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ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to evaluate the implementation of the new History curriculum at Grade 10 level of Further Education and Training band in the Qumbu district of the Eastern Cape Province. The focus of the study was on evaluating:

(a) the extent to which the new History curriculum was implemented as intended;
(b) concerns harboured by History educators in relation to the new History curriculum; and the
(c) degree of support undertaken by principals in the implementation of the new History curriculum.

A review of literature related to the implementation, evaluation and support in curriculum implementation was done. It was the basis for establishing a theoretical framework.

The approach used in the study was the survey method. Data was gathered by means of a Stages of Concern (SoC) questionnaire and principal intervention questionnaire. The sample was made up of 15 educators from 15 high schools.

The findings indicate that History educators have intense concerns about the new History curriculum. Also, the data shows that principals provide support during the implementation of the new History curriculum. However, the data indicates an occurrence of a disjuncture. It seems that there is no correlation between the intensity of educator concerns and the degree of support undertaken by the principals. It is acknowledged that due to the limitations of this study, further studies on curriculum implementation should be done. It should encapsulate the use of an interview schedule and observation method of data gathering.
It is recommended that principals should be trained by the Eastern Cape Department of Education by using stages of concern as the diagnostic tool of evaluating the degree of curriculum implementation. Principals should undertake to provide relevant and effective support to educators during curriculum implementation. Support should be provided according to the findings of the study.
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CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction

The 1994 democratic elections presented a watershed in the history of South Africa and ushered in a period of unprecedented change. The education terrain, characterized by dramatic curriculum change, was among the areas of interest targeted by the new political order. In 1995 the South African government began the process of developing a new curriculum for the school system. There were two imperatives for this change. First of all, the demands of the 21st century required learners to be exposed to various high level skills and knowledge other than those of the Apartheid era curriculum. Secondly, owing to the change South Africa was experiencing, the curriculum in schools had to be revised in order to be aligned to new values and principles in the Constitution of South Africa.

Every school subject curriculum had to be revised. The revision of the school curriculum began with the General Education and Training (GET) band, and was introduced into the Foundation Phase in 1997. It became known as Curriculum 2005. The concerns of educators influenced a review in 1999, which led to the development of the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) (Grades R – 9) and National Curriculum Statement (NCS) for grades 10 – 12. The NCS consists of numerous subjects. History, which is the focus of this treatise, was one of the subjects which were revised.

In 2006, the new History curriculum was implemented at grade 10 level of the Further Education and Training (FET) band. Numerous concerns emerged from educators, although a series of workshops was held by the Department of Education (DoE) spanning a period from two days to a week. Every school was represented in the in-service training that was organised by the DoE. On completion of the in-service training, it was expected that the educators would go back to their respective schools to cascade training at their own schools.
Despite all these efforts, the implementation of the new History curriculum is not proceeding as intended. A cursory glance from a distance suggests that the concerns emanating from educators were not adequately considered. Therefore, the purpose of this evaluation study is to investigate the degree of the seriousness of educators’ concerns in curriculum implementation.

1.2. Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the implementation of the new History curriculum in selected high schools in the district of Qumbu in the Eastern Cape Province. The researcher’s interest in the topic was motivated by the apparent inability of the educators to translate the curriculum policy into action. The investigation was limited to teacher implementation of the new History curriculum in grade 10. In addition, the evaluation sought to find out how principals provided support for educators in implementing the new History curriculum.

The evaluation of the implementation of the new History curriculum focused on the following questions:

(a) What are the concerns of educators with regard to the implementation of the new History curriculum?
(b) What degree of support do principals provide to educators in the implementation of the new History curriculum?
(c) To what extent are the principals employing strategies that address the concerns of educators?

1.3. Clarification of Concepts

1.3.1. Evaluation
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Nevertheless, it is impossible for evaluation to take place without the elements of judgment. It is the judgment that informs the implementer and decision-maker about the worth or merit of an object of evaluation. According to Nevo (1995:11), evaluation is an “act of collecting systematic information regarding the nature and quality of educational objects”. This definition by Nevo suggests that evaluation performs descriptive and judgmental functions.

According to Stufflebeam (2003:34)

Evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining and providing descriptive and judgmental information about the worth and merit of the object’s goals, design, implementation and impacts in order to guide decision making, serve needs for accountability, and promote understanding of the involved phenomenon.

Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1986:165) identifies four types of evaluation, namely context, input, process and product (CIPP). The CIPP model of Stufflebeam states that evaluation may focus on a summative character which serves to improve on accountability or formative character which focuses on guiding the decision making.

In addition, Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1986:163) states that “context, input, process and product evaluations may be used both to guide decision making, the formative role, and to supply information for accountability, the summative role.” Lewy (1977:30) defines evaluation as “the provision of information for the sake of facilitating decision making at various stages of curriculum development”. Lewy’s definition suggests formative and summative evaluation. The envisaged stages of curriculum development include curriculum planning, implementation and evaluation.

This treatise focuses on an evaluation of the implementation of the new History curriculum which Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1986:163) refers to as
process evaluation. Process evaluation is directed towards eliciting judgmental information about the ongoing implementation.

1.3.2. Implementation

According to Berman (1981:266) “implementation is the process whereby the system attempts a change in the state – that is, it comprises the activities of the users attempting to use an innovative idea”. Berman’s definition emphasizes the change of practice. Fullan (1982:246) concurs with Berman (1981) when he says “implementation is the process of altering existing practice in order to achieve more effectively certain desired learning outcomes for students”.

Fullan (2007:84) further defines implementation as “the process of putting into practice an idea, program or set of activities, which is new to the people attempting or expected to change”. An explanation of implementation as a process implies that change is not an event. Implementation happens in phases. Berman (1978:164) identifies implementation at two levels, namely macro-implementation and micro-implementation.

The fundamental differences between the two types of implementation lie in the institutional settings and model of operation. In macro-implementation, the national government “execute its policy as to influence local organizations to behave in desired ways” (Berman, 1978:164). Schools are systematically altered to conform to policy dictates of the national government. At the level of micro-implementation, Berman (1978:164) argues that schools, which constitute the local level, “have to devise and carry out their own internal policies” in response to the policy dictates of the national government. This treatise is focusing on the micro–implementation of the new History curriculum at school level.
1.3.3. Curriculum

The concept of curriculum does not lend itself to a unanimous definition. According to Posner and Rudnitsky (2006:8) “there are almost as many definitions of curriculum as there are writers” and no claim can be made about any definition as a correct one. The operational definition of curriculum is contingent upon the context in which it is used. Marsh and Willis (1999:7) acknowledge that defining curriculum is no easy matter. Curriculum originates from the Latin word “currere” which means, “race course”.

Although Schubert (1986), Walker (1990), Henson (1995), and Beane, Toepfer and Alessi (1986) have many definitions of the concept of curriculum, they agree that curriculum is a programme of planned activities for instruction. Marsh (1997:3) defines curriculum as the content which includes what is to be taught. The definition of Marsh (1997) will be the operational definition for the purpose of this treatise.

1.4. Research Methodology

This treatise incorporates both a literature study and empirical investigation. The literature study focuses on the evaluation of implementation.

The empirical investigation included a survey on the concerns of educators with regard to the implementation of the new History curriculum and support provided to the educators by the principals. The approach necessitated the use of questionnaires as a tool to gather data. There were two types of questionnaires, namely the stages of concern (SoC) questionnaire developed by Hall, George and Rutherford (1979) which solicited responses from the History educators along the continuum of seven stages of concern in relation to the implementation of the new History curriculum, and the Principal Intervention Questionnaire. The stages of concern are awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration and refocusing.
Sample

The groups targeted by the evaluation were the educators who are hands-on in the delivery of the new History curriculum at the grade 10 level of the FET band. The individual educators that were included in the evaluation were taken from high schools in the district of Qumbu which falls under the jurisdiction of the Eastern Cape Department of Education (ECDoE). Eighteen schools were chosen for this study; all offering History as a subject at grade 10 level. Both questionnaires were handed out to each educator delivering the new History curriculum by the researcher. All schools are situated in the rural areas with the exception of two in Tsolo and Qumbu magisterial towns. The two magisterial districts are operating as one entity for the ECDoE.

1.5. Outline of the study

In this chapter I have presented an overview of the entire treatise, which covers an elaboration of the problem statement, the historical background of the curriculum reforms, and an exposition of key concepts.

In chapter two, a review of the literature related to the problem that constitutes the theoretical framework of the study will be done.

In chapter three, the research design and methods will be discussed.

Chapter four offers the presentation and interpretation of the results as well as the discussion thereof.

Finally, chapter five offers conclusions and recommendations emerging from the study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

The review of the related literature is intended to provide a theoretical framework of the evaluation study. It constitutes the basis upon which evaluation will be carried out. The literature review focuses on educational change, various models of curriculum evaluation, and the use of support in curriculum implementation.

2.2. Educational change

The year 2006 marked the beginning of significant educational change in the history of curriculum development in South Africa. It was the year in which a new curriculum was phased in at the Further Education and Training (FET) band which is known as the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) for grades 10 – 12. According to Fullan (2007:30) there are at least three components or dimensions at stake in any new programme or policy:
- the possible use of new or revised materials;
- the possible use of new teaching approaches; and
- the possible alteration of beliefs.

