the MM PDM curriculum. The selection of data was informed by the conception of curriculum as outlined in this research (see Chapter Three). The *data set* of unpublished documents referred to in this thesis is included in Appendix A. These unpublished *data items* were categorised and allocated archival codes by which they are referenced in the body of this thesis. Published sources written by P&DM academic staff members, research partners and associates are drawn on in analysing the MM PDM curriculum and are listed in Table 5. When cited in the text, these are contained in the list of references. All of these secondary source documents, both published and unpublished, were produced for purposes other than this research, so specific *data extracts* or “chunks of data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006:79) were mined for analysis. Selection of these data extracts was framed by my choice of a particular conceptual framework and alertness to the kinds of data items that would be important for exploring this framework and its concepts further. Archival documents, secondary published sources and personal field notes enable a rich, historical and complex description of the development and implementation of the MM PDM curriculum and the difficulties experienced in the process.

In the next section I describe the process of conducting the research, outline the sources of evidence I used and address questions of reliability.

### 4.4.1 Unpublished, archival sources

An archive of unpublished documents was developed following retrieval from academic colleagues and archives at P&DM. These documents were both electronic and hard copies. The documents that make up the final reduced archive of documents used for this thesis are summarised in Table 3, and the full list with references and authors is included as Appendix A. Information on staff who were at P&DM during the time period under investigation (qualifications and statistical information on staff demographics), information on students (demographics, prior degrees, age, completion rates, entrance test scores and student performance), samples of external examiners reports and samples of students admissions forms were also collated from my own records. These records formed part of data sets that had been retrieved (with appropriate
university permissions) for previously collaborative and individual research relating to teaching and curriculum issues at P&DM (for example Badenhorst, 2002; Hewlett, 2006; Hewlett, 2007; Hewlett & Muller, 2002).

Table 3: Summary of Unpublished Archival Source Types (1993-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Authorship⁹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentaries</td>
<td>School-solicited and unsolicited commentaries on various topics related to teaching and curriculum</td>
<td>P&amp;DM academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal and external examiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioned reports</td>
<td>Internal reports commissioned or solicited by P&amp;DM</td>
<td>External evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External academic associates familiar with P&amp;DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course outlines</td>
<td>Outlines of courses prepared for students by lecturers teaching a particular course</td>
<td>Lecturers of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion papers</td>
<td>Written and presented by individuals or groups on particular issues</td>
<td>P&amp;DM academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs of P&amp;DM committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of academic programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>Personal emails to and between colleagues, provided by colleagues or attached to other documents</td>
<td>Heads of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs of committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of academic programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Personal notes taken by the researcher during the time period mid-1999 to 2005</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuals</td>
<td>Internally produced manuals for staff and students</td>
<td>Academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs of programmes/committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memoranda</td>
<td>Memos sent to colleagues or attached to other documents</td>
<td>Academic staff members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>Formal minutes of various types of meetings and proceedings – at the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management and P&amp;DM</td>
<td>Chairs of committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Notes or observations from various meetings, workshops and formal staff discussions at P&amp;DM</td>
<td>Academic committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chairs of committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>Planning documents</td>
<td>Heads of school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ Actual authorship for individual documents is indicated in Appendix A. For documents where no author (individual or collective) is indicated on the document, I have recorded P&DM as generic author. In these latter cases, authenticity of the documents have been verified with interviewees and/or other academic staff members from this period, or by intertextual references across documents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Authorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Written policies</td>
<td>Chairs of committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heads of academic programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>Written presentations to staff</td>
<td>P&amp;DM committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals</td>
<td>Written proposals tabled at Faculty and P&amp;DM meetings or circulated for</td>
<td>Heads of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>P&amp;DM committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>Advertisements, brochures, web-based publicity</td>
<td>P&amp;DM committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Formal reports produced for various purposes</td>
<td>Heads of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Course leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study guides</td>
<td>Guides produced annually for students or staff members and produced under</td>
<td>Individual academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the name of P&amp;DM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches</td>
<td>Public presentations – written records</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching case</td>
<td>Teaching cases produced by and/or used by P&amp;DM for teaching purposes</td>
<td>Individuals or groups of P&amp;DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>academics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Author summary from Archive of unpublished documentary sources, Appendix A).

I retrieved P&DM-specific material through existing, official school archives, consisting of *ad hoc* selections of boxed documents in storage (e.g. course packs, minutes of meetings, manuals, study guides, case studies, commissioned reports, commentaries and research material used for course and curriculum development). The historical nature of this material and weak and inconsistent document management and storage processes (both electronic and paper-based) over the years at school level meant that this data set was inevitably not complete. It was, however, extensive, involving some 400 documents as an initial and selective data corpus. From this, I compiled a final data set which I used for analysis and supplemented extensively with various colleagues’ personal, paper and electronic archives, and with my own documentary collection (electronic and paper-based) from the time of my employment (mid-1999 to the present). I extracted data items that consisted of documents and parts of documents related
specifically to curriculum development process and teaching, as well as documents that gave insights into how social, professional, collegial and financial influences related to curriculum (from both inside and outside the university) and into different aspects of curriculum development. Inevitably, my selection of these data items was guided by my research purpose and questions outlined in Chapter One. I developed an archival coding system to manage the data set and to facilitate citation and referencing in the research. The data set was organised and coded according to different types of documents. This is presented in Appendix A.

4.4.2 Published documentary sources

I sourced published documents (official and unofficial) through journal databases, university libraries, the internet and through collecting copies of conference papers and presentations from various colleagues where these were not available electronically. These published documents comprise published journal articles, books and chapters in books, published case studies, and conference papers presented by members of P&DM staff and/or academic staff who played an associate or advisory role at P&DM during the time period under scrutiny in this thesis. Their contents refer to P&DM specific teaching and curriculum issues, and to education and training in the public sector as well as public management education in South Africa more broadly during the time period examined in this thesis. These sources gave insights into the thinking that shaped the MM PDM curriculum and pedagogy and into the social and political context of the time.

Published, official documents were retrieved from archives at the University of the Witwatersrand and the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management. These consisted of faculty rule and syllabus descriptions for each year and publically available university promotional material. These published sources also included public speeches relating to P&DM and its curriculum.

Published documentary source types are summarised in Table 4. Where I cite these published documents in the thesis, they are referenced in my list of references.

Table 4: Published Resources on Teaching, Research and Curriculum at P&DM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of document</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>(Badenhorst, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>(Picard, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td>(Fitzgerald, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td>(Munslow, Fitzgerald, &amp; McLennan, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td>(Swilling &amp; Wooldridge, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of case studies</td>
<td>(de Coning, Cawthra, &amp; Thring, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>(Schütte, Schwella, &amp; Fitzgerald, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>(McLennan, 2007a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>(Hewlett, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>(Mabin, 2004b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>(Munslow &amp; Fitzgerald, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters dissertation</td>
<td>(Schütte, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speech</td>
<td>(Fraser-Moleketi, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published conference paper</td>
<td>(McLennan &amp; Fitzgerald, 1992a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published conference paper</td>
<td>(Cawthra, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published conference paper</td>
<td>(Fitzgerald, 1992a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published conference paper</td>
<td>(Mabin, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published conference paper</td>
<td>(McLennan, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published conference paper</td>
<td>(McLennan &amp; Fitzgerald, 1992b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Rules and Syllabus booklets</td>
<td>University of the Witwatersrand, Faculty of Management/Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management Rules and Syllabus booklets (1993-2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished conference paper</td>
<td>(Badenhorst, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished conference paper</td>
<td>(de Coning, Walker, &amp; Molefe, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished conference paper</td>
<td>(Hewlett, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished conference paper</td>
<td>(Hewlett &amp; Muller, 2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Summary generated by author from published and unpublished sources).

**Evaluation of documents**

Documents were initially evaluated according to their credibility, authenticity, representativeness, and as to whether they were comprehensible and clear to the
researcher, using Scott’s criteria of authenticity, authorship, clarity and representativeness (Scott, 1991).

All documents were verified as authentic and credible through consultation with past and long-term colleagues, although some did not have an author’s name or date on them. Where no name was indicated on either the printed or electronic version of the document that I used for analysis, or where no date was indicated, I did not retrospectively insert names or dates into documents. Authorship and approximate year of production was, however, not difficult to authenticate from the context to which the documents referred and through cross-checking with colleagues teaching at the time. The issue of clarity to the researcher was also not a major problem for this research. For the period until mid-1999 (i.e. prior to my employment at P&DM), I was able to use interviews for the purposes of confirmation and clarity about events and my interpretations of events, and from mid-1999 to 2005, as noted, I was a staff member at P&DM and therefore more familiar with the context in which these documents were produced.

Representativeness was inevitably compromised by erratic, official archiving procedures (discussed in Section 4.4.1) but supplementation through the personal archives of several academics who were long-standing members of staff at P&DM ensured a suitably comprehensive collection of key discussion documents, reports, manuals, study guides and a selection of minutes of meetings. What was more of an issue for the criteria of representativeness were the unwritten texts. Discussion documents and concepts papers reflect the views of their authors, and disagreements around these views only find their way into minutes and comments on processes on a selective basis according to the minute taker. However, where minutes indicated or alluded to disagreement, I was able to probe these issues in interviews or through other documentary sources. My decision to focus primarily on curriculum as intended was, in part, based on the limited availability of documents, such as course reading outlines, ‘course packs’ of readings, assessment tasks, examination papers and scripts for the period until 2005, which would have indicated more about curriculum implementation. However, an analysis of curriculum implementation would also have required an analysis of live classroom discourse, which was obviously not available retrospectively.
This research and the use of these documents was approved by the University of the Witwatersrand’s Ethics Committee and by the Head of School at P&DM at the time the study was commenced.

**Status of documents**

In line with my examination of curriculum as *intended* (discussed in Chapter Three), I have used documents in this research as representations of a social and organisational contextual reality. However, I have been mindful of the intertextuality of these documents (particularly the context of their production and intended audiences) and of their limitations in showing how an organisation actually operates (Atkinson & Coffey, 2011). I have examined articles for both the ‘master narrative’ of the MM PDM curriculum and for dissenting views, and used interviews to probe disagreements further. I also have sufficient insider knowledge due to my *observing participant* (Alvesson, 2003) status in the second curriculum period (2000-2005) to be able to identify gaps and silences, which I probed further with interviewees where necessary.

**4.4.3 Personal field notes**

As noted, I was a member of the academic staff at P&DM from mid- 1999 to 2005 (the period covered by the second MM PDM curriculum iteration). As a participant in curriculum development, teaching and supervision during this period, I kept several notebooks each year, in which I made notes during various staff meetings and workshops. I mined these notebooks from this 1999-2005 period for observations and comments that assisted my description of the data and my analysis. The dates to which these notebooks refer are recorded in Table 5.

Table 5: Field Notebook Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;DM 2001 (1)</td>
<td>Notes - Graduate School of Public and Development Management – meetings, committees, discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;DM 2001 (2) to June 2002</td>
<td>Notes - Graduate School of Public and Development Management — meetings, committees, discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;DM June 2002 – Nov 2002</td>
<td>Notes - Graduate School of Public and Development Management – meetings, committees, discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;DM Dec 2002-2003</td>
<td>Notes - Graduate School of Public and Development Management – meetings, committees, discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Summarised from author’s archives)

Although these notes were primarily taken for record keeping and personal follow-up purposes, I did note down personal observations and interpretations related to pedagogy and curriculum since I (in collaboration with colleagues or alone) conducted research for internal purposes on student learning and progress and also presented some of this research outside of P&DM and published it. I have also been an observer of classroom teaching, in the role of providing peer feedback for promotion or staff development purposes, as well as a participant in discussions about lesson planning and assessment. I have notes from these interactions, including video recordings of some lessons and observation notes. Although the purpose of this study was not to analyse classroom pedagogy, these notes have informed my understanding and interpretation of the academic culture at P&DM and its multi-disciplinary nature as well as enabled some checking of factual information and assisting my understanding of issues related to the theory of framing as applied to the MM PDM curriculum. My observations and conversations with these P&DM academics over the years have certainly improved my interpretation and analysis in this thesis. I have also set up, attended and run academic staff development workshops where discussions on curriculum, teaching and research have taken place, and in all cases these were either formally minuted or I produced summaries from my notes.

4.4.4 Interviews

As mentioned, the main data sources for this research was archival documents and secondary published sources, but I also conducted eight formal semi-structured interviews with purposively selected participants using an interview guide (included as Appendix B). A non-probability, purposeful (Patton, 1990) or
purposive (Bryman, 2012) interview sample was selected after the initial documentary analysis, and the primary purposes of the interviews were to seek clarification about issues raised in documentary sources and seek feedback on emerging interpretations. The interviews assisted with explanations of patterns identified in the data, especially where these explanations were less well recorded or elaborated on in documentary data. The interviews were conducted from mid-2012 to early 2013. They also assisted me to supplement the published documentary data corpus available for the second period of curriculum iterations (2000-2005), which was smaller than the data corpus available for the first period (1993-1999).

I conducted interviews at mutually convenient venues and recorded and selectively transcribed these interviews. I selected interviewees on the basis of their familiarity with aspects of the MM PDM curriculum during all or part of the time period under discussion, their proximity, their availability and their willingness to participate. There was an element of referral in the selection of interviewees, as interviewees identified by me referred me to others on the basis of the latter’s familiarity or involvement with particular aspects of the curriculum or questions I asked. While all interviewees were willing to let me use their actual names in this research, in line with the University of the Witwatersrand’s ethics approval protocols and qualitative research journal publication conventions, I have attempted to keep their identities anonymous although the social nature of the group may have made this impossible.

The nature and structure of the interviews are perhaps closest in interview type to Spradley’s understanding of an ethnographic interview as a formalising of a “series of friendly conversations” (Spradley, 1979:58-60) where interviewees have been asked to respond as informants over a period of time. Interviewees were not explicitly asked to validate my analysis but to provide their understanding in relation to issues and concepts that I have explored, and to provide their explanations and understandings in relation to events, themes and issues identified from secondary documentary sources and point out inaccuracies. As noted, interview data were particularly important for second period curriculum iterations (discussed in Chapter Six) where processes were less extensively documented. These formal interviews enabled me to test aspects of my analysis and provided an opportunity for respondents to reflect on
this time period and their involvement in it in more nuanced ways than what might be reflected in documents produced at the time.

4.5 Strategies for improving reliability

There are differences between qualitative researchers in relation to the extent to which reliability is a key concern for qualitative as opposed to quantitative research.

I have adopted an approach to reliability that does not conceive of it in a quantitative sense (i.e. as measurement in different occurrences leading to the same answer (Willig, 2008)) as this is not directly applicable to quantitative studies. However there are procedures that qualitative researchers can follow to enhance the ‘dependability’ or ‘consistency’ of results obtained from data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

When viewed from a qualitative perspective, the question of validity becomes one of how consistent the results obtained from the data are. I developed an archive of documents, coded them and have them available for external auditing. One of my supervisors is a former P&DM staff member, who was also able to indicate where data did not sufficiently support my analysis and conclusions. The primary procedure I employed to strengthen both reliability and internal validity was that of triangulation of data sources. I have attempted to enhance reliability through the use of multiple data types. I used unpublished curriculum documents, interviews, published work on the MM PDM curriculum, internal reports and external examiners’ reports. I also provide a detailed account of my relationship to the data and the theoretical framework and concepts that guided my selection and analysis of data.

My use of this theoretical model moves the research out of the realm of case specifics but does not claim generalisability across Public Management schools, Public Management curricula or integrated curricula. It does, however, claim enhanced external validity through detailed, thick description (Geertz, 1983). In order to check how consistent the results are with the data that I present (i.e. attempt to satisfy requirements for external validity or generalisability), I use the opportunities presented by a single case study for a research strategy based on rich, thick description. This provides a basis for user-generalisability, particularly the possibility that other readers are able to determine which aspects might be
applicable to their own context. It is also key to arguing that the information has been read consistently and accurately, i.e. to its reliability and validity (Brown & Dowling, 1998).

4.6. Data, analysis, interpretation and presentation

My analysis is framed by a particular conceptual framework and the application of particular concepts to a particular case, using it to explore an attempt to develop an integrated curriculum and its limitations. In order to describe, organise and present my data, I employed an approach that can be broadly referred to as thematic content analysis which I explain in the following section.

4.6.1 Thematic content analysis

In some views thematic content analysis is primarily a process or technique that may be used together with a number of qualitative methods or approaches (Boyatzis, 1998; Coffey & Atkinson, 1996) and in others, it is method in its own right (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

However, in its most minimal application, thematic content analysis is a process for allocating codes (or themes) to a qualitative data set to enable processing, description and organisation of qualitative information, but in adding codes or themes it often moves into early analysis as these effectively begin the process of interpreting the phenomenon being investigated (Boyatzis, 1998:4). Although thematic analysis has the flexibility to be applied within different theoretical frameworks, the theoretical position that the researcher takes in conducting analysis should nevertheless still be made explicit as it makes assumptions about the nature of data and what the data represents about reality (Braun & Clarke, 2006:81). As outlined in Section 4.3, the theoretical position I have adopted is broadly realist in the sense of there being an external reality that is separate from descriptions of it and social realist in relation to the recognition of human agency in the production of knowledge. The identification of themes in the data in this thesis had both deductive and inductive elements, reflecting the use of both data-

10 Thematic content analysis is not to be confused with content analysis which is a type of analysis that is often used in analysing recurrent themes in media texts and may be primarily quantitative, requiring enumeration and identification of recurring words, phrases and trends.
driven and theory-driven coding (Boyatzis, 1998). I set out to examine my documentary data in order to identify how curriculum developers had attempted to construct an integrated type curriculum and on what basis they saw this curriculum as holding together according to their own understandings and in their own terms. This drew my attention to recurrent themes, such as ‘academic/professional’, ‘interdisciplinarity or multi-disciplinarity’ ‘competence/competencies’. However, on another level of analysis, my selection of both topic and data was driven by a conceptual framework derived from a particular theoretical position, outlined in Chapter Three. In this sense, my approach to identifying themes was theoretical and I focused more on particular sets of data that might help me explore theoretical concepts than on giving attention to the data corpus as a whole. An example of this is that I focused strongly on thematic categories and examples of instances relating to ‘integration’, ‘coherence’, professional ‘identity’, ‘professionalism’, ‘interdisciplinarity’, ‘genericism’ and ‘selection, sequencing and pacing’ as they related to theory. This selection was shaped by theoretical and conceptual concerns in relation to the concept of an integrated curriculum and knowledge structures or boundaries.

However, while being aware of and alerted to the significance of particular themes within the literature, this research did not attempt to initially apply, modify or extend an existing coding frame to the data. I attempted, where possible to reflect the initial development of themes in the words or expressions used in documents and to look across documents for recurrence of these themes. In this sense, at the level of initial description, coding was data-driven. Inevitably, not all themes that emerge in the data are reflected in this thesis or were subject to analysis. Rather ‘relevant’ themes for further analysis were selected according to the concepts already identified as pertinent to the aims of this study in the theoretical framework and literature and in the research questions guiding this thesis.

4.6.2 Relating theory to data

For a researcher working with an elaborate theoretical framework and conceptual models developed, in my case by Bernstein and further developed by others working in this tradition, tensions and limitations exist in that analysis of data can become determined by theory and become largely a description of data in terms
of conceptual categories. Bernstein was aware of and addressed these limitations in discussions about the data and interpretation or connections between data and theory (Bernstein & Solomon, 1999). As summarised by Maton, for Bernstein, empirical descriptions of phenomena (i.e. data) need to be “redescribed” (Maton, 2000) or turned into “research devices” or “principles of description” (Moore, 2006:36) so that their underlying principles can be conceptualised in order for the development or refinement of theory and for theory to be generative. In this thesis, I do not claim to have directly tested and extended Bernstein’s ideas using the MM PDM curriculum as an example.

Data analysis in this thesis was conceived as more of a “dialogic process which involves moving between the empirical and theoretical fields” (Brown & Dowling, 1998:98) in order to better understand the conditions under which the possibilities envisaged in Bernstein’s theory are realised (or not), how, and with what effects or consequences. Through an in-depth examination of an attempt at producing an integrated curriculum over time, I may shed light on a gap between the model of an integrated curriculum and what data reveal about its development and implementation, which may enable refinement of the theory.

4.6.3 Presentation of data and conclusion

In Chapters Five and Six, I present and analyse data to explore the case of the MM PDM curriculum over two periods. I distinguish these two periods in terms of shifts in the aspirant integrating logics between these periods and shifts in the changing priorities of the state. I present data gathered from documents, interviews and field notes to provide a detailed account of the MM PDM curriculum case during these two periods.

The first period is from 1993 to 1999 when the ‘pioneer’ curriculum was developed and amended. The second time period spans the period 2000-2005 where curriculum revisions took place in response to market and state developments, experiences of curriculum in the first time period, and changes in the profile of both students and academics. I draw extensively on published and unpublished documents from these two time periods to develop the case and supplement these data with interview data.

The structure of both the following two data chapters is similar. I first present data contextualising the academic unit (P&DM) within Wits university and give an
overview of the structure and goals of the curriculum. I locate the staff and students of the time within the culture of the school, the university, and the historical context. I go on to outline the structure of the curriculum using documentary analysis to identify how it was envisaged to cohere or hold together. I then examine the data using Bernstein’s model of an integrated curriculum as my lens and reference point. Through analysis of available data, I identify, name and explain the logics that curriculum developers drew on as a means of holding the contents of this curriculum together and providing a basis for ‘integration’, and I also identify practical difficulties experienced in these aspirant integrating logics playing this integrating role and providing coherence to the MM PDM curriculum.

The purpose of Chapters Five and Six is thus to provide a rich description of the case and to identify and outline the approaches to developing curriculum that were adopted, the aspirant integrating logics employed, and the assumptions that were made about how these logics could work for holding curriculum contents together and achieving curriculum goals, while enabling learning and progression.
Chapter Five: The pioneer curriculum (1993-1999)

5.1 Introduction

In Chapters Five and Six I present the case of how the Masters of Management in Public and Development Management at the Graduate School of Public and Development Management was constructed. I purposefully selected the MM PDM degree as a case where curriculum developers attempted to develop an integrated-type curriculum in the disciplinary field of Public Administration in postgraduate continuing education. The phenomenon of curriculum thus forms the unit of analysis in my examination of how curriculum developers tried to shape and hold together an integrated-type curriculum that could enable student learning and progression and shape the identity of a particular type of new public servant, the public manager. In developing this case in the next two chapters, I focus on data enabling insights into this curriculum and telling the story of the various curriculum iterations during the period 1993-2005, as reflected in the published and unpublished documentary sources outlined in the previous chapter, with additional insights and clarification from interviews with academic staff teaching at P&DM at the time as well as my own personal field notes. I distinguish these two periods in terms of shifts in the aspirant integrating logics between these periods and shifts in the changing priorities of the state. The first period is from 1993 to 1999 when the ‘pioneer’ curriculum was developed and amended. The second period covers the years 2000-2005 where curriculum revisions took place in response to shifts in priorities of market, state and the internal university environment.

In this chapter, referring back to my introduction in Chapter One, I locate the beginning of the development of the MM PDM curriculum in the early 1990s, i.e. the years leading up to South Africa’s first democratic elections in 1994, and I then move onto looking at curriculum developments up to 1999. I provide a rich description of the new graduate school at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, the nature of its staff and student experiences and identities, as well as the context of higher education reform at the time. I examine how curriculum developers attempted to ‘integrate’ or hold this new MM PDM
curriculum together, and I identify, name and explain the aspirant integrating logics that I see reflected in data in this first iteration of the curriculum. I examine each logic in turn, explaining how I see these logics reflected in this curriculum and the integrative role they attempted to play.

The purpose of Chapters Five and Six is thus to provide a detailed description of the case and to identify and outline the approach to developing a curriculum that was adopted, the aspirant integrating logics employed in the curriculum as well as the assumptions that were made about how these logics could work in terms of holding together curriculum contents and achieving curriculum goals while enabling learning and progression.

5.2 The political and policy context of 1993-1999

In Chapter One, I outlined the genesis of this post-1994 curriculum, locating it in the political and policy context of South Africa and in the disciplinary field of Public Administration at the time. As noted, the first formal move towards attempting to influence curriculum development in South African schools of public administration post-1990 came in the form of the National Public Administration Initiative and the Mount Grace 1 Conference in 1991, in which some of the pioneers of the MM PDM curriculum were centrally involved (see McLennan & Fitzgerald, 1992a). Academics and civil society came together in a loose grouping to debate the nature of education and training for the public service. The NPAI came to strongly reflect a rejection of the dominant existing approach to teaching Public Administration in technikons and higher education institutions prior to 1994 and pressure for a development-oriented and ‘efficient’ public management. The NPAI’s critique of the existing public service was more fundamentally a critique of bureaucracy itself as a suitable model to achieve the goals of the aspirant developmental state.

The national education policy framework from the mid-1990s in South Africa was shaped by several, often competing, imperatives that resulted in (and continue to result in) contradictions in South African higher education. A central tension across the system was that of a political need for development, re-development and redistribution across a divided, unequal and underperforming system inherited from the apartheid state, while simultaneously engaging with and incorporating challenges presented by an economy struggling to find a place in a
global world. Policy responses to these challenges shaped curriculum development in various ways across higher education in South Africa and outside South Africa.

The National Commission on Higher Education’s Report – *A Framework for Transformation* (NCHE, 1996) – was a key framing document for transformation in higher education. It came out two years after the first MM PDM curriculum was initiated. This, together with the *National Plan for Higher Education* (DoE, 2001), provided the basis for structural transformation of the system in the form of university mergers and changes to the subsidy formula for funding universities to privilege certain subjects and disciplines (particularly, Science and Technology). These documents also signalled a more interventionist stance from the state, challenging notions of higher education autonomy that had been fought for previously under the apartheid state. “In the 1990s, however, the concept of autonomy was fiercely juxtaposed with the requirement for accountability, driven, this time, by the emergent post-apartheid state” (Jansen, 2004:297).

Another important government response to these dual challenges came in the form of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). Its key intention was to align and bring together the education and training spheres. It was based on several assumptions. One was that the best route to educational reform (in terms of quality and alignment with global norms and competition) was through a focus on qualifications-driven reform. A second assumption was that alignment of the academic education and the skills or vocational training spheres was possible through qualifications regulation.

Under the influence of neo-liberal discourses, the 1996 Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) Strategy (aimed at increasing foreign investment for job creation) marked a shift away from the poverty alleviation and redistribution focus of its policy predecessor, the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) (Bond, 2000). A consequence of this for higher education was that a discourse of inclusion, access and redress now existed alongside a discourse of massification, efficiencies and operating within the budget constraints of a funding squeeze. Growing marketisation shifted the concerns of higher education outwards to focus on issues of mission, competition for students and third-stream
income\textsuperscript{11} and away from internal core academic concerns (Bertelsen, 1998). Funding priorities of government, research agencies and allied councils followed these ‘market’ trends.

The newly formed Graduate School of Public and Development Management was shaped by these political and economic changes in complex ways, as early academic staff were, on the one hand, influential in their individual capacities in these policy development fora (as unpublished research papers, conference papers and discussion documents indicate (Report 2, 1998)) but also increasingly affected by the changing regulatory landscape. In Bernstein’s terms, the pedagogic recontextualising field (lecturers, academics, curriculum developers) and the official recontextualising field (policy-makers, national curriculum developers) overlapped in terms of both personalities and engagement with policy development.

The Graduate School of Public and Development Management began in 1991 as a public administration programme in the then existing Wits Business School (which had been established in 1968). The public management programme was set up to offer training courses for prospective new civil servants and began running a series of short courses and a Postgraduate Diploma in Public Policy and Development Administration (PPDA) from 1991. The programme offered rapidly developed, short, bridging courses (Publicity document, 2003) for new entrants to the civil service, assisted by relationships with other universities and established with donor funding (for example, P&DM had a relationship around assistance with reading and teaching materials with the University of Pittsburgh in the USA, funded by the Ford Foundation).

P&DM became an independent postgraduate school in 1993. Although set up from within the Wits Business School, its identity as a school was partly defined in relation to its oppositional, and sometimes unclear, stance in relation to business schools in general to, and to private sector management specifically. This stance was based on concerns about the decontextualised nature of management education offered in business schools and its appropriacy for a new

\textsuperscript{11} Income derived from short course, consultancies and commissioned research.
public service (Interviewee 4) with its assumptions of the disciplinary field of management as being generic to all sectors.

5.3 The MM PDM curriculum 1994-1999

The Masters of Management in Public and Development Management degree at P&DM was introduced in 1994 as a full-time degree, and in 1995 as a part-time degree. Its stated objectives were

[…] to enhance the capacity of experienced managers, expand their managerial knowledge, test and explore new ideas, sharpen analytical capabilities, master new technologies, broaden awareness of the complex issues that influence decision making, interact with peers and leading academics and practitioners and reflect on their personal goals, values and careers (Publicity document, 1995).

The envisaged MM PDM student was someone with at least two years experience in a middle-management position (not necessarily in the civil or public service). Prior work experience was viewed as a necessary resource for preferred teaching processes, focusing on reflection, information-sharing and co-construction of knowledge assumed to enhance current and projected future work-based performance. Selection criteria included work experience as a prerequisite, an Honours-level degree or fourth-year equivalent diploma and performance on a psychometric entrance text. The Masters degree was initially introduced as a one-year full-time (two-year part-time) degree.

The MM PDM curriculum introduced in 1994 worked strongly with the idea of a cohort system that was seen as being central to the shaping of a shared identity and ethos. In the first few years, donor funding was available and enabled some initial cohorts to study full-time. P&DM academic staff of the time later associated the introduction of part-time study with a weakening of the professional identity focus of the cohorts, as both student attendance suffered and it became harder

12 The battery of tests used for admissions was made up of four aptitude tests that were developed by the National Institute for Personnel Research/HSRC. The Mental Alertness Test of the High level Battery assesses general verbal reasoning, the Reading Comprehension Test of the High Level Battery assesses ability to answer questions based on written paragraphs, the Arithmetic Reasoning Test measures the application of the arithmetic functions in novel problems designed to require the respondent to develop new problem solving strategies and the Cognitive Reasoning Test is a non-verbal test of inductive reasoning. (Report 18, 2003)
to mould a collective vision and ethos. Concerns were expressed by teaching staff about how part-time delivery modes compromised the “notions of ethos and interaction, experience, a shared sense of mission, and common commitment [...]” (Notes 4, 1991).

In the period 1994-1999, there were three iterations of the degree, reflected in changes to the published university Rules and Syllabuses 1994, 1996 and 1999 (see Table 6 for details). In all iterations, the syllabus was composed of compulsory courses of equal credit weighting (four in 1994 and five in 1999), a choice of one or more elective courses, and a research report (minor dissertation) comprising 25% of the total degree. Full courses were broken down into ‘topics’ or ‘modules’, the titles of which are reflected in Table 6 for each curriculum iteration.
Table 6: MM PDM Courses 1994-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM PDM 1994</th>
<th>MM PDM 1996</th>
<th>MM PDM 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
<td>Economics and Public Policy</td>
<td>Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Finance</td>
<td>Public Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of Management</td>
<td>Political Economy of Development</td>
<td>Paradigms for Public and Development Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance and Management</td>
<td>Governance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues in Development and Public Management</td>
<td>Systems Theory and Social Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity, Development and Public Management</td>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equity, Development and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational and Management Processes</td>
<td>Organisational Design and Development</td>
<td>Organisation and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>Organisational Design and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics in Public Management</td>
<td>Strategic Management and Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics in Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information-based Policy Analysis and Decision-making</td>
<td>Introduction to Public Policy: The role of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analytical approaches and techniques for policy analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information gathering for the policy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Management Approaches</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis for the Public Sector</td>
<td>Analytical Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Research Methods</td>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (one elective course to be selected)</td>
<td>Public Policy Management and Implementation</td>
<td>Electives (three elective courses to be selected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Management and Development</td>
<td>34 Electives listed in Rule Book (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of 34 electives summarised according to thematic or sectoral focus: Policy analysis and implementation Urban/regional focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM PDM 1994</th>
<th>MM PDM 1996</th>
<th>MM PDM 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| International and Regional Development  
Policy research | Multilateral/inter-governmental relations  
Security and Defence  
Gender  
Environment theory, management and policy  
Economy – policy and economics  

(Sources: University of the Witwatersrand, Faculty of Management Rules and Syllabuses (1994-1999)).

---

13 At this point in time the total credits allocated for the mini dissertation was 25% of the total degree.
The sequencing logic of courses and their associated sub-modules made no assumptions about progression in terms of complexity or about disciplinary pre-requisites for courses. The documents I examined reflect assumptions from curriculum designers that lecturers would select and teach “developmentally” (Discussion Paper 1, 1997; Discussion Paper 10, 1996) which meant accommodating a range of abilities, prior knowledge backgrounds and competence in English (which was the medium of instruction albeit not the dominant language of most students). Core, compulsory courses dealing with concepts of management and governance were scheduled to be taught first (i.e. Context of Management (1994 Syllabus) and Paradigms for Public and Development Management (1996/9 Syllabus) as these were viewed as laying down foundational management and development concepts that would be applicable to all courses. However, in practice, sequencing of core courses and their associated ‘topics’ was often influenced by availability of teaching staff, many of whom were part-timers (Report 2, 1998; Report 7 (n.d.)) The range of elective courses that were offered after the core compulsory courses was driven by academic staff specialisations and interests (the main place in curriculum where academics could introduce and teach to their own specialisations). This resulted in a mushrooming of elective offerings (34 by 1996) as new staff joined (see Appendix E) and the full range was often deemed financially unsustainable to run for small numbers of students. The choice of electives in a particular functional area was seen as a way students could add a ‘specialisation’ in a particular sector or functional area (e.g. rural development or defence) to the ‘generic’ management, policy and development courses of the core curriculum.

Before it became an official school in 1993, i.e. when it was still a programme at the Wits Business School, P&DM introduced the Postgraduate Diploma in Public Policy and Development Administration (the PPDA) in 1991 as its flagship degree. Although the focus of this thesis is on the MM PDM degree introduced in 1993, I discuss both here, as the PPDA, although not initially envisaged as a progression route into the Masters degree, became seen as such later and because the PPDA’s design and rationale strongly influenced the curriculum of the initial MM PDM degree.
5.3.1 The Postgraduate Diploma in Public Policy and Development Administration (PPDA)

The curriculum for the first degree offered by P&DM, the PPDA, became the epistemological and ideological template for the new school. Its content knowledge base was eclectic, influenced by the existing staff specialisations and the disciplinary histories of staff teaching at the time (Fitzgerald, 1992a), and it brought together a range of disciplines and insights clustered around broad Social Sciences concepts (‘development’, particularly), organisational theory and public policy, with quantitative and qualitative ‘skills’, analysis and problem-solving skills being envisaged as providing the ‘generic’ knowledge base. The purpose of the PPDA was to train high level staff for the civil service, economy, social service sector and political structures (Discussion Paper 9, 1991). The curriculum comprised a compulsory core curriculum with the main aim of building “a shared vocabulary and ethos amongst a critical mass of ‘new South Africa’ public servants” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:63).

The aim [of the PPDA] is to provide a corpus of future public administrators with the practical and conceptual skills to move into any managerial position and act effectively. The programme emphasis is therefore career orientated, and aimed at the establishment of [a] group of professionals with a specific ethos and approach to public administration (Discussion Paper 9, 1991:6).

This orientation is summed up in the goals of the first PPDA curriculum:

The course should attempt to develop a public administration ethos which suits the South African context. Non-racial democratic values, as well as responsiveness and awareness of community needs and political dynamics should be encouraged (Minutes 9, 1991).

The PPDA was a one-year full-time curriculum, including an eight-week internship undertaken in a development organisation or NGO (as internships in government departments were mostly not an option until after the 1994 elections that brought the ANC to power) culminating in an Applied Project. The diploma was structured around four full courses that reflected the key content areas identified as curriculum priorities in the consultative stages of setting up the diploma. These broad content areas were economics, development, organisational theory and knowledge about comparative public administration/management developments. The four content areas were regarded as the key ‘knowledge’ areas and were supplemented by the six half-
courses, focusing on ‘skills’ – management and policy skills as well as analytical techniques. The diploma structure is summarised in Appendix C.

The assumptions behind the PPDA were that this diploma could provide a formative ‘generic’ grounding of an applied nature (including through its exposure to a workplace) that would make students more able to function in any sector of the labour market e.g. health and education. The sector into which the students entered would have the responsibility of providing occupation-specific training (or students would already have this from work experience and/or prior study). By the end of the diploma, entrants were assumed to have an occupation specific ‘readiness’ for employment in the public service or development sector (NGOs, CBOs, non-profits) (Schütte, 1996). The positioning of an *Applied Project* as the PPDA’s final course reflects a logic that this would be the means of integrating conceptual, practical and theoretical skills through ‘applied research’ conducted in or about an organisation by reference to a particular problem and by providing opportunities for linking practical and theoretical knowledge. Neuman identifies three major types of applied research: evaluation, action research and social impact assessment (Neuman, 2006). None of these research types or designs were taught explicitly in the PPDA. Applied research was conceived of as any research conducted in relation to work that could inform practice.

The diploma was also set up to allow an informal Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)\(^{14}\) entrance route for some candidates who were mature students with work experience but incomplete undergraduate qualifications. In some cases, incomplete degrees were due to the political unrest of the pre-1994 decades, with politically active students being involved in protest and excluded from further studies, or leaving formal education for a variety of political and financial reasons. The RPL route did not involve a formal process of portfolios of evidence of competence equivalent to that of the entrance level of the diploma, but operated as an informal and *ad hoc* entrance screening process through considering entrance test scores, prior work experience and previous studies (with an interview in some cases). In this

---

\(^{14}\) Referred to as APEL (Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning) in the UK.
sense, it can be seen as having given ‘credit’ for incomplete prior qualifications on a pragmatic and seemingly fairly *ad hoc* basis.

In addition returning political exiles with varying, diverse qualifications (for example, from Europe, former Eastern Bloc and Soviet institutions) were also accepted. Both PPDA and MM PDM curriculum architects were reluctant to try to rigorously evaluate these qualifications for equivalence. This was in part due to the difficulty and political sensitivity of trying to evaluate the quality, relevance and level of undergraduate degrees from across a formerly racially divided higher education system in South Africa and degrees held by returned exiles. Consequently, a quota of 10-12% of 'non-degreed' students was accepted into all degrees without a completed undergraduate degree or equivalent but on the basis of entrance test scores on a psychometric test, ‘relevant’ work experience, and sometimes an interview process with some discretion for judgement in terms of “informal selection” criteria for potential contribution and motivation (Discussion Paper 10, 1999). By implication, courses were then envisaged as having to be “practical in nature and utilise case studies and field work experience which would in any case seem more effective” (Discussion Paper 9, 1991:8). Reflected in this view is an assumption that a focus on an unspecified ‘practice’ would be most appropriate for shaping the identity of the future practitioner and for accommodating the lack of a common knowledge base and verification of its quality. The same RPL logic was applied to entrants to the MM PDM degree. The selection of the first MM PDM cohorts was based on a “less stringent system of admission” (Discussion Paper 9, 1991:8), taking into account community service, experience and ability, rather than formal academic criteria. Not being able to meet prior-degree, performance-based entrance criteria for postgraduate study was seen as being able to be considered in conjunction with adequate experience, performance in the entrance examination, motivation and potential to make a difference in the public and development environment.

The PPDA was also later envisaged to provide sufficient grounding for continuation into a Masters degree and as one of the progression routes into the MM PDM degree.
5.3.2 Progression into the MM PDM curriculum

P&DM was set up as a postgraduate school to provide career-oriented, postgraduate, professional education, i.e. a postgraduate specialisation in Management. P&DM curriculum developers felt that a management specialisation was more appropriate at a postgraduate than undergraduate level (and ideally, after students had had work experience post their undergraduate degrees). They also felt that such a specialisation required a generic undergraduate (or ‘equivalent’) experience in a range of disciplinary fields (Interviewee 4) suited to the notion of a generic manager job role. It was thus seen as a ‘conversion-type’ Masters, or a pathway to a new career or job specialisation. Selection criteria and progression routes through the first MM PDM curriculum were premised on assumptions about relationships of equivalence between formally acquired knowledge (sometimes referred to as academic or theoretical knowledge in documents) and practical knowledge (acquired through generic ‘work’ experience and life experience of particular kinds, especially in communities, political organisations, unions and voluntary organisations (Discussion paper 10, 1996).

The possible formal entrance and progression routes are summarised in Table 7 and then discussed. The range of starting points and progression routes that were adopted in the first MM PDM curriculum iteration were justified by curriculum developers in order to create access possibilities for as wide a range of students as possible (particularly Black African students) and in terms of both P&DM and new government expressed priorities around redress and the urgency of civil service reform.
### Table 7: Entrance and Progression Routes in the MM PDM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Undergraduate study</th>
<th>Postgraduate study</th>
<th>Relationship between work experience and qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 1</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree¹⁵ in disciplines applicable to Public and Development Management</td>
<td>Honours¹⁶ Degree or Postgraduate Diploma</td>
<td>Two/Three years generic working experience prior to postgraduate professional education study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree (in disciplines applicable to Public and Development Management)</td>
<td>PPDA</td>
<td>Short internship component of the PPDA. No required prior work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 3</td>
<td>Three year diploma from a technikon¹⁷ in relevant area</td>
<td>Masters of Management (MM PDM)</td>
<td>Relevant prior work experience acquired prior to or during postgraduate study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4</td>
<td>No undergraduate degree</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma in Management (PPDA)</td>
<td>Relevant prior work experience acquired prior to or during postgraduate study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 5</td>
<td>No undergraduate degree</td>
<td>Masters of Management (MM PDM)</td>
<td>Relevant prior work experience acquired prior to Masters degree study (a RPL or APEL) route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Devised from information in Faculty of Management Rules and Syllabus books (1994-1999)).

The five routes described in the Table 7 reflect sequencing and progression paths that were developed in the context of an agenda aimed at changing the nature and demographic composition of the South African civil service. They were developed

---

¹⁵ A three year degree in South Africa at the time.
¹⁶ A specialist fourth year in a South African Bachelors degree qualification.
¹⁷ Formerly a vocational education institution (polytechnic equivalent) falling outside of higher education, and later renamed as Universities of Technology or merged with existing universities to form Comprehensive Universities.
with a consciousness of a history of poor educational opportunities for Black African students (particularly in terms of higher education).

Analysis of a sample of application forms for students admitted to the MM PDM degree without a previous degree shows a process of granting equivalence for the purposes of entrance based on candidates’ working ‘experience’ (strongly referenced to the ‘community’, ‘political’ and ‘organisational’ experience, and on their mature age (Hewlett & Muller, 2002). There was a reporting structure to the then Faculty of Management for these alternative admissions, consisting of a periodic brief report on each student’s progress. Analysis of the performance of non-traditional entrants (RPL candidates) between 1993-1998 showed no significant difference between their performance on the MM PDM degree and the performance of the rest of the cohort (Hewlett & Muller, 2002). This was attributed to the RPL candidates’ high levels of motivation, their age (average 35) their high calibre (reflected in higher than average entrance test scores) (Hewlett & Muller, 2002) the complexity of the work that they had been doing previously, and possibly to the questionable quality of some of the undergraduate degrees of their peers to whom their performance was compared (Hewlett & Muller, 2002).

External reviewers of the early MM PDM degree expressed concerns that allowing this alternative access route without adequate support (particularly in the form of an initial “pre-entry skills development section” (Picard, 1995)) could disadvantage students in terms of their ability to participate effectively in postgraduate study and weaken the quality of the programme as lecturers tried to accommodate a wide range of students. However, concerns about student ability, appropriate support and about students’ course expectations were also reflected in student comments on their learning experiences at this time (Hewlett, 2006), although these observations did not relate only to students without previous degrees.

[…] you know I think a lot of people came into our study group and our environment with a lot of issues and a lot of [...] insecurities or inferiorities and that kind of thing. And there wasn’t a positive way for people to address that because most people who came in with those ideas and insecurities were very aggressive in their learning environments[...] I think often people just didn’t do things in the syndicate [group] because they didn’t know how and nobody’s gonna admit to just not having a basic skill. (Linda) (cited in Hewlett, 2007).
Examination of a selection of entrance forms and applications for the period 1993-1998 also shows that a ‘cognate’ discipline in a Bachelor’s Degree or technikon diploma qualification was, in reality, any undergraduate degree (Hewlett & Muller, 2002). This meant that students with degrees in, for example, Social Sciences, Commerce, Nursing, Social Work, Education, Biblical Studies or Agriculture (Hewlett, 2007) were all accepted and no common progression route was assumed. Instead there was an appeal to a generic, undifferentiated notion of ‘work experience’ as a substitute for a specialist or common knowledge grounding. It was acknowledged that, at the time, looking for actual experience would have had to involve present experience “that might most often be analogous rather than precise career-specific experience” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:60). The PPDA also reflects a view of management as a generic discipline where the objective was to train general managers who could easily move from one agency or sector to another. Sectoral knowledge specialisation was therefore not seen as a prerequisite for either the PPDA or the MM PDM degree.

5.3.3 Curriculum revisions to the MM PDM degree between 1996-1999.

The initial MM PDM curriculum was revised in 1996 and then again in 1999. Both revisions were initiated from within P&DM in response to internal and external review processes (Discussion Paper 1, 1997; Notes 8, 1997). These revisions are reflected in Table 6. Revisions to the curriculum in the 1996 iteration added an additional course and extended the length of the degree. There was an increase in compulsory course hours (from 60 to 80 hours per course) resulting in an extension of the length of the degree to six quarters (one and half years) for full-time students (Proposal 3, 1996). These first revisions to the MM PDM degree in 1996 were motivated by concerns amongst academics about a lack of depth in the subjects taught, student and staff confusion about linkages between topics (sub-courses) and courses, and a lack of clarity about the logic of the course structure (Proposal 3, 1996). Documents of the time also reflect lecturer concerns about a lack of attention to ‘development management’ and the policy content in the core courses (Proposal 3, 1996). Curriculum revisions from this point onwards all grapple with difficulties in relation to pacing, reflected in the problem of student ‘overload’, as the curriculum tried to deal with demands for ever-increasing new content to be incorporated. The core
knowledge presented in curriculum became a set of ‘issues’ or ‘topics’ (reflected in the naming of sub-courses). Subsequent internal reviews of the curriculum indicated concerns about the curriculum being “too bitty and complex to achieve any fundamental learning” (Discussion Paper 1, 1997) and expressed concerns about a lack of integration across ‘topics’ or modules and a lack of clarity about sequencing (Notes 8, 1997). There were no specific credit-bearing courses preparing students for the research component of the curriculum, although quantitative methods were taught on the Analytical Methods course.

While MM PDM curriculum deliberations at this stage emphasised the importance of context, syllabus descriptions give little insight into the relative importance or weighting of the South African public sector versus international sector context within courses. Comments in some reports and from interviewees indicate that the South Africa context was not necessarily strongly evident in early curriculum iterations (Commissioned Report 4, 1995, Interviewees 1 and 5) and that the curriculum was more reflective of the original North American material and orientations that were put together with the assistance of the University of Pittsburgh for early short courses and the PPDA (Interviewees 1 and 5).

