

## Researching the interdisciplinary curriculum : the need for 'translation devices'

POUNTNEY, Richard and MCPHAIL, Graham

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/16931/>

---

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

### Published version

POUNTNEY, Richard and MCPHAIL, Graham (2017). Researching the interdisciplinary curriculum : the need for 'translation devices'. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43 (6), 1068-1082.

---

### Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>



## Researching the interdisciplinary curriculum: the need for 'translation devices'

Journal:	<i>British Educational Research Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Keywords:	curriculum integration, interdisciplinarity, methodology, Curriculum
Abstract:	<p>This paper discusses conceptual and methodological challenges facing two researchers investigating the development of interdisciplinary curricula in two new secondary schools, one in the UK and one in New Zealand. It is a discussion of research in progress that will be of interest to readers because of both the methodological challenges discussed and the research area itself. The key issue we identify is one for both researchers and teachers; how might the concepts and perspective of one discipline be brought into a relationship with another to enable deep learning? This question in turn highlights a key methodological challenge: developing the means to describe and evaluate new forms of curricular design and implementation where traditional discipline-based curriculum has been rejected in favour of interdisciplinary ones. The integrative aims of interdisciplinarity are also examined. We employ Bernstein's (2000) concept of knowledge structures and languages of description to theorise a continuum of approaches to curriculum integration, from functional to principled. This methodological manoeuvre is made possible by the development of a translation device. This procedural mechanism makes accessible to analysis the organising principles that are in play in the interdisciplinary curriculum design practices we have observed. We conclude with recommendations for the interdisciplinary curriculum researcher.</p>

## Researching the interdisciplinary curriculum: the need for ‘translation devices’

### Abstract

This paper discusses conceptual and methodological challenges facing two researchers investigating the development of interdisciplinary curricula in two new secondary schools, one in the UK and one in New Zealand. It is a discussion of research in progress that will be of interest to readers because of both the methodological challenges discussed and the research area itself. The key issue we identify is one for both researchers and teachers; how might the concepts and perspective of one discipline be brought into a relationship with another to enable deep learning? This question in turn highlights a key methodological challenge: developing the means to describe and evaluate new forms of curricular design and implementation where traditional discipline-based curriculum has been rejected in favour of interdisciplinary ones. The integrative aims of interdisciplinarity are also examined. We employ Bernstein’s (2000) concept of *knowledge structures* and *languages of description* to theorise a continuum of approaches to curriculum integration, from *functional* to *principled*. This methodological manoeuvre is made possible by the development of a *translation device*. This procedural mechanism makes accessible to analysis the organising principles that are in play in the interdisciplinary curriculum design practices we have observed. We conclude with recommendations for the interdisciplinary curriculum researcher.

Keywords: curriculum integration, interdisciplinarity; curriculum; knowledge; methodology

## Introduction

This paper explores one of the key methodological challenges that emerged for two researchers within the context of researching the development of interdisciplinary curricula; developing the means to describe and evaluate the forms of interdisciplinarity evident in the curricular design and implementation in two new secondary schools. One school is in the UK and the other in New Zealand. The paper is a discussion of research in progress that will be of interest to readers because of both the methodological issues discussed and the research area itself. However, we draw only lightly on the empirical data collected to date as the focus of the paper is on the methodological and analytic challenges rather than on the specifics of the empirical studies which are beginning to be reported elsewhere (author). The emphasis is on our roles as analysts and theory builders whose object of study is interdisciplinary curricula in secondary school settings.

While interdisciplinarity is certainly not a new phenomenon (Barnes, 2015; Beane, 1997; Wineburg & Grossman, 2000) it has reemerged recently as part of '21<sup>st</sup> century' future-focused discourses in education (Ministry of Education, 2009; Hipkins, Bolstad, Boyd & McDowell, 2014; Scott, 2015). At all levels from primary to tertiary it is promoted as an approach that can enhance and enrich learning and knowledge production by bringing two or more disciplines together. Frodeman (2014) suggests the aim of interdisciplinarity is the *integration of knowledge* across disciplines, but what form might this integration take? Can interdisciplinarity result in some type of deep conceptual synthesis that provides new theoretical insights, or is it more likely that disciplinary concepts retain a level of independence with some form of bridging of concepts that enriches a central concern? What is needed as these ideas take hold in a variety of educational contexts is a means of evaluating both polemical claims and empirical instances. We can imagine enhanced knowledge production and problem solving where academics in possession of highly developed

1  
2  
3 disciplinary identities and knowledge come together to focus on a particular problem, but is  
4  
5 this possible at the level of the school where such identities and knowledge bases are yet to  
6  
7 be developed? The nature and the quality of this 'bringing together' of subjects is a central  
8  
9 concern. From a pedagogical perspective integration of subjects is well argued for because  
10  
11 the approach appears to stimulate student interest and motivation by providing strong links to  
12  
13 'real-world' problems (Barnes, 2015; Drake, 1998; Ministry of Education, 2009), but from an  
14  
15 epistemological and conceptual perspective it is less clear what students might gain through  
16  
17 integration (Wineburg & Grossman, 2000; Naidoo, 2009; 2010; Dowden, 2014).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 The central argument of this paper is that the potential for the interdisciplinary curriculum to  
24  
25 be fully understood is dependent to a degree on the methodological process of creating a  
26  
27 'language of description' - a form of 'translation device' or conceptual rubric that allows  
28  
29 theory and data to interact. More specifically in this case, this device becomes the means  
30  
31 through which instances of interdisciplinarity can be examined, compared, understood, and  
32  
33 explained. This argument is developed in two parts. In Part 1 we briefly examine the nature  
34  
35 of interdisciplinarity and disciplinarity as a necessary starting point in providing a broader  
36  
37 context for the paper. The focus is on epistemic structures within disciplinarity rather than on  
38  
39 the broader social aspects of the epistemic communities in which knowledge is developed  
40  
41 and made accountable. Part 2 draws on the context established in Part 1 to consider this  
42  
43 central methodological concern - the process of developing the conceptual means to analyse  
44  
45 what we have found in our empirical work.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Part 1. The research context: interdisciplinarity and the importance of**  
4 **disciplinary epistemic structure**  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 Calls for interdisciplinarity in education derive from diverse sources (Barrett, 2007) but the  
11 most common arguments draw on what Moore (2011) terms an ‘apocalyptic ontology’; the  
12 need for radical changes to education so learners can be better prepared for uncertain futures.  
13  
14

