South African Journal of Education
Copyright © 2004 EASA
Vol 24(1) 31 – 41

Interpreting an integrated curriculum in a non-racial, private, alternative secondary school in South Africa

R. Basson
School of Education , University of the Witwatersrand, P O Wits, 2050 South Africa

Research into school curricula indicates an instability of focus. Curriculum may refer to a disciplinary perspective on a programme, to what practitioners 'do' in a programme, to programme content and its arrangement, to the hidden assumptions patterning thought and action and embedded in the discourse of a curriculum, to the historical and political context of curriculum, to the official curriculum, to the curriculum as curriculum-in-use, to combining academic disciplines in Learning Areas, school with community, or incorporating disability into the mainstream. As opposed to curriculum research being seen as an aspirant body of knowledge, it has been argued that curriculum studies may more usefully be seen as a social movement which focuses, in the first instance, on the unstable but usable arts of the practitioner, rather than on the systematic application of a discipline to elucidate programme purposes and effects and to reflect back on the discipline.

Introduction

Research into school curricula indicates an instability of focus (Jenkins & Shipman, 1976). Curriculum may refer to a disciplinary perspective on a programme, to what practitioners 'do' in a programme (Schwab, 1972), to programme content and its arrangement (Kerr in Shipman & Jenkins, 1976) , to the hidden assumptions patterning thought and action and embedded in the discourse of a curriculum (Bowers, 1982), to the historical and political context of curriculum (Lawton, 1978; Jansen, 1991), to the official curriculum, to the curriculum as curriculum-in-use (NEPI, 1993), to combining academic disciplines in Learning Areas, school with community, incorporating disability into the mainstream (Curriculum 2005, 1997; Spady and Schlebusch, 1999; Naicker,1999). As opposed to curriculum research being seen as an aspirant body of knowledge, Jenkins and Shipman argue that curriculum studies more usefully may be seen as a social movement which focuses, in the first instance as Schwab indicates, on the unstable but usable arts of the practitioner, rather than on the systematic application of a discipline to elucidate programme purposes and effects and to reflect back on the discipline.

Within this unstable and shifting focus of curriculum studies, research into school curricula entails both conceptual and implementable recommendations for designing or planning a programme of instruction. It entails justification of what is selected for inclusion in a programme, as well as a consideration of the relationships between the dimensions of a programme and including: formal claims about the programme, a consideration of intentions or purposes, the problem of content selection, pedagogical assumptions, student assessment, adjudication of the programme, and ideally, taking the programme to scale. In the final analysis, the criterion of efficacy, rather than elegance, distinguishes research into a curriculum from other debates in education, and from curriculum being conflated with one of its constituent parts like, the rhetoric about programme intents, prescriptions about the form and content of programmes, or procedures for adjudicating curricula.

This article focuses on the design of an integrated curriculum, specifically on an interpretation from the perspective of students and teachers 'within' it. A recently completed study of this integrated programme, on which the article is based (Basson, 1992), suggests that this programme contributes to the development of students' communicative competence as an aspect of their primary socialization into culture. Students, from this perspective, experience a measure of empowerment through their classroom communication to develop ideas and views in ways which impact on what counts as learning, and on how they see experience. Hitherto its design as a curriculum has been explained by analogy and by reference to themes, materials and pedagogy, a consequence being that an articulation of its design has been under-emphasized and received scant attention. There seems to be little doubt that the design of this programme orients to processes and activities, and hence contrasts with traditional designs of discipline-oriented curricula in the educational mainstream which focus on ends, content and testing. An interpretation of its design is seen as a necessary and preceding study to a consideration of its efficacy as programme, which clearly provides a focus for further research.

Integrated Studies (IS) has been developed in-house by teachers since the early seventies at Riverside (a pseudonym), a non-racial private secondary school north of Johannesburg. Developing IS was the major innovation of the founding principal and staff, and those succeeding them, to make schooling "relevant" (Krige, 1975) to students in that what was learnt connected to student experience without distracting from the requirements of the matriculation programme into which IS fed.

The article considers briefly previous research into integrated programmes focusing on research using grounded or anthropological methods. This is followed by a consideration of the historical context of this integrated programme and recent development at Riverside school, and an interpretation of its design.

Research into integrated programmes

A variety of studies have been completed on integrated programmes. These include: comparative studies (Warwick, 1973); survey studies (Ingram, 1979); conceptual studies (Bernstein, 1971); organizational studies (Pring, 1976; Flexner & Hauser, 1979; Garcia, 1981); studies making the case for integrated curricula (Conkwright, 1982; Ognibene, 1989); integrated programme interventions (Shipman, 1974; Shipley, 1978; Schmidt, 1985; Woodhouse & Jones, 1984; Ericksson, 1989); academic performance studies (Skinner & Fairbrother, 1988); reporting developments in integrated curricula (Frey, 1989); reflections on integrated programmes (Armitage, 1989); integrated curricula in South Africa (NEPI, 1993; Spady & Schlebusch, 1999).

Of particular interest to a study of IS at Riverside is the research of David Hamilton into integrated curricula (Hamilton, 1975; Hamilton, 1976b), as it has an overt commitment to description and interpretation (Hamilton, 1976b) and to anthropological research into school curricula (Parlett and Hamilton, 1976). An anthropological approach distinguishes Hamilton's work from other studies on integrated programmes, offering a contrasting theoretical stance which orients to the 'murky reality' of classrooms (Parlett & Hamilton, 1976). This approach affords a link with understanding the design of IS at Riverside, in that, like Hamilton, it seeks to study this integrated programme from the point of view of students and teachers 'inside' it.

Hamilton's research suggests that integrated programmes as an intervention in school contexts where assumptions about curricula are confined to traditional conceptions of design and seen in discipline oriented curricula, implies a radical change of emphasis in the conception of curriculum as well as in the organizational context of secondary schools. His research suggests that an intervention of this kind

entails more than introducing a new syllabus into already existing structural arrangements of a school. This change also involves a range of barely understood questions to do with on the one hand, the organization and management of a school, such as the selection and grouping of students, questions of responsibility and authority, and questions of school democracy, and, on the other hand, questions concerning its effect on student thinking, knowledge and understanding (Hamilton, 1976b).

His analysis of the language or rhetoric of intent in Scottish Integrated Science indicated that this programme conformed to Bernstein's conception of an integrated code curriculum (Hamilton, 1976b), in theory. However, his in-depth study of interventions in two different school contexts indicated that integration of contributing disciplines was more difficult than it seemed. In the first context, organizational arrangements including time tabling and staffing policies frustrated discipline integration, whilst in the second, assessment procedures and teacher pedagogy did not conform to the conceptual blueprint or to agreed upon protocols for teachers, and career advancement did not lie with teachers who implemented agreed upon integrated classroom practices (Hamilton, 1975). The study suggests that in practice integrated science increasingly became like its disciplinary counterpart, and that the espoused and agreed upon teacher commitment to integration remained the public face of this innovation, while in classrooms teacher and student practices remained, generally speaking, academically oriented (Hamilton, 1975).

IS at Riverside differs from the cases studied by Hamilton, in that student and teacher classroom practices indicated their commitment to subject integration, but the articulation of IS as programme indicated a tendency to lapse into the language of objectives and testing. The articulation of assumptions implicit in the views and classroom practices of IS, clearly needed attention. The question, How is the integrated programme at Riverside conceived?, 'emerged' unexpectedly as a focus of study, two conceptions particularly deserve mention. One, up until 1988 it had been assumed that adequate accounts were given of IS to explain it. However, presentations to parents implied a growing realization that explanation by analogy and/or narrative provided limited insight into the programme, and that fuller conceptualization was needed for explanations of IS to succeed. Two, IS teachers felt increasingly disadvantaged in debates about IS with discipline-oriented colleagues, as the lack of organizing concepts made it difficult to distinguish its dimensions from those of traditional discipline oriented curricula. Not infrequently IS teachers found themselves trapped in the language of traditional designs, and gave explanations which were not too dissimilar to explanations of content curricula. The question for research which emerged, thus, appeared not only to be a fundamental question to ask, but also to warrant consideration.