5.4 The academics

The newly formed graduate school and its students were shaped by the South African political context of the time, with key academic and support staff coming from activist, non-profit, social and policy research and exile backgrounds. Not all had been full-time academics or held university posts prior to this period (1994) but came in from civil society and research organisations. Few had a degree in Public Administration/Management or experience of working in the public sector (Report 2, 1998). Academic staff in the first ten years of P&DM came from a range of undergraduate disciplines (Economics, Statistics, Social Sciences), from other disciplinary fields (e.g. Public Administration, Development Studies, Town Planning) and from various professions (Law, Teaching, Nursing and Engineering).
P&DM was set up with a strong input of donor funds, particularly from the European Union\(^\text{18}\) which enabled a certain initial degree of financial independence, autonomy and ‘oppositional spirit’ (Interviewees 2 and 3) in relation to broader university control, financial and otherwise. The university had been reluctant until this point to house such a department or school due to its oppositional stance to the previous regime (Speech 1, 1993). By 1997, European Union funding still covered 50\% of P&DM’s expenditure, supporting 8 of 14 full-time academic posts (Plan 3, 1998:18). This initial, relative financial autonomy sustained a pioneering and independent ethos and an experimental environment (Commissioned Report 2, 1995). P&DM and the various curricula it offered were organised to try and provide a supportive and welcoming learning experience within the broader university context of the mid-1990s. The university at this point was struggling to deal with changes to the racial profile and class composition of the student body (Hewlett, 1996). In the early years of P&DM, there was sometimes an uneasy relationship with the broader university around finances, the nature of P&DM’s ‘non-traditional’ student body, concerns from some quarters of the university about lowering of standards, and P&DM’s close connections to government through its political activist history (Commissioned Report 2, 1995, Interviewee 6). There were also some voices of concern in the University of the Witwatersrand Senate in relation to the schools’ independence from cognate disciplines and its location within the Faculty of Management, rather than the Faculty of Social Sciences (Interviewee 6).

Development of the initial short courses for teaching that preceded the establishment of the MM PDM degree took place with a small, multi-disciplinary team who became the initial core of full-time teaching staff, teaching on short courses, the PPDA and the MM PDM supplemented by part-time staff working in NGOs, community activists and recent new entrants into government as civil servants or consultants. P&DM’s initial curriculum emphasis was on delivery of many short-course training and

\(^{18}\) Other key funders of P&DM were Kagiso Trust, European Union, Ford Foundation, World University Services, Royal Netherlands Embassy, Canadian Embassy, Rockefeller Foundation, South African Educational Trust Fund and Apheda (Publicity document 1, 1993)
income-generating ‘programmes’, championed by individuals (e.g. Defence, Arts and Culture, Housing, Local Government). The ethos was extensively consultative, with projects being issue-driven and focused on enhancement of practice. Achievements in the first few years were attributed to the “stimulating and motivational style of leadership of the first and [then] present Director” (Commissioned Report 2, 1995) and a “young and relatively inexperienced” staff who were “bright, energetic and committed to new paradigm approach” (Commissioned Report 3, 1998). P&DM was built on what was described as a “championing model” (Commissioned Report 3, 1998:1) with staff being committed to the values of the school and the understandings on which it was built. Staff were held together through the development of a common ideological vision for change which was rooted in a radical break with the past, referred to in terms of the “launching of a new paradigm” (Commissioned Report 3, 1998), as “paradigm” change (Report 12, 1990) or as “romantic idealism” (Interviewee 4). The post-1994 government discourse and that of the school merged. Government’s national project of social transformation and P&DM’s project of public service transformation were essentially one and the same in the early years of the school (Interviewee 4).

The second Director of P&DM, Mark Swilling, summed up the character of P&DM at the time as such.

*The school was glued together by a post-modern sensibility, a systems-type worldview, a skeptical mode of enquiry, a determined commitment to intellectual independence, a passion for management (i.e. equipping people to do and act, or “phronesis”) the power of collective learning, an understanding of the centrality of institutions and organisational life in reconstruction and development, and above all, building up those inner values and strengths the individuals need to do whatever they are doing well and with integrity (Personal communication to Cawthra, quoted in Cawthra, 2000:60).*

In organisational terms, P&DM initially operated in similar ways to development organisations or NGOs in their “pioneer” organisational phase of development (Kaplan, 1996). This phase is characterised by one or more charismatic leaders strongly involved in all aspects of the organisation, by conflation of organisational and private lives (i.e. operating as a ‘family’) and by some dependence on the
leader(s) for direction (Kaplan, 1996:22-25). This rarely holds together when ‘pioneer’ organisations begin to change and formalise.

Internal documents reflect that, by 1996, the nature of P&DM was already beginning to change. Two external reviews were commissioned by the school in 1998 to examine P&DMs performance and its distance education practices on the MM PDM\(^\text{19}\) (Commissioned Report 3, 1998; Commissioned Report 6, 1998). A proliferation of ‘programmes’ and ‘projects’ focusing on training and the delivery of short courses resulted in an increase in academic and support staff, and in tensions between academic staff on the core academic degrees (by then a diploma and two Masters degrees) and the income-generating (short course or certificate) programmes. P&DM was strongly ‘programme-driven’, with semi-autonomous project teams focusing on training in particular sectors (for example, health, local government). These tensions were over resourcing, time for research, career development and status of ‘programmes’ relative to ‘degrees’ (Commissioned Report 3, 1998). This was accompanied by pressure for massification in terms of student numbers as donor seed money dwindled. P&DM’s strategy was defined as ‘survivalist’ (Commissioned Report 3, 1998, Report 2, 1998, Commissioned Report 4, 1995). Cautions about long-term survival and fundraising versus coherent strategies for income-generation were expressed in school-commissioned reviews of P&DM’s performance and in internal university reviews (Commissioned Report 3, 1998, Report 2, 1998, Commissioned Report 4, 1995).

In terms of the academic programmes (the degrees and diplomas), external reviewers cautioned about academic staff “teaching upwards” (i.e. teaching above their level of qualification), struggling to complete their own higher degrees and teaching out of their areas of specialisation (commissioned Report, 1995; Report 2, 1998). The ideal P&DM academic staff member was viewed by P&DM as a

\(^{19}\) The Mpumalanga Management Programme (MMP) was set up by P&DM and the Mpumalanga Provincial Government to provide extend P&DM programmes to the province for a five year period from 1997 while training and higher education institutions were being established (Report 26, 1998). The MM PDM degree was run in the province of Mpumalanga in this period with some classes being delivered via PictureTel video-conferencing to students in Mpumalanga.
generalist, someone who was willing to take on and develop new areas of teaching, incorporate it with their own prior formal learning and/or practical experience, and learn from students (Policy 1, 1997; Interviewees 3 and 5). Lecturers in the early days of the MM PDM degree would often be teaching off new reading packs developed by e.g. the University of Pittsburgh (Interviewees 1 and 5). Documents suggest a weakening of the social network and ideological vision that had provided a basis for integration as staff numbers and diversity increased. This is reflected in comments about concerns in relation to the quality of core academic programmes and the development of courses around individuals (and their interests) instead of around a “strategy” (Commissioned Report 3, 1998:24).

P&DM also started to come under pressure within university structures to improve its research output (Report 2, 1998). Programme involvement and investment into the school left less time for research for some academics, and concerns were also expressed about academics doing individual consultancy (Commissioned Report 3, 1998:15). An external review of P&DM in 1995 concluded that P&DM required investment in “quality of academic input, students’ standards and [that] academic research is crucial to the survival of the School as part of an intellectually independent graduate faculty, rather than as a quasi-NGO, doing consultancy and providing skills for public and development sector jobs” (Commissioned Report 2, 1995:v). An earlier external review had also cautioned about the need to strengthen the intellectual base of the school.

*There is a strong danger that the degree activities will become sidelined as greater and greater commitments are made to deliver contract research and short term training. The demand driven nature of P&DM funding is bound to have a negative effect on the degree (professional education) component of the School* (Picard, 1995:1).

This weakness was noted across schools of public management in South Africa in this period. Publication and intellectual deepening of the academic discipline were secondary to problem-based and policy-directed consultancy resulting in a weak research base and low research output (Cameron, 2008; Cameron & McLaverty, 2008). Tensions like these, applicable to other ‘soft applied’ fields in terms of their
relationships to their fields of practice and the broader academic community in the university, became more evident. In Kaplan’s terms this organisational phase of P&DM can be characterised as an organisational phase of “differentiation” (Kaplan, 1996:25) where the pioneer(s) and core staff leave, a need for structure trumps informality, and new staff without dependency on the charismatic leader arrive. The organisation may lose its cutting edge as it attempts to become more efficient through specialisation, standardisation and division of labour, sometimes leading to alienation (Kaplan, 1996).

5.5 The students

Employment equity was a key policy issue for the new government, particularly in relation to the public service. In 1995 Black Africans made up 75% of the economically active population of South Africa but only 30% of all managers in the public service (Thompson & Woolard, 2002:5).²⁰ P&DM saw a pool of potential new incumbents for posts in government. The target audience for the PPDA was envisaged as mature students with some work experience in various areas of the public and development sector, e.g. welfare, education, policy and political structures, who wanted a career in the public sector, parastatals, the development sector, policy, community–based management and related fields (Minutes 9, 1991) and had a three-year undergraduate degree (or technikon equivalent), with management experience as an advantage but not a prerequisite (University of the Witwatersrand, 1994) (Memo 5, 1997). The students who were admitted at P&DM during the years until approximately 1998 had a range of undergraduate degrees with Social Sciences, Education and Humanities dominating (Hewlett & Muller, 2002) (Minutes 7, 19998). Their average age in the period 1993-1998 was 35 years (Hewlett & Muller, 2002) (Minutes 7, 1998). They were characterised by all staff interviewed for this research and by themselves (Hewlett, 2006) as being idealistic and change-oriented with, in some cases, strong collegial links with the staff teaching them. This sense of a common agenda, a focus on the generalist and a

²⁰ Based on information derived from public service payroll information (PERSAL)
deemphasising of expertise would provide a basis for one of the dominant integrating logics in this curriculum, an ideal practitioner, in this first period, 1993 to 1999.

In the remainder of this Chapter I draw on empirical data from the case study to support my analysis of how attempts at ‘integration’ are reflected in the MM PDM curriculum, why these logics were selected and in what ways curriculum developers saw them as being potentially integrating.

5.6 ‘Integration’ in an integrated code curriculum

In this early MM PDM curriculum, I argue that notion of ‘integration’ was seen by curriculum developers in several ways with seemingly little consensus on either the concept or its implications for curriculum and learning (Notes 6, 1997). P&DM curriculum iterations and documentary sources reflect a search for curriculum ‘integration’, an on-going search for a course “map” (Notes 8, 1997) and attempts at articulating the “golden threads” of the curriculum (Notes 3, 1994). Across documents and in interviews, achieving ‘integration’ was seen as occurring in several ‘common sense’ ways. One was a focus on various attempts to better ‘integrate’ the theoretical and practical components of the curriculum. The second was to bring insights from multiple disciplines to bear on the problems facing public administration/management. The third was to enable formal, theoretical or ‘academic’ knowledge, practical work and life experience to come together and inform each other through ‘integrated’ competence and learning (Report 24, 1995). The fourth way was to find ways (or means of) holding course contents together across the curriculum in relation to a common purpose.

Bernstein’s thesis on integrated curricula is that the contents will be brought together in relation to some “supracontent” idea or integrating rationale (Bernstein, 1975b:101). Drawing on Bernstein’s ideas and through analysis of documentary evidence, I have identified and given names to three broad logics that I see curriculum developers and staff having drawn on to provide a common sense of purpose and ‘integrate’ contents – sometimes explicitly and at others more implicitly.
I provide a summary of the three logics that I identified in Table 8 below, and for the remainder of this chapter I outline these aspirant integrating logics through analysis of the documentary and interview data gathered for this case study.

Table 8: Integrating Rationales Reflected in the MM PDM Curriculum (1994-1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrating rationale</th>
<th>Manifestation of rationale in curriculum discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrating vision or ideology of the ideal product of the curriculum</td>
<td>Public manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration through particular modalities in the structuring and organisation of curriculum</td>
<td>Interdisciplinarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-disciplinarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competency and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy as integrating rationale in the curriculum</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common learning experience shaping dispositions and behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Own analysis of documentary archive data and published documents)

5.6.1 The ideal product of curriculum

An explicit aspirant integrating logic is that of the ideal graduate that the curriculum aspired to produce. This was reflected in three overlapping identities – the public manager, the reflective practitioner and the ‘professional’. I elaborate on each of these in turn.
The prospective ‘public manager’

The dominant ideology reflected in the MM PDM curriculum was managerial (or for some, managerialist). This was expressed in the form of the figure of the ‘manager’, and more specifically, the ‘public manager’. This first curriculum period was strongly and explicitly centred around developing both a shared professional ethos and the promotion and endorsement of a new job role in the South African public service – the public manager.

The P&DM public manager ideology grew out of how the ideal public servant was reflected in both academic debates about problems in public service globally and the specific issues surrounding post-apartheid bureaucracy. I examined these debates in Chapter Two. MM PDM curriculum developers explicitly drew on debates about management and the role of the public sector taking place in South Africa and internationally at the time to develop their integrating idea.

The envisaged new approach to Public Management in the MM PDM curriculum set up the goal of putting in place a ‘normative’ approach as opposed to the existing dominant model of Public Administration and its associated administrative functions and process-emphasis. The use of the term ‘normative’ in curriculum documents at this time had particular associations. The ‘normative’ that is referred to in documents from Mount Grace 1, the NPAI and P&DM early deliberations (Discussion Paper 9, 1991; Minutes 9, 1991) is that of an orientation towards managing in a context of competing values. ‘Public Managers’ were set up as replacements for senior ‘bureaucrats’. New public managers were entering, or would enter, a space that was seen as largely hostile to ‘development’ agendas (the nature of which is discussed more fully in Section 5.7.1) and to the legitimacy of the new government (dominated by the new ruling party, the ANC). This early period of democratic government was described as one of “resistance versus the system” (Interviewee 7) where ‘the system’ was seen pejoratively as the old government bureaucratic structures and the ‘old’ bureaucrats who had functioned to administer and perpetuate apartheid. A ‘cadre’ of new senior managers would attempt to transform the way administration operated, its values and its efficiency. ‘Normative’ in the sense used in P&DM documents referred to explicitly factoring in particular values and their relationships.
to structures, institutions and processes in the public administration domain. Such an approach was viewed as necessary to counteract the “bogus neutrality” (Discussion Paper 9, 1991:11) of the old system. The new civil servant/public manager would become a model of leadership and practical management skills to deliver on electoral mandates, while being strongly aware of, and answerable to, a collective ethical basis for his/her actions and decisions.

As summed up by Fitzgerald, the first Director of P&DM, the ‘wish list’ for the development of public managers would be achieved through:

- a comparative and experiential pedagogic experience;
- encouragement of policy leadership and innovation;
- close attention to state-of-the-art management theory and techniques;
- a public service cadre highly literate in applied economics;
- intellectual and cultural familiarity with important political actors;
- specific competency in financial and information technology management;
- awareness of technological development and changes;

P&DM explicitly drew on documents outlining World Bank thinking at the time reflecting this discourse of the ‘public manager’ (for example Paul, Ickis, & Levitsky, November 1988), and on particular development concerns relating to the transitional political period in South Africa reflected in the South African government’s economic policy at the time, the RDP (ANC, 1994). The early MM PDM curriculum attempted to ‘integrate’ a focus on participatory and sustainable development with rationalist values of “efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, accountability, responsibility and responsiveness” (NPAI, 1992:23) merging particular ‘management’ and ‘development’ orientations. As is discussed in Section 5.7.1, these orientations, and ideological and practical interpretations of ‘management’ and ‘development’, varied between staff members and students.

The implications of attempting to shape an ideal, reflective practitioner identity were on-going tensions between developing what was referred to in P&DM documents as a ‘professional’ vs. an ‘academic’ curriculum, with ‘academic’ sometimes being used pejoratively and being seen to represent conventional “old fashioned” teaching with large amounts of reading (Discussion Paper 9, 1991). An overview of degrees offered in South Africa and internationally conducted by P&DM in its early planning stages for both the PPDA and MM PDM (Discussion Paper 4, n.d.) shows that a
perceived weakness of then existing degrees in Public Administration was that “degrees are not professionally oriented and provide students with an academic background of technical procedures and ideal ethics” (Discussion Paper 9, 1991:13). ‘Professional’ in curriculum documents usually meant work-linked, applied or career-focused, but it was also associated with a particular notion of ‘professionalism’ and the kind of professional the MM PDM curriculum wished to shape.

**Being professional**

Deliberations on curriculum at P&DM in the early 1990s stressed the role that curriculum could play in the development of a particular type of ‘professional’, the public manager. This required the development of a “shared professional ethos” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:59) within cohorts and ultimately across cohorts. The development of this ethos was seen as providing a common integrating logic that could hold staff and students together during the period of formal study and hold students together as a ‘cadre’ once they entered civil service positions (Interviewee 7).

This idea of ‘professional’ was not tied to a traditional model of a profession linked to disciplinary knowledge and licensure e.g. Medicine or Accountancy. The notion of a ‘profession’ or a ‘professional’ envisaged in this case was not seen in this way in terms of a ‘licensed’ public service professional. This was perceived as problematic because it assumed public/civil servants as one united group (rather than as various types of professional e.g. engineers, accountants, teachers or nurses) and carried a risk that a public service profession could potentially be used as a “mechanism of control” (McLennan, 1992:14). Nevertheless, the MM PDM curriculum at the time reflected a sometimes implicit notion of what counts as ‘being professional’. As expressed in P&DM documents, this ‘professional’ ethos would need to strike the right balance “between individually reflective and ethical practitioners and the need for general and specific accountability mechanisms” or balancing the “accountability/professionalism dichotomy” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:62). This would involve attempting to merge accountability in terms of efficiency and effectiveness with accountability to ethical and professional values and codes of conduct.
The development of this ethos of accountability and ethical and professional standards was seen as being able to be developed through the curriculum (Report 13, 1998; Notes 6, 1997). Documents refer to the centrality of an experiential teaching approach based on intensive peer and lecturer interaction in the development of this ethos (Policy 1, 1997). This ethos accorded a central place to peer and lecturer sanctioning of generic appropriate ‘performance’ and behaviour. Lecturers at the time refer to performance and behaviour in terms of how students conducted themselves when doing presentations, how they dressed and the language that they used (Interviewee 2, Field Notes 2). The dominant envisaged professional ethos and how it might be shaped was seen in terms of

[...] **Non-racial democratic values, as well as responsiveness and awareness of community needs and political dynamics. The ethos is likely to emerge in the context of the course, the subject content and the teaching methodology. If students are actively involved, critical and exposed to different viewpoints they are likely to develop their own ethic and code of conduct** (Discussion Paper 9, 1991:34).

There are differing notions of how explicit this ethos was and the exact nature of this new ‘professionalism’ among academic staff and for students. There are some indications that it may have been implicit for some students and even for new academic staff (beyond the pioneers).

*P&DM has an implicit value-base which is not made explicit. Students are not encouraged to challenge this implicit value base and to facilitate this, the value base should be made explicit so that students are aware of the broad philosophies from which the degree/diploma emerges* (Notes 5, 1995).

However, in-depth interviews conducted with former students on their learning experiences during the 1993-1998 period at P&DM indicates that students recognised and could describe a particular perspective on ‘being professional’ largely referenced to their pedagogic interactions (Hewlett, 2007). As the author and researcher of this research, my observations were derived from semi-structured interviews, which I conducted in 2004 with former students who were, by then, working as mangers in provincial government, academics in higher education, managers in the private sector, senior managers in NGOs or were self-employed.
Former students saw ‘being professional’ as being associated with a generic ‘standard’, with particular ways of working, behaving, presenting information, writing and presenting arguments. These ‘standards’ were directly or implicitly contrasted with dominant prior and current work practices and were strongly referenced to validation from lecturers, being answerable to student peer expectations, and students seeing themselves as agents of change (Hewlett, 2007).

In most cases, as reflected in the illustrative quotes from interviews below, ‘professionalism’ was seen as ideology and as being performative (Eraut, 1994).

You need to engage with the public and your clients in a particular way. You’ve got to be, appear to be, you’ve got to be professional. What is professional – its meaning is open – it is not about suit and tie. So it is about the way you work. It’s about being on time and punctual and delivering the good product and so on. That stuff I learnt from the course [...] it was clear what it was meant to be if you are a professional. You are calling yourself a professional – this is the quality and standard you need to live [...] You couldn’t hand in sloppy assignments, you couldn’t go unprepared to a lecture [...] you just couldn’t be taken seriously (Interview with Maureen) (cited in Hewlett, 2007).

[…] and I know that many of my colleagues who completed the programme with me are currently spearheading many change processes within government right now, and there is kind of a common understanding around how one should actually approach this [i.e. standing up in front of a group and presenting, making a case and behaving in a certain way] and I know it is even having an effect on other people in the room about how to go about doing these things (Interview with Mia) (cited in Hewlett, 2007).

The notion of professionalism that was learned in this higher education context of acquisition appears to have been a way of behaving and presenting oneself and a way of demonstrating professionalism in particular ways. It reflects a ‘performative’ (Ball, 2004) ideology of professionalism. Professionalism is presented as being about meeting deadlines and presentation of a professional ‘self’ in appropriate ways according to dress code and public performance. It was also about conveying thoughtful and considered ideas in written and oral texts and of an appropriate standard for both a higher education and work context. Peer and lecturer interaction attempted to set a ‘new’ code of behaviour. Underpinning this notion of
professionalism for students was seeing themselves as agents of change, promoted by the degree and steeped in the context of the time (Hewlett, 2007).

Students appear to have attached less importance to the role of knowledge in shaping this professional identity. Their reflections on what they considered as knowledge and ‘theory’ that they had taken from the degree indicated student perceptions of a strong validation of their prior experiential knowledge. They indicated a validatory and utilitarian relationship to the formal knowledge and ‘theory’ of their courses, where the role of ‘theory’ was seen as validating or naming knowledge they already had and as something to be operationalised in ‘real’ workplace tasks. ‘Knowledge’ was seen to come about through peer interaction and was a ‘refinement’ of what was known before (Hewlett, 2007).

It seems that in early MM PDM curriculum iterations, a particular ideological vision of being professional, although often implicit in documentation, was recognised by students at the time. In this context, students attached importance to a notion of professionalism that was about presentation of self, sanctioned by academic staff and the peer cohort. In this social interactionist view of professionalism (Becker, 1970) it seems from former student accounts that the ideas of a profession and being professional may thus have been about acceptable presentation of self and knowledge and a view of themselves as agents of change, developed through encounters with peers and academics, and about validation of their experiential knowledge.

The reflective practitioner

MM PDM curriculum deliberations on the ideal product of curriculum also refer to the figure of the ‘reflective practitioner’ steering a path through a workplace context of uncertainty, flux and value conflict where academic knowledge was not seen as necessarily being able to provide answers. In common with other professional and continuing professional development programmes, this vision of the ideal graduate and practitioner implicitly draws on the notion of the “reflective practitioner” popularised by Schön (Schön, 1983; Schön, 1987). Although Schön’s work itself is not referenced directly in available MM PDM-related documentation, P&DM emphasised the ‘technology’ of ‘reflection’ in its advocated approach to learning.
design and in its teaching approach (Study Guides 1-4) (discussed in more detail in Section 5.6.2).

However, this ‘reflective’ practitioner identity sat in tension with the ‘new public manager’ identity shaped around notions of accountability and efficiency, although P&DM’s vision for the civil service was that these could come together and both be sustained as an integrating ideology (Fitzgerald, 1992b). The idea of the “reflective practitioner” (Schön, 1987) developed within a view of professional practice that challenged ‘technical rationality’ as an approach to professional practice. However, the generic, standard tools and practices associated with managerial interventions could be seen as exemplifying this ‘technical rationality’ that Schön wanted to avoid. ‘Reflection’ in this sense could be in opposition to being managerial. However, the notion of ‘reflection’, how it works cognitively and in practice, and what its knowledge base is was not clear in the MM PDM curriculum, or more broadly in the ways that ‘reflection’ has been adopted as a mantra in continuing professional education (Ecclestone, 1996) and adult education curricula in South Africa. Data on the early MM PDM curriculum reflect a vision of an ideal practitioner who is citizen-focused and committed to notions of change associated with 1990s ANC ideology. As will be discussed further in Section 5.6.2 below, the identity construction project of the time was strongly “therapeutic” (Ecclestone, 2004), with the construction of an appropriate ‘self’ guiding a “soft skills” (Interviewee 4) curriculum (see Table 13) with emphasis on reflection, presentation skills and decision-making capabilities (Interviewee 5). The central way of promoting and endorsing this identity was seen as occurring through pedagogy, or as expressed by an interviewee, “how we taught” (Interviewee 4).

### 5.6.2 Pedagogy as means of integration

The MM PDM curriculum, particularly in the first phase until 1999, attached importance to a common teaching and learning “methodology” (Interviewee 5) that was seen to be a key means of shaping the desired product of curriculum, maintaining a common academic culture and, in this way, providing a means of integration in curriculum, or at least reducing fragmentation. A particular teaching methodology was perceived by curriculum developers as being a vehicle for
integrating theory and its critical application to ‘real world’ societal and workplace problems by simulating an imagined workplace context. It is in this sense of being viewed as a ‘methodology’ that I am locating it as an aspirant integrating logic. In this way, an integration of formal knowledge and application was understood as taking place at the site of learning (the classroom) as well as assumed to be carried into the workplace, either concurrently or after the degree. P&DM documents reflect a view that the learning experience was able to play a key role in shaping particular behaviour and dispositions (applicable to both the formal learning context and the workplace) and in contributing to the production of a shared professional ethos (Notes 6, 1997). Developing a shared teaching approach, and inducting new academics into it, was also a way of developing and maintaining a shared vision amongst academics on the purpose of the curriculum and the school. Providing a common, formative learning experience resting on assumptions of shared notions about conduct, practice, appropriate knowledge and appropriate ways of developing these was implicitly seen as a way of integrating skills, knowledge and values. In the MM PDM curriculum, learning and technologies associated with the preferred experiential learning approach were recruited to bring practice and theory together, with the role of the ‘facilitator’ becoming crucial in shaping how (and also what) curriculum contents were brought together.

Documents from the period until around 1997 reflect considerable energy and time devoted to attempting to clarify, build and sustain a common pedagogy at P&DM. This took the forms of teaching and learning activities for staff, initially through collegial encounters, informal mentoring (Interviewees 3, 4 and 5) and formative visits to the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University to attend training in the discussion-based teaching approach and associated case study method of instruction at Harvard Business School. Later, induction into this approach for staff who were not part of the initial groups was done in a more ad hoc way through active, formal structures (e.g. the ‘P&DM Learning Project’) and associated staff members with a specific student and staff support and development ‘teaching and learning’ brief. P&DM’s projected ‘generic’ teaching approach envisaged “the creation of a relaxed learning environment, learning by doing, a variety of teaching methods, problem solving exercises, social activity and positive reinforcement”
This teaching approach was explicitly contrasted to prior didactic “chalk and talk” (Policy 1, 1997) student and staff learning experiences in school and at university.

My analysis of P&DM teaching resource documents for staff and students in the period between 1993-1999 reflects the key elements of the ideal, generic, projected teaching approach which I have synthesised and summarised in the table below.

Table 9: Summary of Elements of the MM PDM Ideal Teaching Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Examples of focus reflected in P&amp;DM documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Focus of learning and teaching | To develop critical, independent thinking, reflection and problem solving skills  
To guide learners to become more self-directive  
To enable participants to think, act, decide and communicate  
To find a balance between guided explanation and building on student life and work experience initially, but with the objective of interactive, experiential modes becoming more dominant as greater numbers of students entered the post-1994 public service and would then have current experience to draw on as a basis for reflection |
| Teacher role | Discussion leader  
Facilitator  
Mediator  
Manager of the learning process to guide the individual or group through different stages of learning content and develop independent thought (drawing on Feuerstein’s Mediated Learning Experience) (Feuerstein et al., 1985) |
| View of knowledge | Knowledge seen as emerging through reflection and interaction between practitioners and lecturers  
Students as producers rather than consumers of knowledge  
Lecturers not ‘all-knowing’ |
| Learn (Feuerstein, et al., 1985) | Identification and analysis using own knowledge and experience  
To engage in participative learning through group interaction  
To be reflective |
| Power/control | Movement from controlled learning process to democratic process  
‘Learning contracts’ established between students in groups and between class and lecturer |
| Key theorists and influences explicitly drawn on in documentation | Facilitation (Heron, 1999), Reflection (Kolb, 1984), Multiple intelligences, holistic learning (Gardner, 1985), Mediation (Feuerstein, et al., 1985), Systems theory/enactivism (Capra, 2007), Single loop, double loop learning (Argyris & Schön, 1974) |
The elements of the P&DM teaching approach advocated in formal documents referenced above initially drew on the “discussion approach” (Christensen, et al., 1991) popularised by Harvard Business School, and later on perspectives derived from adult education theory, particularly that of experiential learning. I discuss these in turn below.

The discussion approach, case method and group learning

P&DM drew on international trends in management teaching in adopting the case method and group learning as instructional techniques in the MM PDM curriculum. A ‘case’ in this sense was viewed as an instructional technique (as opposed to case as a method or research design, more familiar in other disciplinary fields). As described by a former P&DM staff member who led P&DM’s initial case writing programme.

*Case studies approximate management and policy activities by presenting, usually in a narrative form, but also in the form of newspapers articles, photographs or video-clips, a particular problem or difficulty faced by an individual or organisation which requires resolution; a situation which requires action or an ethical dilemma which required deliberation* (Schütte, 1995:2).

The case method was seen as a problem-solving or illustrative experience (Merriam, 1998:32) and as used in management studies, widely associated with Harvard Business School. Two examples of published P&DM cases are included in Appendix M for illustrative purposes.

Various P&DM publications and theses outline the case teaching ‘methodology’ (Christensen, et al., 1991; de Coning, et al., 2002) and examine its implementation (Schütte, 1996). In brief, students read and engage with the ‘case’ (usually in groups) and are then guided through a process of engagement with the case based on principles of discussion-based learning. The case method was supported by the use of ‘syndicate groups’ (later called ‘learning groups’) of students, where preparation and tasks in relation to the cases were set up and where (predominantly) oral presentations on the case and the decisions were made. The name change was
not clear to external evaluators as practices and approaches did not appear to change (Commissioned Report 6, 1998).

A cohort of early P&DM lecturers were inducted into the case method used at Harvard (within the Kennedy School of Government) and this cohort then ran subsequent case teaching workshops in South Africa for the Joint Universities of Public Management Education Trust (JUPMET) schools of public administration, of which P&DM was one. The ‘ideal’ teaching case in the Harvard tradition involves researching and writing up a representation of real life management or policy dilemma. This is associated with fieldwork, official agreements for release of information and usually involves a focus on a decision-focused intervention made by (envisaged) top executives or officials. While facilitating cases is seen to require putting into practice the “artistry of discussion leadership” (Christensen, et al., 1991) and is based on assumptions of students be co-constructors of the teaching and learning process (Schütte, 1995), cases are often accompanied by ‘teaching notes’ elaborating on teaching principles and key questions in shaping the teaching process (Lundeberg, Rainsford, Shay, & Young, 2001). This perhaps makes teacher control less visible and is an example of “apparent” (Bernstein, 2000:13) weak framing relations.

In the period until 1997, P&DM strongly endorsed the case study method through the allocation of resources to the development of teaching cases (in the form of a dedicated academic staff member) and to development of case facilitation skills for other academic staff. Case learning (and simulations) were seen as key in developing students’ capacity (and confidence) to make judgements in contexts that simulated real life where there is “imperfect information, inadequate analysis, pressure, compromise and conflicting values” (Memo 1, 1995). During this period, the pacing of MM PDM curriculum and the activities around which the school organised its teaching were explicitly designed around using the case method.

---

21 A trust established by six schools of governance at the Universities of Durban-Westville, Fort Hare, Pretoria, Stellenbosch, the Western Cape and the Witwatersrand take forward the vision of the NPAI and to improve the quality of education and training in the field of Public and Development Management (Publicity document, 2003).
Associated student discussion-based, group work institutionalised three-hour teaching sessions that assumed time for formal input (lecturing), group discussions and whole-class discussion (or case discussion) (Memo 1, 1995). Teaching infrastructure was also designed to support this, with classrooms allowing for discussion-based teaching and break-away rooms for students to work in groups analysing and engaging in problem-solving in relation to the case. The teaching methodology assumed that lecturers adopted and were skilled in specific approaches to facilitate discussion-based teaching (Report 19, 1996).

The majority of ‘cases’ developed at P&DM for teaching during the period 1993-2000 or 1999 were short (four-page) hypothetical stories involving the presentation of dilemmas for decision-making and problem-solving (See e.g. Case 1 in Appendix M) contextualised within South African civil service transformation and social development issues at the time. Later, some P&DM cases were developed on the basis of actual events and actual data (e.g. current policy and legal developments) as they unfolded, i.e. more in the detailed, evidence-based sense of some of the Harvard cases (see e.g. Case 2 in Appendix M). An example was a case based on a South African Constitutional Court ruling in 2000, confirming the constitutional responsibilities of the state to provide access to housing for the poor (Case 1). Some cases developed by the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard were also used under licence in teaching at P&DM at the time. A sample of the case titles used, from both P&DM and the Kennedy School of Government, is contained in Appendix D.

Syndicate groups (later renamed learning groups) were associated with the case teaching approach. However, the intention behind using syndicate groups was broader than just case examination.

In principle learning groups (syndicate groups) are there to facilitate sharing of responsibilities in relation to workload, peer support, a space for action learning through experience, to enable students to learn about conflict resolution and decision making, deepen academic learning and rigour (Notes 8, 1997).

Learning groups were viewed as simulating the real life context of the workplace, where diverse participants have to come together to achieve tasks. In this sense,
they were seen as places to integrate theory and practice. It was assumed that relevant knowledge for practice would emerge through participation, where students would be able to “develop independent thinking patterns and to lessen their propensity to defer to lecturers’ ‘expert’ points of view” (Schütte, 1995:2). It was also assumed that learning how to work together and manage diversity would unfold organically through this group process, with some initial cohort support on team learning and team functioning (Manual 4, 1997). There were, however, on-going student and staff tensions about the functioning or lack of functioning of these learning groups which related to unequal student participation, unclear purpose of group approach, poor group functioning and poor monitoring of intended outcomes by academics (Commissioned Report 6, 1998; Memo 5, 1998; Memo 9, 1998; Notes 6, 1997).

P&DM’s teaching ‘methodology’ was promoted as one of the successes of the new school in publicity materials and by heads of school (Memo 1, 1995; Commissioned Report 2, 1995; Publicity document, 2003) and a key projected marker of its identity as a new school of Public Administration in South Africa. Students found the teaching approach both stimulating and frustrating (Hewlett, 2006) but responded positively to the adult-focused ways of learning, which they saw as respecting their previous experience. They contrasted their prior learning experiences in formal studies to the “adult” teaching approaches they experienced at P&DM (Hewlett, 2006);(Interviewee 5).

P&DM continued its advocacy of the case approach throughout this MM PDM curriculum period, although there were indications of difficulties in sustaining and coherently implementing the approach (Schütte, 1996), (Memo 9, 1998; Memo 5, 1998). From as early as 1995, internal documents begin to reflect concerns (mainly expressed in term of implementation problems) about the case method’s ability to deliver on the outcomes it claimed and hinting at its unsustainability in terms of resources required to maintain it. Research conducted on the use of case studies in the PPDA class of 1996 indicated that despite attempts to train a cohort of staff subscribing to a common teaching approach, the case method approach was inconsistently and eclectically applied (Schütte, 1996). Students experienced
frustration when a single solution was not presented to the problem posed (although the methodology advocates shared construction and ownership of multiple possible solutions) and with lecturer facilitation skills, particularly when lecturers failed to wrap up the case discussion adequately (Schütte, 1996). In terms of the intended functioning of the syndicate groups as learning ‘incubators’ and exemplars of real life workplaces, women students had to battle to be taken seriously, sometimes struggling to participate with male classmates, and there was too little staff intervention in unproductive group processes (Discussion Paper 3, 1993; Memo 9, 1998). The ‘free rider problem’ was frequently mentioned (Notes 8, 1997; Commissioned Report 4, 1995) where students who did not perform adequately in terms of participation or quality were able to receive passing collective grades for assignments to the frustration of some lecturers and other students (Interviewee 3).

Teaching methods and approaches were also noted as very demanding for lecturers and students (Commissioned Report 4, 1995:5). Lecturers struggled to apply the approach where students did not have a basic grounding in the subject matter and where students did not, or were not able to, prepare sufficiently to be able to participate fully in the discussions (Schütte, 1996). The ‘implicitness’ of this form of pedagogy in curriculum was also evidenced in too little structure in some cases and too much in others (relating to expectations about reading and syndicate work) leading to “confusion and discouragement” (Commissioned Report 4, 1995).

External reviewers of the MM PDM noted inconsistent implementation of the teaching approach, implicitness about how course material was to be used by students and insufficient support for students on how to work with reading assignments and preparation (Commissioned Report 4, 1995). Concerns were expressed by external reviewers about a lack of balance between facilitation and teaching, and in particular how students were handling the reading materials where much of the content knowledge was contained (Commissioned Report 4, 1995). In the use of cases (as examples of practice or problem-solving exercises), the content necessary for informed reflection often resided elsewhere outside of the case. Usually, the case was introduced to integrate information from multiple sources, e.g. course lectures, discussions and readings (Carter, 1999:168). There was some ambiguity about whether knowledge or ‘expertise’ was seen to lie predominantly in
the prescribed course readings or in the process of discussion and problem-solving since “[…] not all information can self generate out of syndicate groups. Instructors need to teach, to present or explain materials and put them in context” (Commissioned Report 4, 1995:5). This tension between formal knowledge and the experiential knowledge of students was more widely reflected in P&DM’s advocacy of experiential learning approaches, which I discuss in the next section.

**Experiential learning**

The projected teaching approach at P&DM drew on two perspectives within experiential learning approaches, those of *reflection* and *enactivism*. Both perspectives were reflected in P&DM’s Teaching and Learning Policy (Policy 1, 1997) and in its materials for students expounding on its teaching and learning approach, although distinctions were not explicitly made between them.

An orientation to ‘reflection’ as an approach to learning was dominant and drew explicitly on the work of Kolb in relation to action learning cycles (Kolb, 1984) and less explicitly (in terms of documentation at least) on the work of Schön’s reflective practitioner (Schön, 1983). Kolb’s action learning cycle was reflected in the P&DM Teaching and Learning Policy (Study Guide 2, (n.d.); Study Guide 3, 1996) that was viewed as part of the ‘learning contract’ about how interactions would take place between lecturers and students, and between students themselves. In the early MM PDM curriculum, extensive introductory work was conducted with students around expectations in relation to ‘reflection’, which students conflated with ‘critique’ or ‘being critical’ (Study Guide 2, n.d.)

Although less formally documented, a second perspective on experiential learning, which has been called enactivist or *enactivism* (Fenwick, 2000), was reflected in the earliest part of this curriculum period, between 1993 and 1997. Enactivism is a cognitive theory located within ecological perspectives (and based on biological models) that see the organism (in this case, the student, lecturer or organisation) as a constantly changing complex systems that can change and evolve based on the use of feedback loops and through growth in response to feedback (Varela, Thompson, & Rosch, 1991). Learning is seen as being about exploration of self in a
process of interacting with context, environment and complex systems where both identity and knowledge emerge in the interaction (Varela, et al., 1991).

Reflection was dominant across both MM PDM curriculum iterations before 1999, with enactivism appearing in the early part of the 1993-1999 period (between 1993 and 1997), associated with the influence, in particular, of the second Director of P&DM, and a focus in curriculum on systems theory as a potential interdisciplinary linking concept (discussed further in Section 5.6.3).

I have synthesised the key elements of both approaches as reflected in the MM PDM curriculum in the table below.

Table 10: Experiential Learning Perspectives Reflected in the MM PDM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Enactivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical focus</strong></td>
<td>Construction of meaning from experience to create knowledge</td>
<td>How environment (setting) and cognition are connected and change each other in the process of interaction, i.e. complex systems can spontaneously self-organise based on feedback loops (autopoesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus within MM PDM curriculum</strong></td>
<td>A learning cycle (drawing on Kolb) that enables reflection on experience and using that knowledge for action (Kolb, 1984)</td>
<td>Participant engagement with peers to create shared consciousness and change in both participants and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View of knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Students as producers of knowledge about self and world (changes in individual and group cognition through reflection)</td>
<td>Participation in the world allows for learning which is the ”co-evolution of knower and known that transforms both” (Davis, Sumara, &amp; Luce-Kapler, 2000:64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educator’s role</strong></td>
<td>Validation of knowledge acquired through reflection. Encourage reflective processes. Reflect on own knowledge and expertise</td>
<td>Assist participants to understand old categories and rename them in process of enactment with each other and environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: Author generated drawing on analysis of Study Guides 1-4; Discussion Paper 12, 1996: Memo 1, 1995; Minutes 2, 1990; Report 24, 1997)

Both systems theory as a theory and enactivism as an approach to learning see structures (organisations) and individuals (students, lecturers and work colleagues) as evolving and changing through processes of group interaction.
While there are differences between the perspectives of reflection and enactivism in relation to how they view cognition in experiential learning (discussed in Fenwick, 2000), both perspectives support similar pedagogic approaches. These approaches emphasise peer interaction, extensive discussion, processes of reflection where students are assumed to be self-directing, active developers of self and group knowledge, and lecturers as facilitators and mediators. In both approaches, an ideal class involves the creation of stimulating learning conditions where the outcomes of learning are not prescribed. Both reflection and enactivism see knowledge and knowing as inseparable and as emerging through action (in the case of enactivism) or reflection on action (in the case of reflection). A view expressed in MM PDM or P&DM curriculum documents was that “[i]t is important that students are able to receive and generate knowledge, as well as develop a capacity to think critically. Students should be perceived as producers rather than consumers of knowledge” (Notes 4, 1991).

While there is wide ranging evidence of initial extensive staff engagement with processes relating to clarifying the teaching approaches in the early stages of MM PDM curriculum development (Discussion Paper 1, 1997; Discussion Paper 11, 1997; Discussion Paper 12, 1996), there is less documentation referring to the extent to which they were taken up by individual lecturers. Interviews and research on this curriculum suggest that take-up was patchy, particularly as teaching staff expanded beyond the small full-time core inducted into, and committed to, these approaches (Interviewee 6,3,5) (Schütte, 1996).

In common with the disciplinary field of Public Policy in the USA, the MM PDM curriculum reflected the notion that understanding of public management would be improved by continuous dialogue between lectures and practitioners, “indeed, by breaking down the distinction between the two” (Lynn, 1996:67) with hopes being attached to the idea of “practice-driven theory” that would provide better insight than conforming to “traditional academic standards” (Lynn, 1996:67-68). Responsibility for making this integration happen was largely placed with the students (Interviewee 5). In the case of the students, “the knowledge, experience and judgements of the participants in the course are more important than the presumed expertise of the lecturer” (Memo 1, 1995) and “the issue of integration of different inputs, like in other
training institutions, is still unresolved but participants have more possibilities of experiencing this themselves through case studies and working on “live” policy and management issues” (Commissioned Report 2, 1995:3). This perspective on co-construction of practical knowledge as the preferred knowledge authority and scepticism about the contribution of traditional, discipline-based knowledge shaped the early years of the MM PDM curriculum.

5.6.3 ‘Integration’ through curriculum-organising logics

A ‘cross-curricular’ approach to integration is evident in this early curriculum in two main forms. Firstly, the MM PDM curriculum appealed to a broad and loose notion of ‘interdisciplinarity’ as an overarching logic that was both an ideological justification for the location of P&DM as a graduate school within the university, and represented limited practical attempts to bring curriculum knowledge contents into relationships with each other. Secondly, the curriculum began to look to competency logics, reflected in notions of cross-curricular learning outcomes, to bring together skills, attitudes and knowledge across the separately taught components of the curriculum. I examine ways in which ‘integration’ was envisaged to occur as reflected in this curriculum and how it played out in practice.

Interdisciplinarity integration

Different forms or methods of interaction between disciplines were envisaged in the early MM PDM curriculum as ways of bringing disciplines and contents from other regions (e.g. Management, Development Studies) into relationships with each other. As described in P&DM documentation, the way forward for Public Management as a disciplinary field in South Africa and in the MM PDM curriculum seemed to lie in a “multi-disciplinary/eclectic approach which combines a development and management orientation with a normative base” (McLennan, 1992-12). My examination shows that the search for a ‘multi- or interdisciplinary’ curriculum ‘glue’ within this specific public management curriculum was seen in terms of four possible methods of integration.

The first was to use two of the functional areas related to doing the work of the public sector (i.e. management and policy) and to combine them with an interdisciplinary
concept (*development*). The second was through the use of possible interdisciplinary concepts, frameworks or ‘theories’ that could potentially ‘bridge’ diverse disciplines and practical know-how. The third was through recontextualisation of selected disciplinary contents from some disciplines into teachable knowledge contents. A fourth method of integration was that of the production of a particular research product (or task) – an applied research mini-dissertation, referred to as a ‘research report’.

I depict these four integrative methods in Table 11 and then discuss each of them in detail.

Table 11: Interdisciplinary Integration in the MM PDM Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-curricular ‘sub-fields’ or functional areas</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary concepts methodologies, models or theories</th>
<th>Recontextualisation of disciplinary subjects</th>
<th>Products or tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development Management</td>
<td>Systems theory Policy analytical frameworks</td>
<td>Statistics recontextualised as <em>Information-gathering for the policy process</em> Development Studies recontextualised as <em>Issues in Development and Public Management</em></td>
<td>Integration of theoretical and practical knowledge through an applied research dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cross-curricular integration in a multi-disciplinary field*

Early MM PDM curriculum iterations (in 1994 and 1996) drew their formal knowledge base eclectically from a range of disciplines and sought to hold these contents together through their application to three ‘sub-fields’ seen as comprising the interdisciplinary field of ‘public and development management’. In broad terms, this integration was expressed as involving a “tri-partite synthesis” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:65) of ‘policy’, ‘management’ and ‘development’. The concept of ‘governance’ would enter the mix more strongly in the second curriculum iterations during the period until 1999.

Relationships between the three sub-fields and the particular emphases they were given in curriculum were influenced in part by “inevitable” competing definitions in an
interdisciplinary field (Gaspar, 2000:168) and perhaps also by a reluctance to impose or project an explicit and particular stance or position in relation to the concepts of development and management particularly. The relative importance concepts were given in terms of time allocated in curriculum (pacing) and how they were interpreted as concepts were also influenced by the intellectual traditions and ideological positions of those who taught the individual components of courses (Interviewees 2,3,4,5) and by the changing priorities of the state.

In conceptualising the PPDA and later the MM PDM in 1993, the sub-fields of ‘policy’, ‘management’ and ‘development’ were contextualised with a view of the priorities of state as being “transition, democratisation, transformation and reconstruction” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:66). During the phase in which this initial MM PDM curriculum was conceived and first implemented (1991-1995), the South African state was characterised as being in a ‘reconstruction and development’ phase of state formation, where redress and development of systems, people and economy were the key drivers of state policy (Chipkin, 2009; McLennan, 2007b). The initial envisaged relationship between these three concepts was most clearly articulated in the initial PPDA, but a similar logic carried over into subsequent MM PDM curricula. In the original conception of how these concepts would come into curricular relationships with each other, outlined in relation to the PPDA, the logic was described as moving from “administration to public policy via ‘development management’” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:66). The type of management that was seen as appropriate was ‘developmental’ management, which would drive policy choices and curriculum choices that needed to be made in a context of a “lesser developed” and “aspirant NIC [newly industrialised country] status” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:66). The envisaged curriculum would be a “more operationalised and politicised public policy model” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:66), similar to existing public policy models in the USA at the time.

In its early phases, MM PDM curriculum syllabus descriptions reflect a broad orientation to the rationales of ‘public’, ‘development’ and ‘management’ and the absence of a clear stance in relation to these concepts. Syllabus descriptions reflect a range of emphases. I summarise them below and then examine them each in more detail in the next section.
Table 12: Policy, Development and Management as Reflected in the MM PDM Syllabus Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>1996/1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>Organisational development or capacity-building of organisations and people</td>
<td>Sustainable development — ecological and ‘new science’ perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sector to be managed (NGOs)</td>
<td>Development planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An environment or context</td>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development agencies and institutions</td>
<td>A sector to be managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development economics orientation, e.g. planning of development processes in developing countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public and policy</strong></td>
<td>A sector to be managed — the public sector</td>
<td>Public-private partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A public sector service ethic</td>
<td>Public participation — a stakeholder orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public goods</td>
<td>Policy analysis and policy analysis models, e.g. public choice, rationalism, system theory, incrementalism, institutionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public participation — a stakeholder orientation</td>
<td>Analytical techniques for policy analysis and policy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A context — the ‘public’ sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A sector whose functions need to be managed, e.g. public finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
<td>Functions to be managed – HR (organisations), projects, information</td>
<td>Processes to be managed, e.g. change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on the figure of the manager/leader</td>
<td>The manager leader figure (now a full course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>State/society relations — changing conceptions of public management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy and ‘public’ policy

In terms of the architecture of the broader international fields of Public Administration/Management or Public Policy, curriculum developers acknowledged that the early MM PDM curriculum drew strongly on developments in North American graduate public policy schools, rather than on schools of public administration (Fitzgerald, 1992a). P&DM's early relationship with the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School for Public and International Affairs was influential here (Interviewee 1). In order to give some insights into the initial MM PDM curriculum, some background on these public policy schools is necessary.