15 A key argument is that knowledge needs to be reconceptualised as process rather than content  
16 (Delors 1998; Gilbert, 2005). Hence, we see calls for generic or meta-skills such as those  
17 referred to by Jacob (2015):  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 the knowledge economy requires an adept workforce ... no longer are higher education  
25 institutions able to train graduates to address all of the current and emerging challenges  
26 from a singular disciplinary source. Interdisciplinary (ID) approaches to research and  
27 training are essential underpinnings to best meet the dynamic needs of today’s higher  
28 education students (1).  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 Chettiparamb (2007) notes two main threads in the literature on interdisciplinarity. The first  
34 ‘argues for interdisciplinarity normatively, positioning it either in terms of filling the gaps  
35 that disciplinarity leaves vacant or in terms of transience surpassing what disciplinarity can  
36 ever hope to achieved’ (p. 13). The second thread is described as phenomenological in the  
37 sense that ‘it emanates from observation of practice. This view posits that interdisciplinarity  
38 already exists within the disciplines’ (p. 15). For example, the OECD report of 1972 on  
39 interdisciplinarity notes that specialisms within disciplines are essentially interdisciplinary  
40 (Chettiparamb 2007, p. 26). Education is a case in point. It is a knowledge *region* more than a  
41 singular discipline (Bernstein, 2000) drawing as it does on other disciplines for its theories,  
42 methods, and procedures. In this sense, the research work of the authors is interdisciplinary  
43 as we draw on concepts and methods from various disciplines to focus on the challenges of  
44 researching an interdisciplinary curriculum in schools.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Within Higher Education ‘interdisciplinarity has been largely normatively accepted as part of  
6 the academic landscape. Thus, in both teaching and research, the drive for interdisciplinarity  
7 is encouraged through the Higher Education Academy and the Research Councils’  
8 (Chettiparamb 2007, p. 1). Moreover, Frodeman (2014) suggests ‘interdisciplinarity is  
9 envisioned as the panacea for what ails both research and education. Within the academy  
10 calls for new interdisciplinary initiatives have become a conventional way to indicate one’s  
11 reformist orientation’ (p. 38). In schools, calls for interdisciplinarity are closely linked to the  
12 arguments mentioned above for more generic approaches to the development of knowledge,  
13 skills, and dispositions (Delors, 1998; Hipkins, Bolstad, Boyd, & McDowell, 2014; Scott,  
14 2015). On the other hand, a key concern identified in the counter-arguments is how to  
15 balance the agenda for research and curricular reform so that knowledge production and  
16 education are not reduced to a focus only ‘on products with an exchange value in the market  
17 ... vocational applications rather than knowledge’ (Sarakinioti et al. 2011, p. 72).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The context then of this paper is the trend in the curriculum towards interdisciplinary studies,  
37 which combines curricula from two or more disciplines. A key claim made in favour of  
38 integrated studies at the school level is that it allows students to see how ideas are connected  
39 and thus increases engagement and retention (Barnes, 2015; Drake, 1998; Wineburg and  
40 Grossman, 2000). On the other hand, Young and Muller (2016, p. 184) caution against the  
41 weakening of subject boundaries in which ‘the disciplines have increasingly to justify  
42 themselves in terms of some other idea of relevance’. Naidoo (2010), in a context of  
43 secondary schools in South Africa, further critiques the integration of subjects, pointing to the  
44 potential for lower academic quality in integrated teaching and the difficulty of mediating the  
45 conceptual structure of the subjects. This idea of conceptual structure, how concepts are  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sequenced and integrated as systems of meaning, has significant implications for access to  
4 academic knowledge no matter what form the curriculum organisation takes (Rata 2016;  
5  
6  
7 Winch, 2013). What then are the implications for learning where subjects with differing  
8  
9  
10 conceptual structures are brought to together in some way, and where the means for bringing  
11  
12 subjects together is external to the disciplinary concepts? Can sufficient access to the  
13  
14 disciplinary concepts be provided when the focus of this combining is around themes or  
15  
16 problems? These questions have led author to theorise two forms of curriculum: one that  
17  
18 emphasises conceptual progression, the *progressive knowledge* curriculum; and the other  
19  
20 which views knowledge as process, the *21<sup>st</sup> Century* curriculum. The degree to which these  
21  
22 two approaches are dominant in the curriculum design is likely to have a bearing on the level  
23  
24 of design challenge for teachers in regards to providing access to disciplinary systems of  
25  
26  
27 meaning.  
28

