

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

**Lights, Camera, Lesson Plan: Higher education programme design in the film  
and media environment**

by  
Adam de Beer DBRADA002

A minor dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award  
of the

**Degree of Master of Education**

Department of Education  
University of Cape Town  
2005

*Declaration:*

*This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.*

Signature: signature removed

Date:

20/6/2005

University of Cape Town

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank my supervisor, Suellen Shay, for surviving the journey.

I am indebted to my second reader, Heather Jacklin, for her interesting comments on Draft 12 of possible applications of the data for future research, as seen in Section 8.

Thanks must go to Cathy Eden for making it all 100% proof.

I have to thank my parents for their support, emotional and financial, or I'll never hear the end of it.

And last, but not least, I want to thank my partner for everything else!

University of Cape Town

## Abstract

The primary aim of this research is to explore the question of how learning programmes in higher education are constructed by craft-specific film, television and media industry professionals. This research gathers information from these professionals, tasked with the development and design of their relevant programmes, and focuses on uncovering the influences on their decision-making in the programme design process, and relating these influences to pedagogic theory. Specifically, the research explores how programmes, through the design process, are influenced by the choices made by the professionals who design and offer them, and how this relates to the designers' own conceptualisations of knowledge.

The work of Basil Bernstein is used to set up a theoretical context within which the data are considered. This ethno-methodological case study uses structured interviews for qualitative data collection, and an inductive approach to analysis using thematic analysis to identify and engage with themes.

The argument that emerges from the findings is that the designers' *experience* plays a central role in making decisions about course and programme design in film and media craft education – especially when the craft professionals, tasked with the responsibility of this design, do not have strong pedagogic theory to inform their choices. Within higher education institutions, the discourse of the craft-specific professional intersects with the discourse of the pedagogic environment and a *tertium quid* evolves that is reminiscent of Bernstein's concept of Horizontal Knowledge Structures.

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Contents</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 2: The Case</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Research questions	11
2.2 Rationale	12
2.3 Aims and objectives	14
<b>Chapter 3: Literature Review</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Theory</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1 Susan Toohey	19
4.2 Basil Bernstein	20
4.3 Analytical framework	29
<b>Chapter 5: Research Design</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1 Methodological approach and methods	32
<b>Chapter 6: Analysis</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1 Introduction	35
6.2 The Multimedia Programme	36
6.2.1 Regulative Discourse influences	36
6.2.1.1 Teaching experience	36
6.2.1.2 Education experience	38
6.2.2 Professional Discourse influences	40
6.2.2.1 Professional experience	40
6.2.3 Application of Bernstein's Discourses	42
6.2.3.1 Horizontal Structuring	42
6.2.3.2 Vertical Structuring	43
6.2.4 Re-contextualisation practices	45
6.2.5 Preliminary conclusions	46
6.3 The Film and Television Programme	47
6.3.1 Regulative Discourse influences	48
6.3.1.1 Teaching experience	48
6.3.1.2 Education experience	49
6.3.2 Professional Discourse influences	50
6.3.2.1 Professional experience	50
6.3.3 Application of Bernstein's Discourses	54
6.3.3.1 Horizontal Structuring	54
6.3.3.2 Vertical Structuring	55
6.3.4 Re-contextualisation practices	56
6.3.5 Preliminary conclusions	58

<b>Chapter 7: Discussion</b>	<b>59</b>
7.1 Horizontal Knowledge Structures	65
7.1.1 The Multimedia Programme	65
7.1.2 The Film and Television Programme	67
7.2 Identification of Languages	69
<b>Chapter 8: Implications</b>	<b>70</b>
8.1 Interpretation	70
8.2 Significance	72
8.3 Some limitations of this research and possibilities for future research	73
8.4 Conclusions	74
<b>References</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Appendixes</b>	<b>79</b>
Appendix A: Table 1.1: Interview Data	79
Appendix B: Table 1.2: Research Individuals' Statistics	80
Appendix C: Semi Structured Questionnaire	81
Appendix D: List 1.1: Node Listing	82

University of Cape Town

## Chapter 1: Introduction

*“Through all the curriculum field’s chaos of challenged assumptions and unfounded, but brilliant thoughts, the idea of experience... provided some stable ground while everything else quivered” (F. Connelly, 2000)*

This research looks at programme design by considering the decisions made in terms of that design, and the possible influences on design, by the lecturers involved in this process. This research is attempting to highlight how experience, and the specific professional experiences of individual programme designers, impacts on the content and structure of the programme; but also how different individuals with different experiences can collectively shape that design. Within higher education, discipline-specific, career-oriented education and training is becoming more important in terms of national education imperatives. Till the inception of the Council for Higher Education (CHE), much of the design taking place within private institutions had been without proper quality assurance systems. It is important therefore to understand how the process has taken place in existing programmes, to see what aspects could relate to issues of quality, but also to inform future design in similar fields.

What makes this case study of particular interest is two-fold. Firstly, it focuses on uncovering the influences on the process of programme and course design, within the particular context of the film and media education environments. And secondly, it considers the nature and impact of the role of the craft professional, making decisions of a pedagogic nature in this process, with little or no exposure to formal teacher education or related training. It is perhaps with the move in emphasis towards more vocationally oriented teaching that academic interest is now focusing on the types of areas and environments outlined in this research. This particular study is unique in that the research takes place within a context that has not been the focus of studies in the past. This research will therefore hopefully add to the body of knowledge emerging from this interest.

Chapter 2 of this thesis presents the case, outlining the institution under research and the context of the institution, as well as explaining *vocation* and *craft*, two key concepts for this research. Chapter 3 constitutes the literature review, followed by Chapter 4 that highlights the particular theories of Susan Toohey and Basil Bernstein, and the various theoretical constructs that are integral to my later discussion, as well as outlining the analytic framework for this thesis. Chapter 5 looks at the research methodologies employed. Chapters 6 and 7

constitute the analysis and discussion of the data, looking for various identified themes, after which I move on to an interpretation of the analysis and further applications to Bernstein's work. The final Chapter 8 ends this thesis considering the implications of the research.

University of Cape Town

## Chapter 2: The Case

The site for research is a private, higher education institution, niched within craft oriented multimedia (now called new media) and film and television studies. I will refer to it as ‘the institution’. This is a fairly young institution, established in 1996, that has seen a rapid growth in both the number of courses it offers, as well as the number of students. This is not unexpected, as the institution was established at a time when interest in the areas it represents was growing, and being a ‘market institution’ (Cooper, 1997) it adapted to the needs of the market. Prior to 1995 only three tertiary level institutions in South Africa focused primarily on the teaching of film and television praxis. Two of these were Technikons and the other a private institution. Some non-profit organisations assisted in training at grass-roots level, especially within previously disadvantaged communities, and some universities housed film- and television-related programmes or courses linked to other programmes and offering introductions to media in general, and support to other academic work in a variety of diverse departments. However, after 1995 the number of more vocationally oriented education institutions doubled to include two new private institutions (later a third), and two (quasi) government initiatives, while universities offered a growing host of media-related programmes, though less focused on the praxis of and more on the theoretical implications of the media. In terms of multimedia, the institution is assumed to originally have been one of a kind at the time the programme was implemented. Subsequently, there has been a steady growth in the digital media industries and numerous similar institutions and departments within institutions, both within private and public education, have appeared to fill the perceived need for education in these areas.

Media-related programmes, such as those offered by the institution, are fairly recent additions to the selection of courses offered within higher education in general, and are therefore difficult to categorise. The nature of the relationship between the technologies that are used blurs the boundaries between one craft and another, as very often similar skills and technology are means to wholly separate and diverse ends. Even the naming of such programmes is in constant flux, yielding to the rapidly changing nature of the technology that supports them. The unifying element between the diverse programmes within the institution is the reliance on digital media by both the new media designers and the film and television makers. While new media is, as its name suggests, still a very recent technology, film and television has a language and history of over 100 years, developed through conventions, to

describe the results of the application of these skills. In recent years, however, linked to the growth of digital media and its interconnectedness with this technology, film and television have also had to adapt and redefine themselves. The differentiation between these programmes is therefore presently defined by the different career paths that can be taken, and the nature of what is being produced in those fields. Multimedia or new media designers are focusing on print work (like flyers, posters and business cards), websites, CD ROMs, animation and video games. Film and television makers are focusing on narratives for both the small and big screen, including movies, television serials, adverts and music videos. To illustrate these types of programmes with a corresponding university example is difficult, but the closest comparison would be to programmes such as Architecture. Architecture is craft-oriented and draws both from the profession it supports as well as incorporating elements of the more delimited subjects within institutions, such as physics or mathematics. It has moved, fairly recently, from apprentice-type learning in the profession into the institution.

The research sample was originally suggested to represent a broad spectrum of the staff members who were both lecturers and designers of their course and/or programme within the institution. With this in mind, two of the larger departments (their size represented by the number of students as well as the number of full-time staff) were chosen. The two programmes were the Multimedia Design Programme, later named the New Media Programme, and the Film and Television Production Techniques Programme. I will refer to them as the Multimedia Programme and Film and Television Programme respectively. These two programmes are both practically oriented, teaching towards vocational careers in these two chosen fields-of-practice. The Multimedia Programme focuses on training skilled designers in the new media industry. This industry requires designers for *inter alia* the internet, games and other computer-assisted design products, with a strong working knowledge of computer based design skills and the ability to adapt to the constantly changing technology in the workplace environment. The Film and Television Programme covers the basics of television, film and digital movie making, training in a number of mediums and for a diversity of products in the film and television industries. All aspects of the course, theoretical and practical, are aimed at opening the world of television and film dramas, serials, series and comedies to the prospective visual narrative storyteller.

The lecturers are predominantly craft-specific professionals, representing particular professions within their fields. In some cases their backgrounds include studies in their

individual crafts at Technikons or universities; in other cases they have more apprenticeship-type educations with journeymen or other skilled professionals. Mostly they show a practical nature to their experience, having worked for many years in their respective fields (*see Appendix B: Table 1.2 for more details*). Many of the lecturers bring an international flavour to their repertoire of skills, having worked and/or studied all over the world, or having contact with other international professionals in their respective domains. In some cases they have received recognition for their work in the form of awards and other accolades; again, both locally and internationally. In the majority of cases, however, the lecturers have no formal teacher or educator training other than the experience of their present position of lecturer at the institution, and informal discussions with their colleagues both inside and outside the institution. As can be seen from the above, the lecturers representing my sample can best be described as professionals within a vocational context, having a strong craft basis to their profession. With this in mind, it is important to illustrate what is meant by the concepts *vocation* and *craft*.

Toohy (1998:93) defines vocational training as a “competence (that) may be conceived in terms of (the) ability to perform specific tasks”. Buckingham (2003:99) informs us that vocational courses, especially those related particularly to the education of film and television, should “equip students with adequate skills for jobs”. Atchoarena & Delluc (2002:17) define vocational education within a secondary context as “education which is mainly designed to lead participants to acquire the practical skills, know-how and understanding necessary for employment in a particular occupation, trade or group of occupations of trades”, but also define this type of education within the tertiary context, where “vocational education continues to refer to the acquisition of skills for specific occupations” (*ibid*:18), but predominantly along the lines of apprenticeships. The concepts of *vocation* and *vocational* in the context of this paper relate specifically to programmes of education that teach towards professions with a strong practical nature and having a tangible, interactive entertainment- or information-based product created through that practice, like a website or a television situation comedy. However, these programmes are not limited solely to training or skills development usually located within the Further Education and Training (FET) band of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF).<sup>1</sup> *Vocation* and *vocational* merely refer to the profession-oriented nature of the programme on offer, and not to the level

---

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 2, pg. 12 and footnote 8, pg. 63

of the offering, as vocationally oriented programmes are found even at tertiary levels within higher education (see Atchoarena & Delluc, 2002; Bennel, 1991; Kraak, 1991; Lauglo & Lillis, 1988; Proctor-Sims, 1981 and Rumney, 1989).

To define *craft* is more difficult. Bernstein (1996:181) describes craft as “clearly specialized knowledges” and that it is a “practical mastery over materials according to a functional concept..., or some form of skilled manipulation.” When one considers that the new media designer and the film or television practitioner both use technology to create a specific product, usually with highly specialised computer programmes, equipment or skills; we see a manifestation of practical mastery, using specialised knowledge and skilled manipulation to achieve a desired outcome following Bernstein’s definition. The major difference is that the outcome or product is of a virtual or electronic nature. For example, the webpage that exists only in the digital domain, or the television show that is in effect a stream of electrons on a phosphorous screen, rather than something made of clay or with beads. The contentiousness of this idea of *craft* is further explored during the analysis and discussion of Bernstein’s terminology. Gamble (2002:65) would seem to agree with the context dependent specialisation of the knowledge that makes up a craft as further espoused by Bernstein (*ibid*:170), but limits her definition in a later article (2003:88) on craft in its traditional form to “mainly... mass-production of ethnic artifacts, or to the life-style pursuits of those who want to opt out of the rat-race”. *Craft* therefore relates to the production of something that requires specialised knowledge of a practical nature, using the manipulation of dedicated skills, but not necessary in a professional or career-oriented context. In contrast to Gamble’s narrow definition, a broader reading would allow the concept of *craft* to be equally applicable to the media and film production professions and their products.

Within the institution the teaching is oriented to the vocational and craft aspects of the professions the lecturers represent, and it is because of this interesting perspective on the construction of the learning programme that this case study comes about. The idea behind using a case study was mainly due to it “contribute(ing) uniquely to our knowledge of individual, organizational, social, and political phenomena” (Yin, 1984:2). This case highlights something specific taking place within a unique context, and my interest is in the how and why. In subsequent discussions with other educators, it has become apparent that similar processes are taking place within other organisations of a similar nature and in related areas. This highlights the fact that, although this is a unique context, this is not a unique

phenomenon, but also that parallel evolutions are taking place at distant and unrelated centres of learning. This emphasises the necessity of this type of research and sets the scene for future research with interesting possibilities.

Within a broader context, the case is also one of exploring the relationship between craft as profession and education as profession. More details are given later in the discussion of Bernstein, but for now it is important to understand that the relationship is between knowledge within the field-of-practice and knowledge within the institution, and how this knowledge changes or is changed from the one context to the other. Essentially there is a converting or a re-contextualising of the knowledge taking place that, though similar in process between the two chosen programmes in the institution, seems to ultimately have divergent results. This particular site is interesting in this regard because it represents relatively new or young disciplines, which are unencumbered by an established and existing methodology for the particular discipline in terms of its pedagogy. At the same time this is a difficult site to research, as much of what is taking place is happening within the proverbial 'chaos' that Connelly refers to in the opening quote. This chaos does not exist in terms of the structure or process of the evolution of this pedagogy within the institution, which seems to be developing in a fairly regular and disciplined way, but rather in the lack of rigorous, tested structures or guidelines that clearly elaborate pedagogic practice for the designers. In most cases this chaos is ameliorated through experimentation and discovery on their part. There is therefore a field-of-practice and its experiences, from which knowledge is being drawn, which are being re-contextualised to create the pedagogic content for those fields within the institution.

The areas of focus are therefore how the experiences play a part in the design at the institution, how experiences shape the ideas of what is knowledge, how and what is being reframed for the teaching of the vocation in the institution and how the content and context are related and interact.

## **2.1 Research Questions**

There are three questions that are central to this research. This first question is: what are the influences on the design process? The broad scope of this initial question acknowledges both the designers themselves as obviously influencing design, but also considers what other influences there are, as well as other options such as other individuals, or other factors in the

environment, or experience of the designers. This question teases out and elaborates on what types of knowledge or conceptualisations of knowledge come from the field-of-practice. These can then be used to qualify some of the re-contextualising taking place in the institution and create an understanding of the levels of the programmes being designed. The second question, which flows from the first, is: how does a lecturer design an offering when he or she has little or no knowledge of pedagogic theory? This is not conceived as a negative connotation, but rather as an interest in where the knowledge comes from to inform decisions of a pedagogic nature. This question locates the lecturers in terms of their experiences, both of their profession and their own education towards or in the profession, and then looks at where these come to bear on their decision-making in the design process. My third question is intrinsic to the previous questions and is directed towards elaborating on the related pedagogic theory. This question asks: how do conceptualisations of knowledge explain the design process and the resulting net effects on the perception of the level of the offering? This *level of offering* is related to *degree worthiness* which is discussed below. Here theory plays an important role in defining explicitly what for the most part is implicit in the decisions and actions of the designers.

## 2.2 Rationale

The reasons for this research are numerous and diverse, but initially the instigation was the fact that some of the programmes offered by the institution were considered to be of a degree standard by external bodies, even though the qualifications themselves are granted as Diplomas and Advanced Diplomas by the institution itself.<sup>2</sup> These general comments of degree-worthiness were made after several applications and audits had been held during a quality assurance (QA) process complied with by the institution. An accreditation audit and review undertaken through legislated processes and by legislated bodies felt that some of the Diploma and Advanced Diplomas could be offered as First Degrees.