The implementation of the National Curriculum Statement implies all three of the above.

Educational change puts some people in the limelight and others in shadows (Bascia and Hargreaves, 2001:3). The situation reflects the challenge faced by teachers at the inception of curriculum implementation. This is due to the complex nature of educational change. Wallace and Pocklington (2002:25) maintain that the central feature of educational change lies with its nature of duality as a single entity. They describe the duality of complex educational change as the change itself and its inherent constituent parts. This feature
encapsulates the reorganisation of schooling and people with various expertise and their interaction inside and across administrative levels of the education system. It is not sufficient to explain the complexity of educational change by using definitions only. The characteristics of the complexity of educational change are an essential component. A complex educational change is typically large-scale, componential, systematic, affects people involved differentially, and is contextually dependent (Wallace and Pocklington, 2002:38). The current situation about educational change in South Africa is a true reflection of these features. The degree of the complexity of educational change creates an atmosphere of impenetrability and hopelessness about the implementation of change itself.

For educational change to occur, Bascia and Hargreaves (2001:14) postulate that it is essential that change facilitators should have extensive knowledge about the technical aspects of change management, as well as human and culture-building processes of successful school improvement. The technical aspects of educational change management should include extensive knowledge on:

- stages of concern through which teachers move as they adopt educational change;
- how change is experienced by teachers at various points in their lives and careers;
- major characteristics of successful school improvement;
- leadership qualities needed to foster successful change; and
- lessons and guidelines that can steer schools through the process of developing and implementing complex reforms.

The situation in South Africa regarding techniques of managing educational change is not sound. It appears that there is no effort at developing technical competence of managing educational change. The key actors involved in curriculum implementation display a lack of knowledge and skills required to defuse change management. It is this deficiency that explains the failure of reform efforts throughout the world.
In spite of extensive knowledge of educational change management, reform efforts often fail. A variety of explanations is given. To start with, Levin (2001:143) cites the characteristics of educational change, the setting where implementation is to occur, and the wider context as the determinants of successful policy orientation. In addition, Hargreaves (2000:281) explains the difficulty of bringing about educational change as follows:

- Poor conceptualization or lack of clear demonstration about the change itself;
- The change tends to be too broad and ambitious such that educators have to work on too many fronts;
- The change moves at a too fast pace in order to enable educators to cope with or too slow such that teachers become impatient or bored to move on to something else;
- Lack of resources or withdrawal of resources once the first flush of innovation is over;
- Lack of long-term commitment to the change to carry people through the anxiety, frustration and despair of early experimentation and unavoidable setbacks;
- Lack of commitment from the key staff who are affected by the change or who should be contributing to it;
- Non-involvement of learners in educational change which may be due to the lack of explanation to them. Such a situation motivates the learners to yearn for and cling to old ways of learning which they are familiar with;
- Pursuance of change in isolation such that it becomes undermined by these elements which are not changed yet.

Furthermore, Bascia and Hargreaves (2001:4) advance two key factors which underpin the predictable failure of educational change. Firstly, educational change efforts fail to understand the depth, the range and the complexity of what teachers do. This does not influence an understanding of intervention strategies that can assist the teachers during the implementation of the innovation. Secondly, reformers seldom recognize that change is directed at
the “interconnected, highly complex and profoundly political system which shapes and constraints the work of teaching and efforts to improve or transform it (Bascia and Hargreaves, 2001:4).

Additionally, lack of institutional support does not motivate teachers to embrace the change effort (McLaughlin, 1998:72). Lack of support to the teachers engaged in curriculum implementation leaves them with no option but to resort to the old ways of curriculum delivery. This seems to be indicative of the South African situation. Although the failure of the reform efforts is viewed from a perspective of technical mismanagement and human aspects, contextual aspects play a significant role too.

2.3. Implementation

The concept of implementation is a yardstick used to measure the extent to which an educational change occurs. Implementation is a process of putting into practice of a new idea, programme or set of activities (Fullan, 1986:271). Fullan (1986:271) asserts that those responsible for curriculum implementation must realize that there are numerous dimensions which they must consider. According to Fullan (1982:246) such dimensions are central to the occurrence of educational change. Hargreaves et al. (2000:282) identify four areas which characterize the multi-dimensional nature of educational change, namely politics, context, emotions, and chaos and complexity. The depictions of Fullan (1982:246) and Hargreaves et al. (2000:282) indicate clearly that educational change does not occur in a linear and step-by-step approach.
2.4. MODELS OF EVALUATING CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

2.4.1. LEITHWOOD’S MODEL.

Leithwood (1982:257) conceptualises curriculum implementation as a process of change in behaviour towards the directions suggested by the new curriculum. The basis for this conceptualisation is the idea behind implementation as growth of the individual user (namely, the educator and the learner) and the educational institution as part of the educational system which must change.

The concept of growth describes the types of educator behaviour which must be displayed when operationalising educational change within the context of the preferred and predetermined direction (Leithwood and Montgomery, 1982:159). The manner in which the educator should behave must be in compliance with the preferred and predetermined direction of growth. To Leithwood (1982:256), in order to comply with the chosen behaviour, it is imperative to identify the goals to be accomplished by implementing an innovation.

Growth is influenced by recurring behavioural patterns from the educational change agents which include educators, principals and other educational change agents (notably subject specialists and curriculum specialists). Such growth in curriculum implementation determines growth in the educational system which is characterised by a change in learner behaviour. This is a significant step in the process of implementing an innovation although it requires a strategy to ensure that possible obstacles are counteracted. The envisaged obstacles encompass lack of knowledge or skills, lack of incentives or rewards and motivation, and lack of resources. The obstacles encountered vary in accordance with the level of implementation of the innovation.

Leithwood (1981:26) suggests nine dimensions of curriculum innovation where change or growth can occur when a new programme is introduced. These are: platform, objectives, student entry behaviours, assessment tools
and procedures, instructional materials, learners’ experiences, teaching strategies, content and time. Leithwood’s model of evaluation has four features. These are procedures for:

- identifying descriptive dimensions of the innovation;
- specifying practices implied by the innovation;
- describing actual practices; and
- comparing actual with intended practices (Leithwood and Montgomery, 1980:199).

Leithwood’s model of evaluation of curriculum implementation advocates the use of an innovation profile and user profile as implementation strategy. The innovation profile seeks to specify short-term goals useful in planning implementation activities about the innovation. The specification of the short-term goals of the implementation constitutes a breakdown of clear statements about long-term implementation goals. A focused interview and classroom observations are used to check the existing practice against an innovation profile, while the user profile emerges from an educator’s behaviour as rated within each curriculum dimension. The user profile attempts to compare the classroom practices of an educator with those suggested by the innovation. If there are significant gaps between the two sets of practices, the indication is that there is no implementation. It also suggests that the size of the gaps must be reduced so that the innovation is implemented. The fundamental issue is that educators are experiencing difficulties or have concerns which have adverse effects on the implementation of the innovation.

The innovation profile and user profile constitute yardsticks through which an educator’s behaviour can be measured to see whether it is related to the implementation strategy of the innovation. This research does not use this model. Although Leithwood’s model is a compelling one for evaluation studies, this research specifically focuses on the role of the individual user in the process of implementation which is central to Hall’s model. In addition,
Hall’s model, amongst other issues, focuses on the stage of concern which is central to this research. I will return to Hall’s model later.

2.4.2. WANG’S MODEL

Wang, Nojan, Strom and Walberg (1984:251) discuss the significance of assessing the degree of implementation of complex educational innovations. The discussion advances the use of the Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM). The fundamental goal of the ALEM is the provision of school learning experiences which adapt to the needs and qualities of individual learners in regular classroom settings. The ALEM is influenced by the conceptual model of adaptive instruction. Wang et al. (1984:251) describe adaptive instruction as the use of alternative instructional strategies and school resources which provide learning experiences that are effective in meeting the learning needs of individual learners.

The conceptual model of adaptive instruction consists of three components, namely:
- Programme design work;
- Programme implementation in school settings;
- Evaluation of related process and product outcomes.
An evaluation of outcomes is done in order to establish the actual presence or absence of critical programme dimensions.

Wang et al. (1984:259) conceptualise implementation as the presence or absence of critical programme dimensions in classrooms. Two categories of critical programme dimensions have been identified, namely:

- An action domain consisting of critical dimensions related to the three rules and behaviours required of teachers and learners in classroom;
- A structural domain consisting of critical dimensions related to management and resource support required to establish and maintain effective implementation.
The above programme dimensions are classroom requirements for the effective implementation of adaptive instruction.

The first category is an action domain which consists of eight dimensions. These are:
- Creating and maintaining structural materials;
- Record keeping;
- Diagnostic testing;
- Prescription on learning tasks to be completed by the learner;
- Monitoring and diagnosing;
- Interactive teaching;
- Instructing;
- Motivation.

The second category is the structural domain, and has four dimensions:
- Arranging space and facilities;
- Establishment and communication of rules and procedures;
- Management of aides;
- Development of student self-responsibility.

In addition, Taylor, Glover, Kriel and Meyer (1995:1) have added an affective domain. The affective domain refers to attitudes, feelings and dispositions that the problem-based approach requires of the role players.