29  
30  
31  
32 Claims made for interdisciplinary curricula, therefore, centre around the value of problem-  
33  
34 based learning as being learner-led, in which cross-curricular projects are central to learning  
35  
36 and involve students in constructive investigation (Thomas, 2000). Ertmer and Simons (2005)  
37  
38 ask whether evaluative criteria, specifically assessment of and for learning, are visible in such  
39  
40 emergent forms of curricula. This raises the question of the veracity of interdisciplinary  
41  
42 outcomes, given that schools are increasingly adopting these approaches, and leads us to ask,  
43  
44 what are the drivers for interdisciplinarity and whether this approach engenders better  
45  
46 learning outcomes for students? Our suspicion is that some form of combination of 21<sup>st</sup>  
47  
48 century, project-based approaches that are strongly underpinned by conceptual progression  
49  
50 will provide a strong model for future-focussed learning (Naidoo, 2010). This is a great  
51  
52 challenge, even for experienced teachers, in knowing and determining what such  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 progressions should look like within varied integrative contexts (author; Wineberg &  
4  
5 Grossman, 2000).  
6  
7

8  
9 ***Developing an analytic framework: disciplinary knowledge and its epistemic***  
10 ***structure***  
11

12  
13 To proceed in the process of describing our methodological journey we draw on Bernstein's  
14  
15 (2000) concept of *hierarchical and vertical knowledge structures*. These concepts enabled us  
16  
17 to develop an *analytic framework* (Maton & Chen, 2016); the utilisation of some developed  
18  
19 theory that contains concepts for analysis of the underlying organising, causal, or generative  
20  
21 principles in the empirical data. At the centre of this analytic framework is the concept of  
22  
23 epistemic structure identified above as having important pedagogical implications for  
24  
25 students' access to disciplinary concepts (Muller, 2006; 2009; Rata, 2016; author). These  
26  
27 concepts will allow us to consider interdisciplinarity more deeply and to consider the  
28  
29 assertion of teachers in Naidoo's (2010) study that curricula integration is more difficult than  
30  
31 it appears particularly where there are inherent differences in the conceptual structure of  
32  
33 subjects.  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 Within the vertical discourse of academic knowledge production Bernstein identifies two  
39  
40 types of internal knowledge structure: *hierarchical and horizontal*. A hierarchical knowledge  
41  
42 structure is most commonly found in the physical sciences and comprises 'very general  
43  
44 propositions and theories, which integrate knowledge at lower levels, and in this way, shows  
45  
46 underlying uniformities across an expanding range of apparently different phenomena ...  
47  
48 towards greater and greater integrating propositions, operating at more and more abstract  
49  
50 levels' (161). The typical knowledge structure found in the social sciences, arts, and  
51  
52 humanities by way of contrast, consists of 'a series of specialised languages with specialised  
53  
54 modes of interrogation and criteria for the construction and circulation of texts' (p. 161).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Within sociology for example, Bernstein notes the ‘languages’ of functionalism, post-  
4 structuralism, post-modernism, and Marxism which have emerged and developed  
5 segmentally. So *integration* is the key developmental concern within the physical sciences  
6 resulting in hierarchical structures, whereas development in the social sciences results in  
7 *accumulation*; a series of segmented languages. This differentiation of internal knowledge  
8 structures – hierarchical or horizontal - has clear implications for interdisciplinarity. For  
9 example, one might question whether apparently disparate conceptual structures can be  
10 mediated in some way to enable knowledge building in an interdisciplinary context (Naidoo  
11 2010) or is it only closely aligned disciplines that share some common concepts that may be  
12 usefully brought together? Within horizontal knowledge structures for example Bernstein  
13 (2000) suggests that sets of languages ‘are not translatable, since they make different and  
14 often opposing assumptions, with each ... having its own criteria for legitimate texts, what  
15 counts as evidence and what counts as legitimate questions or a legitimate problematic’ (p.  
16 162).

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 Most significantly Bernstein draws our attention to the fact that there is an interdependence  
36 between the social base for knowledge production, its acquisition as broadly represented in  
37 the concept of field or arena, and the resulting knowledge structure, hierarchical or  
38 horizontal. For example, he suggests in the case of hierarchical structures that what is  
39 dominant within the socialising process of ‘becoming’ in the discipline is ‘mastering the  
40 procedures of investigation and instruments of observation and understanding theory;  
41 developing the imaginative potential of the language comes much later if at all’ (p. 164). On  
42 the other hand, initiation into a discipline with a horizontal knowledge structure is more  
43 likely to involve the acquisition of a ‘gaze’; ‘a particular mode of recognising and realising  
44 what counts as an ‘authentic’ sociological reality’ (p. 164); ‘what counts in the end is the  
45 specialised language, its position, its perspective, the acquirers ‘gaze’, rather than any one  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 exemplary theory ... 'truth' is a matter of acquired 'gaze' (p. 165). Cognisance of the  
4  
5 original episteme of a discipline is critical then to understanding the methods, techniques, and  
6  
7 procedures that a discipline adopts in knowledge production, what counts as an object of  
8  
9 study, and how the discipline treats its own nature as the subject of reflexive analysis  
10  
11 (Squires, 1992). As Abbott (2001) suggests, the discipline is the starting context for the  
12  
13 interdisciplinary curriculum, together with the disciplinary gazes (Bernstein 2000, 164) of  
14  
15 those involved in designing the curriculum. These combined dimensions (epistemic and  
16  
17 social) constitute a notion of practice that shapes how the various curricula develop and how  
18  
19 they may or may not be integrated with other disciplines.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 **Part 2. Methodological manoeuvres: languages of description and developing a**  
26 **'translation device'.**  
27  
28

