

Chapter 5

The Curriculum of PNGIPA

Introduction

PNGIPA, as any other training institution concentrated its efforts on course development, implementation and evaluation. It was within this context of understanding that this study was undertaken. The study explored the PNGIPA's curriculum development processes with particular interest in the discrepancies between the actual and the intended curriculum. The research question therefore, posed the question: *What were the strengths and weaknesses of the PNGIPA curriculum as perceived by the lecturers and the administrators?* There were four issues raised in order to answer the research question. These four issues examined the current curriculum development processes of the Institute as opposed to the intended curriculum. It then explored the strengths and the weaknesses of the current practise and attempts to identify the similarities and the differences between the actual and the intended curriculum of PNGIPA. The data received from the questionnaire, the interview and documents were presented in consideration to each of the four issues raised in relation to the research question. The four issues raised were;

1. *What was the Actual Curriculum development model for PNGIPA?*
2. *What was the Intended Curriculum development model for PNGIPA?*
3. *What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Actual Curriculum of PNGIPA?*
4. *What were the similarities and the differences between the Actual and the Intended Curriculum of PNGIPA?*

In its efforts to respond to the research question, all the responses will be presented as given regardless of whether or not they answered the questions precisely.

The PNGIPA Changes Affecting Data Collection

At the time of preparing the research proposal in Australia, in the first half of 1995, I had no knowledge of the fact that dramatic changes were to take place at PNGIPA before the end of the

year. Between the months of August and September of that year, a baseline study of the systematic training cycle at the Papua New Guinea Institute of Public Administration was conducted by Ken Boulter from ARA Consulting Group Incorporated contracted to the World Bank. Based upon the study's findings and recommendations, rapid changes were being implemented towards the end of 1995 and in early 1996. I returned to Papua New Guinea for data collection at the beginning of the change period, 1996.

The study (Boulter 1995) revealed that there was a lot of upgrading needed in areas of the Institute's product line. These areas included consultancy, research and publication and community service activities. Further, the study indicated that the Institute lacked consistency in curriculum design, implementation and evaluation as well as the mechanism to enforce quality control. The report strongly recommended that longer academic courses must now be phased out and be replaced with short intensive skill-based courses. In a general sense, Boulter's report addressed similar concerns to what this study wished to accomplish.

Presentation and Interpretation of the Data

The recommendations from Boulter's Report were already being implemented when the research field trip for this study, took place. It was within this environment that the questionnaire was distributed and the interviews were conducted. The circumstances of these changes did affect the receipt of the questionnaires in that much of what the questionnaire sought had already been covered by the consultant. Some of the respondents viewed the study as irrelevant and this view manifested itself in comments such as these:

An effective effort is now underway with the assistance of internationally sanctioned consultant and PNGIPA course development procedures should be dramatically improved compared to the past practice. Any criticisms of the past practice would be quite irrelevant and one should only see how the new procedure work first, then may offer critique and recommend suggestions

as you may not know, PNGIPA is already under a major reform in curriculum development...

currently there is a consultant working on this and has made considerable impact on this subject

At the moment we have a consultant who actively conducts workshops in curriculum development.

The underlined words 'considerable impact' was perceived by the researcher as an indication of the favourable impression that was accorded to the consultant's efforts by some.

Although these indications pointing to the study as being irrelevant, initially sounded discouraging, the changes taking place seemed to imply that there was already a problem with the PNGIPA's curriculum thus, PNGIPA's need for a consultant to advise on necessary curriculum changes and improvements as well as other things. In this light, they provided the encouragement needed to pursue this study.

A further encouragement came from comments made by two other respondents regarding PNGIPA's curriculum context before the arrival of the consultant saying:

PNGIPA need to evaluate the Discrepancy Approach to find how effective, efficient and competent the approach has been. PNGIPA has not done so.

PNGIPA already has a course teaching and delivering knowledge and skills in vocational curriculum development yet PNGIPA itself has not taken advantage of this asset to upgrade internal skills before the coming of the consultant.

The respondent in the second instance was specifically referring to the expertise of the Training of Trainers staff since it was the only section in the Institute that delivered these type of courses. The respondent was criticising PNGIPA's failure to capitalise on its internal resources prior to soliciting the assistance of a consultant.

It was indeed a point which the study seriously took note of. It implied that already in place was a system of course development. The study looked into the implied intended system of course development as well as other existing methods that were utilised by the lecturers and the administrators. This study began its explorations by investigating the initial training needs

analysis that were carried out by the lecturers in their efforts to develop courses. It followed through with probes into the setting of objectives, the course design and the evaluation procedures. The investigation was carried out with the use of a questionnaire, cross-referenced with both the interview and the document analysis.

Issue 1: What was the actual curriculum development model for PNGIPA?

A close analysis of the responses to the question items that made direct references to the actual curriculum practice of PNGIPA revealed that there existed five distinct themes within actual curriculum practice. These five distinct themes that emerged were:

1. *Procedures of Course Development;*
2. *Supervision, Control and Monitoring;*
3. *Course Justification;*
4. *Client Consultation and Client Orientation; and*
5. *Curriculum Development and Staff Training.*

For a systematic presentation, all the responses relating to each of these themes were tabulated accordingly. For example, all responses centring on procedural steps of course development were presented together under the theme of Procedures of Course Development. The focus of the responses was therefore, centred on one specific theme at a time to illustrate the different components that make up the actual curriculum processes of PNGIPA. Each theme would be followed by a summary. A final summary of all the themes would then be presented. This would give an overall view of the actual curriculum practice within the Institute.

The presentation of the data was highly influenced by the design of the questionnaire. The questionnaire, being divided into five different sections and targeting different groups of respondents, meant that not all the items in the questionnaire would be answered by all the respondents but by specific groups identified by the questionnaire, within the sample population.

The first section, (A), of the questionnaire, was aimed at collecting the biographical data of the respondents. In this section there were 28 respondents who responded out of the expected 45 people. This was followed by Section B which sought only the lecturers' general impressions of PNGIPA's course development processes. In Section B, 26 respondents identified themselves as lecturers, hence, 26 respondents out of the 28 responded as lecturers. The next section, Section C, was specifically seeking responses from those lecturers who were actually involved in course development activities. The responses from the questionnaire had identified 19 respondents as actual course developers. Therefore, of the total of 28 respondents, 19 responded as course developers in Section C. The next section, Section D, required from the respondents who were non-course developers, their views on the curriculum processes of the Institute. There were 7 respondents who identified themselves to be non-course developers. These 7 respondents, however, would not be responding to any of the Likert scaled items as Section D only posed open-ended questions. Section D items, therefore would have a total of 7 respondents. Finally, Section E was aimed at the PNGIPA management to seek their opinion on curriculum practice as opposed to the policies of the Institute regarding curriculum development procedures. All the administrators were required to respond to Section E. The questionnaire responses identified 7 who responded out of the 11 members that made up the Senior Management Team (SMT). Among the 7 administrators who responded there were two who were involved purely in administrative duties. The other 6 performed both administrative and teaching duties.

Seeing that Section E consisted of rather a small number in the group, the use of percentages would not give a clear indication of the spread of the responses therefore, only a distribution count would be applied to all items of Section E.

Theme 1: Procedures of Course Development

The first of the seven themes concentrated on the procedures of course development. These procedures have been arranged in a course development procedural manner. All the questionnaire items in Table 11(a) were specifically asked of the respondents in an attempt to establish what the PNGIPA curriculum practice was. Its main focus was on the procedural

steps that course developers took in developing their training courses. The questionnaire items revealed that there were a variety of curriculum practices existing within the Institute.

Table II(a)

Theme 1: General Course Development Approach

(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA10	The course has been developed using a definite curriculum model.	7 28%	13 52%	4 16%	1 4%	0 0
C2 (a)	You developed your course(s) by adapting and improving upon existing course materials.	1 5%	1 5%	11 58%	6 32%	0 0
(b)	by compiling your own course materials.	1 5%	11 59%	0 0	7 37%	0 0
(c)	through very close consultation with your clients.	2 11%	2 11%	11 58%	4 21%	0 0
C4(c)	You had difficulties in designing training programmes.	6 32%	11 58%	0 0	2 11%	0 0
C5 (a)	You developed your course with a detailed written guideline to help you.	4 22%	4 22%	8 44%	2 11%	0 0
(b)	with assistance from your colleagues.	2 12%	2 12%	2 12%	9 53%	2 12%
(c)	with the help of your immediate superior.	2 12%	3 17%	4 22%	7 39%	2 12%
(d)	without any help.	3 19%	4 25%	2 13%	4 25%	3 19%

Note: 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree.

Item C2 (a) revealed that 58% of the course developers were not sure whether they adapted and improved upon existing course materials in their course development approaches while the next largest group of 32% asserted that they developed their course by adapting and improving upon existing course materials. In item C2(b), 64% disagreed with the claim that they compiled their own course materials while 37% agreed with the statement. In item C2 (c) there appeared an almost equal strength in opinion regarding close consultation with client in developing their course. The majority, however, indicated uncertainty over whether or not they carried out close consultation with their clients in course development processes. It appeared that there was little consistency between course development and client consultation.

In the follow-up interview, the responses to the interview item 1 regarding the question of how courses were developed (see Appendix 9) clearly indicated that there were a variety of course development methods employed by the 19 course developers. Out of the many course development approaches used, several of the interview respondents were able to identify the models they used to develop their course. The responses to interview item 1 revealed:

I use the Modified Public Service Training Policy Model to develop my courses. I call my approach the Key Result Area (KRA). In this model I concentrate on the results rather than the procedures of getting to the results. I prefer to go directly to the duty statements to identify the key result areas and develop my course to enable students to achieve these key result areas.

I use the discrepancy approach to develop my courses. In this model the actual needs in terms of knowledge skills and attitudes of the clients are identified. These needs are related to the individual concerned, the job the individual is performing and the how this job respond in its outputs towards the organisational aims and objectives of the organisation.

The TNA I conducted was determined by the participants. In this method the participants self-assessed themselves in terms of their leadership qualities, their interpersonal skills as well as their relationships to the people regarding development planning. These details gave me the direction in course content.

My approach is very practical. The participants relate to the content of the course based on their own experiences.

Although there is no training policy, the Board of Studies did provide some guidelines on course development. However, not all lecturers are aware of it.

The BOS guideline has not been endorsed by the authorising body therefore it can only be an assumed guideline.

Items C5(b) and (c) revealed that, help and assistance came mainly from their colleagues rather than from any written guideline outlining course development procedures. Items BA10 and C5(a) indicated support to this occurrence. Neither did they think that their courses were developed using a definite curriculum model as indicated by item BA10.

Various other responses received in the interviews signified that the lecturers were in the position to decide for themselves what method to use and how to implement the selected method.

No guidelines are given. My own teaching experience guided me.

I had no written guidelines to help me develop my courses. I depended on my knowledge of my specific discipline and experience.

The responses appeared to confirm the view implied in the questionnaire responses suggesting the existence of various types of curriculum models. This implication supported the view that was implied earlier in the questionnaire responses that there was an influencing authority dictating curriculum practice in PNGIPA regarding course development procedures. Course developers developed their course the best way they saw fit. Additionally, there appeared to be no clear pattern emerging from the data that suggested a common course development approach within the Institute.

The data also indicated that the processes of course development and course review have been misunderstood and confused. Five of the interviewees expressed thoughts that hinted at this confusion when comments such as these were received:

The course was already there when I arrived. I developed it further by adding to the content what I thought was relevant and deleting parts of the content I felt were irrelevant or out-dated.

The course was already developed. I improved it by making changes in the content to accommodate skill-based training.