The role players envisaged are curriculum planners, principals, educators, learners and parents. However, Wang et al. (1984:255) warn change facilitators that it is not the presence of a single dimension which leads to effective adaptation instruction, instead it is the complimentary integrations and implementation as the components of a comprehensive system that are essential for the achievement of the desired classroom processes and outcomes. Most significantly, the degree of implementation of the ALEM is measured through the presence of performance indicators.
Although Wang’s model is relevant to studies of curriculum implementation, it does not apply in this research. Wang’s model focuses on the extent to which an innovation is implemented, while Hall’s model, for the purposes of this research, seeks to investigate the stages of concern and the extent to which educators have high or low intensity in relation to the implementation of the innovation.

2.4.3. HALL’S MODEL

The model of Hall stresses the role of the individual user in the process of implementation. The feelings and actions of individuals who are implementers of the new curriculum are conceptualised as Stages of Concern (SoC), Levels of Use (LoU), and Innovation Configurations (IC). In an endeavour to cater for the needs of an individual user (educator), a Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) was developed by Hall and his associates. The CBAM plays a vital role in planning and monitoring the implementation of an innovation. Hall’s model has the following assumptions (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall and Loucks, 1981:7):

- Change is a process not an event;
- Change is a highly personal experience;
- To understand the change process in organizations (schools) requires an understanding of what happens to the individuals as they are involved in the change;

- Change entails growth in terms of feelings about and skills in using the innovation;
- Information collected about the change process on an ongoing basis can be used to facilitate the management and the implementation of the change process;
- Teachers (educators) hold the key to the implementation of an innovation;
- Individual users develop a particular behaviour in response to the innovation.
2.4.3.1. STAGES OF CONCERN (SoC)

The stages of concern is the first dimension of the Concerns- Based Adoption Model (CBAM). It elaborates on seven kinds of concerns that educators experience at different times of the change process. These range from concerns about “self”, to concerns about “task” and finally, to concerns about “impact”. The following are questions, which the teacher asks about the new curriculum during the implementation process with reference to the “self”, “task”, and ‘impact’:

“Self” – how will the new curriculum affect me?
“Task” – how can I best manage the new curriculum?
“Impact” – how does the new curriculum affect my learners?
(Loucks and Hall, 1979:3).

Table 1 : The Seven Stages of Concern (adapted from Loucks and Hall,1979:4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of concern</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Awareness</td>
<td>Not concerned about the new curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Information</td>
<td>Concerns about general features of the curriculum and what is required by it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Personal</td>
<td>Concerns about one’s role and possible conflicts between that role and anticipated demands of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Management</td>
<td>Concerns about time, organisation and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Consequence</td>
<td>Concerns about learner outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Collaboration</td>
<td>Concerns about working with others in the use of the new curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Refocusing</td>
<td>Concerns about finding another and even more effective method of delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Stages of Concern focus on the feelings, perceptions, attitudes and motivations of educators towards the delivery of the new curriculum.

2.4.3.2. Levels of Use (LoU) of the innovation

This is the second dimension of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model which describes the manner in which an individual educator behaves as he/she becomes familiar with and more skilled in using the innovation. Central to the dimension of Levels of Use of the Innovation is the description of performance levels in relation to the innovation. Eight levels are defined.

Table 2: Levels of Use of the Innovation (adapted from Loucks and Hall, 1979:5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Use</th>
<th>Behaviour Indices of Level of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Nonuse</td>
<td>No action is being taken with respect to the new curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Orientation</td>
<td>The educator is seeking out information about the new curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Preparation</td>
<td>The educator is preparing to use the new curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Mechanical Use</td>
<td>The educator is using the curriculum in a poorly co-ordinated manner and is making user – orientated change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV A Routine</td>
<td>The educator is making few or no changes and has established a pattern of use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV B Refinement</td>
<td>The educator is making changes to increase outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Integration</td>
<td>The educator is making deliberate efforts to co-ordinate with others in using the new curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Renewal</td>
<td>The educator is seeking more effective alternatives to the established use of the new curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is a logical step for educators implementing a new curriculum to begin with orienting themselves to the innovation. Such educators seek out information about the nature of the new curriculum. More information about the characteristics of the new curriculum is what educators need to know prior to
the resumption of the implementation process. Levels 1,11, and 111 determine whether the educator’s level of use of the new curriculum is a user or non-user, also, these levels of use are a pre-requisite for the determination of the level of intensity for the use of the new curriculum.

The utilisation of Levels of Use in the evaluation of a new curriculum indicates that it takes a minimum of two years for educators to display a behaviour that shows high levels of the use of the new curriculum. This requires a greater degree of support to educators implementing a new curriculum from principal, and staff and Subject Advisory Services. It is not the duration that matters most to determine the stage at which withdrawal of support should occur. Rather, it is the level of use in which the user finds himself / herself. It is when educators begin to seek alternatives to the established use of the new curriculum.

2.4.3.3. INNOVATION CONFIGURATION

While Stages of Concern and Levels of Use focus on the individual educator’s use of a new curriculum, Innovation Configuration addresses what the innovation is. The Innovation Configuration dimension uses an action-orientated approach towards the process of curriculum implementation. The behaviour displayed by individual users describes their understanding of the innovation. The behavioural patterns explain how the user of the innovation understands it. The operational form of the innovation is not the same for all users of the innovation. When implementing an innovation, there are components which are considered critical for acceptable implementation (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall and Loucks, 1981:12).

The dimensions of Innovation Configuration use an action to identify and measure innovation components and configurations. Components of the innovation are divided into two:
- Critical components are those which must be used to claim that an innovation is implemented. These components constitute material resources, or user (educator or learner) behaviours.
- Related components are those which are not essential to the innovation but recommended by the developer of the innovation. The complex nature of the innovation requires the development of a checklist which will be a tool to evaluate the implementation of the long list of components.

The model of Hall is central to this evaluation study, and it is one which is used to evaluate the implementation of the new History curriculum.

In the following section I elaborate on the importance of support during curriculum implementation.

2.5. SUPPORT ON CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

The complex nature of educational change and the process of implementation necessitates massive support to the implementer. Authors differ in so far as how to deliver support towards curriculum implementation. Van der Vegt and Knip (1988) argue that successful implementation of the curriculum is contingent upon strong leadership at school level, which can apply massive pressure on educators and provide the necessary support. Hord (1995) holds a different view. She states that successful curriculum implementation does not happen with massive application of pressure only, but it is through an intelligent use of both pressure and support. Van den Berg (1981) advocates a complex support strategy of curriculum implementation which relies mainly on the implementers themselves, without the pressure of the school leadership. In the following section, I elaborate on these three perspectives.

2.5.1. VAN DER VEGT AND KNIP’S PERSPECTIVE

Van der Vegt and Knip (1988:62) correctly contend that schools are implementing organizations. The schools are occupying a critical place in the implementation of the curriculum. Therefore, as deliverers of the curriculum, schools are involved in a complex process of change. So, strong leadership is at the core of the success of the implementation of an innovation together with four steering functions advanced by Van der Vegt and Knip (1988 :62 ) :

- The direction / concept clarification addresses the extent to which school
leadership is able to articulate the directions based on the targets of the implementation of a new curriculum.

- Directional pressure revolves around the operational mastery of implementation together with pressure in order to achieve the delivery of the innovation. In a nutshell, curriculum implementation can be a success when an explanation is given about what and how to achieve curriculum implementation.

- Latitude definition dwells on the specifications of the acceptable path to reach the target. School leadership has to ensure that implementation tasks are in line with the goal region considerations.

- Assistance/support related to the principal’s capacity to mobilize resources and expertise for renewal work. To ensure provision of assistance/support, a distinction should be made between the delivery of technical assistance, the provision of socio-emotional support, and the use of operational power to remove blockages which would inhibit the progress of implementation.

2.5.2. HORD’S PERSPECTIVE

Hord (1995) emphasizes the use of pressure and support. Pressure and support require an intelligent combination for the successful implementation of a new practice. Pressure is enough if there is no normative change. It is when there is a change in norms of curriculum delivery that pressure must be accompanied by the use of support. Hord (1995:94) argues that “it is one thing to enunciate the need for pressure and support on behalf of policy implementation in schools and classrooms. It is quite another to orchestrate intelligent combinations of the two”. How do principals combine pressure and support in curriculum delivery? Hord (1995) suggests six strategies which principals must employ to facilitate the implementation of a new curriculum as an educational reform. These strategies are:

- Developing and communicating a shared vision;
- Planning and provision of resources;
- Investing in continuous staff development;
- Assessment of progress;
- Provision of ongoing assistance;
- Creation of an atmosphere for change.

The principal engaged in innovation implementation requires massive training in management of the use of pressure and support. So far, it appears that a large number of principals in South Africa are not capacitated in this aspect. Those who do not comply to pressure are perceived to be resistant.

2.5.3. VAN DEN BERG’S PERSPECTIVE

It is recognizable that large-scale changes have failed in numerous countries. This was mainly due to the lack of clear strategies of managing the implementation of a large-scale change. It is necessary to employ strategies when implementing a large-scale change. According to Van den Berg (1981) the strategies are:
- Development of local cadres;
- Use of material;
- Use of peer-multiplier approach;
- Use of turnkey-trainers;
- Provision of networks and clusters;
- Use of resource centres and demonstration sites;
- Use of technical assistance systems;
- Use of continuous evaluation / monitoring / feedback system.