29  
30 In this section, we draw on another of Bernstein's (2000) concepts, languages of description,  
31  
32 and the associated idea of a translation device. Methodologically Bernstein distinguishes  
33  
34 between an internal language of description (L1) and an external one (L2). In our case the  
35  
36 means by which teachers and curriculum designers talk about and tacitly understand the  
37  
38 interdisciplinary curriculum formulates the internal language of description (L1) as the  
39  
40 'principles of description to which it gives rise' (Bernstein, 2000: 91).  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 The external language L2, on the other hand is a "theoretically grounded, conceptual  
47  
48 language for modelling the generative principles of varying forms of social practice" (Moore  
49  
50 2006, p. 135). This external language is a language of enactment (Moss, 2001) because it is  
51  
52 the means by which one can generate a model, as a space of possibilities. For example, when  
53  
54 the possible forms of social practice, such as interdisciplinary curricula development, are  
55  
56 realized empirically they require an "external language of description" for their forms to be  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 recognised (Bernstein, 2000, p. 132). Here the external language of description acts as a  
4  
5 *translation device* between the analytic theorisations and the data, providing a model capable  
6  
7 of describing something other than itself (Moore and Muller, 2002, p. 633). The risk for the  
8  
9 researcher lies in the absence of a model in which the research is ‘marooned’ in the specific  
10  
11 context: ‘Without a model the researcher can never know what could have been and was not.  
12  
13 Without a model, the researcher only knows what his/her informants have enacted (Bernstein,  
14  
15 2000, p. 135).  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 The development of an external language of description becomes a translation device because  
22  
23 it creates a set of rules, or grammar, for the data that allows us to compare and contrast data  
24  
25 in principled ways. It is important to note that through the translation device the data speaks  
26  
27 back to the theory and in doing so may modify its development; a dynamic evolution of both  
28  
29 internal and external languages. Morais (2002, p. 565) suggests that translation devices  
30  
31 ‘represent the dialectical relation between the theoretical and the empirical - the internal  
32  
33 language of description directs the external language of description, and this directs the  
34  
35 practical structuring of research and the analysis and interpretation of results’. Examples of  
36  
37 empirical studies that have applied languages of description include Dowling’s (1995)  
38  
39 translation of the language of school mathematics text books into sociological discourse and  
40  
41 author model of curriculum development in higher education from which a theoretical  
42  
43 conceptualisation of autonomy is derived. For the researcher, it is the transparency of this  
44  
45 translation that enables the competence of the translator (the researcher) to be checked and  
46  
47 verified (Maton and Chen, 2016). The implication of this for the interdisciplinary curriculum  
48  
49 researcher is the requirement to develop an external language of description as a translation  
50  
51 device capable of examining the outcomes of interdisciplinary curriculum design.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ***Developing an internal language of description: conceptualising interdisciplinary***  
4 ***curriculum design***  
5  
6

7 It is important to note here that the interdisciplinary curriculum design process, while  
8 ultimately having students' achievement as its focus, is realised in practice in the first  
9 instance by teachers creating structures for curriculum delivery and texts such as curriculum  
10 plans, handbooks, lesson plans, and other documents. These structures and texts can be said  
11 to represent curriculum design and planning outcomes which make visible the way in which  
12 the interdisciplinary curriculum is being understood and developed. The job of the researcher  
13 is to establish the basis of these practices; to identify how the interdisciplinary outputs are  
14 produced and legitimated and subsequently what effect they have on student learning. By  
15 way of example we begin by noting the contrasting ways in which the two schools approach  
16 curriculum structuring. In School 1, the secondary school in the UK, this structure takes the  
17 form of project based fieldwork, known as *expeditions*, in which several subjects such as  
18 English literature, history, and art are combined and taught together. In contrast, in School 2  
19 in New Zealand, the curriculum is structured by overriding broad themes realised as problems  
20 or *areas for investigation* in modules (where subjects are integrated) and SPINS (where  
21 subjects stand-alone). While similar in their curricular and pedagogical aims the two schools  
22 diverge regarding how the *interdisciplinary* curriculum is organised. What challenges us  
23 here, as researchers, is how we can develop a description of these characteristics that  
24 represents an accurate interpretation derived from our knowledge of the field of education, an  
25 understanding of the phenomena we are investigating, and the data we choose to collect and  
26 analyse. We have begun to identify an increasingly coherent and explicit system of concepts  
27 for analysis, including knowledge structures (Bernstein, 2000), conceptual progression (Rata,  
28 2016), curriculum structure (author), and arguments in favour of subject integration (Beane,  
29 1997; Drake, 1998; Barnes, 2015; Hipkins, Bolstad, Boyd & McDowell; Frodeman, 2014;  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Savage, 2011; Sulla, 2015; Wineburg & Grossman, 2000). At an early stage, we could  
4  
5 identify that the interdisciplinary curriculum practice we observed in both schools was  
6  
7 effective in engaging students and that teachers were committed to make the curriculum  
8  
9 work. At the same time, we became curious about the decision-making operating in this  
10  
11 practice and the degree to which conceptual integration was taking place. We characterise  
12  
13 this as a form of internal language that describes the logic of interdisciplinary curriculum-  
14  
15 making operating in the two schools, but not the underlying principles that account for the  
16  
17 differences between them.  
18  
19