Fieldwork and research methods

Idiographic research refers to a study of the particular, and is to be distinguished from nomothetic approaches seeking general laws, and to explain particular instances deductively. It refers to the personal and individual component of social systems (Getsels & Thelen, 1975), to the 'emic' or insider perspective on culture (Fetterman, 1989), and, to elucidating data as it occurs "naturally" and then asking the question: 'What are the data telling me?' (Spindler, 1987)

Included within this broad research tradition are the methods of anthropology as these have been adapted and used in curriculum and educational research (Hamilton, 1976a; 1976b; Parlett & Hamilton, 1976; Spradley, 1979; 1980; Wolcott, 1976; 1984; 1988; Fetterman, 1984; 1989; 1996; Erickson, 1990; Chang, 1992; Hitchcock & Hughes, 1993). Here the researcher is central to the research: s/he is immersed within the context of research, elicits issues for investigation, provides deliberate and intuitive reasons for sample selection and for the selection of methods not unusually on the grounds that these are likely to provide the data s/he needs for an understanding of the issue in question. The role of the researcher, thus, is aptly expressed in the phrase: the researcher as instrument (Wolcott, 1976).

In-depth interviews and classroom observations were the two main data gathering techniques used. Interviews were unstructured commencing with broad or 'grand tour' questions to engage with informants, and to elicit a range of general issues or 'domains' for further investigation. This was followed by more specific questions including descriptive, structuring and contrast questions and questions revealing interviewer 'ignorance' to elicit more specific information on an issue, interpretation following when sufficient information had been gathered. The researcher took control of each interview as early as was possible, followed clues wherever they led, and constantly sought to check information by corroborating data with the informant in and across interviews (Spradley, 1979).

A sample of 'key' student 'informants' (Erickson, 1990) was chosen with teachers on the grounds that they were well informed about the programme, were communicative on this subject, and that they were willing and had the time to make themselves available for multiple interviews (Spradley, 1979). Informants were arranged into four groups to facilitate conversation and diminish anxiety and the periods of silences which can occur in interviews. The groups ranged in size from one to four students, ten students comprising this sample. Selecting this sample took place over a five month period. All full time teachers in the IS Department were interviewed including two new teachers, as were two past teachers who had contributed to the development of IS and were still accessible, and two principals who had contributed to IS in smaller ways than full time teachers. This sample comprised 8 teachers. All interviews were taped and transcribed, a total of approximately 70 interviews in all.

Unstructured observations were carried out in all IS classrooms over a fourteen month period. These were natural, participant-as-observer observations (Wolcott, 1978), in which as much of the classroom conversation as possible was recorded in writing. Notes were made in longhand, observations being recorded against time. Teacher movement amongst students in small groups was noted diagrammatically and exchanges between teacher and student recorded when possible. A sensitive reading of the data lead to the view that immanent within a curriculum is already a theory for its articulation. Rather than relying mainly on data coding procedures, a deliberate decision was made to interpret the data by probing analytically the significance of the concrete detail (Erickson, 1990), and by providing an interpretative commentary filling in such information beyond the story itself and necessary for the reader to interpret the design in a way similar to the author (Erickson, 1990). The data indicated that IS students exercised a measure of control over what counted as learning and experienced a measure of power through their classroom communication. Language here was not being used in these classes to convey content or in ways which were directive and controlling, as would be expected of a traditional design. The concept of communicative competence developed by Bowers (1984) provided concepts whereby this central, and hitherto elusive, aspect of the programme could be articulated, and its implications for the design of this integrated programme made explicit.

Apart from ongoing checks on data trustworthiness in the use of questioning techniques, such as restatement, repetition and verification questions (Spradley, 1979), checks also had to do with participants recognizing themselves in the interpretation, that is whether it "tell(s) it like it is" (Wolcott, 1976), as well as it enabling a 'stranger' to behave appropriately in IS classes.

Data gathering proceeded through three broad and overlapping phases: one, familiarization, sample selection and observation; two, interviewing teacher and student informants whilst continuing classroom observations; and three, organization and interpretation of the data.

Educational reform and integrated studies

Critical for this interpretation of IS is the historical context in which it was designed at Riverside. As private, non-racial school in South Africa, Riverside [and IS] was conceived within a wider context

characterized by increasing protest action directed at the state indicating widespread hostility to its policies in education in the early seventies to eighties, as well as being a period in which there was a groundswell of initiatives in education which sought to shift education away from its overtly racial premise. This context contrasts strongly with a context in which the state drives curriculum integration, such as Scottish Integrated Science, Scotland, and Curriculum 2005, South Africa.

Context

In the seventies to eighties and early nineties, the period in which Riverside was founded and developed, pressure for reform from within the state system became increasingly evident. Student riots in Soweto in 1976, the coloured students' boycott in 1980, and nationwide black student boycott of classes in 1984, indicated a period of unprecedented acts of student protest and resistance to apartheid education. It was a time when the Bantu Education Department increasingly was unable to enforce its regulations in black schools, and the administration of black schools was collapsing. State reforms in this period were made as a response to mass action, its reforms drawing back from making fundamental change to the principle of race as an organizing criterion for it policies. Reforms acceded to were mainly of an administrative nature, such as moves towards a unitary education system, increased state expenditure on education and the building of new schools, with the result that they led to further mass action and to the intensification of popular democratic struggle (Kallaway, 1988).

In addition, this period was marked by the emergence of independent black movements which freed the long suppressed voice of the silenced majority, and indicated heightened consciousness and intensified demands for social change. A consequence was that student resistance increasingly focused on the question of power. Students organized themselves into youth congresses and developed alliances with the youth and the democratic and trade union movements. It was a time when the National Education Co-ordinating Committee (NECC) in conjunction with the youth and democratic movement sought the transformation of education content and structures, and moved beyond simple rejection of inequality in state education (Christie, 1988).

And, importantly for understanding Riverside as 'open school' within these changes, it [Riverside], more overtly than most, initiated and led a ground swell of resistance from within the education system, to press for system reform along with non-governmental organizations sponsored, broadly speaking, by the private sector. In this respect, Riverside was in the van of what became known as the “open school” movement. This form of resistance was low profile, and along with the Catholic Church, it [Riverside] overtly opposed state policy in education by adopting an open admissions policy in contravention of the law, provoked church-state confrontation on the question of admitting black students to white registered schools, and in turn contributed eventually to the legal recognition of the right of all South Africans to have access to white registered schools in the Private Schools Act of 1986.

Thus, Riverside, along with open schools in this period, posed a real if limited challenge to the state's policy of segregated schooling. By pushing against the boundaries of state educational policies, open schools achieved a limited but sustained alternative to apartheid structures, an achievement which, Christie (1988) argues, would be inaccurate to construe as being part of the state's desegregation initiative which at the same time was moving towards a limited desegregation. The efficacy of open schools specifically contesting the issue of admission to private schools within a wider context of crisis and general resistance to state reforms, placed the National Party under considerable pressure to shift its policy on private schools, whilst at the same time, the state kept schools under its control firmly segregated. In addition to open schools in this period, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) pressed for reform of state educational policies from within the system.

Riverside School — its founding and Integrated Studies programme

Founded in the early seventies, Riverside School represents a singular innovation pressing for change in education within a groundswell of initiatives in the country at the time. As school, it offered a non-racial educational alternative, and a commitment to making academic study relevant to student experience without diminishing a commitment to preparing students for entry to university and to the professions. This alternative organizing principle for schooling and justification for its curriculum in opposition to the principles and ideology underpinning the state curriculum, was visible in Riverside policies in general, and more particularly in its major innovation, Integrated Studies.

Historically, Riverside was founded on a principled decision arising from disaffection with state policy on student access to schools, including denominational and independent schools, in the early seventies, when state apartheid policies made it illegal to admit students of another race into white registered schools. One consequence of this policy for a group of professionals in a denominational school where the founding principal and a group of teachers [Riverside] were employed at the time, was that they broke away to found a non-racial, private secondary school which was open to all.