I have nil experience in curriculum development ... I did not like the course content much ... I felt that a lot more could be added so I used my own resources and developed the course content into a more detailed course.

The underlined words showed where the confusion between *development* and *review* was. The distinction between development and review approach appeared not to have been made. Implicit in these responses was the confusion between the two processes of course development and course review. These responses identified the changing of course contents in an effort to obtain

a much improved version of the course to be the actual course development process in a curriculum model. Whether this process was follow-up of an evaluation is the prerogative of the lecturer.

The interview responses, on the other hand, also revealed that those who offered a detailed description of their course development procedures were able to distinguish between course review and development when they commented saying:

The course was already developed, I only revised the course content to improve it.

The course was there long before I got there. I did not develop any of my own. I adapted the course content based on my pre-evaluation.

I did not develop the course, it was already developed when I arrived. After evaluating it, I just adapted it to suit the client's needs.

The use of the words *adapted* and *revised* indicated the distinction between the two processes. The confusion between the two processes pointed to a language problem.

When asked to give a detailed outline of course development procedures, there were only a few who were able to offer a comprehensive and detailed outline of the procedural steps involved in their course development approach. While most did indicate a general awareness of the stages involved, probes for more detailed descriptions of the processes involved in these stages resulted in a variety of descriptions, some of which appeared to be a cut and paste attempt of various other curriculum models to develop their own.

I prefer my current course development method because my concentration is on the person, their ability and potential, the skills they possessed and how best these can be improved to make the person competent within his organisation ... I adapted a model used in sports and training.

My course development approach is not based on assumed needs but on actual needs. The approach has built within the process, evaluative devices that acts as checkpoints throughout the whole cycle. I feel comfortable with my approach.

I call my approach the Key Result Area (KRA) ... I prefer to go directly to the duty statement to identify the key result area.

I'm not so familiar with course development therefore I rely heavily on my own experience in developing a course.

Most respondents however, settled for a summed-up version of the process by only naming the stages in the training cycle without delving into the mechanics of these stages.

The training needs analysis will determine what objectives need to set up before a course is designed and developed.

The training needs analysis is important ... it identifies what the client needs... the setting of objectives and course design will flow smoothly if everything is in place.

The initial needs analysis will help determine the design of the course as well as giving an indication to what type of objectives need to be drawn up.

However, an indication derived from the data reflects that many of the course developers acknowledged the importance of a training needs analysis. A reflection of this view can be gleaned from these responses to interview item 1, (see Appendix 9), which asks, 'How do you develop your course?' with particular reference to the procedural steps involved.

Courses developed are based on competency and experience of the clients.

The clients dictate ... my courses respond to their needs.

My course development approach is not based on assumed needs but on actual need identified through a needs analysis.

Courses are developed to meet the needs of our clients.

Implicit in these remarks was the notion that the courses that were developed were determined by the identified needs of the clients. Yet, while many were able to identify in general the stages involved in course development, it seemed contradictory that only a few of them were able to give a detailed account of each of the stages. This seemed to imply that either there was a total

lack of knowledge and skill in the discipline of curriculum development or that there is some knowledge and skill but not sufficient to properly implement the process.

Table 11(b) continues to pursue the theme of procedural steps in course development, with a particular interest on the training needs analysis theme. Items BA6 and BA12 seemed to suggest a contradiction. While item BA12 indicated that the majority of the respondents believed their course(s) to be a direct consequence of a training needs analysis, item BA6 signified divided opinions of almost equal strengths regarding the same issue. The responses identified 39% of the respondents in BA6 who gave support to this view while 38% remained uncertain. The difference between this 39% and the 38% who remained uncertain may appear not to be very significant but it did suggest that there was almost an equal split in the strengths of opinions regarding consultation with a client's organisation in an effort to determine their training needs.

Table 11(b)

Procedures of Course Development: Training Needs Analysis
(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA6	Formulation of training programmes is done with staff development of government departments in isolation from specific targeted clients.	1 4%	5 19%	10 38%	9 35%	1 4%
BA12	The course was developed as a result of a training needs analysis	2 8%	2 8%	6 23%	12 46%	4 15%

Note: 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Five out of the 11 interviewees had similar responses when responding to how they conducted their training needs analysis:

My training needs analysis is carried out through the use of such instruments as questionnaires, interviews and accessing clients official documents ... those documents would be employees duty statements,

organisational roles and functions as dictated by the aims and objectives, the job description within the organisation.

The responses to Items BA5 and C4(b) in Table 11(c), which asked after the 'Setting of Objectives' indicated that course developers have little problem in the setting of task-related objectives. The task-related objectives are clearly written out in the majority of cases. The PNGIPA 1994 Handbook, however, implied that the distinction between task-related objectives and general educational objectives were being confused. There was evidence of general educational objectives rather than tasks-related objectives. The 1994 PNGIPA Handbook provides some examples of objectives implying this general educational academic flavour.

The course aims to create an awareness of the value and practical application of research (PNGIPA 1994, p.74)

To increase and update the participants' knowledge and understanding of the professional and industry skills (PNGIPA 1994, p.46).

To upgrade their knowledge on the theory and practise of the management system of their organisation (PNGIPA 1994, p.98)

The course aims to give a good understanding of customary land tenure and especially the nature and causes of disputes and the settlement of disputes through the Land Dispute Settlement Act (PNGIPA 1994, p.95).

Table 11(c)

Procedures of Course Development: Setting of Objectives
(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA5	Specific tasks related objectives are clearly written out.	1 4%	3 12%	8 32%	11 44%	2 8%
C4(b)	You had difficulties in setting training objectives.	7 37%	10 53%	1 5%	1 5%	0 0

Note: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

The implication was that the distinction between a task-related objective which was characteristic of courses meant for training purposes and general education objectives which

was meant for the upgrading of knowledge appeared to be confused. It therefore, seemed that a task-related objective, which is centred on performance of a task within a job, has been equalled to a general education objective.

The responses with regard the implementation of PNGIPA training programmes, as highlighted in Table 11(d), indicated that 90% of the respondents felt that this was not a problem. On the question of whether PNGIPA's institutional type of training could be considered as an effective way to implement its training activities, the responses showed 48% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with that claim. The difference between those who were uncertain and those who disagreed was only by a small margin of 4%. With only a tiny minority of 8% who agreed with the claim, it does imply that the majority feel otherwise.

Table 11(d)

Procedures of Course Development: Course Implementation

(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA7	PNGIPA's institutional training for your clients is quite effective.	1 4%	11 44%	11 44%	2 8%	0
C4(d)	You had difficulties in implementing training programmes	6 32%	11 58%	1 5%	1 5%	0

Note: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Course evaluation appeared to be an area that needs more attention. Generally, the responses relating to course evaluation appeared to converge around uncertainty and disagreement. Table 11(e) demonstrates the distribution of the opinions. While 42% of the lecturers responding to Item BA11 voiced disagreement to courses being evaluated using proper evaluation procedures, 4 out of the 7 administrators responding to item E6 indicated uncertainty over whether proper evaluation had actually been carried out (also see item BA17). This could mean that little attention had been directed to proper course evaluation procedures. Yet, item C4(e) indicated

that the lecturers had little difficulty with evaluating their courses, meaning that course evaluation was not a problem. Items C6(a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) went further to indicate that various methods were used by the lecturers in evaluating their courses.

In the interviews, probes into evaluation approaches revealed similar responses. Both course developers and non-course developers evaluated their course according to their judgement.

My students fill in an evaluation form ... it contains questions which asks them what they thought of the course ... Was it useful, difficult, etc?

Feedback from the client organisations are usually good. I see this feedback as evaluation of my course.

My evaluation of my courses are mainly based on students opinions of the course and my own observations.

Thus, the situation reflected that there seemed to be various ways of evaluating the courses that were conducted.

Items C6(a), (b) and (d) in Table 11(e) had the bulk of the respondents, 68%, 74% and 56% respectively expressing uncertainty over the suggested methods while C6(c) and (e) showed disagreement with the suggested method of course evaluation.

Basically there appeared to be two contradicting views, one suggesting lack of proper course evaluation procedures while the other suggesting course evaluation not being a problem. The methods used in the evaluation process appeared to not be clearly defined as the responses did not indicate any obvious pattern.

Table 11(e)

Procedures of Course Development: Evaluation

(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA11	The course has been evaluated using proper evaluation procedures.	1 4%	10 38%	8 31%	7 27%	0
BA17	Proper evaluation of your course is yet to be carried out.	4 15%	3 12%	11 42%	8 31%	0
C4(e)	You had difficulties in evaluating training programmes.	6 33%	8 44%	3 17%	1 6%	0
C6	You evaluated the relevance of your course(s)					
(a)	by having trainees assess how useful they found the course(s).	1 5%	2 11%	13 68%	3 16%	0
(b)	from verbal comments made about the usefulness of the course.	2 11%	1 5%	14 74%	2 11%	0
(c)	by the high demand for your course coming from your clients.	1 5%	14 74%	0	4 21%	0
(d)	by the course enrolment figures recorded each time.	2 11%	4 22%	10 56%	2 11%	0
(e)	by comparing test results to the intended results.	5 26%	7 37%	5 26%	2 11%	0
E6	There has been proper evaluation carried out on PNGIPA's courses.	1	0	4	2	

Note: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Summary of Theme 1 and its Implications

It was therefore be assumed that there appeared to be no clear pattern in the curriculum process of the Institute. The variety of practices were personalised and did not follow a standard influencing authority on the curriculum processes of the Institute.

The implications are that individual course developer had the prerogative to decide for themselves the best method they were to use to develop courses. The data indicated that while many professed the use of a training analysis, the actual description of the implementation of

the needs analysis was limited to a general presentation. This could mean that there was a lack of confidence in fully understanding and implementing the curriculum processes of the Institute. There was also indication of confusion between the writing up of task-based objectives and general educational objectives. The distinction between the two types of objectives appeared to be confused.

While many indicated that the delivery of training courses was not a problem, they however, implied that the institutional training offered by PNGIPA was not the best way to deliver training. The implication was that there may be other better ways to deliver training.

The indication was that the evaluation of PNGIPA's training programmes appeared not to have received as much the attention it deserved. Evaluation procedures were left to the discretion of the lecturers, which meant that a variety of methods were used.

Theme 2: Supervision, Control and Monitoring.

The second theme that emerged from the data in relation to the actual curriculum development process of PNGIPA was one of ***supervision, control and monitoring*** of the development, implementation and evaluation of PNGIPA's training courses. Supervision, would mean, to some extent, a control and monitoring device. The indications reflected that while some senior staff members practice supervision and close interaction with their subordinates, others tended to leave their subordinates to their jobs. An additional sub-theme on communication had also surfaced from the data and was understood to play a part in the supervision, control and monitoring of courses. The data revealed no clear pattern on the implementation of supervision, control and monitoring devices. There appeared to be divided opinions over whether or not supervision, control and monitoring was effective. It is worthwhile here to remind the reader that the number of respondents to the different sections of the questionnaire varied. All items labelled A and B had 28 respondents responding, items C had 19 respondents, items D had 7 respondents and the items E had 7 respondents from the

managerial rank of 11 responding. The last item (I) will be presented on a numerical count due to the rather small number of people, (administrators), who responded.

Items BA14(a) and (b), BA15(a) and (b), BA18(a), BB3, BB10 and E8 in Table 12(a), revealed that the strength of the opinions rested with disagreement to supervision, control and monitoring being effected. Supporting comments on this issue came from four questionnaire respondents who stated:

Proper monitoring, and reviewing of course validity, credibility and its accreditation is not being done...' and ' effective control monitoring and controlling mechanisms such as monthly reports, appraisals by head of teaching staff are needed.