The claims to authority in these North American schools of public policy were initially based on a strongly analytic (usually qualitative) content base centred on the idea of providing, generalist, policy analysts for high-level decision-making (Lynn, 1996). In order to do this, curricula emphasised economics, analytical and quantitative skills (Lynn, 1996) as well as knowledge drawn from Political Science and Economics (Fleishman, 1990). In this model, graduate students would not necessarily pursue, or want to pursue, a long-term career path as bureaucrats (or public administrators) in the civil service. The intention in public policy schools in the USA was to attract students who would be leaders in policy, rather than functionaries in the civil service (Lynn, 1996). In the MM PDM curriculum, the courses Analytical Management Approaches (1994 Syllabus), Analytical Methods (1996 Syllabus) and Information-Based Policy Analysis and Decision Making (1996 Syllabus) (outlined in Table 6) are examples of this analytical emphasis (or at least the initial intention to have this as a strong focus).

The nature of ‘public’ appears to have been left open to individual interpretation in this curriculum. In reflecting back on the period 1993-2000, not specifically on P&D&M but more broadly in relation to the disciplinary field of ‘Public and Development Management’ in South Africa, Gaspar notes the lack of clarity in the widely varying uses of the term ‘public’ in ‘the public service’, ‘the Public Sector’, ‘public and development management’. He further observed that “[t]here appears to be no
consistent stance on whether the public sector is more than the state sector and whether it includes NGOs and CBOs or not, hence the addition sometimes of ‘and development sectors” (Gaspar, 2000:170). As reflected in Table 12, ‘public’ appears in both the 1994 and 1996 curriculum iterations as a ‘sector’ to be managed (as distinct from civil society and NGOs) and a place where ‘stakeholders’ (or sometimes ‘citizens’) are located. MM PDM syllabus descriptions reflect this ambiguity, as do comments on the marginalisation of ‘policy’ within the degree in relation to ‘management’ (Report 7, n.d.). In the 1994 syllabus, there are occasional references to NGOs and the non-profit sector but the dominant discourse relates to public sector institutions and the ‘management’ of them as well as the envisaged institutional change processes within them.

The concept of public goods that was introduced in syllabus descriptions was also open to a range of interpretations, from the analytic economic understandings to prescriptive understandings of what the state should provide.

‘Development management’, ‘management’ or ‘development’?

Both the Mount Grace Declaration and the MM PDM curriculum reflected international discourses shaping developments in public administration in the UK, the USA and New Zealand at the time. In the USA the “reinventing government” (Osbourne & Gaebler, 1992) agenda was being strongly justified as a backlash against bureaucracy and a mantra for government reform. (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2000). Effective government was reinterpreted as being entrepreneurial, competitive and customer-driven enabling provision of services without actual delivery necessarily being a core function of government (i.e. through outsourcing). Osborne and Gaebler advocated the adoption of business-like practices for the public sector and argued strongly for the principles of efficiency as defined in business practices.

The focus of P&DM’s first qualification, the PPDA, was expressed as being on “analytical and strategic abilities, a proactive institutional development component, clear transfer of ‘hard skills’ capacity, and an overall practical problem solving ethos” (Fitzgerald, 1992a:63). The MM PDM curriculum (in intent) appears to have tried to contextualise the concept of ‘efficiency’ through the addition of ‘development’ and ‘public’ as the adjectives to temper or to contextualise ‘management’ (and NPM) in a
specific developing country context. ‘Development’ was reflected both as a concept, a disciplinary sub-field and as an ‘adjective’ (Gaspar, 2000) to temper or to contextualise ‘management’ and to try and signal its distinctiveness from generic management in a developing-country context.

‘Development management’ became a focus of debate for curriculum change at the first NPAI conference at Mount Grace and in deliberations on the first MM PDM curriculum. While curriculum documents reflect different interpretations of ‘development management’, there are indications in this curriculum, at least initially, that conceptions of ‘development’, ‘management’ and ‘development management’ were influenced to some extent by debates taking place in Development Studies and in the international NGO sector about how to engage with pressures to professionalise and demonstrate greater accountability without losing ideals of progress in the interests of the powerless (see Thomas, 1996).

In the 1994 MM PDM curriculum there are at least five interpretations of development reflected in syllabus descriptions (in the modules Issues in Development and Public Management and Political Economy of Development (MM PDM 1994) and Sustainable Development (MM PDM 1996) (see Table 12). These are: development viewed as a sector to be managed (i.e. managing NGOs and development agencies); development as a context (South Africa as a developing country); a political, economic and planning perspective (e.g. planning of economic development processes); development of institutions and people (a capacity-building/organisational development perspective); and, development as a concept (both a historical change process and a modernist paradigm).

The envisaged dominant ‘development’ orientation reflected across written curriculum documents in early MM PDM curricula appears to be a focus on development sector as the background context for project planning and implementation, i.e. on the management of the development sector and a focus on the procedures and approaches for doing so organisationally and in terms of project management. Management of development is woven in with attempts at contextualising ‘development’ (its purpose and philosophy) in the syllabus descriptions. ‘Development’ as oppositional to the interests of capital and as
separate from, and perhaps more related to, public action (and oppositional to ‘state’) is less explicitly visible in syllabus documentation (a point noted by Gaspar at the Mount Grace 2 conference in 1999 (Gaspar, 2000)), although this begins to emerge in the 1996 syllabus in the course Political Economy of Development and its references to civil society and in elective courses. Different orientations to the concept of development were driven by staff teaching at the time (Interviewees 4, 5 and 6).

The early MM PDM curriculum until 1999 also reflected the broad use of the concepts of ‘development’ and ‘sustainability’. ‘Sustainability’ was seen as an “organising principle” (Munslow, et al., 1995) around which all policy, institutional design and strategy issues could revolve, however, there is little evidence of it being explicitly promoted or ‘mainstreamed’. In its interpretation in syllabus outlines, ‘sustainability’ emerged as a concept to guide institutional reform that would, for some academics, become more focused around development of institutions and institutional capacity, and for others around informing “a normative strategic approach” (Swilling & Wooldridge, 1997) focused on participatory approaches to governance, drawing on systems theory and postmodern analyses of organisations. Sustainability was also reflected in ecological and new science terms in courses, e.g. Sustainable Development. In the 1996 syllabus, the concept of ‘sustainable development is more visible, viewed both as an ecological and ‘new science’ perspective and in terms of long-term organisational change. An economic development/planning perspective was also evident in the 1996 syllabus in the 1996 syllabus (University of the Witwatersrand, 1996).

The shifting emphases in syllabus descriptions, published documents on the early curriculum and internal sources reflect the dominance of particular orientations and ideological perspectives of the staff who were drafting the syllabus descriptions and teaching the courses at the time. Syllabi during this period do not reflect a clear preferred orientation to ‘development’ and its consequent use as a ‘floating’ theme capable of being used in various, and perhaps competing, ways, particularly as the relative cohesiveness of the early pioneer group of staff waned. What was emphasised in terms of content depended on individuals and their orientations or ideological positions (Interviewees 5 and 6). The initial curriculum focus was
envisaged as being about bringing public administration into a relationship with development to ensure that “the appropriate developmental spirit (as opposed to the merely entrepreneurial spirit) may drive transformation of the South African public sector” (Fitzgerald, 1995:515). This ‘developmental spirit’ as initially promoted and reflected in various publications was that of ‘sustainable’ development involving a range of emphases from sustainable livelihoods and cautions on formal economic growth benefitting the few, to the use of resources for poverty alleviation involving effective participation of citizens and co-ordination between sectors (Munslow & Fitzgerald, 1994; Munslow, et al., 1995).

In the initial stages of development of the PPDA curriculum, while a ‘management’ focus was seen to involve a shift to more efficient, effective and proactive government (and a shift from civil servants to public managers) more accountable to its citizens, it was also seen to be management of a ‘sustainable’ type and “effective management of resources” (Fitzgerald, 1995:513). All interviewees confirm that orientations towards ‘management’ in the MM PDM curriculum also varied according to lecturer emphasis, including a mix of managerialist positions and those supportive of various aspects of NPM, a focus on organisational theory and change (including critiques of bureaucracy and endorsement of postmodern alternatives) and critiques of NPM. Publications by lecturers during this first period also reflect a diversity of views (see for example Bond, 1998; Fitzgerald, 1995; Paine, 1999; Swilling & Wooldridge, 1997; Wooldridge & Cranko, 1997). Students may have received mixed messages in relation to NPM, and for some, the variety of messages was seen as a positive aspect of the MM PDM degree (Interviewee 5).

**Interdisciplinary concepts or frameworks**

The MM PDM curriculum also looked to particular concepts, frameworks or ‘languages’ that it saw as having the potential to play the role of unifying interdisciplinary concepts. In the language of trans-disciplinarity, it found the possibility to work towards an “overarching synthesis” (Klein, 2010:24) to transcend disciplines. Although there is evidence of two envisaged methods of integration, i.e. theoretical concepts (e.g. development) and models (policy analysis, systems theory), none of these was ever sufficiently developed or sustained to be able to fulfil
this role and ‘interdisciplinarity’ functioned more as an ideology (as I argue in Chapter Seven) or as an individually applied orientation to teaching dependent on the lecturer’s disciplinary background. In this section I examine curriculum data reflecting this focus on potential methods of integration and the practical difficulties they reflected for integration.

In the early curriculum iterations, ‘development’ was suggested as a possible interdisciplinary concept, although the MM PDM curriculum reflected ‘development’ both playing the role as a potential unifying concept and ‘development’ as a subject of study (e.g. Development Studies) as reflected in the following quote. It was argued that a

[...] holistic approach was needed in which students would be taught about what they were doing in a development context. Development would then inform the entire curriculum, as a trans-disciplinary, rather than an inter-disciplinary subject” (Notes 4, 1991).

The discussion on the use of ‘development’ shows that although there was an intention to theorise development in an integrative way, it is not clear how it might be translated into practice within the MM PDM curriculum as an interdisciplinary concept, beyond being taken up by individual lecturers in their own ways. In practice, the intention to theorise and strengthen the concept as a curriculum integrator was not taken forward into the structuring and content of courses across the curriculum in any consistent way (Interviewee 6).

In literature on interdisciplinarity, ‘policy analysis’, is also put forwards as a potential interdisciplinary linking methodology through use of the models (predominantly quantitative) that it generates (Fleishman, 1990; Miller, 2010). Policy analysis in this view “chooses the analytic methods, theories, and substantive knowledge generated by other fields that are useful to integrate into its own framework for application to particular problems at hand” (Fleishman, 1991-6). It is seen to be genuinely ‘interdisciplinary’ because “it differs from the disciplines on which it draws so heavily – principally political science and economics [...]” (Fleishman, 1990:747). Analytic frameworks or analytic skills function as the “disciplinary substitute” (Fleishman, 1990:749) in this view.
Although a policy analytical focus was promoted in the early curriculum, both this analytical focus and the sub-field of policy itself gradually weakened in terms of their reflection in courses and components of courses by the end of this curriculum period. Despite the roots of the initial MM PDM curriculum, drawing on orientations in public policy schools in the USA and their emphasis on analytical capabilities, the first MM PDM curriculum (1994) only contained one compulsory policy-related sub-course (Economics and Public Policy), with a specific policy focus being found only in the elective courses. Although in the 1996 curriculum a policy focus (or policy analytic focus) was strengthened through the introduction of the full core course Information-based Policy Analysis and Decision Making, in the 1999 curriculum the course Analytical Methods is removed reflecting a gradual de-emphasising of a policy analytical focus specifically, and an quantitative focus in general. The weakening of this analytic focus began with a lack of vertical progression from analytical courses in the PPDA to the MM PDM in terms of a development of a wider knowledge base or levels of complexity to engage with evidence-based analysis. PPDA students could, for example, be given credit for their PPDA analytic course on the MM PDM (University of the Witwatersrand, 1996). It seems that the intended policy-driven, analytical focus weakened when it ran up against the weak analytic and mathematics base of the majority of students. Entrance test scores on the analytic component of the psychometric tests indicate the low levels of mathematics and analytical skills of many students with the majority of students producing scores in the lower 2 of 9 grades (Presentation 1, 2010). Letters responding to student appeals for reinstatement of registration on the PPDA after having failed its Analytical Techniques course (sometimes more than once) in 2001 indicate retrospective attempts to put in place some prerequisites by requiring students to complete and pass an unspecified ‘foundation course in Mathematics’ and repeat the Analytical Techniques course. This waning of analytic focus was not only reflected in the decreasing amount of time allocated to it in the curriculum but also to a progressive cutting-back on content to accommodate student weaknesses with lecturers “ending up having to go over the basic concepts in more detail and not get as far” (Interview 3).
‘Systems theory’ was another candidate as an interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary concept. Systems theory as an interdisciplinary concept is seen as an integrative framework that can enable exchanges between disciplines and better exchange of information across disciplines (Strijbos, 2010). Systems theory is reflected in the early MM PDM curriculum as both a specific knowledge area (in a course like *Systems Theory and Social Change* (University of the Witwatersrand, 1996) and as a methodology to inform processes of change and orientations to change, leadership and change management in courses and modules such as *Strategic Management and Leadership, Introduction to Public Policy and Organisational Design and Development* (University of the Witwatersrand, 1996). Its visibility in curriculum declines in the 2000-2004 round of curriculum iterations, probably due to two of the academics promoting it in teaching moving on and it not being systematically taken up by others (Interviewees 3 and 4).

**Recontextualisation from disciplines, other regions and the workplace**

The 1994 and 1996 MM PDM curricula drew on a range of disciplines and other regions for their contents, insights, theories and understandings. Chief amongst these disciplines were Economics, Political Studies, Statistics and Psychology, with content also being drawn from other regions or interdisciplinary fields, such as Development Studies, Public Administration, Public Policy, Management and Law.

Factual, conceptual and procedural knowledge was selectively drawn from these disciplines and disciplinary fields and recontextualised into courses, mostly according to individual views on perceived ‘relevance’ to the public sector and to the functions that curriculum developers saw public managers as needing to be able to perform. These functions are to some extent reflected in course titles. Public managers need to, for example, manage resources (*Resources Management*), manage organisations (*Organisation and Management*), conduct policy analysis and be involved in decision making (*Information-Based Policy Analysis and Decision Making*). Interviewees confirmed that in their own teaching they drew on their own disciplinary strengths or developed new areas of interest over time. Disciplines seem to have been drawn on eclectically and used as the basis for developing appropriate conceptual knowledge providing ‘paradigms’ or ‘frameworks’ for the business of
government or critique of approaches to governance and bureaucracy, e.g. *Paradigms for Public and Development Management*. Official syllabus descriptions (the officially published, cryptic ‘templates’ for courses offered), indicate that procedural knowledge was largely drawn from the legislative and policy requirements of the public sector workplace (e.g. legislation and procurement protocols) and from ‘best practice’ case studies and examples or models and techniques. However, confirmation of this would have required analysis of actual course outlines and prescribed readings or course packs which were not comprehensively available for this time period and teaching in classes.

The shorthand nature of official syllabus descriptions left room for wide interpretation as to which bits of various disciplines could be drawn on in each lecturer’s design and delivery of courses. A course could be very different in focus, emphasis and demand when re-developed and taught by different lecturers. Inevitably, the interpretation and actual content was driven and changed by the individual or individuals teaching the actual course (reflected in course outlines and reading outlines or ‘course packs’). Consequently, ‘integration’ between courses became dependent on students either ‘integrating’ on their own (i.e. making (or not making) connections) or on collaboration between individual lecturers teaching different courses to seek synergies across courses and make them explicit. There is little evidence in documentation of the latter occurring by design or systematically, although, according to some interviewees, this may in fact have taken place between individuals (Interviewees 3 and 4).

**Integration through applied research**

In the early MM PDM curriculum, the final research component was seen as enabling integration of curriculum contents. In terms of the structure of curriculum, this involved meeting the ‘capstone’ requirements of the degree through the production of limited\(^\text{22}\), short, applied research dissertation (referred to as a ‘research report’ in official university rules and syllabuses (University of the Witwatersrand, 2013).

\(^{22}\) Limited in credits (25% of the MM PDM degree) and in scope (range, reliability and validity in both qualitative and quantitative understandings of these concepts).
1995). Students were expected to demonstrate some familiarity with basic processes and approaches to designing and conducting research on a topic of choice (Manual 1, 1996).

The research component of the MM PDM curriculum was seen as ‘integrating’ in two ways. In common with other postgraduate degrees (albeit mostly Master’s and PhDs by coursework and research), the completion of a research component was associated with the development of a range of generic ‘scholarly’ capabilities, for example, problem-solving, writing, planning, critical thinking and analysis (Atkins & Redley, 1998). In MM PDM documents, the production of a research product was seen as a way of integrating the various course components in relation to a self-selected researchable problem of relevance to students’ workplaces, or a researchable, practical problem they were facing. The relationship between coursework components and the research component of this curriculum was not clearly specified. It seems that development of capabilities and integration of content relevant to these studies are assumed to have happened organically or seamlessly through individual students drawing on insights from coursework (particularly their choice of electives) and through feedback and guidance from supervisors.

An applied, user-focused research orientation was appealing to P&DM as an institution, since it seemed to offer a way of closing divides between experts and practitioners (and the knowledge they bring). ‘Practitioner-students’ were able to research topics of an immediate, problem-solving nature, guided by supervisors and assessed by a wider range of examiners who were not all university- or discipline-based (Badenhorst, 2002). The assumption was that students would draw on and integrate knowledge and skills acquired during coursework, and integrate these into a focus on a practical research problem. In this sense, the ‘capstone’ research requirement appears to have been envisaged as a ‘seamless’ extension of problem-solving skills and knowledge acquired during the courses that made up the curriculum.

Completion of the research component, however, proved to be the major hurdle for students attempting to complete the degree. This was indicated in student throughput figures for this period, with total part-time student completion rates in the
1993-1999 period averaging at 47%\textsuperscript{23} (Report 17, 2003). Although student research was implicitly viewed as a way of generating new knowledge in the region of Public Management, little of it was published or of a publishable quality or scope (Interviewee 6). There were tensions between a pedagogic rationale for the production of some kind of research output in the degree and notions that this might contribute to either problem-solving or, more ambitiously, knowledge production in the disciplinary field (Notes 12, 2001). There was also little consensus between lecturers or examiners about what was considered necessary or acceptable in terms of scope or quality (Interviewees 2, 3, 6) (Badenhorst, 2002).

In confronting poor completion rates and a lack of clarity around sequencing, progression and expected final performance increasingly experienced in the curriculum, developers began to explore the solutions that outcomes-based (and later competency-based) models appeared to offer for greater clarity about the goals of courses and the curriculum as a whole and possibilities for ‘integration’. In the next section I thus examine the third potential integrating ‘logic’ – that of learning outcomes and applied competence.

5.6.4 Learning outcomes and applied competence

P&DM began visibly engaging with thinking in national policy developments around curriculum-driven educational reform in 1995 (Minutes 1, 1995), with follow-up staff workshops in 1998 (Memo 2, 1998; Report 24, 1995; Minutes 1, 1995). Curriculum documents and interviews with lecturers reflect a range of perspectives in relation to this emerging national policy architecture.

Firstly, there was pragmatic engagement with ‘anticipated’ developments and emerging frameworks of outcomes-based education and qualifications-driven reform (in the form of the NQF) and the outcomes-based premise on which it rested. Familiarity with the emerging policy discourse and the likely structures that would emerge were seen as enabling P&DM’s qualifications and changes to qualifications

\textsuperscript{23} Block release and evening part-time students combined. Block release figures were lower than those of part-time students.
to remain market-relevant and attractive to government departments by anticipating some of the changes that would become required and pre-emptively aligning the curriculum accordingly. Workshops for academic staff were held with an external consultant expert on competence-based education, training and development, who introduced academic staff to the language and architecture of outcomes-based education and views of competence (Bellis, 1999) well before universities were required to 'record' their qualifications with the SAQA in 2000 (Report 24, 1995); (University of the Witwatersrand, 2000b).

Secondly, outcomes-based (and later competency models) appeared to offer solutions to lack of clarity around sequencing, progression and expected final performance increasingly experienced in the degree. As expressed in P&DM documentation, this move towards defining what were called “learning outcomes” was driven by attempts to find a solution to lack of clarity about overall degree objectives, specific course objectives, ways of integrating or looking for synergies or duplications between courses (Memo 2, 1998; Discussion Paper 1, 1997) and thus support P&DM’s goal of producing managers who could “get things done” (Interviewee 4). In the MM PDM curriculum, the idea of using ‘outcomes’ as a technology to describe course objectives was appealing to curriculum developers who were seeking to bring theoretical and practical contents of curriculum into relationships within and across courses in a more coherent way. It was also seen as a way to get academics to be more explicit about the basis for construction of their courses, assessment criteria and practices (Memo 2, 1998). Specifying exit-level outcomes for courses and for the degree as a whole appeared to offer a way in which individual bits of course knowledge (both theoretical and applied) could be related to the achievement of an outcome (or outcomes) at course- and degree-level. ‘Outcomes’ appeared to offer greater visibility and transparency about the objectives of individual courses and a way of conceiving of objectives and learning in uniform ways to counter the fragmentation in curriculum already experienced by staff and students in the first MM PDM curriculum iteration. Lecturer concerns about difficulties in transferring appropriate analytical skills to students (particularly those involving selection of information, constructing arguments and integrating material) were the context for the appeal of learning outcomes as a possible way of clarifying course
objectives, and in so doing, achieving a better relationship between content knowledge and skills and their application (Memo 2, 1998).

Analysis of documentary evidence suggests that difficulties in achieving coherence in this early MM PDM curriculum and promoting student learning were seen to lie predominantly in a failure to develop learning ‘skills’ within students and appropriate teaching and course design knowledge in academic staff. In the case of students, documents record the observation that “[w]e seem to leap to autonomous learning methodologies before we have provided the basic skills required to manage self-learning” (Discussion paper 1, 1997). However, it was acknowledged that the problem also lay also in lack of clarity about the desired ‘output’ of courses. “This [lack of explicitness about criteria] is in part due to the fact that we may not have a clear sense of what participants should be able to do by the end of our courses” (Discussion paper 1, 1997).

In MM PDM curriculum iterations until 1999, the notion of skill and the associated understanding of competence that was drawn on was the concept of competence as consisting of understanding, understanding the system and innovation (Bellis, 1999), (Minutes 1, 1995; Presentation 2, 1995). It was an attempt to engage with a concept of competence that allowed for a position somewhere between critiques of outcomes-based and competency-based approaches and their uncritical advocacy in South African policy discourses at the time.

However, an emphasis on learning outcomes was not well received by all academics teaching on the MM PDM degree. Concerns were raised about outcomes being reductionist and inadequate as means to simulate the workplace in classrooms, as well as doubts about whether outcomes enabled the curriculum to prepare students to be generic change-agents as opposed to functionaries within the then current work roles and contexts (Minutes 1, 1995; Notes 8, 1997). Some staff saw a conflict between educating for present realities (as represented by practical competencies vs. educating for desired (and not measurable) future realities). There was consequently some scepticism about outcomes-based logics on the part of some staff members, particularly the workability of expressing all outcomes of learning in observable, demonstrable forms and reluctance to prepare students for specific job
roles (Notes 5, 1995). While course descriptions may have increasingly reflected outcomes-based language, it seems that some academics may have engaged with this more as a matter of compliance than as a matter of changing the way they taught and designed their courses (Interviewees 3 and 4).

Curriculum development documents, however, continue to reflect a possible ‘solution’ to achieving greater coherence in the MM PDM curriculum by exploiting the opportunities for greater clarity and explicitness in course objectives that outcomes or competency-based models appeared to provide. The difficulties of working with an outcomes logic are illustrated in one of the outputs of a Curriculum Review Meeting in 1997 attempting to give some clarity on difficulties experienced with sequencing in the MM PDM through the development of what was termed ‘learning milestones’ (developed in accordance with the definition of competence used in these curriculum iterations). The intention was to use these ‘learning milestones’ to enable a more explicit guide for what needed to be known and demonstrated in each course, i.e. as a guide for organising the sequencing of contents in the degree. An example of the draft ‘Learning Milestones’ that were produced at this time (see Table 13) indicate the shift to attempting to see courses in outcomes-based terms and to try and develop a sequencing logic for knowledge, attitudes and skills across courses.
Table 13: MM PDM ‘Learning Milestones’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of applied competence</th>
<th>Courses in the MM PDM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Paradigms for Public and Development Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Concepts of governance, systems, development and equity as well as introduction to ideas of democracy and their constitutional implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Handling complex judgments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Selection strategies, writing and presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Notes 8, 1997).

Progression in knowledge development is seen in relation to horizontal accumulation of concepts, propositional knowledge in the forms of concepts, models and theories. In this initial learning milestones document there is no reflection of progression in terms of complexity or level of difficulty. I argue that this represented the start of a new search for ways of creating a more integrated curriculum through appealing to a generic logic of competence. That was not able to be translated into explicit principles for organising curriculum content and progression in terms of levels of
complexity or difficulty. This is discussed further in the next chapter and analysed in Chapters Seven and Eight.

5.7 Summary and discussion

In this chapter I have presented a rich description of an attempt to develop and implement an integrated-type of curriculum in a Masters degree in Public Management in South Africa – the MM PDM – during the 1993-1999 period. I traced the historical antecedents of this curriculum, its genesis in an ideological project of political transformation and the early years of attempting to implement this pioneer curriculum.

To achieve this curriculum, architects needed a logic or relational idea around which curriculum contents could be brought and held together to enable a common sense of purpose for students and lecturers. In this chapter, I identified, named and described the logics that were used to try and integrate curriculum contents or provide the ‘glue’ to enable the development of an integrated curriculum.

Firstly, curriculum developers tried to construct and drive through a common vision of a post-apartheid, public manager and a new type of professional. The ideal public manager graduate was seen as being able to actively drive organisational change towards a post-bureaucratic form, to draw pragmatically on ‘new’ ideas about efficiency and accountability deriving from private sector management practices, and to combine these approaches to further the aims of the developmental state. The way forward was seen to lie in a turn to some of the principles exemplified by orientations to management and NPM in the USA, the UK, Australia and New Zealand. The pioneer MM PDM curriculum attempted to adopt some of these principles of market and private sector efficiency and temper them through a focus on applying them to a context that was ‘developmental’ both in terms of economy and in terms of a contested process of shaping a new society. In this early curriculum period, the ideal public manager (as projected in curriculum documents) was someone loyal to the ideology of taking ‘the struggle’ to a new terrain, and someone who was technically and inter-personally skilled, committed and able to transform a bureaucratic organisational from into an efficient, effective post-bureaucratic organisation to deliver on the promises of the newly elected
government to its citizens. Initially, this vision was mostly shared by a small, close-
knit group of pioneers (not all of whom had worked in higher education previously),
who – although not sharing common disciplinary or practitioner backgrounds –
broadly shared a common vision of this ideal curriculum product. They relied on this
vision and on intensive interaction to maintain links between the diverse parts of the
curriculum, although this integration does not always seem to have been explicit to
students and new, incoming academic staff. While this was the predominant
integrating idea for the 1993-1999 MM PDM curriculum period, it became more
difficult to maintain as P&DM grew, members of the pioneer group moved on, new
staff came in and higher education in South Africa came under increasing pressure
financially.

Early MM PDM curriculum developers relied on two other key interacting integrating
logics to drive this vision and identity through the curriculum. One was by attempting
to hold contents together in ‘interdisciplinary’ ways (that were in practice, mostly an
unstructured, multi-disciplinarity) where the broad themes of policy, development and
management were combined in eclectic ways and seem to have been interpreted
differently depending on the perspectives of individual lecturers who taught the
courses and their prior disciplinary, intellectual and work backgrounds.
‘Management’ existed in tension with the fields of ‘policy’ and ‘development’, with
competing, and increasingly implicit, positions or stances interacting in relation to all
three. Documents reflect ambiguity about relationships between these themes, their
emphases and centrality in the curriculum and the identities they attempted to
privilege (generic manager, public manager, managerialist or development activist).
While some notion of interdisciplinarity or multi-disciplinarity was endorsed as an
integrating rationale, it was never translated into principles for organising content.
Where interdisciplinary concepts and models were drawn on, they seem to have
been championed by individual lecturers (especially within their own courses) and
fell away when these individuals moved on. What was left was possibly more like
non-interacting disciplinarities or themes drawn from different disciplines.

In the 1993-1999 period, pedagogy, and a particular approach to it (that of
experiential learning), was turned into a way of trying to hold together the disparate
contents of the MM PDM curriculum. There was a strong focus on pedagogy (or the
Transmission of knowledge) as the means to developing a common experiential teaching culture focused on endorsement of a teaching ‘methodology’ into which new staff were (or were intended to be) inducted. This was most strongly represented by experiential learning (and a focus on reflection) and was exhibited in ‘non-traditional’ particular instructional techniques, the most visible being the use of the case method. An adult-learning-centred, experiential pedagogy seemed to offer the possibility of bringing together practical and theoretical knowledge, different staff and student knowledge and abilities, and enable knowledge and new identities to be constructed through interactive processes. In Maton’s terms, the early MM PDM curriculum favoured a knower rather than knowledge identity (Maton, 2006).

In order to provide some basis for engaging with the fragmentation that this produced, from its inception P&DM was receptive to the possibilities for ‘integration’ offered by notions of competence-based and outcomes-based approaches and expressions of curriculum intentions and aims in terms of cross-curricular outcomes. A third possible relational logic entered the picture more strongly towards the end of the 1990s in the form of appeals to notions of competence. Influenced to some extent by the qualifications-driven educational reform discourses shaping South African education policy at the time, P&DM began experimenting with using ‘output-based’ approaches to course design to try and recreate or refine a common vision of the ideal product of the MM PDM curriculum before actually required to do so in 2000 by policy interventions in higher education.

In the constructivist notion of knowledge that underpinned this approach to pedagogy and identity construction, boundaries between lecturers and students, theoretical and practical knowledge, and between novices and experts would be reconfigured or removed. In so doing, two threads within adult education learning theory that were drawn on to legitimate this logic were those of experiential learning and, particularly, a perspective of ‘reflection’. In common, they shared an ideal of an envisaged learner actively constructing knowledge, a teacher’s role as a generalist and facilitator of knowledge, and a foregrounding of processes of learning. Knowledge as a category independent of knowing was backgrounded, assumed or underspecified. The unstated underpinnings of the teaching approach were broadly constructivist and progressivist (discussed further in Chapter Seven).
Each relational idea generated particular contradictions and tensions for the early MM PDM curriculum. Despite very demanding and labour-intensive attempts at creating a common vision and pedagogy amongst staff and students, in this curriculum iteration, practical difficulties were experienced and undermined the achievement of the less stated educational goals of the curriculum. Completion rates for the degree were not improving over time and the common vision that had held many staff together was increasingly no longer shared or explicit. Tensions remained between the practical and theoretical objectives of the curriculum, and in terms of agreement on how to define and appropriately assess student performance and curriculum fragmentation. These tensions existed in a political, economic and social context where external funding for P&DM was no longer secure, where income-generating short courses became key to survival of the school, and where government and educational policy-makers began asserting more direct and indirect influence on the curriculum.

In Kaplan’s terms, this organisational phase of can be characterised as one of “differentiation” (Kaplan, 1996-25) where the pioneer(s) and core staff leave, a need for structure trumps informality, and where new staff without dependency on the charismatic leader arrive. The organisation may lose its cutting edge as it attempts to become more efficient through specialisation, standardisation and division of labour, sometimes leading to alienation. By the end of the time period reviewed in Chapter Five, P&DM was looking towards changed or new possible integrating rationales to signal this responsiveness to external pressures, to rekindle an integrating vision that could better hold curriculum contents together and improve on student throughput and graduation. In the next chapter, Chapter Six, I continue to build this case by tracing the second round of curriculum development during the period from 2000-2005 examining the relational logics in similar ways.
Chapter 6 : Curriculum from 1999-2005

6.1 Introduction

In 1996, P&DM began a process of curriculum review that culminated in changes to the MM PDM degree, subsequently implemented during the 2000-2005 period. This curriculum review and later revisions were primarily driven by concerns on the part of some academics teaching on the degree about the relevance and marketability of the qualification to government (and its changing priorities) and concerns (on the part of the university and P&DM academics) about improving student completion rates.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the second round of curriculum revisions. Through further exploration of the revisions themselves, and what the data reflect about the reasons these revisions came about, I examine how curriculum developers continued to search for a means of better integrating curriculum contents, improving student performance and making the degree more relevant to the public service at the time.

I argue that data reflect shifts in ways of trying to overcome fragmentation (or seeking integration) in the MM PDM curriculum and signal greater “economic responsiveness” (Moll, 2004:3) in curriculum to policy imperatives in both the higher education field and the public service. While the curriculum was still seen as a vehicle for attempting to shape civil servant identity, the nature of this identity became more diffuse and the knowledge and approach viewed as appropriate for doing this more contested. In this chapter I examine these new attempts to forge ‘integration’ in the curriculum, the tensions they produced – particularly for the unresolved academic/professional tension – and the difficulties in terms of producing improvements in student progression and successful completion.

I begin by outlining changes in the political and higher education policy context and then look at changes to the MM PDM curriculum in the period from 2000-2005. I examine changes in the composition of P&DM’s academic staff, its identity and its students, and then go on to outline the dominant aspirant integrating logics reflected
in this 2000-2005 period and the difficulties experienced in implementing them in practice.

6.2 The political and policy context: Higher education, the public sector and regulative discourse

During the period that this thesis covers, Jansen argues that South African higher education faced its most concerted phase of social engineering (Jansen, 2003:55) as it attempted to deal with the legacy of apartheid education, a low skills base and a declining economy. There were two parallel and related policy developments that impacted on curriculum in South African higher education during the late 1990s and early 2000s as they began to be implemented.

The first set of policy developments were national skills initiatives to address low levels and shortages of key skills, and the second were initiatives to address the poor quality of education and training. Within a broader, global perspective, South Africa tried to merge a neo-liberal focus on global competitiveness (Bond, 2000) with a simultaneous focus on transforming an education and training system to facilitate greater access and equity.

The NQF and its implementation through SAQA was seen by policy-makers as the vehicle to drive qualifications-driven education reform through a blurring of boundaries between the education and training spheres, between everyday knowledge and academic knowledge, and between disciplines, as well as reducing structural distinctions and articulation between them in order to meet demands of industry. This strategy was based on several assumptions and principles. One was that the best route to educational reform (in terms of quality and alignment with global norms and competitiveness) was through a focus on qualifications-driven reform. A second assumption was that alignment of the academic education and the vocational training spheres was possible through qualifications regulation. One of the logics behind South Africa curriculum policy reform was a belief that all similar types of qualifications could offer comparable levels of knowledge and skills irrespective of how knowledge was acquired. This was reflected in the emphasis on a credit exchange discourse (Ensor, 2004) in South African higher education, which stressed a shift away from the knowledge associated with subjects or disciplines as the basis
for progression through a qualification, stressing instead a logic of modularisation. Modules or ‘units’ would be described in terms of generic outcomes to be achieved, which would then – in theory– make different modules comparable and transferable.

Review of the MM PDM curriculum was influenced by these changes, with P&DM attempting to pre-empt or second-guess some of the likely developments in educational policy-making by doing some curriculum changes (for example, writing up courses and qualification descriptions in terms of outcomes) before being required to do so by the DoE (Notes 1 (n.d.). Most South African universities, including the University of the Witwatersrand, at the time subscribed to a whole qualifications approach (or “institutional approach” (Young, 2008a:131)) to curriculum development, in opposition to the unit standards approach initially endorsed by the Department of Labour (DoL) (DoE, 31 May, 2000). South African universities submitted their qualifications to SAQA for ‘recording’ on the NQF in 2000 in the format of an outcomes-based language to support the notion of credit exchange. By this stage, at P&DM, this largely involved retrofitting existing qualification descriptions (including the MM PDM) to new reporting requirements, as staff with an educational background were already familiar with these policy debates and formulations and had begun a process of engaging with the technology of outcomes in previous curriculum iterations. As observed in the UK in relation to postgraduate, taught, conversion Masters degrees and quality assurance compliance, this compliance resulted in large amounts of detailed institutional level documentation relating to standards and quality assurance, but it was less clear whether this was understood by ordinary staff members, including the part-time staff on whom these degrees often rely (Atkins & Redley, 1998).

There were also policy changes in relation to the public administration sector. The dominant rationale for policy changes in both the higher education and public administration policy arenas was a concern about poor ‘performance’ in its broadest sense, with poor economic competitiveness and student throughput being

\[\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\text{ I was involved in the University of the Witwatersrand’s SAQA qualifications submission process in 2000 on behalf of the Faculty of Management as it was then called (University of the Witwatersrand, (2000b).}\]
emphasised by the higher education sector and poor delivery of services by the public administration sector. In the case of higher education, this translated into pressures on universities to review the appropriacy, relevance and responsiveness of curricula to the economic and racial transformation imperatives of the state (DoE, 1997; DoE, 2001). In the arena of public administration, a discourse of ‘improved service delivery’ became the dominant projected view of the state, replacing a previous policy orientation towards reconstruction and development (McLennan, 2007a). State policy in this period reflected an emphasis on decentralisation and improved performance in the public service to be delivered increasingly through the ‘tools’ of NPM (Chipkin, 2008; Paine, 1999). These changes and their implications for P&DM were summed up in its 2003 Academic Plan.

The market that P&DM serves has shifted from a focus on policy development to the tools and challenges of implementation in a resource strapped economy. This shifting agenda has forced P&DM to assess its course offerings and re-engineer them for changing market needs (Plan 1, 2003).

In the occupational field, national training authorities in the form of Sectoral Education and Training Authorities (SETAs) were also established. Although the Public Services SETA (PSETA) and Local Government SETA (LGSETA) were the two SETAs with the most obvious relevance to the Public Sector and to P&DM, the activities of other SETAs related to functional areas would also become significant (e.g. Health and Welfare Services). Academics, including some at P&DM, became involved in some of the key standards-generating processes that would later become the responsibility of SETAs. A Standards Generating Body (SGB) was registered for Generic Management and another for Public Administration, and unit standards began to be generated. ‘Management’ as driven by ‘generic’ private sector principles, values and practices became dominant in the setting of unit standards for the Generic Management SGB. An example of a unit standard is included as Appendix J for illustrative purposes. The SGB for Public Administration also developed a generic matrix of qualifications, made up of unit standards and reflecting many of the language and principles of generic management. Students doing Public Administration qualifications based on these unit standards could (according to the
assumptions and architecture of the NQF and SAQA) build up to qualifications comprising of these units.

The six schools of public management that were part of JUPMET, of which P&DM was one, were involved to various degrees in the standards-generating processes. The work of initial standards-generation within JUPMET was done by a small team plagued by constant problems related to lack of funding and poor attendance (Minutes 10, 2001). There was limited participation in the SGB from the universities in general, with much of the agenda being driven by the technikons, who embraced the opportunities presented by re-curriculation for institutions other than traditional universities to offer a full qualifications range from National Certificate to Doctor of Technology (DTech) and the opportunity to offer degrees (Burger, 2000).

The university sector adopted different institutional responses to these developments. There were mixed reactions from the higher education disciplinary field of Public Administration to these standards-generating initiatives. P&DM perceived it as necessary for universities to be involved to try and influence the shape of the emerging unit standards to try and prevent the worst forms of technicism (that would later emerge (see Allais, 2007)) and to protect the variety of offerings that already existed in higher education institutions. However the work was time-consuming, requiring voluntarism from all SGB members and there was deep scepticism about the process of standards-generation (Clapper, 2000) from some sections of university academia. At P&DM and within the SGB itself, there were concerns about the poor participation of universities on the Public Administration SGB (relative to technikons, organised labour and employers) (Minutes 10, 2001) and the suitability of the unit standards approach for P&DM’s short courses. However, as examined in Chapter Five, P&DM had already begun actively incorporating some of the thinking on outcomes-based description and generic competencies into their curriculum revisions in an attempt to seek better integration of practice and theory and to try and improve curriculum coherence and clarity about curriculum objectives.

P&DM displayed a similar responsiveness to policy changes in the Department of Public Services and Administration (DPSA) and its endorsement of competency-
based movements in the public sector. Rapid transformation of the civil service in equity terms had not been matched by sufficient improvements in the competence and performance of civil servants, which was blamed for what was categorised as poor service delivery (DPSA, 2000). The DPSA saw the solution to poor performance in managerial terms, locating improvement in the development of a Senior Management Service (SMS) Competency Framework that could form the basis for performance assessment. An SMS framework was introduced by the DPSA in 2001 (DPSA, 2001a). This framework was to underpin all human resource processes for recruitment and selection, performance management, training and other functions in the civil service. The DPSA argued that managers were being promoted out of their area of competence and were not being properly prepared and trained for their new responsibilities (DPSA, 2000). There was little consideration of career development or planning for succession and there was not a common understanding of competencies needed for creating and building leaders in public administration (DPSA, 2000; DPSA, 2003). This SMS framework would influence the design of the 2004 MM PDM curriculum, as curriculum developers attempted to adopt notions of generic competence and competency frameworks as visible logics for the organisation of curriculum, albeit pragmatically and often largely symbolically (Interviewee 4).

6.3 Revisions to the MM PDM curriculum 2000 and 2005

The MM PDM curriculum review process began in 1996 and culminated in two revisions to the MM PDM introduced in 2000 and 2004, respectively, along with the introduction of a new Masters degree in public policy. The outline of the two MM PDM curriculum iterations is summarised in Table 14. In both the 2000 and 2004 curriculum iterations, the rationale for change to the structure of the degree, particularly its modular orientation and multiple entrance and exit points, were driven by similar imperatives. A motivation for change was economic, expressed in documents and interviews as relating to the sustainability of P&DM as it attempted to respond to the more assertive, expressed training needs of government, comply with the qualifications-driven reform demands of educational policy, and project the school as relevant to the market (Proposal 2, 1998; Report 11, 2001). Both academics at P&DM and university reviewers of P&DM as a school noted concerns
about the completion rates of students. On average 25% of students admitted between 1993 and 2010 did not compete the course work (Presentation 1, 2010)\textsuperscript{25} and throughput for the MM PDM degree as a whole between 2000 and 2005 ranged from 26% to 51% across modes of delivery part-time, full-time and block release) (Report 1, 2006). Many failed to complete the research component of the degree and there was acknowledgement that many students were “struggling with academic training” (Notes 13, 2001).

\textsuperscript{25} Data reported in this chapter are from Wits University Management Information Unit (MIU) unless indicated otherwise.
Table 14: MM PDM Curriculum 2000 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Classification of courses</th>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>Type of course and NQF level</th>
<th>Classification of courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Methods and Information Literacy</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Basic competencies</td>
<td>Managing Information and Communications</td>
<td>Fundamental NQF Level 7</td>
<td>Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and Managing Organisations</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>Fundamental Level 7</td>
<td>Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Governance</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Governance and Development</td>
<td>Fundamental Level 7</td>
<td>Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Management and Service Delivery</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Managing Service Delivery</td>
<td>Fundamental Level 7</td>
<td>Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector and Development Finance</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Economics and Public Finance</td>
<td>Fundamental Level 7</td>
<td>Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Process</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Fundamental Level 7</td>
<td>Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Context</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Approaches to Development</td>
<td>Core Level 8</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing People and Change</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Managing People in Organisations</td>
<td>Core Level 8</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, Leadership, Competing Values and Ethics</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Strategy and Leadership</td>
<td>Core Level 8</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Project Management Skills</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Basic competencies</td>
<td>Policy Management and Evaluation</td>
<td>Core Level 8</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five elective courses selected from a range clustered in specialist streams, e.g. Local Governance and Development, Policy, Economic Policy, IT</td>
<td>Elective course</td>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>Four elective courses</td>
<td>Elective course Level 8</td>
<td>Specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design and Methods</td>
<td>Research Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Design and Methods</td>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Report</td>
<td>Research Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: University of the Witwatersrand, Faculty of Management, Rules and Syllabuses (2000-2003), University of the Witwatersrand, Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, Rules and Syllabuses (2004-2005) (Notes 16, 1999)).

26 In this curriculum iteration ‘core’ meant compulsory. ‘Fundamental’ was conceived of as all courses needed as a base for students who wanted to study further in this area, i.e. Public Management, ‘core’ in this 2004 iteration refers to courses taken at a higher level in a particular programme (Faculty of Management, University of the Witwatersrand. (n.d.) Proposal for the restructuring of qualifications to Masters level). ‘Elective’ means open to selection from a range offered. (Notes 16, 1999).
The MM PDM degree continued to be a coursework Masters degree with a research component (minor dissertation) as the final assessment\(^{28}\). However, there was greater attention to exit and progression routes than in the previous curriculum iterations and the beginning of a modular or ‘credit accumulation’ logic. I discuss these developments in more detail in the next section.

### 6.3.1 Overview of changes to the MM PDM curriculum

In the first round of curriculum revisions (2000), a new Diploma in Public and Development Management was introduced. This was done in order to provide a progression route from diploma to Masters degree and an exit route for those not progressing or able to progress to the Masters degree. As noted, this signalled the beginning of a modular or ‘credit accumulation’ logic to progression. The 2000 curriculum revision is depicted in the figure below.

Figure 2: MM PDM Curriculum 2000 Progression Route

(Source: Summarised from (University of the Witwatersrand, 2000a)).

\(^{28}\) At this point in time, the total credits allocated for the minor dissertation (referred to as a Research Report in Faculty Rules and Syllabuses) was still 25%.
In terms of sequencing and pacing, the 2004 revisions explicitly took this modular logic further by breaking down the MM PDM degree into a three-stage certificate-to-postgraduate diploma-to-Masters route (summarised in Figure 3).

Figure 3: Progression Route From Certificate to Diploma to Masters Degree 2004

(Source: Summarised from (University of the Witwatersrand, 2004)).

The six “fundamental” courses, comprising the Professional Certificate in Public and Development Management (PCPM), were regarded as providing the frameworks and concepts necessary for progression from certificate to diploma/Masters level and were intended to stress application of concepts and frameworks and research (Notes 11, 1999). Successful completion of the PCPM (with a requisite grade and the production of a portfolio of tasks demonstrating integration of contents) allowed entry into the Diploma in Public and Development Management (PDM PDM). The diploma comprised five core courses, on completion of which students could progress to complete their research and exit with a Masters degree.

The 2000 and 2004 MM PDM curriculum iterations introduced a new integrating logic which I have referred to as genericism as reflected in the motivations for curriculum restructuring. I discuss the integrating logic of genericism in more
detail in Section 6.6, but below I briefly describe how it was reflected in the structure of the 2000 and 2004 curricula.

The 2000 MM PDM curriculum introduced what was seen as a “building block structure” (Proposal 2, 1999). This signalled the beginning of a modularisation logic in curriculum built around different entrance and exit points, influenced by the credit exchange discourse of the NQF (Ensor, 2003). The initial section of the Masters curriculum (also marketed independently as a postgraduate certificate) was explicitly designed to be a stand-alone, marketable product for training of staff in government departments. The PCPM did not have the same entrance requirements as diploma or Masters degrees but was seen as being equivalent to the first six masters courses in ‘outcomes’ and content terms. Students who did not fulfil entrance requirements to enter directly in the diploma-to-Masters degree route could do the certificate courses, and subject to both performance and the completion of an integrating portfolio, they could then gain entry to the diploma and subsequently the MM PDM. This structure allowed for keeping an alternative entrance route open to promising students who did not meet entrance requirements for a Masters degree. They could prove themselves on the PCPM and be encouraged to progress into the Masters programme. This was a strategy for increasing student numbers in the degree as well as for P&DM being able to meet what it saw as its access/redress or ‘developmental’ agenda (Discussion Paper 12, 1996; Discussion Paper 10, 1996; Discussion Paper 1, 1997). This structure was also envisaged to enable rationalising of resources, since the same ‘generic’ courses would be taught for income-generating as well as degree purposes to different groups of students.