In terms of the perceived degree-worthiness of some programmes, it must be pointed out that of the nine purposes laid out in the discussion document for a Generic First Degree, as proposed in 2002 by South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA), only two are initially apparent within the institution. Another one is possibly complied with, and the other six are

---

<sup>2</sup> Within the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) of South Africa, qualifications range across 8 (eight) levels, with concomitant expressions to describe the qualification. First Degrees (e.g. BA, BEd or BSc) are Level 6 qualifications, whereas Diplomas and Advanced Diplomas fall within Level 5, namely 5a and 5b

not considered central in terms of the vision and mission of the institution and the discipline-specific craft oriented training and education it undertakes. These include “to provide students with a variety of basic scholarly and intellectual competencies”, “to develop an understanding of elementary research methods”, “to equip students with the ability to give an accurate account of scholarly positions”, “to prepare students for postgraduate study”, “to provide students with a well-rounded and broad education across a number of disciplines” and “to produce learners who understand the principles of, and are capable of critical citizenship”. I do not wish to question the legitimacy of such claims, or consider these as *a priori* evidence to support my research. Rather my interest is in what this implies. Namely, that programme and course design is taking place that is degree-worthy in some programmes (and admittedly not in others), with lecturers, the majority of whom do not have a formal educational qualification experience to inform their choices, and who may or may not have post secondary education in their field-of-practice or related fields, at a degree level. How then is design taking place that is of a First Degree standard, and what, in the experiences of the lecturers, is shaping the programme (or not shaping it, as the case may be), to conform to acceptable and recognised criteria used to describe this level of an offering?

A later addition to the impetus behind this research has been the need to dispel the myth that education in the areas of filmmaking and new media is by its very nature a Horizontal Discourse. (I will elaborate more on this concept in later paragraphs.) The general trend in attitudes that have been observed is that something having its origins in an apprenticeship-type education, such as film and television has been for most of its existence, should automatically be considered ‘every day’ and ‘common sense’, as Bernstein describes these concepts (1996). Gamble (2001:191), who draws heavily on Bernstein, even asks “why it is that craft knowledge can only be ‘caught’ and not ‘formally taught’”; illustrating a view that craft-like education cannot have formal structures or pedagogies. The central argument being that a common sense, apprenticeship-type education (if this is indeed what film and media education is), does not have the potential to acquire a Pedagogic Discourse (another concept for later discussion) to legitimise an alternative status. I hope to illustrate that this is not the case and that such structures are in fact emergent. To paraphrase Gamble, that craft *can* be taught, not only caught. And indeed in Gamble’s later work we see how the dual nature of craft “signals the presence of a re-contextualizing principle that comes from outside a specific

---

respectively

object or context... (and) this is the puzzle that puts craft as 'knowledge structure' in need of investigation" (2003:76).

### **2.3 Aims and objectives**

My research therefore sets out to: establish what the dominant influences are on design, as articulated by the designers; establish each programme's theoretical context and position this within current theories of knowledge conceptualisations; and explain and compare the design processes of the programmes.

This research should add to the body of knowledge trying to explain how programme design takes place, and especially how new programmes of study, particularly craft-oriented programmes, are being translated from the field-of-practice into the institution.

## Chapter 3: Literature Review

With the potential for a limited set of specific or directly appropriate sources, the literature review for this research focused mainly on exploring two bodies of literature to support the empirical research results. These were: literature of a general nature surrounding pedagogic theory, and literature surrounding curriculum design, especially in higher education, with emphasis on those texts that incorporate film and media. Curriculum Design, Higher Education and Film and Media Studies, are however all distinct areas for discussion and theoretical disputation and cover a vast tract of literature. This makes it important to narrow the range of the texts that inform this research. At the same time, however, it is important to note that there is a relatively small overlap of these areas, delimiting what seems to be a neglected and highly specific arena for discussions of curriculum, namely curriculum design for craft-oriented, discipline-specific programmes in higher education. If one is to consider the potential impact that visual narratives (e.g. movies) and other screen media (e.g. websites and video games) have on their audiences, then the influence of the environment that educates film makers and media professionals should be an important focus for debate.

In the broader context of research into educational issues at post secondary levels, there are numerous authors who focus on the issues of curriculum design in higher education, but very little research contextualises this work within the above-mentioned visual narrative and media training and education. The list of authors in the field of education and curriculum design is vast. Much of the discussion around curriculum either focuses on defining constructs to explain curriculum and the curriculum-making process (Barnett, 2000; Bernstein, 1996) or considers the construction of the curriculum from a specific perspective, which is seen as a fundamental influence on the design process itself, such as the issue of evaluation or issues of teaching and learning (Ramsden, 1992). There are texts, however, that do consider the construction of the curriculum and syllabus from a more pragmatic perspective (Kelly, 1999; Tanner, 1995; Marsh, 1992; Miller, 1987) acting as *how-to* manuals for the curriculum designer. It is this perspective that is important in this research, as the main issues that I will focus on relate to the content and structure of the curriculum (Toohey, 1999; Ramsden, *ibid*) but contextualised in a broader discussion of what impact conceptualisations of knowledge have on the design process, exemplified by the work of Bernstein (1996).

Susan Toohey's (*ibid*) work helps to illustrate the strong relationships between conceptualisation of knowledge and design of an offering and gives examples of the influences on the re-contextualisation process in higher education. Whereas Bernstein's (*ibid*) work is to find a generic code to describe a broad range of pedagogic interactions, Toohey's work is more specific to higher education and to the design process of a curriculum. What is helpful in her work is that she outlines various fundamental questions that pertain to the design process in such a way as to make explicit some of the choices that the designer makes. Her work also considers decisions on selection and sequencing in course design and therefore aids in analysing approaches to design. Toohey's work can be used not only to locate the lecturers in terms of their approaches to design decisions, but also to frame these approaches to course design in higher education. In higher education, Toohey believes that the design of the programme is left up to the teacher and that the programme being presented comes from the lecturer's experience of what can and should be taught. And, as Toohey's discussion is from the perspective of an educator in higher education, it is safe to assume that the primary model she draws on for the lecturer/designer would be the university or college lecturer situated within the intellectual field.

This is where Toohey's work is in contrast to the particular context of this research; while still higher education, this research is set within craft oriented education, and with lecturers who are primarily from the professional fields-of-practice that represent their expertise. These lecturers generally tend to have little or no formally taught pedagogic theory as a base for their pedagogic practice, but rather field-of-practice experience. If the lecturer is the primary source of programme design as Toohey states, then the content and structure of the programme and the framing thereof are heavily dependent on the individual and this aforementioned experience, or as Marsh (1992:96) states, "how subject matter is organized for teaching and learning depends very much on one's *philosophy* of what counts as important knowledge". This process of selection and sequencing based on experience means that diverse issues such as the lecturer's disciplinary specialisation, education, professional experience and experience of teaching should in some way influence decisions taken in terms of the final design. Within the context of this research, design is taking place within an institution that houses the type of lecturer described above, and in the way described by Toohey, where lecturers are indeed left with the sole responsibility of constructing the programmes they teach.

Within the literature, there is ample discussion and research surrounding issues of film and media and their related fields of study. The literature covers a broad spectrum of disciplines and sub-disciplines from visual literacy (Zettl, 1999) and film criticism to textual analysis (Gianetti, 2002; Monaco, 2000; Cook & Bernink, 1999) and theoretical discussions of author, content and intent (Fourie, 2001; Sobchack, 1987), to name but a few. This diversity is not an unexpected scenario, as especially with the evolution of the internet and satellite television in the last decade, screen media have become more abundant and play a greater role in impacting on society and the individual. However, when the discussion turns towards the *teaching* of film and television or screen media, new media in general, and the related crafts, it is a far narrower area. The majority of work relates to visual literacy and media studies (Bordwell, 2004; O'Shaughnessy & Stadler, 2004), or the broader contexts of film and media theory in higher education, rather than research into the structure of the more practical programmes that deal with film and media production, such as craft training for visual narrative filmmakers or new media designers. Studies pertaining to educational research in this particular context of film and television training and education, are therefore rare, both internationally and locally.

In the South African context, this scarcity is to be expected, as film and television education and training is a very young field of study for both learner and practitioner. However, there is the work of Du Plooy (1989, which is one of the few texts exploring research in this field. Du Plooy's predominantly socio-cultural approach concerns more the topic of visual literacy education and the improvement of visual literacy through television-related experiences than the teaching of the craft of film-making. She does however relate her discussion to curriculum design, illustrating visual literacy as a teachable competency (*ibid*:84) and relating much of the international context of the work done in this field to a local context. Though her work offers some local perspective it is not a primary source for this research. Buckingham, by contrast, is a prolific writer specifically in the arena of media education. His text assists in defining what media education is and considers the success of vocational teaching in how it "actually equip(s) students with adequate skills for jobs, or whether they are recognised to do so by the industry" (2003:99).

Evidence to support the shift in research interest into craft and craft-related pedagogy can be found in several recent articles. The work of Jeanne Gamble elaborates on Bernstein's concepts of vertical and horizontal knowledge, while emphasising their application within a

'craft' context (Gamble, 2002 & 2003). Gamble is seeking to understand the concept of craft knowledge and how it is transferred, both using and re-interpreting Bernstein's descriptions of knowledge structures. Though her particular context is not relevant to my research, much of her discussions of Bernstein highlight the applicability of his work to my research.

The recent work of Cliff & Woodward (2004) researches considerations of knowledge in a design environment for a South African polytechnic (*sic*), and how academics understand knowledge in this particular environment. Their work focuses on the "origin, development, structure, and contestation of knowledge" (*ibid*:269) for discipline-specific knowledge in various design fields and is therefore relevant in that it highlights craft and design considerations within a higher education context. Once again, although the focus of their research (namely, how knowledge is understood in a tertiary, craft-oriented environment) is not directly related to my research, the environment in which the research is taking place is related in terms of the level of the offering and its craft nature. Because they are dealing with academics with a clear understanding of their own pedagogic identities and who have had experience in the academic nature of their professions, their approach is of a more academic perspective to begin with, especially if one considers the complexities of the concept knowledge and the discussions that surround it. Cliff and Woodward clearly state that their focus was on a sample of study participants who had "the necessary knowledge (and) experience...to be able to reflect meaningfully on the scope of the study... (and a) wide ranging formal learning and teaching experience" (*ibid*:275). My research sample does not come from a strong pedagogic background with grounding in pedagogic theory or canon, and as such, the focus of my discussions had to be more applicable to the context and nature of the institution. The primary relation of Cliff & Woodward's work to my research is in the fact that they are researching and considering knowledge in the higher education craft context.

For my research however, I am going to draw heavily on the work of Basil Bernstein, supported by some of Toohey's concepts.

## Chapter 4: Theory

### 4.1 Toohey

To describe the general approach used in designing the courses or programme in the institution, I would turn to Toohey's description of the Performance or System's Approach.<sup>3</sup> Toohey's research in the field of designing courses for higher education refers to other authors (Kemmis *et al*, 1983; Eisner, 1994 and Posner, 1995, all quoted in Toohey, 1999), who have posited a number of approaches to curriculum that include the five Toohey feels have an application within post secondary contexts. Toohey's main argument for selecting these categories is that there are recognisable patterns in the design of programmes in Higher Education that are a result of choices, made according to the values of the individual designer, that reflect a community or discipline (Toohey:48) and which tends to influence the formulation of the course or programme design in a particular direction.

The approaches therefore embody a particular perspective of both what an approach is meant to achieve for a particular course or programme, and how to achieve these ends by incorporating certain elements within the course's design. Toohey's research therefore begins by identifying these five approaches as: the Traditional Approach, the Performance Approach, the Cognitive Approach, the Experiential Approach and the Socially Critical Approach. Each approach represents a coherent set of assumptions that Toohey describes by answering certain fundamental questions for programme design she has identified earlier in her work. These fundamental questions can be briefly summarised by topic as: the view of knowledge for the approach, the process of learning, the role of the teacher, the learning goals and how they are expressed, how content is chosen and organised, what purpose assessment serves, what methods are used and what kind of sources and infrastructure are needed.

Toohey (*ibid*:1) feels that *especially* within higher education, design is mostly left up to the lecturer along with the "significant advantage... (of being able to) control the curriculum". Toohey is referring here to the nature of most education systems, where primary and secondary education is controlled through strong curriculum designs that are handed down by government institutions or bodies, whereas tertiary institutions, being the knowledge producers, have more freedom in designing the content of the programmes they offer. This

---

<sup>3</sup> Both Toohey and Bernstein use the concepts of Performance and Competence in different ways and to different ends. For this thesis, I have only used Toohey's concept of Performance Approach to describe a particular type of approach to programme design.

must not be confused with quality assurance, where legislated and government bodies exist at all levels to ensure the quality of the offerings but do not involve themselves in the creation of the curriculum. It is such that in the history of the institution, and due to the nature of the learning programmes, there were very few designs on which to draw in terms of the programmes they wished to offer, and under these circumstances it is easy to see how the process of control of the curriculum had to necessarily fall into the hands of the lecturers.

In the Performance or systems-based approach, course design is seen as “technical, a question of what means to use to achieve certain desirable ends and of how to measure results so that improvements can be soundly based” (*ibid*:50). In this approach, therefore, the “desirable ends” need to be defined and usually in terms of a performance that can be measured in some way. Also, “understanding is exemplified in action... content based on research into the nature of the practice...” and learning structured “with feedback leading to competence in performance” (*ibid*). The best example of this would be competency-based education where understanding is illustrated through action. In this particular Performance Approach, learning is analysed so as to break down the process into component knowledge and skills and then structure these so that learning builds incrementally on previous knowledge and skills, until more complex performances can be mastered (*ibid*:52). The content for this approach is derived from the nature of the practice in the profession or by the observation of skilled performers. It should be obvious that the designers of the programmes being researched fall into this category, with the strong focus on practice and the understanding of the practice of their profession coming from practical experience and mastery of performances.

## 4.2 Bernstein

Basil Bernstein’s work is a sociological perspective on the relationships between various factors at play within pedagogy and he creates a device to help to explain these relationships, namely the Pedagogic Device.<sup>4</sup> This device, and its derived models and modalities, is central to my discussion in that it illustrates the relationship between the mechanisms and institutions in the context of pedagogic practice and highlights many valuable concepts to aid my research and analysis. Bernstein’s work best describes my context because his work is applicable to all forms of pedagogic interaction and the device “makes possible a great

---

<sup>4</sup> For the sake of clarity, Bernstein’s theoretical concepts will be quoted using capitalisation of their initials throughout this thesis. Theoretical concepts in italics with initials capitalised are my own, and concepts in italics without capitals are those used in their generic sense.

potential range of communicative outcomes” (Bernstein,1996:42), and for that matter the explanation of them.

Bernstein’s starting point in describing the Pedagogic Device is with the main pillars that represent concepts of power and control, respectively called Classification and Framing. Classification is “the means by which power relations are transformed into specialized discourses” (*ibid*:3), and Framing is “the means whereby principles of control are transformed into specialized regulations of interactional discursive practices” (*ibid*). Classification therefore helps to describe the process of converting knowledge into discourses, whereas Framing can be used to describe the same conversion into pedagogic practices with their related rules and conventions and governing bodies. It is therefore important to note that Classification deals with power and power relations and how the interaction of power creates, legitimises and reproduces boundaries, whereas Framing establishes the forms of control of the communication to socialise individuals into the relationships created by classification. Thus, as Bernstein states, “power constructs relations between, and control relations within, given forms of interaction” (1996:19). For my discussion Classification is important in so far as it plays a major role in establishing the identities that could lead to some of the decisions made during Framing, rather than how those identities are created or maintained and by whom. In my discussion I therefore focus on the relations within interactions in the particular context being observed, rather than the relationships between broader interactions of larger power structures. My research focuses on the way in which a programme curriculum is constructed and specifically what influences the design, in terms of the content the designers put in, and the progression of that content. Put in Bernstein’s terms, I am exploring that part of Framing known as the Re-contextualisation Principle and how the Re-contextualising Agents therefore *frame* their offerings.

To make the leap from Framing to Re-contextualisation we need to look at the Pedagogic Device in more detail to see where the connection lies and to explore how this happens in different contexts within education in general and in Higher Education in particular.

The Pedagogic Device is a construct with which Bernstein (1996) tries to explain the transmission and sociological nature of pedagogic knowledge. His work in this regard is much discussed and critiqued by various authors (see King, 1976 and 1981; Pring, 1975;

Gibson, 1977 and 1984, and Edwards, 1987), and a further critique of Bernstein's work is outside the scope of this research. My intention is to use his work as a theoretical lens to analyse my particular context. Bernstein (*ibid*) states that the device has "internal rules which regulate the pedagogic communication which the device makes possible" therefore "restricting or enhancing the potential discourse available to be pedagogized" (pg. 41). From this perspective it is important to see that the discourse to be pedagogised (the professional discourse) and pedagogic practice as discourse (Regulative Discourse (RD)), are considered separate from one another. The discourse of the subject, or the intellectual field of knowledge that represents a specific discourse, is separate from the teaching of the subject as a discourse. The Device shapes both the specific discourse as well as the teaching of the discourse and in this way effects both reciprocally. In effect, the Pedagogic Device creates a way of describing the creation of a discourse and its pedagogic practice as discourse, while at the same time illustrating how a particular discourse and practice can be delimited by diverse factors. In this way Bernstein creates a generic model to explain pedagogic interactions. What Bernstein does not make clear is whether or not these diverse factors delimiting pedagogic interactions are *explicit* or *visible* on the part of the agents themselves. In other words, whether individuals constructing pedagogic practice in a specific discourse, e.g. a curriculum in multimedia design or media practice, are actually aware of the factors influencing their decisions, or for that matter *need* to be aware of them. However, it is clear that the model should be applicable to any pedagogic context and the inferences one can make should be equally applicable to both the *explicit* and *implicit* scenarios.

Bernstein puts in place a set of rules that form the grammar of the Device that also lay bare the workings of the Device; namely, Distributive Rules, Re-contextualising Rules and Evaluative Rules. These hierarchically related rules regulate *inter alia* the relationships between power, social groups, forms of consciousness and practice, regulate the formation of specific pedagogic discourse and constitute pedagogic practice itself. For my research the focus is more on the formation of specific pedagogic practice and therefore focuses on the re-contextualising rules, but a brief discussion is important to once again illustrate the connectedness and interwoven nature of the influences of the Device.