Following a gift of land and a move, Riverside was established in more or less open veld bordering a river, its buildings consisting in asbestos huts left by a construction company. A new purpose-built face brick campus was completed in the late eighties, and included a Community Centre, administration block, laboratories, classrooms, dormitories, tennis courts and a swimming pool. Since 1975 when first admitted in small numbers, black student enrolment has steadily increased until in 1988 black and white students were admitted in equal numbers into the school.

As the major, in-house innovation in the fledgling school, IS was implemented firstly, to rekindle student interest in academic study by relating subject disciplines to personal experience, and secondly as a vehicle to encourage communication and assist second language English speakers to adjust to the new school environment and ethos of the school in preparation for the matriculation programme in the eleventh and twelfth year of schooling.

In 1988, IS thematically integrated across three academic disciplines [English, History, and Geography], was studied by all students in Standards 6 to 8, and was allocated fourteen periods in a seven-day cycle timetable. It co-existed with traditional discipline-oriented programmes in Standards 6 to 8, and was succeeded by a discipline-oriented programme which students studied for their matriculation examination in Standard 10. Early in the fieldwork it became clear that a central design dimension of the programme [a formal claim about it] linked disciplines to experience in the first instance, and not to grades, or to ends/outcomes as pre-specified content statements playing a dominant and circumscribing role in its design.

Importantly for this interpretation, late in 1988 IS lapsed into crisis as a result of its formal claims and fundamental commitments. This arose in part out of the principal's success in attracting sponsors to the school and to rising costs, both fostering renewed pressure for accountability which ran counter to the interest-raising and socializing function of IS. Management and discipline oriented teachers particularly sensed the need for grades, in the matriculation examination more specifically, particularly because of the diversity of backgrounds students came from and deterioration in the quality of teaching students drawn from DET schools had received during the eighties. And the crisis arose in part, too, from longstanding IS teacher commitment to Riverside ideals, to democratization, and to implementing founding ideals, which ran counter to this new and emerging emphasis on grades.

Thus, in contextualizing Riverside within contestations both inside and outside the school, and seeing its integrated innovation as self-initiated, in-house developed programme designed as an act of protest against the state at the time, this innovation clearly differs from

a state initiated and developed integrated programme as national innovation. Particularly, the inspiration and passion IS teachers brought to integration is likely to distinguish this innovation from integration in the national innovation, Curriculum 2005, and, IS being ideologically driven and self-initiated is likely also to contrast strongly with integration [as design principle] being imposed on teachers in the roll-out of Curriculum 2005 as national government initiative.

Nevertheless, sensitivity to the way an integrated curriculum discourse tacitly patterns thinking to create an awareness amongst students and teachers that choices are available and choices are to be exercised in our fledgling democracy, rather than state ideology monolithically controlling thinking through the curriculum, suggests consciousness raising practices linked to real life experience in both IS and the national innovation which may variously be achieved in both. With this end in mind, interpreting IS in terms of classical conceptions of curriculum emphasizing pre-specification and content embedded in ends and outcomes, is likely not only to distort an understanding of IS, but worse still, to miss it altogether.

Interpretation

Communicative competence and primary socialization into culture

Following Bowers (1984:2), the concept of communicative competence refers to competences acquired during students' primary socialization, which includes how they operate in terms of the language system governing beliefs, how they expand their sets of interpretational rules, and how they develop confidence in themselves. Quoting Bowers, this competence refers to,

> the individual's ability to negotiate meanings and purposes instead of passively accepting the social realities defined by others. (It requires) a knowledge of relevant issues and conceptual frameworks that influence our ways of thinking.

This concept refers to a form of communication in which students reflect critically on the assumptions underpinning their beliefs to question them, to renegotiate their beliefs, and to come to rely on their views instead of passively accepting the views of others. Language, in this perspective, is seen as a carrier of culture, making available to students the concepts and criteria in terms of which students make sense of their world. These concepts and criteria are internalized in consciousness and are negotiated to accord with their experience.

Meanings, in this perspective, are seen as cultural beliefs which students acquire through language and which function as a ‘code’ to guide behaviour in daily life. Cultural beliefs are ‘learnt’, for the most part, tacitly, students being unaware that learning is taking place in their interactions with others and being unaware of the hidden controls applying in daily life. Their concepts and codes function as ‘interpretational rules’ mediating the world to students, and ensuring that behaviour is predictable within a range (Bowers, 1984:36-37).

Students, in this perspective, are active meaning-makers who continually negotiate meanings in daily life, make adjustments in their behaviour, build up personal repertoires of beliefs which work for them, and renegotiate taken-for-granted beliefs to be more original where necessary. They are thus, not free of culture, but are **both** constrained by language and freed from the determinism of traditional beliefs.

This perspective provides a clear contrast to assumptions implicit in the design of traditional discipline oriented curricula which emphasize content stated explicitly in statements of ends for recollection and testing. On this perspective, communication does not refer to the function of language to convey content from teacher to learner, or to speaking, or to mere proficiency in language. Nor does meaning necessarily reside in the explicitly stated and structured content of a discipline. And, furthermore, students are not seen to be passive assimilators of content pre-specifications. The assumptions underpinning the design of mainstream discipline oriented curricula tend to restrict the ‘space’ for student participation in classrooms and their power to influence classroom practices. Personal and idiosyncratic considerations are precluded in these designs and have limited or little importance in discipline oriented classrooms.

The concept of communicative competence, rather, indicates that students experience a sense of empowerment through their participation in the process of meaning-making. That is, in negotiating beliefs students make changes, minor and major, in their views which they come to rely on, thus providing them with choices between views and hence with a measure of power to influence decisions which affect them.

In essence, this concept refers to a form of communication which allows students to escape the determinism of the language binding them tacitly to cultural meanings encoded in the concepts and categories of academic disciplines and arranged in mainstream programme designs, to intentionally direct attention and see experience in new ways. At the heart of this process is a tension between the conserving propensity of language binding to the beliefs and practices of disciplines contributing to this integrated programme, and the potential for students' language to free thinking and action from the grip of these established academic and educational traditions to create “space” for fresh insights into experience.

Integrated Studies at Riverside

Formal claims of integrated studies as a curriculum

Recognizing the importance of communicative competence as an educational goal shifts thinking about the design of this integrated programme from content prespecifications linked to grades and assumptions underpinning traditional discipline oriented programmes, to conceive of it as a form of language socialization which both functions to bind and release student thinking to be more idiosyncratic and personal.

Indications that student ideas count and that student thinking can be distinctive in IS classrooms were “foreshadowed” (Wolcott, 1976: 23) within IS classroom practices. These emerged unexpectedly in classroom observations and interviews and took more specific form whilst processing the data. Student and teacher classroom practices and what they say about this programme in interviews, linked communication, rather than content and grades, to what counted in IS. The purpose now is to give selected insights into the design of this integrated programme, principally of conceiving it to contribute to the development of competencies in communication linking communication to empowerment in classrooms.

Three indicators of this interpretation of the formal claims of IS emerged from student and teacher practices in IS classrooms and from the accounts they give of this programme at Riverside in interviews. These include, (i) that communication and the centrality of competences in communication lie at the heart of student socialization into culture, that (ii) through classroom pedagogy teachers initiate students into the communicative activities of IS which are sustained in and negotiated through language, and that (iii) participation in these activities leading to the development of individual views becomes a passion or deeply felt commitment students feel towards the programme.

1. Communication and IS

New participants soon learnt that communication was central to IS activities. They were initiated into these activities early in their introduction to IS [Obs7IS21/1/88]. Communicative activities varied students being initiated into a range of these activities in any one school day, which might include formal presentation and debate of an issue [Obs8IS15/2/88], a speaking part in a drama presentation [Obs7IS4/11/87], note taking in student research [Obs6IS3/3/88], a discussion of a theme-related topic [Obs8IS18/3/88]. Particular attention was also given to language usage and sentence construction [IVVR28/7/88], writing style [Obs8IS3/11/87], data inputs and noting evidence [Obs8IS11/11/88; IS Document 88-9], discussion, planning and writing-up an assignment [Obs8IS16/11/88; Obs6IS1/2/88]. Student familiarity with grammar was assumed unless found to be lacking, in

which case they attended an extra class called English Skills [Obs ISOrien22/1/88; ISDocument88-9].