In the 2004 curriculum, this modular logic was developed further. In terms of sequencing, the six fundamental courses (the certificate courses) were intended to provide the contextual and theoretical foundations (or ‘frameworks’) of the disciplinary field of Public Management. The five core courses were intended to then translate these foundations into practical and applicable management skills and expertise (i.e. to be the more practically-oriented parts of the MM PDM degree referred to as “applications”) (Notes 11, 1999). In the envisaged

29 It was subsequently run for the Department of Land Affairs (2004) and the Gauteng Education Department (2005) (Report 1, 2006).
sequencing, conceptual knowledge would precede procedural knowledge or application. The first six courses (the PCPM) were designed to be the knowledge-based courses that would provide the concepts, principles and discourse that would then be supplemented by more practical hands-on orientation, i.e. a logic of knowledge about appropriate concepts and frameworks, preceding practical, technical application (Discussion Paper 6, 1999). The PCPM courses drew on the assumption of outcomes-based education that different content and assessment could demonstrate the same exit-level outcomes for the courses. This curriculum iteration also introduced an apparent way for curriculum developers to resolve tensions in relation to genericism versus specialisation in the curriculum. It developed ‘streams’ intended to run across degrees, which would enable students to specialise in either functional areas (e.g. health, defence, local government) or in specialist knowledge areas (e.g. economics, finance, policy, analytical methods, governance) by selecting an appropriate group of electives after completion of their core and fundamental courses (Notes 16, 1999). Curriculum documents reflect extensive discussion of these streams and how competence in a particular stream could be built by combining ‘generic’ foundational courses, followed by specialist courses, particularly in the Economics and Development areas of teaching. This specialisation (in a functional area) in combination with the research report in the same area was intended to allow students to build their knowledge, understanding and skills in a particular sector (e.g. health) or knowledge area (e.g. rural development) to assist their performance and career prospects. These specialist areas were offered primarily on the basis of staff expertise, offering one of the few opportunities for staff to teach within their disciplinary or interest areas. A wide range of electives was offered on paper (University of the Witwatersrand, 2000a), although what was taught in practice was limited by the actual number of students who selected the courses, and by availability of academics to teach in these specialist areas. The selection of specialisation streams was short-lived due to their financial unsustainability (the high costs of running many courses for small numbers of students on each) and the streaming-specialisation logic was removed as compulsory in the 2004 curriculum iteration.

There were also changes that influenced pacing in this curriculum. Since the beginning of the MM PDM degree there were progressive changes to the design of the degree to introduce more ‘flexible’ modes of delivery (part-time and then
block-release in 2000) to accommodate (and derive income from) modes of
delivery suitable for government departments and students based outside the
geographical feeder areas of Johannesburg and Pretoria. However, these
changes to the pacing of curriculum affected completion rates with block release
students having lower completion rates than part-timers (Report 1, 2006). Block-
release modes of delivery experienced difficulties with poor student attendance
and a semi-distance mode of delivery (Report 22, 2001). In both the 2000 and
2004 iterations of the curriculum, the degree was intended to be completed in a
minimum of 2 years part-time (part-time and block-release modes of delivery) or
in a year full-time, with a maximum of four years (part-time) to complete. In
practice, the coursework was completed within two years and the average
number of years to complete all components (including the research was
between 3 and 5 years for block release and part-time students) (Report 1, 2006,
Section 1g). Graduation rates for block-release were lower than those for part-
and full-time students (21% vs. 43% over the period 2000-2005) (Report 1, 2006,
Section 1g). This was attributed to unfamiliarity with and under-resourcing of a
resource-intensive, distance education mode of delivery. The number of contact
hours per course was also progressively reduced to cope with increased
numbers of courses in the curriculum and perceptions of student and teaching
staff overload. In the 2000 curriculum, all courses were 30 contact teaching
hours, and in the 2004 curriculum this was reduced to 24 contact teaching hours.

The 2000 curriculum also introduced a credit-bearing course (Research Design
and Methods) to introduce students to postgraduate research and to prepare
them for writing a proposal and reporting on research (University of the
Witwatersrand, 2000a). This course was introduced to try and address problems
of poor degree completion rates (Proposal 2, 1999). Over the course of the time
period reviewed, the MM PDM curriculum mostly followed a sequencing logic of
coursework first and then research. There were various experiments around
changing the sequencing logic between coursework and research components
(i.e. running coursework and research components in parallel, or over several
teaching blocks).

30 The Masters degree was delivered in concentrated, residential teaching blocks – four per year.
The streaming-specialisation logic of the elective coursework envisaged that assessment tasks and contents of the elective courses would enable better preparation for the research component (through engagement with literature related to selected research topics). In practice, however, any sequencing logic between elective courses and the research component was largely dependent on individual lecturer intervention in the specific course that they taught and how they may or may not have connected their course to tasks or knowledge to assist and build towards the design and conduct of research (Interview 6; e-mail 3, 2001). There was little evidence of how this progression worked in practice and what knowledge or level of conceptual difficulty was being sequenced.

### 6.4 Changing academics and changing students

Documentation reflects a change in the composition and nature of academics and students in the period from the late 1990s until 2005. This was confirmed in interviews and is discussed in the following two sections.

#### 6.4.1 The students

The majority of students admitted in this period were working students in junior and middle-management government positions who studied part-time in the evenings or on a block-release basis. They came from a range of government sectors (Report 14, 2000). On average, 90% were Black African (reflecting the South African categorisation of students from ‘previously disadvantaged’ educational backgrounds) (Report 1, 2006). Class sizes continued to increase over the period from 1998-2005 in response to funding constraints (see Table 15).
Table 15: Student Enrolments by Degree (1st Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MM PDM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Postgraduate Diploma in Management (P&amp;DM)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from Report 1, 2006:12).

The increase in class sizes was not, however, matched by increasing graduation rates, which indicate a range of 26-51% of students between the years 2000 and 25 (Report 1, 2006:13). Students from this period are described by interviewees as being less idealist and more career-focused than their earlier counterparts (Interviewees 2,3,4,5 and 6) and as focused on certification and credentials (Interviewees 2 and 6; Report 13, 1998). Interviewees pointed out to having to spend more time teaching ‘the basics’ of their respective subject areas, for example, politics, statistics and economics (Interviewees 3, 4, 5, 6). Lecturers noted that these newer students were not as senior as their predecessors, and that some were not even line managers or in managerial positions, giving them little management work experience to draw on in relation to the pedagogic practice of reflection (Report 13, 1998). Analysis of the first cohort of block-release students and their stated job roles confirms this observation (Report 14, 2000).

6.4.2 The lecturers

As examined in Chapter Five, academics at P&DM were mostly held together in the early curriculum by a prospective project, a vision of contributing to a new civil service and society and, in some cases, a political project of support for the new ruling party. The overarching integrating ‘glue’ for curriculum was ideological in P&DM’s visioning of a future civil service and the type of society that it served.

31 These were students admitted via the RPL Diploma entrance route, some of whom went on to complete the Masters courses. This route was closed as an exit route by the University of the Witwatersrand in response to changes to the NQF/SAQA DoE. (2007). The Higher Education Qualifications Framework, Government Gazette No 30353. Pretoria: Government Printer.
This common ideological integrating idea in the 2000-2005 period was not strongly expressed in curriculum documents. In reflecting on the identity of P&DM in 1998, a planning document notes three different ideas about the identity of the school as expressed by staff.

*One view is that we are a unique combination of the US style public policy school and South African (British?) style public administration. The implications of this are a focus on both intellectual development and professional skills building i.e. writing skills and media skills etc. Another way was that our curricula reflect a tension between policy and management and needed to incorporate a wider notion of professional education. A third felt that our courses reflect the Mount Grace vision (Plan 3, 1998).*

Attempts to establish a common curriculum vision were now driven more formally by a different group, including some of the original pioneers, with more focus on teaching and academic development (Notes 18, 2005) and with assumptions of implementation by a wider core or lecturers. As with the previous curriculum developments, considerable time was spent on curriculum discussions. Staff turnover during the 1993-1998 period was high (Report 2, 1998; Report 7 n.d.) and P&DM had become accustomed to working with what was termed a “revolving door” between theory and practice” (Report 2, 1998:10). As staff moved in and out of government, extensive use was made of part-time lecturers (working as consultants, or in government and NGOs), academic staff furthered their qualifications and moved on (or became consultants). Interviewees reported a change in the type of lecturer who now joined. This was described as a shift towards more ‘academics’ being appointed and bringing with them more traditional approaches to teaching and engaging with students than their earlier counterparts (Interviewees 2, 5 and 6).

There were numerous tensions around the finances of the school, specifically around a move from donor funding to sustainability in terms of income generation and managing on the resources provided by the university, tensions which were reflected in various internal P&DM documents (Report 1, 2006; Report 10, 2001). Donor funding, which had formed the seed money for P&DM and its initial MM PDM curriculum, had now largely dried up. The school was more and more pressurised to operate within increasing university financial constraints, supplemented by what it could generate from its own third-stream income. This
income was derived from the teaching of income-generating short courses for government, from consultancy work and from limited funded research.

In addition, Wits University as a whole faced its own financial constraints arising from cuts in subsidy to the tertiary sector and rising student debt (Report 10, 2001). This resulted in rationalisation moves to consolidate faculties into ‘super-faculties’, greater pressure on schools and departments to justify their presence and existence as independent, financially viable entities, and a more managerialist approach to university administration (Barchiesi, 2000; Johnson, 2005; Webster & Mosoetsa, 2002). While P&DM had operated in this income-generating manner since its inception, pressure on other university departments to pursue similar practices resulted in inter-departmental competition for external resources, greater inter-departmental rivalry and greater pressure on schools to pursue income-generating activities (Report 10, 2001). The notion of rationalising P&DM and the Wits Business School emerged from time to time in internal university debates (Interviewee 6), but despite “living in the shadow of the Business School” (a reference to the sister Wits Business School) (Fieldnotes 1, 2008), P&DM maintained a public argument for the difference between public and private sector management and for independence of the two schools. P&DM consciously attempted to stay close to the training and development priorities of government with a diminishing focus on NGOs and CBOs in degree programmes (Report 9, 1996). The composition of an external curriculum advisory group for P&DM in 2001 (Notes 9, 2001) reflects this orientation, with members being former students (now with high-profile positions in government), former staff and in high profile in government and departments and Standards Generating Body members (Minutes 3, 2001).

Academics saw their primary identities in different ways as evidenced in their orientations towards judgement of quality student research (Badenhorst, 2002) and the varied accredited journals and other forms in which they published. The accredited journals were from the disciplinary fields of Law, Health, International Affairs, Information and Communications, Development, Political Science, Education, Urban Planning, Security, Labour, Geography, Political Economy and Public Administration/Management (Report 1, 2005; Report 2, 1998). However publication rates were considered low and attributed to a small number of staff (Report 1, 2005; Report 2, 1998).
From 1999, P&DM began to formally organise academic staff into structures called ‘Learning Areas’ to try and address academic fragmentation. These were initially called Economics and Development; Governance, Organisation and Management; and Policy. These learning areas were an attempt to provide a “discussion, learning and management forum for individuals who share a particular key functional or “disciplinary’ focus” (Proposal 1 (n.d.). They were intended to bring academics together across degrees and income-generating programmes and across sectors (e.g. health, defence, local government, education). They also aimed to provide a structure for the co-ordination of the sequencing and content of cognate and related courses. The learning areas were envisaged to provide a focus for research and publication and to co-ordinate courses and consultancies for third-stream income (Minutes 6, 2000). In effect, they were expected to function as entrepreneurial hubs and also to provide an intellectual home for a multi-disciplinary academic staff. These learning areas had varying success as attempts to deepen intellectual debate, although some were successful at initiating collaborative publications (especially the Policy and Governance, and Organisation and Management areas). A sample of minutes available from various learning area meetings reflect staff concerns about poor staff attendance and commitment to the learning areas, with a few key members driving initiatives. They also reflect concerns about a dominance of administrative discussions, organisation of teaching loads, sequencing and staffing of courses, supervision management, external examiner lists), and initiating and sustaining income-generating short courses (Minutes 6, 2000). They also functioned as ‘holding spaces’ for academics to discuss sequencing and selection on cognate courses in the area of policy, and for some engagement on course content and teaching practice.

Despite recognition of the need for, and attempts at, improving collegiality (Discussion Paper 2, 1997), the shared ideological vision that characterised the first MM PDM curriculum increasingly became more implicit and was left more open to individual emphases in teaching.

*Do we need a broad P&DM approach in terms of values and concepts which underpins our courses? By this I do not mean that we should teach X, H or T, but understand that what we teach is underpinned by a*
Despite the introduction of the learning areas as ‘intellectual homes’ that could be a catalyst for academic staff research, the school's own self-analysis report (Report 1, 2006) expressed concerns about low accredited publication output and dominance of publishing by a few staff members. Difficulties in building P&DM’s institutional research capacity was acknowledged within P&DM especially in relation to collaboration and research (Discussion Paper 5, (n.d.)). Lecturers tended to publish outside of Public Administration journals (Report 1, 2006; Report 2, 1998) and did not share common intellectual interests.

Debates at the Mount Grace II Conference held at the end of 1999 indicate this weakness in the South African Public Administration/Management disciplinary field more widely (Theron & Schwella, 2000). The development of appropriate knowledge through research in the academic field of Public Management and staff capacity to develop and teach key areas of knowledge and understanding in the ‘new’ field of Public Management in South Africa field were highlighted as weaknesses across the South African schools of public administration (Cameron, 2008; Mabin, 2004a). In the South African Public Administration field, there was poor accredited publication output and a high number of publications that could not be accredited because of their applied, practice-driven nature and intellectual property considerations (e.g. policy papers, government policy documents, position papers, framework documents). The quality of publications in South African Public Administration journals was judged as poor and tending to focus on problem-solving (Cameron & McLaverty, 2008). In Cameron and McLaverty’s research, the focus of published output was categorised as “descriptive, normative and/or identify[ing] problems and variables for future study” (Cameron & McLaverty, 2008:91) limiting theory development within Public Administration. They concluded that “there appears to be a low level of conceptualisation in the field, perhaps one step removed from practitioners ‘day-to-day’ discourse”. This problem-solving approach limits the development and testing of empirical theory” (Cameron & McLaverty, 2008:91).

In summary, during this period at P&DM there were a number of changes to academic staff composition, high staff turnover (Report 1, 2006), a loss of senior academic staff, massification in terms of student numbers, and less autonomy in
relation to funding than previously. This progressively contributed to a weakening of the broad ideology that had underpinned the integrating logic of the early MM PDM curriculum and opened the space for greater influence on curriculum from outside the university, as my examination of the aspirant integrating logics in the 2000 and 2005 MM PDM curriculum will show.

6.5 Integrating logics in curriculum (1999-2005)

As with previous curriculum iterations, different integrating logics were appealed to during this period in order to try and provide greater curriculum coherence. I have identified these logics through analysis of documents and interviews covering this period of curriculum development. Those that were evident in these second curriculum iterations are summarised in Table 16 and then developed and elaborated on in the remainder of this chapter. I identify four broad aspirant integrating logics operating in the 2000-2005 period.

Firstly, the curriculum reflects different kinds of genericism. One is a related modularisation or credit exchange discourse working with assumptions of different routes and combinations of content (knowledge) and skills leading to the same outcomes. A second is a broad concept of competence, and a third is a related notion of scholarliness or graduateness, referring to generic attributes of a scholar in any discipline or professional field. A fourth kind is a view of explicit and (in theory) assessable competencies (or generic skills) underpinning a job role in terms of measurable performance. A final kind of genericism is based on an assumption of generic, neutral ‘management’ that is context-free. I draw on Jones and Moore here in using competency or competencies to refer to the behaviourist model of competence, and competence to refer to the general concept of competence as an underlying, generative capacity (Jones & Moore, 1995).

The second aspirant integrating logic was a changed, more ambiguous version of the desired identity projected in the first curriculum iteration, reflecting increasing tensions between a generic manager identity and ‘scholarly’ identity.
The third aspirant logic consisted of attempts to try and drive curriculum integration *pedagogically* through an increasing focus on the technical design and development of courses and on academic teaching and assessment skills while the emphasis on experiential learning becomes more patchy and dependent on individual endorsement and championing.

The fourth integrating logic was one of *interdisciplinarity* that existed in various forms in the early curriculum iterations, but becomes more implicit and less visible during this period (other than being reflected in assumptions about the nature of students' multi-disciplinary, applied research and the integrative role it is envisaged to play in the curriculum).

I examine each logic in turn and explain how it was reflected in the MM PDM curriculum and the integrative role it attempted to play.
Table 16: Integrating Logics Reflected in the MM PDM Curriculum (2000-2005)

|------------------|-----------|-------|------------------------------------------|
| Genericism       | Modularisation and credit exchange | Credit accumulation. A logic of comparability of knowledge acquired through different subjects and in different ways which can be built up in ‘units’ to achieve the same outcome | Reflected in common modules across curricula and multiple entrance and exit routes.  
Tension between specialisation and genericism |
| Competence       | Competence is seen as generic sets of skills and attributes underlying any competent performance | Notion of ‘applied competence’ reflected in descriptions of course objectives |
| Scholarliness or graduateness | ‘Scholarliness’ or ‘graduateness’ – generic attributes of a ‘scholar’ in any discipline or professional field | Assumptions of critical thought, logical argument, evidence-based argumentation and abilities to work with text in assessment  
Introduction of research skills course |
| Management competencies and competency frameworks | A regionalised generic view of competency where a set of behaviours is seen to underpin performance in a particular job role | Reflected in management competency frameworks designed for measurability and performance |
| Management       | Assumption of ‘management’ as a generic discipline or overarching idea to which others would be subordinated | Dominance of management orientation with public and development as qualifiers in syllabus descriptions  
Private sector (generic) management techniques/tools and language  
Performance of a generic job role, i.e. a public manager |
| Preferred identity | Generic manager, civil servant or scholar | Academic or scholarly identity in tension with a career-focused, performing (or ‘performative’) manager | Tensions between ‘theoretical’ or ‘practical’ orientations in curriculum  
Conflicting examiner perspectives on preferred identity |
| Pedagogy         | Experiential learning | Integration of curriculum content can be driven pedagogically | Moulding of curriculum to the needs and capacities of students |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Groupwork as ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tensions in pedagogical orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic development</td>
<td>Integration of society, institution and curriculum</td>
<td>Assumption that social change and improvements in student performance can be driven by pedagogic interventions into curriculum design and teaching practices</td>
<td>Emphasis on course design and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinarity and multi-disciplinarity</td>
<td>Interdisciplinarity</td>
<td>Non-interacting disciplinarity</td>
<td>Individual lecturer emphases according to interest and prior specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Applied research</td>
<td>Integrates theory and practice in relation to problem-focused understanding and solutions</td>
<td>Demonstrates critical thinking, logical argument, problem solving and independent working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Generated from discourse analysis of data set of documentary sources and interviews).

32 In other countries and ‘academic development’ focus and orientation is referred to as ‘educational development’ (UK) (Volbrecht, 2003) and ‘staff development’ (USA) (Volbrecht, 2003).
In Table 16, I have indicated and named each of the logics that I see as attempting to fulfil an integrative role and their associated discourses. I briefly indicate what the logic is and where I see it reflected in the MM PDM curriculum. In the sections that follow, I explain and explore each logic and its associated discourses in turn.

6.5.1 Genericism

The curriculum reflected different kinds of ‘genericism’. The first was a broad concept of competence. The second was a narrow view of explicit and (in theory) assessable competencies (or generic skills) reflected in management competency frameworks. The third was a related modularisation or credit exchange discourse working with assumptions of different pathways, combinations of content (knowledge) and skills leading to the same outcomes in terms of performance. The fourth was a notion of generic scholarliness or graduateness and the fifth related to management as a discourse or generic discipline, an assumption of generic neutral management that is context-free.

Modularisation and credit exchange

The redesign of curriculum explicitly looked to forms of modularisation to enable the implementation of a logic of genericism. In broad terms, P&DM saw modularisation in terms of an approach to enable portability across its degrees and short courses across qualification/course types (academic and professionally-oriented short courses). The emphasis within the NQF on specifying learning in terms of generic outcomes (rather than in knowledge terms) for the purposes of comparability and the establishment of equivalence between ‘units’ of qualifications provided an apparent endorsement and legitimation of P&DM’s search for an integrating logic that could cross qualification types.

A strong discourse in South African higher education at the time saw modularisation as supporting and enabling “credit-accumulation-and-transfer or credit exchange” (Ensor, 2004:342) across disciplines, types of qualifications (vocational and
academic) and across types of institutions. There is evidence from documents that P&DM drew selectively on these discourses and the rationales they gave rise to in the NQF to justify changes to curriculum. One use of modularisation within P&DM’s curriculum was to try and secure portability across its own degree and diploma qualifications and its professionally-oriented certificated short courses. This logic is most clearly expressed in the articulation route from certificate-postgraduate diploma-Masters in the 2004 curriculum and in the notion of ‘streaming’ of courses to introduce a ‘specialisation’ within the MM PDM degree.

P&DM drew selectively on the credit exchange discourse in the NQF to justify some of the changes it would make to deal with some of the intractable problems experienced within the degree, for example poor student completion of the research component. As expressed in P&DM documentation “the lifelong learning approach adopted by the NQF is suggestive of the means of its [poor completion issues] resolution” (Proposal 2, 1999). Here, P&DM drew selectively on the ‘flexibility and mobility’ discourse of the NQF, particularly its endorsement of multiple entry and exit points, to justify an exit point at diploma level for students who could not complete the research component for a variety of reasons (see Table 17).

The reasons for poor completion were complex and multi-faceted, related to academic performance, work-related pressures, financial problems and personal issues.

Table 17: Reasons for Non-completion of the MM PDM Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-payment of fees</td>
<td>A high proportion of those not completing, (between 19% and 41% on the block-release and part-time degrees, and 22% on the full-time degree) owed fees. (Report 1, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty completing in minimum time (and using up employer bursary allowances)</td>
<td>Report 17, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption in personal lives due to illness, violence and personal stress</td>
<td>Notes 12, 2001; Plan 1, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High job mobility (often it was not necessary for students to complete their degrees in order to be promoted and receive higher salaries)</td>
<td>Notes 12, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being able to make the jump from coursework to independent research</td>
<td>Notes 12, 2001; Interviewees 3 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big gaps in student’s knowledge that are difficult</td>
<td>Discussion Paper 12, 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thinking of performance in outcomes terms, i.e. outcomes to be achieved by the end of the courses, also provided a further justification for de-emphasising differences (and entry qualifications) between students entering via the certificate route or coming directly into the Masters programme as, in theory, both routes would be able to achieve the same outcomes albeit using different content. Modularisation also appeared to offer a way of building ‘specialisation’ into particular areas focused on particular sectors (e.g. health, defence) or particular functional areas (e.g. monitoring and evaluation) or disciplinary areas (Statistics, Economics).

In a staff discussion on the difficulties of managing the “tension between development of technical capacity or skills and intellectual rigour” (Plan 3, 1998) the resolution to this ‘tension’ is suggested in P&DM documents as lying predominantly in different variations of structure and sequencing of degrees and in various combinations of different types of courses (technical/academic and specialist/generic). Suggestions on how to resolve these tensions relate to curriculum structure and course design and included:

- **The development of modular courses which could cater for one or the other and build up to different types of qualifications**
- **Ensuring a mix of both [technical capacity and intellectual rigour] in degrees and short courses (managing this tension may be what makes P&DM unique)**
- **combining theory and practical in applied contexts**
- **sequencing everything that students do to include both theory and practical application” (Plan 3, 1998).**

While modularisation and credit exchange were seen as offering potential means of better integrating offerings across curricula and providing a progression logic within P&DM and selectively used accordingly, there was scepticism from some academics about the underlying assumptions of ‘equivalence’ between all qualifications and the notions of a generic competence for both technical capacity and academic rigour that they assumed (Memo 11, 1999). There were also tensions among P&DM staff about the assumptions of credit exchange and ‘equivalence’ in relation to comparability.
between technical, practice-oriented courses and courses requiring theoretical
rigour. These tensions and the practical problems they gave rise to, particularly in
relation to progression, are expressed most clearly in the following quote:

*With many institutions the need to proliferate various training opportunities of
various depth and time have significantly diminished the ‘centrality’ of core
[i.e. degree] programmes [...] too often, the assumption is made that the
need to generate specialised sub-programmes [short courses] implicitly
means that a general programme [degree] must be bought into line with the
modus operandi of these specialised programmes [...] While a dynamic
interaction between the general and the particular is necessary, it also means
that notions of equity have to be adjusted to this reality, i.e. everyone cannot
do the same thing in the same way (Discussion Paper 5 (n.d.).

The introduction of elective courses grouped within a ‘specialist stream’ carried with
it an assumption that these courses would lead to greater ‘depth’ and ‘rigour’,
indicating a progression in terms of cognitive demand and knowledge. It was also
envisaged to enable content or methodological specialisation to assist with research
(Min 6, 2000). How this was to be achieved, however, was not clearly articulated and
it did not seem to translate into practice (Email 3, 2001).

Ideas relating to ‘specialisation’ in this curriculum represented an attempt to develop
some vertical progression (increasing levels of knowledge and complexity) within the
curriculum, largely absent until this point. This concern about progression was
particularly reflected in relation to the courses falling under the Economics and
Development learning area (Discussion Paper 8, n.d.). Although the perspective on
economy in the first iterations of the MM PDM curriculum was on political economy,
rather than a “maths/econometric modelling emphasis” (Discussion Paper 8, n.d.),
and the intention was to develop managers who were economically and financially
literate and able to engage in contemporary debates. A need for some sequencing
and some prerequisites was increasing raised in order to address poor student
performance and difficulties experienced by those with no economics background
and a poor mathematics background. Some lecturers teaching in the economics and
finance areas were concerned about students being unable to progress sufficiently to
be able to do research of quality in this area (Minutes 6, 2000; Discussion Paper 8,
n.d.). Similar views were also expressed about sequencing and ‘specialisation’ in
relation to core courses in *Analytical Methods*. Quantitative courses increasingly had
to limit the content of even basic introductory statistics due to the poor mathematical and analytical abilities of students (Interviewee 3).

Assumptions about generic competencies were increasingly evident in the 2000 and 2004 MM PDM curricula. The next section examines how these were reflected as possible integrating rationales and why difficulties were experienced in implementing ideas based on competency logics.

**Competence**

P&DM had already begun to describe the objectives of its qualifications in outcomes-based terms and thinking in the 1996 MM PDM curriculum and this became more evident in the 2000 and 2004 iterations where the outcomes logic was more explicitly brought down from whole-qualification level to course level. Despite the reservations of some P&DM staff about the reductionism of outcomes-based approaches (discussed in Chapter Five), requiring staff to think about what they did in outcomes-based terms was variously appealing to staff seeking more explicitness about teaching objectives and assessment criteria. Thinking in terms of outcomes was envisaged to enable greater explicitness to students and staff about what they assessed and taught, reducing in overlap between courses (Memo 2, 1998) enabling greater accountability in terms of “constructive alignment” (Biggs, 1996) between course objectives, teaching and assessment. In these two post 1999 curriculum iterations, the understanding of competence that was drawn on was the concept of “applied competence” as developed by the ETD Practices Project (GTZ/NTB, 1997:106) and then adopted in the Green Paper: Skills Development Strategy for Economic and Employment Growth in South Africa (DoL, March 1997) (Memo 10, 1999).
Figure 4: Defining Applied Competence

(Source: (NTB/GTZ 1997:106)).

This definition of applied competence was developed by the ETD Practices Project to try and avoid the association of competence with some of the more behaviourist competency associations, and to emphasise holistic understandings of competence being comprised of knowledge, attitudes and skills (GTZ/NTB, 1997:106). Using this notion of applied competency was an attempt to provide a broader conception of outcomes than that of the behaviourist, decontextualised notions of competence which underpin many competency standards (Ashworth & Saxton, 1990; Kraak, 1999) and which also ultimately came to dominate the ‘unit standards-based qualifications’ developed by SAQA (Allais, 2007), despite attempts to have the broader concept adopted (Kraak, 1999). This broad understanding of applied competence or variations of it was evident in the initial descriptions of the MM PDM courses and their write-up in several curriculum development planning processes (Notes 20, 2002). Working with descriptions of courses in terms of competence (and outcomes) occupied considerable academic time in curricular deliberations over the four year period between 1999-2003. Available documents reflect most attention being devoted to creating initial course blueprints. Minutes of these various meetings
reflect little discussion of the content knowledge of these courses beyond generic mention of ‘frameworks’, ‘concepts’ and ‘theories’ with some staff expressing concerns about the lack of engagement with content (Mins 6, 2000). These types of discussions on the actual knowledge content of courses did, however, take place in a limited way in some learning area meetings (Interviewees 4 and 6).

**Scholarliness and graduateness**

A generic notion of competence was also reflected in the ideal of *scholarliness* or *graduateness* that competed with the ‘professional’ orientation as an integrating logic. Interviewees refer to this second period of curriculum development as a period in which more ‘academics’ came in and ‘scholarly’ or ‘academic’ notions attempted to assert or co-exist with the ‘practical’ orientation (Interviewees 1, 5 and 6).

The idea of scholarly competence is evident in documents and interviews as an expression (sometimes implicit) of the generic goals of liberal education, for example, critical thought and writing, inquiring reading, evidence-based argument and logic largely assumed to be acquired through induction into disciplinary discourse as undergraduates. This, often implicit, generic idea of scholarship existed within or alongside tensions about how to develop it where many students did not seem to exhibit it. At one level, individual lecturers report attempts to develop scholarly dispositions in relation to working with texts and writing within the logic and practice of their own courses and disciplinary or professional orientations (Interviewees 3 and 6), but the poor completion of the research component of curriculum and the lack of this scholarly disposition (Commentary 3, 2005; Interviewee 2; Commentary 2, n.d.) in many students, coupled with their poor writing (Memo 4. n.d.) resulted in pressure for interventions in the form of courses where ‘generic skills’ could be more explicitly taught, e.g. information processing and IT skills in the Managing Information and Communication course, and research skills in Research Design and Methods.

Poor completion rates, many students who struggled with writing, had little or no prior research inquiry background (disciplinary or otherwise), and/or poor writing competence (Memo 4, n.d.) resulted in a heavy burden being placed on supervisors (Email 3, 2001; Report 16, 2003; Notes 12, 2001). A research methodology course
(Research Design and Methods) was developed to try and address student throughput. As written up both in course descriptions and subsequently in a publication (Badenhorst, 2008), this course attempted to develop the identity of a scholar engaged in a process of investigation through a focus on generic writing processes for designing and reporting on research and building an identity as a scholarly writer. The knowledge-based contents of the course (research methodology) were limited to a third of the course in the 2000 and 2004 iterations (Report 4, 2005) relative to the dominance of a focus on a general process of becoming an evidence-based researcher/scholar, while engaged in writing-up research. With a main focus being on process, the course inevitably assumed that most of the knowledge base of social research methods and discipline-based inquiry is developed elsewhere (via supervisors), or autonomously through reading and literature reviews.

Both these courses (Research Design and Methods and Managing Information and Communication) did not appear to attempt to implement a notion of ‘generic skill’ as discrete, explicit and assessable, as increasingly reflected in higher education generic skills courses of this nature, but showed more of an intention to try and teach a broader notion of generic, evidence-based scholarliness through non-specialist content that is not specific in attempts to remediate a lack of focus on this in students’ prior academic trajectories. Nevertheless, an assumption of scholarliness being able to be taught outside specific subject or disciplinary content and its preferred methodologies is evident.

Competencies – management competency frameworks

In the South African public sector policy arena, concerns about poor performance of public officials, particularly managers, was held to be linked to poor delivery or services (DPSA, 2000). Competency-driven approaches for public managers were seen by government as being able to provide the best approach to education and training for middle and senior managers (DPSA, 2000). The concept of competency-driven frameworks was not new to those who had already engaged with education and training in the disciplinary fields of Management and Public Management locally and internationally. In South Africa, the concept of a Senior Management Service
(SMS) derives from similar initiatives in the public sectors in other countries e.g. the USA, Canada, the UK and France (Horton, 2000) in response to political concerns about service delivery and performance of the civil service. In the UK, the senior management service was intended to create a cadre of senior civil servants (middle managers) operating with a common work ethos to address improved quality of service delivery, increased flexibility and accountability of managers, co-ordination of transformation efforts and improved monitoring and evaluation (Horton, 2000).

In South Africa, the DPSA’s Senior Management Service Competency framework is a description, from an employer’s perspective, of the desired attributes of senior managers. The framework focuses on ‘generic’ competencies that are expected of all senior managers, and not on technical or functional competencies that may related to a specific job or department. The generic competencies identified for the SMS are reflected in the fourth column of Table 18. These competences were then elaborated on and linked to four proficiency levels, with behavioural indicators that linked to expected performance (see Appendix K). In essence, these are performance criteria comprised of behavioural indicators, with levels of competence ranging from ‘basic’ to ‘expert’.

The competency statements can, in theory, articulate with unit standards formats for training as required by the NQF. They were written in outcomes-based language to follow a curriculum logic of providing outcomes that could be measured and described. The SMS competencies focus on a mix of inputs and outputs in relation to an understanding of the competence that a person brings to a job in order to perform to a certain level.

Although it drew on the definition of competence in The Public Service Regulations, 2001 which define ‘competence’ as “[...] the blend of knowledge, skills, behaviour and aptitude that a person can apply in the work environment, which indicates a person’s ability to meet the requirements of a specific post” (DPSA, 2001a:8), the

33 International, private human resource consultants (Accenture) were commissioned to develop a competency-based Senior Management Service framework for the DPSA in South Africa.
SMS competency framework focused strongly on behavioural indicators of desired performance. An analysis of these SMS competencies shows some blurring of what is being measured. Examples of some of the competencies are included in Appendix F. In some instances the competencies refer to skills needed to perform a role (observable, assessable and indicative of what could be stressed in training) but in most cases it is behaviour traits and characteristics that are held to underpin effective performance (more in the tradition of work done on competencies for effective management (see for example Boyatziz, 1982) that are reflected. My analysis of these SMS competencies shows that the envisaged knowledge is of three main types. One type is knowledge of ‘best practices’ and international trends related to each of the competencies. Another type of knowledge is that of ‘methods’, tools and techniques and systems and a third is that of ‘procedures’. Indicators that drive performance rather than standards of work are emphasised, and detail on conceptual knowledge is absent, either backrounded or assumed. These competencies mainly refer to procedural knowledge.

How then did P&DM relate to this competency framework in its Masters degree curriculum? As the SMS competency framework was intended to contribute to the improvement of the recruitment, selection and mobility of senior management at all levels of government engagement, ‘alignment’ with this framework was put forward as a rationale for the new MM PDM curriculum for 2004. This could attract practising middle and senior managers and signal P&DM’s ‘relevance’ and ‘responsiveness’ to public sector initiatives (Proposal 5, n.d.). However, P&DM’s ambiguity towards ‘responsiveness’ to these government policy initiatives and to those of SAQA is reflected in its motivation for curriculum changes submitted to official university committees. Deciding where to pragmatically place P&DM curricular offerings in relation to unfolding policy developments was expressed in documentation as finding ways to accommodate “constraints which have been imposed on us or which we have agreed to meet” (Proposal 2, 1999). Interviewee 4 commented that there was pressure on P&DM through informal networks in government to adopt a more technical orientation to management.

These SMS competencies certainly drove the naming of courses on the MM PDM 2004 revision and reflected P&DM’s stronger orientation towards ‘management’,
already introduced in 2000. Curriculum development documents at the time referred to the SMS competencies arguing that

> these twelve competencies cover many of the training needs that are referred to in other [government] documents with different names [...] our courses cover all of these, but it may be useful to see what component of each course they constitute (if they do not constitute a course on their own) in order to assess if we should emphasise them more or less (Notes, 10 (n.d.).

Using these competencies both as logic for curriculum organisation and assessing them in practice was seen by academic staff as problematic. There were staff discussions on and scepticism about the sequencing implications of adopting these competencies in curriculum, e.g. where in the curriculum these competencies would be taught (Minutes 10, 2001). P&DM’s curriculum advisory group\(^{34}\) noted that there had been a shift towards managerialism in the public sector and expectations (unrealistic in some of their views) that universities should provide the public sector with these types of graduates (Notes 9, 2001).

There seems to have been an assumption that these competencies would implicitly guide classroom teaching and assessment on individual courses in the MM PDM curriculum, and that their pragmatic incorporation would strengthen the applied ‘professional’ focus of curriculum (Minutes 10, 2001). Whilst it was viewed as relatively easy to overlay these competencies on the existing curriculum, this overlay appears to have taken place more in the description and naming of courses, rather than in either the wholesale adoption of the competency logic or its behavioural emphasis. ‘Retrofitting’ P&DM’s curriculum to the SMS competencies operated as a “justifying discourse” (Interviewee 4). They did not guide academics in what to teach, which was still interpreted by individuals (Interviewees 3 and 6). Draft course outlines in the MM PDM 2004 curriculum show the influence of broader notions of competence, rather than the behavioural competencies reflected in the SMS framework (Notes 20, 2002). Changing curriculum to allow for actual assessment of these competencies was either not possible and/or not wanted. My analysis of

\(^{34}\) An advisory group comprised of current or former government officials associated with P&DM as either former students, lecturers or external examiners.
assessment tasks in the MM PDM courses in 2003 reflect that courses tested predominantly conceptual and procedural knowledge (See Appendix H).

Management as the generic discipline

‘Management’ became more visible in the 2000 and 2004 curricula in terms of its reflection in syllabus descriptions, course titles and timing in curriculum as a stronger managerial ‘implementation and service delivery’ orientation was introduced into curriculum descriptions. The majority of courses in the degree now reflected an orientation to either ‘management’ (a responsibility of P&DM’s Organisation Management and Governance learning area in courses with a specific management, organisational development or governance focus) or an ‘implementation and service delivery’ reflected in courses such as Managing Service Delivery, Strategy and Leadership and Policy Management and Evaluation.

The table below reflects the location of courses in the different P&DM ‘Learning Areas’, showing the number of equally weighted courses and, in the case of the 2004 curriculum, their assumed link to the competency areas in the SMS Competency Framework.

Table 18: Focus of MM PDM Courses and their Relationship to the SMS Competency Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Area</th>
<th>Curriculum 2000</th>
<th>Curriculum 2004</th>
<th>SMS Competency Framework competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation, Management and Governance</td>
<td>Designing and Managing Organisations</td>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Governance</td>
<td>Governance and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing People and Change</td>
<td>Managing People in Organisations</td>
<td>People Management and Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, Leadership, Competing Values and Ethics</td>
<td>Strategy and Leadership</td>
<td>Strategic capability and leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Project Management Skills</td>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Area</td>
<td>Curriculum 2000</td>
<td>Curriculum 2004</td>
<td>SMS Competency Framework competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Policy Processes</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Policy Formulation and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analytical Methods and Information</td>
<td>Policy Management and Evaluation</td>
<td>Policy Formulation and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>Financial and Project Management Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Context</td>
<td>Development Context</td>
<td>Approaches to Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Managing Information and Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed to run across all courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty and Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Client Orientation and Customer Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving and Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author developed from (DPSA, 2003; University of the Witwatersrand, 2000a; University of the Witwatersrand, 2004).

The 2000 and 2004 MM PDM iterations reflected less of an explicit focus on ‘development’ across the curriculum compared to the pre-2000 curriculum iterations. Appendix I shows the course descriptions for the courses with an explicit ‘development’ emphasis across three curriculum iterations, showing some continuity with the sustainable development theme and the insertion of a ‘managing’ development focus. The development orientation in the 2000 curriculum retains ‘sustainability’ as a focus, but in the 2004 curriculum there appears to be more of a ‘management of development’ and development planning intention in later courses, with the concept of development and what type of development being either linked to notions of governance in the course Governance and Development or interpreted according to individual lecturers (Interviewee 4). There was a diminishing focus on the NGO sector, with fewer students from these sectors applying for courses (Interviewees 4 and 6; Report 14, 2000).
An emphasis on public policy and policy-making also diminished in syllabus descriptions. Policy is one of the key distinctions made between curricula aimed at private and public sector managers. While differences between public and private sector management were debated at P&DM, it does not seem that P&DM clearly and consistently defended a clear position on its ‘public’ distinctiveness in the curriculum, especially in relation to a type of management that was different to market-inspired management. The introduction of a new Masters degree in 2004 specialising in public policy may have resulted in less of a focus on policy in the MM PDM Masters degree. However, the diminishing of an explicit focus on policy in the MM PDM degree may have contributed to ambiguity about the orientation towards a ‘public’ management within the curriculum. Commentators on curriculum in Public Management in South Africa and a senior P&DM staff member generally warned about the possible consequences of a diminishing explicit emphasis on policy (Gaspar, 2000; Moharir, 2000), particularly in relation to the influence of the field of generic management and the likelihood of Public Management becoming generic management under the influence of values inspired by the market (Gaspar, 2000).

The stronger management emphasis in P&DM’s 2000 and 2004 curricula reflected a shift in demand and sentiment of the South African public service towards improved performance and delivery. A stronger managerial focus is reflected in both the titles and syllabus descriptions of course content, with more evidence of processes, systems and techniques than previous curricula. My analysis of proposed key texts prescribed for courses in available draft course outlines in curriculum deliberations for 2004 (Notes 20, 2002) indicates a range of both generic management and public sector specific texts, with some courses emphasising generic management texts more than others (e.g. Strategy and Leadership, Managing People and Organisations and Managing Service Delivery) but attempting to contextualise these ‘generic’ texts through local case studies or assignments locating and critiquing these texts in relation to the South African public service. In some courses, the texts themselves are directly critical of generic management and managerialism (e.g. in the courses Governance and Development and Approaches to Development). ‘Governance’ also enters more strongly in the 2000 curriculum, where its sequencing in the curriculum is seen by some staff as undermining the discourse of management
(Discussion Paper 6, 1999). In particular, there are concerns expressed that its location as a one of the first courses in the curriculum potentially deconstructs management and managerialism, and in its place (or alongside management) puts back in a central role for government (and politics) in steering reform (especially in relation to notions of a developmental state). Other courses appear to focus more on managerial tools, e.g. processes, systems and techniques (for example, *Managing People and Organisations* and *Managing Service Delivery*). It seems that while syllabus descriptions and some selected texts indicate stronger managerialist orientations in course descriptions, students were exposed to critiques from individual lecturers in class (Interviewee 4 and 5) and in the lecturer publications (Bond, 2005; Mhone & Edigheji, 2003). It seems that they the students may have received mixed messages dependent on course and lecturer orientation issue of management and governance. Students who registered from the late 1990s were increasingly seen to be less receptive to such critique, as it was not seen to be directly helpful or applicable to their daily public sector workplace contexts (Interviewee 6; Report 13, 1998).

To summarise, different orientations to a logic of genericism became more evident in this period of curriculum iterations. Rather than there being a shift between the two periods, it appears that there was a strengthening of the position adopted in the first period. However, while the discourse in documents indicates this greater orientation to a generic logic of curriculum integration, it is less evident whether it is applied in practice and what exactly the generic logic is. There is evidence of several generic logics existing side by side, and perhaps competing. What they share is little focus on the knowledge itself that is the content of curriculum.

### 6.5.2 Pedagogic identity – generic managers, public servants or scholars?

In curriculum reviews, the nature of the identity that the 2000 and 2004 curricula were trying to promote is less clear than in the previous curriculum iterations – and possibly more contested. The integrating idea around professionalism that was strong in the first curriculum period required a level of ideological consensus for success which was more difficult to sustain during this second period. There had been a large turnover in academic staff (Report 1, 2006), the public sector had
changed, and so had the students (in the views of interviewees). An interviewee who joined P&DM around this time described the culture of the school as “a friendly group sitting at a table chatting but all facing outwards” (Interviewee 6).

Whereas the first curriculum iterations in 1993 and 1996/99 had seen the role of graduate professionals working as management change agents to shape a new public service, an orientation to ‘professional’ in these iterations is more focused on the manager role, job performance and mobility within the existing system. Interviewees describe some students as being more credential and career-focused, less interested in engaging with critique of public sector policy and workings and more politically and personally ambitious. Interviewees provide various examples of students who were there for what was referred to as ‘the Gold card’\textsuperscript{35}, i.e. a ticket to mobility and promotion.

Shaping the curriculum to more visibly reflect the competencies developed by the DPSA and now required for performance and progression in the system (at least rhetorically) is an example of one P&DM response to this shift in focus. There may have been increasingly less of an emphasis on explicit shaping of a notion of service (whether oriented to a political ideal or to publicness). An example of this shift is an erosion of an explicit focus on ethics present in the 1994 and 1996 curricula (in the form of the sub-course \textit{Ethics in Public Management}), subsumed under \textit{Strategy, Leadership Competing Values and Ethics} in the 2000 curriculum, and by 2004 only visible as a topic (Ethics of Resource Distribution) in the course \textit{Governance and Development}. The figure of the ideal public or civil servant thus gradually appears to be less visible.

While P&DM exhibited ‘responsiveness’ to public sector demands in the formulation of its 2000 and 2004 curricula, tensions are reflected in relation to this responsiveness, particularly in relation to a need for closer working relationships between P&DM (and other public management schools) and government in shaping a ‘professionalising’ project.

\textsuperscript{35} Reported by interviewees as being based on a student comment made to the first Director of P&DM (Interviewees 3 and 6 and Field Notes 1, 2008).
We do not have – but need – a close if controversial engagement with government on the formation of the personnel of the public sector [...] If we want to move in a direction of professionalising it is hard to imagine how that could be done without a close relationship with government (Mabin, 2000:132).

A key element of this tension in relation to ‘professionalising’ public managers would be the relationships of P&D&M and the DPSA to the managerialism inherent in NPM, which was by now being critiqued from within government. The question of whether, and in what form, managerialism was adopted in the South African public service was reviewed in Chapter Two, so here I simply put forward the debates in terms of how they were reflected in relation to the MM PDM curriculum at this time within P&D&M. A tension at the time was the question of if, and in what form, NPM had entered the public sector and what its consequences had been. The Minster of Public Services and Administration was at this point clear and critical of the role that she saw some of P&D&M’s graduates having played in introducing NPM into the public sector during the 1993-1999 curriculum period and the ‘resistance’ of “the Executive” to these moves.

In terms of the content of public administration, P&D&M was quick to embrace New Public Management as the new paradigm for public administration [...] Through key individuals who were educated here, this line of thinking permeated public service reform and modernisation efforts [...] However, for all the good that this approach might have in ensuring more efficient and effective public institutions, from the side of the Executive we have always been cautious as to the more fundamental new-liberal perceptions of the role of the State [...] This instinct that we have had about the excessive and uncritical embracing of NPM is proving to have been the correct one [...] I trust that P&D&M will also become more critical about this prevailing paradigm that so heavily influenced its initial orientation and academic programmes. I trust that you will use your research capacity to study the impact of NPM on SA society and to discuss the unintended consequences for the development state (Fraser-Moleketi, 2003).

Although this view of P&D&M having been part of promoting NPM in government was shared by some analysts (see Chipkin, 2008), there was clearly ambiguity within the DPSA itself at this time on the issue of managerialism. This ambiguity was reflected in proposals that senior management in government be encouraged to study MBAs (DPSA, 2000); (Minuted 10, 2001), i.e. “that holy grail of some areas of private business management” (Mabin, 2004b:55). While some P&D&M staff expressed
reservations about responding to this government move (Mabin, 2004b), P&D documents indicate that there was consideration given within P&D to reshape the MM PDM qualification as an ‘MBA for the public sector’ or as an MPA (a Masters in Public Administration). There were advisory consultations with public servants in government familiar with P&D as to the appropriacy of following this route (Notes 9, n.d.; Minutes 10, 2001). This idea was, however, not taken forward.