Dialogue between branch head and lecturers ... is a problem.

Some branch heads don't really make it their business to know or be familiar with the course contents ... thus, they cannot do much to assert in review of contents, only in assessment procedures and administrative aspects.

The existing practice is that the branch head lets the section carry on with what is existing and leaves course development to the sections concerned.

These remarks indicated that the lecturers were implying that branch heads expressed very little interest in how the courses in their branches were developed, the specifics of the course content, the course design, the proposed methodology of delivering the course, the assessment procedures and instruments and the evaluation procedures applied in evaluating the usefulness of the course.

On the other hand, items BA18(b), BB3, BB11 indicated that some communication did take place through dialogue with those in authority.

Table 12(a):
Supervision! Control and Monitoring
(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA14	(a) Development of course materials are closely supervised by branch heads.	4 16%	11 44%	2 8%	6 12%	2 8%
	(b) section heads.	3 12%	9 35%	3 12%	10 38%	1 4%
BA15	(a) Course tests are reviewed by branch heads.	6 24%	11 44%	5 20%	2 8%	1 4%
	(b) section heads.	3 12%	9 35%	3 12%	6 24%	3 12%
BA18	(a) Teaching and learning activities are in close consultation with with branch heads.	4 16%	9 36%	3 12%	6 24%	3 12%
	(b) with section heads.	1 4%	6 23%	1 4%	15 58%	3 12%
BB3	Your branch head monitors the review of courses within your branch.	3 12%	9 36%	5 20%	6 24%	2 8%
BB5	Your section head monitors the review of course(s) within your section.	2 8%	3 12%	15 60%	5 20%	0 0
BB10	Dialogue between branch heads and lecturers regarding course development procedures is not a problem.	4 15%	7 27%	7 27%	4 15%	4 15%
BB11	Dialogue between section heads and lecturers regarding course development procedures is not a problem.	3 12%	5 19%	4 15%	10 38%	4 15%
C5(c)	You developed your course with the help of your immediate superior.	2 12%	3 17%	4 22%	7 39%	2 11%
E8	All courses are screened thoroughly before they are conducted.	3	2	0	1	0

Note: 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

The implication therefore, was that while dialogue and consultation between section heads and lecturers could be seen as some form of supervision, control and monitoring device, it, however, was limited to only these group of people. The response revealed little participation

from the branch heads in these areas though there appeared to be some formal meeting involvement.

With this indication pointing towards section heads' interaction with lecturers, it was curious to note an indication of uncertainty surfacing in the responses to BB5 when referring to the section heads' involvement in monitoring course reviews. The strength of opinion showed 60% of the respondents expressing uncertainty.

Items BA15(a) and (b) indicated that both branch and section heads have little to do with course tests reviews though the anticipated involvement would most likely come from section heads. The implication was that branch and section heads' role in supervision, control and monitoring was only restricted to stages prior to the course review. These included course development, implementation and evaluation. Other offerings after the evaluation did not involve the branch and section heads.

The impression portrayed by the data seemed to suggest that supervision, control and monitoring was left to the discretion of those in positions of authority as reflected by the manner in which it was implemented.

Five interviewees responding to the question of supervision, control and monitoring asserted that this screening process was effected by the Board of Studies.

Control and monitoring of our training is the responsibility of the BOS
... and yes, ... the courses are screened by the BOS ... all new courses
have to be screened.

Table 12(b) focused on other related sub-themes. Items BA20, E7 and E10 in Table 12(b) showed that although management had ensured that accountability for courses had been maintained, its participation and involvement in branch and section meetings had been minimal.

The data further revealed a curious pattern when dealing with course development issues being on the agenda of branch and section meetings. It was noted from Table 2(b) that while 46% in item BB1(a) asserted course development issues being on the agenda of branch meetings, 62% of the respondents in item BB2(a) were not sure of whether section meetings dealt with these issues. It was an interesting indication that respondents were uncertain over sections' dealing with course development issues when compared to the branches, they (sections) were the next closest unit to the actual implementation process of course development. The same pattern emerged with item BB3 (Table 12(a) p.115), where 44% advocated that course reviews were monitored by branch heads compared to the 60% in item BB5, Table 12(a), who were uncertain about the section heads involvement.

This was an interesting indication that 60% were uncertain over the sections' dealings with course development issues. Naturally sections were the immediate unit directly involved with course development process and yet the responses indicated otherwise.

Table 12(b)
Control and Monitoring and Other Related Issues
(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA20 / E7	Management has ensured that branches and sections are accountable for their courses.	1 4%	5 20%	4 16%	11 44%	4 16%
BB1(a)	Your branch meetings deal with course development issues.	1 5%	7 29%	5 21%	10 42%	1 4%
BB2(a)	Your section meetings deal with course development issues.	1 4%	4 15%	16 62%	5 19%	0 0
E10	Management has made efforts to be regular participants of branch and section meetings.	2	2	0	3	0

Note: 1 - Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

While on one hand, there seemed to be a strong suggestion that there was little supervision, control and monitoring being effected, there also appeared a contradictory view suggesting that

supervision, control and monitoring was effected. However, this latter view only went as far as limiting the participants in this process to only section heads and lecturers. There seemed to be little involvement of branch heads in this operation. Given this setting, it became difficult to establish whether or not there was close control and monitoring of training courses. There appeared to be no distinct pattern in the implementation of this process.

Feedback from questionnaire Item D1, which asked of the respondents if they knew how their course(s) were developed before they had taught it, seemed to support the argument that supervision was not necessary since course developers were professionals and knew what was best. These response best illustrated this view.

No, I don't know how the course was developed but I know it should have been developed by professionals

We have all the experts at the Institute to offer any training programme.

Lecturers are professionals who can develop their own programmes.

The implied argument supporting this view as indicated by the responses was that each course developer was knowledgeable and skilled in their specific discipline therefore, there was an unspoken trust in the integrity of the course developer. It was implied here that to have the course developer subjected to close monitoring and supervision would mean that the professional qualities, integrity and experience of the course developer were being undermined.

Summary of Theme 2 and its Implications

The overall impression gleaned from the responses indicated that while supervision, control and monitoring appear to be in place, the responsibility of the actual implementation of the process rested with only a few people. It appeared that there was no set rule relating to supervision, control and monitoring. By implication it was the prerogative of the section heads and the branch heads to initiate this responsibility.

Theme 3: Course Justification

The third theme that surfaced from the data was related to the subject of *course justification*, in other words, the reasons for conducting any particular course. The data reflects the PNGIPA's course developers' perceptions on how they justified their current courses.

It appeared, as inferred in Table 13 that while claims justifying the existence of the course was made based on evaluation reports, the course evaluation reports appeared not to have considered client feedback as one of the dictating forces in offering justification to the course.

Questionnaire item BA2 in Table 13 showed 61% of the respondents asserting that data indicating the real demand for the particular course existed. The implication is that courses conducted were based on actual needs of the clientele as presented by the available data rather than on assumed needs. In items C1(a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f), various responses were given to justify why the course was developed. It was interesting to note that Item C1(a) had a majority of 78% who voiced the opinion of wanting to be productive which is most probably dictated to by their duty statements. This indication was portrayed by item C(f) with 66% majority agreeing. Item C1(c), on the other hand, raised an interesting point by implying that the course developers thought that their course was a need for the clients. This was clearly indicated in item C1(c) with the majority of 72% voicing agreement. Item C1(e) reflected that many of the course developers, 67%, justified their course based on the successes of past experiences while 56% in item C1(d) were not sure on the impact of their own speciality towards course development.

Contrasting items C1(c)'s 72% and C1(g)'s 45% who thought that their courses were a need for their clients to item C1(b)'s 59% who expressed uncertainties in identifying clients' needs, it can be implied that there were many people were unsure of the involvement of the clients in course development process. Items C1(a) and (f) implied that the duty statement has a lot of influences on the lecturer to be productive in course development.

Table 13
Course Justification (Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA2	Data exists which indicated the real demand for the particular course.	1 4%	3 12%	6 23%	12 46%	4 15%
BA8	Your branches and sections justify the existence of your course.	3 13%	2 9%	12 52%	6 26%	0 0
BA16	A course review involves justifying why the course is being taught.	6 12%	15 19%	10 38%	15 19%	0 0
C1	The reason why you developed your course(s) was you wanted to be productive.	1 6%	1 6%	2 11%	10 56%	4 22%
(a)	your clients wanted such a course.	2 11%	0 0	11 59%	6 32%	0 0
(b)	you thought it was a need for you clients.	1 6%	2 11%	2 11%	8 44%	5 28%
(c)	you are a specialist in that particular subject.	1 6%	2 11%	10 56%	5 28%	0 0
(d)	you had taught the course before and it had been a success.	1 6%	4 22%	1 6%	10 56%	5 28%
(e)	it is a requirement as dictated by your duty statement.	1 6%	0 0	5 29%	8 47%	3 18%
(f)	you thought it was a good course to teach.	2 11%	4 22%	4 22%	5 28%	3 17%
C7	Your course reviews are determined by your course evaluation report.	1 5%	3 16%	2 11%	11 58%	2 11%
(a)	the assessment results of the trainees.	2 11%	1 5%	14 74%	2 11%	0 0
(b)	changes in the training policies of PNGIPA.	1 5%	6 32%	9 47%	3 16%	0 0
(c)	feedback from the client_organisation.	4 24%	11 65%	0 0	2 12%	0 0
(d)	changes in the teaching personnel available.	1 5%	8 44%	3 17%	6 33%	0 0

Note: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

In pursuing this thought, item C7(a) showed that 69% supported the view that course reviews were determined by course evaluation reports. It was interesting to note however, that item C7(d) indicated that 89% of the respondents expressed disagreement with the claim that course reviews were determined by clients feedback. These responses seemed to suggest that client feedback was not significant.

Respondents to items C7(b) and (c) expressed uncertainty over how course reviews were determined by students' assessments and changes in training policy. Furthermore, 49% in item C7(e), indicated that course reviews were not determined by changes in the teaching personnel available.

Summary of Theme 3 and its Implications

The indications were that courses were justified in that they were needed by the clients. Yet, a closer examination revealed that much of the clients' needs were determined by the course developers with very little input from the clients themselves. The course reviews were done with little consideration to the feedback from the clients organisation but rather from the lecturers own course evaluation report.

The overall implication of C7(a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) items in Table 13 would be that while course evaluation was done, it, did not include influences such as client feedback, changes in teaching personnel nor changes in training policy. The key justification was courses based upon data but not on evaluation of course data.

Theme 4: Client Consultation and Client Oriented Training

In this theme, it appeared that the strength of the opinion laid with the assertion that PNGIPA's training was client centred. The indications of the distribution of responses was such that there was a wide a spread of opinion that it was difficult to identify any one dominant pattern. While some claimed that PNGIPA has client consultation and client oriented training, the data revealed that no clear pattern could be identified to substantiate this claim.

Table 14 sets out the distribution of opinions regarding client consultation and client oriented training. All the questionnaire items that were labelled B have 28 respondents responding, the 'C' items with 19 respondents, and the 'E' items with 7 members from the managerial ranks responding.