Teachers recognized communication to be a vehicle for expressing an 'awareness of self as well as an awareness and acceptance of others', and for expressing differences between self and others. They recognized that communication allows one to stand 'outside ... personal points of view' to see the viewpoints of others; to recognize 'another's tradition' and avoid stepping on 'another's toes'; and that they cannot hold 'stereotypes in a multi-dimensional world' [IVJ-AH11/11/87]. Teachers recognized that views developed in the programme were constructed in language which objectified dimensions of reality, and that meanings were negotiated and accommodated within the repertoire of meanings with which a student was familiar and that meanings could be renegotiated to express more individual views.

Students used lessons to articulate particular views, some examples in relation to the theme of Violence being: it caused people to 'crack'; one doesn't have to be physically 'hurt' by violence; life is about sadness and happiness — 'sometimes you have more of one'; 'everybody is caught up in a stupor of violence' which can be related to the pressure we live under. Consequently 'people don't know how to handle it' and one's attitude to violence may 'change ... totally' with time [Obs8IS15/2/88].

Students also renegotiate meanings in classrooms, as indicated in the early stages of a discussion on the theme, Survival, after the class had been initiated into a discussion of 'mutation' leading to beginning definitions of this term:

St 1: ... mutation and evolution. For example, an animal born with two heads, six fingers, etc. is a mutation. Getting taller is getting good and is evolution.

St 2: Where something goes wrong, then it's a mutation. [Obs7IS1/2/88]

Communication in this programme related to developing ideas in ways which were freed from conveying traditional views or the content of a discipline, to allow students to fashion ideas in their own way, to reflect on the needs and opinions of others from the perspective of the other, and to break down prejudices [IVJ-AH11/11/87].

Communication here is essentially non-directive. It refers to providing opportunities, encouraging and supporting the expression of personal views in classrooms, and creating 'space' in which students can reflect on information drawn from the disciplines as well as from their own experience to renegotiate views and develop confidence in these views.

This contrasts sharply with the use of language in classrooms where academic disciplines were taught. In these classrooms language usage tended to be teacher-centered, directive and controlling. A lesson in a discipline-oriented classroom at Riverside where teaching was organized around subject content provides a useful contrast. From the beginning of the lesson the teacher directed student attention to the content to be learnt through the stages in the lesson. The teacher introduced the topic, defined and explained concepts for recollection, gave examples of definitions which succeeded and those which did not, provided opportunities during the class for questions, concluded with a resume of the concept and set exercises, and gave an indication of acceptable responses to questions on the topic. When discussion broke out towards the end of the lesson and student definitions of key concepts and their views counterpoised the pre-specified definitions and views presented in the lesson, their ideas were declared novel but they were told that their ideas would not, in the end, be considered acceptable [Obs8IS6/5/88]. Language use here was, in the main, one-way from teacher to pupil, monological, and was used primarily to convey content. Students made no significant impact on what counted in this lesson. In place of communication creating 'space' for students to negotiate personal and particular meanings with others, language use in this lesson suggested another function of language, namely, it function to act as a conduit for conveying information, in this instance, of an academic discipline from teacher to student.

IS student and teacher practices and views, thus, suggest that the metaphorical nature of English as medium of instruction encodes the understandings, assumptions and definitions of the programme. Implicit in these practices and views is the suggestion that IS meanings and codes are 'learnt' through the multiple pathways of communication that students are initiated into, and that in being initiated into these activities students and teachers create 'space' for expressing individual views and for developing competencies in communication leading to fresh insights into experience.

2. Sustaining communication

Communication is sustained in this integrated programme through the multiple pathways of communication into which students are initiated. Teacher communication is pivotal in sustaining the codes and concepts of this programme, evidence for this being seen in the range of pedagogies IS teachers utilize in classrooms.

How teachers use language in classrooms varies within a considerable range. Included are formal communications when teachers give instructions on how to engage in specified activities in different pedagogical situations, for example, in a drama lesson when students were instructed in body movement [Obs6IS4/2/88], in the Library where students received instruction in library research [Obs6IS3/3/19988], and in teacher talk and communication where students give back information in response to teacher questions [Obs8IS6/5/88]. Informal teacher communication manifest in supportive communications where teachers engage with students in the development of their ideas. This is seen, for example, in teacher-student dialogue in plenary sessions [Obs7IS5/2/88], in one-on-one teacher-student discussion with students in small groups [Obs8IS18/3/88], and in plenary sessions where students report the findings of their research on a theme prior to submission of the final written assignment. Here, dialogue consisted in voicing different views, challenging interpretations, and holding up 'expert' opinion as exemplar for students to note [Obs 7IS15/2/88].

In a typical Standard 7 IS lesson early in the development of the theme 'Who am I?' in which time-lines were used to locate students in historical time initially, 1967-88 in the case of an Indian male student and thereafter link it to offler's wave theory encompassing mans' early history till modern times, formal communication accounted for approximately 8 minutes of this 35 minute lesson. Informal communication, in contrast, accounted for 10 minutes of teacher-student and student-student dialogue in small groups, and 17 minutes of plenary discussion dominated by students making connections between their own years and the years spanning the development of mankind [Obs7IS21/1/88]. Included within formal communication in this class were teacher interjections during the plenary discussion, when students were reminded to direct their communication to another [Obs7IS21/1/88].

In general, lessons in this integrated programme could be expected to encompass more formal communication early in the development of a theme. For example, in 'stimulus input' presentations/lectures communication tended to be monological from the teacher/guest lecturer to the pupil, its purpose being to raise interest in a theme in a short space of time and to make available to students information for noting and use in later theme development. This type of communication frequently launched a new theme and consequently was used at the beginning of the IS pedagogical sequence, which culminated in one-on-one student-teacher tutorials to discuss and assess theme-based student projects. In this pedagogical arrangement informal, dialogical communications predominated.

Through their communication in classrooms, thus, teachers not only made available to students the codes and concepts of this programme, but their communication also provided an ongoing dialogue which sustained IS messages governing action in classrooms.

3. A passionate engagement

For an IS parent, IS 'rekindles students' desire for study' in ways which she was unable to explain. For teachers in the programme, IS

was about seeing students as 'people' [IVDF8/11/87], about 'breaking down stereotypes' and 'connecting education to personal experience and development' [IVJ-AH11/11/87]. For students, the programme was not a time to erect 'barriers' between persons, particularly not between students and teachers [IVStGp127/9/88]; it was a time to 'read' and 'discover the value of reading' [IVDF18/1/88]; it was a time to 'discover oneself and others' [IV3StGp127/9/88]. And, common to these beliefs about the programme were strong and frequently unarticulated views that IS was about values, such as, 'freedom' and 'democracy', and that it opposed authoritarianism [Obs4/6/88; Nkwe, 1988; IV3StGp127/9/88].

These views suggest a third indicator for interpreting the design of this integrated programme. The communicative activities students are initiated into through the multiple pathways of communication in the pedagogy of IS, refer to deeply felt teacher and student commitments to the programme. Kurt Hahn (1964:1-17) of the Outward Bound, Gordonstoun, and the International College movement, uses the term *grande passion* to refer to deeply felt commitments such as these in IS, and to indicate vigorous pursuit of issues such as relationships between people, tenacity to survive in war and in times of peace, service to the community, preservation of the environment, etc. The term is pertinent here as it refers to connecting such issues to individual experience, believing as he did, that a major weakness of school programmes today is that they encourage being a spectator or, learning about issues, rather than engaging with issues in personal and particular ways. Formal claims about Integrated Studies at Riverside take for granted activities such as engagement with issues and initiating into communicative activities, not as a formality and seen in learning "about" issues, but as a *grande passion* and seen in serious engagement with issues and in personal dialogical communications with others in relation to issues.

Summarizing, the classroom practices and student and teacher views of IS suggest that formal claims about the integrated programme at Riverside recognize the importance of communicative competence as an aspect of a student's primary socialization into culture, here specifically into the culture of IS. These claims recognize that initiating students into communicative competences is to engage in a process of uncovering meanings tacitly 'learnt' whilst interacting with others, and that language both binds and frees thought thereby permitting students to experience a measure of empowerment through language in IS classrooms. These claims recognize that the multiple pathways of communication made available to students through the various pedagogical arrangements in this programme, serve to sustain its codes and concepts against the erosion of time here particularly against the fallibility of student recollection. And, lastly, these claims recognize that a student's engagement in dialogical communication with others involves a passionate and personal, rather than detached, engagement in language activities to which they become increasingly committed in exploring fresh insights into their world.