The Distributive Rules function to shape the specialised field in which the discourse for that specialisation is produced, and in so doing create the rules of access and power control that go with it. These rules regulate or attempt to regulate access, so as to control the alternatives

in the discourse and thereby control the discourse itself. The Distributive Rules are a good example of the interaction of Classification and Framing, where the field-of-practice creates the discourse or language of that field, and the language again in turn creates the specialised nature of the field. Power and control therefore shift back and forth to re-define each other. In film and television and new media, the field of practice forms the main influence on the discourse that we find in these mediums. In the evolution of educational programmes for both these programmes, it is only within recent years that the discourse of pedagogic practice attempts to describe the pedagogy for these specialised discourses. Up until fairly recently, film and television were both considered from an educational perspective as apprenticeships rather than teachable crafts. Gamble's comments (2001:191) suggest that apprenticeships cannot be taught as such knowledge is not "accessible to re-description in terms of general principles and rules". Essentially, that there is no language to both codify and express how to teach the discipline, other than a language that is somehow contained in the actions of the practitioners of the specific discipline. The skills of film and television production and new media are therefore embedded in the identity of the industry and its official and unofficial rules and codes. The Distributive Rules are therefore important in terms of this research, as they shape the experiences of the individuals, which in turn shape the design process.

Re-contextualising Rules by contrast constitute Pedagogic Discourse. They shape what is to be taught and how it is to be taught. Pedagogic Discourse is in fact a principle more than a discourse as it embeds the Instructional Discourse that creates specialised skills, within the moral discourse that creates order, relations and identity as regards the transmission of knowledge. This Pedagogic Discourse is one I will investigate as it "is the principle by which other discourses are appropriated and brought into a special relationship with each other, for the purpose of their selective transmission and acquisition" (Bernstein, 1996:47). This selection process for the transmission of the specific discourse constitutes part of the Re-contextualisation Rule referred to. Pedagogic discourse is "constructed by a re-contextualising principle which selectively appropriates, relocates, refocuses and relates other discourses to constitute its own order" (*ibid*:47). The design of any course or programme is therefore a fusion of two discourses: that which forms the specialised knowledge of the professional discourse or discipline, and pedagogic discourse (the discourse of general teaching knowledge) to create a *tertium quid*, a new discourse specific to the teaching of the specialised discipline knowledge.

It is this new discourse that is the main focus of this research as so little has been done in this regard for this particular context. And more interesting is the fact that the specific context being researched seems to lack the *explicit* Pedagogic Discourse that Bernstein seems to imply must be in place so as “to constitute its own order” (*ibid*). The Re-contextualising Principle creates Re-contextualising Fields. These in turn create Agents with Re-contextualising Functions and the functions, *explicit* or *implicit*, become the means whereby a specific pedagogic practice is created. Bernstein states that the “recontextualizing field has a crucial function in creating the fundamental autonomy of education” (*ibid*:48) and exists in numerous physical forms such as institutions, ministries, other constituted or legislated bodies and even the state. Within this diversity we find the Pedagogic Re-contextualising Fields (PRFs) which are made up of pedagogues, individuals within different types of pedagogic institutions, who legitimise the pedagogic field and are known as “agents”.

And finally, the last of Bernstein’s rules, the Evaluative Rules, transform the discourse into pedagogic practice with continuous evaluation playing a central role. While these rules are important, as they ultimately shape the final offering through the assessment thereof, they are outside the focus of this study.

Pedagogic Discourse is a discourse that imbeds an Instructional Discourse (“rules [which] refer to selection, sequence, pacing and criteria of the knowledge”, (*ibid*:28)) within a Regulative Discourse (which constitutes the “social order rules [which] refer to the forms that hierarchical relations take in the pedagogic relation and to expectations about conduct, character and manner” (*ibid*:27)). Bernstein converts these concepts into a simple visual formula:

$$PDis = \frac{ID}{RD}$$

where (*ID*) represents the Instructional Discourse, (*RD*) the Regulative Discourse and (*PDis*), Pedagogic Discourse.

My research is an examination of the formulation of Pedagogic Discourse taking place within a particular context, and the influence of the discourses of the individual agents and their pedagogic practice on the design of the programme. Bernstein (*ibid*) explains that Pedagogic Discourse and pedagogic practice form an arena in which there is a struggle for “symbolic

control” (pg. 30). This struggle is between both the Instructional Discourse, which carries the discursive order rules that refer to selection and sequencing of knowledge, and the Regulative Discourse, which forms the social order of pedagogy, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the Distributive Rules that encompass the regulatory aspects of any professional practice other than pedagogy. So we see the Pedagogic Discourse conflicting with the professional discourse that the vocational professionals bring with them into the lecture and design situation. Bernstein also states however that the Regulative Discourse contains within it the “hierarchical relations in the pedagogic relation” (*ibid*:27). This allows for the Instructional Discourse to be embedded in the Regulative Discourse, as Bernstein seems to suggest that the latter discourse *flows* from the social order rules (the Distributive Rules) that shape the experience and identity of the practitioner in pedagogic terms. However, Bernstein (*ibid*:46) notes that “Pedagogic Discourse selects and creates specialized pedagogic subjects through its contexts and contents” by appropriating through selection “other discourses for the purpose of transmission” (*ibid*:47). For my research the relevance here is that the Regulative Discourse is seen in Bernstein’s model as the primary influence and source for the knowledge that needs to be used to describe an Instructional Discourse for the discipline. This does not take into consideration how this *description* takes place when there is no strong pedagogic discourse (and therefore no Regulative Discourse) through which to filter the specialised discourse of the designer, and leads to the possibility that it is in fact the Distributive Rules that are playing a more important role in these types of decisions where the Regulative Discourse is weak or non-existent.

The focus of my research therefore is primarily the Framing aspect, but Framing and Classification can never be wholly separated. Where Classification plays a part in my discussion is in the description of the programme itself. The Film and Television Programme is a discipline-specific, craft-oriented programme for training in visual mediums, now found within a Higher Education context, but formally situated within the field-of-practice as apprenticeships. This programme tries to fuse the craft of movie-making with the theory of film and media for specific professional vocations in this field. The Multimedia Programme follows a similar format, but within the digital design field-of-practice and its related professional and vocational opportunities. These programmes are unlike the usual Film and Media Studies programmes to be found in universities that focus more on the theoretical aspect of these industries and on the intellectual pursuit of knowledge, rather than the practical pursuit of skill and skill based knowledge. On the broadest level the notion that is

most interesting in the Classification discussion is whether or not film and television production techniques, or multimedia design, as programmes, can be considered regions. This aspect of Classification is important for the discussion of re-contextualisation.

A Singular is identified as “a discourse which has appropriated a space to give itself a unique name” (Bernstein, 1996:23) whereas a Region is “created by a recontextualizing of singulars” (*ibid*) and recognisable by the fact that Regions interface between the field of the production of knowledge and any field-of-practice. It is easy to see how a programme such as film and television or multimedia can be considered a Region, if you consider that it is a re-contextualising of Singulars and it is an interface with a field-of-practice, respectively the film and television and design industries. The difficulty is that the Singulars themselves are not necessarily found in the intellectual field, which is where Bernstein’s theory places them, and the programme does not necessarily produce knowledge, which is a particular identifier for a Singular in the intellectual field. This means that if the programmes are to be considered as part of a Region, it is one with distinct differences from Bernstein’s context. In terms of Classification, the Singulars of the intellectual field have a strong Classification, whereas Regions within the intellectual field have weak Classifications and draw in (some) Singulars as part of their make up. The progression towards Regions moves from the strong Classification of the Singular to the weak(er) Classifications of the Region. These Regions in their turn interface with the field-of-practice. Lecturers and designers of Regions following this progression would therefore move from the strongly Classified in the intellectual field, to the weaker Classifications of the Region and then draw on the field-or-practice in terms of knowledge. The example of craft programmes would seem to indicate that the progression is from the field-or-practice, where knowledge is Classified along similar strong Classification principles, but solely within the practical context and then moving into the Region of the institution, where the Singulars of the field-or-practice are then less strongly Classified. Strictly speaking, these cannot be called Singulars within the definitions as given by Bernstein. However, because the various disciplines do form distinct characteristics in the field-of-practice that could be seen to differentiate from each other along similar lines as within the intellectual field, namely with strong boundaries, I will use this terminology in my argument.

Re-contextualising, however, only takes place within a Vertical Discourse and as such the concepts of Horizontal and Vertical Discourse need to be explained. It must be pointed out

that Bernstein (1996) focuses predominantly on Vertical structures, leaving much of the discussion about horizontal structures to small paragraphs, examples and footnotes.<sup>5</sup>

Horizontal Discourse is defined by Bernstein (1996:170) as “the form of knowledge usually typified as everyday, oral or common-sense... features: segmental, context dependent, tacit, multi-layered, often contradictory across contexts but not within contexts” and Vertical Discourse (*ibid*:171) as taking “the form of a coherent, explicit, systematically principled structure, hierarchically organized, *or* it takes the form of a series of specialized languages with specialized modes of interrogation and specialized criteria for the production of texts”. The essential difference between these two discourses is that the Vertical Discourse has a Pedagogic Device, with a Pedagogic Discourse, an interrelated system of individuals and institutions that shape what knowledge is and how it should be circulated in the discipline, whereas Horizontal Discourse does not. The Vertical Discourse is structured in a way that concepts build on each other, growing from the simple to the complex, through a process that over time is constructed by the Pedagogic Device and its components and machinations. Horizontal Discourse does not have this hierarchical approach and therefore the concepts are isolated and dependent on being taught within specific situations, where learning can be achieved by mimicking a performance of someone who has already mastered that performance.

It is perhaps easy to visualise this distinction if we consider the learning traditionally considered to take place within an educational institution such as a university, versus the learning that would take place in a non-formal environment such as an apprenticeship. Within a university we can see the student following a structured course of learning, moving from the general to the specific, following a structured course as established over time by the various institutions that impact on the discipline. In contrast, the apprentice learns each step of the craft as and when the opportunity arises for the professional to show those particular skills, without any formal structure of one component following another and without any problem of assimilating any particular piece of knowledge without one of the missing pieces. However, this rather simplistic dichotomy becomes problematic when a craft migrates to an institutional context and the process of creating a structure needs to evolve to ensure that the

---

<sup>5</sup> This exclusion is corrected in his 1999 essay, where Bernstein elaborates on his 1996 discussions, focusing more on Horizontal Discourse. This research does not draw on those elaborations as the concepts and theories utilized are fundamentally the same in both publications.

learner has the opportunities that would have been afforded in the workplace, but in an accelerated and condensed format. In order to achieve this there must be some form of selection and structuring taking place and if there are no Official Re-contextualising Fields (ORFs), that are “created and dominated by the state” (*ibid*:48) or a limited Pedagogic Re-contextualising Field (PRF), as mentioned earlier, then the design of the offering does indeed become the sole responsibility of the lecturer. However, because the lecturer has a background in the vocational profession and an experience of the field-of-practice, there is the assumption that other re-contextualising factors that are drawn from the professional discourse and therefore linked to the discipline’s Distributive Rules come into play when deciding on design. These other factors are explored in the analysis, but are not the direct focus of this research.

Bernstein further defines two different types of structures under Vertical Discourse; namely, Hierarchical Knowledge Structures and Horizontal Knowledge Structures. The former is “an explicit, coherent, systematically principled and hierarchical organization of knowledge” (1996:172) and the latter is “a series of specialized languages” (*ibid*). Both, by definition as a Vertical Discourse, have a Pedagogic Device. The Hierarchical Knowledge Structure represents most closely the example discussed above of traditional, established university type knowledge, e.g. Physics, and the Horizontal Knowledge Structure represents more disputed types of university knowledge as found for example in Humanities, where the very language to explain a phenomenon is critically analysed equally as much as the phenomenon itself, e.g. Sociology.

It is Bernstein’s description of the Horizontal Knowledge Structures that is most interesting, as his definition tries to explain these specialised languages where “the constraints on the production of this knowledge... create a series of expanding, non-translatable, specialized languages with non-comparable principles of description based on different, often opposed assumptions. ... Horizontal knowledge structures develop by *addition* of another specialized language (original emphasis)” (*ibid*:173) and in terms of what Bernstein says about Pedagogic Discourses appropriates these other discourses *or languages* specifically for the purposes of the process of transmission (*ibid*:47). In a footnote (no. 5, pg.181), Bernstein returns to this discussion considering discourses other than academic, and classifies crafts like pottery as “often acquired through apprenticeships where mastery is more a tacit achievement than a consequence of an explicit pedagogy. This suggests... that crafts could

be regarded as *tacit* horizontal knowledge structures”. This perhaps answers the question of the status of the knowledge structures in terms of craft pedagogy, but fails to explain this within a structured academic context, when the teaching of the craft has moved into a tertiary, higher education environment, where there is the need for an explicit approach to pedagogy in such an environment and therefore a relevant Pedagogic Discourse.

It becomes apparent that I am making two assumptions in my research. Firstly, that Re-contextualising is in fact taking place in terms of the craft-specific programmes I am researching. I am therefore assuming that the knowledge structure of craft, seen by Gamble as “in need of investigation” (2003:76) is in fact vertical in nature. This vertical nature implies some form of Re-contextualising Rules which are “regulating formation of specific pedagogic discourse” (*ibid*:42) as well as a Pedagogic Discourse within which re-contextualising is taking place. And secondly, that the general approach to course design exemplified in the programmes under investigation is what Toohey would term a Performance Based Approach (1996:51). These assumptions are necessary to underpin the direction my argument will take and will need to be born out by the data to confirm them as a foundation on which I can build my later discussions.

### **4.3 Analytical Framework**

It is necessary to take the above discussion of Bernstein’s work and reframe some of his terminology and descriptions for this specific research. The Regulative Discourse contains the regulatory rules of the discipline of pedagogy, whereas the Distributive Rules frame the regulatory rules of the professional discourse of the lecturer/designer. This research is therefore looking at the interplay between Bernstein’s Distributive Rules and his Re-contextualising Rules, as applied to the individuals articulating this relationship within an educational context. What this should highlight are the different influences that the individuals bring to the process of design and how regulatory rules of the professional discourse (elements of the Distributive Rules) fulfil the role of the Regulative Discourse of pedagogy, when such is lacking in the experience of the individual. If this is so, then it would illustrate a migration of the Distributive Rules into the role of regulatory rules in the Regulative Discourse and would help to partially fulfil the role of the Regulative Discourse as far as the individual is concerned. Though there are still elements of a Regulative Discourse of pedagogy at play, the possible merging of these two discourses – the professional and the pedagogic – is the focal point of this study. This can be visually explained by supplementing

Bernstein's earlier visual formula

$$PDis = \frac{ID}{RD} \leftrightarrow DR$$

with the symbol  $\leftrightarrow$  illustrating the interaction between the regulatory natures of the Distributive Rules and the Regulative Discourse.

In order to illustrate this process and explain its possible mechanisms, I will need to look to the data to illustrate the influences on design by looking for elements of a Regulative Discourse; the Distributive Rules and how they are operationalised; Horizontal and Vertical Discourses, in terms of conceptualisations of knowledge within which the individuals can be located, singularly and collectively; and the Re-contextualisation that is taking place. Suggestions of an implicit Regulative Discourse should be found in the experiences of the lecturers, namely their experiences of teaching and being taught in an institution. The Distributive Rules form part of the *Professional Discourse* of the vocational practitioner and are illustrated through what is used from the professional experiences of the individuals in the design process. These professional experiences can take a number of different forms and I will use the label of *Professional Discourse* to discuss these. Horizontal and Vertical Discourses are not so much a clearly applied practice on the part of the designers as an inference I will draw from general structures I find in the data related to their practice. Also, these Discourses are an external label that I will be applying to the data, and being a pedagogic concept, may or may not be explicit to the individuals themselves, based on their experience. I will therefore look for structuring that is taking place in the programme and course design that is of a horizontal and/or vertical nature to illustrate these Discourses. Re-contextualising will be highlighted in the data by the actions of translating one discourse into another by the individuals, as they design their courses and programmes.

In terms of the analysis, Bernstein's Horizontal and Vertical Discourses will help to locate each programme in terms of a general conception of the nature of knowledge for the programme and illustrate how this impacts on the design. The Re-contextualising aspects will further highlight the issue of whether these Discourses are as clear-cut in this particular case as laid out by Bernstein. The experiences of pedagogy, representing an implicit Regulative Discourse as far as the lecturer/designers are concerned, and the experiences of the vocational profession, highlighted through the concept of *Professional Discourse*, will

illustrate the Distributive Rules in action and inform all these discussions. I am making a clear distinction here between knowledge of the field-of-practice, as found in the experiences of the individual of their profession, versus the knowledge of pedagogy, as found in the experiences of the practice of teaching or lecturing.

Once I have illustrated the above, I will return to Bernstein and his concept of Horizontal Knowledge Structures to consider how a Pedagogic Discourse for the disciplines is being formed through the interaction of different discourses or languages.

## Chapter 5: Research Design

### 5.1 Methodological approach and Methods

The main methodological approach for this research has been that of an ethno-methodological study, where Silverman (1993) explains that this is the “study of the methods that individuals use to make sense of their social world and accomplish their daily action.” In essence, the experiences in and of their practice has shaped the lecturers in terms of the decisions they have made about their social and professional worlds. These decisions have in turn shaped their daily actions and these now form part of the body of *experience* or knowledge that needs to be re-formulated and projected into a learning environment or situation.