The Van den Berg approach to the provision of support during the process of curriculum implementation has limitations in South Africa. It is difficult in rural areas to use networks and clusters, and a peer-multiplier approach. There are no resource centres and demonstration sites to enable educators and learners to understand various aspects of the innovation either.
2.6. SUMMARY

The preceding review of related literature affirms that implementation of an innovation is a personal and individualistic experience. Therefore, Hall’s model, which is used in this treatise, identifies three dimensions of stages of concern, level of use and innovation configuration. This treatise focuses on the dimension of stages of concern to examine the extent of concerns which educators experience during the implementation of the new History curriculum at an individual level. In addition, the extent of support given to educators implementing the new History curriculum is a crucial factor. The complexity of the implementation process is affirmed by various perspectives presented by the literature on support to implementation of an innovation. The extent to which History educators have concerns and gravity of concerns, as well as the nature of support by school leadership when implementing an innovation forms the basis for collecting data.

The following chapter outlines the methodology of data collection used in this research.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research design, sampling, data collection instruments, and data analysis procedures.

3.1. The research design

The research design constitutes a logical step after problem formulation. According to Mouton (2001:55) a research design is a plan or blueprint of how one intends to conduct research. The research design seeks to describe how you are going to collect data, present data, and the tools that will be used in providing solutions to the problems researched. Mouton (2001:55) suggests that to select an appropriate research design, the researcher should ask the following questions:

(i) What kind of study will I be doing?
(ii) What type of study will best answer the questions I have formulated?

This research incorporates the use of empirical investigation and a literature study. The general approach that was used to examine the questions of evaluation is a descriptive survey method. It seeks to describe the collected data in its simplest raw form and sophisticated form whereby data was grouped and presented in tables and figures. Anderson (1990:195) states that the purpose of using surveys is to describe the characteristics of a population like attitudes, opinions and measures of performance. This research focuses on surveying the performance of fifteen Grade 10 History educators when implementing the new History curriculum.

Anderson (1990:195) advocates that surveys should be used on the basis of the following reasons:
- Surveys are more efficient and have a cost-benefit factor which allows for the study of the entire population.
- Surveys allow researchers to contact the entire population in a shorter time. Nevo (1995:11) further strengthens the idea of using surveys by stating that it has the potential of providing a lot of information from a large sample. However, Nevo (1995:11) reminds researchers that certain steps should be carefully considered when using surveys, namely that:
- Researchers must ensure that questions to be answered are clear and not misleading.
- Researchers should be aware of the difficulty of getting a sufficient number of questionnaires completed and returned so that meaningful analysis can be made.

3.2. SAMPLE

The target population consists of eighteen respondents who are involved in the delivery of the new History curriculum at Grade 10 level of Further Education and Training (FET) band. The focus was on the respondents whose academic credentials qualified them to be employed as History educators and who have a minimum of five years’ teaching experience. The individual educators that were used in the evaluation study were taken from the eighteen schools in Qumbu district offering History in their school curriculum. Questionnaires that were posted to three high schools out of eighteen did not come back. It was the questionnaires from fifteen high schools that were used to gather data as they were handed out by the researcher and taken back immediately after the respondents finished. These high schools are located in the district of Qumbu which falls under the jurisdiction of the Eastern Cape Department of Education (ECDoE).

The idea behind choosing all high schools delivering the new History curriculum was to obtain information about the realities of curriculum implementation in a particular district.
3.3. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES

Data was collected on the concerns of educators about the new History curriculum and on the support given to such educators by principals during the implementation process. Permission was required (see appendix 1) and granted from the Eastern Cape Department of Education to do research in schools that were identified (see Appendix 2).

In order to collect data, questionnaires were handed out to the respondents by the researcher. Two types of questionnaires were used to gather data, namely a stages of concern (SoC) questionnaire and a principal intervention questionnaire for teachers. Principals were not used in this study.

3.3.1. The Stages of Concern (SoC) Questionnaire

The stages of concern (SoC) questionnaire (Appendix 3) served to assist the evaluator with answers in relation to the stages of concern in accordance to the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (Hall, et al.1979) which was adapted to make it applicable for use in this study. The evaluator used the stages of concern questionnaire (SoCQ) to obtain answers to the following research question: What are the concerns of educators with regard to the implementation of the new History curriculum? The stages of concern questionnaire has two components, namely an introductory page, and 35 items on two pages. The introductory page states the purpose of the questionnaire; explains and indicates by means of examples how to complete the instrument; shows which innovation the individual respondent should consider when responding.

The second component of the questionnaire has 35 items to which the individual educator responded. The respondent marked each item on a 0 to 7 Likert Scale in accordance to how true it is that the item describes a concern felt by the individual respondent at that particular time (Hall, et al.1979:23). The purpose of the stages of concern questionnaire was to identify concerns of individual educators. Therefore, each respondent was asked to complete the questionnaire without the assistance of any one. The stages of concern questionnaire solicited responses from the History educators along a
continuum of seven stages of concern in relation to implementation of the new History curriculum. The stages of concern are awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing. The stages of concern questionnaire was the first instrument that was handed out to the respondents, and it was followed by the Principal Intervention Questionnaire.

### 3.3.2. The Principal Intervention Questionnaire

The Principal Intervention Questionnaire (Appendix 4) seeks to provide answers to the following questions:
- What degree of support do principals provide to educators in the implementation of the new History curriculum?
- To what extent are the principals employing strategies that address the concerns of the educators?

This is done in order to collect data on the intervention strategies undertaken by the individual principals and whether such strategies are really assisting in addressing the concerns of individual educators about the delivery of the new History curriculum.

The Game Plan Intervention (Hall and Hord, 1984:285 – 286) constitutes the basis of the instrument. A game plan is the overall plan and design of the interventions that are made to implement an innovation. The instrument consists of Game Plan Intervention to which individual respondents responded on a scale ranging from ”strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”.

The Principal Intervention Questionnaire has two components. The first component consists of information relating to the purpose of the questionnaire in terms of getting opinions from Grade 10 History educators with regard to the action taken by the principal to address the educators’ concerns about the use of the new History curriculum. The responses provided an indication of what actions the principals undertook to address the concerns. The second component consists of statements that the respondents were expected to respond to. Statements are preceded by instructions on how to respond to each statement. An assurance of confidentiality was given to the respondents,
together with an explanation about the purpose of both questionnaires and the study.

Questionnaires are an obvious and immediate choice for researchers. The use of questionnaires is motivated by the need to collect relatively routine data from a large number of respondents. However, Anderson (1990) cautions researchers who opt to use questionnaires in their endeavour to gather data. Questionnaires do have shortcomings which a researcher should be aware of. For Anderson (1990: 207), well constructed questionnaires allow for the collection of reliable and reasonably valid data in a relatively simple and cheap and in a short space of time.

Gillham (2000:1) points out that the use of questionnaires has attained great popularity as a quick fix for the research methodology. Researchers are motivated by a host of factors to opt for the use of questionnaires. Such factors include the following:

- Questionnaires have low financial costs and it takes less time to administer them compared to other data collection instruments;
- It is easy to get information from a lot of people very quickly;
- Respondents can complete the questionnaire when it suits them;
- Analysis of answers to closed questions is relatively straightforward;
- Respondents can answer in their own time and at their own pace;
- Questionnaires assure individual’s anonymity. This allows respondents to be free to disclose information;
- Questionnaires are highly standardized so that interviewer / researcher bias is eliminated; and
- Researchers have ideas about what they are testing.

Criticisms are levelled against the use of questionnaires:

- The response rate is always very low unless the sample is captive. A captive sample is the one to which questionnaires are administered at the same place and same time. In the case of this treatise, it was not difficult for the researcher to get a high response rate, because all respondents were virtually familiar with the researcher. It was easier to get maximum co-operation in the completion of the questionnaires.
- Respondents are seldom motivated to complete a questionnaire unless it has personal relevance. The respondents were interested in completing the questionnaires because the research was focused on the subject they were teaching. It transpired, from most of the respondents, that since no research had been done on History teaching, it was exciting for them to realize that History was accorded a significant position in the new curriculum development.

- Questionnaires that are long and use difficult jargon, do not motivate respondents to complete them. The questionnaires used in this research were very short and used simple language. It did not take much of the respondents’ time to complete the questionnaires.

- Questionnaires are misunderstood by the respondents. Gillham (2000:10) states that misunderstanding can never be entirely eliminated. It is suggested that piloting can pick up questions that are ambiguous or misleading. It was not problematic to address such misunderstanding. The researcher explained questions which appeared to be misleading or were misunderstood. Respondents asked for explanations where they encountered problems.

- It is not possible to check the seriousness or honesty of answers given by the respondents.