These formal claims about curriculum differ significantly from the traditional insistence on the primacy of content, grades and ends/outcomes evident in formal claims about the design of traditional academic curricula in the educational mainstream.

Interpreting the programme as contributing to the development of communicative competence as an aspect of a student's primary socialization into culture, further illuminates the dimensions of this integrated programme, such as its purposes, programme content, and pedagogy.

Purposes of the Integrated Studies programme

Recognizing that communication, and sustaining communicative activities to which participants become committed, is central to understanding IS at Riverside, implies that mainstream conceptions linking a conception of aims and ends to content prescriptions need re-articulation in the development of an understanding of this integrated programme.

Sockett (1976:44-8) draws a distinction between aims and ends in an educational programme. Aims are more general and long term aspirations of a programme. Ends, however, are highly specific, and pre-specify in detail and in measurable language statements what is to be attained at each stage in the learning process as well as providing a means for assessing whether ends have been attained.

With reference to the integrated programme at Riverside, the term 'purposes' is used to distinguish traditional or mainstream conceptions of aims/ends so described, from the aims of this integrated programme. Broadly speaking, purposes in IS have two referents. One, purposes have an internal locus, and refer to teachers and students defining for themselves purposes of the programme. Purposes in this sense are individually defined and pursued, and are consequently varied and particular. Two, purposes also refer to the espoused goals of the programme which are shared and frequently reiterated.

Purposes in this case refer to open-ended commitments of the activities students are initiated into in the programme, and, whilst these may vary, they are more or less settled formulations comprising a core of broadly stated and generally accepted statements which recur in classrooms and in public explanations about IS.

In the former sense, purposes give a feeling of particularity to the programme, not in the sense that these statements are objective and universal, but in the sense that participants define for themselves what the programme does for them. For one student, purpose meant discovering the value of reading [IVDF18/11/87], for another it meant straddling divisions between people [IV4StGp14/10/88]. For another, the school provided a mix of students by race, language, creed, gender, age, for him to do all the rest (Basson, 1992:20). Developing this idea, he explained that IS provided him with the opportunity to develop a spirit of *rapprochement* between himself, a Shangaan, and a variety of 'others' through developing communication strategies including trading insults and provoking laughter [IV3StGp222/7/88]. Purposes in this sense tend to be particular, are descriptive and loosely stated as if still in formulation, and are invariably implicit in what students and teachers say about the programme. Purposes place student and teacher engagement in communicative activities at the centre of theme development, and have a tendency to be process rather than end oriented.

In the latter sense, purposes refer to the public face of IS, to elucidatory claims about direction and what is hoped to be accomplished by orienting attention away from learning academic content, and examinations. For the founding principal, the purpose of IS was to be "relevant" in the sense that the programme connected with student lives and helped them in the 'difficult business of becoming mature human beings as they learn to live' (Krige, 1975:7).

Purposes, in his view, orient away from 'antique chalk, talk and set book methods of conveying facts'. Relevancy as a purpose of this programme arose from the failure of mainstream academicprogrammes to orientate to a student's life, a conviction borne out of a lifetime in teaching in state and private schools. For far too long, Krige (1975:7) argued, schools have been content with programmes which students have found to be 'irrelevant to their lives however much meaning they [facts] may have within the confining covers of the history, geography etc. textbook'. This approach has fostered feelings of 'frustration' with programmes in the present being designed on the 'principles of the past', and is a practice which has resulted in students becoming 'bored' with learning.

IS purposes, in this sense, connect students with life. In conception they are dynamic and process in character. Ends, referring to prescribed content to be learnt in a traditional design, are seen to be in the service of IS purposes, and are used to give a wider perspective on life than is usually afforded by a focus on any one academic discipline. Not to be appraised of the content of several academic disciplines for the purpose of developing an integrated understanding of life in the difficult business of becoming a mature human being, would constitute a failure of purpose in the sense intended here.

Purposes, as general statements, indicated activities into which students were initiated in the programme. Implicit in these statements is the centrality of communication for student development. Engaging

in communicative activities is seen as engaging in the learning process, but not as a desirable end-state to be attained. As a dimension of this programme, purposes function to elucidate, here a focus on relevancy and student development, and serve as an *aide-de-memoire* of the clusters of activities entailed in IS.

In interviews, teachers cited phrases drawn from IS statements of purpose to eludicate the programme's orientation to relevance, and to distinguish this orientation from aims and ends of traditionally designed academic discipline curricula. For them, purposes entailed,

- the personal development of the student;
- paying attention to personal needs and interests;
- self-development; and
- relevance (Basson, 1992:134).

Founding IS teachers stated six purposes for this integrated programme, purpose number 2 insisting that the whole area of study is relevant at as many points as possible to the present and likely future way of living of each pupil. By relevant in this context is meant [from the pupil's view] to start from a recognizable point in his/her experience and extend from that in a manner worth pursuing [purpose number 2: brackets indicate my addition to this quote] (Anon., 1976: 1).

In 1988 the purposes of this programme included,

- to integrate various disciplines within a broad theme of interest and relevance in students [such disciplines would include History, Geography, Communication, Art, Music, Religion, Psychology, Sociology];
- to develop the various skills needed for students to cope with any learning situation **and** with life itself, and to provide students with a wide variety of learning situations that will stimulate and motivate them to learn;
- to facilitate the students' development into mature, confident, questioning human beings capable of making decisions and solving problems;
- to expose students to a wide variety of inter-personal situations to enable them to develop healthy relationships with others;
- to at all times maintain a child-centred approach at the core of the programme (Sheldon, 1988).

Clearly, when citing words like ‘relevance’, ‘development into mature ... human beings’, ‘cope with ... life’, ‘child-centred’, ‘integrate ... disciplines’, ‘develop ... skills’ which have been associated with purposes of this programme since the seventies, participants indicate that these terms are more than catch phrases. They represent deep-seated commitments of teachers to a conception of curriculum whose purpose centres the individual and competencies in communication at the heart of student socialization into culture. This conception of purposes differs significantly from aims/ends in traditional programmes, in that purposes are both immanent within students and impel individual and particular formulations, and public, indicating activities into which students are initiated when pursuing their studies in this programme. Purposes, in both senses, differ in several important respects from mainstream aims/ends, one in particular being that purposes in IS do not provide a clear means for adjudicating the efficacy of individual purposes or of the purposes of the programme as a whole. This is a weakness in a process conception of purpose.

‘*Content*’ *and Integrated Studies*

Content in this programme refers to facts and figures of the academic disciplines integrated in IS, as well as to explanations of key concepts of contributing disciplines. In this respect, ‘content’ does not differ significantly from the facts and textbook knowledge implicated in the designs of traditional academic curricula. However, one significant difference is how information is used, as IS content is used for individual purposes as well as for more general and public purposes.

As opposed to learning the concepts and facts of a discipline and how these articulate as an academic specialism, the content of a discipline is used in theme development and related to student experience. Rather than content rounding out and deepening student understanding as a unidimensional reality, students develop a polyfocal perspective on a theme linking academic disciplines with a view to broadening their grasp of and ability to use such insights in their daily life. Encoded in the language of the teacher and in the dialogical classroom communication are concepts and criteria which serve as interpretational rules functioning to make sense of a student's experience. These are internalized in consciousness through the multiple pathways of classroom communication, and are built up cumulatively as a student's personal biography of IS meanings.

Putting this another way, content or what is to be learnt in this programme, also refers to the interpretational rules and codes of IS. Students internalize these concepts and codes in consciousness, and these serve as a shared, socially constructed reality or world of meaning which make communication possible in IS classrooms. They learn this world of meanings through their participation in daily classroom discussion, students being for the most part unaware that learning is taking place at all. Students internalize the concepts and codes which work for them, and develop understandings and views of their experience which are both shared and idiosyncratic.