I have chosen to use the case study as the method for this research, using mainly textual analysis of interviews as data (see Silverman, 1993; Cresswell, 1998 and O’Leary, 2004). Yin (1984:1) states that this type of study is “the preferred strategy when ‘how’ or ‘why’ questions are being posed”. In my research I am attempting to explain not only the question of *how* programme design takes place within a specific educational and social context, but more importantly, *how*, and to a lesser degree *why*, decisions are made and what influences these decisions or choices. The *how* question points to sources of knowledge and information (*how* does he/she do that?) that are available to the lecturer, and being a question more of an explanatory nature, lends itself to investigating the “operational links (that) need... to be traced over time” (*ibid*:6). This investigation is therefore trying to find the link between the design process (*how* design happens), the influences on the designer (*why* they do what they do), the resulting programme (*how* this is influenced and *why*) and the manifestation of this relationship (*how* the resulting programme looks) in terms of theories of approaches to design and to conceptualisations of knowledge.

Yin (1984) lists two other conditions that steer the research design towards the use of the case study. In my research there is no “required control over behavioural events” (*ibid*:6), or manipulation, on my part, of the site or sample. None of the research intends to control the present situation within the institution I am researching, but merely to observe and gather information on what is actually taking place, rather than what *should* or *could* be taking place. The focus is also on “contemporary events” (*ibid*), attempting to explain the process as it is at present, looking at the programme design as it presently stands.

The primary source of evidence this case study relies on is “systematic interviewing” (*ibid*:8). Lecturers from the institution, tasked with designing their own courses and representing two separate departments or fields-of-practice, form the interview sample. Though the sample is very small, (n = 9), (*see Appendix B: Table 1.2 for full details*) they are representative of both the type of individual I have sketched earlier, and the norm found in similar film and television and media institutions. The sample represents a number of diverse and contrasting approaches to programme design within each field, as well as between distinct yet related fields. The decision was made to make use of individuals within two separate programmes. Later on during the analysis, the fact that two programmes had been chosen with equal numbers of participants allowed for a comparison between the two that added to the analysis, but had not originally been intended. Half the sample constitutes the principal lecturers within a visual narrative programme (Film and Television Programme), focused on television and film making, and the other half of the sample constitutes the principal lecturers from a digital design programme (Multimedia Programme), focused on computer design for multimedia platforms. The main reason for this choice of sample was the possibility for contrasting different types of approaches to design between the two areas, and comparing the various approaches to sources of knowledge for the respective programmes. This sample allows therefore for a possible interpretation and analysis of the relationship between the programmes as well as within the programmes between individuals. Each individual was interviewed only once, for a duration of between 35 and 60 minutes (*see Appendix A: Table 1.1 for full details*), with only one of the interviewees requesting the questionnaire prior to the meeting. The majority of the replies were therefore not rehearsed, but were an immediate reaction to the question. The lecturers’ voices, as separate identities, are used to represent the two programmes. Although I draw on the individual perceptions of the lecturers, these should be read collectively to represent the programmes and the holistic impression I am trying to generate to characterise each programme.

The questionnaire (*see Appendix C: Questionnaire*) was semi-structured, allowing for the interviews to diverge down related paths of inquiry, if these were found to be more illuminating. All the interviewees did however give replies to all the questions, though not always directly. The data were then transcribed by myself and filed, by individual and per programme. These documents were printed, and an initial reading and coding was done manually to highlight key words, namely *content* and *structure*, and to become acquainted

with the data. The word processed documents were then converted to compatible files for importing into Nudist NVivo®. In this qualitative research programme the texts were highlighted and sections collated to different nodes (*see Appendix D: List 1.1*). These node documents were printed and exported and further edited for inclusion into the main body of this research. The various themes emerged during this collation and subsequently some of the nodes were deemed unnecessary for the final analysis. In some cases there was a correlation between node and theme (e.g. Structure), and in others, multiple nodes developed into single themes (e.g. Experience).

The individual structured interviews therefore constituted one part of the empirical data for this research. A second set of empirical data, used to triangulate the data from the interviews, was a historical survey of the institutional documentation dealing with issues related to the design process over several years. These documents include institutional and departmental memos, minutes of meetings, policy documents and prospectuses. No textual analysis was done on this data, but rather it was used to inform the observations and interpretations.

A major difficulty in this research and in using this method has been the fact that as the researcher, I am immersed in the site of research, having been the Head of department for the Film and Television programme for the last nine years since its inception. Also, my own research and education into related issues of teaching in this particular environment has influenced many of the managerial and academic decisions taken in the development of the programme in general, which have filtered down to the various lecturers to implement in their own courses in particular. One of the methodological challenges has therefore been to separate myself from the data, so as to be as objective as possible in its interpretation. This immersion does however mean that there is a far deeper understanding on the part of the researcher of the situation and the complex social interactions that may influence the data.

## Chapter 6: Analysis

### 6.1 Introduction

The data have been presented per programme and the following needs to be taken into account for both the analysis as well as for the subsequent discussion.

The dominant influence indicated by the data is Experience. This is highlighted in the following analysis under the Regulative Discourse and *Professional Discourse* headings, and is substantiated by illustrative discussions of *Teaching* and *Education Experience* in the case of the former and *Professional Experience* in the case of the latter. These three distinct areas of experience differentiate between the nuances of what experience can mean for individuals, and it is therefore important to qualify what is meant by each concept of experience. *Teaching Experience* is the experience of teaching at an institution, *Education Experience* is the experience of being taught, either formally or informally, and *Professional Experience* is the experience of the vocation or craft. Separating the various experiences under three headings may seem unusual, but I am particularly trying to identify and categorise the various experiences to try to see if there is some differentiation in the impact of the experiences, and therefore their different regulatory rules, on the choices that lecturers make in the programme design process and what knowledge structures these may be supporting. I have also kept the departments separate, to see if there is in fact some aspect of the general predisposition of a department to a particular type of experience which might separate the two in terms of the resulting perceived level of the programme on offer. Having established that experience is the main source of content and structure for the programme and therefore to a large extent the main influence, it becomes important to establish if there is indeed some form of Re-contextualising taking place, which in its turn reveals the evidence of a possible Pedagogic Discourse that may exist in which this iterative process is taking place. I will therefore consider each programme in terms of evidence to support the concept of the two Discourses: Horizontal Discourse and Vertical Discourse, and also look for elements of Re-contextualisation.

Though some topics have been separated out for the sake of discussion and clarity, this is an artificial situation. This has been done to find evidence of some particular topic, but does not imply separation from the other elements under analysis. The later discussion attempts to draw these separate threads back together through synthesis.

## 6.2 The Multimedia Programme

This programme at CityVarsity focuses on training in the field of design, both traditional design and for multimedia platforms. This includes a strong foundation of technical subjects (e.g. computer-aided design and software layout packages), and traditional design subjects (e.g. typeface and elements of design). These generally recognised design subjects are supplemented by those that deal with design for websites and games, which include a diverse selection of related software packages.

The lecturers are all professionals from the design industry and represent a diverse selection of professional vocations and careers. Most have diplomas and advanced diplomas in design, with Louise and Richard having degree qualifications. In the case of the latter, this is at a post graduate level. It is only Louise and Stuart who have some form of teaching qualification, though Susan and Hannah have attended short courses related to education.<sup>6</sup>

### 6.2.1 Regulative Discourse Influences

The experience of the education environment forms part of a Regulative Discourse of pedagogy and is evidenced in both the *Teaching Experience* of lecturers and their own experience of their education, namely *Education Experience*.

#### 6.2.1.1 Teaching experience

I will highlight the examples in the data that elaborate on the experiences of teaching, e.g. at an educational institution, and their potential impact on design.

Within the Multimedia Programme, Hannah<sup>7</sup> has the least experience of teaching, compared with her colleagues, and often defers the final decision to others whom she feels have a better understanding of the field of education, “bounc[ing] the ideas off Louise, because she’s head of department, and Susan, because they’ve both been around a long time, and... having only ever worked in the industry and not actually taught, I sometimes... have to just see whether, where my ideas fit in”. She recognises that their experiences within the educational environment have changed their approach to teaching their respective fields-of-practice. Also, she understands the value of improving the course through interaction with her peers: “If I do

---

<sup>6</sup> More details can be found in the Appendixes.

<sup>7</sup> Pseudonyms have been used throughout for all the interviewees.

notice things that I think could be improved or whatever, I would always talk to Louise and Richard and Stuart, pick their brains, see what they think, and try to find a way to work it in". She particularly states that she's never had teaching education, except for a train-the-trainer programme implemented by the institution to broaden the skills of those members of staff who are lacking in this regard. However, she conveys the understanding that this educational environment will give her the necessary tools she needs to qualify her own judgements and decisions in the future. "This is the first time I've got my first years from last year [they] are now going to second year and I can already see big improvements from what I got from last year's second years, so there are gaps that I was (*sic*) filling." Indeed, she believes that in time she will be "able to see, to what extent those gaps are filled". The assumption here seems to be that the experience of the institutional environment will teach her how to understand and work within it, to manipulate her knowledge to this new environment.

Louise's career in the education field was jumpstarted when she decided to have a child and felt that her career as a designer was not conducive to bringing up children. An interesting differentiation arises in her discussions, where she claims that one of the reasons why her initial experience at the institution was so difficult was that she "wasn't taught to be a teacher", but then describes having had "teacher training" that was "one year... that's what gave me the, I suppose, educational experience, how to teach. But that didn't extend into how you create curriculum, that really was about how you actually get down in the classroom and do things". To some extent she is differentiating *teaching* and *being a teacher*, where the one is 'getting down in the classroom and doing things' and the other is having a broader experience and understanding of other aspects of the teaching experience, namely management and design, such as curriculum construction. This made her introduction to teaching at the institution a difficult one, as when she arrived to teach, a week before the course started, all she had for a curriculum was "a list of bullet points ... and that list of bullet points really described minimal content." With this as an introduction and because she had no experience in how to design a curriculum, she claims "I started to formulate a curriculum... based on my experience, even though it was some 20 years ago, in London, on how I had been taught".

Richard's experience of teaching comes from his university days. While he was studying he was sent to private institutions for additional training to teach computer graphics in his fourth year. He adopted the university's approach, while applying some of the techniques he had

learned during his training. His experience at the university, however, did influence the design of the programme in some way, especially because he was at the university and was involved in lecturing, so he “saw how they worked and based mine [his design] on a similar principle”.

Susan’s initial exposure to education was training graphic design in a community college before later moving to the institution where she started as creative design lecturer, training in art and drawing and illustration, where she has been for five years. Her original portfolio has changed and she has moved into computers. Susan’s discussions with colleagues regarding the educational environment extend beyond the confines of the institution to her “friends, who are in training” and it is from them that she gained a lot of information. She has done “quite a bit of reading”, primarily because when she first started at the institution she wanted to “understand the structure of training and how to communicate your thoughts”, illustrating her appreciation that there was a different form of communication required within the context of education to convey her practical, professional experience.

Stuart’s pronouncements on teaching would seem to predestine an individual with teaching abilities, as he believes “you’re either a teacher or you’re not a teacher”. At the same time he admits that experience is actually the best teacher for someone wishing to pursue such a career, and states simply that “experience has taught me how to be a good teacher”. Not just his own experience, but also “instruction from other teachers, experienced teachers, has also led me to... *that* method works very well, *this* method doesn’t work”. His experience of teaching includes “six years’ experience. I was head of the art department at [a public secondary] school, where I taught Art and Design, up to Matric. I’ve taught, design and design technology, up to A levels in London” and includes curriculum design experience “in terms of the course content, and structure” for secondary school students.

#### **6.2.1.2 Education experience**

This section highlights in the data the experiences of *being* taught, either formally or informally.

Hannah explains of her tertiary education experience that the lecturers were good, “some of them better than others”, and goes on to illustrate the problem that what was being communicated was either too theoretical or too outdated or not career oriented enough, with

goals that were not quickly achievable. When referring her own education, though not waxing lyrical of her own lecturers, she searches for an elusive conceptualisation of what she was looking for: “What I wanted from them, I suppose at that point, was to get the knowledge that enabled me to go and go do stuff.” This remains a vague description, yet is assimilated into her approach to designing a course that tries to teach more than just the technique but also a whole philosophy of design, while not being able to foreground this philosophy in a clearly articulate way.

By contrast, Louise has nothing detrimental to say about her lecturers and describes them as highly successful and career-oriented individuals who taught second hand and were professionals in their own design crafts first, as well as taking time during their working week to teach students. “That’s the kind of lecturer we had. People who were out in the industry producing work, were well known in the industry and came in two to three days a week to teach us”.

Richard, though trained in design at a tertiary level and at university, feels that most of his real skills, especially for the computer applications that he now teaches, were “self taught. Reason being that there aren’t always training facilities for that. Secondly, in my company I need to use them, so it’s stuff we use and that’s how I get to know it”. His main influences from his own education have been to pick up on the design methodologies of the courses he experienced, both at public university and private further education training institutions, and to adapt those methods to the design required within the institution. But the basic concept he refers to, to “start with the one that’s easiest, and then move on to more complicated stuff”, comes from private further education. This concept is still fundamental to his attitude to teaching, but he tries to marry it with the more tertiary approach of the university.

It was Stuart’s experiences of teaching that tempted him to do his Higher Diploma in Education (HDE). This education has left an indelible mark on his attitude towards such studies. Stuart slates the education of educators, being derogatory about educational theory: “And in terms of educational theory... HDE has certainly NOT taught me how to be a good teacher” (emphasis in the dialogue). He aligns himself first and foremost to being a designer. Although he’s been involved in education for a long time he believes that “education is... a natural by-product of what I do” and that you “cannot be an effective educator, particularly in an industry such as multimedia or new media, without being actively involved in the

industry”. Stuart feels that his teaching diploma was a “complete waste of time” and that the main impact on his ability as a teacher has been “[professional] experience” and the “instruction from other teachers, experienced teachers” to show him which methods were more effective.

Susan’s comments indicate the complexity of separating out experiences and their impact on design, when she talks of what she was taught at Technikon and how it “has got absolutely nothing to do with the software [that she now teaches], because I never trained in that, but it has everything to do with the design”. She is, after all, teaching design and her statement would seem to indicate that she should draw heavily on her education experience; but it is the learning of technology and skills that seem to carry greater weight in terms of the perceived value of the educational experience, and these she did not receive at a tertiary level.

### **6.2.2 Professional Discourse Influences**

The experience of the professional vocation, the field-of-practice and its environment, collectively inform and create a body of conventions that constitute the rules for the specific professional field, or the Distributive Rules. This section highlights those examples in the data that illustrate an influence on the design process.

#### **6.2.2.1 Professional experience**

The resounding influence, at least from the perspective of the lecturers themselves, is that of their own experiences of their professional fields. In the Multimedia Programme, Hannah talks of her experiences as an Art Director, handling “the visual stuff, which is design, choose (*sic*) photographers and go to the shoots and all that stuff... It includes design and TV and everything...normal radio, TV, print, press. And any other stuff like that”. Hannah gives a sense that her international experience is very valuable having “worked overseas, in the same [fields], in London for six years”. Along with this she speaks of the recognition she received for this work, winning “a lot of awards, international awards”. In fact, she qualifies how well she perceives she did in the field by these awards, which predominantly validate the practical achievements in the profession. Ultimately Hannah confirms that the course design comes from her “work experience. I try to make sure that whatever briefs I design are of industry standard, or the work that can come out of it could be of industry standard” and this includes the influences from the people around her, including “the great Art Directors I worked with, how they thought, how they worked... what was it that made them brilliant at what they’re

doing”.

Louise’s background is less advertising oriented and more television related having been a television graphic designer for 15 years, and then doing freelance graphic design for two years. Louise identifies herself and the other lecturers in the department as designers first and foremost, even though they are all full time lecturers at the institution. “We are all designers, all of the lecturers that teach, are designers”, and it is this fact that keeps the courses current “because of the lecturers that are working in industry and know what’s going on, and know the direction that the course needs to take therefore”. This illustrates the strong connections between the *Professional Experience* and how this impacts on the course design.

Richard takes a more entrepreneurial line. He opened his own multimedia design company almost as soon as he had finished studying and from there “started with print, then expanded into multimedia”. Richard shows a highly individualistic approach to the career path not uncommon in this particular professional field. Richard also feels that the course comes from his experience in the profession, but refers to his experiences as learning: “I think the course comes from what I’m learning outside, and I spend a lot of time working, it’s a field that takes a lot of hours”. But he still concedes that the business is what shapes the design of the course: “I can see exactly what software needs to be taught, what needs to be covered and what people need to know, because I’m in the business”. He feels that it is these personal experiences that add so much value to the programme for the learner, giving them not only a sterile academic feel for the contents of the career, but also a feel for the context of the working environment. “I would cover it from... my experiences of what I had in my day, and what I would want now. ... So I use my, I think I use everyday business experience to fill in the course”. Ultimately his design comes from “personal experience”, but here again personal experience is used in a very narrow sense, seemingly focusing on the *Professional Experience* without exploring any *other* aspects of personal experience as playing a role.

Stuart has an equally long and varied career, having started working in the industry in 1988 where he trained as a graphic designer and then worked locally and internationally in design studios doing mainly graphic design. He then moved into multimedia and now has his own company. Stuart does seem to take cognisance of a duality of experiences; that the design of the course is based on experience, but that this includes “my working experience and my teaching experience”, and maintains that it is his experience that tells him if something is

right or wrong. This awareness however, probably stems from his own personal philosophy of “you cannot be an effective educator... without being actively involved in the industry” and from a background that includes a large amount of teacher training and experience.