- Respondents tend to be uncertain as to what happens with the data. This is caused by an awareness of respondents about the risk of giving information. The questionnaire contained explanations regarding the purpose of asking for responses. I gave respondents background information regarding the rationale for administering the questionnaires to them. I was able to allay fears harboured by the respondents because I was acquainted with most of them. Some respondents were eager to participate purely on the basis that it was research focused on their subject area specialization. It is essential that researchers should be aware of these shortcomings. Such awareness will enable researchers to gather reliable data.
Questionnaires were handed out personally and collected on an individual basis. I visited each high school which offered History in the school curriculum, with the exception of three questionnaires that were mailed. The variation in the administration of the questionnaires was based on facilitating and ensuring quicker responses as well as the fact that it was easier to go to the schools because of their proximity to one another.

3.4. DATA ANALYSIS

The size of the sample to which the Stages of Concern Questionnaire was administered consisted of fifteen respondents. In order to carry out data analysis, the Quick Scoring Device developed by Parker and Griffin as cited by Hall et al.(1979:113 – 117) was used in which scoring was done by hand. Individual educators’ responses were translated into raw scores for each fundamental area of concern, which finally were converted to percentile scores. Individual percentile scores for each stage of concern were aggregated to develop a group profile.

The statements in the Principal Intervention Questionnaire represent six Game Plan Interventions by Hall and Hord (1984:285 – 286). The responses of the respondents were scored in the form of percentages per statement. All percentage scores were aggregated according to the Game Plan Interventions. The scores were analyzed to explain the extent of support provided to individual educators during the process of implementing the new History curriculum.

The scores are presented in the form of pie charts indicating the responses of individual educators about the provision of support as well as the extent to which it addresses the concerns of individual educators. The methodology used in gathering data and data analysis was clearly stated. The precision of procedures and documentation account for credibility and trustworthiness of the data. The research is replicable in the similar setting with similar participants.
3.5. SUMMARY

This chapter described the research design, sample, data collection instruments and data analysis procedures. The next chapter will present and discuss the data.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data and the results will be discussed in the following order: biographical data, stages of concern of teachers, support given to teachers by principals in relation to the new History curriculum, and discussion of results.

4.1. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF COMPETENCY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF YEARS</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA (Ed) (n=4) 26.67%</td>
<td>1 - 5 years (n=4) 26.67%</td>
<td>Female (n=6) 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA (n=1) 6.67%</td>
<td>6 – 10 years (n=3) 20%</td>
<td>Male (n=9) 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDE (n=3) 20%</td>
<td>11 – 15 years (n=6) 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Hons (n=1) 6.67%</td>
<td>16 – 20 years (n=1) 6.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (PG) (n=4) 26.67%</td>
<td>20 years and above (n=1) 6.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD (n=1) 6.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHED (n=1) 6.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 3 indicates that 93.33% of teachers have received professional training as History teachers. The level of teacher competency attests to the degree of proficiency the respondents have in History teaching. Data indicates that 73.32% of respondents have been teaching History for more than six years. This group of teachers has experience in teaching History encompassing the NATED 550 and NCS curricula. Therefore, these teachers are in a position to distinguish between various philosophies underlying the teaching of History in relation to the respective curricula. Such a distinction affords teachers the potential to grapple with curriculum change. Also, data reflects the diversity of teachers in terms of sexual orientation. The
data shows figures of male and female teachers that teach the new History curriculum in the selected high schools. Although History teaching has always been dominated by male teachers, there is an indication that females are reasonably represented as History teachers, since 40% of the History teachers in the small sample were females.

4.2. STAGES OF CONCERN OF TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW HISTORY CURRICULUM.

**TABLE 4: INDIVIDUAL STAGES OF CONCERN PERCENTILE SCORES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT NUMBER</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Profile n=15**

Means 66.5 80.7 83.5 63.4 62.4 73.9 78.4 84
The statements in the Concerns Questionnaire (See Appendix 3) represent seven stages of concern (See Table 1 in chapter 2) of the Concerns – Based Adoption Model. These stages of concern focus on the feelings, perceptions, attitudes and motivations of teachers towards the delivery of the new History curriculum. The size of the sample to which the Concerns Questionnaire was administered was small, and it required the use of a quick scoring device (Parker and Griffin, 1979) by means of hand scoring. Individual teachers’ responses were translated into raw scores for each fundamental area of concern, which were finally converted to percentile scores as shown in Table 4. For each stage of concern, raw scores of each statement were aggregated to give a raw scale score. Each item number was associated to a particular concern (See Appendix 5). The raw scale total score was measured against the fundamental concern in order to find its value. The first respondent is used to explain how values were obtained in Table 4. For instance, statements 3, 12, 21, 23 and 30 in the Concerns Questionnaire (See Appendix 3) are associated with stage 0 (awareness concerns). These are aggregated to give 12 as a raw scale total score. By using the Stages of Concern Raw Score – Percentile Conversion Chart for Stages of Concerns Questionnaires (See Appendix 6), the raw scale total score was measured against the fundamental concern (that is, awareness concern in this case) to find its value. The value of the raw scale total score is the 86th percentile. In addition, the raw scores of all stages of concern were aggregated to give a total raw score for each respondent, which was translated to a percentile score. With reference to the first respondent (in Table 4) the total raw score is 210, which translates to the 99th percentile. The percentile score is the reflection of the combined values of each stage of concern for the individual respondent. Percentile scores (in Table 4) were obtained by using the Stages of Concern Raw Score – Percentile Conversion chart for Stages of Concern Questionnaires (See Appendix 6).

Individual percentile scores for each stage of concern were aggregated to develop a group profile. The higher the stage of concern percentile
score, the more intense the concerns at that particular stage are. The lower the stage of concern percentile score, the less intense the concerns are at that stage. An analysis of percentile scores was based on high scores for each stage.

**TABLE 5: STAGES OF CONCERNS OF EDUCATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Refocusing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table on stages of concern of teachers (Table 5) is informed by the individual stages of concern percentile scores (in Table 4). Table 5 shows a summary of the highest scores of the group in accordance to the individual stages of concerns. The number of individual educators with high percentile scores on each stage of concern was tallied. This made the range of the peak scores for the entire group clear. In each stage of concern a percentage was calculated based on the total number of respondents. From Table 5 it appears that 66.67% (n=10) of educators have self – concerns (stages 0-2), 6.67% (n=1) have task concerns (Stage 3) and 26.67% (n=4) have impact concerns (stage 4 – 6).

**FIGURE 1: NEGATIVE ONE / TWO SPLIT WITH TAILING - UP**
The profile in figure 1, above, represents a negative one/two split with sharp tailing – up at stage 6 (refocusing concerns). The graph is respondent 10’s profile obtained from Table 4. It represents a profile of a non-user who is negatively disposed to the use of the new History curriculum.

In a classical case, the profile of a non-user depicts high percentile scores in stage 0 (awareness concerns) and 1 (informational concerns) followed by a decline of percentile scores in subsequent stages of concern. This case, however, is not a classical example of a non-user as his/her informational concerns are not high. Stage 0 (awareness concerns) overrides all stages of concern. The respondent’s profile suggests that he/she is still looking for information and is not aware of the History curriculum. Stage 6 (refocusing concerns) is tailing – up. It may suggest that the respondent has other ideas that are potentially competing with the new History curriculum. As a result, an inference can be drawn that the respondent is resisting the implementation of the new History curriculum.

**FIGURE 2: NEGATIVE ONE / TWO SPLIT**

Figure 2 represents a profile that also leans more to a non-user profile. This is respondent 15’s profile obtained from Table 4. The profile depicts an occurrence of negative one/two split. The respondent, in this case, has tense concerns about what the new curriculum is all about. This is closely coupled with doubt and a possibility of resisting the new History curriculum. The level
of intensity at stage 2 (personal concerns) illustrates uncertainty about the future of the respondent within the context of the new History curriculum. The respondent is more concerned with learning about the new History curriculum in an endeavour to resolve a crisis which he/she finds himself/herself in. The crisis referred to here is his/her personal position and well-being in relation to the new History curriculum. He/She wants to secure his/her position first. For him/her to do so, he/she requires more information about the new History curriculum. The graph tails up at stage 6 (refocusing concerns). An inference can be drawn from the data that principals have employed effective support mechanisms and strategies to assist the educators.

**FIGURE 3: INEXPERIENCED USER**

![Graph showing relative intensity across SoC stages](image)

Figure 3 represents respondent 7's profile obtained from Table 4. It is a profile of an inexperienced user of the new History curriculum. The respondent has high intensity in stage 0 (awareness concerns), stage 1 (informational concerns), stage 2 (personal concerns) and stage 3 (management concerns). The level of intensity shows gradual decline from awareness through to management concerns. The level of intensity is high in all these stages. The profile suggests that the respondent is still unsure of the new History curriculum. Also, he/she poses a potential risk of resisting the new History curriculum. The graph begins to tail up towards stage 6 (refocusing concerns). From this profile, (stages 0-3), an inference can be drawn that the respondent
does not have any knowledge about the new History curriculum. The respondent then seeks co-ordination with others in relation to the new History curriculum. As a result of intervention by his/her principal, the respondent might have begun to develop better ideas of implementing the new History curriculum.