20  
21 As discussed earlier in this paper, the approaches that teachers take when developing the  
22  
23 interdisciplinary curriculum may be influenced by the interrelationship between their  
24  
25 disciplinary gaze and the epistemic structure of the subject itself (Bernstein, 2000, p. 164), or  
26  
27 by other sorts of motivating factors such as the apparent logic of student-centred (Sulla,  
28  
29 2015), 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Bolstad, 2012), or social justice discourses in education (Beane, 1997).  
30  
31 Where disciplinary structure is considered, approaches are likely to vary according to  
32  
33 whether the epistemic structure of the discipline is horizontal or vertical (see the explanations  
34  
35 of knowledge structure above) and the degree to which this is explicit or implicit to the  
36  
37 teacher or curriculum designer. Disciplines such as history, for example, exhibit a horizontal  
38  
39 structure in which knowledge is developed segmentally, while others such as physics have a  
40  
41 hierarchical knowledge structure (Bernstein, 2000). It can also be seen that horizontal  
42  
43 knowledge structures tend towards a weaker system of meanings with a less dense and  
44  
45 interrelated epistemic structure (Maton, 2011).  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 One potential outcome of this weaker system of meanings in the context of interdisciplinary  
52  
53 curriculum design can be seen in the way history, for example, is more likely to provide,  
54  
55 implicitly at least, a shaping or guiding influence on the form the curriculum takes rather than  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 a more explicit conceptual contribution. In our research we have observed that history  
4 teachers who are (co-) designing interdisciplinary curriculum bring broad themes or topics to  
5 the table rather than discrete sets of historical concepts. Integration of history concepts in  
6 interdisciplinary curriculum therefore, tends towards less visibility and a more overarching  
7 curricular influence in response to this weaker integrative potential. However, it is also  
8 important to note that the reproduction of disciplinary knowledge in educational settings is  
9 subject to theories of pedagogy adopted by teachers, which are themselves horizontal  
10 structures of knowledge (Morais, 2002, p. 566). This could have the effect of limiting or  
11 increasing the possibility of integration through the basis on which teachers make an  
12 informed choice of which disciplines to combine. Interdisciplinary curriculum design,  
13 therefore, can be conceptualised as having an emphasis on the management of the curriculum  
14 in which teachers pay attention primarily to the selection and pacing of content and rather  
15 less to how knowledge is sequenced and progressed conceptually (author). The implications  
16 of this conceptualisation of interdisciplinary curriculum making will now be discussed in  
17 relation to its organising principles and how it might be examined and analysed in relation to  
18 three key considerations for the researcher.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### ***The emergence of three key analytic considerations for the researcher***

40  
41  
42 The first challenge for us as researchers was to consider the outcomes of interdisciplinary  
43 curriculum design as an organising principle and to make a choice concerning the *unit of*  
44 *analysis*. The question arose as to whether the analysis was to be of the meso level  
45 formulation of learning and teaching interaction (i.e. at the level of modules or units of study  
46 or instruction that might last several weeks) or whether to examine the micro level of learning  
47 activity (i.e. at the level of individual activities, tasks, exercises or challenges for the learner,  
48 that might only last part of one lesson). Taking the example of a module of work at School 2,  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 knowledge of microbes (biology) is theorised as enhancing understanding of dietary choices  
4 (health/physical education) and in the integration of these disciplines at the level of micro  
5 activity the teacher is challenged to select, sequence, and pace concepts from the disciplines  
6 being studied together. It is interesting to note that we observed that teachers were challenged  
7 by the amount of planning needed at both the micro and meso level in the interdisciplinary  
8 curriculum. Furthermore, we noted that this led to a trial and error approach to planning in  
9 which the teacher learns through experience what does and does not work when disciplines  
10 are brought together (see also Naidoo, 2010). Also, at the meso level of the teaching unit or  
11 module, conceptual progression, the coherent integration of concepts into structured systems  
12 of meaning that are the building blocks of disciplines (Rata, 2016), tended to withdraw from  
13 view and was replaced by broad topics or themes that were more easily described in  
14 handbooks and learning materials.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 A second organising principle for our research was the degree to which concepts from  
33 different disciplines *interrelate* (see discussion in Part 1). In School 1 the interdisciplinary  
34 curriculum unit of work, *Let's Get Physical*, aimed to combine biology, sports science, and  
35 mathematics. The guiding question 'How can science make us superhuman?' directed the  
36 expedition towards the effect of science on athletes' performance, and an understanding of  
37 how the body works but the emphasis is on measurement, recording, and analysing metrics.  
38 Thus, mathematics became the dominant idea in the interdisciplinary approach, and while this  
39 may have suited the purposes of the project for learning it was less likely to result in a true  
40 integration of the disciplinary concepts, especially at the micro level. Similarly, in School 2,  
41 in a unit of work combining biology and health, *i-Care*, the 'therapeutic' idea of caring for  
42 oneself and developing strategies and knowledge to support this placed biological knowledge  
43 (of microbes for example) in an instrumental relationship with the more dominant, everyday  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 idea. Here the teacher needed to be aware of the way the integration may have affected the  
4  
5 potential for knowledge to become disconnected from its disciplinary system of meaning, and  
6  
7 the danger that one can subject may become instrumental to the other.  
8  
9