The above illustrates how teaching experiences and the experiences of being taught in the Multimedia Programme have far less value in the eyes of the lecturers than the experiences of the profession. In most cases decision-making in terms of design references the experience of the profession far more than the experiences of teaching and being taught. However, it must be noted that the discussions that take place within the department do include the strategies and input from other lecturers in their role as lecturer. It is possible to conjecture that the teaching experiences are simply not recognised as playing a significant role, because of the informal nature of the interactions. The Distributive Rules of the profession therefore seem to take a dominant role over the Regulative Discourse of the pedagogy. It is possible however that the former is merely more explicit to the lecturers than the latter.

### **6.2.3 Application of Bernstein’s Discourses**

The data were analysed to consider elements that indicated one of either of Bernstein’s concepts of Horizontal and Vertical Discourse.

#### **6.2.3.1 Horizontal Structuring**

There is a strong emphasis on the contextual nature of the knowledge being transferred in the Multimedia Programme. Louise illustrates this context dependency numerous times as she discusses the content and structure of the programme. Firstly, in her own course presentation she uses examples from her experience to illustrate a particular point. “I tell them first where it would be used, show them the context and then show them how to design a type for that context”. Even when designing a project, the more generic skills of design are always applied to a specific project as the outcome: “[if] I see an interesting book that’s newly published, I bring it to class, we discuss it, and do something related to that new publication”. Secondly, we see how the industry and the needs of the industry for particular skills determine what is taught. This aspect of the *context dependency* is best illustrated as Louise explains “the content of the course, does relate to computer applications first and then teaching the principles and theory that go around designing” illustrating the emphasis first on the practical nature of the programme and second on the more generic type of design skills. Susan even limits these essential skills to 20 or more categories that the students need to know, “so we

would look at the types of design elements that they would have to create in the industry and there probably are normally about 25 categories of... design elements that they would have to create, obviously with variations”, requiring that the student be taught how to design for these categories.

Richard admits that his main emphasis is that the students need to know certain skills to be employable. The everyday nature of some aspects of the knowledge of the profession, illustrating a Horizontal Discourse, comes across during Richard’s description of what he covers in the course and his reasons for doing so. “I would cover it from... my experiences of what I had in my day and what I would want now. ... So I use my... everyday business experience to fill in the course, so that they don’t really get trapped the same way”. Richard is not transferring knowledge in any particular structured way, but allowing his own experiences to surface in his classes.

Even though Susan changes her emphasis in terms of her lecturing during the term from technical to creative support, her scaffolded approach to the structure of the course still places the skills within very narrow and specific design contexts. “It starts off with... step by step tutorials, instructions on how to work in the application and it evolved (*sic*) through the term on, ‘okay, now you know how to use it, let’s see what you’re doing with it and this is how you create’”. Stuart agrees with this view of being context dependent as he structures his course “in such a way that it reflects what’s happening out in the professional environment”. He summarises the general approach of the department neatly when he indicates that what he tries to do “is provide my students with a set of skills, aesthetic skills and technical skills, which they can take into a commercial environment and hopefully, grow with, develop”, showing the context dependent goals that are set, while still indicating some aspects of development that are allowed within this context, though the skills are predominantly related only to this career path.

### **6.2.3.2 Vertical Structuring**

There are numerous examples of the verticalised nature of the programmes in the data. Something as simple as Hannah’s comment, “then I work with them, because they need to cover x, y, z to get a diploma”, already shows that there is some form of structured learning in place, no matter how rudimentary that may be as presupposed by this comment.

Louise illustrates the explicit organisation of the programme when she explains how she contextualises what she teaches, so that “the students don’t feel that they are learning unrelated things that they don’t know what they’re doing it for”. Louise also explains how the teaching for the course does include the more specific aspects of training for the profession, but that the broader concepts and principles are also part of the programme, “so, the content of the course does relate to computer applications first and then teaching the *principles* and theory that go around designing, not just being operators” (my emphasis). Richard echoes this when he indicates that “it doesn’t really matter what software one uses... it’s to solve a problem”, illustrating the move to more generic skills and concepts.

Richard’s simple statement of building up to a “more complex sort of end” illustrates the hierarchically organised nature of the programme. The need for a structured context to his course is exemplified as he tells of a computer course where the lecturer,

“didn’t build up... in that subject, and threw it around between complicated and not complicated and they [the students] were completely confused, they struggled, and it was a very bad year. So I do believe there’s definitely a certain hierarchy you should follow in teaching this kind of thing”.

The aspirations of some of the lecturers in the department are for the course to achieve something closer to a university programme, and with this in mind they advocate moving beyond the predominantly practical nature of the present programme into something more theory based. Richard says, “I would like to see the course be more theoretical, where there’s more written papers going on. I don’t think there’s enough of that, and I think for it to be a substantial course, and I’d like it to be probably a degree course, or something like that... you would need to do that”. Richard does come from a degree background, so this is perhaps to be expected, but what is important is to see that the aspirations are shaping the thinking about the course and these aspirations are for the most part focused towards a tertiary and degree objective, necessitating a Vertical Discourse.

Susan raises interesting observations around the difficulties in teaching design, especially in terms of the less easily articulated aspects that make design the art that it is, rather than a simple craft. Susan mentions the basic principles of design, “...rhythm, unity, variety, composition...” and how these all factor into the design process and invariably are recognisable in the final product. She admits that these should be in place and that to some extent this is mainly what the programme sets out to achieve. She then indicates an

additional less definable aspect: “Plus, it [the final design] should have some sort of visual spark that gives it originality”. Though Susan does not clearly articulate what *originality* means and how to clearly recognise it (other than through experience), she does try to explain this within the broader context of what the programme is aiming for: “We’re trying to teach them [the students] conceptual development, and the ability to think of a unique solution to a design problem. Anybody can create a poster and copy what somebody else has created, but in order to create something that’s fresh and unique, you have to be able to look into the communication problem”. Though this does not directly indicate a Vertical Discourse in place within the programme, it is perhaps illustrating, as with Richard, the environment that seems to be grappling with many higher level conceptualisations of what they are teaching. That the student is not merely being taught how to push buttons and run computer applications, but that they are also teaching knowledges that are transferable, rather than context specific.

#### 6.2.4 Re-contextualisation Practices

This section considers examples of *translations* of discourses in the data: where such translations take place in the practice of the lecturers as they interpret a *Professional Discourse* from the professional context into the new pedagogic context of the institution.

Hannah talks of using “some stuff that I’ve been given, in other words history of previous years, and stuff like that” in terms of the content, but that she slowly adapts it because “new stuff come[s] out and new stuff is happening all the time, so [she is] trying to pull bits of what’s happening now and making it relevant”. This is important as this implies that she is changing content and structure, re-contextualising the knowledge based on her experience or ideas of what is relevant. And she does this through talking to her colleges and testing their input.

Louise’s decisions in the process of designing the programme have been to keep it abreast of a more modern approach to teaching design, especially in terms of the highly technical nature of the field in its present form. With this in mind her re-contextualising takes place very much within the context of her peer group: the lecturers at the institution who are firstly all designers and secondly have a working knowledge of the industry. Louise relies heavily on this forum, referring to discussions where ideas are developed collectively. Likewise, Stuart’s experiences of talking with other professionals, both in the professional field and

other lecturers, help to shape the design. The feedback he gets from colleagues in other institutions includes, “what he’s doing [and] what problems he’s having with the course”. Here we see the emergence of a broader field of Re-contextualising Agents and the beginnings of a Pedagogic Re-contextualising Field.

At the same time, however, the programme is influenced by both the literature related to the field as well as the industry requirements imposed from external sources. Louise refers to her use of “book reference[s] in order to keep the course contemporary” and the evolution of the industry and its various software requirements, stating how they “should teach this application now, because that application isn’t used any more”. Susan relies heavily on textbooks and manuals for the course content, allowing her experience to guide her in the choice of these sources. “There are a lot of tutorials that have already been developed and from that one can get a basic skeleton of how to structure the course. Stuff that’s been developed by professionals for years and that works very well, in terms of design” and “in terms of the software, a lot of it’s in manuals already... and I take stuff directly from authorised training manuals... books that are out there and that exist, and ...a lot of the course is based on that, because of the sound structure”. This implies that she understands she is using content that has been previously re-contextualised for use in a learning situation and makes a further choice to either use it or not and how to adapt it for her needs.

For Hannah, the process of undergoing some teacher training experience has also helped to shape her understanding of what she is doing, and this in turn builds on her own reflexivity towards her craft. “All the stuff that I know, like assessment type of thing... that you do without even thinking, it [the teacher training] put it in a formal structure, because that’s what it was meant to do I suppose”. For her it did help to clarify her *implicit* decision-making and make the reasoning behind this more *explicit*. On a fundamental level, Re-contextualising is taking place either explicitly or implicitly for the lecturer(s), where different experiences and sources of knowledge are repackaged for the particular course in the programme, and continually updated and revised based on feedback, both internal and external to the institution.

### **6.2.5 Preliminary Conclusions**

The main influence for the Multimedia Programme is *Professional Experience* and what would seem to be the random nature of acquiring knowledge as a designer, as opposed to the

structured approach of acquiring the skills to be one. By contrast, the lecturers' own experience of their education seems of less value and in many cases the training or education received at other institutions is eschewed, either in part or in whole. The Multimedia Programme therefore has a strong inclination towards the experience of the professional field from which to draw, in order to advise and shape the design process of the programme itself. The Distributive Rules of the profession are playing a far more *explicit* role in the structuring of the programme than the Regulative Discourse of pedagogy.

In spite of a diversity of approaches and backgrounds, the lecturers' discussions narrow down and focus the direction of the programme's development. The lecturers often defer to the experience of the head of department (Louise) in this regard, though it is not clear if this is due to an actual or perceived developed knowledge base that she (could or does) represent, or merely a product of the hierarchical nature of the institution and its levels of management and lines of responsibility. The predominant discourse seems to be Horizontal, although there is Re-contextualising taking place that would seem to suggest a Vertical Discourse as well. The general approach to the discourse of this programme is of a horizontal nature, but containing elements of the vertical, especially when we consider how the burgeoning reflexivity of some lecturers is forcing them to consider the pedagogic environment and how it impacts on the content and structure of the knowledge of their profession. This includes how to shape the full complexity of the profession, with all its nuanced performances, into something that can be taught, and not simply haphazardly caught.

The above data describes the Multimedia Programme and I will return to this discussion after covering the same topics in the Film and Television Programme.

### **6.3 The Film and Television Programme**

This programme trains learners in the skills of producing visual narratives. Subjects are primarily field-of-practice based, e.g. editing, directing and camerawork and lighting, while other related subjects like communication, visual literacy, and film history and criticism are more theoretical. The practical subjects are *hands on* with minimal teaching of software packages, mainly because computer related programmes are only relevant to one subject, namely editing.

The lecturers are mainly professionals from the film and television industries, once again, as

with the Multimedia Programme, representing a diverse selection of professional vocations and careers. The majority of the lecturers have degrees in related fields, with only Terry having no tertiary qualifications. All of the lecturers with degrees have postgraduate qualifications, Matthew's being a PhD. I am the only one with postgraduate degree experience in education.

For this section I will proceed with the same analytical methods, using the same headings as per the previous section for the Multimedia Programme, and I will look for similar examples in the data.

### **6.3.1 Regulative Discourse Influences**

#### **6.3.1.1 Teaching experience**

In the Film and Television Programme, Matthew's initial experience of teaching was through distance learning, which he freely acknowledges "is a bit different from face to face... teaching" and consisted of "compiling... tutorial letters, sending it out, getting essays back, sign (*sic*) them, marking it and on certain occasions having discussion classes with the students". His experience in this distance education institution shaped his approach to course design, especially regarding understanding on the part of the learner in terms of clearly defined outcomes. It was also during this time that he describes his own theoretical paradigms as shifting from a phenomenological perspective to a more ideological analysis perspective, indicating a strong theoretical aspect to his experience of education and the ability to articulate this clearly. Matthew's move to the institution meant that he now moved from distance to face-to-face learning and even with his extensive experience he still feels that he "did grow a lot from 1999 till now. Where [in] 1999, I tried to do everything, and it was a bit confusing for students, especially with first year film history". Here too, we see how the experience of teaching slowly shapes an understanding of how to restructure the knowledge gained through the *Professional Experience*.

Samson's experience is similar as he indicates that "I've never been trained as a lecturer, *per se*, and every year that I've done it, I've learnt a little bit more and hopefully my course is improving". What Samson does indicate is that in the process of designing his course, or "putting it all together", both his experience in the profession and the experiences of his own education have "enabled me to focus my own knowledge and kind of sort it out, because it comes from so many scattered, different places". This is showing a more developed though

still embryonic assertion of the impact of the pedagogic on the shaping of knowledge for the academy.

By contrast, Terry has never had the experience of any formal education for the profession, and yet his experience has been that in the professional arena he has “always, always, always taught”. Working at a time when there were not many institutions that were teaching film and television formally, this necessitated much of the teaching to take place on-the-job and Terry felt comfortable taking this role. In his case, his teaching has taken more the form of apprenticing new film makers and this approach transfers well into a formal environment of a film school, especially for the more practical subjects. Where Terry has difficulty though, is in articulating why he does what he does and pinpointing the reasons for why one approach is more appropriate or better suited to a situation than another.

My experiences of teaching also began with a sudden immersion into the institution as a lecturer. The structured nature of my own Technikon experience and a short stint as lecturer at that institution had given me some idea of the requirements of the academy. However, much of the understanding of education as professional practice has come from later studies in Higher Education that had been ongoing for five years by the time of this study. Once again, as with Terry, there have always been occasions where I have been in the position of teaching others, and this mantle is one that I have accepted as my career has diverted from film maker to film lecturer.

#### **6.3.1.2 Education experience**

My experience of being taught is from the practical perspective of the Technikon (the equivalent of the old English Polytechnic). This experience has played a highly influential part in establishing the basis of the programme design. However, another strong influence has been the lack of professionalism of the lecturers at the Technikon where I was taught, and this impacted the way in which I teach and the way I approach the presentation of the programme in general. From the outset it has been important to ‘do it better than they did it’. In effect, wishing to create the improved version, or ideal version, of what my own educational experience could have, or should have been, as far as I was concerned. This indicates a strong reflexive process with a clear understanding of the two different aspects of craft professional versus pedagogic professional, and how they interact to develop a Pedagogic Discourse.

Samson's experience of going to what he perceives as a very professional educational system, and at a very high level of education in terms of film, helped him to get "a much clearer vision of how to do things, and a lot more organised" in terms of his teaching. But this experience does not rate very high in terms of influencing the decisions he makes on course design. Much of his appreciation of the American approach was the opportunity to have access to professionals from the film industry, from whom he could learn the techniques and skills that he later put to use in his own professional career. His American educational experience is therefore more a practical than a theoretical one, with the lecturers taking the role of advisors or 'masters' from whom he could learn through discussion and their supervision. Samson seems to extend this approach into his own practice of teaching at the institution.

Terry also has a strong apprenticeship bent in his experience of learning his profession. For him the training was always on the job, it was "the only way then". He tells of how learning was left in the hands of those who wanted the knowledge, and they had to go out and ask to be taught "because somebody has got to train you into using it. You know, pick some guy and say 'how does this machine work?' and he told you; that's training". This still persists in his own method of training today – what he refers to as a "scatter gun approach", where he follows the required content and structure for the year, but tackles some topics as they come up and are needed. "Every now and again you trip over something and, whoops, you gotta fix that one up, and so you fix that one up and hope someone is listening".

What is obvious here is the separation of the individuals into two factions: the theory lecturers on the one hand (Matthew and me), and the practical lecturers on the other (Terry and Samson). The lecturers with a stronger theoretically oriented education seem to draw more on a Regulative Discourse than the more practically oriented lecturers.

### **6.3.2 Professional Discourse Influences**

#### **6.3.2.1 Professional experience**

There is as strong an inclination towards the *Professional Experience* as the dominant influence for the design of the Film and Television Programme as there was for the Multimedia Programme, but as we will see, there is a different mix of experiences within the department that changes the overall perception.

Matthew's professional background is situated in the areas of psychology and research, starting out at the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) in 1983, predominantly within the field of psychological and psychometric research. In 1986 he moved into Media Studies, doing audience research, and only later moving into textual analysis and film research on policy matters and film history, film analysis, and media studies in general. These contexts lead Matthew to classify himself as "an academic", illustrating the common perceived divide between the identities of those with more theoretical backgrounds versus those with more practical backgrounds, who classify themselves as "film-makers". Matthew qualifies this by indicating "academic in the sense that my strength was always research. I think I gained a lot of experience in applied, as well as basic research". At the same time, Matthew's love of film brought him into contact with the film industry where he was working within the Film and Allied Workers Organisation (FAWO) on the restructuring of the industry and looking at different models of film commissions. Subsequently, his experience has developed through the many international institutions and journals he assists with information on the history of South African film, and many facets that relate to the theoretical development of the industry, as well as his work in further developing the various political and governmental bodies that steer the general course of the film making profession in the country. Although the emphasis of Matthew's career is not directly related to the production of films *per se*, his knowledge of the spheres that surround this process is substantial. Though of a strong academic bent, background and identity, those courses that Matthew now teaches at the institution are self-taught. He states that "in terms of my knowledge of film theory, film history, it's all self-taught ... and what I basically picked up". This would seem to be a startling pronouncement, but when one considers that his research work spans hundreds of topics that relate to film making and film makers, both nationally and globally, that his research work in this regard is internationally acclaimed, and that he has many years' worth of experience volunteering in the film industry and shaping film policy for South Africa, it is perhaps easy to understand how he could 'teach himself' and still maintain a high level of academic credibility in his work.