FIGURE 4: SoCQ GROUP PROFILE

The data in figure 4 represents the mean stages of concern percentile scores obtained from the data given in Table 4, and represents a profile for the entire group of respondents. From the group profile it is evident that the concern of the educators is mainly at stage 2 (personal concerns) which is closely followed by stage 1 (informational concerns). Also, the data on the group profile indicates that this group of educators has low levels of intensity concerns in stage 3 (management) and 4 (consequence). In the case of stages 5 (collaboration) and 6 (refocusing) concerns, the levels of intensity are tailing up. This profile suggests that the educators who participated in the study are largely non – and inexperienced users of the new curriculum. This is probably based on unresolved conflict between their roles and anticipated demands in relation to the new History curriculum. From the profile in table 4, it appears that these educators are seeking support from others in order to implement the new History curriculum. There is, however, no indication that the new History curriculum is implemented as intended. This is evident from the high level of intensity in the mean of stages 0-2 and 6 percentile scores.
The fact that the mean percentile score of stage 6 (refocusing) is so high, might suggest that the educators have competing methods of curriculum delivery.

4.3. INTERVENTION STRATEGIES UNDERTAKEN BY PRINCIPALS

The statements in the Principal Intervention Questionnaire (See Appendix 4) represent the six Game Plan Interventions (in Table 5) by Hall and Hord (1984:285 – 286).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Providing supportive or organizational arrangements and resources</td>
<td>Actions taken to plan, manage staff and funds, restructuring roles and providing spaces, materials and maintaining use of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training</td>
<td>Actions taken to develop positive attitudes, knowledge and skills in relation to curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Providing consultation and reinforcement</td>
<td>Actions taken to encourage and assist educators in solving problems related to curriculum implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Actions taken to gather, analyze or report data about the implementation of the new curriculum and taking corrective actions to help the new curriculum to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. External communication</td>
<td>Actions taken to gain the support of individual groups outside the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dissemination</td>
<td>Actions taken to spread information and materials about the new curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above interventions are actions undertaken by a principal in order to influence the use of the new curriculum. The types of interventions undertaken (or not undertaken) by a principal influence the concerns profile about the implementation of the new History curriculum by educators. The following figures (figure 5.1 – 5.8) provide a synopsis of the responses to the statements from the Principal Intervention Questionnaire (see Appendix 4).
The synopsis is expressed as a percentage of the total number of respondents (n=15).

Figure 5: Percentages of respondents’ agreement levels related to support provided by principals about organizational arrangements and resources (statements 1 – 8).

Statement 1: The principal actively communicates that the teaching of the curriculum is a priority.

FIGURE 5.1.

From figure 5.1, it is clear that 93% of respondents feel that the principals actively communicate that the teaching of the new History curriculum is a priority. Principals, therefore, communicate their support through the emphasis of teaching the new History curriculum.
Statement 2: The principal always motivates and gives moral support to educators teaching the curriculum.

FIGURE 5.2.

From figure 5.2, it is evident that 86% of respondents feel that they enjoy moral support and motivation in teaching the new History curriculum. Principals are ensuring that the new History curriculum is taught. The support provided by principals, in this regard, appears to be rendered on a continuous basis.
Statement 3: The principal ensures that educators know and understand their role in teaching and learning situations pertaining to the curriculum.

FIGURE 5.3.

According to figure 5.3, it can be seen that 87% of educators feel that principals ensure that educators know and understand their roles in delivering the new History curriculum. This implies that a large number of educators are conversant with the anticipated demands of the new History curriculum. The support rendered by the principal is directly related to the resolution of the personal concerns of the educators about the new History curriculum.
**Statement 4:** The principal helps educators to plan activities for the curriculum.

**FIGURE 5.4.**

It can be seen from figure 5.4 that 60% of educators feel that principals assist them to plan activities for the new History curriculum. The educators' responses point to a picture that is somewhat positive regarding the intervention strategy employed by principals. It implies that educators are largely provided with support. However, 40% of educators feel that the amount of support given by the principals is not adequate. This group of educators (40%) indicate that principals do not address management concerns effectively.
**Statement 5:** The principal creates opportunities for educators to interact professionally about their feelings and concerns.

**FIGURE 5.5.**

![Pie chart showing the responses to the statement](image)

From figure 5.5 it can be seen that 87% of educators are of the opinion that principals create opportunities for educators to interact professionally about their feelings and concerns. The respondents’ feelings indicate that adequate space is provided for professional discourse to take place. This serves to allow educators to share their feelings and concerns relating to the new History curriculum. Professional discourse helps educators who are teaching History to tap into knowledge other educators have in order to help them resolve their concerns. The focus is on creation of a favourable atmosphere where co-operation with others with regard to the teaching of the new History curriculum is encouraged.
**Statement 6:** The principal continues to make funds available for the curriculum to alleviate educators’ concerns about the use of the curriculum.

**FIGURE 5.6.**

From figure 5.6, it is evident that 60% of educators feel that principals provide an excellent role in supporting educators. The other responses (40%) seem to suggest that principals do not make sufficient funds available. Although the majority of educators’ feelings point to a positive picture, one would expect principals to provide a substantial financial back – up.
**Statement 7:** The principal ensures that equipment and material for the curriculum are always available.

**FIGURE 5.7.**

Respondents feel that the principals seem to provide sufficient support to History educators in so far as resources are concerned in the delivery of the new History curriculum. From figure 5.7, 80% of the respondents justify this interpretation.
**Statement 8:** The principal provides the required time for educators to teach the curriculum.

**FIGURE 5.8.**

Based on figure 5.8, the entire group of respondents (that is 100%) feel that the availability of time for History teaching is not a concern to them. It appears that they enjoy full support from their principals to enable them to teach the new History curriculum.
Figure 6: Percentage of respondents’ agreement levels related to training opportunities provided for educators by principals (statements 9-11).

**Statement 9:** The principal helps the educators focus their attention on teaching methods required for the new History curriculum.

**FIGURE 6.1.**

![Pie chart showing agreement levels](chart)

From figure 6.1 it can be seen that 66% of respondents have a feeling that principals help educators to focus their attention on teaching methods required for the new History curriculum. This is based on the fact that two – thirds of the respondents’ indicated that it was justifiable to say that support rendered by principals is adequate. The new History curriculum has its teaching methodologies founded on the philosophy of Outcomes – Based Education (OBE), which means that History educators must change their teaching towards focusing on learning outcomes. There are however also suggestions that principals do not provide sufficient support. This is not unqualified support though, especially when there is a sizable percentage (34%) of educators who express a feeling of disagreement in relation to the support given.
**Statement 10:** The principal holds regular coaching sessions with educators.

**FIGURE 6.2**

From figure 6.2, it is conspicuous that 54% of respondents feel that principals do not hold regular coaching sessions with educators. The responses of educators are a poor reflection on the action undertaken by principals to assist History educators. Apparently, principals neglect aspects of coaching History educators to further assist in the implementation of the new History curriculum.
Statement 11: The principal ensures that new educators and those at new Grade levels receive the necessary in-service training to teach the new curriculum.

FIGURE 6.3

Based on results obtained from figure 6.3 it is evident that 87% of respondents have a strong feeling that principals are ensuring that both the new educators and those at new Grade levels receive the necessary in-service training to teach the new curriculum. The respondents are all new to the new History curriculum taught within the framework of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS). Respondents enjoy supportive intervention by principals. The provision of in-service training spells an endeavour to resolve refocusing concerns harboured by History educators.
Figure 7: Percentage of respondents’ agreement levels related to consultation and reinforcement provided to educators by principals (statements 12 and 13).

**Statement 12:** The principal visits classrooms and advises on problematic aspects of the curriculum.

FIGURE 7.1.

According to the data shown in figure 7.1, 53% of respondents feel that principals visit classrooms and offer advice on problematic aspects of the new History curriculum. The educators’ responses show that there are actions taken by principals in providing assistance to History educators. There appears to be an even distribution of responses by educators in relation to the provision of assistance.
**Statement 13:** The principal ensures that he receives feedback from educators on a continuous basis related to progress made with the use of the new curriculum.

**FIGURE 7.2.**

![Pie chart showing 87% agree, 13% disagree, 33% strongly agree, and 54% agree.

On the basis of the results shown in figure 7.2, 87% of respondents feel that principals are ensuring that they receive feedback from educators on a continuous basis related to progress made with the use of the curriculum. The respondents confirm that principals are ensuring that the implementation of the new History curriculum takes place and is monitored. The educators' responses suggest that principals are constantly in touch with educators as they are implementing the curriculum.
Figure 8: Responses from educators regarding the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the new curriculum by principals (statement 14).

FIGURE 8.1

From figure 8.1, it can be seen that approximately 73% of educators' responses suggest that principals are well informed about the concerns of educators regarding the implementation of the new History curriculum. Monitoring and evaluation thus, are adequately attended to.
From figure 9.1, it is clear that 73% of respondents feel principals make an effort to build collaborative structures with the external environment so that educators can share their concerns. The educators’ responses suggest that principals are providing support by assisting educators in establishing working relations with others who use the new History curriculum. The picture presented by the educators’ responses indicates that collaboration concerns are addressed. This is done through communication and co-ordination with external structures that have the potential to render valuable assistance in the implementation of the new History curriculum. Such assistance creates opportunity for History educators to share their concerns with external structures. These external structures include, but are not limited to, History Subject Advisors, subject associations and educators who are coping well with the implementation of the new History curriculum.
Figure 10: Responses from educators regarding principals’ dissemination of information and materials concerning the new curriculum (statement 16).