10  
11 A third consideration for us as researchers arose from the need to examine the relations that  
12  
13 organise and constitute the outcomes of interdisciplinary curriculum design and the  
14  
15 (inter)disciplinary materials, objects, and content that were put to use by the teacher. The  
16  
17 need for a constructive alignment (Biggs 1996) between the teaching methods and learning  
18  
19 targets was critical here. For example, the way in which key texts were chosen for School 1's  
20  
21 unit of work *All Together Now* (guiding question 'What makes a successful community?')  
22  
23 privileged a literary conception of community (in the selection of Paul Fleischman's fictional  
24  
25 work, *Seedfolks*) as opposed to say its geographical or historical development. In one sense  
26  
27 the dominance of one or other discipline is perhaps inevitable given that the means of  
28  
29 evaluation in educational contexts is via formal assessment of learning, and that the criteria  
30  
31 for this evaluation is developed and validated in disciplinary concepts (e.g. in how  
32  
33 examination boards and subject associations are closely aligned in the UK, and how national  
34  
35 Achievement Standards drive curricula content in New Zealand). One might also ask again  
36  
37 whether assessment criteria exist that can examine the learning outcomes of interdisciplinary  
38  
39 learning (Naidoo 2010) or to what extent the outcomes of interdisciplinary curriculum design  
40  
41 are recognisable as new forms of knowledge for which criteria exist or are potentially  
42  
43 created? In the next section, we will outline the notion of a translation device capable of  
44  
45 making these organising principles of practice first visible and then, second, accessible for  
46  
47 deeper analysis and comparison.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Towards a translation device for examining the integration of disciplinary concepts*

Having begun to examine the organising principles of practice operating in interdisciplinary curriculum making we echo the point made earlier that interdisciplinarity is promoted as an approach that brings together and enriches knowledge and learning and that it is the nature and the quality of this 'bringing together' or integration that is our central concern in this paper. We are seeking the basis for establishing 'what counts as data and what provides for their principled reading' (Ensor and Hoadley, 2004, p. 92). Our developing analysis of the data has revealed two paths towards integration in interdisciplinary curricula. The first path is where a strong conceptual base exists independently for each of the disciplines involved. This is illustrated in the way that learners produce work that is assessed according to existing disciplinary assessment frameworks and rubrics. The second path towards integration is where a conceptual framework for assessment does not yet exist. An example would be where meanings emerging from an interdisciplinary curriculum project such as *Grand Designs* (guiding question 'What is it about nature that inspires us?') leads to new understandings for students and teachers such as the interaction of human and physical processes in the environment and novel insights into the ethical consideration of topics such as creationism versus evolution. The distinction here is not in the academic level that learners achieve (and whether they outpace or exceed national expectations of learning) but rather whether it is generative of novel insights – or more importantly perhaps if it enables learners to go beyond their contexts, as an example of powerful knowledge (Young, 2009); to extend what is presented in a disciplinary context to identify and explore that which might be possible in an interdisciplinary perspective. It is important to note that where the criteria for evaluating the outcomes of integration do not exist, the result is likely to be generic, or meta-skills, of 'learning to learn' (Bernstein, 2000). The degree to which these forms of integration vary in the cases we have studied suggests a typology of integration as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: A typology of (inter)disciplinary curriculum design integration

This typology shows how the two paths of integration are distinguished by the orientation of the disciplinary conceptual base towards internal epistemic structuring for path 1 and external, thematic or problem-based for path 2 and how the (inter)disciplinary integration varies from weak(er) to strong(er). The strength of this integrative variation is indicative of the type of integration that is likely to hold sway in the interdisciplinary context. For example, weaker conceptual integration suggests that the basis of integration is *functional or pragmatic* – in other words on how the curriculum is organised or managed (author). Stronger integration, on the other hand, is indicative of a *principled* form of integration that more likely to involve the combining of *concepts* from different disciplines. In the latter, it is more likely (but not inevitable) that attention is paid to conceptual progression in the curricular design (Rata, 2016). The outcomes of these forms of integration are shown in the last column. It should be noted that both paths can result in the development of generic or meta-skills, although our research is showing that the outcome is differentiated by purpose: i.e. by the explicit targeting of competences such as ‘learning to learn’ in the functional/pragmatic form of integration, as opposed to meta-skills being the implicit and subsidiary outcome of the more (epistemic) principled approach. At this point the typology describes and conceptualises what we observe to be the case in our research schools. To go beyond this theorisation, we need the means of reading or translating the integrative paths and how this is enacted in practice. In other words, how might this typology inform how the interdisciplinary curriculum is designed and evaluated in other contexts? For this we need to develop the model further.

### *A translation device for interdisciplinary curriculum design research*

The typology derived as a first stage in theorising interdisciplinary curriculum design in the cases we are examining, shown in Table 1, can be used to describe types of integration that vary according to the strength of epistemic synthesis and the purpose that drives it. Our task now is to move beyond the internal description that the typology provides in order to identify the organising principles of the practices we are actually examining by means of a model (Bernstein, 2000, p. 135). However, the model is inert if it is not responsive to empirical data that helps to identify further generative principles. The model shown in figure 1 acts as a translation device for our research in that we can examine the extent to which interdisciplinarity achieves the integration of knowledge from two or more disciplines into one synthesised whole. A dimension of integration is emerging based on the degree of context dependence that exists or that becomes possible. Allowing for the fact that all knowledge, regardless of its verticality, is to some degree conceptual, it can be argued that forms of knowledge that emphasise strategies and procedures, and which are segmentally organised, have a form of integration which is *functional*. Whereas, knowledge whose integration is at the 'level of meanings', can be said to have a form of integration which is *conceptual* (Young and Muller, 2016, p. 171).