Interpretational codes, as an aspect of this dimension of IS, thus, are not memorized for recall and testing but are internalized in consciousness and used continually to fashion and sustain a reality which is both individual and idiosyncratic as well as being shared and public in classrooms. Through their use of codes in classroom dialogue with others, students internalize codes which work for them. These codes mediate IS to students and govern action so that it becomes predictable within a range. And internalized codes enable students to act appropriately in classrooms.

The concept of the intersubjective as developed by Alfred Schutz (Wagner, 1975) is useful in articulating this dimension of IS. It entails how the experience of others becomes part of an actor's life world. The intersubjective refers to socially derived sets of assumptions, definitions, beliefs and action routines which serve as the student's frame of reference and underly their perceptions and behaviour. The intersubjective is in part a hidden set of controls governing experience which students simply take for granted, except for when these rules fail them. Students internalize appropriate codes through interaction with significant others, so that the publicly available interpretational rules and beliefs become stabilized in consciousness as a personal biography of meaning. The inter-subjective self, as it is called, is built up cumulatively, and is both idiosyncratic and social. It comprises recipe knowledge, rules, symbolic knowledge, action routines, codes, beliefs and values. Internalized codes ensure that actors understand the experience of others, and make action predictable.

Consequently, a word like “theme” directs students to see what they need to focus on and do, to develop a theme in classes. Predictably, students researched a theme from various disciplinary perspectives [Obs7IS3/3/88], debated issues related to an understanding of the theme, and presented verbally in public forum understandings negotiated with others [Obs7IS15/2/88]. That is, ‘theme’, as an internalized code, or part of a student's intersubjective self, is learnt in the sense that students typically behave in the way intended. A “theme” governs student thinking to see that needs and interests are important and are not to be undervalued or ignored, that themes are for research, debate and public presentation. It also guides students to see that themes relate to personal experience and are not decontextualized bits of information unconnected with them as persons, and that as individuals students are, in a sense, “an” authority facing choices and do not necessarily need to defer to others, for example, on grounds of the other being ‘the’ authority or in a position of power. The word ‘theme’, thus, is not understood because it conveys content. Rather it functions as a shared interpretational rule guiding each student and enabling all students to predict probable responses of others, as well as allowing for distinctive personal views. Its use distinguishes a theme from a ‘topic’, referring to content for recall [IVStGp17/11/88], and the use of ‘theme’ and codes like it in the programme, guards against an understanding of IS collapsing back into mainstream con-

ceptions of curriculum (Basson, 1992:152).

Socialization into IS also involves students internalizing in consciousness — into their personal biography — the beliefs and values of the programme. Students internalized beliefs include personal 'rights' [to participate, to be heard, to experience] and 'freedoms' [of speech, of belief, of association] (Basson, 1992:150). These internalized codes, in the main, ensure that students treat with respect and listen to the views of another: to a student's view of violence borne out of experience in Mamelodi [Obs7IS15/2/88]; to a mother's advice to a child [Obs7IS15/2/88]; to personal assertions [Obs7IS2/1/88]. A consequence is that students simply assume, for the most part, that they are free to express their views without fear of ridicule or reprimand [IV4StGp14/10/88], free to choose with whom to associate [IVStGp14/10/88], that is that they enjoy these freedoms [IV2St Gp18/8/88]. Through the patterned discourse of IS they also learn that this programme is inimical to coercion [IV4StGp14/10/88], and, they learn that through shared, dialogical communications distinctive personal beliefs are possible, and indeed, encouraged. Students argued for their views against discipline oriented teachers and administrative staff during the Crisis, for example, that they 'had the right to choose; it was a right students should exercise', and, "it was a right they should use with discretion as it did not mean there were no restrictions on their choices" [IV4StGp14/10/88].

A communicative competence perspective, thus, shifts thinking about this dimension of IS to include knowing how to develop personal and more idiosyncratic views, as well as knowing about the content of an academic discipline. Being made available in the discourse of IS classrooms, interpretational rules of IS are internalized students building-up a personal biography of meanings which permit them to make sense of classroom experience in ways which are distinctive. Classroom communication also guards against this conception of content collapsing back into mainstream conceptions emphasizing the content of an academic discipline, and it sustains this conception of content against the erosion of time.

Pedagogy and renegotiating meanings in Integrated Studies

Teacher pedagogy in IS provides multiple language contexts for the development of communicative competence in classes, these, as well as their respective pedagogical styles, being tied to the fundamental pedagogical pattern of the programme. These contexts allow for language to be used reflexively, and enable students who develop this ability to renegotiate settled ideas and develop confidence in their views.

Students are initiated into multiple language contexts in IS, the range permitting students to develop a corresponding range of competencies in communication. Language contexts in the fundamental pedagogical pattern (Basson, 1992:162) followed a sequence commencing with the function of language to convey content and culminating with language usage which questioned and reformulated views. The pedagogical pattern included: stimulus inputs, whole class discussion, library research, small group discussion, drafting assignments, dramatization, plenary presentations and student/teacher directed discussion, completion of written presentations, and one-on-one student-teacher assessment tutorials (Basson, 1992:59; 150). Immersion in these contexts provided opportunities for students to develop multiple language activities. These included: accessing information on a theme in a stimulus input presentation to decode messages, spark ideas and focus individuals on theme development (Basson, 1992: 185-6); reflexive language use in plenary sessions and written assignments challenging accepted views; persuading others to a particular point of view; and defending arguments when interrogated in public [Obs7IS15/2/88].

Within each language context, considerable variation in teacher communication style is evident. Morag Nkwe, Jo-Anne Harmen and Tom Snaddon (names are fictitious) generally speaking, were considered to have a "progressive" communication style (Nkwe, 1988:1), Gail Joyce and Peta Gooding to have an impassioned style which embroiled them personally in themes their communication grappling to come to terms with issues raised in classrooms, and new teachers were considered to have a more formal style being new to IS and early in their induction into its conception and practices.

Despite this diversity in communication styles, a teacher's communication style emphasizes students developing communication skills promoting individual growth and a student's confidence in his/her views. Morag's communication style, for example, connected themes to students first-hand experience of indigenous African cultures (Nkwe, 1987:34). She used language in classrooms to demonstrate that language was a great integrator which unlocked and related the experience of the individual to human development from hunter-gather societies till modern industrial man (Nkwe in Basson, 1992:57). Noting that English as the medium of instruction oppressed second language speakers particularly, she used language to address the problems they experience to develop their confidence in English through participating in discussion to influence decisions affecting them in lessons (Nkwe in Basson, 1992:57). For her, teaching IS was an all consuming passion, and her communication style brought into focus a child-centred approach to teaching which emphasized the development of supportive working relationships with students in classrooms. The communication style here contrasts quite sharply with the more formal communication implicit in mainstream curricula and found in discipline-oriented classrooms, and the tendency there to distance teachers from students.

Morag's style had been developed over a period of two years mentored by experienced IS teachers particularly by Tom. Her style incorporated much of the spirit of this programme including emphasis being placed on individual growth, child-centredness, supportive relationships with students. And, in her three month tenure as head of department she had added a meta-theme [Toffler's wave theory] in an attempt to give a sense of connectedness between themes, and between themes and the individual life experience of students in the programme. Clearly language served to integrate learning, building-up student confidence in their views through language. She, thus, set the tone for communication in this integrated programme. For an understanding of this integrated programme, this tone emphasizes developing reflexive communicative activities which question and allow for views to be renegotiated, sharing views and allowing for individual differences, and students having confidence in their views.

As previously argued, in being socialized into forms of communication within the various language contexts of IS, students come to view communication as engagement in language activities which share, sustain and negotiate IS codes, and to view learning as a language game which, amongst other things, leads students to pragmatically internalize in consciousness codes which work for them. The recognition in IS that schooling influences the development of the student's communicative competence also points to language activities which allow the student to intentionally direct attention to the interpretive framework governing their thinking, to renegotiate aspects of their beliefs. That is, there is also an intentional quality to human consciousness and seen in the pedagogy of the programme, where choice and interpretation come into play. Intentionality refers to individuals consciously calling into question their assumptions thereby providing a moment in cultural time or a moment of " 'liminality' " (Van Gennep in Bowers, 1984:6) when doubt is created, and individuals experience a measure of freedom and power to renegotiate those aspects of their framework of assumptions in need of attention to make major changes in the way they see experience.