In analysing the evidence for the adoption of NPM in the public sector, Cameron concludes that NPM in South Africa was not fully embraced or systematically applied and quotes the Minister of Public Services and Administration as saying that “the government wanted to borrow NPM skills and techniques without buying into the ideological framework” (Cameron, 2009:915). Gaspar noted at the time that the field of public management in South Africa had not distinctively mapped out its position on a number of key issues, particularly development, management and policy, leaving these discourses, particularly policy and management, open to risk of appropriation from ‘private’, ‘market’ sector interests and discourses.

*We require, as one element at least a consolidated public and development core vision [...] that ‘public’ is more than ‘state’; and ‘the public’ is more than the monied; ‘development’ means improvements for ordinary and disadvantaged people; and accountability is to the broad public, not only to chiefs or the market* (Gaspar, 2000:178).

Not only was the ‘professional’ identity that P&D wished to promote unclear but it existed in tension with alternative or parallel notions of an ‘academic’ or ‘scholarly’ identity. Interviewees discuss in various ways how a more scholarly orientation was introduced in the late 1990s and early 2000s through the employment of academics who were more scholars and less practitioners or activists (Interviewees 4, 5 and 6).

This tension was expressed as follows:

*Instead of adapting the academic environment to the ‘lacks’ manifested by students, do we need to better prepare students to participate effectively in an academic environment that reflects rigorous standards? Or, do we simply concede that we do what we can with whom we have to work with in the easiest way possible in order to successively “get by”* (Discussion paper 5, n.d.).
We need to return to and conclude debates held many times in the past as to whether this is primarily an academic or professional degree (Minutes 3, 1999).

This on-going tension between 'professional' and 'academic' (or scholarly) was most strongly reflected in the criteria internal and external examiners used to examine student research, which are discussed in Section 6.6.

6.5.3 Driving integration pedagogically

Both the 2000 and 2004 curricula reflect continued attempts to drive curriculum integration by means of a common approach to pedagogy through which a shared vision on curriculum objectives could be sustained among academic staff and fragmentation could be lessened. The strong focus on student learning in the early curriculum iterations of this period (reflected in the focus on experiential learning and reflection) is less evident in internal documents examined, although it is still reflected in study and degree guides developed for students and staff (Study Guide 1, 2004). The experiential learning focus, although remaining as 'policy' in guidelines for students (Study Guide 1, 2004), is less evident in other documents and its assumed widespread adoption is questioned (Report 6, 2004). This common approach to pedagogy was little evidenced in practice (Report 11, 2004). In practice, teaching approaches appear to have become more diverse, “traditional” (Interviewee 5) and information-focused with more lecturing and expectations (not always realised) of student engagement with reading (Report 22, 2001). There is also more critique of assumptions made about group processes, lack of clarity about the objectives of a focus on group work, its assessment and the nature of group tasks (Memo 5, 1998; Report 5, 2002, Report 1, 2004). Nevertheless, the use of learning groups (previously called syndicate groups) remains as a key part of the curriculum, used perhaps in more ritualistic ways than previously. The shift from syndicate to learning groups did not seem to involve a reconceptualization of the role of learning groups “merely a decision to ‘add’ something to the existing policy documentation” (Report 25, 1998:64). In addition, the institutionally-funded and -supported development of teaching cases had mostly stopped (Email 4, 2000) although some more research-based cases were developed according to the interests of particular staff members
There was a shift in pedagogic focus from student learning to course development. An analysis of ‘teaching and learning’ workshops held with staff in the period 2000-2005 shows this greater focus on course design and assessment practices (Notes 18, 2005). Interventions into pedagogic practice, drawing on some of the principles of the academic development movement in South African higher education were intended to provide ways of getting academic staff to plan courses and the curriculum as a whole to better guide students through their respective knowledge contents. Elsewhere academic development is referred to as “educational development” (Volbrecht, 2003:111) in the UK or as “staff development” in the USA (Volbrecht, 2003). In broad terms, it refers to various foci on the “teaching function” (Trowler, Fanghanel, & Wareham, 2005:428) in higher education. It was a way to get staff to think about and to make their expectations and the rules of production of appropriate texts in the academic world more transparent. In so doing, it was hoped that they would be able to assist students to think about and produce content in ways appropriate for their discipline and higher education context. The student ‘support’ emphasis of the 1993-1999 curriculum period largely fell away as student numbers and intakes rose and the emphasis shifted to work on course design and workshops focusing on pedagogy and assessment. I was employed at this time to lead this process as it was assumed that improvement of poor completion rates and fragmentation across curriculum could be addressed through improving teaching, course design and management of the research process.

Pedagogic interventions aimed at better integration of theory and practice and fostering integration across content areas were largely driven by individuals in relation to their own courses. Attempts at ‘integration’ across subject areas, and of ‘theory’ and practice, largely took place through reflections on specific workplace or

36 Two examples were a case developed on the City of Johannesburg’s turnaround strategy (iGoli 2000 – Towards a world class African City – A good practice case study in change management) and the turnaround strategy of the South African Revenue Services.

37 Some staff members were specifically tasked with this responsibility, including the author.
societal problems represented through an integrating task within a course (e.g. Government and Governance) or across courses (see Appendix H).

There were also short-lived attempts to design and teach integrating ‘capstone’ courses. In the original curriculum design of the 2004 curriculum, for example, Managing Information and Communication and Strategy and Leadership were conceived of as ‘integrating’ or ‘capstone’ courses to be assessed on a portfolio or simulation basis, drawing on content and insights from other courses. Integration was seen to take place through competency-based assessment tasks involving a simulation (e.g. in the case of the Strategy and Leadership course) or based around a practical problem-solving task where students would need to draw on a number of courses to solve the problem, or through completing practical tasks being integrated though a contemporary theme (e.g. HIV/AIDS). Pedagogy and assessment was thus envisaged as the means to facilitate the integration of content knowledge and its application. Both attempts around integrating tasks in capstone courses waned due to time required to design, drive, sustain and implement the initiatives and individual champions moving on and, as I discuss later, lack of clarity about what was being integrated (Discussion Paper 7, 2004).

However, the appropriacy of time spent on ‘looking inward’ to pedagogic interventions and developing a common approach to doing things was critiqued by some staff members. The concern expressed here was that staff were not paying enough attention to engaging with and building reputations in the larger communities of government, policy domains and their own research areas (Interviewee 6).

To what extent this [a better balance and greater linkage between our research/consulting and teaching] is attained through repeated interventions into pedagogical approaches or trying to get faculty to behave in more uniform ways – as opposed to getting the institution to be involved in various kinds of work, networks and deliberations outside the institution – remains a major question. In other words, all the effort P&DM places on efficient administrative systems, teaching and learning processes and course delivery may in the end not mean much of anything if it is not complemented by a more activist position in larger communities. (Discussion Paper 5, n.d.)
6.6 Interdisciplinarity and multi-disciplinarity

The first iteration of the MM PDM curriculum during the pioneer 1993-1999 period appealed to a broad notion of interdisciplinarity as an overarching logic that was both ideological and also represented a practical attempt to bring curriculum contents into a relationship to each other, although not sustained. There does not seem to have been strong consensus about the integrating idea of ‘interdisciplinarity’, and relationships between the relational idea and curriculum content organisation increasingly became implicit, individually interpreted and implemented (perhaps only within individual courses), but not horizontally across the degree components. While the early pioneer curriculum reflected a discourse of interdisciplinarity (as distinct from a strong attempt to apply interdisciplinarity in practice), these later curriculum iterations reflect less of either. While ‘themes’ emerged as possible interdisciplinary bridges, e.g. a focus on HIV/AIDS in the first six course of the 2004 curriculum, there does not appear to have been a rigorous or sustained attempt to seek out or exploit particular concepts (or even themes) to promote multi- or interdisciplinarity in any rigorous way. Arguments for ‘development’ being best placed for a common departure point for either greater inter- or multi-disciplinarity re-emerged under new champions but there is no evidence of this being taken forward after their departure (Discussion Paper 2, (n.d.).

The P&DM approach to ‘interdisciplinarity’ the MM PDM degree was that of taking selectively and eclectically from disciplines, interdisciplinary fields and semi-disciplines where the disciplinary origins of the contents may not always be explicit (unless made so by a lecturer familiar with that discipline). In practice, this seems to have been a form of non-interacting, multi-disciplinarity. A similar approach was visible in the research component of the degree.

6.7 Student research

The broad, general purpose of a research component (the minor dissertation) in this degree in these 2000 and 2004 curricular iterations remained the same as in the previous curricula, i.e. the development and demonstration of practical problem-solving and critical analysis capabilities. The ‘integrative’ role of the research component was seen in terms of fostering these generic capabilities as well as in
terms of integrating theory and practice (or formal education and workplaces). The assumption is that this research output would demonstrate the ‘integration’ and application of knowledge from the course (theoretical and practical) through application to a real world problem (University of the Witwatersrand, 2000b). This notion of ‘integration’ was also increasingly being discussed in policy circles, later appearing in South African policy documents referring to higher education advocating such ‘integration’ in terms of assessment policy (SAQA, September 2005) and ‘integration’ between formal education and workplaces (DoE, 2007).

While the general purpose of the research component was broadly agreed, there were two discourses within P&DM school relating to expectations and quality of research (Interviewees 1 and 3). One held that the quality of student research needed to be improved to demonstrate more scholarship, and the other held that as these students were ‘professionals’ this was not necessary and the research component was a hurdle that needed to be got through in terms of the delivery of a small, applied ‘project’ (Interviewee 2).

This tension was echoed in the views of internal and external examiners of minor dissertations. Badenhorst’s (2002) research on assessment practices in relation to MM PDM student research indicates the persistence of both ‘professional’ and ‘academic’ orientations depending on the internal and external examiners and their primary disciplinary or practitioner identity. Examiners (both internal and external) falling within the category which Badenhorst labels “academically oriented” (and which I would call ‘disciplinary-oriented’) are usually discipline-based and look for students’ abilities to locate their work within a disciplinary or strongly multi-disciplinary literature base and produce a masters level product within a disciplinary or multi-disciplinary area. Those whom Badenhorst labels as “professionally oriented” focus on results and application of the research for practice, with less attention to academic rigour, literature and empirical research processes. Badenhorst also identifies a third category: the “academically flexible” (which I would call ‘process or academic literacies-oriented’) who are similar to Badenhorst’s ‘academically oriented’ group in terms of expectations of well conceptualised research, located in literature (that may be more limited and eclectic), insightful analysis and thorough data collection, but are more tolerant of style and use of
language. Badenhorst argues that the assessors in her ‘academically flexible’ category draw more on ideological models of literacy (Street, 1984) as their point of reference for judgement about student competence. They are more tolerant of writing and style, more focused on emerging academic identities, more questioning of standards in relation to writing processes (and products), and more focused on the process of doing research than the product. There is a greater focus on assessing the development of student thinking and the process of writing production conceived of in constructivist terms.

In common with some of the literature on interdisciplinarity and interdisciplinary assessment practices, these P&DM examiners carry their assumptions about the purpose of research implicitly influencing what they foreground in assessment and what they actually assess with reference to their own disciplinary grounding (Biggs, 1999). Implicit criteria are partly influenced by the discourses of their prior and current disciplinary, inter-disciplinary and practitioner experiences. As examiners are internal as well as external, it indicates the absence of a consensual integrating logic about the purpose and product of research activity despite the research component of the degree being seen as an expression of an integrating logic. As with research on conversion Masters degrees in the UK external examiners tend to be selected on the basis of being familiar with, and sympathetic to, programme objectives (Atkins & Redley, 1998).

An applied, use-oriented research focus was appealing in this curriculum as it seemed to offer a way of closing divides between experts and practitioners (and the knowledges they bring) as ‘practitioner-students’ are able to research topics of an immediate, problem-solving nature guided by academics and assessed by a wider range of examiners who are not all university or discipline based. The assumption was that students would draw on and integrate knowledge and skills acquired during coursework and use these to focus on a practical research problem. In this sense the capstone research requirement seems to have been seen as a ‘seamless’ extension of a problem-solving orientation and skills and knowledge assumed to be acquired during the courses that made up the coursework component of curriculum. Firstly, there seems to have been an assumption the competences required for doing research are either generic to all courses in the curriculum and have been developed
organically during coursework. Secondly there was an assumption that the (interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary) knowledge base students would draw on for their research had either been developed in coursework, or would be developed through extensive literature review or, is not central to conducting this kind of ‘applied’ research. Some staff expressed concerns about the lack of linkage between courses and the research component (Email 3, 2001).

On-going struggles to improve completion rates are reflected in the rationales of both curriculum iterations during this period. While various structural and personal reasons are advanced for students’ difficulties in completing the research component (some empirical and others anecdotal, see Table 17) it is apparent that the curriculum did not prepare many students for the analytical work of conceptualising and conducting research, however limited in scope. Similar concerns have been expressed in relation to ‘integration’ between coursework and research in professional postgraduate programmes (particularly professional doctorates) more generally (Manathunga, Smith, & Bath, 2004). It seems that a discourse that could be referred to as ‘scholarly’ attempts to gain ascendance in the research stage of the curriculum where the goalposts shift, and the segmented knowledge base of the early part of the curriculum does not seem to assist with the more vertical expectations of an epistemic logic of inquiry where epistemic values underpinning academic practice attempt to regain ascendency. I discuss this further in the next chapter.

6.7 Summary and discussion

In 1993, P&DM set out to develop a curriculum envisaged to be a vehicle to shape the identity of a new type of civil servant, the public (and development) manager, who would be competent at getting things done according to best generic management practices while being responsive to the developmental objectives of the state and society. This curriculum was envisaged to provide students with both management skills and knowledge to be effective managers and to shape attitudes and values to deliver on the developmental objectives of the state. In Chapter Five I examined how the curriculum was seen to be able to both shape the identity of aspirant and practising public managers and how it was loosely structured around
integrating logics of interdisciplinarity and a new identity as a professional and public manager. I also examined how a pedagogy based on experiential learning was seen as a key way of integrating various components of curriculum.

In the second phase from 2000-2004 examined in this chapter, changes to the integrating logics were influenced by changes in the policy environment in both higher education and the public service. The curriculum was still seen as a vehicle for shaping the identity of the public manager, but the nature of this identity was less clear and the knowledge and pedagogic approach for doing this more contested.

Academic staff composition changed as some of the pioneer group moved on and as some new staff, who were more strongly ‘academics’ than practitioners or activists, were recruited. The ways in which the curriculum seems to have tried to shape this collective identity changed along several lines. In early curriculum iterations, attempts to shape student identity drew on student idealism and commitment to making social and political changes for broader societal betterment and attempted to shape professional identity in relation to a group-defined notion acceptable behaviour and performance. This seems to have waned or become more implicit in later curriculum iterations under the influence of increasing class sizes, a weakening of the cohort system, a shift to flexible modes of delivery, and changes in the composition and more diverse backgrounds of academic staff. Student motivations seem to have become more pragmatic and oriented towards credentialism to enable career progression. The priorities of the state and the public service, to which the MM PDM curriculum responded, reflected a focus on improved management, senior management in particular, viewed as necessary to meet citizen expectations of improved ‘service delivery’ from the state.

P&DM responded to shifts in the expressed management training needs of the public service and the increasing influence of outcomes-based qualification-driven reform in the structuring and organisation of its MM PDM curriculum. Two broad notions of ‘genericism’ existed in the curriculum as often implicit, aspirant integrating logics. The one was managerial competencies and the other a broader notion of generic academic competence associated with graduateness or scholarliness. They reflected an on-going tension between the ‘academic/theoretical’ orientations and the
‘practical/vocational’ orientations of this curriculum. While different forms of genericism were evident in modularisation and credit exchange discourses and in attempts to strengthen ‘management’ as the generic discipline in the curriculum, what they had in common was that they all underemphasised a specific consideration of knowledge in the curriculum, did not distinguish between different forms of knowledge and proved difficult to translate into principles for organising sequencing in the curriculum.

A stronger generic management emphasis was reflected in descriptions of courses alongside a diminishing visibility of ‘development’ or ‘public policy’ that had ‘tempered’ the private sector focus of ‘management’. The manager role and performance within the requirements of the public service was now the projected identity, but it increasingly existed in tension with alternative or parallel notions of a ‘scholarly’ identity. The nature of the projected graduate identity became even less explicit than in the first curriculum iterations. The strong focus on pedagogy and experiential learning and building a ‘common approach’ to pedagogy in the first curricula also shifted to a focus on common approaches to course development while remaining as a ‘mantra’ in teaching policy guidelines for staff and students.

Interdisciplinarity or multi-disciplinarity also became less visible as both a unifying discourse and in terms of practical attempts to seek out interdisciplinary concepts or methodologies around which to focus curriculum contents. Students were likely to have been exposed to different perspectives (probably both ideological and disciplinary) in relation to key concepts given the diversity of academic staff, but what they took away from it (if anything) would have relied on them doing their own integration, rather than it being done through an explicit integrating logic translated into principles for organising curriculum content and knowledge.

Educational objectives also proved difficult to achieve. Successive curriculum revisions did not seem to substantially do away with fragmentation in the curriculum or the lack of clarity about relationships between different parts of the curriculum. This was sometimes attributed to lack of a common staff vision, common identity and willingness to devote time to collaborative work on teaching approaches and assessment. Poor completion rates for the degree reflected students’ difficulties in
completing the more academically demanding research component of the degree. On-going tensions between and within the professionally-oriented components of the degree and its more scholarly or academic components were not able to be resolved as hoped for. There was also lack of clarity about what competences or competencies the more professional component was trying to achieve (and how these would or could be demonstrated) and ambiguity in terms of acceptable academic or scholarly performance. There was no clear sense of how courses built up to helping students progress through the various demands of the curriculum in terms of the knowledge and logic required for conceptualising and conducting research according to the scientific method.

To put forward an explanation about why it proved difficult to achieve both the educational aims of the MM PDM curriculum and its shaping of a particular ideal practitioner, when viewed from perspectives form within the sociology of education (particularly those of Bernstein), I argue that the difficulties that this curriculum faced in achieving these goals arose, in part, from an attempt to construct a curriculum without a clear social theory of curriculum that takes into account the crucial role of boundaries in establishing the identity of learners, enabling their progression and providing coherence. Designing and implementing a curriculum without such a perspective contributes to difficulties in achieving curriculum goals and in expecting curriculum and pedagogy to be able to do more than what they realistically can do. In Chapter Seven, I outline and defend this analysis.
Chapter Seven: Analysis

7.1 Introduction and overview

Between 1993 and 2005, as shown in the previous two chapters, P&DM curriculum designers set out to create a Masters of Management curriculum that they saw as being relevant and responsive to the goals of the aspirant developmental state and society, and that could target a wide range of students to address diversity and employment equity in the public service. The MM PDM curriculum also challenged existing local and international curricula which had an administrative focus resting on the construct of rule-governed bureaucracy and rational administration. In Bernstein’s sociological terms, the type of curriculum that P&DM attempted to create can be described as an ideal-type integrated curriculum. A key question for the P&DM curriculum developers concerned how a coherent curriculum could be developed and held together to enable the production of a new type of civil servant, the public manager.

In this thesis I described and analysed the development of the Masters in Management curriculum in the field of Public Management at the University of the Witwatersrand from its inception in 1993 until the year 2005. I drew on sociological perspectives on curriculum informed by the theoretical and conceptual framework developed by Bernstein (Bernstein, 1975b; Bernstein, 2000). I employed a single case study approach where my focus was on this attempt to create an integrated curriculum driven by an ideological vision in an applied field or ‘region’ in postgraduate higher education that sits at the interface between work and academic studies.

I explored several questions in relation to this case study. I wanted to understand the nature of the curriculum that was seen as appropriate for producing the ideal civil servant, the preferred identity or specialised consciousness that this curriculum tried
to privilege in the ideal civil servant and the specific orderings of knowledge in the
curriculum that were privileged for bringing about this preferred identity.

In Chapters Five and Six, I developed the case of the MM PDM curriculum over a ten
year period. I presented data drawn from both public and organisational documents
and from interviews to describe how this curriculum was conceived of, developed
and changed. Using this data I located the curriculum within the broader social,
political and economic context of the late 1990s and early 2000s, within South
African higher education, and within the disciplinary field of Public Management; I
examined the various attempts of curriculum developers to seek coherence; I
identified and classified the logics they saw as being potentially integrating; and I
discussed the difficulties they experienced in using these logics as a basis for
‘integrating’ contents and improving curriculum coherence and student performance.

In this chapter, I argue that in the process of attempting to produce an integrated or
interdisciplinary curriculum, P&DM curriculum developers did not take into account
the role that boundaries play in holding disciplinary-based curricula together, in
providing a basis for shaping pedagogic and professional identities and in offering a
common sense of purpose for staff and students. Consequently, curriculum
developers struggled to shape a new curriculum that was coherent and where
criteria for progress were clear and shared. The development of an integrated
curriculum involves having to try and establish an integrating rationale or idea that
can enable learners and lecturers to have a common sense of purpose and clarity on
how to achieve curriculum objectives. The MM PDM curriculum looked to various
ideas circulating at the time in the Social Sciences and Education fields as possible
integrating logics. In this chapter, however, I argue that each of the integrating logics
that were appealed to were not able to adequately fulfil an ‘integrating’ function and
did not take sufficient account of the role of various boundaries in establishing the
identity of learners and enabling their progress. Curriculum developers drew on
integrating ideas that were sometimes contradictory and certainly difficult to turn into
principles for developing strong and explicit relationships between an idea (or ideal)
and curriculum contents – a necessary condition, it seems, for a strong integrated
curriculum.
Curriculum developers perceived integrative coherence or ‘integration’ in various ways in this curriculum, all of which involved a blurring of different types of boundaries with particular consequences for clarity about sequencing, pacing and selection of contents, i.e. the forms of knowledge and social practices that are privileged in or legitimated by a curriculum.

In this chapter, I outline why these integrating logics that were appealed to were not able to provide a basis for overcoming the fragmentation of the curriculum or produce adequate guidance to inform selection, pacing and sequencing of the curriculum and its various components. I also explore the difficulties these logics presented for trying to shape the identity of students and the nature of the identity that was privileged in this process. I argue that these difficulties were experienced due to the failure to set up a strong, consistent, integrating rationale as a possible basis for a strong, integrated curriculum, and because of a lack of recognition of, or disregard for, the crucial role of boundaries in these processes. In addition, the logics themselves contained internal contradictions in trying to achieve these various goals.

In practical terms, MM PDM curriculum revisions reflected ongoing attempts to deal with fragmentation, content overload, unsatisfactory progress of students, as well as lack of connection or integration between courses and between practical and theoretical knowledge, alongside perceptions that the MM PDM degree was either not practical or professional or academic enough.

Before I examine each of these integrating rationales in terms of their clarity as rationales and their implications for boundaries and learning, I recap the central role played by boundaries from the perspective of the work of Bernstein and others working in the same tradition, particularly the components of it that provide both the theoretical framework and the conceptual tools for explaining and understanding curriculum formation in higher education.

### 7.2 Curriculum and boundaries

When examined in Bernstein’s terms, the curriculum development project analysed in this thesis was explicitly a project of creating an integrated curriculum that is underpinned by both weak classification and weak framing. To summarise from Chapter Three, classification refers to boundaries between ‘subjects’ or
recontextualised disciplines or disciplinary fields within the curriculum and the ways in which power “activates” (Hoadley & Muller, 2010:71) categories. Framing addresses pedagogy and classroom interaction – so, which knowledge and which knowledge forms are selected, how are they sequenced, paced and evaluated and who has control over these processes (Hoadley & Muller, 2010). Bernstein’s model builds in the possibility of change along a continuum of strong to weak, where changes in classification and framing (boundaries) involve considerations of power (where does the pressure for change come from and whose interests are served by the change). The process of recontextualisation allows for ideology to come into play (Bernstein, 2000). For Bernstein, drawing on Durkheim, boundaries are a key social category. They not only separate knowledge from experience and different types of knowledge from each other, but they are also the basis of student and professional identities (Young 2010). In structuralist terms, it is socialisation into these knowledge logics and progression through increasing complexity within them that, in part, shapes a specialist or professional and their particular dispositions (e.g. the professional, graduate, educated person) (Beck & Young, 2005; Bernstein, 2000:49).

A key educational implication of drawing on the notion of boundaries as categories that distinguish between knowledge and experience, and between different types of knowledge, is recognising differences between knowledge forms that are drawn on to inform the practical (and curricula more oriented towards the ‘contextual’) and those that inform the theoretical (and curricula more oriented towards the ‘conceptual’), and implications of this distinction for organising knowledge in a curriculum. To summarise, Bernstein argues that a vertical discourse (abstract, theoretical knowledge) enables explicit connections or generalisations to be made between ideas and the empirical world, while a horizontal discourse (everyday experience) makes connections by reference to its applicability to a particular context (Bernstein, 2000). Key to the MM PDM curriculum is that vertical and horizontal discourses have different expectations in terms of what constitutes growth, learning or development. Both contain different recognition rules, i.e. rules that signal being able to “classify legitimate meanings” (Shalem & Slonimsky, 2010:771), and different realisation rules that enable production of a legitimate performance or text (for example, through assessment in formal education, production of appropriate
workplace performances, workplace texts and oral storytelling performances (Heath, 1983)).

This distinction is further complicated by the distinction between two different knowledge structures within vertical discourse – i.e. knowledge structures that are *hierarchical* (e.g. Natural Sciences), and those which are *horizontal* (e.g. Social Sciences and the Humanities) with their different criteria for what counts as development or progression within them. In addition, the Social Sciences and the Humanities in turn contain different types of disciplines with different capabilities of generating empirical descriptions and models where some have “strong grammars” (e.g. Maths, Linguistics and Economics) while others are ‘weaker’ (e.g. Sociology) (Bernstein, 2000:163).

A key argument that is made is that knowledge forms are different and these differences restrict or place limits on pedagogic transmission or how knowledge is reproduced through curriculum (Gamble, 2004b). Disciplines that are recontextualised to produce subjects for teaching retain some links back to the ‘parent discourse’ (Muller, 2009) and its structuring. In the case of some disciplines (e.g. Maths or Statistics), a conceptual spine dictates sequencing in order for abstraction or complexity to be grasped. In other words, different knowledge discourses and knowledge structures have different requirements for achieving coherence in a curriculum. In the MM PDM curriculum, differences between these knowledge forms (and their knowledge structures) were not clearly recognised or acknowledged, and it was assumed that their acquisition could be sequenced and paced in similar ways and indeed, conflated.

Bernstein’s work also provides a way of thinking about professional knowledge and the identities of academic staff. Bernstein’s argument is that there are relationships between how knowledge is organised and the shaping of professional identities (Beck, 2010; Beck & Young, 2005; Bernstein, 2000; Young, 2008a). The roots of his theorising lie Durkheim’s sense of the *sacred* (*Durkheim, 1912 [2001]*) , an orientation to ‘inwardness’ that is shaped by knowledge and the structure of knowledge and not by reference to the contemporary *profane* of market, economic or political forces (Bernstein, 2000; Moore, 2013). In Bernstein’s work, the role of symbolic boundaries
in relation to academic professional identity is seen in their potential to foster and reinforce an identity that is not shaped by the ‘outside’ (pressure from market and state). In Bernstein’s terms, a weakening of relationships between singulars and fields of practice implied a loss of control over the shaping of ‘inner dedication’ and professional identities, which are increasingly under pressure from the market. Regionalisation and genericism as well as their associations with different knowledge relations (shaped by reference to market and state) are seen in various ways as a threat to an ideal professional inner dedication and ‘purity’ and to academic identities.

Disciplines and their knowledge structures in this structuralist view have historically shaped dedicated academic identities. Boundaries have also played the role of “socialization into subject loyalties” (Bernstein, 1971b:56) where they provide a common sense of purpose for staff. The question that arises in examining this curriculum is how this common sense of purpose to sustain ‘integration’ would arise when subject loyalties could not be assumed, either because of the lack of disciplinary connections between staff or a lack of professional work-based connections.

The Masters curriculum examined in this thesis turned to two main rationales to fulfil an integrating role. The first was an idea of the ideal product of curriculum and what these students would become (i.e. an identity-construction project). This envisaged ideal product of this curriculum was reflected in three overlapping identities: the public manager, the reflective practitioner and the new professional.

The second rationale that was appealed to in this curriculum was an attempt to foster integration through two key curriculum integrating logics that inform (or attempt to inform) the organisation of curriculum itself, what content is drawn on, what knowledge forms are privileged and how progress it is assessed. These two concepts are interdisciplinarity and competence. Interdisciplinarity (or multidisciplinarity) was seen as a possible way of holding knowledge together from a range of disciplines and other regions. Curriculum developers also drew on particular notions of competence and competencies as envisaged integrating logics, particularly to ‘integrate’ the theoretical and practical components of this curriculum.
Alongside these two key rationales relating to identity and curricular organisation and closely bound up with them (especially in the early curriculum), is a an aspirant third ‘rationale’, a specific approach to pedagogy that sees an integration of different knowledge types in the process of how they are taught. A broad notion of experiential learning and associated pedagogic tools were endorsed and promoted in the curriculum to serve the function of trying to socialise staff into a common culture and privilege particular ways of seeing knowledge (or knowing), and to socialise students into ways of thinking and behaving as ‘professionals’. Providing a common teaching and learning experience to students was seen as a key way to support the structuring of the ideal graduate (the first logic referred to above) and the socialisation of staff into a shared identity in relation to this project. A particular way of teaching (and an associated view of knowledge) was an attempt to create a common pedagogy that was envisaged to be able to provide predictability, a shared approach for staff and students, and hence (indirectly) reduce fragmentation arising from bringing many ‘bits’ into the curriculum. In sociological terms, this envisaged common approach was perhaps seen as being able to compensate for some of the fragmentation arising from weak classification and weak framing and the practical difficulties experienced in accomplishing a form of integration. Pedagogy and specific pedagogic approaches seemed to provide the means through which otherwise fragmented contents could be brought into a relationship with each other so as to bring together knowledge derived from practice with academic knowledge.

I briefly examine each of the aspirant integrating logics in the MM PDM curriculum, how they were drawn on to fulfil an integrating function, and why they faced difficulties in performing this integrating role and in providing a basis for curriculum coherence and student progression. I then discuss the implications of trying to adopt these logics as a basis for curriculum coherence and for achieving the identity formation and learning objectives that the curriculum developers intended.

### 7.3 The ‘professional’, reflective, public manager

The MM PDM curriculum drew on three main intersecting ideas for shaping its ideal product. The dominant aspirant identity was that of a new public manager. This envisaged ideal public manager was seen to be both a reflective practitioner and a
new type of professional. This ideological vision of the desired graduate and new type of government official was the dominant aspirant integrating rationale or logic for holding this curriculum together, particularly in the early curriculum iterations until 2000.

However, maintaining a common, cohesive vision of this ideal product of the curriculum and getting it to function as an integrating logic proved difficult to do. Bernstein’s theoretical concepts and their further elaboration in relation to what they imply for professional identity (Beck, 2010; Beck & Young, 2005; Young, 2008b) enable consideration of why this might be the case. I address the identity construction project first and how this curriculum was seen as being able to accomplish it and then discuss the difficulties in using an ideological identity construction project as an integrative rationale in the context of this curriculum.

The MM PDM curriculum development project took place as part of a broader project of trying to re-invent the disciplinary field or ‘region’ of Public Administration in South Africa. P&DM advocated against and moved away from shaping a public or civil servant rational ‘bureaucrat-identity’ on the basis of the construct and organisational form of bureaucracy with its rule-based, meritocratic and long-term career-based logics and its relatively stable knowledge base. Instead, P&DM chose to locate the identity it wished to project in the figure of the post-bureaucratic ‘manager’, and more specifically in the public manager, who could ideally draw on the best of private sector know-how and its commonly accepted reputation for getting things done efficiently, but temper it with a sensitivity to the context of a developing country with particular social needs and development problems, requiring flexible and different means and approaches to ‘being managed’ or getting things done. Coherence in the curriculum at this stage was strongly referenced to an imagined, future context that these managers would contribute to establishing.

A difficulty in pre-2000 curriculum integrations was establishing and maintaining a sense of development and public to temper generic or decontextualised management or, in other words, to try and keep “the alternative sense of development and management [at] the fore to prevent monopolisation by the corporate world” (Gasper, 2000:166). Critics suggest that the curriculum and some of
its graduates were not able to do so (Chipkin, 2011; Fraser-Moleketi, 2003), allowing NPM to take hold in various ways in the public service. Others, however, reflect on governments role in increasing pressure on schools of public administration to move towards privileging private sector-oriented training solutions (Mabin, 2004b). For both the MM PDM curriculum developers and some in the public service, this new public manager identity rested on assumptions of being able to separate managerial tools from a managerialist ideology (Cameron, 2009). But how can we understand why it was difficult to try and shape this type of identity through this specific curriculum?

Using Bernstein’s concepts, the ideal structuring of a professional identity requires a separation of inner and outer, or the “word preceding the world” (Young, 2008b:154), in terms of the sequencing of theoretical and applied knowledge in a curriculum as well as protection and insulation of knowledge from the influence of the outside (market, politics and state). For Bernstein, the ideal conditions for the shaping of inner dedication and specialised identity in the professional was the knowledge relation or ideal-type construct that he termed singulars (or disciplines) with their strong classification and maintenance of their distinction. Drawing on Durkheim, in Bernstein’s view it is the knowledge structure that carries the message that shapes professional identity. His ideal-type singular with its “specialised discrete discourse with its own intellectual field of text, practices, rules of entry, examinations, licenses to practice” (Bernstein, 2000:52) and its strong boundaries was seen to be best able to achieve this. He expressed reservations about regions being able to do this, because they are answerable to both academia and work and more influenced by both market and state than singulars (or, at least, than singulars have been historically). He also hinted at similar concerns about the knowledge relations he called generic modes being able to do this with their favouring of ‘flexible’ identities that could be continually remoulded to fit the demands and priorities of market and their lack of a knowledge base. These views on genericism essentially reflect a less positive outlook on the ‘lifelong learning’ thesis (Young, 2008b) and a conception of ‘traditional’ professionalism and its jurisdiction over a knowledge base for professionals as the ideal professionalism.
However, in contrast to singulars, Management as a region has an unstable, shifting and contested ideal knowledge base whose composition relates to the particular approach taken to the study of Public Administration and that is subject to a range of influences from outside of academia. In addition, in referring to generic management, Mintzberg notes that “little of its [Management’s] practice has been reliably codified, let alone certified as to its effectiveness. So management cannot be called a profession or taught as such” (Mintzberg, 2004a:11).

The MM PDM curriculum was even more complex than only engaging with the contested knowledge base of the disciplinary field of Management as it drew eclectically on sources of knowledge from generic management (mostly tools, grand theories and principles), ideas, themes and concepts from other disciplines or disciplinary fields (e.g. development and public), mostly in the Social Sciences, as well as values, (moral) judgement and interpretation from historical and philosophical origins, and lastly postmodern influences in terms of interpretation and scepticism about formal theory. The knowledge base for the MM PDM curriculum was flexible and minimally specified, granting individual lecturers a high level of autonomy in how they interpreted course descriptions and packaged the knowledge of their course into the reading and materials of their course packs. Lecturers came in from different disciplinary backgrounds and their disciplinary (or regional) histories their epistemologies, their experiences of work outside academia and their politics contributed to their selection of contents for teaching.

The subject areas of policy, management and development (and later the three learning areas that were intended to become intellectual homes for academics and the ‘glue’ for curriculum) were minimally specified in syllabus descriptions and other documents and allowed for a range of individual emphases in selection of content, ideological stance and disciplinary emphasis. While individual lecturers may have been explicit in their theoretical and ideological positions in relation to the concepts of management, development and (public) policy, students were exposed, over time, to different ideological messages about the ideal P&DM/public manager identity. While exposure to a range of ideologies, epistemologies, political perspectives and not one dominant message may be an ideal in liberal, postgraduate education (and there was perhaps reluctance to try and explicitly impose a ‘P&DM view’ on these
concepts) this poses problems when relying on a central integrating ideology to provide curriculum coherence and to socialise a common public manager identity. This limited the possibility of management operating as a shared and explicit integrating rationale to reduce the weak classification between recontextualised subjects in this curriculum and to enable curriculum contents to be less isolated from each other.

In addition, the type of knowledge viewed as underpinning this public manager identity was also ambiguous. In deliberating on the nature of the ideal practitioner in the initial MM PDM curriculum, curriculum developers presented the workplace context into which practitioners would go (or where some were already) as one of uncertainty, flux and value conflict where theory or conceptual knowledge would not be able to provide ready-made answers for decision-making in action. This P&DM ideal of shaping a professional disposition focused on ‘doing’, where the knowledge for ‘doing’ was seen as emerging in the context of learning and workplace practice. This resonated with Schön’s theorising of the reflective practitioner and its less restricted view of professionalism (Noordegraaf, 2007) where “intuition” (Schön, 1983:49) is foregrounded over technical rationality and the scientific theories on which it is premised. P&DM emphasised the notion of reflection as a key component of identity and the technology of reflective practice (Ecclestone, 1996) in its advocated teaching approach (discussed further in Section 7.4).

Reflection, and more specifically in Schön’s terms reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983), was seen as central to being able to manage in a context of political and organisational flux. The assumptions of Schön’s explanation of a process of rapid reflection-in-action, a process by which “knowledge-in-action” develops in a way that Schön envisages “to be as ‘rigorous’ as the development of theory in the ‘scientific’ tradition” (Munby & Russell, 1989:71), are reflected in the MM PDM curriculum (particularly the early curriculum) and its promotion of practitioner knowledge gained through experience. Schön argues that professionals have (and use) a special type of knowledge derived from practice and that this is undervalued, particularly in formal academic institutions where the knowledge base lies in disciplines. Conflating distinctions between theoretical and practice-derived knowledge was attractive to P&DM curriculum developers in their search for greater integration of theory and
practice within the curriculum. The problems that this blurring of boundaries between different knowledge forms present are discussed in Section 7.5.

The notion of the public manager that underpinned the MM PDM curriculum was not only an identity-shaping project but, when looked at from the perspective of developing an integrated curriculum, it was also seen as a possible integrating logic. However, in terms of providing an integrating logic that was both shared over time and could provide coherence in curriculum, using this logic of the managerial or managerialist public manager identity presented difficulties.

Public Administration as an interdisciplinary field and its association with bureaucracy came to be regarded as an inappropriate relational idea to shape the selection of contents of a post-1994 public sector education curriculum. Instead, P&DM drew on a managerialist orientation or a broad view that intractable problems of civil service performance, competence and accountability could be resolved through managerial solutions. The multi-disciplinary, applied, field of Management was appealed to as the generic discipline in the MM PDM curriculum, to which other disciplines or disciplinary fields were subordinated. It is this sense of management being integrative that Pollitt argues is a reflection of managerialism as an ideology. Managerialism as an ideology “assumes that ‘management’ is a distinct and separate activity, and one that plays the crucial integrative [emphasis added] role in bringing together plans, people and technology to achieve desired results” (Pollitt, 1998:47). Management, and for some lecturers managerialism, appeared to offer a way forward as an integrating curriculum logic. Chapters Five and Six showed that these three discourses (policy, management and development) operated not only as ‘subject areas’ (recontextualised subject areas with contents drawn from a range of disciplines) but also as ideological constructs. My discussions of the two first MM PDM curriculum iterations indicated that sufficient clarity on a common sense of these three ideas (management, policy and development) and their relationship to each other in terms of horizontal coherence in the curriculum was perhaps not achieved. It seems that the integrating idea may not have been sufficiently explicit and shared to play this role. There was also potential conflict between the rational managerial and managerialist orientations and the more post-bureaucratic and postmodern orientations in the curriculum. The integrating idea was not able to be
developed into guiding principles of curriculum organisation (in terms of sequencing) beyond a broad principle that in the second curriculum iteration 2004 that courses more strongly based on theoretical concepts (factual and conceptual knowledge) should precede those more strongly based on procedural knowledge (or application) in terms of explicit sequencing of courses in the curriculum.

Thus neither the ideal identity of the public manager, nor the reflective practitioner could provide an adequate basis for coherence, be it in terms of ‘conceptual’ or ‘contextual’ coherence in Muller’s terms (Muller, 2009). Reflective practice and reflection leave curriculum developers without a strong basis for translating a vision or ideology into a set of principles for holding curriculum contents in an explicit relationship. While a focus on reflection seeks to elevate the place of practical or professional knowledge in academic institutions, this form of contextual knowledge that professionals are seen to have is underspecified in research on professional knowledge (including in public administration). Particular forms of practical knowledge, such as tacit knowledge, cannot be specified in terms of procedures or principles that are able to provide a basis for selection and sequencing in the curriculum (Eraut, 2004; Gamble, 2002; Gamble, 2004b). If coherence in an integrated curriculum rests on articulating principles for how knowledge can be sequenced, paced and evaluated, a key question arises: what is the knowledge that is the basis for reflection that enables the reflective practitioner to reflect beyond what is already known? This is in part related to “the learning dilemma” (Bereiter, 1985), which Sfard articulates in terms of questions about how it is possible to want to know what is not yet known (Sfard, 1998). A critique of constructivist perspectives on reflection is that they assume a knowledge base as the basis for reflection, the nature of which is not (and in some instances perhaps cannot) be articulated. This leaves the issue of the type and place of knowledge in curriculum silent or implicit. In this curriculum, different approaches to the practical seem to rest on different sources of knowledge which do not seem to be made explicit. An approach to practical management focuses on knowledge that reflects generalisations or procedures for practice, while an approach to the tacit (leadership, values) focuses more on judgment, values and wisdom (loosely referenced to Philosophy or History).
Understanding the nature of this action and the change or shift that takes place in the heat of the moment of the “epistemological event” (Munby & Russell, 1989:76) of reflection-in-action is not described and cannot be so as it is largely tacit. Schön does not describe practice-based knowledge (Eraut 1995). It is unclear how trying to make reflection-in-action (which is largely tacit in real world practice) a principle for organising curriculum could work in practice. Making explicit tacit knowledge as principles visible for guiding curriculum design and coherence is complex if not impossible (Gamble, 2002).

In practice, the ‘reflection’ that is often referred to as a learning driver in continuing education where students are already practitioners such as this MM PDM curriculum is different to the ‘thinking about action’ that occurs metacognitively at the same time as action, or in other words, tacit knowledge. Rather, what curriculum developers seem to have in mind in this curriculum is a retrospective ‘reflection on action’ that has been associated with learning from experience and reflected in, for example, the work of Dewey and Kolb (Eraut, 1994). Blurring distinctions between the two and their contexts of acquisition does not assist a quest for an ‘epistemology of practice’ that might enable the development of principles for curriculum design and coherence.

As summed up by Munby and Russell, Schön’s work (and other work in this tradition of reflection) may offer a discourse indicating where professional education should and may go, but is short on detail about the processes necessary to get there (Munby & Russell, 1989) and is therefore unable to provide a description of a knowledge base to facilitate a transparent sequencing path in the curriculum or an epistemology of professional practice.

Both the graduate identity and the knowledge base to inform the shaping of this identity remain ambiguous through both the 1993-1999 and the 2000-2005 MM PDM curriculum iterations as the curriculum attempts to reconcile its various ‘academic’ and ‘practical’ orientations. As a Masters degree looking to the university and to its professional (practical) orientation as well as to social, economic and political changes informing higher education there were on-going tensions around which
orientation or which approach within orientations was or should be dominant and how they could be reconciled to produce a coherent curriculum.

7.4 Curriculum integrating logics

The MM PDM curriculum also turned to three different logics as possible integrating logics to inform curriculum structuring. Firstly, curriculum developers turned to various applications of generic competencies where the contents of individual courses and the degree as a whole are referenced to particular competencies to be developed or outcomes to be reached, ostensibly derived from real world practice (or desired real world practice). Secondly, the curriculum was seen as being interdisciplinary or held together according to an interdisciplinary (or multi-disciplinary) logic and objective. Thirdly, an orientation towards applied, problem-solvi

7.4.1 Competence and competencies

In searching for relational logics to guide integration and improve curriculum coherence, the concepts of competence and competencies are reflected in several ways in this curriculum. Firstly, there is a growing emphasis across the 1993-1999 and the 2000-2005 curriculum iterations on specifying course and degree objectives in terms of generic outcomes in greater detail. Secondly, the curriculum appeals to management competency frameworks, albeit rhetorically. Thirdly, there is a reflection of generic graduate skills, attributes or competences assumed to be able to be taught independently from specific disciplinary content (e.g. critical thinking skills and research skills).

What competency-based and outcomes-based notions share is an idea that education can be provided in reference to performance (competency or outcomes) statements, where outputs (workplace and generic performance) rather than inputs
(knowledge) can be specified and measured. Another way of viewing it is that the real world is assumed to become the organising principle for curriculum (Young & Muller, 2010). The assumption is that the knowledge that is to be acquired need not be that of a particular discipline or subject and can change as long as the outcome or competence is reached. This reinforced and legitimated undifferentiated access to the MM PDM curriculum and its underspecification of prior knowledge.

The P&DM curriculum reflects a turn to a decontextualising logic of genericism (reflected in notions of competence, competencies and generic skills) as a relational idea for several reasons. Firstly, it appeared to offer a way of bringing together a theoretical, academic orientation (knowing that) and a practical, applied orientation (knowing how), and of reinforcing the curriculum goal of relevance to practice and production of practitioners who could get things done. The notions of competence, competency-based (or outcomes-based) education and generic skills circulating at the time in South Africa and beyond appeared to offer a way of bringing different forms of knowledge together. The logic of (management) competencies appeared to offer this ‘synthesis’ through de-emphasising the context of acquisition of knowledge, differences between the two knowledge forms and how they are acquired. The logic of competence thus appears to offer a way out of the ‘academic/professional’ tension often inherent in curricula providing and legitimating differentiated access routes for students and responding to policy drivers focused around qualifications-driven educational reform.

In post-1999 curricula a focus on using the tools of outcomes specifications (specification of course and degree aims in terms of outcomes-based language) appeared to present a way of providing specificity and transparency about the goals and assessment criteria of different courses, which was perceived as a weakness in the 1993-1999 curriculum. The appeal of outcomes specifications for curriculum developers lay in the possibilities it appeared to hold for a more explicit pedagogy, where rules and criteria for expectations of performance could be made more explicit for both staff and students. ‘Outcomes’ appeared to offer greater visibility and transparency about the objectives of individual courses and a way of conceiving of learning as an activity of mediation to counter the fragmentation in curriculum already experienced by staff and students in the pioneer curriculum iterations. The
reworking of course descriptions in terms of outcomes also provided opportunities for staff to talk about what and how they taught. When conceived of in terms of ‘applied competence’ in relation to a whole qualification, this approach lent itself more broadly to a constructivist rather than a behaviourist orientation reflected in, for example, the outcomes statements for unit standards-based qualifications in South Africa (Allais, 2007). The approach to the MM PDM curriculum was also focused in building down from qualification objective or ideal product to outcomes. The appeal of ‘outcomes’ also lay in legitimating or supporting undifferentiated access for students. Hypothetically, if there are different routes to the same outcome, particular knowledge prerequisites are not seen as necessary as it is possible to meet the outcome in various ways independent of a core of common knowledge. A ‘public manager’ can thus be recognised through certification at postgraduate level without reference to a prior specific knowledge base and without vertical progression in relation to this base. The possibility for an informal RPL process was thus legitimated allowing P&DM to avoid directly engaging with educational consequences of past unequal access.