Figure 1: A continuum of integration in interdisciplinary curriculum design

On this continuum, a stronger conceptual coding for interdisciplinary curriculum design represents a principled shift and a stronger emphasis on conceptual integration. Reading this from the left to the right one sees increasing context independence. Towards the functional pole one would expect an increase in the pragmatic purpose of aligning disciplines together, in say how the organising principle governing the interdisciplinary impulse arises from

1  
2  
3 instrumental purposes or what author terms 'external organisers'. Stronger functional/  
4  
5 pragmatic emphasis is likely to shift the emphasis towards the generic, for example how  
6  
7 personal engagement of the learner is valued, or what competencies they appear to be  
8  
9 developing. A movement towards the conceptual pole indicates a shift towards the epistemic  
10  
11 basis of the curriculum and places the emphasis on knowledge building and conceptual  
12  
13 progression. As a translation device, it should work at the meso (teaching unit or module)  
14  
15 level and at the micro (specific learning activity) level. The crucial point is that this model  
16  
17 can capture an infinite set of positions, as opposed to a discrete set of cases, suggesting that  
18  
19 this elaboration of the model is a topology rather than a typology. The interrelationship  
20  
21 between the internal and external languages of description provides us with a means of  
22  
23 recognizing various modalities of practice but perhaps most importantly, it provides us with a  
24  
25 means of imagining (and ultimately developing and testing) alternative modalities of teaching  
26  
27 as well.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The concept and use of a translation device offers a methodological mechanism that serves to  
35  
36 provide the researcher with the means of approaching context independence while also being  
37  
38 relevant to specific contexts. This offers a greater basis for trustworthy claims about the  
39  
40 interdisciplinary curriculum and the opportunity for reflexivity to avoid circularity: 'Internal  
41  
42 languages are the condition for constructing invisibles, external languages are the means of  
43  
44 making those invisibles visible, in a non-circular way' (Bernstein, 2000, p. 133). It is the  
45  
46 external language of description that attempts 'to close the discursive gap between theory and  
47  
48 data' (Moore, 2006, p. 38) in which 'to close the gap is thus a normative moment in the  
49  
50 research act' (Young and Muller 2016, 173). What remains is the need to further interrogate  
51  
52 this model with further data from our studies, as we have started to do in the examples of  
53  
54 interdisciplinary curriculum design practice given above.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ***Conclusion: Implications for the interdisciplinary curriculum design researcher***  
4

5 The integrative aims of interdisciplinarity appear to implicate either an epistemological  
6 bridging or a synthesis of disciplinary concepts and modalities, two quite different outcomes.  
7

8  
9  
10 As part of our methodological work we theorise this as a continuum of 'integration' with  
11 'functional integration' at one pole and 'principled' at the other depending on what  
12 understandings of knowledge is driving the curricular design. Our aim is to develop a means  
13 to make visible the underlying principles at work in actual curriculum making, as distinct  
14 from the general claims made for interdisciplinarity in the literature. We have highlighted our  
15 process to date, particularly the methodological development of a translation device.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Underpinning our process theoretically we note the importance of an analytical framework  
26 and the development of a translation device as an 'interpretative interface, or the means of  
27 dialogue between the agency of enactments and the generating language of the model'  
28 (Bernstein, 2000, p. 133). It is as Moss (2001) points out, the generative possibilities of this  
29 model that offers the researcher the means to examine the claims made for the outcomes in a  
30 given research context. Drawing on our own research in the context of curriculum design in  
31 secondary education in the UK and New Zealand we have illustrated and exemplified the  
32 notion of a translation device for evaluating attempts to combine and integrate school  
33 subjects. This methodological approach offers us a way of examining the epistemic outcomes  
34 of the interdisciplinary curriculum and to separate the degree of access to apposite  
35 disciplinary, conceptual knowledge, from generic, skills-based instrumentalism. Ultimately, it  
36 will assist teachers and school leaders to determine whether their efforts to engage students  
37 through new forms of curricular organisation are well founded in strong claims for  
38 cumulative knowledge building.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**References**

- Abbott, A. (2001) *Chaos of disciplines* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Barnes, J. (2015) *Cross-curricular learning 3-14* (London: Sage).
- Barrett, B. (2007) Is interdisciplinarity old news? A disciplined consideration of interdisciplinary, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 33 no. 1: 97-114.
- Beane, J. A. (1997) *Curriculum integration: designing the core of democratic education* (New York: Teachers College Press).
- Bernstein, B. (2000) *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. (Rev. ed.) (New York & Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield).
- Biggs, J. (1996) Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment, *Higher education*, 32 no.3: 347-364.
- Bolstad, R. (2012) Principles for a future-oriented education system, *New Zealand Review of Education*, 21, 77-95.
- Chettiparamb, A. (2007) *Interdisciplinarity: a literature review* (HEA Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning Group, Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, University of Southampton).
- Delors, J. (1998) *Education for the twenty-first century* (Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation).
- Dowden, T. (2014) Challenging, integrated, negotiated and exploratory curriculum in the middle years of schooling: designing and implementing high quality curriculum integration, *Australian Journal of Middle Schooling*, 14 (1), 16-27.
- Dowling, P. C. (1995) A language for the sociological description of pedagogic texts with particular reference to the secondary school mathematics scheme SMP 11-16, *Collected Original Resources in Education*, 19 (2) 1-438.
- Drake, S. (1998) *Creating integrated curriculum: proven ways to increase student learning* (Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press).
- Ertmer, P. A., & Simons, K. D. (2005). Scaffolding teachers' efforts to implement problem-based learning. *International Journal of Learning*, 12(4), 319-328.
- Frodeman, R. (2014) *Sustainable knowledge: A theory of interdisciplinarity* (Palgrave Macmillan).
- Gilbert, J. (2005). *Catching the knowledge wave* (Wellington, NZ: NZCER).
- Hipkins, S., Bolstad, R., Boyd, S., & McDowell, S. (2014) *Key competencies for the future* (Wellington: NZCER Press).
- Jacob, W. (2015) *Interdisciplinary trends in higher education* (Palgrave Communications). <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/articles/palcomms20151>. (accessed June 1, 2016).