Though certainly not as extensive an experience as the other lecturers in the programme, my own experience has included working in the industry for some years as an editor for a wide variety of productions for local broadcast television. This experience has been most beneficial in understanding the nature of the production process that is at the centre of the

institution's approach to teaching film and television. However, the majority of my experience has been in the educational arena, with far more years spent *teaching* film production, and *studying* education and educational concepts, than working in the field-of-practice itself. This has meant that I more readily consider my profession as being that of a lecturer, or academic, than a film-maker. As head of department, I have the dual function of developing the programme as well as my own course content. In terms of the content, much of the initial design for the programme was drawn from existing film schools' programmes at the time of the inception of the programme at the institution. The broad brush strokes for that design have subsequently been filled in as the programme has developed and grown, with certain aspects of content usually decided upon in group discussion, but for the majority, individual courses have been left up to the decisions of the individual lecturers. My approach to pulling together the content of my own lectured course has been one of exploration through my own studies and discussions with other members of staff. My own studies into the nature of teaching within a tertiary context have made me question my own designs and this reflexivity has resulted in major changes being made to the programme and the course over a period of years, as my understanding of the theoretical field has developed. Design issues are therefore linked to the type of learning I want to take place, and the cognitive aspects of the learning process, as well as the specifics of the topics to be conveyed. The choices are therefore less directed to the professional field of film-making than to the field of cognitive development within a tertiary context.

Samson's experiences are also more situated within the practice of film-making.

"I started off my professional life as a journalist... Worked for foreign news companies including German television and CBS in America, and public television in America, shooting the struggle against apartheid mainly, kind of township stuff, during the 1980's and I also spent three years... running the media centre at the University of Durban Westville, which mainly involved producing teaching aids with lecturers, also doing a bit of teaching in terms of training them and training some of the students how to use the equipment. I then got a Fulbright Scholarship, went off to the United States, did a Masters Degree in Film Production at NYU and from that point on moved more into the world of feature film and music video and commercial production."

Because of this experience, Samson feels that he knew "what I had to teach them [the students] were the skills that were necessary to enable them to shoot a film or a video that at least looks like it is more than a home movie... I knew what they needed to know in order to make films. I also knew what I'd learned at NYU and to a certain extent at Rhodes

University". This 'knowing' is however limited to its practical application in the field of producing films, rather than an intellectual consideration of the craft in terms of an underlying theory, or the theoretical discussions that shape the discourse surrounding the practice. When asked about what exactly influences his decisions in terms of the design of his course, Samson stated, similarly to the lecturers in Multimedia, that it was "just my working experience, more than anything else".

Samson's experiences offer "two main sources that I use in terms of the course design, one is the rest of the course and what everybody else is doing. And the practicals that the students are doing, kind of shape where and how you teach them what you teach them". Here the decision for the structure seems to be largely left up to accommodating to the larger picture of the whole programme, as established by the department, rather than the *Professional Experience* itself. In this way, Samson is essentially deferring to the choices of the head of the department. Though this could constitute more a pedagogic experience in terms of the influence on design, the difficulty in separating the two experiences once again highlights the complexity of the fusion of the Distributive and the Regulative, where there is no clear distinction between where the influence is coming from as far as the lecturer is concerned. It is also unclear whether Samson's decisions are due to the experience of having been in various film schools and other tertiary institutions and seeing the logic of the existing structure of the programme, or whether the programme has itself been influenced in its evolution by the profession, and therefore follows a concurrent design to what he as a professional would expect in such an institution.

Terry's career spans 50 years, with an extensive amount of experience across varied practical positions in the field. His knowledge and experience of the field is solely from the perspective of the film-maker, with a thorough understanding of what it means to make a movie, no matter what the context and what the medium may be for that work of visual narrative.

Although *Professional Experience*, and therefore Distributive Rules, also plays an important role here, as with the Multimedia Programme the difficulty is what is considered to be the profession of the lecturer, by the lecturer. For those lecturers who consider themselves foremost film-makers, it is the nature of that profession and its socialisation rules that come first in terms of any design aspects. For those lecturers who consider their profession to be

that of an educator, the Regulative Discourse of the pedagogic profession plays a stronger role.

### 6.3.3 Application of Bernstein's Discourses

#### 6.3.3.1 Horizontal Structuring

It is interesting to note that there is little evidence of a Horizontal Discourse in Matthew's comments, whereas Samson's discussion is heavily influenced by the context of the profession. Both Matthew and I have an approach that seems to extend the skills we are teaching into more cognitive and generic aspects of the training for the field, sometimes even seen as irrelevant by the students, as far as film-making is concerned.

In Samson's case the *context dependency* identified in Bernstein's Horizontal Discourse is related to two aspects; both the dependency to the field of film-making, and dependency to the specific career path represented by the course the lecturer is teaching. Samson teaches a practical course, namely camerawork and lighting. He states,

"I think what I teach people here... has two main areas that I deal with. One is very specific and technical, which is camerawork and lighting, which are two fields but in one, how to actually physically create images and put them onto (*sic*) a camera of various kinds. The other thing that I think I teach the students is how to make films in a broader sense. In terms of how things work on set, I've had a lot of on-set experience, I teach them the correct industry way of doing things, hopefully".

Samson's approach therefore focuses the teaching on to the technical aspects of film-making. He believes, however, that this is the main focus of a film lecturer. "I think that any film lecturer is there to teach technical stuff, yes, but also very much in terms of being someone whom the students can consult about their projects". Even in terms of content, Samson's discussion remains of a horizontal nature:

"I knew that what I had to teach them were the skills that were necessary to enable them to shoot a film or a video... to give them the skills to be able to basically light something effectively and the skills to be able to frame and compose their images correctly, and the use a tripod, to use a camera. I knew what they needed to know in order to make films".

This is emphasised again when Samson states, "I'm trying to teach them the real stuff, I'm trying to teach them as much of the professional film-making as possible" and that he is teaching them "very specific skills... This is what professionals in the industry fulfilling this job description need to know. So therefore this is what I'm going to teach them". Here

context dependency and thus a horizontal nature to his course are clearly illustrated.

Terry's approach is even more dependent to the context of film-making, where some of his course content is actually inspired by events during the teaching of the course where a particular context raises issues and concerns that then need to be addressed. "Every now and again you trip over something and, whoops, you gotta fix that one". This strong sense of horizontality is similar to what we see in the Multimedia Design programme.

### 6.3.3.2 Vertical Structuring

Matthew's experiences are predominantly those of the academic in the university environment and it is therefore not difficult to understand that his aspirations for the programme are niched within a university framework. He even states that, in terms of the course materials and design, it's "very much in line with what's taught at this stage at institutions elsewhere". Matthew is referring mainly to tertiary institutions both locally and internationally. It is however still important for Matthew to ensure that the theory does not remain an inaccessible, dry thing, detached from the experience of the learners. He feels "it's very important for me that it's not just academic material, that it's not just hanging there, it should have almost a really (*sic*) applied value". The structured and hierarchical nature of his courses are illustrated when he speaks of his one first year course having a "pre-established structure", and admits to copying the structure of a similar course from another university author and lecturer. His other courses have a similar hierarchical organisation, with clear principles relating to their structuring:

"So, first year, very general overview of film history, second year film theory, very general overview, film analysis is [the] outcome at the end of the second year. Based on the two years, they will be able to take one movie, analyse it from different viewpoints. The third year [is] going very much in depth. Here's classical Hollywood, here's all the alternatives, going very much in-depth in theory, feminism, structuralism, gender studies, things I just scratch the surface of in second year".

Samson's approach, though less theoretical, still has a strong systematic structure, though less explicit. Samson indicates that the knowledge he teaches the students follows "a natural progression of events which has to happen and which is one reason why it's really upsetting for me when students miss classes, because they miss a *link*, it all builds in a way. The knowledge has to kind of come *on top of the previous knowledge*" (my italics). Even though exactly why or how this should be is not articulated explicitly, it is still obvious that Samson

*implicitly* understands that there is a structure to the knowledge transfer.

Even though Terry comes from a strong apprenticeship-like background in terms of his own education into the profession, he does indicate that he has a natural bent towards teaching and it is perhaps this tendency that directs him to looking for the more generic skills in his profession: “I always liked going to a principle, going to a basic way of doing something”. Terry struggles to elaborate on this generic aspect to what he’s trying to teach, explaining it as “I desperately don’t want them to learn the method, I want them to develop their own minds. So, what I think I’m giving them [is] the hammer and the screwdriver, and telling them how to use it, but not telling them what to do with it”. This seems to illustrate context independent skills that extend beyond a simply context specific formula and into a more generic cognitive realm of development. Terry, lacking any pedagogic theory to articulate these cognitive links, explains these principles as, “they [the students] must learn the *tools* from me, and the fact that... you can extend the tools beyond you and your hand and the tool, into something remarkable, by the way you use it, and that’s what I’m trying to get across” (my emphasis).

Once again we see here an example, not so much of an *explicit* Vertical Discourse, but rather implicit principles at work in the structuring of the knowledge that the lecturers are attempting to transmit. In terms of my involvement as head of department, however, a Vertical Discourse is not only apparent in the design, but also intentional and deliberate. It is perhaps this specific variable, not seen in the case of Louise as head of the Multimedia Programme, which could have a dominant impact in the overall perception of the discourse of the programme.

#### **6.3.4 Re-contextualisation Practices**

Matthew’s process of designing the course, seen as a balancing act “balancing academic [and] education aspects” is fundamentally based on his experience at other tertiary institutions, but also heavily influenced by his experiences in the fields of research and policy and legislation development. For him, the main Re-contextualising taking place is to rework information and knowledge to the particular context of the institution, based on the local context; “comparing it with what’s going on in terms of the discussion within the... National Film and Video Foundation (NFVF) and [the] Cape Film Commission (CFC), looking at... the Sector Education and Training Authority (SETA) work” and “...also to look at the

contextualisation of South African and African film history, and keep up with that. Also the recent research, like the Price Cooper Waterhouse work, from [the] NFVF Indaba". Also, where appropriate, the work is re-contextualised to convert dry theory into more context specific applications of the theory. Matthew describes meticulously how he explains the theory of communication to make it relevant to a learner film-maker, for whom some of the concepts seem far removed from the reality of film-making.

"I'm saying to them at the beginning of the communication course that you're going to use communication in all facets of film-making, right through from the moment when you're pitching ideas to a group of people, you're doing public speaking... and later as a professional, how you conduct yourself, [your] code of conduct, your personal appearance, body language, all those sort of things. Then in your writing, scripts, all a form of communication, what you're doing is use of non-verbal communication".

We see here how Matthew is taking 'dry theory', as far as the students are concerned, and making it more relevant for the student by Re-contextualising it within an example that illustrates its application.

The strong reliance on textbooks as a source is echoed in the structures of both my and Samson's courses. Samson states "a lot of my information comes from text books... and the information that I've used has kind of grown as those books have become more available, because I have the knowledge in my head, but some of the books present it in a way which is very nice for teaching". We see here how Samson is considering the quality of the book in terms of presenting the course and course content. To do this he is using his *Professional Experience*, which he readily admits to being scattered and segmented, and compares it to how well the text books convey this knowledge, affecting his own approach to constructing the knowledge at the same time. "My knowledge has come from all over the place at different times and stuff, but I think that putting together this course and developing this course has enabled me to focus my own knowledge and kind of sort it out because it comes from so many scattered, different places". His *Education Experiences* have helped in the design of the course, but more so, teaching has helped him to discover what he knows and forced him to evaluate where that knowledge has come from. He states that "there are things that I've discovered that I know how to do on set, professionally, but I never really figured out why or how it works". So, teaching has been valuable for him because he has had to figure out why certain things happen and how they work, precisely so that this can be conveyed to students. For Samson, therefore, this is an embryonic iterative process, displaying the beginnings of

reflection on his teaching practice. We also see a very clear example of how the discourse of the profession is finding footholds within the discourse of pedagogy.

### **6.3.5 Preliminary Conclusions**

The main influences for the Film and Television Programme are equally distributed between *Professional Experience* and *Teaching Experience*, if the latter is perceived as the individual's profession. There is therefore equal emphasis on the Distributive Rules, as a form of Regulative Discourse, as there is on a legitimate Regulative Discourse, impacting on the course and programme design. Here again the lecturers defer to the experience of the head of department (myself) and mainly due to the perceived pedagogic knowledge base. The predominant discourse seems to be vertical in nature, although there are still substantial horizontal aspects within the design, with this predominance clearly influenced by the head of department.

I will now return to a discussion of the data, synthesising the themes that I have highlighted in the above analysis.

University of Cape Town

## Chapter 7: Discussion

The following discussion not only summarises the analysis, but also attempts to find an explanation for what is taking place in the design process in the institution and describe this in Bernstein's terms.

From the above it is evident that the main influence, in terms of pedagogic practice and the influence on design in the institution, is that of experience, with *Professional Experience* (the experience of the profession) being the most influential, followed by *Teaching Experience* (the experience of teaching in a formal setting) and lastly *Education Experience* (the experience of being taught). It is interesting to note that this contradicts the general assumptions surrounding instruction at a tertiary level where Gagné (1971, quoted in Miller (1987:3)) states that "most college instructors set about their initial task of teaching courses by using a model derived from their own college experiences, in other words, they try to emulate their own professors". We see in this institution a very clear indication that this is not always the case. Especially as the college experiences are in some cases missing or seem less than satisfactory in this particular case.

The Multimedia Programme is predominantly based on the socialisation and informal learning process in the professional environment, as would have been experienced by the lecturers during their own professional careers, but taking into consideration the problems in that approach and their experiences of the vagaries of such a haphazard methodology. The general consensus drawn from the data is that, should the learners only be taught the computer programmes or applications, they may become well versed in running the technology, i.e. becoming 'button pushers', while achieving no skill as a designer; something that occurs in a less structured or standardised and codified way in terms of the transmission of the practice. The computer programme is seen as an extension of the designer, "a pen that you write with... it's just not a pen" (Susan). One can perhaps start to see the complexity of separating conceptualisation from fabrication in terms of design in the virtual mediums. Louise even goes so far as to indicate that this separation is exactly what they are trying to avoid. "We're trying to do both things at the same time, give them the design, give them the theory in principle, but give them the practical skill, right at the same time, so that the two run parallel".

We do see a clear distinction between lecturers in the multimedia department, where some are returning primarily to the experience of the profession for decisions, and others to the experience of being taught, though in neither case exclusively so. This relates to Louise's stress on the intuitiveness of the course design. She also describes a broad range of sources, yet remains unable to articulate a precise reasoning behind all of the decisions that are taken for the course and *intuitiveness* is her best option as descriptor. The experience is most often negotiated through conversations with colleagues, where intuition is seen to play a large part. It is perhaps the lack of strong academic theory that proves the hurdle, where having such a lexicon may assist with articulating many of the ideas that are considered intuitive. Louise indicates that the department "choose[s] to start with [a computer application] because we choose to start to teach the students about typography, because typography would be a really important core issue in learning about design". She does not articulate why typography is such a core issue, or indeed why this is considered as such by the designers. An interesting design consideration that seems to illustrate these unarticulated elements of the programme is where Louise relates the decision by the department to include a papier-mâché mask as part of the programme for the specific year under discussion. Here she shows how a decision was taken that was contrary to the typical reasoning for the design of media programmes, rather using a "holistic approach" with which she indicates she feels uncomfortable. Louise asks,

"Does anyone in industry require of them the skill of doing a papier-mâché mask? Perhaps not. But is it relevant to include it in the course? Yes, because it gives them [the students] a physical experience as well, and a design experience, thinking how to cover this mask. And a personal experience because they have to create something from themselves, from within".

These decisions seem to be taken against the logic of what is required in terms of basics for the students to be 'employable'. It includes other ideas of what is required that flow from a more intuitive and unarticulated source.

In the Film and Television Programme, by contrast to the Multimedia Programme, there seem to be stronger links to an academic influence on structure. The film and television department has a strong theory basis to articulate its considerations and reasoning behind using a particular approach to the design of the courses and programme, or indeed in its methodologies. There is therefore more often a clearer articulation of the sources of decision-making in terms of design. The experience of the profession in this department, versus the experience of education or the educational environment, shares the same importance as in the Multimedia Programme, but limited to the more craft-oriented lecturers.

The design of the Film and Television Programme, however, leans more heavily towards referencing the experience of teaching in a tertiary environment, with additional information coming from the realm of the film-maker's *Professional Experience*, rather than experience being the driving force. In contrast to multimedia there is therefore a less homogeneous situation in terms of individual lecturer's predisposition to relying on a practical experience to inform design. Some lecturers distinctly draw on a more theoretical framework, drawing from their educational experience, while others draw predominantly from their experience of their own professional practice, as seen in multimedia. The emphasis is therefore located in the mix of the individuals and their specific course contributions, rather than generally to the programme. While there is a discussion forum in the Film and Television Programme that considers the general direction of the programme, there is less of a sense of collegiality as there is in the Multimedia Programme, with a perceived theory/practice divide setting up what could be considered subtle animosities that separate and divide the department. Also, the diverse interests and approaches to course design based on the differing experiences create fewer opportunities to recognise shared points of concord. In both departments though, they defer to the head of that department who, as can be seen, both have different experiences and attitudes that shape their own views on design in general.

Samson's responses illustrate the disjointed and diverse nature of some of the lecturers' experiences in the film and television department, and how these experiences impact on various aspects of the design process. Samson's case is one that illustrates how diverse the influences can be in and on an individual. He states,

"I then learnt a lot just practically by *doing* in a fairly haphazard kind of way. Like, you're in a situation, you have to film something and you don't know how to do it, and you figure it out. ... And then again, working more, doing more in the field... putting it all together... my knowledge has come from all over the place at different times".