Table 14
Client Consultation and Client Oriented Training
(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA6	Formulation of training programmes is done with staff development of government departments in isolation from specific targeted clients.	1 4%	5 19%	10 38%	9 35%	1 4%
BA18	Teaching and learning activities are developed in close consultation with clients.	5 19%	8 31%	4 15%	7 27%	2 8%
BA19	There is dialogue between the client organizations' training division and PNGIPA regarding PNGIPA's training courses.	3 12%	6 23%	5 19%	9 35%	3 12%
C2(c)	You developed your course(s) through very close consultation with your clients.	2 11%	2 11%	11 59%	4 21%	0 0
C6(c)	You evaluated your course(s) by the high demand for your course(s) coming from your clients.	1 5%	14 74%	0 0	4 21%	0 0
C7(d)	Your course review is determined by feedback from the client organisation.	4 24%	11 65%	0 0	2 12%	0 0
E11	PNGIPA has developed its aims and objectives through extensive research and consultation with client organisation.	2	3	0	2	

Note: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Items BA6, BA18(d) and BA19 in Table 14 indicated support to the view that PNGIPA's training courses were developed through close dialogue with the clients of the Institute, although the data from the previous theme indicated that courses were justified based on course data rather than on course evaluation data.

A similar view was portrayed in the responses received from the interviewees when they were highlighting the strengths of their course development approach.

Courses are developed to meet the needs of our clients.

Courses developed are based on competency and experience of the clients.

The clients dictate ... my courses respond to their needs.

Courses are focused on the people in the field ... take into consideration the economic situation of the country ... direction and thrust of the Southern Regional Training Centre ... all these contribute to the development of my courses.

The course is client-centred and aimed at a high level ... participants have expressed satisfaction and success in work.

On the other hand, the table showed items BA18(c), C6(c), C7(d) and E11 pointing out that client consultation did not play such a significant role in the review process. Item C7(d) on its own had a great majority, 89%, of the course developers asserting that client feedback was a minimal determinant in course reviews. Item C2(c) interestingly enough, had 59% of the respondents indicating uncertainty over the development of course(s) through very close consultation with the clients.

Summary of Theme 4 and its Implications

In such a setting where there was a wide spread of opinions, no clear pattern could be established. Thus, the claim of client consultation and client oriented training was only be an assumption. The status of client consultation and client orientated training remained unclear.

Yet, again, it must be admitted that the data received was not responding directly to the issue of course development since the questions asked were irrelevant and misdirected. The questions ventured into areas of course implementation and course reviews which were not the focus of this study.

Theme 5: Curriculum Development and Staff Training

The fifth and final theme in PNGIPA's actual curriculum that came to light was of curriculum development and staff training. The implication drawn from this data was that it seemed that very little attention had been directed towards lecturers' enrichment training in vocational curriculum development. The spread of the responses is illustrated in Table 16(a). Questionnaire item BA9(a), (b) and (c) clearly indicated that 40%, 61% and 58% respectively disagreed or strongly disagreed with the claim raised in these items.

Table 15(a)
Curriculum Development and Staff Training
 (Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
(a)	PNGIPA has offered in-service training for lecturers in vocational curriculum development in planning.	3 12%	10 38%	5 19%	5 19%	3 12%
(b)	implementing.	4 15%	12 46%	5 19%	3 12%	2 8%
(c)	evaluating.	3 12%	12 46%	6 23%	3 12%	2 8%

Note: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Interestingly enough, two respondents though supportive and respectful to the lecturers being highly trained specialists in their own disciplines, nevertheless, had this to say:

Most lecturers are professionals but have no training in curriculum development processes ... they need training in curriculum development

knowledge and skill in curriculum development ... are essential necessities ... PNGIPA needs to arrange for its lecturers to be trained in this area.

This view implied that curriculum was a specific discipline. It went on to suggest that PNGIPA lecturers need to possess both knowledge and skill in curriculum development processes to

better design and deliver specific knowledge and skills in their own respective disciplines to the clients.

In a follow-up on staff training, the study focused on management's view regarding this issue. In these questions, the aim was not to isolate the actual course from the developer, but to relate the developer's knowledge and skills in curriculum development to the finished product which was the course itself. In other words, it was centred on the utilisation of this knowledge and skill in producing a well-designed and meaningful course for PNGIPA's clients.

The responses illustrating managements' views regarding staff training were shown in Table 15(b). The indication portrayed by the responses to item E5 was that PNGIPA has accounted for its courses to higher authorities. Item E9 focused on the managerial assessment of the lecturers' knowledge and skill in the implementation of the training cycle from needs analysis to course review. For item E9(a.i) to (a.vi) the strength of opinions appeared to indicate that these factors were not considered in staff appraisals. Indications shown by item E9(b) was with 5 of the 7 respondents asserted that staff appraisals did not include client feedback on courses offered by members of staff, however lecturers' behaviour and attitude towards work, as in item E9(c), had 4 people out of a total of 7 expressing agreement to it being considered in staff appraisals.

Summary of Theme 5 and its Implications

There appeared to be a heavy bias expressed towards minimal involvement of staff in curriculum development training. Data indicated that in-service training for the academic staff in the regard of curriculum development has been neglected.

The implication that could be drawn from responses of interviews was that although PNGIPA has accounted for the validity and relevance of its courses, it, however, placed minimal emphasis on its lecturers' knowledge and skills in the full implementation of the training cycle. The responses seemed to indicate that management viewed lecturers' behaviour and attitude

towards work more important to the knowledge and skills needed in implementing a curriculum process.

Table 15(b)
Managements' Role in Staff Training
 (Frequency Distribution)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
E5	PNGIPA has been accountable to higher authorities on the validity and relevance of its courses.	1	2	0	3	3
E9	Staff appraisals consider in detail the lecturers' knowledge and skills in					
(a.i)	conducting a training needs analysis.	3	2	0	2	0
(a.ii)	setting of performance-based objectives	4	1	0	2	0
(a.iii)	designing of meaningful courses.	4	1	0	2	0
(a.iv)	reviewing courses based on course evaluation reports.	6	0	0	1	0
(a.vii)	marketing courses.	1	4	1	0	1
(b)	clients feedback on courses offered.	3	2	0	2	0
(c)	lecturers' behaviour and attitude towards work.	1	2	0	3	1

Note: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

Concluding Summary of Issue 1 and its Implications

The implications that emerged from the data reflected that the actual vocational curriculum development context of PNGIPA was a mixture of a variety of curriculum approaches. There appeared to be no proper guiding authority dictating the standard procedures thus, the onus was left to the lecturers to implement the training cycle. For those who possessed some knowledge and skill in curriculum development, it offered a starting point, whereas those without this knowledge and skill fumbled their way through. Furthermore, while some course developers were thorough in meticulously implementing the curriculum process, others preferred a speedy approach. The selected approaches were adapted depending on the lecturer's viewpoint which then meant that where one course developer would see a particular procedural step as

important, another course developer may not. In such a context, not surprisingly, these variety of approaches developed.

Issue No. 2: What was the Intended Curriculum for PNGIPA?

With the Institute currently operating on a variety of course development approaches as gleaned from the data, the question of the Institute's intended curriculum development model is then raised. In attempting to establish PNGIPA's intended curriculum, a study of the data revealed three views. One view asserted that PNGIPA did have an intended curriculum while the other view indicated a direct contradiction claiming that PNGIPA did not have an intended curriculum. Then, there was the third view that expressed uncertainty over the issue.

The Likert items, (Table 16), when subjected to simple statistical analysis of percentiles and frequency distribution revealed the spread and strength of lecturers' and administrators' perceptions on the issue. A reminder once again with regard to the number of respondents to the various sections of the questionnaire. For all items labelled B there were 28 respondents, the items labelled with a C had 19 respondents and all the E items with a total of 7 respondents. All items labelled 'E' will be subjected to only a numerical count due to the small number of respondents.

There is no standard approach. PNGIPA branches and sections are working in isolation

The respondents to item BA10 clearly indicated that the majority of lecturers, 80%, voiced disagreement to the claim that their course(s) were developed using a definite curriculum model. Five questionnaire respondents had these comments when responding to open-ended question C10 (see Appendix 8).

No clear guidelines but still required to provide courses

No laid-down policy, Different instruction each day. Therefore, need to establish a policy on curriculum development procedures.

I have yet to see a syllabus and course development guideline.
No policy guidelines and set procedures.

Table 16
PNGIPA's Intended Curriculum
(Frequency Distribution and %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA10	The course has been developed using a definite curriculum model.	7 28%	13 52%	4 16%	1 4%	0
C2(a)	You developed your course with a detailed written guideline to help you.	4 22%	4 22%	8 44%	2 11%	0
E1	PNGIPA, as a training Institute does have clear specific performance-based aims and objectives to guide vocational curriculum processes.	1	3	0	3	0
E2	There is currently a policy that dictates the procedures of course development within PNGIPA.	1	2	2	2	0
E3	Lecturers in branches and sections of the Institute are well aware of this policy.	1	1	0	5	0
E5	All branches and sections are effectively implementing this policy.	4	0	3	0	0

Similar responses asserting the non-existence of a proper course development guideline were received in response to lecturers' interview item 4, (see Appendix 9), from 4 interviewees.

No guidelines. My own teaching experience guided me.

I had no written guidelines to help me develop my course. I depended on my knowledge of my specific discipline and experience.

There was no curriculum policy. The BOS guideline has not been endorsed by the authorising body therefore it can only be an assumed guideline.

Only guideline on Management by Objectives, Public Service Training Policy. No Institutional curriculum development policy.

On the same note, the respondents of item C2(a), those lecturers who have actually developed courses, had an equal split of opinions between disagreement and uncertainty with 44% uncertain.

The management's view on the issue also indicated a mixture of opinions. In an attempt to establish the existence of a current curriculum policy of PNGIPA, item E2 revealed that three respondents disagreed with the statement asserting an established PNGIPA curriculum policy, two confirmed the existence of curriculum policy while the other two voiced uncertainty.

Following up on this claim of an existing curriculum policy, in three separate interviews with three members of the Senior Management Team (SMT), attempts at locating the 'curriculum policy' failed. When the Registrar was approached, the search for the 'policy' turned out to be just as unsuccessful. The consultant (ARA Consultants), when approached on the matter responded with:

Why would PNGIPA need a training policy? It already has the National Training Policy .

The interview responses reinforced the notion of uncertainty surrounding the curriculum development policy.

I have not sighted any curriculum policy. If there is one, all lecturers should have access to it.

PNGIPA does not had any policy on curriculum development.
Prior to the National Training Policy, no training policy. Curriculum policy does not exist.

No curriculum policy. Lecturers have their own methods of developing courses.

Item E2 appeared to suggest that there was no current policy on curriculum development activities within the Institute. Yet having said that, it was then surprising to find five respondents out of a total of seven in item E3, asserting that lecturers were aware of this policy which item E5 took further indicating that this policy was not effectively being implemented by the lecturers. There was an obvious discrepancy between the two claims. In responding to item E1, four out of seven respondents disagreed with the statement that indicated that PNGIPA has clear specific performance-based aims and objectives to guide vocational curriculum processes. Hence, there seemed to be confusion over whether or not there was an established curriculum

development policy within the Institute. While most lecturers expressed unawareness of an established curriculum development policy, among the managerial ranks there was also division in opinion relating to an established curriculum policy that dictated the procedures in course development.

Additional support for a non-existent curriculum policy was evidenced through the documents of the Development of the Administrative College Reference Group (1990, p.60). It asserted that the Institute since 1973 had been operating without proper guidelines. The Group recognised the Institute's setbacks and disappointments and had accorded it to the lack of guidance from the parent department, the Department of Personnel Management.

In the introductory note of the public service training needs, it was revealed that prior to April 1989 there was not a curriculum policy established (Administrative College of Papua New Guinea 1990, p.1). This document confirmed the assumption made earlier on the lack of curriculum development policy. Thus, the scenario was such that curriculum development up to 1989 was operating on isolated and different levels. Individual course developers assumed a curriculum model upon which their courses were developed.