- 1  
2  
3  
4 Maton, K. (2011) Theories and things: The semantics of disciplinarity, in: F. Christie and K.  
5 Maton (Eds) *Disciplinarity: Systemic functional and sociological perspectives* (London:  
6 Continuum), 62–84.  
7
- 8  
9 Maton, K., & Chen, R. T. H. (2016) LCT and qualitative research: Creating a language of  
10 description to study constructivist pedagogy, in: K. Maton, K., S. Hood, and S. Shay  
11 (Eds) *Knowledge-building: educational studies in legitimation code theory* (Abingdon  
12 and New York: Routledge), 27-48.  
13
- 14 The Ministry of Education (2009) The move to an integrated curriculum and inquiry  
15 learning. Retrieved from at [http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Curriculum-stories/Case-](http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Curriculum-stories/Case-studies/Curriculum-implementation/Theme-six)  
16 [studies/Curriculum-implementation/Theme-six](http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Curriculum-stories/Case-studies/Curriculum-implementation/Theme-six)  
17
- 18  
19 Moore, R. (2006) Knowledge structures and intellectual fields: Basil Bernstein and the  
20 sociology of knowledge, in: R. Moore, M. Arnot, J. Beck, and H. Daniels (Eds)  
21 *Knowledge, power and educational reform: applying the sociology of Basil Bernstein*  
22 (Abingdon and New York: Routledge), 28-43.  
23
- 24  
25 Moore, R. (2011) Making the break: disciplines and interdisciplinarity, in: F. Christie and K.  
26 Maton (Eds) *Disciplinarity: functional linguistics and sociological perspectives* (London  
27 & New York: Continuum), 87-105.  
28
- 29  
30 Moore, R., and Muller, J. (2002) The growth of knowledge and the discursive gap. *British*  
31 *Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4), 627–637.  
32
- 33  
34 Morais, A. M. (2002) Basil Bernstein at the micro level of the classroom, *British Journal of*  
35 *Sociology of Education*, 23 no. 4: 559-569.  
36
- 37  
38 Moss, G. (2001) Bernstein's languages of description: Some generative principles,  
39 *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 4(1), 17-19.  
40
- 41  
42 Muller, J. (2006) Differentiation and progression in the curriculum, in: M. Young & J.  
43 Gamble (Eds), *Knowledge, Curriculum and Qualifications for South African Further*  
44 *Education* (Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council), 66-86.  
45
- 46  
47 Muller, J. (2009) Forms of knowledge and curriculum coherence, *Journal of Education and*  
48 *Work*, 22, 205-26.  
49
- 50  
51 Naidoo, D. (2009) Case studies of the implementation of “progression and integration” of  
52 knowledge in South African schools, *Education as Change*, 13 (1), 5-25.  
53
- 54  
55 Naidoo, D. (2010) Losing the “purity” of subjects? Understanding teachers’ perceptions of  
56 integrating subjects into learning areas. *Education as Change*, 14(2), 137-153.  
57
- 58  
59 Rata, E. (2016) A Pedagogy of Conceptual Progression and the Case for Academic  
60 Knowledge, *British Journal of Educational Research*, 42(1), 168–184.



- 1  
2  
3 Sarakinioti, A., Tsatsaroni, A. & Stamelos, G. (2011) Changing knowledge in higher  
4 education. *in: G. Iverson, B. Davies and J. Fitz (Eds) Knowledge and identity: concepts*  
5 *and applications in Bernstein's sociology*, (Abingdon & New York: Routledge), 69-89.  
6  
7  
8 Savage, J. (2011) *Cross-curricular teaching and learning in the secondary school* (London  
9 and New York: Routledge).
- 10  
11 Scott, C.L. (2015) The futures of learning 2: what kind of learning for the 21st century?  
12 UNESCO, Education Research and Foresight, Paris. [ERF Working Papers Series,  
13 Mo. 14]. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002429/242996e.pdf>  
14
- 15 Squires, G. (1992) Interdisciplinarity in Higher Education in the United Kingdom.  
16 *European Journal of Education*, 27(3), 201-210.  
17
- 18 Sulla, N. (2015) *It's not what you teach but how* (New York & London: Routledge).  
19
- 20  
21 Thomas, J.W. (2000) *A review of research on project-based learning*. (San Rafael, CA:  
22 Autodesk Foundation).  
23
- 24 Winch, C. (2013) Curriculum design and epistemic ascent, *Journal of Philosophy of*  
25 *Education*, 47 no. 1, 128-146.  
26
- 27 Wineburg, S. & Grossman, P. (2000) *Interdisciplinary curriculum: challenges to*  
28 *Implementation* (New York and London: Teachers College Press).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Figure 1: A continuum of integration in interdisciplinary curriculum design



Interdisciplinary integrative path	Conceptual orientation	How the integration varies	Outcomes
Path 1 (disciplinary conceptual models)	Internal	Weaker integration (functional / pragmatic)	Disciplinary knowledge  (Meta-skills / knowledge)
Path 2 (interdisciplinary conceptual models that are emergent or yet to exist)	External	Stronger integration (conceptual /principled)	Novel insights, new knowledge  (Meta-skills / knowledge)

Table 1: A typology of (inter)disciplinary curriculum design integration