The haphazard acquiring of knowledge in different situations, both formal and informal, educational and experiential, is only clarified for the lecturers through the process of delivering their courses and learning from instances that have and have not worked in this delivery.

The collegial nature of the Film and Television Programme and its lecturers is similar to that of the Multimedia Programme, where information is shared between peers. Here however, we see there is more discussion surrounding academics and pedagogy than is found in the

Multimedia Programme. These discussions are driven by me as head of department, and Matthew; due to our own interests and studies into the field of education, and due to our involvement in the various quality-related functions we fulfil in the institution. Samson indicates that he's "got a lot... from you and from Matthew, in terms of teaching technique, which I didn't know before, and it started to improve my course". Both Samson and Terry indicate the involvement of the head of department in the design of their courses. Samson feels the design has

"been negotiated with you as head of department, I mean, certainly you've pushed myself and others to become more organized which is a good thing and the school and the demands of the Council for Higher Education, etc. has pushed us towards doing organized lesson plans, etc. etc. and again it's a very good thing, it's... made the whole process better",

whereas Terry acknowledges that he inherited the course and thought that he could change it, but realised that what was in place was fairly sound theory-wise and only needed more practical input. Terry's comments very clearly establish the theory/practice divide to the perceived identities of the lecturers, while still showing how they can function as a unit. For the more practically oriented courses in the programme, which Samson and Terry both represent, the emphasis remains experience. Samson acknowledges that his *Professional Experience* is his main source on which he draws, and Terry's 50 years of practical experience leave this in little doubt.

Another observation is how often the lecturers for these programmes have come to the institution with no formal teaching experience, or teacher training (even in my case, where my learning has subsequently taken place in the field of educational practice) and how teaching and all that it entails is *picked up* along the way through trial and error, and this experience in turn informs design. In contrast to the Multimedia Programme, the Film and Television Programme acknowledges the experience of the education for the profession, and in most cases is seen in a positive light. This influences both the individual courses and the programme as a whole. Samson indicates that many of his decisions are because "I've been one [a film student]". And in my own case, the original programme design was based on the actual curriculum and adapted from my experiences of a tertiary film and television programme at a South African Technikon. This would seem to indicate a stronger academic bent to the general approach of the programme, due to the emphasis of the design leaning towards the academic environment.

We see therefore that both programmes do tend to conform to Toohey's Performance Approach type, in terms of design. It is the identification of *roles* or *performances* that is important. These then need to be "defined... and analysed to determine what knowledge, skills, attributes and dispositions students will need to acquire in order to perform them. Knowledge and skills are then sequenced from the most elementary, prerequisite ones to the more complex, sophisticated final performances" (Toohey, 1999:93). This is an apt description for what we see taking place at the institution. Toohey's discussion further supports this when she indicates that "performance or competency-based curricula are most likely to be found in those courses which offer some kind of vocational preparation" (*ibid*:94). This compares well to the data, if one is to consider how *experience* is the primary influence on the lecturers and therefore directly on the design process itself. The lecturers in effect embody the notion of the *role* or *performance* that Toohey is referring to, as their experience has shaped their own roles or performances, which they then use implicitly and around which they then design a course or programme. However, this does not explain why the courses, if so similar, are perceived as being different in terms of the level of the offering, where one is seen as at an FET (Further Education and Training), and the other at an HET (Higher Education and Training) level.<sup>8</sup> What we see in Toohey and in the data does not direct us to a distinct argument to help to explain this disparity.

Even though experience of the field-of-practice is the fundamental influence in the design process for both programmes, the application and mix of these experiences and how they relate to each other in the programme itself, in terms of the relationships between the lecturers, manifest in different programmes having different predominant views of knowledge. In both cases these different views are created by a mix of individual designer's views, or Toohey's *Hybrid Approach* to course or programme design. For the most part the heads of department are possibly the primary filters in terms of determining the overall approach adopted by the programme and, as can be seen from the data, the Film and Television Programme has a stronger grounding in the Vertical Discourse than the Multimedia Programme, perhaps giving an explanation for the perceived degree-worthy nature of that programme.

---

<sup>8</sup> FET and HET are seen as *bands* within the NQF, with FET only going as high as Level 4 and HET taking over from Level 5. The diplomas at the institution are Level 5 qualifications; however they are seen as being appropriate for a Level 6 qualification, i.e. a first degree.

At this point we need to return to the broader conceptualisations of knowledge to try to further explain the design process and its implications. We have seen what the influences are on the design process, and how they manifest in some aspects that relate to the lecturers' design decisions, but there is still the notion that one programme manifests itself at a degree-worthy level and not the other. To do this, we need to use Bernstein's conceptualisations of Horizontal and Vertical Discourse to explicate the data.

The main difference therefore between these two programmes seems to be the shift in emphasis between a predominantly Horizontal Discourse, seen in the Multimedia programme, versus a predominantly Vertical Discourse, seen in the Film and Television Programme. I speak of *predominant* because both courses do not seem to fit neatly into either one of Bernstein's two main categories of discourse, sharing enough elements of both to warrant further investigation into what this could mean. In order however to further develop this analysis, we have to make the assumption that both courses are examples of some type of Vertical Discourse, and that this is illustrated by the Re-contextualisation that is taking place. This is important, as it is only within a Vertical Discourse that we find a possible third Bernstein concept to describe what is taking place in the design of these programmes and the perceived difference in the level of the offering, namely the Horizontal Knowledge Structure. To begin this discussion we must consider what we do see in these two programmes.

Both these programmes exhibit elements of Horizontal Discourse in that the following elements are present: the context dependency of some of the courses, the fact that there is a shared community of practice, that the learning is segmental in some cases, and that the learning is oriented to the field of practice. At the same time, however, the programmes are definitely not examples of an oral transmission of knowledge (witness the use of textbooks, references to the impact of legislation, interaction on peer reviewed websites and texts of various types); neither are they necessarily common-sense knowledge. In some cases the extent of the technical knowledge required for the practice is counter-intuitive, and in other cases, some courses venture beyond the common-sense into generic, transferable skills and cognitive development that goes beyond the borders of what is required merely 'to be employable' in a specific career. At the same time we witness the above, the programmes also display notions that relate them to a Vertical Discourse; there are elements of the courses and programmes that are not context-dependent; there is explication taking place, there is a

hierarchical organisation to much of the content, and in some cases there are principles to that structuring. The contradiction is that so many aspects of both discourses are present, with clear evidence of each discourse, when they cannot both be present as Bernstein's concepts are meant to describe two separate and distinctly discrete discourses.

It is also possible to identify Re-contextualising taking place in both programmes and therefore to tentatively commit to both programmes being of a vertical nature. If there are elements of verticality and horizontality at play in the design process, and if Re-contextualising is taking place, and, finally, if we accept that the courses are both predominantly a Vertical Discourse, then we can once again turn to Bernstein to find a possible concept to explain what is taking place.

Bernstein talks of a Horizontal Knowledge Structure that is one of two types of Vertical Discourse. If we consider this as a possible concept to explain the process taking place in the design of these programmes, we have to consider what discourses, or *languages*, are interacting with each other, as described by Bernstein, as one of the two possible manifestations of this type of pedagogic discourse. Bernstein's discussion of Horizontal Knowledge Structures is fairly brief and he gives no direct description of this concept, barring examples to illustrate his train of thought. If we are therefore to assume that we are seeing a Horizontal Knowledge Structure, then we need to consider how we could describe this and look for evidence that it is indeed taking place. I will therefore reconsider the data looking for evidence of *languages* that could be interacting with each other.

## **7.1 Horizontal Knowledge Structures**

### **7.1.1 The Multimedia Programme**

What can be seen in the data is the attempt by the lecturers to appropriate a lesser known discourse or *language*, that of pedagogy, with the *languages* or vocabularies that constitute their own professional discourses. Hannah comments on the contextualising of her experience in the field of her profession, to her emerging knowledge of the field of pedagogy, "in other words, all the stuff that I know, like assessment type of thing, you know and that you do without even thinking, it [the lecturer training] put it in a formal structure". Even though seemingly confused by this struggle between understanding the discourses and how they interact, she still understands the value of this experience: "But it does help, because it does make it kind of clearer". Hannah is still a newcomer to teaching and explains the

process of achieving an understanding of what she's doing as a lecturer through the experience of teaching. We see her strong understanding of the profession bending the curriculum to achieve both her objectives in terms of teaching for the discipline, as well as the objective of achieving the academic requirements for the year. The teacher training courses that the lecturers have been on are for the most part seen as beneficial, but only in so far as they make *explicit* some of the actions that are *natural* or *usual* as far the lecturers are concerned.

Louise's examples of discussions taking place around the curriculum illustrate the process of negotiating these understandings of discourses, between the various experiences of the profession versus the various experiences of teaching and being taught. The results being that "the course will be changed when you find out they don't work properly. But also... we all discuss amongst us. ...new ideas come about through discussion". Fundamental to this process is the struggle to articulate the two discourses, namely that of their professional practice (their own professional discourse), and that of pedagogy, and letting them *speak* to each other.

Stuart's description of the integrated nature of the multimedia professional/pedagogue dichotomy, offers a possible reason for why this type of discourse dialogue is taking place. He is advocating the necessity for practice and the experience of the profession to inform the lecturer, thus creating a more realistic picture of the career and therefore to have a deeper understanding of how to teach multimedia. However, this does discriminate between the two experiences and separates them into categories that can either support or oppose each other. This is perhaps where the struggle begins as these two discourses now need to be merged within the new context of the academy.

Louise makes it very clear that there is no framework, specific to her teaching of the field, that directly assists her in designing the programme. "There is no theory that I've learned, no book theory, that I can say, 'oh yes, I can apply chapter 12, now'". This is not to say that she feels there is no theory that is applicable, but rather that the theory has not always been adapted to the particular requirements of teaching design in a technologically driven context. In effect she has to *create* her own theory to derive an answer on what works and what does not work in the context of the institution, and this is created in a very practical way through *Teaching Experience*.

Richard tries in his approach to create a *language* that is appropriate to convey the complexities of what is being taught to a young audience that he feels struggles with understanding in general:

“I basically... try and put myself in the other guys’ shoes and understand that they don’t know much and never use language they don’t understand. I’ll try and bring it down to earth, basically. I’ll try and get the message across in that way... not speaking over their heads”.

This requires that the knowledge of the experience of the field be married with the knowledge of how the field is being taught, and then still further contextualised into a language that is pitched correctly for the audience. Susan seems to echo this sentiment, especially in terms of trying to understand how to pitch the offering correctly. Her reading-up during the initial stages of her tenure at the institution were specifically to “understand the structure of training and how to communicate your thoughts”.

### 7.1.2 The Film and Television Programme

Matthew describes this struggle of *languages* more succinctly, as a balancing act, referring to both the professional and the pedagogic nature of the programme design. Matthew is making this observation not only in terms of the profession, but also in terms of the institution, and the service it provides to its learners, versus the needs of national education as legislated through various white papers, policies and acts. Here there is a clearer articulation of the Pedagogic Discourse and a more explicit understanding of how this is shaping the *Professional Discourse*, as it evolves into a programme of study within a tertiary education context.

Matthew shows a deeper understanding of the problem of translating what he’s trying to achieve into a more pedagogic framework, tending to reference the legislative aspects of the pedagogic language. “It’s difficult for me to translate it into more exact sort of educational discourse. It’s here, but it’s not in a SAQA, CHE way”; which illustrates that there are distinct vocabularies to the different discourses while still acknowledging that one could contextualise the course within educational theory. For Matthew, a dominant requirement of his teaching is trying to convey the multi-layered meanings that are the language of film, on top of and in relationship to the practical requirements of capturing a production. For Matthew the learners need to understand that “this medium is not just... neutral technology...

that they could... during, for instance doing camerawork and lighting, that... shooting using a certain angle... could have a political significance". And he tries to build this into the re-contextualisation of the theories he teaches in his classes. These are a highly complex set of languages that are being synthesised into a single action. On the simplest level the learner is applying knowledge of practice, how to structure a shot and how to light it; on the next level, the lecturer is hoping the students will begin to see the connections to more important ideologies and discourses that could result from a particular use of the medium within the field-of-practice; and on the next level, we have the lecturer who is trying to encode personal experience into a neat, accessible package of knowledge that can be experienced in a practical manner by the learners.

Samson's experiences seem to struggle less with the problem of ideology and more with the problem of transmission and how to encode the knowledge for that transmission. Samson's conversations and research into manuals and books, especially those that have already found a way to package content, seem his main concern. The process of design has led him to better understand the origins of his own knowledge and how disjointed and disaggregated they are, and in this way to focus on a way of getting this across. "One thing about teaching is that there are things that I've discovered that I know how to do on set, professionally, but I never really figured out why, or how it works. So, teaching has been valuable for me, because I've had to figure out why certain things happen and how it works" with the idea of being able to transmit this knowledge to others. This "figuring out" is the process whereby the one *language*, that of pedagogy, intersects with the other *language*, that of the field-of-practice.

Terry's experience shows how an intervention from a strong pedagogic source, in terms of design, has proven itself to hold up against his own professional scrutiny, to the extent that he has had to admit that he has found it difficult to make the wholesale changes he thought would be necessary to the course design he was given; settling to re-contextualise some of the more theoretical ideas within a more practical application:

"In the first place I didn't design the course, I took over a course... and I had deep feelings in the beginning of, oh yes, we can change this, we can make that look better. In lots of cases, it wasn't, because what you'd put down is kind of solid. But it was solid in a more academic way, so I regard us, together, as being a team, we are a team... you on an academical (*sic*) designing side, and me concentrating on turning the screws, handling the layout of the practical side. I do regard my stuff as more practical (*sic*) applicable, although I am doing the

theory from a practical perspective”.

Here the gap between theory and practice has been bridged by ensuring that a member of staff, with the appropriate experience, has *translated* or Re-contextualised sections of the course into the educational context using the appropriate language from the Pedagogic Discourse.

## 7.2 Identification of Languages

What the lecturers all seem to be struggling with is the process of shifting their experience into the realm of education and lecturing, drawing from their own professional discourses to inform the Regulative Discourse and Instructional Discourse within the particular discipline specialisation. In effect, they are trying to create the Regulative Discourse and Instructional Discourse peculiar to their fields-of-practice when transferred into the academy. However, Instructional and Regulative Discourse have their own identities within a wholly separate field-of-practice, namely pedagogy, and the designers are attempting to take on board this second Regulative Discourse that has developed for education as a profession. They are trying therefore to align this new discourse, a secondary or subsequent Regulative Discourse, which for most of them is that of pedagogy, and align it to their own primary *Professional Discourse* with its own regulatory and socialisation frameworks or Distributive Rules.

Pedagogic Discourse is, as quoted earlier, the appropriation of discourses, or *languages*, “brought into a special relationship with each other, for the purpose of their selective transmission and acquisition” (Bernstein, 1996:47) within a pedagogic situation. Bernstein’s concept of Horizontal Knowledge Structures illustrates this relationship between the Regulative Discourse of pedagogy and the discipline specific discourse of the profession, by explaining how the Pedagogic Discourse for the discipline is developed “by *addition* of another specialized language” (*ibid*:176) (italic in original) to the Regulative Discourse, in this case the discourse of the profession as exemplified in the Distributive Rules for that profession.

## Chapter 8: Implications

### 8.1 Interpretation

In terms of Bernstein's concept of Horizontal Knowledge Structures, the two *languages* that are struggling with each other are that of the professional fields represented by the programmes and their individual Distributive Rules, and the specialised language that is pedagogic in nature, namely the Regulative Discourse. This Regulative Discourse is more clearly witnessed in the references to the various training programmes that have been undertaken and the audit process for the CHE, undergone by the institution as a whole. The difficulty in clearly defining the discourse of the two programmes (i.e. an either/or choice between a Horizontal or Vertical Discourse) would seem to indicate a disputable nature to the discourses of the two programmes, representing a possible Horizontal Knowledge Structure. Also, if we consider Bernstein's own proposition that 'crafts' are indeed *tacit* Horizontal Knowledge Structures, when there is no explicit pedagogy, we can perhaps ask whether they are therefore fully fledged Horizontal Knowledge Structures when the pedagogy is *explicit* or is moving towards such a state. It would seem that the heads of departments' conceptualisations of knowledge and experiences are the primary catalyst in shaping the predominant discourse in the *hybridity* of the programme, with implicit or explicit specialised language of pedagogy, lending a more horizontal or vertical aspect to the overall discourse respectively.

In terms of the *Education Experience*, the variety of responses to this concept share at least one common thread: that the lecturers' own experience of what and how they were taught fell short of their expectations, or had little impact on their own decision-making processes in terms of wanting to emulate these performances. In some cases, this is because no such model existed, as in some cases where the lecturer had no formal education post-matric; or in some cases may have been so long in the lecturer's past, that it was generally understood that whatever techniques may have been useful then were no longer applicable today in a very changed environment of new technology. They therefore fall back on to more recent or accessible experiences.

In terms of design, the one aspect that all the lecturers do seem to agree on is the fact that there is a progression in the choice of applications and content and in the difficulty factor of each, determined by the level of expertise the learner should have achieved at any given point

in the learning process. This would seem to confirm a logical structure to the design of a vertical or incremental nature. The lecturers, however, seem to have difficulty separating the practice from the technology of their profession, probably pointing to a conceptualisation of what it means to be a designer or film-maker and how these two separate aspects (practice and technology) are implicitly seen as one.