But in May of 1989, the Board of Studies approved and endorsed the Discrepancy Approach as one of the two curriculum models to be used in course development (Administrative College of Papua New Guinea 1990, p.1). The 1989 Training Needs Analysis of Public Service in Papua New Guinea identified a few members of the academic staff as being active participants in a Needs Analysis workshop. There were three training needs analysis workshops held in the months of July and August 1989, purposely to help lecturers to understand the processes involved and to be party to the development of the necessary instruments to put into effect the process of the training needs analysis (Administrative College of Papua New Guinea 1990, p.2).

In the interviews, more in-depth probing into the Discrepancy Approach being the intended curriculum development process brought to light that although all of the respondents were aware of the model, 6 of the interviewees had these comments to make:

I do not understand the model therefore I have not used it much in course development.

I do not like the model because I feel it is too time consuming and a waste of time ... There is insufficient time available to implement thoroughly such a process.

I have heard of the model however I have my own model ... I think the model is quite old given that it was developed in 1975 ... therefore I do not use it.

My understanding of the approach is very vague ... I don't use it, but if need be then I think I can use it.

I have attended workshops on the model but ... not very clear to me.

I do not use the discrepancy approach. I use the BOS guideline. Although the intended curriculum development had been used by some course developers, the implied message was that it was not favoured as the above responses showed.

One questionnaire respondent came out quite strongly on the issue stating:

I don't totally subscribe to the view ... I consider that if we continue to rely on alleviating discrepancy we are not providing any creativity to our participants, i.e. we are concentrating on their mistakes, their failures. We have to think beyond their current problems, jobs and see how they can adapt to the changing requirements of their organisation. Course development must therefore be based on the changing circumstances that make an impact on us.

Discrepancy approach is in theory only.

On the other hand, there were other responses from the questionnaire that signified that the discrepancy approach was not completely abandoned.

Given no other model we did need this model to identify the training needs of field officers.

I use this model to find out why the intended outputs weren't achieved. I teach the approach as a course therefore I am very familiar with the procedures.

I have used this model to find out the specific skills that the client used in their organisation, in particular, the tasks / duties they perform and place more emphasis on that skill in my training.

I use it ... Helped a lot in my course development ... identifies actual needs

This indicated that although the discrepancy approach was not be fully utilised by the course developers of the Institute as the intended model, knowledge of this model's existence was evident. It also signified that parts of the model was used whenever and wherever the course developer thought it best.

Summary of Issue 2 and Its Implications

There were several implications that surfaced from these responses. Firstly, it seemed that course developers have actually used parts of the training needs analysis model if and where necessary judging from these responses. It appeared that the decision to use the model was once again left to the discretion of the course developer, and as a consequence, other models were also used, perhaps by the majority of lecturers. Whenever they chose not to use the model they could totally disregard it, the decision was entirely their own to make as indicated by the responses. These responses presented suggested that there existed among the course developers a situation where there was total ignorance of the discrepancy approach to complete use of the discrepancy approach depending on their familiarity of the approach. This verified the implication that was raised in the first issue where the data indicated that many of the course development approaches were 'cut and paste' approaches taken from various other models.

The next implication was that a number of lecturers have been exposed and have actually participated in design and development of phase one of the discrepancy approach. Despite the BOS endorsement of the discrepancy approach as one of the intended model of the Institute, the actual isolated practise of course development has not changed much as indicated by the responses.

Also implicit in these responses was the suggestion that the course developers preferred their current approaches more so than the discrepancy approach. It seemed that the course developers have a personal attachment to their own 'creations' and therefore expressed high regard for their own approaches.

With regard to lecturers' unawareness to the discrepancy approach being the intended model for PNGIPA, the implication confronting this circumstance was not so much the lecturers' ignorance but rather of a communication problem. It was implicit in the responses that the dissemination of information regarding curriculum development procedures decision and the necessary information for implementation of this decision appeared not to have been properly circulated.

The implications as revealed in Issues 1 and 2 indicated that there existed some discrepancies between the actual and the intended curriculum development practices of PNGIPA.

This was not to say that the actual practice was not the appropriate practice nor the intended achieving its purpose. However, the study would rather direct its attention to the strengths and weaknesses of the actual practice before making a comparison between the two practices.

Issue 3: What were the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Actual Curriculum Development process of PNGIPA?

In Issue 3, it was revealed that the PNGIPA's actual curriculum development process and the intended curriculum development process were not the same in practice. The study would like to explore the strengths and the weaknesses of the actual curriculum development practices before making a comparison between the two curriculum development practices.

Once again it was necessary to remind the reader that the study has defined the term 'client' as the individual trainee rather than the organisation.

It was implied in the responses that each individual course developer identified their advantages based on the approach they had chosen as their course development approach. An analysis of the data revealed that the main and the only strength as claimed and shared by most of the course developers was that their developed courses were client-centred which was that the courses were responding directly to client needs. This assertion was detected in the responses as presented in Table 17.

Item BA12 had a majority of 61%, item BA18(d) with a majority of 50% and item BA19 with 47% indicating the client centred approach.

Table 17
Strengths of the Actual PNGIPA Curriculum
 (Frequency Distribution & %)

Item No.	Questions	1	2	3	4	5
BA12	The course has been developed as a result of a training needs analysis.	2 8%	2 8%	6 23%	12 46%	4 15%
BA18 (d)	Teaching and learning activities are developed in close consultation with staff development of client organisation.	4 15%	6 23%	3 12%	11 42%	2 8%
BA19	There is dialogue between the client organisation's training division and PNGIPA regarding PNGIPA's training courses.	3 12%	6 23%	5 19%	9 35%	3 12%

Note: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 - Undecided, 4 - Agree, 5 - Strongly Agree

The open-ended questions of Sections C and D in particular question C8 and D6, (see Appendix 8), which referred to the strengths and weaknesses of the actual curriculum, brought forth these types of responses:

The course was developed on demand.

Client orientated training. Only one of its kind for public servants.

It captures the training needs of the clientele and at the same time incorporates the current knowledge about the field that is applicable to PNG environment.

Courses developed are based on competency and experience of the clients

Identifying the real needs of the clients. Tailored according to the needs of the clients.

Training cycle is consistent and client oriented.

Additional comments came from six interviewees reflecting similar views.

Courses are developed to meet the needs of our clients.

The clients dictate ... my courses respond to their needs.

Courses are focused on the people in the field ... take into consideration the economic situation of the country ... direction and thrust of the Southern Regional Training Centre ... all these contribute to the development of my course

Course is client centred and aimed at a high level ... participants have expressed satisfaction and success in work

Client needs ... This is what matters most to the participants than the facilitator.

You develop courses according to the client needs by asking them the type of training required by workers concerned.

The indications were that the clients' input into course determination was crucial to the course developer if they were to develop client oriented courses. The implication, consequently, was that the need for the courses to be delivered could be justified in that, according to the course developers, the client needed the course. The responses in the interview therefore, could probably be taken to mean the course existence could be justified as it responded to the client needs, in other words it was client centred. A safe assumption could therefore be made that the main strength of the actual curriculum was the client-oriented theme.

However, the same could not be said for items C1(b) and (c). While item C1(b) had the majority, 59%, expressing indecisiveness relating to whether or not the client needed the course, item C1(c) went on to suggest that it was the course developer who determined the needs of the clients. The validity of the client centred approach then appeared to be doubtful.

The responses from the managerial ranks with regard to open-ended question item E13 (see Appendix 2), addressing the same concern of identifying the weaknesses of curriculum processes of the Institute not surprisingly limited itself to policy.

Lecturers are not well aware of the policy that dictates the procedures of course development.

Lack of adherence to policy by its teaching staff

The issue of 'policy' implied that there may have been a policy drafted however the nature of the policy referred to was not as explicit in terms of curriculum development process.

Additionally, there were views that sympathised with the notion that PNGIPA needed to be consistent in maintaining a dialogue with the clientele populace otherwise the notion of asserting client oriented training becomes a mockery.

Developed course not needed by the organisation partly because some parts of the developed course were irrelevant

Lack of dialogue with the client departments.

Not doing enough TNA for clients so as to keep abreast with changes in technology, social, economical and political affairs in the organisations. Most are still teaching out-dated course material.

Further, while this assertion of client centred approach was perceived as true for many PNGIPA course developers, there were others who do not have the same opinion. According to (Turner 1985, p.4; Duque and Saffu 1991; Saffu 1993, p.2), there were still criticisms directed at the Institute's training programmes, criticisms that advocated that the courses offered by the Institute were outdated and irrelevant to the current working environment. Saffu (1993)

urged that there was a need for PNGIPA to reassess its existing training programmes and to improve the present curriculum to meet the changing needs of its clients.

This implied that some courses at least did not appear to be fulfilling their purpose to enhance as well as equip its clients with the knowledge and skills to improve productivity in the work place. It was likely that the claim then of a client oriented training was only an assumed claim if complaints and criticisms were still being levelled at the Institute for some courses.

A related theme that was brought to light highlighted on discretion and prerogative of the course developers in tailoring the course to suit their clients' needs by using their own course development approaches. The flexibility found within such a context gave the course developers and lecturers the freedom to decide on how best to bring about client oriented training. As one interviewee describes:

It allows me to design and develop the course the way I want, and teach it the way I want ... My own personal flavour...

They were not bound by any compulsory policy that dictated to them the procedures to use, a policy that would make them feel obliged to follow. Thus, it was not surprising that course developers' individual preferences towards course development approaches were at play. As implied in the responses, the discretion to choose their own approaches rested with each course developer. It appeared that each course developer thought theirs was the best method to develop a course. The implication was that little regard was given to other models. People were working in isolation with no guiding standard. It was from this context that a lot of the lecturers expressed a certain amount of dissatisfaction and uncertainty over the current curriculum development practices. The responses from the questionnaire hinted at that dissatisfaction over the current situation as well as voicing the need for more knowledge and skill for the Institute's staff through staff development and training. Some of the responses were:

Appoint curriculum specialists to position in the curriculum section.
The positions have for too long laid dormant.

Set up immediately the curriculum development unit. Staff it with the appropriate personnel. Have the curriculum Development staff run an

in-house vocational curriculum development course for all the academic staff regardless of what was run by the world bank consultant.

PNGIPA hasn't got a proper curriculum unit.

No in-service training in curriculum development procedures. Lack of curriculum development specialists to advise.

I think the important thing is to have a section itself 'Curriculum Development', so we can have workshops or conduct our own training for our staff in course development.

We need to staff the Curriculum Development Unit with specialist ... for PNGIPA staff.

The main weakness is the lack of personnel in the curriculum development section.

Set up a full-time curriculum developing, implementing and monitoring committee.

Similarly, interview responses ran along the same line.

Re-establish curriculum development unit.

PNGIPA needs a curriculum office to be set up.

Establish curriculum development section ... we need specialist advice and assistance.

In-service training needed in curriculum development ... curriculum development unit a need in PNGIPA.

Vocational curriculum specialists may be worthwhile for PNGIPA.

A positive move for PNGIPA would be to have a curriculum office. It will assist in the enrichment training needed for the staff in the discipline of course design, implementation and evaluation.

The implications that could be drawn from these responses was that there appeared to be no proper direction in relation to curriculum activities. It seemed that the lack of a proper dictating authority has led to a state of confusion over the curriculum development processes. Hence, the call for the re-establishment of PNGIPA's Curriculum Section to ensure that the institutional curriculum development processes were established on a common understanding and implemented.

There were other disadvantages raised which had little to do with the actual PNGIPA's curriculum development processes. Rather many of these disadvantages were indirectly related but are not primary to the processes concerned.

Summary of Issue 3 and Its Implications

The main advantage that surfaced from the data was the suggestion that the actual curriculum of PNGIPA was client centred. It meant that the courses that were developed were meeting the training needs of the clients.