FIGURE 10.1.

It is evident from figure 10.1 that 87% of respondents feel that principals furnish educators with information and materials that deal with the implementation of the new History curriculum. This high percentage paints a positive picture concerning support rendered by the principals. On the basis of this picture one can deduce that informational concerns are adequately addressed.

The data related to the actions taken by principals to address educators’ concerns about the use of the new History curriculum portrays a positive picture. The opinions of the History educators point out that they get adequate support when implementing the new History curriculum. There are, however, responses from some educators that suggest a contrary view. The implication of this is that these respondents feel that principals do not give absolute support during the implementation of the new History curriculum.

In the following section I will discuss the findings.
5. DISCUSSION

5.1. CONCERNS OF EDUCATORS REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW HISTORY CURRICULUM

The information (presented in Table 4) indicates that educators have definite concerns about the delivery of the new History curriculum since the percentile scores indicate high levels of intensity in all stages of concern. Hall, George and Rutherford (1979:5) state that to be concerned means to be in a mentally aroused state about something. This description by Hall and his associates incorporates the significance of the emotional dimension regarding the implementation of the new History curriculum. The intensity of arousal depends on the individual educator’s past experience as well as his/her closeness to persons and how immediate the issues are perceived to be. “It is a person’s perceptions that stimulate concerns, not necessarily the reality of the situation”. (Hall, George and Rutherford, 1979:5).

A large number of educators displayed self-concerns. Huberman and Miles (1984:75) claim that the initial stages of the implementation of an innovation are characterised by concerns of users in relation to what may happen to them. These educators seem to have awareness, informational and personal concerns, although concerns at other stages reflect a degree of relative intensity. Self-concerns have high levels of intensity. Hall, George and Rutherford (1979:6) postulate that there is a developmental pattern through the stages of concern. It is significant to highlight that one should not be over-concerned about the degree of intensity which is shown in self-concerns. Hall, George and Rutherford (1979:6) correctly allays over-concern about the degree of intensity of self-concerns by suggesting that “this developmental pattern holds for most process and product innovations”.

The resolution of initial concerns, for instance self-concerns, automatically leads to the arousal of later concerns. This pattern seems to explain that it is both logical and to be expected for this group of educators to have intense concerns about the new History curriculum before task concerns could
emerge. The reason for this is that the History curriculum is new to this group of educators. This trend is seemingly established (as shown in Table 5) since educators developed concerns about the new History curriculum only after they were introduced to the new History curriculum. This features through to concerns about the role and anticipated demands of the new curriculum. The central issue to this group of educators is the concern about the ability to implement the new History curriculum.

It appears that educators do not use the new History curriculum as was the intention by policy-makers. The educator concerns indicate that it is unlikely that proper implementation of the new History curriculum is taking place. On the other hand, principals seem to be providing the necessary support for the implementation of the new History curriculum. Based on the results provided in figure 9.1, 73% of educators show that principals seek valuable assistance from external structures about the implementation of the new History curriculum. From the informational concerns shown by educators (in Table 4) one can deduce that policy translation into practice does not take place. From the data, it appears that the group of educators claim to have no information about what the new History curriculum entails. The percentile scores of informational concerns seem to suggest that educators already had a sense of what the new History curriculum looked like through their existing knowledge of the Apartheid curriculum.

Blignaut (2008:3) concurs with this perspective when he asserts that “what a policy comes to mean for teachers depend to a great extent on their repertoire of existing knowledge and experience”. One can deduce that these educators are not implementing the new History curriculum as intended, based on the high concerns exhibited.

Building on Blignaut’s (2008) contention, Hargreaves (2000:292) postulates that the emotional dimension of educational change also draws attention to the necessity of avoiding reform strategies, leadership styles and work conditions which create conditions of hopelessness, feelings of guilt (through being overwhelmed) and shame (being blamed for failure).
Although the percentile scores (in Table 4) reflect that History educators are going through a developmental stage of implementing the new History curriculum, an inference can be drawn from the data that this innovation was not implemented as intended. The mean score reflects that it is improbable that the new History curriculum is implemented as intended by the teachers.

Blignaut (2005:19) provides numerous explanations that add to the discourse on the failure of policies in permeating classroom practices. Amongst his explanations, I align myself with the statement which argues that most reform strategies focus on structured and formal requirements and do not struggle directly with existing cultures and which new values and practices may be required.

The intensity of stage 2 (personal) concerns might have influenced a conditional resistance to the implementation of the new History curriculum. The data reflects that the individual respondents have concerns that cause strain in teaching. Responses from teacher 1 represent a very good example of a struggling teacher. The data suggests that these teachers are not implementing the new History curriculum as intended and prescribed by policy-makers. Huberman and Miles (1984:72) propose that successful implementation of an innovation entails anticipating certain events and taking measures to reduce their intensity. It is clear from the data that these educators have self–centred concerns with an intensity that requires immediate attention.

5.2. INTERVENTION STRATEGIES UNDERTAKEN BY PRINCIPALS

The information exposited in figure 5 – 10.1 shows the extent to which the principals are engaged in employing intervention strategies. According to the data shown, principals are making an effort towards addressing the concerns of educators who are implementing the new History curriculum. Also, the data indicates that principals take a commendable initiative in supporting the implementation of the new History curriculum. The educators are largely not left on their own to implement the innovation.
This could be ascribed to the fact that high school principals are more concerned with the consequences of the innovation.

However, there are certain areas of intervention which are not adequately attended to by principals. These areas include helping educators to plan activities for the curriculum, provision of funds to alleviate educators’ concerns with regard to holding of regular coaching sessions with educators, and visits to the classrooms and rendering of advice on problematic aspects of the curriculum. The feelings of respondents regarding the areas of intervention highlighted above indicate that some respondents disagree about the adequacy of intervention by principals. Although this represented a minority view, due attention should be focused on these identified areas by principals.

5.3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERVENTION STRATEGIES UNDERTAKEN BY PRINCIPALS AND EDUCATOR CONCERNS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW HISTORY CURRICULUM.

The group profile suggests that educators have the highest concerns at stage 2 (personal concerns). It seems that the educators seek answers to the question: How will the use of the new History curriculum affect me? They require more assistance in resolving conflicts that exist about their expected role in the curriculum itself. The mean scores indicate that educators have a high intensity of concern at all stages. It is, however, not evident from the percentile scores whether the principals are addressing the concerns of the educators or not. The intervention strategies undertaken by the principals have little or no impact in reducing the levels of concerns by educators.

Alternatively, principals seem to be over – emphasizing the innovation itself to the exclusion of personal concerns. There seems to be a schism between the educator concerns and intervention strategies employed by principals to assist in the implementation of the new History curriculum. One is tempted to ask the following question: Despite the high levels of support strategies by
principals, why do the concerns of the educators remain at such a high level? There are various possibilities to explain the situation.

To start with, it is possible that the respondents to the Concerns Questionnaire were not applying themselves seriously to the questionnaire. In addition, as the respondents are not first language speakers of English, it is possible that their English language proficiency has failed them. The stages of concern (SoC) questionnaire has its origins in the United States of America and was designed for use by first language speakers of English. Therefore, the questionnaire may need to be further adapted to South African conditions. Further investigations into the above possible situations are needed.

The results in figure 5 illustrate that principals give moral support to educators teaching the new History curriculum. Although directional pressure is necessary during the implementation of an innovation, Hord (1955:94) argues that “it is one thing to enunciate the needs for pressure and support on behalf of policy implementation in schools and classrooms”. The critical aspect relates to the manner in which pressure and support can be used to the benefit of the implementers of an innovation. Hord (1995:94) advances the idea of using an intelligent combination of pressure and support. The fundamental differences reflected by the data about the educators' concerns and intervention strategies undertaken by principals, suggest incapacity of principals as curriculum leaders to strike an intelligent balance in the provision of pressure and support during the implementation of the new History curriculum. Although there was adequate support provided by principals, the mismatch between the concerns of teachers and the support provided could suggest that the support provided is not the kind required by teachers.
6. BRIEF SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The main findings of this study are summarized as follows:

STAGES OF CONCERN

- The educators have highest personal concerns. These concerns relate to inadequate knowledge about roles educators should play when implementing the new History curriculum.
- Most of the educators indicate high intensity virtually in all stages of concern.
- The data suggests that educators are largely not using the new History curriculum as intended.

SUPPORT BY PRINCIPALS

- Principals take initiative in assisting History educators during the process of implementation of the new History curriculum.
- The types of support rendered by principals are not related to the concerns of educators about the implementation of the new History curriculum.

In this chapter, data on stages of concern (SoC) and support undertaken by principals were presented and discussed. A brief summary of the findings was also presented. In the next chapter, a summary of the main findings and suggestions of strategies that can enhance the implementation of the new History curriculum will be presented. Finally, recommendations will also be made.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the main findings and suggests strategies that can improve the implementation of the new History curriculum. Finally, recommendations are made.