Students, the data suggests, consciously renegotiate meanings given in the language contexts of this programme. The language made available in a stimulus input lesson [a film entitled 'In the Beginning' directed by Richard Leakey on the theme 'Survival'] initiated students into reflexive language activities leading them to question settled understandings on survival in hominid and human society, to speculation, and to fresh accounts of survival, fresh in the sense that settled personal and programmatic understandings were expanded [Obs7IS1/

2/88]. Students developed and refined their understandings in subsequent lessons where classroom communication encouraged refining of views through discussion with others, in a plenary session, and in written assignments for assessment [Obs7IS15/2/88).

A characteristic of the multiple language contexts provided in the pedagogy of this programme, thus, has to do with students feeling a measure of empowerment through language. That is, that choices are open to students in classes, that they have the freedom in classes to question and expand the range and scope of understandings available to them, and that they come to rely on their views, rather than simply accepting the settled views of experts or others.

Summing up, this perspective suggests a notion of pedagogy which centres students at the heart of the learning process. Through the multiple pathways of communication made available to students in the pedagogy of this integrated programme, students are provided with a form of communication enabling those who develop this ability to put critical distance between themselves and settled personal and public knowledge, to question and renegotiate views and make major changes in the way they see their experience. Arguably the most significant impact of the teachers' communication style and of the multiple language contexts comprising the pedagogical pattern in this integrated programme on its students, has to do with students developing confidence in and reliance upon their views. Being initiated into communicative activities, student competencies in language go beyond the conception of language as a conduit for conveying content efficiently from teacher to learner, to encompass, in addition, reflexive forms of communication leading to their reliance on self and on their own views, and to them sensing a measure of empowerment in learning. In conception, this dimension of curriculum contrasts with pedagogies in traditional mainstream curricula where language has a tendency to assume students to be relatively passive, and language to be directive and controlling in classrooms.

Concluding comments

Four concluding comments are made on this interpretation of Integrated Studies at Riverside.

1. This interpretation of Integrated Studies is signalled by key concepts such as, contributing to the development of communicative competence, initiating into language activities, purposes being immanent within individuals as well as being public commitments, content comprising data as well as interpretational rules functioning as codes, and pedagogy allowing for reflexive language use affording fresh insights into experience. These concepts distinguish the dimensions of this programme from traditional discipline oriented programmes in the educational mainstream and signalled, rather, by concepts such as, objectives as measurable language statements, programme content as data for recall and testing, and outcomes as evidence of programmatic accomplishment. The recognition that this programme contributes to the development of communicative competence, provides organizing concepts, a 'language' as it were, for making sense of IS in its own terms, concepts which also help to distinguish this integrated programme from traditionally designed discipline-oriented curricula in the educational mainstream.

   Clearly the purpose of this article is to provide an interpretation of the design of IS at Riverside in terms foreshadowed within claims about it and made available in student and teacher interviews and embedded in their classroom practices. Understanding how this programme and the dimensions of its design can be conceived is a necessary and prior consideration to the question: how well is the programme performing? What has not been attempted here is an adjudication of this programme the 'goal' of which would have been to establish how well this programme has performed (Scriven, 1972:60-104). The project of this research is somewhat different. It seeks to conceive of this integrated programme, rather than to judge it.

   The real life flavour given IS by proponents and practitioners at Riverside and reflected in quotations and paraphrases in this article, it needs to be pointed out, puts on one side debates about the programme and the considerable criticism aimed at IS at Riverside. Criticism at the time, seemed mainly to be premised on assumptions underpinning traditional academic discipline curricula, rather than to engage in debates about the programme in its own terms and how it might be accommodated within school arrangements [Extraordinary Staff Meeting, 1988]. Clarification of the concepts underpinning this design, once again, seemed an important and prior step to critique, as, with what is the IS critic to engage in the absence of a conception of the design of this integrated programme and a 'language' to distinguish it from the design of traditional discipline oriented curricula?

   In addition, IS is not a panacea for those expressing disaffection with traditional curriculum designs. Interventions of this kinds in mainstream schooling seem, rather, to introduce a range of new difficulties and contests which await the unwary and which need resolution.

2. In contributing to the development of students' communicative competence, IS, on this interpretation, initiates students into language activities which allow them also to think against the grain of the ideology taken for granted in the educational mainstream and implicit in assumptions embedded in the design of traditional discipline-oriented programmes. The recognition of the development of communicative competence as a goal of education makes explicit the need for: (i) a new form of authority emphasizing the individual as an authority; and (ii) a form of social control emphasizing the individual voice, a questioning attitude, student renegotiation of views, and democratic procedures. These student and teacher competencies not usually given prominence in mainstream secondary school programmes, intimate a conception of secondary school programme which may have a role to play in an educational dispensation moving away from its authoritarian and segregationist past.

   More specifically, this interpretation suggests that students who develop this ability re-think assumptions about schooling including, as mentioned above, what counts as authority and control in their daily classroom experience. This emphasis on the student's voice links to democratization in IS classrooms, and links IS with wider popular movements which since the Seventies have organized and pressed towards a new democratic post-apartheid social order. On this interpretation, the integrated programme at Riverside assumes an ideology of progressivism, meaning that IS teachers and students develop critical abilities assisting them to question, rather than merely to accept as fact, issues which can clearly be contested, by initiating students into communicative activities leading them to develop views which are both shared and idiosyncratic, and to rely on their views in classes and in daily life. That is, a communicative competence perspective suggests that students and teachers are also intentional beings who develop confidence in, and come to rely on, their views through their classroom communication. This perspective does not once again, seek to impose on students another set of prescriptions engendering in them a mind set that these are for memorization and recall.

   Furthermore, on this interpretation, IS resists engendering in students a mind set linking teaching and learning to race as an organizing category in the organizational context of the school, or linking teaching and learning to authoritarian forms of control. Rather, it provides students with choices between alternatives, with the need to choose between decision alternatives, and to take responsibility for the decisions they make in their lives.

3. This distinctive conception of Integrated Studies at Riverside needs recognition by school administrators, for it to be accommodated within the organizational context of the school guided, in the main, by traditional conceptions of curriculum. Experience with integrated programmes elsewhere (Hamilton, 1975; 1976b)

suggests that the dynamics of integrated programmes as interven-tion in schools in the educational mainstream, are little under-stood. Experience at Riverside concurs with this view, that there is a need to better understand Integrated Studies at Riverside here how it is conceived by participants 'within' the programme, for it, like integrated programmes elsewhere, to be able to co-exist with discipline-oriented programmes without provoking unwar-ranted dilemmas, if not crises (Hamilton, 1976b:196-197), within this secondary school.

4. Two decades experience of thematically integrating across academic disciplines at Riverside School may illuminate the concept of 'integration' in the national innovation in South Africa Curriculum 2005, an outcomes-based intervention in state schools aimed at transforming apartheid education and redressing past imbalances in education since the country's first democratic election in 1994. At present this concept is loosely defined, referring to (i) grouping together academic disciplines into 8 Learning Areas [such as Human and Social Sciences, integrating History, Geography, Religion, *et al.*], where Critical and Specific Outcomes as well as Organizers serve to integrate academic disciplines, and (ii) to linking Learning Areas.

   Where Learning Programmes are developed for teachers as in the Gauteng Institute of Curriculum Development, integration in the late 1990s refers to academics contributing collectively to the design of learning programmes to achieve outcomes. Here, however, it would seem that strong framing of academic disciplines prevails, although perhaps less so than prior to 1994 in state school curricula. Experience at Riverside suggests that weaker framing may assist this process of transforming state school curricula, and that more permeable boundaries allows for other learning than learning a discipline to take place as intended in the national innovation.