In the second curriculum iteration (post-1999) P&DM drew on the competencies (identified by management consultants involved in the development of the SMS Competency Framework for the South African public sector to try and provide a logic for organising the content of its revised curriculum (detailed in Chapter 6)). Within the field of management there have been on-going research attempts to identify competences that underpin the performance of effective managers since the influential work of Boyatzis on identifying management competencies (Boyatzis, 1982). Management competences appear to offer predictability and certainty in describing what managers do (Grugulis, 1997) perhaps making them attractive as possible ways of organising curriculum. Referencing the SMS competency framework (even if only predominantly through the naming of courses and course content) was used to legitimate the MM PDM curriculum in the eyes of students and employers by demonstrating its relevance and responsiveness to employers and the world of work. It seems to have been used mainly as a retrospective “justifying discourse” (Interviewee 4) to name and reorganise mostly already existing curriculum courses. Although promoting and relying on these competency
frameworks for signalling curriculum relevance, in practice it was not possible to actually assess these (mainly behavioural and attitudinal) competencies in curriculum. Assessment of students in the MM PDM curriculum was through either ‘inferred’ management practice, e.g. reflecting on the management practices of others through case studies (sometimes hypothetical ones), producing ‘text and talk’ to persuade others about the best solutions (Pollitt, 2003), producing accounts of practice (rather than ‘doing’ practice itself) or through discursive academic tasks requiring application of theoretical knowledge to practical contexts (See Appendix H). Despite the impossibility of applying assessment against these SMS competencies within the curriculum, without an observed work-based practical component (and perhaps even with it) there is nevertheless an appeal to the decontextualising logic of competence, because it appears to offer a way of resolving tensions involved in bringing practice and theoretical knowledge together in curriculum. P&DM saw its role as providing the knowledge that underpinned these competencies, rather than specifically evaluating students against the achievement of these competencies. However, this specific knowledge base for practice is not clearly articulated.

The second curriculum iterations (2000 and 2004) begin to look more to ‘generic’ academic skills (or generic graduate attributes) as possible integrating logics, albeit often implicitly. These generic skills are either assumed to be able to develop over time relatively independently from a prior common formative education knowledge base appropriate for postgraduate study, or it is acknowledged that what can be taught is limited and survivalist (for example, writing skills and research skills). In the absence of agreed minimum numeracy and language competence, the curriculum dealt with these problems through assuming that developmental pedagogic processes and good teaching can compensate for gaps in prior knowledge bases. At its most structured, this logic of ‘generic’ skills or attributes is reflected in a deliberate processes of teaching students to try and think like a researcher (in the Research Design and Methods course) or, in the case of numeracy and analytic competence, attempts to recontextualise only a very limited range of basic concepts that may later be insufficient for progress in conducting research or for academic progression beyond the degree (or, for perhaps functioning effectively in workplaces in relation to these assumed competencies).
Translating the logic of outcomes/competences into principles for sequencing and shaping of content in the MM PDM curriculum was also problematic. Firstly, it was difficult for management competencies to play the role of a strong integrating ideology to bring academics together around a common vision or project. There was scepticism from some academics about the intent as well as the applicability of this approach in producing the ideal graduate. Research on the use of these standards argues that the standards developed to describe and benchmark these competences are neither good descriptions of managerial work as described in literature, nor actually experienced by managers, and they fail to distinguish between “work that is managerial and work that managers do” (Grugulis, 2000:96). In the South African context, it is also argued that imprecise job descriptions for managers often require a manager with an unrealistic skills and knowledge set to perform analytical, managerial, financial as well as administrative functions, which were previously distinct roles (Chipkin, 2008). P&DM academics had similar reservations about both outcomes logics and managerial competencies and do not seem to have united around a common acceptance or understanding of this logic or if/how it could be recontextualised into the MM PDM curriculum.

Secondly, outcomes or competency statements do not present a basis for deciding what knowledge to include in a curriculum and how to organise it. It is not always clear how a piece of content can be directly related to a specific learning outcome (Shalem, Allais, & Steinberg, 2004). The notion of competence assumes that knowledge is embedded in the performance of the task. In educational programme design terms, knowledge is embedded in outcomes statements or competency statements that are specified for each job role. In “designing down” (Allais, 2007:74) from outcomes to learning programmes or courses of instruction, there is little specification of what knowledge should be included or, in fact, why any particular piece of knowledge should be selected at all. Despite considerable work on specifying outcomes in both the first curriculum iterations (until 1999) and redesigning the courses of the second curriculum iteration (until 2005) to reflect the core SMS competencies, neither outcomes nor competencies were effectively translated into principles for organising content and relationships across courses in the MM PDM curriculum. The reflection of these competencies in the curriculum
were however intended to signal a responsiveness to market demand. They may have enabled greater transparency in expressing the objectives of individual courses and did, for a period of time, seem to begin to provide some basis for discussion about the knowledge taught in courses and the overarching objectives of the degree and the ideal graduate. The production of new course outlines pulled staff together for a while around a common pedagogic endeavour. The process contributed to greater amounts of more uniform and explicit documentation about degree objectives, which would subsequently become important for quality audits and reviews. What is less clear is whether and if so, how these were actualised in courses. A major problem here is that competence logics do not distinguish between different knowledge forms and requirements for sequencing and progression. I return to this point in Section 7.5.

### 7.4.2 Interdisciplinarity

The MM PDM curriculum appealed to a broad notion of interdisciplinarity or multidisciplinarity as an overarching logic. In discussing this logic of interdisciplinarity, it is first necessary to distinguish between appeals to interdisciplinarity in terms of what happens in practice (how teaching, curriculum design and research take place in interdisciplinary ways) and as a discourse. In order to understand its appeal to P&DM’s curriculum designers as a relational logic, I highlight distinctions between, on the one hand, interdisciplinarity (and its variants e.g. multi-disciplinarity) as a discourse around which the academics, activists and NGO practitioners could come together and justify a space for this new project in the university, and, on the other, interdisciplinarity as a practice in knowledge-generation, research and curriculum. If implemented as curriculum practice, disciplines would be brought into various explicit relationships with each other in courses and tasks, and in research multi-disciplinary teams would work on developing synthesising concepts or general principles that cross disciplines (i.e. ‘doing’ interdisciplinarity) in practice. The variants of interdisciplinarity (e.g. trans-disciplinarity, multi-disciplinarity) are distinguished by variation in relation to the extent to which disciplines ‘merge’ and are transformed into new configurations (Klein, 2010). However, in the MM PDM curriculum, appeals are often made to interdisciplinarity as a discourse (where claims and assumptions are made about what interdisciplinary can do). These distinctions between
interdisciplinarity as a *discourse* and as a *practice* sometimes get blurred in curriculum discussions so I discuss them separately below, beginning with interdisciplinarity as a discourse.

A number of reviews and publications have outlined the assumptions of arguments promoting interdisciplinarity over disciplinarity (Christie & Maton, 2011; Jacobs & Frickel, 2009; Moore, 2011; Muller, 2011). Disciplines, according to those promoting ‘interdisciplinarity’ and interdisciplinary curricula, produce epistemic barriers that impede the flow of knowledge. For this reason, these barriers need to be weakened or removed through new approaches to applied research, different ways of conceiving of knowers and through curriculum restructuring to promote interdisciplinary initiatives. Moore refers to these views of disciplines as obstacles to flows of knowledge as *hyperdisciplinarity* (Moore, 2011) to distinguish them from the routine interdisciplinarity that Abbott identifies as taking place as a normal part of sub-divisions and developments within and between disciplines (Abbott, 2001). The broad assumptions of views framed within a discourse of hyperdisciplinarity accord little epistemic values to disciplines, see them as defending social interests and as being able to be reconstructed under new historical conditions (Moore, 2011:88) or marshalled to either achieve a particular pedagogic end or a particular notion of relevance to markets (Muller, 2011).

Implicitly and sometimes explicitly, interdisciplinarity or multi-disciplinarity in the MM PDM curriculum is projected as being advantageous for the task of either supporting research in projects of innovation or supporting knowledge-making in applied problem-solving contexts, like Public Management, or as an asset in terms of academic staff disciplinary diversity. The idea of a curriculum that has an identity of being ‘interdisciplinary’ was appealing to PDM’s curriculum developers who were concerned with engaging with immediate problem-solving, attracting external funding, challenging barriers to entry associated with traditional university organisational structures (including disciplines) and carving out an independent space, project of reform and challenge within existing university organisational structures dominated by disciplines. An interdisciplinary logic also justified the inclusion of students and staff with a wide range of prior disciplinary and professional backgrounds into a postgraduate degree and the housing of academics from
different disciplinary backgrounds. Although envisaged as being multi or inter-disciplinary research, student selection of research topics did not require building on their previous knowledge bases.

However, in terms of interdisciplinarity as practice, at various points in the MM PDM curriculum particular interdisciplinary analytical or methodological approaches are visible as possible options for creating interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary ‘synthesising bridges’ between courses in the curriculum. Usually, they are championed by individuals or by a core group of academics and they change over time as staff change. The two most visible contenders as cross-curricular interdisciplinary methodologies in early rounds of curriculum development were systems thinking and policy analysis. In addition to these two specific methodologies, there were two ‘rationales’ or “adjectives” (Gaspar, 2000:168) that functioned as holding discourses informing this interdisciplinary field of ‘management’, namely development and public. These methodologies or synthesising discourses are summarised in the table below.

Table 19: Potential Interdisciplinary Synthesising Methodologies in the MM PDM Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synthesising methodologies</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary rationales or holding discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g. systems theory, policy analysis</td>
<td>E.g. ‘development’ and ‘public’ (to temper ‘management’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Analysis of P&DM curriculum docs, memos, field notes, interviews).

In literatures engaging with the concept of interdisciplinarity, both systems thinking and policy analysis are put forward as exemplars of interdisciplinary approaches or methodologies to generation of knowledge and as ways of going beyond perceived limitations of disciplines in generating practical and applied knowledge in contexts requiring problem-solving (Fleishman, 1990; Miller, 2010; Strijbos, 2010). Both have as their goals an attempt to overcome increasing specialisation in scientific thinking and to present ways to promote looking at issues and problems in generalist and
holistic terms. In this sense, they both involve weakening of classification between disciplines.

While early P&DM students were introduced to systems thinking and approaches to analysis (see Syllabus Outlines in Appendix E) and while some students used systems approaches in conducting their research, there is no evidence of systems thinking being used consistently as an approach for generating knowledge through interdisciplinary student research across the curriculum. Its explicit visibility in curriculum as a possible interdisciplinary methodology gradually diminished over time and in the second round of curriculum iterations it all but disappeared in syllabus descriptions (although individuals may have engaged with it in their teaching).

The use of policy analytical frameworks as interdisciplinary methodology devices was also visible in the first curriculum iterations until 1999. In designing the initial PPDA and the first version of the MM PDM degree in 1994, P&DM drew strongly on the curriculum models presented by public policy schools in the USA where, it was argued, these schools had been exemplars of interdisciplinarity in the Social Sciences (Miller, 2010). In these North American policy school curriculum models, public policy was originally underpinned by a strong analytic focus reflected in course contents with a strong quantitative orientation (including statistical methods, economics). This reflected a view of public policy as ‘science’ (Lynn, 1996) and a consequent focus on analytic skills and tools that could bridge disciplines in the exercise of complex problem-solving. In this sense, policy analysis arguably represented the strongest attempt, in practice, of implementing an interdisciplinary methodology in the early MM PDM curriculum. However, over time the prevalence and visibility of policy as a relational idea and policy analysis as a methodology seem to have weakened. Firstly, the quantitative and analytical emphasis necessary for policy analysis of this type diminished in curriculum, and its contents and complexity were gradually reduced. After the first few curriculum iterations where classes consisted of an initial small pool of work-experienced, motivated and mostly academically capable students, pressure to massify changed the nature and range of abilities of the students accepted. There were progressive changes in pacing reflected in reducing content and time allocated to analytical components. Due to this
pressure, the course *Analytical Methods* was dropped altogether in the 1999 MM PDM curriculum and it only re-emerged in progressively less rigorous and demanding forms in the 2000 and 2004 curricula. The MM PDM curriculum thus gradually shifted to accommodate students’ poor underlying mathematical knowledge and analytic abilities necessary for success in analytical components, limiting what could be achieved in terms of analysis and limiting possibilities for implementing policy analysis as an interdisciplinary methodology in the curriculum.

While ‘themes’ would also emerge as possible cross-curricular interdisciplinary bridges, e.g. a cross-curricular thematic focus on HIV/AIDS in the 2004 curriculum along with on-going appeals to ‘development’, there does not appear to have been a rigorous or sustained attempt to seek out or exploit particular interdisciplinary concepts to promote a bridge between disciplines and maintain them. In practice, the curriculum seems to consist more of a non-interacting multi-disciplinarity, with potential interdisciplinary concepts being prominent at particular points in time, usually as a consequence of new ‘fads’ in the field of management (e.g. ‘Knowledge Management’ appears in the second round of curriculum developments as a possible contender) and/or as a consequence of individuals championing them as ‘holding discourses’. *Development and Policy*, for example, are both drawn on as interdisciplinary subjects (and discourses), with both waning under the growing influence of *Management*. Although appearing in the content descriptions of many courses across both curricula, ‘development’ is not explicitly promoted as a coherent, interdisciplinary concept driven through the curriculum. It appears to have a place as a discourse left open to interpretation and emphasis from different perspectives in different courses, probably according to the orientations of those teaching, but there is no clear sense of how it is viewed as ‘connective’ and for what purposes.

In practical, epistemological and curriculum terms, attempting to achieve interdisciplinarity in curriculum is not a simple endeavour if an interdisciplinary curriculum is to become ‘integrated’, rather than remain a series of unconnected themes, particularly at postgraduate level where students are encouraged to engage in ‘interdisciplinary’ research of a problem-solving nature. In practice, the approach to interdisciplinarity in this MM PDM degree was that of individuals taking selectively and eclectically from disciplines, interdisciplinary fields and semi-disciplines for
teaching, without the disciplinary origins of the contents being explicit (unless made so by a lecturer familiar with that discipline) or without the requirement for a strong base in any of the contributing disciplines.

There are constraints on trying to be interdisciplinary in this way. Research literature on interdisciplinary curricula highlights some of the conditions for what might be considered a ‘strong’ interdisciplinary (or integrated) curriculum. It stresses that strong disciplinary knowledge is important for principled interdisciplinarity. Interdisciplinarity that has as its focus on the enhancement of knowledge, or “good interdisciplinarity” (Fuller, 2007), relies on a strong disciplinary knowledge base for both students and lecturers (Benson, 1982; Boix Mansilla & Duraisingh, 2007). A key observation for interdisciplinary curriculum design is that in assessment, a strong disciplinary grounding for doing good interdisciplinary work seems to be valued by researchers working in interdisciplinary ways and by faculty assessing student work (Benson, 1982; Lamont, Mallard, & Guetzkow, 2006; Mallard, Lamont, & Guetzkow, 2009) i.e. interdisciplinarity builds off, and either assumes (or has to put in place), strong disciplinarity. Teaching in ways that make claims to being interdisciplinary, by implication, requires explicit development and articulation of integrative conceptual or methodological frameworks to develop courses that are more than eclectic offerings from a range of disciplines. In interdisciplinary teaching, the responsibility for integration is placed with curricula developers and teachers because "self-synthesis, the assumption that students can integrate materials and ideas themselves, is inadequate" (Klein, 1996:214). Some note that issues of cross-disciplinary integration have not been adequately examined at the level of instruction (Minnis & John-Steiner, 2006). Few lecturers are experts in several disciplines, so working with an interdisciplinary logic for curriculum design implies actively setting up both techniques and institutional arrangements for communication across disciplines to take place, e.g. joint appointments, research collaboration, team projects, team teaching, collaborative curriculum development all of which are high in cost (Benson, 1982). In research terms, this means discussion about the nature of the subjects that are in a relationship to each other, particularly in relation to reconceptualisation of common concepts from different disciplines and the theories in which they are embedded (Muller, 2011). Soft applied fields where academics come from a range of
disciplines may not have a strong enough common academic culture for this integration to happen easily in terms of curriculum development and or for it to be maintained, a valid point for the MM PDM curriculum, especially as it developed over time. In a curriculum such as this where some academics’ postgraduate socialisation is in the region of Public Administration (as perhaps will be the case for more academics in the future) rather than in disciplines, this also raised questions as to what extent ‘good interdisciplinary collaboration’ may be possible.

Chapter Five showed that aspirant dominant interdisciplinary concepts and themes are individually driven and wane when individuals move on unless actively taken up by other champions and accepted by the teaching collective. This seems to be the case in other management curricula (Moore, 2004b). Disciplinary integration within and across courses in the MM PDM curriculum appears to have relied on student self-synthesis and engagement with the discipline through assumed further reading and study. While official syllabus descriptions of content were developed through particular organisational structures (e.g. learning areas or committee processes) to attempt to provide a broad consensus around a common subject area, knowledge itself was underspecified in these descriptions and only broadly implied or suggested through analysis of the readings selected by individual lecturers when teaching courses, or through actual course outlines and observation and analysis of classroom teaching. Consequently, a weakness in using this MM PDM case study is that less is documented about how framing may have affected the message of interdisciplinary conveyed through the curriculum at the time. This underspecification of knowledge was in part a convenience to allow for the possibility of flexible adaptations to courses when taught by staff with different expertise and perspectives, and in part in the interest of an assumed constant need for updating the content knowledge and procedural knowledge emphasised in courses to meet the criteria of relevance to practice.

Where ‘integration’ occurs in the MM PDM curriculum in practice, it appears to be at the level of tasks, with tasks assuming a range of skills rather than explicitly requiring integration or synthesis of knowledge across courses or disciplines. While these complexities in terms of implementation are important, key to this analysis are the assumptions about integration of knowledge forms that these appeals to
interdisciplinarity represent. The dominant integrating methodologies that are drawn on, both systems theory and policy analysis, privilege the role of generalist over specialist knowledge and expertise. Systems theory, for example, looks to provide a holism that is perceived as not possible through disciplinary analysis. In both integrating concepts, specialisation in either a discipline or a sector or applied knowledge field (e.g. education, health) is seen as not necessary or perhaps even as being limiting as in these views it is better not to have analysis “bounded by the substantive knowledge and perspectives of the problem areas to which they apply their analytic skills” (Fleishman, 1990:749). This privileging of the generalist is reflected in the sequencing and progression logic of curriculum and the negating of a need for disciplinary or regional undergraduate courses on which a postgraduate curriculum can build vertically. De-emphasising disciplinary knowledge in particular, and formal, conceptual knowledge in general, as a base for study in Public Management also allows for undifferentiated student access and a logic of progression that is not based on assumptions of specialisation or increasing complexity. This assumption, however, perhaps only works for some subjects as the discussion in Section 7.5 will highlight. The need for both prior disciplinary knowledge and prior generic knowledge (reflected in some form of mathematical or language competence grounding) are negated. MM PDM curricula increasingly assume that sufficient necessary prior disciplinary knowledge in Economics, Statistics and Politics, can be taught within the curriculum and in sufficient depth to enable some reasonable level of scholarly analysis when students reach the research component. The progressive expansion of MM PDM curriculum contents and adjustments to pacing reflect the pressure this assumption places on the curriculum to include ever-increasing amounts of content or less discussed, reduce expectations when this assumption does not hold.

Another implication of appeals to interdisciplinary logics relates to weak framing and the implications of weak framing for curriculum. In the MM PDM curriculum, a primary role is accorded to the process of synthesis in interdisciplinary work and, in particular, the role of the ‘knowers’ in influencing decisions about framing (what to select, emphasise and bring together and in what depth) and which knowledge forms to privilege. In Maton’s terms, this accords status to a ‘knower’ rather than a
‘knowledge’ perspective (Maton, 2007). Doing interdisciplinarity in curriculum involves an epistemic relation to the various disciplines that inform the project (or knowledge relation) and a strong social relation (or knower relation) to the process of synthesis or integration of knowledge (Maton, 2007). Versions of interdisciplinarity with a more transgressive (or trans-disciplinary intent) widen the composition of legitimate knowers beyond those from various disciplines to include a wider composition of stakeholders or ‘knowers’ including workplaces, communities and government as is the case with the MM PDM curriculum. There are likely to be tensions between some of the disciplines informing the joint curriculum project as to whether knower or knowledge relations are more or less privileged, and within the various knowers, i.e. whose ‘gazes’ are privileged in bringing together various knowledge forms and experiences. In the MM PDM curriculum because knowledge contents were weakly specified, where synthesis or integration occurred it did so mainly within courses according to the ‘gaze’ of the particular course lecturer. Attempts at trying to strengthen framing relationships through a common pedagogy (discussed in Section 7.4) and more transparent specification of ‘outcomes’ existed in tension with the weaker framing encoded in social relationships between different categories of knowers (both teachers from different disciplinary backgrounds and student, practitioner knowers). An implication is that judgements about evaluation were likely to have been diverse and perhaps implicit, as examiner comments on student research suggests. It is here in relation to assessment that the implications of blurred classificatory boundaries for staff are perhaps most significant.

7.4.4 Research

In the MM PDM curriculum, the research component was referred to in documentation as enabling integration of curriculum contents through the conduct of ‘applied’ research. In terms of the structure of the curriculum, this involved meeting the ‘capstone’ requirements of the MM PDM degree through the production of limited applied research demonstrating some familiarity with basic processes and approaches to designing and conducting research. This notion of applied, problem-solving or use-oriented research is drawn on as a possible integrating curriculum logic. In similar ways to the discussion on interdisciplinarity (in Section 7.4.2) this potential integrating vision is reflected in two ways in the MM PDM curriculum.
Firstly, it is reflected in an attempt to create an integrating ideology around the idea of ‘applied research’ and its value (vs. ‘basic’ research), and secondly as an attempt to bring the disparate bits of curriculum into a relationship (largely relying on students to do this integration themselves). I explain each in turn.

Firstly research, and particularly applied research, is visible in the curriculum as a particular orientation to what is seen as relevant research. Relevant research is perceived in terms of problem-solving, use-oriented, applied and interdisciplinary research. P&DM curriculum documents and curriculum discussions reflect a curriculum orientation to what is referred to as ‘applied research’ (as distinct from basic or academic or pure research) which is seen to be able to address specific topical concerns in Public Management and to provide practical results, rather than being oriented towards generation of theory with the scientific community as the primary audience. However, while a broad orientation to ‘applied research’ (interpreted as problem-solving relating to workplaces and work-focused problems) seems to have been largely shared, judgements about what it is and evaluating it are not. The ‘scholarliness’ and ‘relevance’ of student output is contested by both internal and external examiners (as Chapter Six examined).

It seems that the appeal of applied research to curriculum developers may not only have been motivated by usefulness to the new discipline of Public Management but also to broader local and global policy debates at the time relating to the purpose of Masters degrees (Atkins & Redley, 1998; DoE, 2007; Drennan & Clarke, 2009). This particular MM PDM curriculum reflects an orientation towards discourses associated with notions of ‘applied research’ or ‘use-oriented’ research (Cooper, 2011) reflected in the South African policy development context of the 1990s and early 2000s. Development of higher education policy in South Africa in the 1990s and early 2000s occurred in the context of broader, global debates on models explaining changes in knowledge production and innovation and their implications for how knowledge is produced in higher education (for example, Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000; Gibbons, et al., 1994). Although there was little evidence at the time of a major shift from Mode 1 (disciplinary) to Mode 2 (applied) orientations to knowledge (Gibbons, et al., 1994) in undergraduate curricula in South Africa beyond structural changes to how curricula are organised (Ensor, 2002; Jansen, 2002), it is argued that this analytical
framework has had particular influence on South African government policy in relation to higher education generally (Kraak, 2000) and a privileging of Mode 2 in research policy and funding specifically. Take-up of these ideas is also seen in South African Department of Education endorsements of Masters degrees as being not only preparation for academic specialisations and academic career paths, but also for supporting the career development of ‘knowledge workers’ beyond universities and assumptions that these two goals can be reconciled in a particular degree (DoE, 2007). This applied, use-oriented research orientation was appealing to P&DM curriculum developers as it seemed to offer a way of closing divides between experts and practitioners (and the knowledge they bring), as practitioner-students were seen to be able to research topics of an immediate, problem-solving nature guided by academics and assessed by a wider range of examiners who are not all university- or discipline-based. Likewise, the conduct of applied research by academic staff (often contract-related) legitimated academic time spend on consulting to generate third stream income as this knowledge was seen as becoming a basis for teaching and supervision.

*Applied research* is also seen as the means of integrating content across the course components in the MM PDM curriculum. The assumption was that students would draw on and integrate knowledge and skills acquired during coursework and integrate these to focus on a practical research problem. In this sense, the capstone research requirement is seen as a ‘seamless’ extension of the problem-solving orientation and skills and knowledge acquired during the courses that made up the curriculum. This seems not to be the case in terms of how student progress and performance played out. Firstly, there was an assumption that the competences required for doing research are generic to all courses in the curriculum and have been developed organically during coursework. This, however, does not seem to be the case. Secondly, there is an assumption that the (interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary) knowledge base which students draw on for defining their research problem and purpose has either been developed in coursework or will be developed mostly independently through extensive literature review or, more controversially, is perhaps not central to conducting applied research at all. In practice, as it became clear that this base (both knowledge and skills) may not have been developed
(reflected in high non-completion rates for the research component of the degree) and in concerns about the quality of student research output.

I argue that it is here (in the research component of curriculum) that the consequences of not adequately engaging with a need for strong and explicit links between an integrating idea and co-ordinated knowledge become most apparent. Students (and probably supervisors as well) drew eclectically from different knowledge bases (disciplinary and work-related) and different knowledge forms (that may not have been strongly reflected in coursework) to develop research proposals and to conduct research. Students may also be called on to apply knowledge and skills not emphasised in coursework or not emphasised at the level now required. Here, at the research stage of curriculum they are assumed to be able to be put in place by students in relation to a student-selected topic or focus. A lack of attention to sequencing and progression become most evident at this point, with attempts to counter this through introduction of ‘generic’ research skills, ‘good’ supervision and the (late) fostering of disposition of ‘scholarliness’ in the curriculum. Many students were not able to get through this hurdle.

7.5 Pedagogy

Early curriculum iterations reflect attempts to drive curriculum ‘integration’ or coherence pedagogically. Particular approaches to teaching, ways of conceiving of learning and what is being learned and their associated teaching technologies were actively promoted as a way of both trying to shape a student ‘therapeutic’ (Ecclestone & Hayes, 2009) identity and to try and provide ‘coherence’ based on a consistent learning experience, in which ways of viewing knowledge and particular behaviours were emphasised rather than knowledge (content) itself. A common pedagogy was seen as a way of providing a common, formative learning experience for students (and for staff) to shape a common ethos through subscribing to sets of activities, performances and displays of knowledge that were valued by curriculum developers. The pacing of curriculum was organised around assumptions of time needed for particular teaching activities (e.g. case studies, role plays). This attempt to drive coherence pedagogically is reflected in the curriculum in two key ways. The first is through promotion of teaching approaches in official school discourse
associated with the perspectives of ‘reflection’ and ‘participation’, both of which are associated with experiential learning approaches. The second is through promotion of discussion-based learning and the pedagogical tool of the case method with which it is associated.

‘Reflection’ and ‘participation’ are both rooted in conceptions of learning that are constructivist in nature. A notion of learning as ‘participation’ is an umbrella metaphor for approaches to learning that see the learning of a subject in terms of a process of becoming a member of a particular community (Sfard, 1998). ‘Reflection’ stresses the ideal of learning from, and through, the experience of student practitioners and their ‘reflection’ on that experience. Constructivist orientations to both ‘participation’ and ‘reflection’ are sometimes referred to in the management and adult education literatures as an umbrella concept of experiential learning (Fenwick, 2000). I briefly outline their main assumptions separately and then examine them together in relation to problems they pose in terms of playing an envisaged role of driving curriculum coherence pedagogically.

Both curriculum periods of the MM PDM curriculum reflect views of learning that broadly see learning as arising from participation in a community (of student practitioners, lecturers and invited practitioner guests). This MM PDM curriculum justifies or advocates teaching approaches and learning strategies that are common in generic management education. The ‘participatory’ views of learning that these teaching approaches reflect are based on a range of broadly constructivist theories, the most well-known of which in professional education is that of situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Particular versions of constructivism emphasise the social, material and cultural roots of cognition and the social and participatory nature of both the knowledge and the practices of different practice base ‘communities’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Knowledge is seen here as arising from or through participation in shared social practices. Participatory learning practices underpin an approach to the study of Public Administration that has been broadly categorised as “practical wisdom” (Raadschelders, 2005a) with learning being a consequence of participatory apprenticeship.
These broad ideas were appealing in the ‘emancipatory’ curriculum that P&DM envisaged. These participatory theories have also been appealing in management, adult education (and other disciplinary) fields for a variety of reasons. Firstly, they offer a critique of theories (and associated approaches to teaching) that see teaching (and learning) as processes of filling the passive mind of the learner with information that is new or not known. In the adult-centred view of learning promoted in the MM PDM curriculum (explicitly contrasted to past ‘traditional’ teacher-centred learning experiences) it was envisaged that through participation, participants learn to become members of a community (P&DM-educated public managers or leaders) through adopting shared values and norms and the shaping of a particular self. “Learning a subject is now conceived of as a process of becoming a member of a certain community” (Sfard, 1998:6). Knowledge is seen here as ‘constructed’ via participation in shared social practices or as the differing perspectives of individuals based on their particular location and experiences in society and by implication, it (i.e. knowledge) is not specified or able to be sequenced.

As discussed in Section 7.2, the MM PDM curriculum also reflected an envisaged key component of the identity of its graduates as being reflective practitioners. Within these experiential learning perspectives a broad orientation to ‘reflection’ as an approach to learning was dominant and drew explicitly (in documentation) on the work of Kolb in relation to action learning cycles (Kolb, 1981) and less explicitly (in terms of documentation at least) on the work of Schön’s reflective practitioner (Schön, 1983).

Kolb’s model of experiential learning (and its cyclical four stages of concrete experience, observation, reflection and concept formation and testing in new situations) has been widely adopted in management education literatures to guide the structuring of learning activities and in some cases the structure of courses (e.g. problem-based courses in medicine) (Kolb, 1981; Kolb, 1984). Its emphasis is on the learner using concrete experiences to test ideas and then going through a process of reflection to change both theories and practices (Kolb, 1984) by challenging assumptions guiding students “theory-in-use” (Argyris & Schön, 1974) drawn on for problem-solving in practice. Although appeals to these ideas as models to frame learning activities may have become more mantric (Ecclestone, 1996) as the MM
PDM curriculum changed, the assumptions of about knowledge and the forms of knowledge they privilege in this curriculum are visible in various ways.

‘Reflection’ is a process that is claimed to create knowledge, an idea that was appealing in the early versions of the MM PDM curriculum. One of the common characteristics of different views of experiential learning is a similar view of knowledge where “knowledge results from the combination of grasping experience and transforming it” (Kolb, 1984:41). The assumption for theorists and practitioners working in this tradition, is that new knowledge is created or constructed in the process of reflection, rather than existing practices (knowledge) being reinforced. In the MM PDM curriculum reflection is seen in this way and as providing a means of integrating practitioner knowledge and formal instruction.

The case method associated with Harvard Business School was seen as key in developing students’ capacity (and confidence) to make judgements in contexts that simulated real working life. The case methodology is seen as a tool for developing abilities to analyse general problems and the ‘soft skills’ in terms of becoming confident in problem-solving and convincing others of valid arguments. However, critiques of the case method highlight how, in its facilitation, it is not as open as claimed, as it encodes and promotes particular management philosophies and solutions to problems (Contardo & Wensley, 2004), and because it may unintentionally reinforce organisational and individual practice that works against double-loop learning (e.g. questioning the organisations underlying policies and norms) (Argyris, 1980). As with ‘participation’ and ‘reflection’, the case method presents the possibility of a pedagogic technique being a way of resolving tensions between academic and practice-based knowledge by bringing them together through a real world ‘case’. However, it is argued that this process legitimates “uncodified folk wisdom [and] craft techniques” (Lynn, 2006:18) through certification, i.e. certifies assumed practical wisdom. This approach also has implications for framing relations in the MM PDM curriculum. The discussion-based approach to pedagogy that underpins its case teaching makes assumptions about pedagogic relations that involve ‘apparent’ weak framing relations between ‘discussion teachers’ and ‘practitioner students’ that endorse sharing of power and accountability, and the establishment of a learning community that shares values and common goals.
(Christensen, 1991). However, the argument is made that it does not allow for questioning about the nature of the management knowledge encoded in the case (Contardo & Wensley, 2004) and that power relations between facilitator and students are less explicit than claimed. What appears to be weak framing may in fact not be so as some students’ confusion about the purpose of cases in this MM PDM curriculum (documented in Chapter 5) seems to point.

The MM PDM curriculum reflected ambiguity about the role of cases in relation to conceptual or factual knowledge and its sequencing, with students expressing some confusion with regards to expectations of performance when working with cases, and staff expressing concerns in relation to students’ poor engagement with factual or conceptual content knowledge (mostly assumed to be contained in ‘background’ conceptual and theoretical readings and lectures, rather than in the case itself). These readings may or may not have included more direct guidance on procedural or principled knowledge relevant to enabling knowledge from the case to be generalised or abstracted beyond the context of the case. The curriculum assumes that much of this confusion can be handled through improvements in pedagogy (e.g. through getting students to read more and more thoroughly and through training staff to be more skilled in case facilitation and discussion-based teaching). While both improvements in pedagogy may be valid strategies for trying to improve student learning and performance, a view of this from the perspective of examining boundaries between knowledge forms is more instructive. In the case approach, knowledge and the artefact or case that is seen as holding it are regarded as the one and the same. It is argued that in the discussion form of pedagogy used with cases “content and what contains it ...become one and the same by conflating pedagogy and textuality” (Contardo & Wensley, 2004:220), a view captured in a much quoted comment from a former Dean of Harvard Business School: “[H]ow we teach is what we teach” (Elmore, 1989:173). By presenting texts for problem-solving that provide a view of what managers are supposed to be and what managerial knowledge is, cases (it is argued), avoid discourses on knowledge prevalent in academic research and privilege a certain form of knowing that “avoids knowledge by being relevant” (Contardo & Wensley, 2004).
Literature also reflects concerns that the case approach misrepresents what management is actually about by overemphasising the decision-making and problem-solving elements (Lundeberg, et al., 2001; Mintzberg, 2004b), trapping “managerial knowledge in a reciprocal relationship with best practices” (Contardo & Wensley, 2004:212) and becoming a ‘ritual’ for signifying group membership (Lynn, 1996). A similar point is made in relation to cases and the group projects and group work associated with task or project approaches, which may neither achieve the goal of modelling ‘authentic’ workplace experience and learning about the functioning of teams, nor enhance content learning, unless carefully and explicitly designed to do so (Bacon, 2005). Both the case approach and team-based or group learning may thus misrepresent what ‘management’ is and conflate pedagogic forms with knowledge.

7.6 Achieving integration without boundaries?

Overcoming fragmentation and trying to achieve ‘integration’ in a curriculum that is put together in a particular political and social context and on the basis of recontextualising knowledge from various disciplines, disciplinary fields and sub-fields, while at the same time attempting to recontextualise knowledge and practices derived from workplaces, is complex and influenced by the political and social context of the time. Curriculum architects and staff teaching the curriculum examined in this thesis conceived of integration and the means to achieve it in different ways. Chapters Five and Six explored the case of the MM PDM, an integrated-type curriculum seen as appropriate for the task of shaping a new type of public servant, the public manager.

I argue that the different logics that were appealed to try and achieve integration in this curriculum were not able to ‘integrate’ in the sense of providing internal coherence or to adequately ‘integrate’ the theoretical and practical components in a vision for the curriculum. In my analysis, I related ‘integration’ to curriculum coherence, referring to how a curriculum holds it various contents together in order to enable students and staff to see the ‘whole’ that lies beyond the different parts and in order to facilitate progression through a particular curriculum and beyond, as this curriculum and this qualification provides access to PhDs. I refer to curriculum
integration and coherence specifically with reference to both horizontal linkages between subjects (or disciplines) and vertical linkages between levels within a degree.

I further argue that problems in the MM PDM curriculum which arose in relation to difficulties in achieving internal coherence and 'integration' were related to how 'curriculum' as a phenomenon was conceptualised and what curriculum developers envisaged it was possible to achieve through curriculum. This curriculum reflected an assumption that the identity of the new public manager and his/her abilities to perform academically and professionally could be shaped through the curriculum via development and maintenance of a common ideological vision, cross-curricular concepts intended to inform the organisational logic of curriculum itself (i.e. interdisciplinarity and competences/competencies), and particular approaches to pedagogy which attempted to hold contents together from a range of disciplines, other regions, the field of practice (i.e. work in the public service) and students experience of life and work.

I argue that the different logics that were appealed to in order to try and achieve and improve integration were not able to integrate in the sense of providing internal coherence in the curriculum or to 'integrate' the 'theoretical' and 'practical' in the vision of curriculum developers for several, related reasons. This was in part because the logics themselves contained internal contradictions for performing these roles. Secondly, the logics themselves reflected competing approaches to the study of public administration or management, each associated with different types of knowledge. Thirdly, it proved difficult to sustain a clear and explicit ideological vision as an integrating logic for academic staff over time. Fourthly, and related to all of the previous reasons, in sociological terms curriculum developers attempted to find a logic to integrate curriculum contents while weakening, de-emphasising or ignoring key boundaries between disciplines, between different knowledge forms and between educational and political/economic spheres. The view was that these were obstacles to be overcome, perhaps through pedagogy. I conclude this chapter by elaborating on each reason in turn and then exploring implications of these blurred boundaries in this particular case and for Bernstein’s theory more broadly in the concluding chapter, Chapter Eight.
Each of the logics that were drawn on in the MM PDM curriculum contained internal contradictions that undermined the possibility of them playing the integrating roles that were explicitly and implicitly envisaged for them. The identity-shaping project of producing a new kind of civil servant, the public manager, rested on positions whose inherent contradictions were difficult to overcome. These related specifically to merging the goals of participatory and sustainable development and the skilled practice required to enable government to do this with the ‘hard skills’ and values needed for efficient, accountable management drawing on private sector know-how. The identity that this curriculum wished to project was represented by the figure of a post-bureaucratic ‘manager’, and more specifically, a public manager who could ideally draw on the best of private sector know-how and its commonly accepted reputation for getting things done efficiently, but temper it and drive it with a sensitivity to the context of a developing country and ideas of a developmental state with particular social needs and development problems. There was a lack of clarity about connections between, and dominant emphases within, a recontextualised, eclectic selection of different knowledge and positions or principles in relation to the concepts of development and management, and how they might sustain a vision that could resist the dominating influence of private sector management solutions.

A second point of contradiction, in relation to shaping a student identity, were the sometimes competing attempts to shape both a scholarly and a practitioner identity in the same curriculum, and attempts to reconcile the multiple, different assumptions about appropriate knowledge and the generation of appropriate knowledge that they rest on. This curriculum was based on assumptions that knowledge gained from everyday experience, knowledge about and for practice, and academic knowledge could be brought together, or that boundaries between them could be blurred to shape the new ideal civil servant, a principle that has been termed hybridity (Muller, 2000).

In terms of the second aspirant integrating logic, the main cross-curricular concepts intended to inform the organisational logic of the curriculum itself (i.e. interdisciplinarity and competences/competencies) presented a number of contradictions for performing an integrating role. Interdisciplinarity, and its envisaged ‘integrating’ role, was reflected both as a discourse and as practice in the curriculum.
While it played the role as a discourse to justify a space for Public Management in postgraduate higher education (particularly in this university context) and a diverse academic staff component that went beyond those with a public administration background, as well as to name an aspirant ‘integrative’ identity for staff, there were contradictions in applying it as a practice. Firstly, ‘integration’ in terms of disciplines (or new knowledge being developed through interaction between disciplines) happens in high level research and interactions with practice and developments within disciplines, rather than in curriculum or pedagogy. Secondly, in this curriculum potential interdisciplinary concepts or methodologies that might play a role in overcoming fragmentation at the level of curriculum emerged. These potential interdisciplinary concepts or methodologies were sometimes associated with individual championing and were not, or are not able to be, converted into explicit principles for organising curriculum that are sustained. At best they seemed to largely remain at the level of non-interacting (or occasionally-interacting) themes with students either making, or assumed to be making, connections between themes or the methodology as a whole. The multi- or inter- that could perhaps have been drawn on was dependent on academic staff backgrounds and inevitably can only be introductory in nature because the role of prior disciplinary knowledge is negated.

Recognising the difficulties in ‘integrating’ the curriculum and attempting to improve the explicitness of curriculum organisation in early MM PDM curricula lead to a second round of curriculum iterations between 2000 and 2004, where attempts were made to specify curriculum output more strongly in terms of outcomes or competencies. To try and engage with issues of integration and coherence, these later curriculum iterations turned to ‘generic’ forms of management competencies whose rhetoric, (perhaps more than an actual attempt to implement its technologies), allows for blurring distinctions between knowledge forms. Theoretical and practical forms of knowledge, in this view, can be conflated into demonstrable performance and measurable common underlying competence.

However, a focus on outcomes and competencies as pedagogic interventions was not able to resolve curricular problems of what to teach and measure in relation to the ‘practical’, despite hopes that their use would lead to greater transparency about criteria for assessment. Management competencies are difficult if not impossible to
evaluate in formal institutional assessment and, for that matter, in workplace performance assessment regimes where management job roles are imprecise and shifting (Grugulis, 2000). Their measurement is difficult even in contexts where assessors have a longer tradition of working with management competency-based assessment than in South Africa generally, and in the public service particularly. A key conceptual problem for the ‘practical’ (in a Public Administration curriculum like the MM PDM curriculum) is that even if there had been an assessed practicum component in this curriculum there still would have been no direct way of relating work to curriculum. It is not possible to talk about practical knowledge (as contrasted to practical performance) because it is largely tacit (Gamble, 2004b; Gamble, 2006). ‘Work’ itself does not have a form of knowledge and a direct relationship between theory and practice (or knowledge and experience) cannot be specified because they refer to different kinds of knowledge (Gamble, 2006; Shalem, 2001). The knowledge that underpins practice is seen as indirectly supporting performance but is underspecified and as such cannot provide a basis for curriculum organisation and coherence. What seems to have been drawn on in the MM PDM curriculum was an eclectic selection of procedures, models and ‘best practice’, the selection of which was based on current relevance as judged by the lecturer teaching the course, then current trends or ‘fads’ in management, and current practices in government at the time curricula are taught, with indications of some repetition of processes, technologies or tools across courses. The number of segments or bits related to practice appears to have proliferated to respond to new fashions or movements within the field of management (and later in government), with continuous curriculum revisions to try and accommodate lists of ever-increasing, ‘relevant’, loosely specified content. In other words, procedural knowledge related to practice is not clearly identified or specified. The ‘practical knowledge’ component of this curriculum thus also remained largely underspecified, and tended to only be able to be expressed in terms of changing procedural knowledge or a mix of behavioural attributes (in relation to putting on a performance) or more implicit attributes (e.g. being strategic).

The main way of attempting to resolve curriculum fragmentation was through pedagogic innovation and interventions. These interventions are reflected in two
main ways: particular approaches to and theories of learning, and in the notion of
generic academic competences.

Early MM PDM curriculum iterations reflected attempts to drive curriculum ‘integration’ or coherence through adopting particular teaching approaches with their associated assumptions about knowledge and learning. Particular approaches to pedagogy, their associated ways of conceiving of learning and what is being learned and their associated teaching technologies were actively promoted as a way of both trying to shape a student ‘therapeutic’ (Ecclestone & Hayes, 2009) identity and to try and provide ‘coherence’ based on a consistent learning experience, in which particular behaviours and dispositions were emphasised more than knowledge (content) itself. A common pedagogy was seen as a way of providing a shared, formative learning experience for both students and staff to shape a common ethos through subscribing to a set of activities, performances and displays around which the pacing of curriculum was organised and which fulfilled the role of attempting to shape a common culture and identity for staff and students.

A number of contradictions arise for curriculum and assumptions that pedagogy can either be a logic or vehicle to drive integration or a means to cope with fragmentation. The social constructivist assumptions underlying the experiential learning approach adopted by P&DM and the conflation of knowledge and knowing that they reflect, undermine distinguishing a separate category of knowledge and the specification of its components that might allow for greater coherence in curriculum organisation. Through promoting and attempting to adopt a collective and shared pedagogic approach amongst teachers, the MM PDM curriculum appears to try and rely on framing relationships to mitigate or manage the effects of weak classification. However, there seem to also be mixed messages in relation to what may be transmitted in the pedagogic relationship. The different logics reflect different approaches to the study of Public Administration that Raadschelders broadly categorised as scientific knowledge, practical experience, practical wisdom and relative existence (or postmodernism) (Raadschelders, 2005a), as discussed in Chapter Two. They all draw on different sources of knowledge with different knowledge structures and different recognition and realisation rules. The application of different approaches to the teaching of Public Administration education across one
degree, with their different assumptions about the production of appropriate texts and different forms of knowledge, means that students will rely on explicit approaches to pedagogy to be able to recognise what is required in terms of assessment in relation to knowledge structures. In examining evaluation of performance based on horizontal knowledge structures (e.g. in a professional education course), Shalem and Slonimsky argue that students face difficulties in producing appropriate academic performance because the structure of horizontal knowledge structures make it difficult for them to see the rules that structure academic knowledge, and they are very dependent on a particular type of explicit feedback that gives them access to the realisation rules of these discourses (Shalem & Slonimsky, 2010). This implies strong framing relationships and suggests a strong place for the role of explicit instruction. However, the discourse of experiential, adult learning (as reflected in curriculum documents on P&DM’s advocated teaching approach) stressed the constructivist nature of knowledge (or knowing) and the role of student practitioners in its co-construction in classroom contexts, particularly drawing on personal experience in relation to cases which may reflect both weak framing and the privileging of the perspectives of knowers rather than a knowledge code. Framing in relation to both student and lecturer identity also favours knower dispositions with the interpretation of concepts of ‘management’, ‘development’ and ‘public’ resting strongly with individual lecturers and with students.

Initially, staff at P&DM were brought together around a broad common ideological vision and attempts to develop a common, informed pedagogy. However, it proved difficult to sustain a clear and explicit ideological vision as an integrating logic for academic staff over time. In the initial MM PDM curriculum iterations, academic staff came from a variety of disciplinary and working backgrounds. Few had worked as academics in universities for any length of time. They came into a new school and adopted a pioneering project to develop a new curriculum suitable for an aspirant ‘new’ region in South Africa, Public (and Development) Management. Documentation relating to the early pioneer period reflected scepticism towards the idea of the traditional ‘academic’ as an identity to aspire to, privileging an approach to doing things differently, particularly in teaching approaches. Setting up and trying to maintain a common sense of purpose around a common ideological project proved
difficult as it required time, energy, financial stability resting on external funding, as well as champions. Champions moved on, new staff joined, income-generation priorities became more pressing and the school came under university and staff pressure to focus more on research and academic staff career development and promotion.

Specialist knowledge was not the claimed basis for authority in the initial pioneer curriculum. Instead the basis for authority was the ideological challenge to the Public Administration disciplinary field of the past (as represented in South Africa) and its transformative intent. The ideal staff member teaching on degrees was seen as a generalist, someone who was innovative and willing to learn and teach beyond their previous specialisation. In relation to degrees, short courses and training staff members were positioned as being constantly willing to innovate and respond to demands for different programmes and training. Initially, there was a strong social network, with staff being held together by a common ideological vision and a common sense of purpose and with new staff being recruited partly on the basis that they subscribed to the broad vision. Permeable boundaries between the university and the outside world enabled a staff complement encompassing different disciplines, academics and practitioners, as well as a large contingent of part-time, mostly practitioner-based staff or consultants.

However, even before the second curriculum revisions between 2000 and 2004, these relations were changing as the pioneer core moved on and the P&DM came under pressure to focus more on its relationships with the university, its research output and the progress of its students in terms of their academic performance and progression, as well as legitimating the new disciplinary field of Public Management. New staff seem to have seen their identities more in terms of their identification with a generic ‘academic’ or ‘scholarly’ disposition (as opposed to a practitioner identity). The different P&DM staff members faced outwards to their own networks, disciplines, publications, conferences of choice and consultancy networks. The ideological vision that had provided the basis for a common sense of purpose waned. At the same time, the new disciplinary field of Public Management in South Africa had not been able to strengthen its conceptual and theoretical core, making it
vulnerable to challenges especially from private sector/generic management. This same challenge was reflected in the MM PDM curriculum.