However, despite this main advantage, it was evidenced through the responses that not all the courses were developed as a result of the client needs being used as a determining factor. There were indications that the courses had been developed more so on assumed needs rather than the actual needs of the clients. The course developer *thought* that the clients needed the course rather than the client deciding for themselves what kind of training they needed. This was perhaps instigated by the duty statement which imposed that the lecturer need to be productive in developing new courses.

Although the flexibility and the freedom to develop a course on one hand was seen as an advantage, it at the same time was considered as a contributing factor towards the isolated curriculum development practices of the Institute. With the prerogative to chose whatever model they preferred probably gave rise to individual course developer asserting that their model was superior to that of another. With no standard active model, it became frustrating for lecturers and course developers to find a common ground from which to start. The call for the reestablishment of the curriculum office was an indication to find a common starting point for all curriculum development activities of the Institute. It was also an indication of the lack of knowledge in the specifics of curriculum development processes.

Lastly, the criticisms aimed at the Institute over the lack of directed and relevant training implied that PNGIPA courses were not responding to the actual needs of the clientele it was supposed to be serving. It therefore, contradicts the claim of a client centred curriculum as asserted by many of the course developers. This issue could be resolved by a study on clients to gauge their level of satisfaction with PNGIPA courses.

In consideration of this, the study therefore, proposed to compare and contrast the similarities and the differences of the intended curriculum and the actual curriculum practise of the PNGIPA.

Issue 4: What were the similarities and the differences between the actual and intended curriculum of PNGIPA?

Given that each course developer in the Institute had borrowed, adopted, adapted and even developed their own approaches, it meant that the task of making a comparison was quite difficult. Each method would have to be compared and contrasted with the intended method. Some of these methods were 'cut and paste' efforts with no proper rationale explaining the procedural steps thus, making it difficult to make a comparison. Although these methods professed to possess the basic principle of course development, as claimed by the users, the procedural steps appeared to be a weak point or at least weakly articulated by respondents. With course developers' individual preferences acting as the prime guiding force for the course developer, the procedural steps of course development varied. In the case of PNGIPA, the data revealed, in the first issue which highlighted on the actual curriculum development practices, that such was the practice thus, the differences were more conspicuous than the similarities.

Conclusion

While there appeared to be an intended curriculum process for PNGIPA, the knowledge of the model and how to implement it had been limited to only a few members of the academic staff. The scenario as revealed by the data was one where every course developer became the authority on course development. Individual course developers had their own method of course

development of which they expressed high regard. Therefore, it came as no surprise to find an atmosphere where course developers work in isolation from one another. Such a context caused confusion and uncertainty over what method to use and the procedural steps involved. Hence, supervision, control and monitoring devices became difficult to implement. PNGIPA's curriculum development context lacked a standard dictating policy that would be the instructing device against which course developers could use to enable them to develop courses. It had one TNA on the public sector but was perhaps not used as much. PNGIPA's current curriculum context was one of uncertainties and confusion.

Chapter 6:

Discussion on The PNGIPA Curriculum.

Introduction

The Institute since its establishment, has been responsible for the training of the bulk of the public service work force in Papua New Guinea. Its purpose has been to help prepare many public servants in the work force to be more efficient and productive in their working environment. However, until recently, it seemed that much has been said about the direction in which PNGIPA had directed its training programmes as well as the relevance of the courses offered. These criticisms have prompted the researcher to undertake this study.

The process by which PNGIPA had over the years developed its courses had been an area of uncertainty. The data indicated an undisciplined approach towards course development within the premises of the Institute. The previous chapter raised a number of implications that surfaced concerning PNGIPA's curriculum. These implications would further be discussed to amplify PNGIPA's current curriculum development context. The purpose of this chapter, is to discuss in detail the implications raised by the research data, in the light of the selected established vocational curriculum models presented in Chapter 2. The focus of the discussion was centred on the principles governing vocational curriculum and its compatibility to PNGIPA's curriculum experience.

A vocational curriculum placed great emphasis on the provision of skills through training. Training could be delivered to the clientele in two ways, either teacher centred (pedagogy) or learner centred (andragogy). Knowles (1975, p.19) explained that:

pedagogy is the art and science of teaching with the central focus on the child student while andragogy is the art and science of helping adults ... learn.

Knowles realised that more and more educationists at all levels are integrating andragogical approaches with those of pedagogy in effecting better learning. PNGIPA's intended approach

was more inclined towards andragogy seeing that most of its clients were adults. Knowles (1975, p.19), described these two approaches as 'teacher-directed' learning and 'self-directed' learning, the former more inclined towards the young learner while the latter towards the adult learner. Knowles (1975, p.19-21) in his summary of the differences between the young learner and an adult learner pointed out several assumptions:

Teacher directed learning assumes that the learner is essentially a dependant personality ... teacher has the responsibility of deciding what and how the learner should be taught ... whereas self-directed learning assumes that the learner grow in capacity to be self-directing as an essential component of maturing

Teacher directed learning assumes that the learner's experience is of less value than that of the teacher . . . whereas self-directed learning assumes that the learner's experience becomes an increasingly rich resource for learning

Teacher-directed learning assumes that students become ready to learn different things at different level of maturation... whereas self-directed learning assumes that the individual becomes ready to learn what is required to perform their ... life tasks.

Teacher directed learning assumes that students enter into education with a subject-centred orientation to learning ... whereas self-directed learning assumes that this orientation is a result of their previous conditioning in school and that their natural orientation is task or problem centred.

Teacher-directed learning assumes that students are motivated to learn in response to external rewards and punishments, such as grades, diplomas, wards degrees and fear of failure; whereas self-directed learning assumes that the learner is motivated by internal incentives such as the need for esteem.

In this instance, the young student's learning was being dictated and manipulated by others whereas the adult learner, on the other hand, differed. They have that freedom and right to choose the type of education and training they need. PNGIPA's clientele populace fall under the category of adult learners. It is important here to make the distinction that much of Knowles' focus was concentrated around the individual learner rather than the organisation of which the individual is a part of. It was the individual's training needs that was important and not the organisations' training needs. It was within this context that the term 'client' is being

discussed, the individual learner's training needs and not the organisation's training needs. Thus, in considering Knowles' assertions, it was therefore, assumed that the PNGIPA clients most probably already have some formed opinion on what kind of training they would want as people performing a prescribed task. While this assumption may be so, the data indicated that there was very little input from the people actually performing the tasks, namely, the needs of the learners themselves. It was implied that the focus was more centred on the organisation's need in relation to the organisation's aims and objectives.

The Actual Curriculum of PNGIPA

The current curriculum development context of PNGIPA was a scenario where a number of curriculum development models and no models were used. These models were either adopted or adapted from other established models. Of these, the adopted models offered a more comprehensive understanding of the procedural steps than the adapted curriculum development models which appeared to be sketchy and vague in their representation of the procedural steps. This had been PNGIPA's experience for a long time. It had been developing and conducting courses without any clear policy that identified the Institute's intended curriculum. This became quite evident when the responses received expressed a great deal of uncertainty over the possibility of a PNGIPA curriculum policy. Yet, in spite of the adopted models offering comprehensive understanding of the procedural steps, there had been no clear indication of the aim of the models and where these models place their emphasis.

Vocational Curriculum: Aims and Objectives

In addressing the issue of aim and emphasis, the selected assumed vocational curriculum's approaches differ. In Nadler's (1989, p.111), Critical Events Model (CEM), he began by first making the distinction between training and education stating:

In the case of training, the problem already exists, but when education is being considered, attention is on a possible future problem whose full dimensions cannot be known at that time.

He asserted that the purpose of education was to provide learning for the learner to use at a later date. It was to prepare the learner to be a possible future employee. Nadler's curriculum development model, on the other hand, was aimed at solving problems associated with jobs and their immediate surroundings. The model began by exploring the dimensions of the problem with those who have the problem. Nadler asserted that all parties to the problem must agree on what the problem is and that training is the solution to the problem before training was to be effected. His argument was that as all jobs were either input or outputs of one another within an organisation, the standard of performance would naturally be affected. For example, should the input of one job appear below the expected standard it would obviously affect the output of this particular job. PNGIPA's course developers' experiences with the training needs analysis of its clientele exhibited a similar pattern when they delved into factors which may influence the performance of the person doing the job (see Chapter 2).

PNGIPA, however, differed from Nadler where he directed attention towards identifying the problem associated with the prescribed tasks. The data indicated that in the PNGIPA's case, it was not so much a problem but rather the differences between the actual outputs of a job and the intended outputs (see Chapter 2). A distinction needs to be made here between Nadler's 'problem' and PNGIPA's 'discrepancy'. When Nadler referred to a problem, he may not necessarily be referring to the difference between the intended and the actual outputs only but may also be referring to other problems such as the competence of the person performing the job, for example. In the PNGIPA setting, the organisation's aims and objectives often set the scene therefore, discrepancy was referring to what was prescribed by the duty statement as opposed to the actual results of the job (see Chapter 2). The proposed training therefore, in Nadler's case, is focused on how it was to solve the problem and in PNGIPA's case, to bridge the gap between the intended and the actual results.

Unlike Nadler, Blank (1982, p.65) was not so concerned about problems that may exist but rather emphasised the importance of trainees mastering any particular skills of a trade. His

approach was aimed at improving the competence of workers within any one occupation. The underlying philosophies of Blank's approach was the notion that:

human competence' is the ability to actually perform. Knowledge, attitudes, and efforts are of little value without results.

'mastery learning' - holds that most anyone can learn most anything well if given quality instructions and sufficient time.
(Blank 1982, p.vi)

In Phase 1 of his model (Blank 1982, p.65), an analysis of job tasks had to be done to identify areas of competency. This would involve describing tasks that the worker actually performed on the job so as to develop a training programme that would help trainees acquire and master skills that would make them successful workers. Compared to Blank's approach, this study indicated that the intended purpose of PNGIPA needs analysis was, to identify the gaps between the actual and the intended outputs. This would then offer the basis to the plan, if need be, for a training programme that would bridge this gap or as PNGIPA preferred to call it 'discrepancy'. It seemed from the responses, that the emphasis was not so much to enhance the existing skills so as to have the trainee gain mastery of the skills but more so on having the trainee achieve the intended results. In so far as the discrepancy approach was concerned, identifying the discrepancy did not indicate that the worker was capable of performing at the required level as prescribed by the duty statement. For PNGIPA to place emphasis solely on discrepancies would mean a disregard of the client's competency. It would be in PNGIPA's best interest to ensure that a lot more attention was directed towards the client's potential and ability as well. The latter could be done through a staff appraisal, by assessing not only what the client was able to do but how well the tasks was accomplished. Based on this judgement, some insight into the client's potential and ability is possible. It is one thing to know the discrepancy but another to know whether the client has the potential and the ability to perform in order to bridge the gap between the actual and the intended outputs. With this argument in mind, Blanks' (1982) competency-based model could be adopted by PNGIPA to ensure a more realistic needs analysis. The focus then would be two-fold; the first to identify the discrepancies and secondly to have prior knowledge of the client's potential and ability. When equipped with

these pieces of information, the decision for a relevant training programme could be developed. The training programme could be aimed at either offering in-service training and pre-service training. The in-service training would be designed for those who already possess some skills but would require more updated skills to better themselves in their jobs. In other words, to be more competent in the current job. The latter kind of training would be for those who did not possess the skills and would need to acquire the skills to perform the prescribed tasks. Blank's sole objective was to produce 'results'.