*Professional Experience* therefore informs and guides the choices and decisions the lecturers make. These diverse experiences achieve a form of synthesis over time and become implicit, and are *used* implicitly, by the lecturer. Over time this synthesis is operationalised by the lecturer into an understanding of what the content and structure of the design *should* be for a possible course or programme and comes mainly from the experience of the field-of-practice. The intellectual field of the institution, with its pragmatic necessities and Regulative and Instructional Discourses of pedagogy, which are alien in most cases to the lecturer, also shape content and structure but in a way that is not always consistent with the experiences or preconceptions of the lecturers. The transition from field-of-practice to intellectual field is a cognitive effort that tries to align the regulatory social discourse, the Distributive Rules of the profession, with the Regulative Discourse of the academy, in many cases without the benefit of a rigorous foundation in pedagogy.

The historical nature of the transition of these professional fields into the educational sphere is such that in most cases design is by experienced practitioners from the field-of-practice, and hence most similar courses look alike, drawn as they are predominantly from the experience of the profession. The semblance of a tertiary level type programme, in some cases, is through the mix of different people with diverse backgrounds who give a more rounded programme, due to the diversity of their input and experiences. Also, the final decision *filter* in the process of design – usually the heads of department – plays an important role in shaping the general direction of the design process; with a more education oriented perspective lending a concomitant emphasis to the educational aspects of the design process, and a more practically oriented perspective doing the same for a more practical design.

## **8.2 Significance**

We see therefore that both the researched programmes fit broadly into Toohey's Performance Approach in terms of programme design, but that each shows significant differences in the application of this process, and this difference could be explained in terms of *hybridity*, or the

mix of the courses and lecturers for each programme. Bernstein gives us finer analytical tools to understand these differences, which has to do with discourses or modes of knowledge and how the lecturers in the two programmes are drawing implicitly on conceptualisations of knowledge in terms of Horizontal and Vertical Discourses. Both programmes emerge as having a Vertical Discourse with strong elements of a Horizontal Discourse, but different mixes within the programmes give each its distinctiveness. The Film and Television Programme emerges having a stronger element of verticality and the Multimedia Programme a stronger horizontality in terms of the overall design. Lecturers are using Distributive Rules, the social regulatory rules of the profession, to inform and formulate the Regulative Discourse of the pedagogy for their discipline. The Re-contextualising Rules of these specific Pedagogic Devices allow for experience to become a discourse that is appropriated into an emergent Regulative Discourse.

When considering film and television and multimedia programmes as programmes of study, they can be considered Regions, as previously discussed, but Regions with a difference, and this lies not only in the construction of the Regulative Discourse, but also in what Singulars are being appropriated into the mix. The Distributive Rules are therefore also playing a role in deciding the *what*, or the content, of these emerging tertiary programmes. Singulars are being drawn from the field-of-practice and not the intellectual field. This would be appropriate for these particular types of programmes, considered to be a craft. Gamble (2002:63) describes craft as “situated activities with practical mastery as transmission outcome, (and) at the same time ensembles of specialised meanings available only to those who have mastered the principles that organise such symbolic meanings”. Gamble’s meanings can be read here to also mean *languages* as earlier elaborated on, where the language need not be verbal, but can be physical or kinetic and still communicated. Pedagogic Discourse for the specialised fields of film and television production and multimedia design therefore Re-contextualises specific activities and their contexts, in such a way as to allow the acquirer to master not only the activities themselves, but also the principles behind the activities.

The problem in terms of this research is, though it does elaborate on *what* the differences are in the programmes, it does not adequately *explain* the differences in terms of their *hybridity* or in their mix. It is not clear whether the particular mix for the particular programme is inherent in the knowledge for that field, predisposing the lecturer to design in a certain way,

and for a head of department to make choices to a particular end, or whether it is the individuals themselves that are influencing how knowledge is structured in the institution, towards a particular (un)articulated goal.

It could be proposed that it is in fact the individuals that are collectively moving towards a structuring of knowledge that is best suited for the teaching of their respective professional fields. This is achieved through a process of Re-contextualising their field-of-practice knowledge into the new context of the academy, through the experience of pedagogic practice. The Distributive Rules of their respective vocational and craft professions are co-opted to substitute for a Regulative Discourse while they negotiate an understanding of their new identities as pedagogic professionals and what this means for the transmission of their knowledge. Once this is achieved, the Distributive Rules reformulate the *pure* Regulative Discourse of pedagogy, to specialise it for the teaching of their particular craft. This *subsequent* Regulative Discourse is one that combines the regulatory aspects of the vocational discipline with the regulatory aspects of pedagogic interactions, to create a *merged* regulatory discourse. It is in this process that we see the most unique aspects of this case of programme design.

### **8.3 Some limitations of this research and possibilities for future research**

This research not only helps us to think differently about film and television and media education as practice, but has also raised a number of issues that should be considered for future research.

Firstly, there is the issue of the focus of this research on the influences on the lecturer as part of a social construct, rather than on how these influences manifest in certain procedures and coping mechanisms. Though the one leads into the other, I chose to delimit the argument by focusing on conceptualisations of knowledge (a critical approach) rather than a discussion of mechanisms (a functional approach). As ethno-methodological research, the methods I am referring to are cognitive methods (and not mechanistic methods) *prior* to a practical application of the cognitive (which is where I would place the procedures and coping mechanisms referred to). I therefore chose to draw the observations into a strongly theoretically driven discussion to try to explain what is taking place. The data however could be rich ground for further discussion and analysis surrounding these topics of procedures and mechanisms.

Secondly, with the above in mind, a discussion of the concepts of Reservoir and Repertoire (see Bernstein, 1996:171 and 1999:159), neglected in this research due to these concepts' implication of having only a Horizontal Discourse nature, could be developed and applied to the data. This could present a compelling account of ways in which the lecturers on these programmes and/or courses develop their own repertoire of evaluative criteria and ways of selecting and presenting content by referring to practices circulating within the reservoirs of practice communities and how the lecturers begin to shape these elements making the implicit explicit.

#### 8.4 Conclusions

I will frame the conclusions in terms of the original questions that defined this research.

The recognised influences on the design process, in terms of the data that were gathered, focus on the *experiences* of the lecturers, specifically their professional, teaching and education experiences, with *Professional Experience* the overriding factor in terms of design. Other environmental factors, such as peer groups and availability of printed matter, as sources of content and structure in the design process, were hinted at in the data but not fully developed due to the nature of the questions in the present research instrument. The diversity of the mix of experiences found in the case of each programme contributed to expanding on how the implicit conceptualisations of knowledge, as they came from the field-of-practice, were translated into the different contexts within the institution. The Multimedia Programme is conceived more in terms of a horizontal conceptualisation, struggling with the vertical elements, whereas the Film and Television Programme tends towards a more explicitly elaborated Vertical Discourse.

These above, interrelated concepts were used to try to elaborate on the possible reasons for labeling the former programme as Further Education and the latter as Higher Education. The design process, and the part the individuals played in it, in terms of their conceptions of the various disciplines, is seen as significant to define why this perception may have occurred. The above conceptualisations of knowledge, analysed in combination with the data on the influences of experience, help to some extent to explain the resulting net effects on the perception of the level of the offering. Where the level of the offering is regarded as *degree-worthy*, the strength of the design process for the programme is in that it is translating a

Horizontal Discourse more effectively into a Vertical Discourse, though not without difficulties in that process. In this regard, theory plays an important role in defining explicitly what for the most part is implicit in the decisions and actions of the designers.

The knowledge to inform decisions of a pedagogic nature comes from *experience*, and particularly *Professional Experience* of the craft-specific vocation. This is only clearly defined in the cases of those lecturers who have little or no knowledge of pedagogic theory, for this particular context. It is less clear in the case of those lecturers who do have developed pedagogic theory to support their views. In this latter case, *identity* could play an important role. Professional identity being a separate influencing factor that was not considered for this research but, based on some of the data, could play a vital role in defining the decision process further.

## References

- Atchoarena, D. & Delluc, A. (2002) *Revisiting Technical and Vocational Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: An update on trends, innovations and challenges*, UNESCO.
- Barnett, R. (1992) *Improving higher education: total quality care*, SRHE & Open University Press: Buckingham.
- Bennel, P. (1991) *Vocational Training in Sub-Saharan Africa: Lessons for Post Apartheid South Africa*, Education Policy Unit: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Bernstein, B. (1996) *Pedagogy, Symbolic control and Identity*, Taylor and Francis: London.
- Bernstein, B. (1999) Vertical and Horizontal Discourse: an essay in *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 20, No. 2, p157 – 173.
- Bordwell, D. & Thompson, K. (2004) *Film Art: An introduction*, McGraw-Hill.
- Buckingham, D. (2003) *Media Education, literacy, learning and contemporary culture*, Polity.
- Connelly, F. M. (2000) Life in the foothills of curriculum in *Journal of curriculum studies*, Vol. 21, No. 6, p743 – 748.
- Cook, P. & Bernink, M (1999) *The Cinema Book* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition), British Film Institute Publishing.
- Cooper, D. (1997) Introduction: Comments on the ‘Market’ and/or ‘Development’ University with respect to UCT discussion on ‘Changing Research Cultures’ in *Social Dynamics*, Vol. 23, No.1, p23 – 41.
- Cliff, A. F. and Woodward, R. (2004) How do academics come to know? The structure and contestation of discipline-specific knowledge in a Design school in *Higher Education*, No. 48, p269 – 290.
- Cresswell, J. W. (1998) *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*, SAGE: London.
- Dewey, J. (1938) *Experience and Education*, The MacMillan Company.
- Du Plooy, G. M. (1989) *Understanding Television: Guidelines for visual literacy*, JUTA.
- Edwards, A. D. (1987) Language codes and classroom practice in *Oxford Educational Review*, Vol. 13, No. 3, p237 – 247.
- Fourie, P. J. (Ed) (2001) *Media Studies Volume 1: Institutions, Theories and Issues*, JUTA.
- Fourie, P. J. (Ed) (2001) *Media Studies Volume 2: Content, Audiences and Production*,

JUTA.

- Fox, D. (1983) Personal theories of Teaching in *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, p151 – 163.
- Gamble, J. (2001) Modeling the invisible: the pedagogy of craft apprenticeship in *Studies in Continuing Education*, Vol. 23, No. 2, p185 – 200.
- Gamble, J. (2002) Teaching without words: Tacit knowledge in apprenticeship in *Journal of Education*, No. 28, p63 – 82.
- Gamble, J. (2003) Retrieving the general from the particular: the structure of craft knowledge in *Journal of Education*, No. 29, p73 – 91.
- Gagné, R. M. (1971) Learning theory, educational media and individualized instruction in Hooper R. (Ed) *The curriculum: context, Design and Development*, Oliver and Boyd.
- Gagné, R. M. & Briggs, L. J. (1974) *Principles of Instructional Design*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Gianetti, L. (2002) *Understanding Movies*, Prentice Hall.
- Gibson, R. (1977) Bernstein's classification & framing: a critique in *Higher Educational Review*, No. 9, p23 – 45.
- Gibson, R. (1984) *Structuralism and Education*, Methuen: London.
- Kelly, A. V. (1999) *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice* (4<sup>th</sup> Edition), Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- King, R. (1976) Bernstein's sociology of the school: some propositions tested in *British Journal of Sociology*, No. 27, p430 – 443.
- King, R. (1981) Bernstein sociology of the school in *British Journal of Sociology*, No. 32, p259 – 265.
- Kraak, A. (1991) *Beyond the Market: Comprehensive institutional restructuring of South African Labour Markets, Education, Training and Work*, Education Policy Unit: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Lauglo, J. & Lillis, K. (Eds) (1988) *Vocational Education: An international perspective*, Vol. 6, Comparative and International Education Series, Pergamon Press.
- Marsh, C. J. (1992) *Key concepts to understanding curriculum*, Falmer Press: London.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996) *Qualitative Research Design*, Sage: London.
- Miller, A. H. (1987) *Course design for university lecturers*, Kogan Page: London.
- Monaco, J. (2000) *How to read a film: Movies, Media, Multimedia*, Oxford University Press.
- O'Leary, Z. (2004) *The essential guide to doing research*, SAGE: London.

- O'Shaughnessy, M. & Stadler, J. (2004) *Media and Society: An introduction*, Oxford University Press.
- Pring, R. (1975) Bernstein's classification and framing of knowledge in *Scottish Educational Studies*, No. 7, p67 – 74.
- Ramsden, P. (1992) *Learning to teach in higher education*, Routledge/Falmer: London and New York.
- Rumney, A. (1989) *New Directions in Vocational Education*, Routledge.
- Silverman, D. (1993) *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for analyzing talk text and interaction*, SAGE: London.
- Sobchack, T. & Sobchack, V. C. (1987) *An introduction to film*, Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Tanner, D. (1995) *Curriculum Development: theory into practice*, Merrill: Englewood Cliffs, New York.
- Toohey, S. (1999) *Designing courses for higher education*, SRHE and Open University Press: London.
- Yin, R. (1984) *Case Study Research Design and Methods*, SAGE: London.
- Zettl, H. Y. (1999) *Sight, Sound and Motion* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition), Wadsworth Publishing Company.

#### **Government Notices**

- SAQA (2002) Discussion Document for a Generic Bachelor of Arts Degree *Government Gazette*, Vol. 446, No. 23688, 2 August 2002, Government Notices, Notice 1035 of 2002, South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA).

#### **Conference Proceedings**

- Proctor-Sims, R. (Ed) (1981) *Technical and Vocational Education in South Africa* Cape and Transvaal Printers Proceedings of a conference held on 30-31 March 1981 at the G. R. Bozzoli Pavilion, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

**Appendix A:**

**Table 1.1: Interview data\***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Times (Start – Finish)</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Programme</b>	<b>Code</b>
Louise	12/03/2004	09.00 – 09.35	35 minutes	MMD	LC
Matthew	15/03/2004	11.05 – 12.05	60 minutes	FTV	MB
Richard	15/03/2004	14.05 – 14.45	40 minutes	MMD	RvT
Hannah	16/03/2004	09.25 – 10.00	35 minutes	MMD	HB
Samson	17/03/2004	12.15 – 12.50	35 minutes	FTV	SS
Susan	18/03/2004	14.20 – 14.55	35 minutes	MMD	SB
Terry	19/03/2004	09.10 – 10.05	55 minutes	FTV	TS
Stuart	02/04/2004	09.00 – 09.55	55 minutes	MMD	SSy

\*Listed Chronologically

University of Cape Town

**Appendix B**

**Table 1.2: Research Individuals' Statistics<sup>‡</sup>**

Name	Sex	Qualifications	Professional Experience	Experience in Education
<b>Multi Media Design Programme</b>				
Louise	F	BA Graphic Design	17 years Television Graphic Designer	10 years* (1+9)**
Hannah	F	National Diploma in Graphic Design	20 years Art Director and Stylist	2 years (0+2)
Susan	F	National Diploma in Graphic Design National Trade Certificate in Photolithography	4 years Printing	6 years (3+3)
Richard	M	BA (Honours) Fine Arts (Majoring in Design)	11 year Freelance Multimedia Design	9 years (0+9)
Stuart	M	National Higher Diploma in Graphic Design National Higher Diploma in Education	17 years Graphic Designer	8 years (5+3)
<b>Film and Television Programme</b>				
Terry	M	Matric	50 years Film Production and Directing	4 years (0+4)
Samson	M	BA Journalism BA (Hons) Journalism MA Film Production	20 years Film Production and Camerawork	3 years (0+3)
Matthew	M	BA BA (Honours) (Majoring in Psychology) MA (Research Psychology) PhD (Psychology)	22 years Research (Media Related)	9 years (6+3)
Adam	M	National Diploma in Film and Television Production Techniques BEd (Higher Education) Post Graduate Diploma: Higher Education Studies MEd (Higher Education Studies)	3 years Film Editing	11 years (2+9)

<sup>‡</sup> Grouped by programme.

\* Number indicates total year of experience in teaching.

\*\* Brackets indicate breakdown of years of teaching experience. Second number indicates years at institution.

## **Appendix C: Semi Structured Questionnaire**

### **1. Background Questions**

- 1.1 What is your professional background?
- 1.2 What is your educational background?
- 1.3 How would you describe your field of expertise?
- 1.4 How would you describe your approach to lecturing?
- 1.5 How would you describe your approach to designing your course?

### **2. Design Questions**

#### **2.1 Content**

- 2.1.1 How do you decide on the content of your course?
- 2.1.2 What sources do you draw on to decide on the content of your course?
- 2.1.3 What experiences do you draw on to decide on the content of your course?
- 2.1.4 Who or what influences your decision(s) on the content of your course?
- 2.1.5 Who or what influences the final decision on the content of your course?

#### **2.2 Structure**

- 2.2.1 How do you decide on the structure of your course/
- 2.2.2 What sources do you draw on to decide on the structure of your course?
- 2.2.3 What experiences do you draw on to decide on the structure of your course?
- 2.2.4 Who or what influences your decision(s) on the structure of your course?
- 2.2.5 Who or what influences the final decision on the structure of your course?

### **3. General**

- 3.1 Did you consciously draw on any educational theory to inform the design of the course in terms of content and structure?
- 3.2 How did you decide on what to include and exclude from the content of the course?

**Appendix D:**  
**List 1.1: Node Listing**

**Nodes**

Content  
Decisions Institutional  
Decisions Technology  
Decisions Vocational  
Discourse Horizontal  
Discourse Vertical  
Experience  
Knowledge Structure Horizontal  
Languages Impact  
Re-contextualisation  
Sources Explicit  
Sources Tacit  
Structure  
Toohey Approach