Without a common disciplinary base or a common structuring of knowledge relations to refer to as a basis for integrating logics, P&DM’s academic staff may have had only some form of ‘generic’ to fall back on to look for commonality. Indications are that apart from what may have been emphasised individually in the framing relationship where the demands of the degree require an emphasis on ‘academic’ or ‘scholarly’, it seems to have been retrospectively inserted into the curriculum in various ways, one of which was through attempting to teach skills and attitudes associated with a generic ‘scholarliness’ and ‘graduateness’. Attempts in the student academic support courses of the 1994 and 1996 MM PDM curriculum iterations to introduce students to a scholarly logic, and the design of the research course in the post 1999 curriculum iterations reflected these attempts to teach a generic scholarliness. A second way that this ‘scholarliness’ was reflected in this curriculum was to introduce students to the scientific method in, for example, ‘statistics’ and research methodology courses, although this focus is somewhat in conflict with the epistemology of teaching cases emphasised in other components of the curriculum, particularly in the early curriculum iterations. However, there was not a clear and shared approach to attempting to develop this ‘scholarliness’ as a clear and shared organising principle, and it is unclear to what extent a decontextualised generic skills approach can be developed and implemented successfully (Breier, 1998; Hyland & Johnson, 1998).

By not examining curriculum in terms of its key role in classifying educational knowledge, by blurring various types of boundaries and by adopting progressivist, epistemological positions that de-emphasise knowledge as a category independent of knowing, the MM PDM curriculum did not take into account the various roles that different boundaries play for structuring progression and shaping both learner and staff identities. In relation to progression, some components of the curriculum (those reflecting knowledge structures that are hierarchical) had a requirement for vertical, conceptual sequencing, i.e. understanding of concept is premised on understanding prior concepts with an assumption of verticality in knowledge progression (e.g. Maths, Statistics and perhaps some components of Economics). When
recontextualised as subjects such as ‘analytical methods’ or ‘economics and public finance for managers’, a hierarchy of abstraction or progression reflected in a conceptual spine in the parent discipline is inevitably removed with ‘bits’ being recontextualised according to their perceived relevance to the world of public managers and usually taught as discrete concepts or ‘themes’. When this conceptual spine is removed and the content is subjected to selection based on contextual rather than coherence criteria (e.g. teaching only the most important bits a public manager needs to know at the time they need to know it, or according to their abilities and prior knowledge in relation to a task in the curriculum), key cognitive steps may be missed out. This may prevent or deny the possibility of competent performance in more demanding components of curriculum, such as independent research and progression to higher levels of study and perhaps competent work performance. Successive revisions, particularly to the analytic or quantitative courses in the MM PDM curriculum, involved a reduction in content, slower pacing, a minimising of the weighting of such courses in curriculum, and on-going tensions between staff about the appropriacy of trying to put back in place some sequencing in terms of prerequisites or more specific selection criteria.

Criteria for and quality of assessment also remained contested. I argue that performance expectations may have become arbitrary as there was no clarity about the ‘waypoints’ students needed to reach along the way, either for practical or theoretical knowledge development. Early responses to the curriculum from past students in the 1994-1998 period indicate that they received the message that the realisation rules for horizontal and vertical discourses were different, but that judgement of adequate performance (perhaps in both ‘conceptual’ and ‘contextual’ components) was strongly peer-referenced, and in early curricula perhaps reflected in being able to ‘put on a performance’ or present a certain aesthetic. Later curriculum iterations seemed to privilege conceptual knowledge more, perhaps because this builds off a starting position where there is not a common base of factual or conceptual knowledge. This places a burden on curriculum to either ‘catch up’, teach an ‘executive summary’ of necessary bits of disciplinary knowledge or to select only a minimum of necessary, ‘just in time’ theoretical/analytical knowledge.
This relies on students reading widely for detail to fill in their gaps. However, it is recognised that in practice this broad reading does not take place for most.

In the final Chapter, I reflect on the nature of the MM PDM curriculum that was seen as appropriate for producing the ideal civil servant for the context of the time, the preferred identity or specialised consciousness that this curriculum tried to privilege in the ideal civil servant, and the specific orderings of knowledge in the curriculum that were privileged for bringing about this preferred identity within the social, political and economic context of the time. I also reflect on the strengths and limitation of the theoretical framework that I employed in this thesis. I conclude by making some observations on this particular case and what it may highlight for consideration in relation to other attempts at developing integrated-type curricula in postgraduate studies.
Chapter Eight: Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

This research tells the story of an attempt to develop an integrated curriculum at postgraduate level in Public Management – the MM PDM curriculum at P&DM. The origins of this curriculum lay in an ideological vision of a new public service, a new public servant for a post-apartheid South Africa and a new curriculum for achieving this. Curriculum developers invested their idealism, intellectual and pedagogic resources into creating a curriculum for a new type of public servant (the public manager) to give shape to a transformed, more responsive and efficient public service. This identity was initially conceived of in early curriculum iterations in relation to finding a way of combining two different and competing discourses, that of ‘generic management’ (involving the technologies for greater efficiency and accountability promised by NPM) with broad notions of ‘development’ to direct and temper ‘management’. While the shaping of a public manager identity remained as the objective in the second curriculum iterations (2000-2005), it became more strongly seen in terms of being aligned to the managerial demands of the (by then) more assertive public service. The DPSA saw the improvement of management as being key to solving problems labelled as poor ‘service delivery’ from the public service.

Curriculum was seen as a way of shaping professional identity. Whether and what individual graduates may have contributed to the envisaged project of both social and public sector change in this period was not, however, the subject of this thesis. Rather, in this thesis, I focused on understanding the particular integrated-type curriculum that P&DM’s curriculum developers tried to develop. This case study of a public management Masters curriculum drew on ideas from sociology, the sociology of education and the sociology of knowledge, particularly the concepts and models developed by Bernstein and refined and extended by others working within this particular tradition of the sociology of education. Drawing on these concepts I
attempted to understand the nature of the curriculum that was seen as appropriate for producing the ideal civil servant for the context of the time, the preferred identity or specialised consciousness that this curriculum tried to privilege in the ideal civil servant, and the specific orderings of knowledge in that were privileged for bringing about this preferred identity.

Employing a single case study approach, I provided a detailed, rich description of the development of a Masters Degree in the disciplinary field of Public Management in the years from 1993-2005 in South Africa. Drawing extensively on documentary evidence, supplemented by interviews with academic staff teaching the MM PDM curriculum at the time, I focused on how curriculum developers attempted to hold together or ‘integrate’ the various components of the degree and to shape the professional and educational identities of its graduates. I selected this curriculum as the case study due to the possibilities it presented for understanding an attempt at developing an integrated curriculum in postgraduate studies in an applied disciplinary field within a particular social and political context. Public Administration/Management, as a disciplinary field in higher education, has also not been well examined though a sociological curriculum lens. In addition, within literature examining integrated curricula in higher education from the perspectives of sociology of education and sociology of knowledge there has been little exploration of integrated-type curricula at a postgraduate level, particularly in the area of ‘conversion’ qualifications.

Consensus around the integrating logics or visions of the MM PDM curriculum proved difficult to sustain and convert into explicit principles for guiding the organisation of the curriculum. The difficulties experienced in the case of this particular curriculum may reflect experiences that are similar in other contemporary regions or disciplinary fields that also look for ways of bringing together various disciplines, formal institutional learning and workplace practice in a region in a region that is not a traditional profession.

In this concluding chapter I reflect on the attempts to create coherence in this curriculum, the context of the time in which it was developed and the strengths and weaknesses of the theoretical framework that I used for analysis.
8.2 Curriculum reform and context

The development of the MM PDM curriculum took place within a global context of increasing state involvement in higher education, weakened boundaries between the educational and economic/political spheres (Beck, 1999) and a local context of political change. In the early curriculum, there was a strong responsiveness to a national project of ‘reconstruction and development’, and later to shifting ideas of the ideal developmental state and the public servant necessary for developing it. In this curriculum its initial ‘responsiveness’ involved an attempt to produce a capable and skilled, ideal, public manager while simultaneously transforming the civil service in terms of both its gender and racial composition and its organisational form and responding to historical legacies of lack of access to higher education.

The pioneering ethos of the early MM PDM curriculum placed the new, efficiency-driven, entrepreneurial, but also socially conscious and accountable, public manager in opposition to the rule-governed, public administrator or ‘bureaucrat’ of the pre-1994 eras. This shift was represented in terms of a radical break with the past. This curriculum was initially conceptualised by its architects within a broad view of curriculum as a means to bring about organisational and societal change through appropriate socialisation and education of a new type of civil servant, the responsive public manager. Curriculum developers assumed that this curriculum could be developed and held together through combinations of a strong integrating ideology, the development of a common pedagogy, a multi- or interdisciplinary logic and various generic logics (relating to both academia and workplaces) to provide a basis for curriculum organisation. I argue that despite repeated interventions to change the structure, integrating logics and pedagogy of this curriculum, considerable investment of intellectual resources, time, goodwill and pedagogic labour, curriculum developers struggled to find ways of achieving the kind of integration that could overcome fragmentation in relation to learning and enable learning progression for all students.

This struggle to achieve integration and create real conditions for learning was in part related to some of the internal contradictions in the various integrating logics that were drawn on and the consequent difficulties of translating them into principles
for the structuring of the curriculum. There was also insufficient recognition of the kinds of constraints that combining contents from different disciplines and the field of practice places on establishing conditions for learning and progress. In this thesis, I explored the phenomenon of *curriculum* within a sociological understanding of curricula as specific social phenomena that embody and work according to particular rules that enable coherence. When viewed from this perspective, limits are placed on what can and cannot be easily combined or ‘integrated’ and with what consequences.

Both pre- and post-2000 curriculum periods reflect a blurring of different classificatory boundaries. Firstly, boundaries were blurred between subjects or disciplines in terms of specialisation and their distinctiveness. Secondly, the curriculum iterations in both time periods examined sought to de-emphasise distinctions between different knowledge forms (e.g. ‘theoretical’ and ‘practical’ knowledge) and between the different knowledge structures of specific subjects. In the early curriculum iterations (1993-1999) experiential learning and knowledge derived from work and everyday experience were privileged and in the second period (2000-2005), both a broader logic of ‘applied competency’ and a narrower logic of managerial competencies were drawn on alongside the emergence of a generic scholarly discourse. I discuss each instance of weakened classification in turn and why these weakened classificatory boundaries were appealing to curriculum developers at the time.

The first instance of weak classification relates to access and entrance to this qualification. Adopting a broad interdisciplinary (or “hyperdisciplinary” (Moore, 2011)) rationale, a generic job role (the manager), a generic disciplinary field (management) and a pedagogy premised on assumptions of supportive, therapeutic, individual development legitimated adopting an undifferentiated access route with no requirements for specialisation in any particular subjects or disciplines prior to postgraduate study. There were no sequencing requirements in terms of common prerequisite subjects or disciplinary bases beyond an assumption that a generic, four-year, vocational or undergraduate qualification (or equivalent work experience) was necessary for entrance. More conventional Public Administration progression routes into postgraduate study from either specific disciplinary bases or a public
administration undergraduate base were not seen as appropriate, and the model adopted was one of a postgraduate taught masters ‘conversion’ qualification seen to be at a higher qualification level than an undergraduate degree. Subject-specific knowledge was not required as a prerequisite and levels of ‘generic’ general formative knowledge in the sense of Mathematics or high levels of written language competence in the medium of instruction (English) were de-emphasised. In order to be able to target potential, mainly Black African, public servants, to ‘fast-track’ potential ‘managers’ in the public service and to cope with a social and political legacy of unequal access to quality higher education, specialisation in particular subjects were de-emphasised. In relation to academic staff specialisation most taught outside of their areas of prior academic or previous work specialisation and took on new generic (management) subject areas of teaching outside of their prior areas of study or academic teaching.

Secondly, both curriculum periods ought to blur or de-emphasise distinctions between different knowledge forms and between the different knowledge structures of specific subjects. The MM PDM curriculum specifically attempted to find different ways of ‘integrating’ the ‘theoretical’ and ‘practical’ and in so doing blurring or de-emphasising distinctions between both vertical and horizontal discourses (using Bernstein’s (2000) terms), between knowledge and knowing and between different types of practical knowledge. In terms of sequencing requirements in the curriculum, little distinction was drawn between different implications for progression and mastery of horizontal and hierarchical knowledge structures e.g. differences between subjects recontextualised from Economics or Statistics where progression through a vertical spine is more central to mastery of knowledge within them, and subjects such as Politics or Sociology where verticality does not work in the same way. Thirdly, the category of the ‘professional’ or ‘practical’ that was drawn into this curriculum was undertheorised and not able to provide an understanding of the types of knowledge informing or underpinning different workplace practices and how and if these might be realised in this institutionally-based curriculum specifically, but more generally in the disciplinary field of Public Administration.

Why were these key boundaries de-emphasised, undermined or simply not considered in this case? In answering this question, I explore several interlinked
explanations related to the historical and political context of the time both in South Africa and beyond.

Firstly, the MM PDM curriculum was primarily developed as part of an ideological project involving challenges to a range of social and political boundaries. The rhetoric of entryism was strongly reflected in the pioneering stage of this curriculum. This was not unique to this particular curriculum in South Africa at the time. The “political triumphalism” (Muller, 2000:4) of the early 1990s in South Africa made it seem possible for progressive groupings to overturn all forms of exclusion. This did not only include apartheid but also other social forms seen as undemocratic or exclusionary. These exclusionary social forms ranged from “expert knowledge and science, to bureaucracy and to national policy making” (Muller, 2000:4). In this context, it was perhaps not surprising that several key boundaries in relation to professional identity, to different forms of knowledge and to bureaucracy itself were challenged in the MM PDM curriculum. Curriculum generally, and this curriculum in particular, was seen by P&DM curriculum developers as a way of shaping and contributing to societal and political change during a period where progressive South Africans in educational circles had heightened expectations of, and belief in, their power to dismantle various forms of exclusion through changed institutions and particularly changes at the level of curriculum across the education system.

The projected ideological project that was the rationale for this curriculum was that of rapidly providing the public service with a new (demographically representative) layer of public managers who shared a common ethos of support for the transformative goals of the new state and the skills and ethos of a new approach to management of the public service. In the absence of other suitable professionalising agents (e.g. a transformed internal civil service training unit or a professional body) or a clear sense of the ‘profession’ a postgraduate degree with a particular curriculum was seen as being able to take on this professionalising role. Curriculum was predominantly perceived in terms of being the vehicle for driving social change. In the first MM PDM curriculum iterations, the political necessity of providing a demographically representative civil service responsive to the agendas of the new government sanctioned the promotion, through certification and qualification, of ‘manager cadres’
and an undermining of time- and experience-bound progression routes within the bureaucracy.

Curriculum as knowledge organisation was not, however, foregrounded. The knowledge base for this new Masters curriculum was initially envisaged to come about through selective and eclectic recontextualisation from disciplines and other regions and, more importantly, through gradual development of an evolving contextual practice-oriented knowledge base of public management as practitioners found their way into and through a new public service. Distinctions between different forms of knowledge both relating to the theoretical and practical were either blurred, not acknowledged or not recognised. There was ambiguity about the usefulness of theoretical knowledge, particularly in the early curriculum iterations in terms of its relationship to knowledge, or ways of knowing, derived from experience of both life and work. Experiential learning discourses influenced administrative models evident in early curricula and were combined with features of the educational pedagogic movement in schooling, labelled progressivism, which was strongly evident in South African schooling reform in the 1990s (Muller, 2001). It is argued that progressivism has similarities to the concept of andragogy in adult education (Elias, 1979), possibly accounting for its appeal to lecturers of older students. The intent of progressivist pedagogies is equitable outcomes, inclusion and social justice (Muller, 2001) making them appealing to P&DM curriculum developers in the early curriculum iterations. Bernstein saw varieties of progressivism as examples of a “competence mode” (Bernstein, 2000:56) where the concern is with practical and experiential development leading to individual growth, change of consciousness and recognition of knowledge and experiences traditionally excluded from mainstream education. This view accorded with what was referred to as the ‘developmental aspect’ of the MM PDM degree where progression was viewed in terms of individual growth and development as variously judged by different lecturers.

In the version of progressivism evident in the early curriculum, there was an envisaged radical break with the past and its replacement by a new and better system (i.e. the shaping of a prospective or forward-looking curriculum identity). There was also scepticism about the appropriacy of traditional ‘chalk and talk’ or “traditional pedagogy of a classical canon” (Cope & Kalantziz, 1993). Progressivist
teaching approaches set themselves up against a traditional body of knowledge in favour of an emphasis on hands-on experience and content selected on the basis of having the most immediate relevance to learners’ experiences and work. As with the MM PDM curriculum, there is a strong focus within a progressivist pedagogy on problem-solving and knowledge construction in the context of validation of performance by teams of peers. This was viewed as central to fostering individual development and shaping desired group dispositions for the workplace, albeit without active, on-going intervention or guidance in learning groups or syndicates to engage with behaviours that were not conducive to team learning or performance. Lecturers in the early curriculum were positioned as (and positioned themselves as) generalists and facilitators (or managers of learning processes) rather than as instructional or subject specialists and did not see themselves as being knowers, particularly in terms of teaching the new, aspirant multi- or inter-discipline of Public Management.

The early MM PDM curriculum consequently reflected a conflicted relationship to the category of knowledge, and particularly to the place of theoretical knowledge. On the one hand, the initial curriculum aimed to give students strong analytic skills and knowledge for which a base of theoretical knowledge was required. This was seen as a requirement to be able to engage in analysis and problem-solving in rigorous, evidence-based, ways that could be applied to improving practice. However, for some staff, particularly in early curriculum iterations, there was a postmodernist scepticism towards the idea of a category of knowledge independent of power relations. The early curriculum also saw useful knowledge as arising from practice and being developed through engagement with, and reflection on, practice, but the knowledge that was to be a basis for reflection was underspecified. The combination of these different knowledge forms and their relationships in this curriculum was initially envisaged as being a matter of seeking a pedagogic resolution to the ‘academic or professional’ tension in the curriculum pedagogically by drawing on notions of reflective practice and discussion-based adult education principles and through the types of connective tasks and teaching activities it emphasised. The first curriculum iterations also reflected an undifferentiated view of knowledge where knowledge acquired through education and through life/work experience were seen
as similar and perhaps interchangeable in terms of prior learning. This absence of differentiation or “hybridity” stresses the “essential identity and continuity of forms and kinds of knowledge, the permeability of classificatory boundaries” (Muller & Taylor, 2000b:57) particularly in relation to school or academic knowledge. In principle, it was assumed all subjects could be taught in broadly similar ways through drawing on different student life and work experiences as well as different prior formal knowledge as bases for engagement with content, and by focusing on specifying outcomes or competencies for courses and the entire degree more clearly. The appeal of competency-based solutions (however eclectically, inconsistently or formulaically they were applied in this curriculum) lay in the solutions they appeared to offer in terms of being able to ‘integrate’ theory and practice and provide a basis for bringing ‘work’ or ‘professional knowledge’ into the curriculum. In addition, outcomes specifications also appeared to provide a technology for greater transparency about teaching outcomes or objectives which, it was envisaged, could improve course design, teaching practices, assessment and links within and across courses as well as staff communication across course and disciplines. In this sense, the apparent explicitness of outcomes was appealing to curriculum developers concerned about the implicitness of assessment criteria for students and staff and the fragmentation of academic staff and communication amongst them.

P&DM’s curriculum developers, however, experienced difficulties in trying to overcome fragmentation and strengthen connections between parts of the curriculum through pedagogic practices (experiential learning) and/or by looking to practice itself and the undertheorised messiness of the real world of work to provide the organising principles for curriculum (competence and competencies). These ‘integrating logics’ were not able to resolve some of the consequences of weakened classificatory boundaries. Constant pedagogic ministrations and interventions at the level of pedagogy did not enable greater coherence across the curriculum or significantly improved student performance in the period reviewed. More importantly, attempting to combine both a discursive academic and a more technical professional or managerial orientations to practice with a reflective approach to ‘practical wisdom’ or “phronesis” (Aristotle, 1976) without examination of implications for staff and
students of combining different types of knowledge in this curriculum does not appear to have assisted ‘integration’ or overcome fragmentation.

To understand why this was the case in relation to this particular curriculum, I turned to Bernstein’s theorising of regions, recontextualisation and integrated curriculum types. This enabled me to locate and analyse the nature of a curriculum in a disciplinary field such as Public Administration/Management in higher education within a framework that distinguishes between curriculum, pedagogy and assessment, and between disciplinary knowledge and curriculum knowledge. In the next section I reflect on the usefulness of these concepts and models in relation to the MM PDM case and on their potential to explain why this curriculum struggled to become ‘integrated’.

8.3 Reflections on Bernstein’s theory

Bernstein’s distinction between the ‘message systems’ (Bernstein, 1971a; Bernstein, 1973; Bernstein, 2000) of knowledge, transmission of knowledge and realisation of knowledge through assessment (or curriculum, pedagogy and assessment) are distinctions that become blurred in the constructivist discourses of management education that underpin pedagogic approaches popular in management and continuing professional education, and experiential learning particularly. These theoretical distinctions enabled me to locate the MM PDM curriculum in relation to other disciplinary and professional fields in higher education in terms of similar or related curriculum types, and knowledge forms rather than in terms of social, disciplinary characteristics, practice/theory orientations or science/humanities distinctions which tend to ignore or underemphasise curriculum as a phenomenon. This enabled me to take a perspective on the phenomenon of curriculum and curriculum development that is not reflected in the disciplinary field of Public Administration more generally, in this curriculum specifically, and in the under-examined area of taught and conversion Masters degrees in higher education. Bernstein’s model of an integrated curriculum offered a way of examining the organisation of this Masters curriculum and its attempt to shape practitioner identity in terms of exploring how curriculum developers attempted to hold curriculum
Bernstein’s early work describes curriculum organisation and the shaping of student identity in relation to his categories of classification and framing and the variations in boundary strength that they reflect. Classification and framing refer to the structure of the message systems of curriculum and pedagogy, respectively. Bernstein conceptualised the ideal type models of collection-type curricula and integrated-type curricula according to their operation in terms of weak insulation (blurring of boundaries) between categories. He was initially interested in exploring the shift he observed (and describes as being one of change from strongly classified collection codes to more weakly classified integration codes) in schooling in relation to science curricula. He was initially particularly interested in understanding the recontextualising principles that construct the new discourses that emerge when an integrated curriculum is developed and the ideology that underlies the recontextualising as his insight was that “every time a discourse moves, there is space for ideology to play” (Bernstein, 2000:9). The key question for him was identifying the ideological bases on which they are integrated and whose interests are served by this integration. This insight was particularly relevant for analysing this ‘conversion-type’ Masters degree and perhaps others that are being generated with weaker or stronger links to a variety of disciplinary bases. In this case I examined how an initial shared ideology of an ideal public servant reflected an attempt to combine managerial (and for some, managerialist) ideologies with shifting notions of ‘development’, viewed as being able to temper the decontextualised and depoliticised nature of generic ‘management’. This division became difficult to sustain as a clear integrating logic from which principles for curriculum for curriculum organisation could be developed. Firstly, staff changed and socialisation into, and consensus on, an initial integrating logic weakened. Secondly, the logic itself was unclear and implicit (perhaps beyond the initial pioneers). Thirdly, the logic itself was perhaps not coherently developed to be able to withstand the pressure of generic management on this curriculum at the time it was developed and implemented.

Bernstein hypothesised several conditions that would have to be in place for an integrated curricula to emerge and ‘work’ (in the sense of creating order and a
common sense of time, place or purpose for teachers and students) (Bernstein, 1975b:107-111). These hypotheses related to experiences of integrated curricula in schools at the time of Bernstein’s writing (particularly middle schools and the science curriculum) but these have subsequently been used in various ways by researchers adopting his theoretical and conceptual framework to describe and understand other integrated or ‘interdisciplinary’ curricula in higher education. These were consensus on the integrating logic, a coherent link between the integrating logic and the knowledge to be co-ordinated, organisational structures for socialisation into and monitoring of the implementation of the integrating code and, a focus on clarifying the multiple assessment criteria likely to arise (Bernstein, 1975a:101-103).

However, in and of themselves the conditions he identifies only broadly indicate what ‘weaker’ and ‘stronger’ integrated curricula may look like in regions in higher education and the kinds of issues that will have to be explicitly addressed in curriculum development. He also speculates as to what might be the effects of curricula that do not fulfil these conditions might be for teacher and learner identities and for learner progress. A ‘strong’ integrated curriculum for him is not one based on different subjects (or disciplines) focusing on a common problem where the integrating or relational concept is applied selectively to the knowledge of each discipline that is recontextualised.

Bernstein’s later work which engages with and conceptualises the structuring of knowledge within different knowledge discourses provides a more revealing way of understanding what curriculum developers do in relation to knowledge when they attempt to ‘integrate’ within a particular curriculum. This is particularly so in relation to blurring distinctions between knowledge forms or structures in this particular curriculum and in de-emphasising the progression pathways into and beyond this conversion-type Masters curriculum. His distinctions between vertical (theoretical) and horizontal (everyday, common sense) knowledge discourses and the further distinction between hierarchical (Natural Sciences) and horizontal knowledge structures (as in the Humanities and Social Sciences) indicate what it is that curriculum developers try to ‘integrate’ in relation to knowledge forms. While these categories are ideal types that do not exist in a pure form in practice, what they do in relation to this thesis is alert curriculum developers, especially in regions (but also
perhaps increasingly in disciplines and approaches subject to market ‘responsiveness’ pressures), to the presence of different structuring of knowledge underpinning the different disciplines and between theoretical academic knowledge and knowledge from the world of practice. When considered in the light of increasing numbers of conversion-type Masters curricula claiming interdisciplinarity as a rationale and organising logic for curricula in higher education, it seems that there is a need for greater theorising of a range of integrated curriculum types, particularly as to what ‘stronger’ and ‘weaker’ integrated curricula may involve, and of the principles that would have to underpin curriculum organisation for integrated curricula to be strengthened in terms of coherence. By implication ‘conversion-type’ Masters degrees that do not draw on a very limited number of disciplines, with students and lecturers sharing the discourses, knowledge and methodologies of these shared disciplines, will experience difficulties in building bridges between concepts, methodologies and the ‘languages’ of these disciplines. A similar observation may be made in the future in relation to graduates of increasingly modularised or ‘unit standards-based’ undergraduate degrees. Nevertheless, conversion-type postgraduate degrees are becoming more numerous and some of them are probably in need of strengthening in terms of coherence. This requires greater thought as to what needs to be strengthened, and in both theoretical and practical terms, what stronger contemporary ‘integration-type’ curricula may look like and how (or if) these can be achieved.

Another observation is that interdisciplinary curricula in higher education may tend to blur distinctions between creating or developing interdisciplinary knowledge through research and through teaching in interdisciplinary ways in (mainly undergraduate) curricula and do not address ways in which different knowledge forms are brought together. The types of integrated curricula positioned as ‘conversion degrees’ at postgraduate level (such as the one in this case study) are even less explored in this regard.

These distinctions seem to get blurred in the process of recontextualisation in this curriculum. This is perhaps the major usefulness of Bernstein’s theory for this thesis. He provides a way of conceptualising how knowledge develops and progresses that highlights differences between different knowledge forms and, consequently, what
the implications of a process of recontextualisation that does not consider this may be for student progression and achievement of learning. In ignoring this, particularly in relation to recontextualising the disciplines where a particular kind of ‘verticality’ is more important (e.g. maths, science) learning and the possibility to progress to higher levels within formal education may be effected, as developments in the South African schooling system have shown. When different knowledge forms are ‘combined’ within new educational subjects, distinctions about how progress is judged in the recontextualised subjects and how this is communicated through pedagogy may become less explicit. However appealing notions of generic academic skills that cross disciplines, or generic skills that are common to performance in formal learning and workplaces, may be as a way of resolving this, they do not in and of themselves signal the knowledge stages or benchmarks that students need to reach along the way to develop the conceptual base that progression requires. Bernstein’s examination of variation in vertical discourses in relation to hierarchical knowledge structures enable some insight into some of the difficulties experienced in relation to fragmentation in ‘interdisciplinary’ curricula (or non-interacting, multi-disciplinary curricula) where teaching subjects based on different knowledge structures are combined (for example, recontextualised subjects loosely based on Maths, Economics and Politics).

However, his analysis of horizontal discourse is less detailed and less useful for analysing the complexity of this particular MM PDM curriculum and arguably others, where curriculum developers are concerned with bringing academic theory and workplace practice into relationships with each other. The nature of horizontal discourse is less theorised in his work, as is ‘practical knowledge’ within the disciplinary field of Public Administration more generally i.e. what the professional knowledge is in relation to this particular curriculum, other Public Administration curricula and, perhaps more generally in different types of professional curricula. Without this it is not clear what it is that it to be used at the basis of reflection on practice that is emphasised in this and other continuing professional education curricula.

Attempting to achieve ‘integration’, particularly in terms of wishing to integrate ‘theory and practice’ pedagogically (either through experiential learning or competency-
based approaches) without a focus on knowledge structures as a curriculum ideal, is not possible and carries consequences related to student progression and learning through curriculum. In this MM PDM case study coherence was compromised not only by blurring distinctions between knowledge forms associated with horizontal discourse (or the theoretical or academic), but possibly also by blurring distinctions between different practical forms of knowledge. There were also different structurings of knowledge underpinning approaches to ‘the practical’ in this curriculum. *Practical experience* (with its associated usable standardised activity, grand theory, principles and techniques) and *practical wisdom* (requiring judgement and interpretation), as two approaches to the study of Public Administration (Raadschelders, 2005a) which were evident in the MM PDM curriculum, make different assumptions about their underpinning theoretical approaches (behaviourist and constructivist, respectively) and about appropriate sources of practical knowledge. This complicates what is visible or considered to be relevant in relation to appropriate displays of knowledge (assessment) and consequently for progression. While these different approaches to the ‘practical’ in the disciplinary field of Public Administration (together with approaches oriented towards the rational or theoretical) may compete between the disciplinary fields of Public Administration, Public Management and Public Policy (Raadschelders, 2005a; Raadschelders, 2005b), these different approaches to practical knowledge are evident here within the same curriculum in this MM curriculum. There is not clarity about what knowledge is considered valid practical knowledge and how it might be organised within curriculum or realised through assessment, hence the appeal of competence and competencies which can also not provide an adequate basis for relating work to practice. Practical knowledge (horizontal discourses) are not strongly conceptualised within Bernstein’s theory, yet “requirements for teaching and learning posed by the form of knowledge to be transmitted” or the “epistemic logic or curriculum” (Gamble, 2004a:176) require consideration not only in relation to theoretical knowledge but also in relation to practice. Appeals from within the disciplinary field of Public Administration/Management to strengthen relationships between theory and practice (Bourgon, 2007) and relationships between practitioner and academic work without a stronger theory of what practical or professional
knowledge looks like, especially when recontextualised into a form for teaching, are likely to be undermined.

8.4 Observations on the case and beyond

The MM PDM case study suggests that developing an integrated curriculum that enables progression between courses and across the different years of the qualification requires greater acknowledgement and awareness of the kinds of structural differences between different knowledge forms that are being combined in the curriculum. These set limits on attempts to blur differences between the ‘academic/professional’ as referred to in this curriculum and on blurring distinctions between different knowledge structures and pedagogies associated with these different knowledge forms in the same curriculum, despite what policy-makers may argue and what may be socially desirable, and what curriculum developers may envisage to be possible.

If the main focus is to be on practical knowledge or knowledge derived from practice, several problems remain. Firstly, there is contestation about what that knowledge base for practice in Public Administration/Management should be and whether it should be more strongly oriented towards ‘practical experience’ or towards the craft or ‘practical wisdom’ of leadership or strategy. The ‘practical experience’ emphasis, as exhibited in the MM PDM curriculum, tends to be an eclectic selection of ‘best’ or current practices, procedures, principles and techniques, with the ‘practical wisdom’ being largely tacit, possibly making it accessible only through the kinds of pedagogic interventions that favour direct apprenticeship, observation and forms of pedagogy and assessment directly related to workplace tasks. This suggests a need for greater understanding of what the loosely conceptualised ‘practical’ might be in this curriculum and perhaps more broadly in the disciplinary field or Public Administration and theorising how to strengthen it as recontextualised curricular knowledge. Drawing on research in vocational education, theorising what different ‘knowledge for practice’ looks like in vocational contexts and in curriculum suggests that what might be coded and better sequenced in this formal continuing professional education context is procedural knowledge (or applied theory), where procedures/models derive their sequential logic from the situated knowing (task performance of everyday
life) (Gamble, 2004b; Gamble, 2009) and the principled knowledge (or pure theory) which provides a basis for progression beyond the qualification. This, however, may need greater investigation of professional knowledge or practical knowledge in the public administration field of practice more generally.

In the MM PDM curriculum the practical forms of knowledge sat alongside the academic (or non-empirical) knowledge required for successfully demonstrating `Masters level’ competence, particularly in relation to the final, capstone integrating task of research. Here, there were tensions around whether conceptual or contextual meanings dominated in the curriculum and, perhaps more confusingly for students, in which part of the curriculum or in which courses. Difficulties in relation to links between coursework and research components are, however, not unique to this curriculum or the disciplinary field of Public Administration/Management. Levels of integration between coursework and research components of taught doctoral degrees across disciplines in Australia, for example, point to a trend in Social Science disciplines to show greater integration between coursework and research than professional disciplines (e.g. Law and Management) (Manathunga, et al., 2004) and although taught Masters degrees are becoming the main means of delivery of continuing education in professions they are one of the least researched levels in higher education (Drennan & Clarke, 2009). The recontextualised disciplinary knowledge that is recruited involves selections from different disciplines with different knowledge structures and different ‘rules’ for gauging progress within them. When combined and sequenced as non-interacting courses in a curriculum such as this Masters degree curriculum, they did not give a sense of how they cumulatively lead to a greater conceptual knowledge base that ran across the range of knowledge structures, particularly of the type that enabled engagement with the scientific method and social research methods required of final ‘integrating’ capstone task in this qualification. The promoted experiential learning approaches appeared to privilege horizontal discourse in their endorsement of the centrality of everyday experiential knowledge derived from life and generic work ‘practice’. However, both in terms of assessment within courses in the curriculum, and more importantly in the requirements for completing the capstone research component of the curriculum, horizontal discourses (and conceptuality) appeared to reassert themselves,
producing a final curriculum hurdle emphasising the discursive that many students seem to struggle to complete.

A second problem is that structural differences between knowledge forms and the idea of boundaries between them go against many progressive teaching ideas, particularly in relation to access and equity in a context of previous (and on-going) forms of educational exclusion in schooling and higher education. Consequently, they are challenged, often in ideological terms, by those pushing an agenda of change and, ironically, sometimes by those progressive educators who seek more inclusiveness and equity in educational outcomes. A focus on curriculum as “the conditions for acquiring new knowledge” (Young, 2010:18) and in terms of boundary considerations in relation to acquiring new knowledge runs up against progressivist tendencies, particularly when placed within a social and political context like that of South Africa where it was seen to be possible to simultaneously achieve the goals of redress and equity, improve the quality of education and performance and reduce distinctions between ‘academic’ and ‘vocational’ qualifications. “The barrier that an unnuanced image of knowledge and pedagogy creates is simply that, from these perspectives, we do not have to take the internal order of symbolic forms seriously” (Maton & Muller, 2007:21). In other words, curriculum development can become more focused on the individual bits of content being taught, on promotion of shifting professional identities and validating experientially acquired knowledge (or espoused knowledge), rather than on giving “access to the ‘messages’ of knowledge itself without losing the level of conceptual demand” (Moore, 2013:141). A key tension here is whether it is possible to do both well within the same curriculum and organisational space, particularly as late as at postgraduate level in a ‘conversion-type’ Masters curriculum. This case study suggests not.

Contemporary arguments that promote hybridity and ‘de-differentiation’ in this curriculum are often located in views of knowledge based on social constructivism. Social constructivism questions, or even argues against boundaries in the interests of greater flexibility and responsiveness (to economy) and, in the South African case, responsiveness to issues of historical exclusion in race, class and gender terms. These arguments are thus attractive to policy-makers and progressive teachers and lecturers because they seem to offer answers to achieving greater access and
transparency in a curriculum. However, research in the field of sociology of education increasingly questions this claim to greater access and transparency (Allais, 2007; Wheelahan, 2007). This is particularly so in terms of the performance of weaker students and students who are not easily able to access the often implicit codes of academic education (Shalem & Slonimsky, 2010; Wheelahan, 2007). These views also question whether hybridity assists with the generation of new knowledge beyond specific cases (Fuller, 2004; Moore, 2009; Young, 2008a) and argues that arguments for greater ‘integration’ do not recognise, or underemphasise, a need for progression in key subjects (Muller, 2006) e.g. mathematics and language (particularly English in the case of South Africa). Questions of equity and redress come into conflict with acknowledging and engaging with the performance consequences of poor prior education, a condition that persists in the contemporary South African education system.

Similarly, in examining how the contradictory rationales of equity and improvements in performance have played out in the South African civil service, von Holdt observes that attempting to reconcile these two objectives (equity and performance) against the backdrop of changing conceptions of the state has led to several contradictory rationales shaping the workings of the bureaucracy. One of the key consequences has been an "ambivalence towards skill" (von Holdt, 2010:6). The concept of skill in South Africa has for long been social and associated with racial domination, privilege and the structuring of power (von Holdt, 2010). Consequently, von Holt documents that in the public service there is huge ambivalence to skill (and to those who have high levels of skill and knowledge) and contestation about the meaning of skill, how it is measured and rewarded. Given South Africa’s history, this inevitably takes on racial overtones (von Holdt, 2010). In the MM PDM curriculum, related tensions with regard to knowledge existed in terms of distinctions (or lack of distinction) between categories of knowledge and ambivalence about engaging with and seeing either selection or progress in terms of the category of knowledge. The integrative discourse of competencies and generic skills was appealing not only in terms of the promise it appeared to offer for engaging both the conceptual and contextual in this curriculum, but also due to its de-emphasising of the category of knowledge, different knowledge forms and what they imply for progression.
To conclude, I explore some implications of my analysis of this particular case. Firstly, the attempt to integrate the 'academic' and 'professional', as it is referred to in this curriculum, under the umbrella of either a generic competence or work-linked competencies, an interdisciplinary logic or through a 'unifying' pedagogy did not produce a basis for a conception of progression within curriculum. In other words, there was an unclear basis for making distinctions that showed how a student had progressed through a curriculum (other than having met minimum requirements of having engaged with the material presented and what an individual lecturer decided was adequate as pass for a particular course at a particular time). There was not a clear conception of the particular performance markers to be met along the way that might have enabled progression within this curriculum and beyond it. This was complicated by 'progression' meaning different things for both the academic and practice-linked components of this curriculum. This apparent weak framing in relation to expectations of performance placed students in a position of either relying on individual lecturers to make recognition and realisation rules explicit for different curriculum components, or themselves being able to read the implicit pedagogy of different lecturers and its performance demands, particularly but not exclusively in relation to the academic components. Research alerts educationalists to the observation that it is usually those with the most familiarity with the codes and expectations of generalisation and hierarchy who are best able to do this (Wheelahan, 2007).

Secondly, if knowledge is seen as undifferentiated, then there is an unclear basis for decisions about sequencing, selection and combining of curriculum contents other than by reference to individualised lecturer notions of relevance or by applicability to a shifting context. This makes any curriculum in Public Management in higher education vulnerable to shifting notions of relevance viewed from the perspective of employers and state. What is relevant to context at one particular time may be less so at another point in time, particularly where the demands of the field of practice shift according to changes in the nature of the state, ideological positions, and political and economic priorities. The constant curriculum revisions in the case of the MM PDM curriculum reflected this attempt to show “economic responsiveness” (Moll, 2004:3) to the shifting demands of the field of practice and to try and reconcile the
dual demands of different knowledge forms (without explicit recognition of their differences), as well as dealing with the curriculum fragmentation this produced. Because of the difficulties in identifying a knowledge base for practice and perhaps inevitably, given the make-up of academic staff, the conceptual or theoretical component of the MM PDM curriculum gradually began to reassert, particularly in the second curriculum iterations. Although framed in terms of the SMS competencies, the 2000/2004 curriculum may have become more oriented to an ‘academic’ or theoretical base as reflected in the dominance of assessment in terms of conceptual knowledge (See Appendix H), as changing staff composition to include more full time ‘academics’ and a ‘scholarly’ discourse existing alongside and perhaps competed with the ‘experiential’ discourse of the first curriculum.

The pioneer curriculum iterations responded to the need to change the racial profile of the public service and to provide an imagined best product to champion change in the public service. The 2000 and 2004 curriculum iterations responded to the need to provide the right kind of public manager as defined more by the changing priorities of government in relation to delivery of services than an ideal of the future public servant. Responding to capacity needs as defined by government and being seen to be responsive to them came to dominate curriculum discourse in the post-1999 curriculum iterations at the same time as a more ‘scholarly’ discourse attempted to gain ascendency. The attempt to merge ‘academic and ‘professional’ in curriculum (or in other terms, to conflate different knowledge structures and pedagogic forms) and to deal with some of the difficulties this produced through promoting a common pedagogy, alongside repeated curriculum restructuring, produced unanticipated consequences for progress and possibly also for professional identity.

The various MM PDM curriculum iterations stressed an envisaged role for curriculum in shaping a shared professional ethos and a particular type of professional who could perform competently and act as a change agent. The professional identity that this curriculum attempted to endorse was at one level oppositional to the classic or traditional professional (the doctor, lawyer or engineer) with ‘the profession’ in this view exerting some control over both knowledge contents, membership of associations and particular behavioural ethics. The projected professional identity also reflected antipathy to the ‘neutrality’ of a public servant shaped by time-bound
and meritocratic service and by routine application of procedures and techniques (the knowledge) which is seen as having shaped the old South African approach to Public Administration. Instead, it presented the new ‘professional’ as someone more reflective, critical and as an initiator of change. However, although initially rejecting this ideal of traditional professions and professionalism, this curriculum still saw the degree (and presumably the knowledge and dispositions it endorsed) and the formal university-based curriculum (usually reflected in postgraduate Masters degrees, MBAs, MPAs or certified short courses) as a professionalising agents. However, in the MM PDM, the basis for curriculum restructuring became more influenced by market demands. Curriculum iterations or “continuous pedagogic re-formations” (Bernstein, 2000:59) reflect the perception of a need to continuously adapt to the sometimes ill-formulated demands of the public service. “Whereas the bureaucratic model delineated clearly between analytical, managerial, administrative and financial skills, the imprecise job descriptions associated with the NPM [in South Africa] often required these skills to be found in one and the same person” (Chipkin, 2008:147). This need for workers to continually adapt to requirements that change often establishes “a permanent need for repeated pedagogic ministrations” (Beck, 2009:6) and the development of dispositions or an identity to constantly remould to these demands. As reflected in the MM PDM curriculum, this required constant attempts to change sequencing in curriculum, struggles with incorporating increasing amounts of content to be responsive to new demands (an issue of pacing), and increasingly less focus on the shaping of a particular identity.

In this curriculum, where curriculum contents were not clearly bounded, the knowledge base that underpinned this envisaged ‘profession’ was unclear and shifting. This curriculum appeared to turn to a looser notion of professionalism, less based on underpinning knowledge and more about controlling ‘soft’ knowledge’ and endorsing a view of professionalism that was relational, i.e. involved accountability to a ‘group’ for particular behaviours, ways of presenting self and assumed common values endorsed by the peer group or cohort. The notion of professionalism that P&DM appealed to is one that is seen to provide practitioners with ways of behaving in neo-bureaucratic settings that are in flux (Farrell & Morris, 2003). Aspects of this looser notion of hybrid professionalism seems to involve more agreement about soft
skills necessary for interactions, an ‘ethos’ relating to performance and behaviour (evident in the pre-2000 MM PDM curricula) and perhaps a focus on learning a managerial language and being able to put on a managerial performance (evident in later curriculum iterations). Implicitly, what students may acquire and the basis on which an identity is shaped is the “talk and text” (Pollitt, 2003:21) of shifting conceptions of management (i.e. an ability to produce persuasive oral and written text) resting on accounts of practice rather than practice itself and eclectic, changing and unstable knowledge base.

The attempt to ‘integrate’ the practical and the theoretical without explicit engagement with their differences and the implications of these for curriculum and pedagogy may have resulted in undermining both in the MM PDM curriculum in terms of trying to provide a basis for sequencing, pacing and progression. Viewing them as if they are the same and could be ‘integrated’ through pedagogy via the use of particular teaching technologies or through ‘drawing on experience’ and current ‘relevance to work’ as the access points to applied theoretical knowledge, may undermine the independence of theoretical knowledge from context and its role as a building block to higher levels of understanding. Similarly, knowledge derived from practice was also underspecified. In this case it seems that engagement with applied theoretical knowledge (of the kind relevant for theorising practice) and the procedural knowledge (action or doing) necessary for practice were both weakened or not clearly developed to be able to form a strong basis for the organisation of a curriculum in higher education. It seems that this may have resulted in neither the ‘academic’ nor the ‘professional’, in the words of these curriculum developers, being strengthened over time and in a ‘drift’ towards a generic ‘academic’ that was not well defined or necessarily shared.


Fraser-Moleketi, G. (2003). Keynote address by the Minister for the Public Service and Administration at the Occasion of the 10 year celebrations of the Graduate School of Public and Development Management, University of the Witwatersrand. Johannesburg.


Schwella (Eds.), *The State of Public and Development Management in South Africa* (pp. 68-84). Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.


Appendices
Appendix A: Archive of unpublished documentary sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archival Code</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archival Code</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email 4, 2000</td>
<td>Unpublished internal email</td>
<td>Comment from Gavin Cawthra on case study use and agreement with Kennedy School of Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field note 1, 2008</td>
<td>Researcher’s personal notes</td>
<td>Notes from P&amp;DM Storytelling Workshop. 31 October 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field note 2, 1999</td>
<td>Researcher’s personal notes</td>
<td>Notes from Staff Development workshop. (1999).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Code</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo 8, 1999</td>
<td>Unpublished internal document, P&amp;DM</td>
<td>Memo from Head of Economic and Development Learning Area to Academic Director. <em>No title</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Code</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Code</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal 2, 1999</td>
<td>Unpublished internal document, Faculty of Management, University</td>
<td>University of the Witwatersrand, Faculty of Management. (1999, 7 April). <em>Proposed changes to curricula for MM (P&amp;DM) and PDM</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Code</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity document, 2003</td>
<td>Public document</td>
<td>Ten Years of Leadership Through Learning in Africa’s Leading School of Governance. 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Code</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Code</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data set selected, compiled, numbered and categorised by author from available data corpus.
Appendix B: Interview guide

1. When you designed and taught the courses that you taught did you/how did you see them fitting into a bigger picture about what the P&DM curriculum was trying to do? Were there any overarching concepts/ideas/ideologies that held or tried to hold curriculum together?

   Was this big picture one that was shared by your colleagues? How did you come to know about it? Was their only one big picture? What were the alternatives? Did it change? Did everyone buy into the big picture? Did students see this big picture?

2. How did you try and achieve coherence in your own course? How did you decide to combine contents – from where and how explicit do you think this logic was to students? Did what you taught and how you taught it change over time? Why/how?

3. P&DM documents refer a lot to the development/management/policy trilogy and at some point governance enters the picture? Were you aware of it, how did you understand it and did it mean anything in the courses? How did the balance work between these ideas? Did it change?

4. What do you think the ideal graduate was that the P&DM MM curriculum tried to produce? Did this change over time (1993-2000) and (2000-2005)? Did the big picture change over these two periods?

5. Was their such a thing as an ideal P&DM person or lecturer?

6. P&DM documents set up a distinction between and academic/professional curriculum – what did this mean to you?

7. What is your disciplinary background? Where/how do you see your academic identity? Has this/how has this influenced how you teach in Public Management?

7. What did ‘management’ mean at P&DM in relation to this curriculum? What about development and policy?

8. Was there a common pedagogic ideal approach? What was it? Did you apply it? Why is it emphasised so much in documents?
Appendix C: Postgraduate Diploma in Public and Development Administration (PPDA) degree structure.