In Knowles' (1975) Self-Directed Learning, the focus was on the learner in deciding the kind of training needed, the delivery of training and the purpose of receiving this training. Knowles asserted that the adult learners possessed some formed idea on what they wanted so it was by their choice that they have opted for training. The facilitator's role was only to assist them achieve their objectives. This assertion would not hold true for PNGIPA. The responses to Item C1(b), (c) and (g) of the questionnaire (Appendix 8) revealed that the client did not play a significant role in needs analysis. Taking Knowles' assertion into account, PNGIPA appeared to be domineering and making decision in the 'best interest' of the clients. In other words, PNGIPA presumed to know what was best for the client rather than the clients deciding for themselves.

Although there were distinct differences in where the main emphases were in these three models, the common feature that the three different approaches shared was that all three centred their activities around their clients, the people who needed their services. Clearly, there was a distinct difference between PNGIPA's definition of 'client' and the three selected vocational curriculum development models. While PNGIPA identified the 'client' to mean the organisation, the selected three curriculum development models focused on the individual learner as the client and not the organisation from which the learner came. The PNGIPA's definition of the term 'client' implied an influence of the communal culture of Papua New Guinea environment where the group needs took precedence over the individual needs. Further, and more importantly, the underlying rationale of these models were clearly set out.

Having said all that, PNGIPA needed to reflect upon its own curriculum and reassess its curriculum's intention. Currently, with the numerous various curriculum development practices effective within the Institute, these immediately added to the complications (see Chapter 5). Take for instance the implication regarding procedural steps of a curriculum model. The aim and emphasis most probably differed from one model to next, therefore, the steps appeared varied and difficult to verify. While PNGIPA course developers asserted the importance of a needs analysis, few were able to offer comprehensive detailed procedural steps on its implementation as well as justification to the purpose of a needs analysis (Chapter 5). Where the needs analysis was justified, it was expected that it made the task of control and monitoring a lot easier. PNGIPA's assertions of a client-centred training would be true if a substantive needs analysis model with procedural steps was in place. In this way justification was provided, otherwise, there was no credibility in this claim of a 'client oriented' training when there was little evidence of a well-documented system of operation concerning the implementation of a needs analysis. The question of client relevance was used as 'lip-service' only. This was clearly indicated in the findings when a wide range of opinions were received. No dominant pattern emerged. Those lecturers who were not involved in the course development procedures availed themselves in other ways. Little thought was directed to the procedural steps used in developing the courses. It was apparently accepted that the developed courses were developed by knowledgeable and professional academics. Thus, from a wide range of varied experiences and training there evolved a wide range of varied course development approaches. It was therefore, concluded that a needs analysis was crucial in the determination of any training programme that would minimise the inadequacy in performing a specified task.

Given that there were many curriculum models being used simultaneously, PNGIPA was not able to effectively monitor the implementation of the needs analysis. There was no guarantee on whether the jobs and the tasks involved were properly analysed. A well-substantiated job and task analysis was dependent on a well set out and manageable needs analysis model, with all procedural steps clearly set out as well as the dictating rationale of needs analysis.

With no common curriculum development approach emerging from the data, PNGIPA curriculum development context seemed all the more disorderly. PNGIPA appeared not have a central coordinating body that would oversee the implementation of the training cycle. Such an environment no doubt did not develop overnight. Given very little guidance by the parent department throughout its years as an appendage to the government department (see Chapter 4), it was not surprising that it was a case of 'swim or drown' for the lecturers. The overall purpose to train propelled PNGIPA on, yet, the very much needed direction was lacking. The Institutional aims and objectives pointed out the general direction though they failed in providing the 'route' to take to reach the targeted goal. Therefore, with the course developers required to not only teach but to develop the course as well, they had little to go on except their own background training and experience (see Chapter 5). The findings also indicated that there has been very little in-service training in curriculum development offered to the members of the academic staff. The percentage distribution indicated a very heavy bias in support of very minimal training. The question of the validity of PNGIPA courses would appear questionable. It was not sufficient to justify the validity of the courses by asserting that the courses were developed by 'experts' as some of the responses indicated. Curriculum is a specific discipline and knowledge and skill of this discipline was required if one was to properly deliver training in their respective discipline.

This deficiency contributed to the difficulty of executing thorough checkpoints throughout the implementation of the curriculum development process since each approach was different. It would require knowledge and skills of individual models used to effect thorough and proper monitoring. In Nadler's Critical Events Model (CEM), there are seven checkpoints which act as filtering devices (see Chapter 2). These checkpoints were integral parts of identifying the needs of the organisation. These checkpoints ensured that the development of the training course responded directly to the need identified. Blank (1982) also has filtering devices which he identified as 'self-check'. In this instance, the course developer was presented with a series of question after completion of each procedural stage. These questions played the role of filtering devices to ensure that the training package being developed was directly responding to the

identified need. In the self-directed learning, the checkpoint was found in the fact that the learners designed and evaluated their performances during training by developing some form of rating scales. These checkpoints in each of the models could also be recognised as monitoring devices which maintain, control and direct the flow of the training cycle in the right direction. These checkpoints needed to be closely observed if the intended objectives were to be achieved.

Within the PNGIPA setting it seemed that curriculum development model checkpoints were not being given the attention they needed. The responses indicated that branch heads for example, have little input in course development procedures utilised within the branch by the various sections of the branch. They only asserted themselves in the assessment procedures of the Institute. Evaluation of training programmes were done on an irregular basis. If valid feedback and evaluation of each procedural step was as important as the 'experts' alleged it to be, then PNGIPA need to assess its own control and monitoring devices. It could not boast justification in its supervisory, control and monitoring roles when it allowed individual course developers the flexibility to pick and choose their own course development procedures. In such an environment, it no doubt created complications in offering proper guidance and advice considering that each model may vary in where the aim and the emphasis were placed. An elaboration of this point would further clarify what was meant by aim and emphasis. Knowles' Self-Directed Learning (1975), placed its emphasis on the learners knowing their learning needs and designing their own learning contracts on the type of education and training they would like to receive. Simply stated, the onus of deciding the type of training was on the trainee rather than on the trainer. Blank's (1982) Competency-Based training, on the other hand, placed its emphasis on helping the learner to gain mastery over skills to be a more competent worker in the working environment. Nadler's CEM, (1975), was focused on identifying problem areas in the occupation and solving these problems through training if the situation demands that training was needed. It would therefore, as mentioned earlier, require some knowledge of the different models to be able to pilot the processes of course development effectively within the Institute.

The concept of training appeared to have been misunderstood for quite some time in PNGIPA.. For many, it has been an ambiguous term. Many viewed generalist education course as providing training functions as noted in the data. Structured rigorous lectures were mistaken for training. The distinction has not been made between generalist educational objectives and training objectives (see Chapter 5). Training was centred on the delivery of skills. This ambiguous concept has continued to repeat itself as evidenced by the yearly handbooks. In further highlighting this problematic area, one needs to look at some of the current practises of the Institute. For example, in the setting of course objectives, PNGIPA portrayed itself through its courses as a skill-based training Institute yet, the training objectives as presented in the PNGIPA handbook (1994), appeared to suggest a heavy bias towards general education. In spite of this bias, the responses indicated that the setting of task-related objectives area was not a problem area for many of the course developers. It appeared that there was certainly a big misunderstanding between training objectives and educational objectives. As mentioned earlier, it was worth noting the distinction made by Nadler (1975, p.111). This distinction would probably help clear this misunderstanding when he referred to education and training, he asserted that in education 'attention is on a possible future problem whose full dimension can not be known at that time'.

In the light of this assertion, PNGIPA would have been for a long time delivering many of its training programmes to solve 'unknown' future problems. PNGIPA's immediate concern was not to solve unseen future problems but to raise the productivity of the present work force. Furthermore, there was no way PNGIPA could have foreseen what those 'future problems' were. Thus, the set objectives contradicted the intention of offering skill-based training for immediate use.

In as far as supervision, control and monitoring was concerned, this bias could have been minimised had constant feedback and evaluation been exercised from the initial needs analysis to the setting of the objectives. The feedback and evaluation would have guided the direction in

the setting of objectives. On the other hand, such feedback and evaluation would not have been possible given the curriculum development environment that prevailed then.

Yet another example of minimal supervision, control and monitoring as gleaned from the implications, was the uncertainty surrounding the assertion of a 'client oriented training'. The implication that surfaced out of the data suggested a wide spread of opinions leaving the claim unclear and unjustified (see Chapter 5). Currently, individual course developers working in isolation were alleging such a claim. The task of accounting for the relevance of the course with regard to the needs of the clientele could only be seen and taken as an individual assumption. In an environment where the identification of clientele's training needs were not closely supervised and monitored by a central coordinating team, there would be difficulties in verifying the theme of 'client oriented' training among course developers as well as non-course developers. Without standard control and monitoring device that linked up all the various models in the Institute, the task of verifying this claim became complicated and difficult. The control and monitoring devices used in making this assumption in the first instance, were not the standard procedures across the board hence, making it a handicap. Assertions such as 'client oriented training' emanating from individual and isolated practises of course development could not be easily justified. It would be more assertive if issued by a central coordinating team whose speciality is to ensure that there was cohesiveness in PNGIPA curriculum development activities. The lack of a coordinating body has been a part of PNGIPA's current curriculum practice as was obvious in the organisational structure which did not cater for a curriculum office (see Chapter 4).

Summary of PNGIPA's Actual Curriculum Development Process

It appeared that PNGIPA's curriculum development practices have placed it in a very unsatisfactory position. Its curriculum development activities were conducted with minimal checks. Without a standard curriculum method across the board, those who were in the position to check out these activities could not do so effectively given the existence of the various models. PNGIPA, in many ways had condoned this practice. There was indication in

the responses which expressed high regard for the professionalism and integrity of the course developers. Based on this assumption the courses that were developed were accepted at face value. There was little attention directed to the procedural steps in course development and the rationale associated with these procedural steps. If PNGIPA had seriously dwelt upon the curriculum models used within the Institute, and their aims and where they placed their emphasis, then it could identify the control and monitoring devices built into the curriculum model used. The fact that very little time was spent in familiarising and understanding the curriculum models prevalent within the Institute has led PNGIPA to become weak in effecting proper control and monitoring of its courses.

PNGIPA's Intended Curriculum.

The curriculum development environment of the Institute has hardly been its strength in view of its past history and current practices as implied by the data. The Institute has for a long time been operating in an inconsistent and disorganised manner (Reily 1976, p.213; Turner 1985, p.5). The findings revealed that 80% of the respondents denied working from a definite curriculum model when they were developing their courses. The responses indicated that the course developers and other lecturers have not sighted any curriculum policy nor were they aware that such a policy existed. This confirmed that prior to 1989 there was no established curriculum policy. Further, according to the Development of Administrative College Reference Group and Administrative College of Papua New Guinea, the Institute did not have a proper curriculum policy spelling out curriculum development guidelines.

However, there appeared to be a contradicting view from the management. There was strong indication from the management that there was such a policy and that it was not being properly implemented by the lecturers (Chapter 5). The policy to which the management was referring seemed to be the curriculum policy. If such a policy did exist then the question of dissemination of information was at stake. It seemed curious that only a few members of the management knew of the policy when the bulk of the academic staff appeared unaware of this important document.

The documented evidence revealed that it was not until 1989 that the Board of Studies endorsed the Discrepancy Approach and the Training Needs Analysis Model (see Appendix 10) to be the intended curriculum model. The endorsement of the intended models was prompted by the Institute's move towards autonomy. It was interesting to note that in spite of this endorsement, very few people within the Institute were aware of these intended curriculum models as revealed by the findings. In fact, the indications from the data suggested that the discrepancy approach's use was limited to only a few members of the staff, in particular those in the Training of Trainers sections since they specialised in offering courses in course development procedures. The responses also indicated that familiarity and understanding of the model was inadequate. Thus, they preferred not to use models (see Chapter 5).