   In addition, Integrated Studies suggests that foregrounding communication and student development of communicative competence leads to the development of a learner-centred curriculum in-keeping with the national innovation, but in a more radical form than anticipated by it as Integrated Studies empowers students to take control of their own learning and daily life thereby promoting the idiosyncratic over nationally prescribed outcomes as well as academic disciplines as indicated above. Clearly the two organizing principles of Curriculum 2005 [ends/outcomes and integration] are likely to conflict, and one is likely to prevail over the other and to its exclusion in the design process, in this instance ends/outcomes over integration.

   Finally, integrated curricula abroad as well as at Riverside indicate that these curricula are barely understood and consequently are difficult to manage particularly when coming up against mainstream management practices. Where curriculum integration in the national innovation is implemented here it is likely to add to the difficulties school administrators already have implementing Curriculum 2005, rather than reducing them. Integrated curricula, far from being a panacea in curriculum reform, in reality provoke at best dilemmas, at worst crises, as experience in Scottish Integrated Science and Integrated Studies at Riverside School suggest.

Acknowledgement

The financial assistance of the Centre for Science Development (CSD) towards this research is acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and not necessarily to be attributed to the CSD.

References

Anon. 1976. *Standard 8: Humanities. The Integrated Studies Programme*. Johannesburg: mimeo.

Armitage P 1989. Some comments on the future of integrated or modular humanities courses in schools. *Teaching History*, 27-30.

Basson R 1992. Integrated Studies: an idiographic perspective. PhD thesis. Eugene: University of Oregon at Eugene, Oregon, USA.

Bernstein B 1971. On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In: Young MFD (ed.). *Knowledge and Control.*. London: Collier MacMillan.

Bowers C 1982. The Influence of Language on Thought and Behaviour: a sociology of knowledge approach to curriculum development. Paper. Eugene: University of Oregon at Eugene, Oregon, USA.

Bowers C 1984. *The promise of theory: education and the politics of curriculum change*. New York: Longman.

Chang H 1992. *Adolescent life and ethos: an ethnography of a US high school*. London: Falmer.

Christie P 1986. The open schools: a study of racially mixed catholic schools in South Africa. PhD thesis. Brisbane: University of Queensland, Australia.

Conkwright A 1982. Only connect ... a passionate plea for an integrated curriculum. Issue paper. Maricopa: Arts and Science Task Force, Maricopa Community College District, USA.

Erickson F 1990. *Qualitative methods. Research in Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 2. New York: MacMillan.

Ericksson G 1989. Developing creative thinking through an integrated arts programme for talented children. *Gifted and Education International*, 6:8-15.

Extraordinary staff meeting, Riverside School,17/3/1988.

Fetterman D (ed.) 1984. *Ethnography in educational evaluation*. Beverly Hills: SAGE.

Fetterman D 1989. *Ethnography*. California: SAGE.

Fetterman D, Kaftarian SJ & Wandersman A (eds) 1996. *Empowerment Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Flexner H & Hauser G 1979. Interdisciplinary programmes in the United States: some paradigms. In: Kocklemans J (ed.). *Interdisciplinarity and Higher Education*. London: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Frey K 1989. Integrated science education: twenty years on. *International Journal of Science Education*, 11:3-17.

Garcia K 1981. Five styles of curriculum integration. *General Education*, 35:11-15.

Getzels S & Thelen H 1975. A conceptual framework for the study of the classroom group as a social system. In: Morrison A & McIntyre D (eds). *The Social Psychology of Teaching*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 17-34.

Hahn K 1964. Origins of the Outward Bound Trust. In: James D (ed.). *Outward Bound*. London: RKP.

Hamilton D 1975. Handling innovation in the classroom: two Scottish examples. In: Reid W & Walker D (eds). *Case Studies in Curriculum Change*. London: RKP.

Hamilton D 1976a. *Curriculum Evaluation*. London: Open Books.

Hamilton D 1976b. The advent of curriculum integration — a paradigm lost or a paradigm regained? In: Stubbs M & Delamont S (eds). *Explorations in Classroom Observation*. London: J Wiley and Sons.

Hitchcock G & Hughes D 1993. *Research and the teacher: an introduction to qualitative school-based research*. London: RKP.

Ingram J 1979. *Curriculum integration and lifelong education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Jansen J 1991. Knowledge and power in the world system: the South African case. In: Jansen J (ed.). *Knowledge and power in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Skotaville.

Jenkins D & Shipman M 1978. *Curriculum: an introduction*. London: Open Books.

Kallaway P 1988. An introduction to the study of education for blacks in South Africa. In: Kallaway P (ed.). *Apartheid and education: the education of black South Africans*. Johannesburg: Ravan.

Kerr J 1978. The problem of curriculum reform. In: Jenkins D & Shipman M (eds). *Curriculum: an introduction*. London: Open Books.

Krige S 1975. *Report to the Board of Riverside School*. Johannesburg: Riverside School.

Lawton D, Gordon P, Ing M, Gibby B, Pring R & Moore T 1978. *Theory and practice of curriculum studies*. London: RKP.

Naicker S 1999. *Curriculum 2005: a space for all*. Cape Town: Renaissance.

National Education Policy Initiative [NEPI] 1992. *Curriculum. NEPI. The framework Report*. Cape Town: Oxford.

National Education Policy Initiative [NEPI] 1992. *Integrated studies as a curriculum option for post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town:

mimeo.
Nkwe M 1987. English. In: Smuts L (ed.). *The Riverside way*. Johannesburg: Broederstroom Press.
Nkwe M 1988. English. In: Basson R. Integrated Studies: an idiographic perspective. PhD thesis. Eugene: University of Oregon at Eugene, Oregon, USA.
Ognibene E 1989. Integrating the curriculum: from impossible to possible. *College Teaching*, 37:105-110.
Parlett M & Hamilton D 1976. Evaluation as illumination. In: Tawney D (ed.). *Curriculum evaluation today: trends and implications.* London: MacMillan.
Pring R 1976. *Knowledge and schooling*. London: Open Books.
Schmidt WH, Roehler L, Caul JL, Buchman M, Diamond B, Solomon D & Cianciolo P 1985. The uses of curriculum integration in language arts instruction: a study of six classrooms. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 17.3:305-320.
Schwab J 1971. The practical: a language for curriculum. *School Review*, 78.
Scriven M 1972. The methodology of evaluation. In: Worthen B & Sanders J. *Educational evaluation: theory and practice*. New York: Wadsworth, 1973.
Sheldon L 1988. *The Integrated Studies programme 1988/89*. Johannesburg: mimeo.
Shipley P 1978. The foundations of faculty design. *Studies in Design Education*, 10:73-87.
Shipman M 1974. *Inside a Curriculum Project*. London: Methuen.
Skinner R & Fairbrother R 1988. How do A-Level Science grades of Integrated Science pupils compare with those of pupils who take all three separate Science disciplines? *British Educational Research Journal*, 14:149-54.
Spady W & Schlebusch A 1999. *Curriculum 2005: A guide for parents*. Cape Town: Renaissance.
Spindler G & Spindler L 1987. Ethnography: an anthropological view. In: Spindler G (ed.). *Education and cultural process*. Prospect Height: Waveland.
Spradley J 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Van Gennep A 1975. In: Bowers C. *The promise of theory: education and the politics of curriculum change*. New York: Longman.
Wagner H 1975. Introduction. In: Wagner H (ed.). *Alfred Schutz*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Warwick D 1973. *Integrated Studies in the secondary school*. London: Unibooks.
Wolcott H 1976. Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in schools. In: Roberts JI & Akinsonya SK (eds). *Schooling in the Cultural Context*. New York: David McKay Company Incorporated.
Wolcott H 1978. *Man in the principal's office*. Illinois: Waveland.
Wolcott H 1984. Ethnography sans ethnography. In: Fetterman D (ed.). *Ethnography in Educational Evaluation*. California: SAGE.
Woodhouse D & Jones A 1984. Integrating CAL with other instructional activities in schools. *Computer Education*, 12:381-89.

Reference — primary sources

Observations and interviews are cited in square brackets as follows:

- [Obs7IS21/1/88]: observation, Standard 7 Integrated Studies, 21 January 1988.
- [IVStd8VR28/7/88]: interview, name of educator, 28 July 1988.
- [IV4StGp14/10/88]: fourth interview, Student Group 1, 4 October 1988.