The structure of the degree is summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PPDA 1991</th>
<th>PPDA 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full courses</td>
<td>Comparative Public Administration</td>
<td>Comparative Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues in Development</td>
<td>Issues in Development Management OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics and Public Finance</td>
<td>Economics and Public Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Issues in Provincial Governance and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half courses</td>
<td>Analytical Methods for Public Managers</td>
<td>Analytical Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy Formation</td>
<td>Policy Analysis and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of Development Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problems in Public Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Skills</td>
<td>Administrative Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Ethos of Public Management</td>
<td>The Ethos of Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Project</td>
<td>Applied Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix D: Sample titles of teaching cases used in teaching on the MM PDM Degree (1994-2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Reference (P&amp;DM Catalogue)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDMC 10.93.15</td>
<td>Affirmative Action in the Alexandra Town Council</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMC 10.93.02</td>
<td>African Accountancy</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG58</td>
<td>Assessing Rent Control in Los Angeles</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG65</td>
<td>California Water Pricing</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMC 10.93.06</td>
<td>Careerists and Political Appointees in the Public Service</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG37</td>
<td>Houston’s Transport Plans</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG62</td>
<td>Keynes and Friedman on the Great Depression</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMC 19.93.1</td>
<td>Mr Hoffman’s Dilemma</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMC 10.93.17</td>
<td>Peter Mahtangu and the Department of Works</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG36</td>
<td>Privatising Park Maintenance in Beunos Aires</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG15</td>
<td>Rural Reform in Centropico</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG10</td>
<td>Scaling down the Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG05</td>
<td>Strengthening Public Managers in Argentina</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG47</td>
<td>Swine Flu</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSG26</td>
<td>The case of the Chinese Checkers</td>
<td>Kennedy School of Government, Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMC 10.93.07</td>
<td>The Case of Zimetco</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMC 11.94.25</td>
<td>The Tyranny of Political Correctness</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMC 6.94.13</td>
<td>Towards a Policy on Hawking</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No ref)</td>
<td>Transforming Apartheid’s Informal Settlements: The Grootboom Case</td>
<td>P&amp;DM, Wits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Database of teaching cases (Graduate School of Public and Development Management).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MM PDM Syllabus 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational and Management Processes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics in Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context of Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in Development and Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity, Development and Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytical Management Approaches</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Analysis for the Public Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM PDM Syllabus 1994</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied Research Methods</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Electives (1 elective course to be selected)** | Public Policy Management and Implementation  
Urban Management and Development  
International and Regional Development  
Policy research |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MM PDM Syllabus 1996</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM PDM Syllabus 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research report (weighted at 25% of the degree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Design and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-Based Policy Analysis and Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical approaches and techniques for policy analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information gathering for the policy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Courses (four elective courses to be selected)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy of Urban Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Management and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of Regional Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Bilateral and Multilateral Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Civil-Military Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Defence Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and International Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Gender Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State of the Environment in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management and Policy - Theoretical Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Sustainable Development - International Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards Sustainable Development in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology, Institutions and the Determination of Economic Policy in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro-economic Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Economic Development and Policy Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Trade Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Market Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Social Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econometrics, Modelling and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Report (weighted at 25% of the degree)**

An in-depth research report must be completed within six months of completing the coursework.
### MM PDM Syllabus 1999

| As per MM PDM Syllabus 1996 but excluding the course *Analytical Methods* |

**Appendix F: Extract from Senior Management Services (SMS) competency framework**

**COMMUNICATION**

Must be able to exchange information and ideas in a clear and concise manner appropriate for the audience in order to explain, persuade, convince and influence others to achieve the desired outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFICIENCY LEVELS</th>
<th>BASIC</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>EXPERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows understanding for communication tools appropriate for the audience but needs assistance in utilising them;</td>
<td>Expresses ideas to individuals and groups both in formal and informal settings in an interesting and motivating way;</td>
<td>Communicates high risk sensitive matters to all relevant stakeholders;</td>
<td>Consulted as an expert in communication both externally and internally;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expresses ideas in a clear and coherent manner but not always taking into account the needs of the audience; and</td>
<td>Receptive to alternative viewpoints;</td>
<td>Develops well defined communication strategy;</td>
<td>Is sought after to lead negotiations and represent the organisation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilates information reasonably well.</td>
<td>Adapts communication content and style according to the audience including managing body language effectively;</td>
<td>Balances political views with organisational needs when communicating differing viewpoints on complex issues;</td>
<td>Inspires people with use of language;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver messages in a manner that gains support, commitment and agreement;</td>
<td>Compiles documents on complex matters that are clear, concise and well structured;</td>
<td>Steers negotiations around complex issues and arrive at a win/win situation;</td>
<td>Creates an environment that is conducive to productive communication; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicates controversial sensitive messages to stakeholders tactfully;</td>
<td>Communicates with the media without compromising the integrity of the organisation.</td>
<td>Markets and promotes the organisation to external stakeholders; and</td>
<td>Coordinates negotiations at different levels within the organisation and externally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listens well and is receptive; and</td>
<td>Encourages participation and mutual understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PEOPLE MANAGEMENT AND EMPOWERMENT

Must be able to manage and encourage people, optimise their outputs and effectively manage relationships in order to achieve organisational goals.

## PROFICIENCY LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>EXPERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Participates in team goal setting and problem solving;</td>
<td>• Seeks opportunities to increase personal contribution and level of responsibility;</td>
<td>• Analyses ineffective team and work processes and recommends improvement;</td>
<td>• Develops and incorporates best practice people management processes, approaches and tools across the organisation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interacts and collaborates with diverse groups of people;</td>
<td>• Supports and respects the individuality of others and recognises the benefits of diversity of ideas and approaches;</td>
<td>• Recognises and rewards desired behaviours and results;</td>
<td>• Creates processes to ensure accountability for people management and development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands team strengths, weaknesses and preferences; and</td>
<td>• Delegates and empowers others to increase contribution and level of responsibility;</td>
<td>• Mentors and counsels others;</td>
<td>• Exceeds set goals for employment equity and affirmative action;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is aware of the appropriate steps and guidelines for employee development and feedback, but not yet fully able to implement these.</td>
<td>• Applies labour and employment legislation and regulations consistently;</td>
<td>• Addresses balance between individual career expectations and organisational needs;</td>
<td>• Has a reputation as a leader in fostering professional growth;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitates team goal setting and problem solving;</td>
<td>• Considers developmental needs of personnel when building teams and assigning tasks;</td>
<td>• Sought after as a mentor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognises differences between individuals, cultures and teams and provides developmental feedback in accordance with performance management principles;</td>
<td>• Establishes an environment in which personnel can maximise their potential;</td>
<td>• Develops comprehensive, integrated strategies and approaches to managing human resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Guides others on managing people;</td>
<td>• Develops systems and processes to recruit and retain high quality staff; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inspires a culture of performance excellence by giving positive and constructive feedback to the team;</td>
<td>• Adapts leadership style to different people, cultures and situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Creates links among various individuals, cultures and teams and instils a common sense of identity towards the achievement of goals by various team members and stakeholders;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROFICIENCY LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>EXPERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Adheres to internal and national standards with regards to human resource practices;</td>
<td>• Shares knowledge of the big picture to help others understand their role; and</td>
<td>• Creates a culture of continuous learning and development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies competencies required and suitable resources for specific tasks;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Displays personal interest in the well-being of colleagues;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Able to manage own time as well as time of colleagues and other stakeholders; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manages conflict through a participatory approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (DPSA, 2001b).
### Appendix G: Syllabus descriptions of MM PDM (2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Syllabus description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Methods and Information Literacy</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>This course will teach candidates how to gather quantitative and qualitative information, how to process it and use it to improve policy and decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and Managing Organisations</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Metaphors and models of organisation, design and change, power and structure, current models and structures are discussed in this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Context</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>The following will be included in this course: Theories of development. Globalisation, economic growth and new approaches to sustainable development. Ecological theory and approaches to sustainability. Comparative models for managing sustainable development. Regional and local development planning and related institutional arrangements. Legislative and regulatory mechanisms. Social movements and private sector involvement in sustainable development. International agreements and institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Project Management Skills</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Candidates will learn how to control and use financial resources effectively, how to budget and how to link projects to budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Governance</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Theories of governance, conceptions of public management, constitutional structures, legislative frameworks and ethics are included in this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing People and Change</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>This course included principal areas of human resource management and development and changing work cultures and relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Management and Service Delivery</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Processes, systems, techniques and evaluation for operational management and service delivery are canvassed in this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy processes</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>This course presents policy processes and cycles, frameworks of policy analysis, decision-making models and comparative policy framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector and Development Finance</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>This course covers concepts and methods; the implications of different policy options for resolving economic and environmental problems; public finance issues and instruments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, Leadership, Competing Values and Ethics</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Personal disciplines for effective time and ask management, team building, ethical paradoxes leadership strategies and the art of judgement are taught on this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design and Method</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>This course covers the post graduate research context, critical academic literacy, research methodology, research proposal writing and research reporting. Candidates must complete an acceptable proposal for their research report as the product for the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Type of course</td>
<td>Syllabus description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Five elective course from a particular stream (2000 Rules)</td>
<td>Local governance and development&lt;br&gt;Public Policy&lt;br&gt;Health Management&lt;br&gt;Economic Policy&lt;br&gt;Information and Communication Technology&lt;br&gt;Arts and Culture Management&lt;br&gt;General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Nature of assessment</th>
<th>Assessment type</th>
<th>Text type</th>
<th>Knowledge and Cognitive Process Dimensions (Anderson &amp; Krathwhol, 2001; Bloom, 1969)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Development</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Reflective journal</td>
<td>Personal writing in the form of diary. Use of a range of genres e.g. expository and discursive.</td>
<td>Diary entries require different knowledge and cognitive processes. The dominant ones are: Knowledge dimension Factual knowledge Conceptual knowledge Cognitive process dimension Understand Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning diary entries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Six learning diary entries focusing on key concepts and their implications for each taught session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Take-home examination</td>
<td>Discursive</td>
<td>Knowledge dimension Factual knowledge Conceptual knowledge Metacognitive knowledge Cognitive process dimension Analyse Understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Information and</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Group assignment</td>
<td>Knowledge dimension Factual knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Formative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a proposal to carry out a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Nature of assessment</td>
<td>Assessment type</td>
<td>Text type</td>
<td>Knowledge and Cognitive Process Dimensions (Anderson &amp; Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (2004)</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Written examination – manipulation and analysis of quantitative data,</td>
<td>Written examination</td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>summary and analysis of findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>article.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group assessment: Critique (oral) Analysis of different readings from the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coursepack presented by each group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Take home examination essay</td>
<td>Discursive</td>
<td>Knowledge dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical analysis of a case study or evaluation of a change management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project or discursive essay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Nature of assessment</td>
<td>Assessment type</td>
<td>Text type</td>
<td>Knowledge and Cognitive Process Dimensions (Anderson &amp; Krathwhol, 2001; Bloom, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Written examination with a range of set questions and problems</td>
<td>Expository – problem and solution, comparison (scenario based)</td>
<td>Procedural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and application</td>
<td></td>
<td>Factual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual written assignment – drawing up a balanced scorecard for an organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Written take-home report analysing an actual organisations operations</td>
<td>Analytical report and summative account of experience</td>
<td>Procedural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet memorandum (analytical and persuasive report written in the form of a technical report) on a current public policy problem or issue</td>
<td>Expository – problem and solution Persuasive writing genre</td>
<td>Knowledge dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Examination assignment – essay</td>
<td>Critical and expository</td>
<td>Knowledge dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Nature of assessment</td>
<td>Assessment type</td>
<td>Text type</td>
<td>Knowledge and Cognitive Process Dimensions (Anderson &amp; Krathwhol, 2001; Bloom, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive process dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Written examination – analysis of a case on leadership</td>
<td>Discursive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing people and organisations (2004)</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Group oral presentation with Powerpoint slides evaluating the contribution of the set readings to people management in the public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Business report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Nature of assessment</td>
<td>Assessment type</td>
<td>Text type</td>
<td>Knowledge and Cognitive Process Dimensions (Anderson &amp; Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Written examination – set questions analysing policy and policy assessment and management mechanisms</td>
<td>Discursive Expository – problem solution</td>
<td>Knowledge dimension Conceptual knowledge Cognitive process dimension Apply Analyse Evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix I: Development-oriented courses in the MM PDM curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Development Context</td>
<td>Approaches to Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a topic within a larger course called</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigms for Public and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of development. Globalisation,</td>
<td>The following will be included</td>
<td>Development economics and process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic growth and new approaches to</td>
<td>in this course. Theories of</td>
<td>The role of the state and not-for-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaches to sustainability. Regional and</td>
<td>economic growth and the new</td>
<td>Comparative models for managing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local development planning and related</td>
<td>approaches to sustainable</td>
<td>development. Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional arrangements. Legislative</td>
<td>development. Ecological theory</td>
<td>planning and related institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and regulatory mechanisms. Social movements</td>
<td>and approaches to sustainability.</td>
<td>arrangements. Legislative and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and private sector involvement in</td>
<td>Comparative models for</td>
<td>regulatory mechanisms. Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainable development. International</td>
<td>managing sustainable</td>
<td>movements and private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement and institutions.</td>
<td>development. Regional and</td>
<td>involvement in development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local development planning</td>
<td>International agreements and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and related institutional</td>
<td>institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arrangements. Legislative and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regulatory mechanisms. Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>movements and private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involvement in sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development. International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreement and institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from information in University of the Witwatersrand, Faculty of Management Rules and Syllabuses 1997 and 2000 and Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management 2004.
Appendix J: Example of unit standard for Public Administration and Management

All qualifications and unit standards registered on the National Qualifications Framework are public property. Thus the only payment that can be made for them is for service and reproduction. It is illegal to sell this material for profit. If the material is reproduced or quoted, the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) should be acknowledged as the source.

SOUTH AFRICAN QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY

REGISTERED UNIT STANDARD:

Apply the principles and theories of public management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAQA US ID</th>
<th>UNIT STANDARD TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>242911</td>
<td>Apply the principles and theories of public management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINATOR</th>
<th>REGISTERING PROVIDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SGB Public Administration and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUALITY ASSURING BODY

-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>SUBFIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field 03 - Business, Commerce and Management Studies</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABET</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>OLD NQF LEVEL</th>
<th>NEW NQF LEVEL</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

332
In all of the tables in this document, both the old and the new NQF Levels are shown. In the text (purpose statements, qualification rules, etc), any reference to NQF Levels are to the old levels unless specifically stated otherwise.

This unit standard does not replace any other unit standard and is not replaced by any other unit standard.

**PURPOSE OF THE UNIT STANDARD**

This Unit Standard is intended for elected political leaders and public sector officials involved with the service delivery activities at a top strategic level. This Unit Standard will enable the learner to examine the theoretical and analytical frameworks of management and their relationship to theories and approaches to public sector management. The learner will be able to examine the major contemporary changes in the public sector management climate and to examine alternative approaches to service delivery as an integral part of successful planning and management.

The qualifying learner is capable of:

- Demonstrating an understanding of the theories and issues shaping contemporary public management.
- Investigating the different approaches to public sector reform.
- Analysing the changing management skills and competences that are required for
significant shifts in public sector activities.

- Utilising budgetary and financial management processes to allocate and manage resources.

- Conducting independent research and critically evaluating issues in the area of public management.

**LEARNING ASSUMED TO BE IN PLACE AND RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING**

All learners accessing this unit standard must be in possession of Level 6 Public Administration diploma, degree or equivalent.

**UNIT STANDARD RANGE**

N/A

**Specific Outcomes and Assessment Criteria:**

**SPECIFIC OUTCOME 1**

Demonstrate an understanding of the theories and issues shaping contemporary public management.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1**

A historic and contemporary review of the theory and problems of public management is explored to describe and explain the machinery of government.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2**

Theories and critiques of the purpose, role and practice of government are reviewed and
discussed in the context of contemporary public management.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE**

Theories include, but are not limited to, concepts drawn from the literature on public choice, institutional economics, regulation and consumerism.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3**

Traditional and contemporary views of the role of the public sector in society are examined and the implication of the changing role of the public sector and its administration are evaluated and explained with examples.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4**

The theoretical and analytical frameworks of management and their relationship to theories and approaches to public sector management are reviewed and critically examined in the context of public administration.

**SPECIFIC OUTCOME 2**

Investigate the different approaches to public sector reform.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1**

Contemporary changes in the public sector management climate are critically evaluated in the context of different approaches to public sector reform.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE**

Changes and approaches include, but are not limited to, privatisation, corporatisation, the exposure of public activities to competition, contestability by contractual or outsourcing arrangements.
ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Practical examples are used to consider developments in strategic and program management, financial and human resource planning and management in a public administration context.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

The relevance of private sector management principles to the public sector are assessed critically.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

The evolving relationship between the public and private sectors in public administration are examined and assessed critically.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

An understanding of public management reform in other countries is demonstrated critically.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION RANGE

Other countries include, but are not limited to, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 3

Analyse the changing management skills and competences that are required for significant shifts in public sector activities.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Leadership and the management of change, and changing skills and competencies are
addressed in relation to the significant shifts in public sector activities.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2**

Alternative approaches to service delivery and techniques for evaluating performance are emphasised as an integral part of successful planning and management.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3**

Traditional and contemporary views of the role of public sector managers and how they fulfil the roles and changing roles of the public sector in society and in public administration are evaluated and explained with examples.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4**

The practice and problems of contemporary public administration and management are explored in the context of the competency demands on public sector employees.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5**

The similarities and differences between public and private sector management are understood and explained with examples.

**SPECIFIC OUTCOME 4**

Demonstrate a knowledge of, and apply the utilisation of budgetary and financial management processes to allocate and manage resources.

**ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

**ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1**

The overall functioning of financial processes in the various spheres of government is understood and explained with examples.
ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

The constituents and components of government budgeting is understood and discussed with examples.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

The government accounting framework is analysed to better understand and utilise government finance.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Budgetary documents are interpreted in the context of decision making and resource allocation.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 5

Key budgetary issues facing public sector entities are discussed in a manner demonstrating an understanding of current policy debates.

SPECIFIC OUTCOME 5

Conduct independent research and critically evaluate issues in the area of public management.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 1

Research methodologies applied to public management are reviewed and explained with examples.
ASSESSMENT CRITERION 2

Prepare a research proposal for research into selected issues of public management demonstrating an understanding of the theories and issues shaping contemporary public management.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 3

Conduct and present research into selected issues of public management demonstrating an understanding of different approaches to public sector reform.

ASSESSMENT CRITERION 4

Conduct and present research into selected issues of public management demonstrating an understanding of the changing management skills and competences required for shifts in public sector activities.

UNIT STANDARD ACCREDITATION AND MODERATION OPTIONS

- Any individual wishing to be assessed (including through RPL) against this unit standard may apply to an assessment agency, assessor or provider institution accredited by the relevant ETQA, or an ETQA that has a Memorandum of Understanding with the relevant ETQA.
- Anyone assessing a learner against this unit standard must be registered as an assessor with the relevant ETQA, or an ETQA that has a Memorandum of Understanding with the relevant ETQA.
- Any institution offering learning that will enable achievement of this unit standard or assessing this unit standard must be accredited as a provider with the relevant ETQA, or an ETQA that has a Memorandum of Understanding with the relevant ETQA.
- Moderation of assessment will be conducted by the relevant ETQA at its discretion.

UNIT STANDARD ESSENTIAL EMBEDDED KNOWLEDGE

- The Public Services Act.
• The Promotion of Administrative Justice Act.
• The Promotion of Access the Information Act.
• The Batho-Pele White Paper on Transforming Public Sector Service Delivery.
• Public Sector Corporate Governance policies and procedures.
• Public Finance Management act.
• The concept of service value and how different service cultures are formulated.
• Quality management and benchmarking.
• Systems awareness from a value perspective.
• Public management principles, issues and theories.
• Different approaches to public sector reform.
• Change management principles that relate to public sector reform.
• Budgetary and financial management processes for the purposes of making decisions and allocating resources.
• Management research techniques and tools.

UNIT STANDARD DEVELOPMENTAL OUTCOME

N/A

UNIT STANDARD LINKAGES

N/A

Critical Cross-field Outcomes (CCFO):

UNIT STANDARD CCFO IDENTIFYING

Identify and solve problems using critical and creative thinking processes in order to apply the principles and theories of public management.
UNIT STANDARD CCFO WORKING

Work effectively with others as a member of a team, group, organisation or community to apply the principles and theories of public management.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO ORGANISING

Organise and manage oneself and one's activities responsibly in order to apply the principles and theories of public management.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO COLLECTING

Collect, analyse, organise and critically evaluate information in order to apply the principles and theories of public management.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO COMMUNICATING

Communicate effectively using visual, mathematical and/or language in the modes of oral and/or written persuasion to effectively integrate public management principles and theories.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO SCIENCE

Use science and technology effectively and critically, showing responsibility to the environment and health of others, as a tool to apply the principles and theories of public management.

UNIT STANDARD CCFO DEMONSTRATING

Demonstrate an understanding of the world as a set of interrelated systems by recognising that problem solving contexts relating the public service management do not exist in isolation and that a variety of factors, sensitivities, stakeholders and politics may impact on management efficacy.
UNIT STANDARD CCFO CONTRIBUTING

Participate as responsible citizens in the life of local, national and global communities by ensuring that the principles and theories of public management are applied in a way that benefits the wider community.

Be culturally and aesthetically sensitive across a range of contexts when applying the principles and theories of public management.

QUALIFICATIONS UTILISING THIS UNIT STANDARD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>QUALIFICATION TITLE</th>
<th>OLD LEVEL</th>
<th>NEW LEVEL</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>National Diploma: Public Administration</td>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>New Level Assignment Pend.</td>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>2010-02-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Bachelor of Agriculture Honours: Extension</td>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>NQF Level 08</td>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>2011-02-06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROVIDERS CURRENTLY ACCREDITED TO OFFER THIS UNIT STANDARD:

This information shows the current accreditations (i.e. those not past their accreditation end dates), and is the most complete record available to SAQA as of today. Some Quality Assuring Bodies have a lag in their recording systems for provider accreditation, in turn leading to a lag in notifying SAQA of all the providers that they have accredited to offer qualifications and unit standards, as well as any extensions to accreditation end dates. The relevant Quality Assuring Body should be notified if a record appears to be missing from here.

### Appendix K: SMS Competency framework proficiency level guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Applies basic concepts and methods but requires supervision and coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Independently develops and applies more advanced concepts and methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans and guides the work of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performs analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Understands and applies more complex concepts and methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leads and directs people or groups of recognised specialists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to perform in-depth analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Sought out for deep, specialised expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leads the direction of the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defines model/theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (DPSA, 2001b).
## MM PDM 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Syllabus description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Information and</td>
<td>Fundamental course</td>
<td>The purpose of this course is to enhance foundational and operational management skills for managers in the public and development sector. The course includes areas such as communication, decision-making, office administration, negotiation and conflict management, systems management and personal management. Furthermore, the course develops information gathering and processing skills and highlights the role of information technology in the context of public administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>Fundamental course</td>
<td>Institutions of public policy. Legal and legislative frameworks Policy processes and cycles.Frameworks of policy analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Public Finance</td>
<td>Fundamental course</td>
<td>Introduction to supply and demand, the functioning of markets, the role of the state in economy, stakeholder interests in economic policy determination. Introduction to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Syllabus description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing People and Organisations</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>public sector economics, public expenditure, public finance and public accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to Development</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Development economics and process. The role of the state and the not-for-profit sector in development. Comparative models for managing development. Development planning and related institutional arrangements. Social movements and private sector involvement in development. International agreements and institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
<td>Core course</td>
<td>Overview f the concepts, issues and technology relevant o information and knowledge management. Using information and knowledge management for policy-decision–making and evaluation. Systems management and implementation of systems to manage knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design and Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>This course covers the post graduate research context, critical academic literacy, research methodology, research proposal writing and research reporting. Candidates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MM PDM 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Syllabus description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>must complete an acceptable proposal for their research report as the product for the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>Four</td>
<td><strong>86 electives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Streams offered at P&amp;DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic Policy and Public Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Human Resource Management and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information and Communication Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Government and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Managing Change and Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy, Planning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix M: Examples of case studies

Case Study One

MOLEFE'S MAZE

Patrick Kelly

POINT ONE:
MOLEFE'S DILEMMA

Molefe Khuele was faced with a dilemma. He had been working in the Human Resources ministry for just over a year, where he was responsible for a unit that was examining ways of making the ministry more responsive to the needs of labour and the business community. He was well qualified for the job, as he had previously been an assistant secretary-general in one of the larger COSATU trade unions. His entry into the civil service had been achieved through his participation in the National Economic Forum, where he had impressed all parties with his understanding of human resource needs and of the interests that motivated different positions that were discussed. He had shown himself to be a hard worker, whether he was representing workers or sitting on a NEF technical committee, and would often stay on after most people had gone home, to finish work that he had been allocated. After the election in 1994, he had been approached with an offer by the Director-General of the Human Resources ministry, and he had accepted the position without hesitation. He felt that many things would change now that there was a democratic government and he wanted to be a catalyst of that change.

Molefe had, so far, enjoyed his time in the department and, although there had been some obstacles, he had learnt many things about the civil service and human resource issues. The role of his unit of five people was to network with unions and business organisations, glean their concerns and feed them back to the department. The legitimacy of the ministry had improved during this time but it was sometimes hard to get people in other Directorates to use initiative or to be creative in their dealings with the public. There wasn't much blatant corruption happening, but people just didn't put any great effort into their work. Molefe had discussed these concerns with his superior, Mr Joubert, but as yet nothing had happened. Now, a few months later, his director had told him that an inter-ministerial committee was being established that was going to draw up a code of conduct for the civil service. As the Human Resources ministry dealt with issues of people and work, they had been invited to send a representative and the Director-General suggested Molefe. Mr Joubert told him that if he accepted this assign-
ment he would need to reduce his current responsibilities by about sixty percent; the project was expected to last for about six months. The organisers needed to know by the end of work that day whether he would be part of the team or not.

During that day Molefe turned the issues over in his mind. If he agreed to go it would be beneficial for his career and he might get to know a bit more about other parts of the civil service. He also felt that a code of conduct would be a useful tool to get people to work in a more enthusiastic and committed manner. On the other hand, his work was really beginning to take off and he felt that he was beginning to have some influence within other directorates. He believed that he could try to broaden the scope of his unit to look at effectiveness and innovation as well as responsiveness within the department.

If you think he agreed to work on the committee,
  go to POINT TWO;
if you think that he declined,
  go to POINT FOUR .

POINT TWO:
WORKS ON COMMITTEE

Molefe was apprehensive but excited as he took his seat in the conference room in the Civil Service Commission (CSC) building. Looking around the table he saw a mix of people from the old civil service, the old homeland bureaucracies and the democratic movement. Molefe was surprised because while he had understood that the code was for the civil service, he hadn't realised that people from the parastatals and local and regional governments would also be attending.

The meeting was chaired by a "comrade" from the CSC who explained why there was a need for a code of conduct, and handed out a timetable for the next six months. The first stage of the process was for the members to examine codes from other countries and to consult their constituencies about what should be in the code. Molefe was unsure why they had only been given the codes of conduct of Sweden, the USA and Canada and privately queried how relevant these were to the South African situation. After a few mundane questions the meeting broke up.

Back at the office, Molefe embarked upon his new duties enthusiastically. He was unsure of whom to consult and how, and there was scant precedent. Being from a sound union background, however, he decided that as many people as possible should participate in the process. He therefore organised a series of workshops in the different directorates and, by the next commission meeting, he had a long list of ideas for the code.

At that meeting most of the members had suggestions for the contents of the code, although several had simply regurgitated the examples that they had been given and others had only consulted their superiors. It struck Molefe that the issues raised by the delegates from the local governments and the parastatals.
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were quite different to those suggested by the others. Work progressed and at the end of the six months a comprehensive Code of Conduct had been worked out that incorporated the concerns of most of the Commission members. There were about fifteen items, with some detailed elaboration, and also a few suggestions on how to implement the behavioural maxims.

Molefe felt that, although the process could have been more inclusive, representatives had developed a document that would help to make public servants more effective in their work. He also felt excited about getting back to his permanent job, especially now that he had a better understanding of how other departments and sectors of the civil service operated. He had developed some ideas of how to network with them on manpower issues.

If you believe that Molefe should hand the Code of Conduct to his superior,
Mr Joubert, and return to his previous position, then
  go to POINT THREE.

If you think that he should get involved in implementing the Code
within his Department,
  go to POINT FIVE.

POINT 3:
GIVES IT TO SUPERIOR

Molefe felt pleased with himself when he left Mr Joubert's office after giving him the new Code of Conduct. Mr Joubert had been impressed with the document and said that this would definitely make a difference to the ethos of the Department. He also suggested that Molefe might get a promotion or salary increase for his good work. A few days later a copy of the document was sent to every member of the department with a letter from the Director-General asking everyone to read it and apply it as much as possible in their work. The letter also mentioned that a printed version of the Code of Conduct would be coming from the CSC along with further directives concerning ethical conduct. Molefe was surprised at this, as Commission members had not discussed anything other than the Code in the Committee, but he thought the more that was said about ethical conduct, the better.

Although it took a few days to assess what had been happening in his unit in his absence, he soon got back into the full swing of things. When he asked colleagues informally how they had found the Code of Conduct, he got replies such as "I am still wading through it" and "It is a very thorough document but I'm not sure if all of it is relevant to my work".

Go to questions for discussion
POINT 4:
STAYS IN THE DEPARTMENT

Molefe wasn't sure that he had made the right decision in turning down the assignment, but felt that it really was possible to have some effect in his present job. He continued to strive to instil an ethos of commitment amongst his co-workers, and his unit was soon a shining star in the ministry. However, the unit's role was to work with the different directorates and most of these continued to be inefficient and demotivated. Matters reached a stage where the work of the unit was being frustrated, and the people in it were becoming despondent.

After several meetings on the issue with his superior and the Director-General, Molefe was motivated to try to jolt people out of their apathy. Mr Joubert had suggested he wait until the new Code of Conduct was published but eventually he and the Director-General agreed that Molefe could send a memo around with suggestions of ways in which people could work better. Not surprisingly, this had little effect.

Molefe realised that there was a need for more comprehensive performance monitoring and evaluation systems. It wasn't the job of his unit to look into these issues but he began to examine ways in which he could use the networks that he was building between the unions, business and the government to monitor the performance of civil servants who dealt directly with the other sectors. He hoped that the good effects of this would ripple through the rest of the ministry. After a number of long, hard-sell meetings with various top officials in the ministry he got the go-ahead to put a plan together.

Go to questions for discussion

POINT 5:
GETS INVOLVED IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION

When Molefe left Mr Joubert's office he felt that he was on the way up. Mr Joubert was impressed with the document and had agreed to Molefe's request that his unit broaden their role to include developing methods of implementing the code within the ministry. Molefe began by running a series of report-back workshops in the different directorates. He explained the key areas to people and soon realised that the document was too detailed and that not all of it was relevant to a central government department. He then went about developing a summary of the document that he thought would be more useful for the department. After he had run a further series of workshops, it appeared that people had internalised the code and were excited about a new approach to their work. He could see a definite change in attitude through his dealings with people in the normal course of events, and his superior suggested that it was time that he refocused his con-
centration on his designated duties. After a few months, however, Molefe began to notice people sliding back into old habits and he realised that it was necessary to do something more.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Why did you make the choices that you did?
2. What are weaknesses of a Code of Conduct?
3. What are the causes of the symptoms that most civil servants in the case exhibited?
4. Are there mechanisms that can be employed against this type of ethos?
5. Is there a conflict between accountability and efficiency and effectiveness in the civil service?

Source: (Kelly, 1995).
"There can be no New South Africa without us!" exclaimed Colonel J. H. Deyzel, Commanding Officer of the Soweto Flying Squad. The case-writer had just asked what the future would hold for 10111 in the "New South Africa".

"We are here to stay," he said, indicating the operations office with a wave of his hand. The room was roughly 6 x 4 meters. It contained a few large desks and grey chairs, as well as some electronic gadgets. In the corner were four large filing cabinets, boldly labelled ALPHA, BRAVO, CHARLIE and DELTA. Above the door was a huge red STOP sign, a gift from the traffic department. Behind the door was a smaller room with sound-proof walls. The case-writer's eyes fell on a collection of porcelain and plastic turtles in various shades of green on the top of the filing cabinet. The Colonel remarked proudly, "Oh! That's my collection."

The Colonel took the case-writer to the smaller control room. The silence in the room was broken from time to time by the telephone ringing, followed later by scratchy voices as officers barked instructions into their high-frequency radios.

"This is the 'nerve centre' of the Soweto Flying Squad," stated the Colonel, proudly. The case-writer thought back to the early 1970s days before television was introduced, when Friday Night's 'Squad Cars" was one of the most popular radio programmes. He recalled the introduction to the programme, and chuckled to himself: "They prowl the empty streets at night, waiting, in fast cars, on foot, living with crime and violence. These are the men of South Africa. These are the men of SQUAD CARS".

BACKGROUND

10111 is the emergency telephone number for the South African Police (SAP) Flying Squad service. It is a geographically zoned dial-free number. In other words, if a caller dials the number, it is relayed to the nearest control centre, and it costs the caller nothing. The system has been in operation, country wide since the late 1970s.

Colonel Deyzel joined the police force in 1965 and served in various police stations before taking command of the Flying Squad in Soweto, colloquially known as, 10111. The case-writer asked him why the number 10111 was selected, and not a number such as 911 or 999. The Colonel stood up, disappeared into the next office and came back with a disconnected dial-type telephone. He then
demonstrated how easy it was for a frightened person to remember and dial the number. Since 1 and 0 were at the extremes of the dial, the number could be dialled even in darkness. The Soweto Flying Squad unit was set up in Protea Police Station in January 1990, with the following main objective:

“To supply and efficient and effective policing unit for Soweto, Lenasia and Eldorado Park communities. This is achieved by immediate attention to complaints and a fast reaction time”.

(See Appendix 1 for the organisation chart.)

SOWETO

The name Soweto is an acronym for the South Western Townships of Johannesburg, a sprawling mass of houses about 15 km South-West of Johannesburg. The name was adopted in 1963. In January of that year, The Star newspaper reported that:

“an effort to give the African Townships of Johannesburg an identity of their own and rid them of the impersonal name of South Western Bantu Townships is being made by the City Council. A special committee has waded through hundreds of suggestions and recommended five – Soweto, Sawesko, Swestown, Phaphama Villages and Partheid Townships. The Council’s Non-European Affairs Department considers one of the first two names suitable. Other suggestions that did not find favour included Verwoerdstad and Hendrick Verwoerdville”.

Soweto is too big to be considered a town, but it does not have the urban amenities of a city. This is a consequence of apartheid legislation, particularly in the 1950s when the government actively discouraged the establishment of amenities such as old age homes, orphanages, clinics and shops.

The history of Soweto is linked to the history of Johannesburg. Johannesburg started as a mining camp in the late 1800s and withing 10 years the population had grown to over 80 000 people, half of whom were black. Many blacks and whites lived together in a squalid area on the western side of town. The Western Native Townships was established in 1918 on the site, and the township grew form then on. When bubonic plague broke out in 1940, the black inhabitants were resettled in and emergency camp at Klipspruit, near the future Soweto. When the Nationalist Party came into power, there was a concerted effort to segregate Soweto into zones for each of the different ethnic groups, and to adhere to a policy that Soweto would serve only as temporary accommodation for the black working class.

Soweto is ethnically diversified, but because of the past official policy regarding allocation of housing and restriction in mobility and choice, the spatial distribution of its people has tended to follow ethnic rather than economic lines. Therefore, there are middle and upper-middle class families living together with
lower-class and very poor families.

The township has had a long history of politically motivated violence and unrest, mainly due to people's resistance to oppressive apartheid policies. In addition, the township is also reputed to have one of the highest crime rates in the world. One of the worst periods was during the uprisings in 1976, when school children protested against the use of Afrikaans as a medium of instruction. The uprising was ruthlessly suppressed by the police and the military, and made world headlines. It was widely publicised that the police had opened fire on a 6 000-strong crowd of schoolchildren. Thereafter, the presence of the military and police in the townships became a way of life.

The 1980s were characterised by rent boycotts, which had a crippling financial effect on town councils. The initial response of the council was to evict people whose rent was in arrears. The evictions were carried out by the police and the military. The response from the community was to remove street names and house numbers so that they could not be easily traced. The evictions were later stopped by a Supreme Court ruling. In addition, there were a number of uprisings in the schools in the 1980s, and 1985 emerged as another year of violent action in the townships. The people's court emerged, and so-called "sell-outs" to the government and police were publicly tried and executed by "necklacing" (a tyre is placed around the neck of the accused, doused with petrol and set alight). The police were criticised during this time for their lack of intervention. There were often reports that they stood by passively while "necklacings" took place.

In 1989, a new type of violence erupted in Soweto when hundreds of people lost their lives because of faction fighting between two main groups, Xhosas and Zulus. Major political organisations such as the African National Congress (ANC), the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), were implicated in the fighting, with claims that the battle was mainly between the allies of the ANC and Inkatha. Police were accused of taking the side of Inkatha in the fighting. These claims further strained the relations between the police and the residents.

In 1994, the first democratic elections were held in South Africa and whilst political violence decreased somewhat, criminal violence continued unabated.

**HOW 10111 OPERATES IN SOWETO**

When a call comes in, it is answered by one of the staff in the operations room. The caller is first asked to describe the nature of the emergency, and then for the address or the area of the crime or problem. He or she may remain anonymous if desired. The details are recorded by hand on a standard foul by the telephone operator. The operator assigns a serial number to the form and an emergency classification code, and then passes it to the supervisor on the radio control unit. Depending on the classification of the emergency, the radio control operator may call up the patrol cars and send the car closest to the area to investigate.

The Soweto operations room is equipped with eight separate telephone units,
chairs and desks. There is a frequency radio control unit, a computer (which is used to record vehicle thefts) and a big wall map of the area, facing both operators. During off-peak times, there are just two telephones, two radios, two operators and a supervisor in the control room. Six patrol cars operate in the field.

States Colonel Deyzel:

"Say, for example, car Tango India 21 responds. The radio operator will explain to the patrol the nature of the complaint, where the incident has taken place, and issue if suspects are armed. The Flying Squad will move into the area, either with blaring sirens or silently (depending on the nature of the emergency), and attend to the complaint. Sometimes they arrest a culprit, and then radio back a report to the Flying Squad Headquarters in Soweto."

Sometimes the 10111 cars are stopped in the streets and asked to respond to an emergency on the spot.

**DEMAND ON THE SYSTEM**

Shortly after the service was introduced, it handled 90 complaints per week. This has increased to an average of 65 calls per day under normal circumstances (i.e. when there is no unrest) and 150 calls per day during peak periods. The average time between a call being received to a patrol arriving at the scene (the reaction time) is 23 minutes. According to Colonel Deyzel, this does not compare well with the first-world standard of 2 minutes' reaction time. It takes no more than 30 seconds for a telephone to be answered and no more than 15 seconds to contact a patrol vehicle.

The Colonel feels that six cars are just a drop in the ocean and would dearly like the unit to have more cars. He is of the opinion that the unit could be more effective with four times its present staff.

During winter months there is generally a decline in the average number of calls per day. The colonel continued,

"Weather is the best policeman. For example, on cold or rainy days we receive very few calls. Hot summer nights are a problem. Monday is quiet. Wednesday night is very busy; we call it 'Klein Saterdag' (small Saturday). Friday night is called 'Boxing Day' because most of the calls on Friday night are about street fights. From 13h00 on Saturdays until about 21h00 hours on Sunday, we are at our peak. I think it is because people drink throughout the night."

**MANAGEMENT OF CAPACITY**

The incoming calls are rated. For example, if a caller says that there are strange people in his/her yard, or that someone is breaking into his/her house, this gets a priority rating. "Boxing match calls" get the lowest rating. We respond to them immediately only when there are free patrol cars available. Patrols are often
redirected from low to high priority calls.

The staff in the Soweto operations' room are able to operate all the equipment - radio control staff can attend to incoming calls.

During Saturdays, an additional telephone operator is employed. Although the unit has only six cars, it has access to other cars at the station. Cars at other police stations often help during emergencies.

Callers during peak time will be answered, but are often asked to hold for some time before an operator is free to take down details of the complaint.

SOWETO FLYING SQUAD STAFF

The Soweto staff is multiracial. The working environment is informal and people address each other on first name terms. According to the Colonel, they regard themselves as friends more than as work colleagues. To stress the point the Colonel recalled,

"In September 1990, one of our cars, responding to a false emergency, was ambushed in Diepkloof. My men were fired at with AK-47s. One of them, a white officer, died. At his funeral the black guys were crying more than the white guys, because they didn't just lose a colleague, they also lost a friend. There is no racial friction. They do the wrong things together and I punish them together. Sometimes, you've got to be reactive, discipline them the hard way in order to motivate them."

In addition to the normal police training, there is an on-going in-house training programme. Sometimes the staff members are sent on external courses.

Meetings are held regularly, giving staff members a chance to share their experiences and exchange ideas with their colleagues and seniors.

"Effective allocation of staff is a problem," Colonel Deyzel continued. "You see, there are two types of policeman. There is a policeman who would not like to spend his time answering telephones or working with computers, the type who prefers to be in the field where there is action. Behind the computer he is useless. You also have the opposite type."

WHAT THE STAFF SAID

During a coffee break, the case-writer decided to interview two operating Soweto Flying Squad staff members:

Q: What are the objectives of 10111?

A: To respond to complaints and emergencies as quickly as possible and to deliver a professional service to the people of Soweto.

Q: What are your particular roles?

A: To serve and protect at all times, by being in charge of the Flying Squad shift.
Q: What problems do you encounter in providing the service?

A: **House numbers and street names** were removed during the 1976 riots and the rent boycott in the late eighties. Sometimes just looking for a house number takes close to an hour.

The zones are also not marked and numbers are duplicated. For example there is house number 200 in each zone in Meadowlands. If you cross the street, you may be crossing from one zone to another without being aware of it.

*The roads are bad and, as a result, the patrol cars frequently get punctures. We often get false complaints, mainly from children.*

*At times the community interferes with our work by preventing the arrest of a suspect.*

Q: How do you think you are perceived by the community? A: **In general, I think we are well perceived.**

Q: How do you think the community evaluates the 10111 service?

A: **It depends. For example, if your car is stolen and we recover it, then you will say 10111 is great. But if your brother drives a stolen car and refuses to stop, and I shoot him, you are not going to like the Flying Squad.**

Q: How does the unit compare with other units?

A: **I cannot say we are a better unit than others, I can only say we are a special unit. If you join this unit you must be a full-blooded policeman, have the right character and be willing to work very hard in risky situations for long hours.**

Q: What are relations like between staff members?

A: **In this unit we work more or less as a family. I think it is because we live in danger all the time. We depend on each other, that is why we are so close.**

**INFORMING THE COMMUNITY ABOUT 10111 IN SOWETO**

"I believe that police visibility is an effective anti-crime weapon," continued the Colonel. "When I took command of the unit in January 1990, all Flying Squad cars were unmarked regular yellow police cars. I recommended that all the unit cars, be clearly marked and identifiable as 10111 Emergency Police Flying Squad. This was done and it helped to create public awareness of the service. Other units throughout the country soon followed."

He feels that public response has been positive.

"When a 10111 car passes in Soweto, it is common to hear teenagers shouting 'Viva Golf GTII Viva 10111! Viva Flying Squad!' People who have been helped also spread the word about the availability of the service. We, as a
unit, don't advertise in the media. However, the police force is trying to improve its image, and there was an advert on TV1, 2, 3 and 4 showing police playing soccer with a multi-racial group of children."

When asked about placing posters in public places, the Colonel replied:

"You have to remember that we are dealing with two types of public: the law-abiding and the criminal. The criminal public would remove those posters if we attempted to place them."

WHAT THE PUBLIC SAID

The case-writer interviewed four randomly selected members of the public:

Q:  What would you do if faced with an emergency, for example, if someone tried to rob you or burgle your property and you needed help?
A:  "I would contact my relatives, only those who are mobile and able to help me quickly."
    "If someone is breaking into my house, I would contact the police by phoning 10111." 
    "I will think of a weapon if my life is at stake, alert neighbours by screaming or telephone Flying Squad at 1011."
    "I will phone the police at 9111."

Q:  Have you ever heard of 10111?
A:  All four respondents replied that they had heard of them.

Q:  How did you become aware of them?
A:  "During the Inkatha / ANC violence, that's when they started operating."
    "I saw the number on the yellow police vehicles."
    "I saw the number in the telephone directory."

Q:  What is 10111 about?
A:  All respondents mentioned handling emergencies and crime prevention.
    Q:  What do you think are the benefits to the community?
    "I would say not that much, but the sound of their sirens makes criminals stop whatever they are doing."
    "If you are alone and a burglar comes in, you can phone for help."
    "Like all police, they normally arrive very late after they have been called."
    "They attend to your problem when called."
Q: Do you think people phone 10111 when there is an emergency?
A: "They may use it, but what about those without telephones - what are they expected to do?"

"Only those with phones."

Q: What would you expect 10111 to do better in the future? A: "I do not know since I have not used the number."

"They should do what 911 is doing, as we see on TV."

"They should increase the number of personnel in their cars, to be more than two."

Q: Is there a difference between the Flying Squad and the Riot Squad?
A: "There is. Riot Squad responds to riots, while 10111 responds to emergencies, but only when a person has phoned them."

"Yes, there is; if you phone 10111 police come immediately. The Riot Squad does not respond that fast."

"I think they work hand in hand."

"The difference is that it takes seven minutes for 10111 to respond, the Riot Squad takes a longer time."

NON-EMERGENCY CALLS

What is an emergency to one may not be an emergency to another. People have different perceptions and interpretations. The screening and ranking of calls is done internally to distinguish non-emergency from emergency calls. No attempt is made to inform the public about the types of situations in which 10111 should be called.

"We sometimes have to perform the duties of Life Line," said the Colonel. For example, a man phoned us and said that he was very lonely, his wife had left him and he was about to commit suicide. Luckily for him, we were not busy, and a car was dispatched. The officer chatted with him for a while, and then told him to stop his bloody nonsense. The man was happy to find someone to talk to.

"The chronic problem we have is with people, mainly small kids who telephone and swear at the staff. About 30% of incoming calls are of this type.

"It is not a problem, it is an epidemic. We receive about twenty false calls per day. Unfortunately we have to answer all the calls. I strongly believe that the number should be paid for. High telephone bills would prompt the par-ents to discipline their kids."
HOW SUCCESS IS MEASURED

Success is measured by the extent to which the system is used by the community, and this has increased tremendously since the unit's inception.

"You may ask how the public measures the success of my unit. Well, some think it's a bad thing. If it takes us five minutes to attend to a complaint, the complainant is happy, and he tells only two people. If it takes us two hours to respond, the complainant will be angry; he tells everybody, including his priest, that the Flying Squad is useless.

"There has been some positive feedback from the public. For example, there was a case which was attended to by a normal yellow police car. When a 10111 Flying Squad car arrived at the scene, the lady complainant politely asked the police in the yellow car to leave, now that the 'real police' had arrived. I wish we had more feedback from the public we are serving."

THE FUTURE

The system is essentially manually operated. There are plans to install a computerised system to automate the control room, and the handling of (among others):

- incoming calls
- on-line data entry by telephone operators
- monitoring of patrol cars.

Portable cordless radio-microphones will replace the present fixed-position ones.

The case-writer was shown some of the new computer equipment that had arrived but was not yet in use. There are plans to extend and refurbish the present operations room.

"If you visit the place a year from now, you will find it completely changed," assured the Colonel. He folded his arms. "I restate my case. There can be no New South Africa without us. All governments of the world have a common enemy - crime. Crime can only be combated by an efficient police force. When people are not safe in their homes, in their work places and elsewhere, then there is no future. Without an efficient police system there is no future."

QUESTIONS

1. Sketch the delivery system of Soweto's 10111 service.
2. Evaluate the internal marketing of 10111 in Soweto.
3. Given the information in the case study, how can the marketing of the service be improved? What action(s) could be taken to address public perceptions of the Soweto Flying Squad?
4. Evaluate the management of capacity by Soweto's 10111 service.
5. How can 10111 evaluate its service quality?
6. How can the Soweto service be improved?
7. What are the main problems and issues in this case? How could they be addressed?

APPENDIX 1

SOWETO FLYING SQUAD
ORGANISATIONAL CHART
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Source: (Myburgh, 1995).