However, documented evidence did state that there had been three in-services and workshop training offered to staff members of the Institute to familiarise them with the mechanics of the discrepancy approach and the training needs analysis model. Despite this initiative, much of the previous practice had not changed. It was also revealed that for those who were aware of PNGIPA's intended curriculum, many did not like the change. There has been an environment where they have been given leeway to make curriculum decisions on course development and such has been the case for a long time. They have therefore, developed personal preferences and attachments to their own approaches and the idea of discarding their methods and adopting another did not go well with them. The responses received revealed resentment towards the discrepancy approach. The responses suggested that the endorsed approaches were not utilised as widely as they were meant to be.

On the other hand, it may be that the information regarding the decision to endorse the models as the intended curriculum was not disseminated as well as it should have been. Consequently, many of the lecturers were unaware of the intended curriculum. Although there were three workshops conducted to have lecturers familiarise themselves with the models, these workshops appeared to have made little difference. Rather than utilising the full models, the course developers only utilised parts of the models whenever and wherever it suited them.

Reflected in this behaviour was the fact that curriculum decisions with regard to course development were still the prerogative of the lecturer regardless of what the endorsement signified.

Although the discrepancy approach, as some of the responses advocated, was out-dated and time consuming, it did have a systematic and well laid out procedural steps of course development. PNGIPA could have utilised fully the Training of Trainers section to conduct regular intensive in-service training for its staff on the usage of the model if it seriously wished for the model to be the common standard procedures of course development within the Institute. It could have, further, capitalised on this existing intended model by properly evaluating the validity of the model in order to improve upon it so as to deliver more effective and relevant training to the clientele populace. The Institute could then make a valid assessment of the usefulness of the model and where needed, improvements could be made. PNGIPA's attempts at both providing in-service training and evaluating the validity of the discrepancy approach were not sufficient to substantiate the endorsement of the discrepancy approach nor the training needs analysis model. These models were just formalities.

Summary of PNGIPA's Intended Curriculum Development Process

PNGIPA's curriculum process has not changed much since the endorsement of the two intended models. The actual practice of individual isolated practice continued to repeat itself as the PNGIPA's training staff designed, developed, implemented and evaluated their training programmes. The reality of the curriculum development processes was that, it was still very dependent on the course developers' prerogative rather than the stated intentions of the Institute as observed in this specific reference to course development procedures.

PNGIPA Curriculum: Its Strengths and Weaknesses

With the curriculum context as it was in the Institute, it obviously became quite difficult to identify the actual strengths and the weaknesses of the institutional curriculum development practices. Given the variety of approaches used, some which were 'cut and paste' attempts of a

model did add to the difficulties (see Chapter 5). The discussion therefore, was in very general terms. However, there may be instances where specific references were made to the identified curriculum models currently in use within the Institute.

Strengths of the PNGIPA Curriculum

There appeared to be one main strength as indicated by the data (Chapter 5). Many of the course developers advocated that the main strength of their approach was that theirs was a client centred approach. By this they had meant that their courses were developed to meet the needs of the clients, in other words, the clients dictated the type of courses they needed and the course developer responded by developing such a course.

Weaknesses of the PNGIPA Curriculum

Having said that, it was rather odd to discover that very few were able to endorse this claim with substantive evidence that theirs was indeed a 'client oriented' training. As raised in the actual PNGIPA curriculum, there was a clear indication from the data that a lot of what the Institute conducted as 'training' were results of the lecturer's opinion of what the clientele needed. Very little in terms of a proper more up-dated needs analysis had been carried out to verify such a claim. For many, it was sufficient to accept the developed courses as face value with no intention of evaluating the validity of the course. To do that would mean a lengthy process of conducting a needs analysis and, as indicated, there just was not sufficient time to implement the process thoroughly. Further to that, there was the common belief that all lecturers were professionals and that to query the validity of their courses and their methods of course development would undermine their integrity. It was likely that as long as this assumption is accepted and tolerated, PNGIPA would not be able to honestly justify to the clients and the public at large that indeed the courses offered were the type of training needed by the clients. The control and monitoring device that would detect how relevant and valid the course should not be based on the assumption that PNGIPA lecturers were all professionals. PNGIPA's procedural steps of course development need to be subjected to close screening. For as long as PNGIPA adopted the stand of accepting courses at face value and not taking the

time to investigate the procedural steps of course development, the danger of having inappropriate training being conducted by the Institute was highly probable.

Another reality of the PNGIPA experience was that without a central curriculum office that would coordinate, control and monitor the curriculum development functions, the Institute has been forced to operate on the assumption and trust that its staff would conscientiously perform their duties. Course development procedures were not the priority but rather that courses needed to be developed and conducted became priority. It could be argued that much has been said and discussed about course development approaches. However, had PNGIPA curriculum development process been effective, then it was unlikely that the Institute should solicit the help of a consultant to advice and recommend on curriculum matters.

Perhaps the most important of the disadvantages faced by the Institute was that it had never drafted, as indicated by the responses, an Institutional policy statement that spelt out the functional responsibilities of the curriculum development practice of the Institute. It was not sufficient to rely on the 1989 National Training Policy (NTP) as the dictating policy statement. Even if the National Training Policy did refer specifically to PNGIPA (NTP 1989, p.34-37), it also encompassed all other tertiary institutions in the country. The NTP's directions are presented in very broad terms and do not necessarily spell out in detail the procedural steps in the curriculum functions and the responsibility towards course development, implementation and evaluation. It would seemed appropriate for the Institute therefore, to draft, based on the National Training Policy, its own curriculum policy statement on the function and the responsibilities towards this discipline. It needed to make provision for all its staff to be well aware of the policy as well as ensuring that its staff were well versed in the implementation of this policy. This definitely meant that more time, money and energy need to be spent on in-service training and further training for its staff in the field of vocational curriculum development. All other facilities such as a boost of the library facilities, computers, resource materials should also be given attention so as to help promote a competent PNGIPA training staff.

Conclusion

PNGIPA has not established an effective curriculum development practice judging from the amount of criticisms levelled at it (see Chapter 1). Its curriculum development processes have been an area of much speculation. There appeared to be very little spirit of teamwork and cooperation among the staff in the field of curriculum development, most preferring to work on their own. For PNGIPA to realise in reality the public image it represented, it should then promote team effort in all its curricular activities. It must first, set the scope within which such desired objectives were to be achieved, perhaps through a policy statement outlining the responsibilities and the functions of curriculum development within the PNGIPA. These considerations were essential for PNGIPA to be a more effective training institution.

Chapter Seven

Conclusion

Introduction: Overview of Chapters 1- 6

As outlined in Chapter 1, the study was aimed at identifying and analysing the curriculum development practices of PNGIPA as opposed to the intended practice. The aims were:

- a) to establish what the actual curriculum practice was;
- b) to identify what the assumed PNGIPA curriculum was and to what extent this intended model was being utilised;
- c) to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the actual curriculum practice; and
- d) to identify the discrepancies between the actual practice and the intended practice and the possible causes for these discrepancies (Chapter 1, 3 and 7).

In order to achieve the aims of the study, a selection of assumed vocational curriculum models that could easily be identified with the PNGIPA context were chosen. The models formed the basis for the study. These were used in the analysis process to contrast and compare the actual and the intended curriculum development practice of PNGIPA.

The study took the form of a descriptive survey so as to obtain the perceptions of those involved in the curriculum processes of the Institute. It did so with the use of questionnaire, interviews and curriculum documents of the Institute.

The Findings

The selected assumed vocational curriculum models were useful in providing insight into the curriculum operations of the Institute. The rationale dictating these assumed models provided the basis upon which the PNGIPA's curriculum could be compared and contrasted.

The study has revealed that PNGIPA's curriculum is in dire need of a lot of improvements. There is currently within the Institute a multitude of curriculum development models, some of which were adopted as they were, others have been adapted to suit the PNGIPA context or

even the course developer's preferences, and others still, were 'cut and paste' attempts to develop a personalised model. Such an environment evolved as a result of the Institute not establishing a clear policy statement dictating the curriculum development practices of the Institute. While those in the managerial ranks claimed the existence of such documentation, most of the lecturers denied having heard or sighted it. This uncertainty has resulted in an unguided and unchecked 'freeway' of curriculum development practices within the Institute. Individual course developers have had the prerogative to decide on how best to develop a course. Consequently, these methods have become the personal pride of their creators, who have expressed high regard for their own approaches. PNGIPA has not been very active in querying the validity of its courses. It has accepted at face value the judgement of the lecturer without subjecting the course to an in-depth analysis of its course development methodology. The reality speaks for itself. The Institute did not possess a standard method of curriculum development. Consequently, as the findings revealed, there have been difficulties encountered in control and monitoring of the courses. Many lecturers indicated that there is a lack of a curriculum policy to guide them in curriculum activities.

In support of that, the study further disclosed that currently, within the Institute there appeared to be no central coordinating team whose delegated responsibility was to ensure that the academic staff were well informed on the Institute's curriculum procedures and that these procedures were implemented accordingly. It therefore, made it difficult if not impossible, for any kind of control and monitoring to be effectively implemented. The findings reported that there was an urgent call for such a unit to be established within the Institute to specifically control and monitor the curriculum development activities of the PNGIPA.

In the study, it was also disclosed that there had been very little training in terms of up-grading academic staff knowledge and skills in curriculum development as a discipline on its own and yet, it was expected from the staff of the Institute to not only teach but most importantly to develop courses. As indicated out of a total of 26 lecturers who participated in the study, 19 asserted themselves to be course developers yet only 5 have had any actual training in

curriculum development. This was reflected strongly when only five respondents were able to offer comprehensive detail on the course development procedures they use to develop courses while most others could only offer an imprecise account of how they developed their courses with little justification of the procedural steps taken.

The findings revealed that the Institute did endorse the intended curriculum development model in 1989. That endorsement was prompted by the fact that the Institute was moving toward autonomy. However, it did not do much in terms of setting the stage for a standard curriculum development practice across the board. Rather the old habit of individual and isolated practices of course development continued. It was hinted that the endorsed intended curriculum development model was not well received among the staff of the Institute (see Chapters 5 and Chapter 6). The expectation that courses need to be developed took precedence over curriculum development procedures thus, any method was 'okay' as long as there was a course to be taught.

Recommendations

As a result of the findings, the study therefore recommend that:

1. (a) a policy be drafted and endorsed; that defines the functional responsibilities of PNGIPA's curriculum development;
- (b) this policy clearly set out the intended vocational curriculum model and the procedural steps of course development;
2. a) a curriculum unit be established and staffed with appropriately trained and educated personnel and that this unit be the coordinating body responsible to all curriculum activities within the Institute;
- (b) the unit be responsible for regular in-service training of the PNGIPA staff in the area of curriculum development. and
- (c) proper determination of the clients be made on whose needs are analysed and fulfilled.

Further Research Proposal

Since this study only concentrated on the design of the curriculum development cycle within the Institute, it would like that further research into the implementation and the evaluation of PNGIPA training cycle be carried out. Some of the provoking questions about the Institutes training cycle that have been asked by the researcher could be worth addressing:

What are the strengths and weaknesses of PNGIPA's current method of delivering training to the workforce?

In what ways has PNGIPA training assisted in enhancing and improving productivity and competence in the workforce?

The study revealed that there is an urgent need for research to be conducted to investigate the methodology of delivery of training as well as an assessment of the relevance of PNGIPA training outputs in the workforce.