5.1. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions are drawn from the sample (n=15) of schools which offer the History curriculum at grade 10. The main findings of the study are summarised as follows:

STAGES OF CONCERN

The educators have high stages of concern about the implementation of the new History curriculum. The individual educators have intense concerns across stages 0,1,2,5 and 6. The educators (n=15) have the highest concern at stage 2 (personal concerns) and it is dominating all other stages of concern. Although concerns at stages 3 and 4 are not featuring as highest concerns, they are at unacceptably high levels. The management and consequence concerns (at stages 3 and 4) deserve attention from principals for successful implementation.

SUPPORT OF PRINCIPALS

There are intervention strategies employed by principals to address concerns of educators. The extent to which educators' concerns are addressed is relatively high. This shows that principals were concerned about the implementation of the new History curriculum.

However, there is a disjuncture between the concerns of educators and intervention strategies employed by principals. This means the intervention
strategies undertaken by the principals are largely irrelevant in addressing the concerns of educators in all stages of concern. The educator responses indicate that principals are employing intervention strategies but the data on educator concerns do not show any impact of these strategies in addressing the concerns of educators, hence the high intensity of the concerns. An inference can be drawn that:
- Intervention strategies are largely irrelevant and ineffective.
- Respondents’ English language proficiency played a negative role in the completion and interpretation of questionnaire items.

What this study made abundantly clear is that educators’ concerns are significant and need to be monitored constantly. If the concerns of educators are not adequately addressed, the success of implementation of the new History curriculum will be put at serious risk. Support provided by principals should take the concerns of teachers into account.

5.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is against this background that the following recommendations are made:

TEACHER CONCERNS

- The Department of Education should provide principals with training in the field of stages of concern and interventions that are concerns-based. The stages of concern is an important tool to diagnose the extent to which individual educators are ready and aware of innovations. Similarly, it is this tool that can assist the Department of Education in identifying aspects which require training.
- The Department of Education should consider the employment of curriculum specialists at district level. Curriculum specialists have the expertise that can provide relevant assistance in the implementation of the innovations. The availability of curriculum specialists will facilitate research on an ongoing basis in order to check the progress and diagnose problems that require attention.
The principal should provide continual assistance to educators who have concerns about the implementation of the new History curriculum.

- Having been trained in stages of concern, the principal should always assess the feelings of educators so that the personal dimension of the implementation of the curriculum is addressed.

**SUPPORT BY PRINCIPALS**

- Time is a crucial factor in the implementation of any curriculum. This should be acknowledged by the Department of Education in order to set and achieve real expectations about the implementation of the curriculum.

- The educators should be afforded an opportunity to engage themselves in vigorous professional discourse. This will allow educators to exchange knowledge and challenges regarding curriculum implementation. Such engagement enables educators to share experiences with their colleagues in other schools. By so doing, collegiality is enhanced.

- Principals should be encouraged to facilitate the formation of clusters. Schools should be grouped according to the dictates of geographical accessibility and proximity to each other. The formation of clusters will allow for diffusion of strategies of implementation across the clusters. After forming clusters, principals should establish networks.

The focus of the recommendations is on principals who are central to the delivery of the curriculum at school level. When principals are fully equipped with regard to curriculum implementation, educators are equally able to benefit with the implementation of the curriculum.
5.3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the degree of the implementation of the new History curriculum in grade 10 classes in the Qumbu district. Educators from eighteen schools were chosen to participate and were in schools offering History as a subject in their curriculum. Educators from fifteen schools responded to the two sets of questionnaires. The degree of implementation was expressed in terms of concerns of educators and support given to the educators by principals. The study clearly demonstrates that unless adequate attention is given to the concerns of teachers, implementation will suffer. In view of the size of the sample, conclusions that were drawn from the whole study cannot be generalised for the whole of South Africa.
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Appendix 3

CONCERNS QUESTIONNAIRE

History Curriculum

Name (Optional): ..................................

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what people who are thinking about using various programmes are concerned about at various times during the innovation adoption process. The items are developed from typical responses of high school teachers ranging from no knowledge at all about various programmes to many years experience in using them. Therefore, a good part of the items on this questionnaire may appear to be of little relevance or irrelevant to you at this time. For completely irrelevant item,
please circle “0” on the scale. Other items will represent those concerns you do have, in varying degree of intensity, and should be marked high on scale.

For Example
This statement is very true of me at this time 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
This statement is somewhat true of me now. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
This statement is not at all true of me at this time. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
This statement seems irrelevant to me 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please respond to the items in terms of your present concerns or how you feel about your involvement with History curriculum.

Thank you for taking time to complete this task.

Biographical Details

Use X to choose an answer appropriate to you from the following items:
1. Sex
☐ Male
☐ Female

2. Academic Qualifications
☐ BA
☐ BA Hons
☐ MA
☐ PhD
☐ Other (Specify) ........................................

3. Professional Qualifications
☐ JSTC
☐ STD
☐ HDE
☐ PGCE
- □ UED
- □ BEd
- □ BEd Hons
- □ MEd
- □ DEd
- □ Other (Specify) .........................

4. Years teaching History Curriculum
- □ 1 - 5 years
- □ 6 – 10 years
- □ 11 – 15 years
- □ 16 – 20 years
- □ 20 years and above.

### SOC QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not true of me now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat true of me now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very true of me now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am concerned about students’ attitudes towards History curriculum 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I now know of some other approaches that might work better 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I don’t even know what the History curriculum is. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I am concerned about not having enough time to recognize myself each day 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I would like to help other educators in their use of the History curriculum. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I have a very limited knowledge about the History curriculum 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I would like to know the effect of reorganization on my professional status. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. I am concerned about conflict between my interest and my responsibilities. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I am concerned about revising my use of History curriculum 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I would like to develop working relationships with both our department and outside departments using the History curriculum 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. I am concerned about how the History curriculum affects students. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. I am not concerned about History curriculum. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I would like to know who will make the decisions in the new History curriculum. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. I would like to discuss the possibility of using the History curriculum 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. I would like to know what resources are available if we decide to adopt the new History curriculum. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. I am concerned about my inability to manage all what History curriculum requires 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. I would like to know how my teaching or administration is supposed to change 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. I would like to familiarize other departments or persons with the progress of this new approach 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Irrelevant Not true of me now Somewhat true of me now Very true of me now

19. I am concerned about evaluating my impact on students 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. I would like to revise the History curriculum instructional approach 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. I am completely occupied with other things. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. I would like to modify our use of History curriculum based on the experiences of our students 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. Although I don’t know about this History curriculum, I am concerned about things in the area. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. I would like to excite my students about their part in this approach. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. I am concerned about time spent working with nonacademic problems related to History curriculum. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. I would like to know what the use of the History will require in the immediate future. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. I would like to co-ordinate my efforts with others to maximize the History curriculum’s effects. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. I would like to have more information on time and energy commitments required by the History curriculum. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. I would like to know what other departments are doing in this area. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. At this time, I am not interested in learning about History curriculum 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. I would like determine how to supplement, enhance, or replace the History curriculum.
32. I would like to use feedback from students to change the programme
33. I would like to know how my role will change when I am using the History curriculum
34. Coordination of tasks and people is taking too much of my time
35. I would like to know the History curriculum is better than what we have now.

Appendix 4

Principal Intervention Questionnaire

Name (Optional) : .................................................................

The Principal Intervention Questionnaire seeks to gather the opinions of educators teaching the new History curriculum (Grade 10) with regard to the action taken by the principal to address the educators’ concerns about the use of the new History curriculum.

It is not about what the principal is supposed to do, but what actions the principal is currently undertaking with regard to the new History curriculum.
Your answer to the statements will be **confidential** and only used for the evaluation study. Please make sure that you respond to all the statements.

**Thank you for your time and cooperation.**

**Principal Intervention Questionnaire Statements**

Make a cross (x) next to each of the following statements under the column and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree. For example, if you strongly agree, make the cross under the column, if you agree, but less strongly, make the cross under agree, and so forth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The principal actively communicates that the teaching of the curriculum is a priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The principal always motivates and gives moral support to educators teaching the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The principal ensures that educators know and understand their role in teaching and learning situation pertaining to the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The principal helps educators to plan activities for the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The principal creates opportunities for educators to interact professionally about their feelings and concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The principal continues to make funds available for the curriculum to alleviate educators’ concerns about the use of the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The principal ensures that equipment and materials for the curriculum are always available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The principal provides the required time for educators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The principal helps the educators focus their attention on teaching methods required by the curriculum.

10. The principal holds regular coaching sessions with educators.

11. The principal makes sure that the new educators and those at new Grade levels receive necessary In-service training to teach the new curriculum.

12. The principal visits classrooms and advises on problematic aspects of the curriculum.

13. The principal ensures that he receives feedback from educators on an ongoing basis about the progress made with the use of the curriculum.

14. The principal continuously monitors and evaluates the feelings and attitudes of the educators with regard to the curriculum use.

15. The principal builds collaborative structures with the outside environment so that educators can share their concerns.

16. The principal continues to ensure the ongoing dissemination of the sufficient information and materials about the implementation of the curriculum.

Appendix 5

TEACHER CONCERNS : ITEM NUMBER AND ASSOCIATED STAGE OF CONCERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NUMBER</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>ITEM NUMBER</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>ITEM NUMBER</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>ITEM NUMBER</th>
<th>SOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6

**STAGES OF CONCERN RAW SCORE – PERCENTILE CONVERSION CHART FOR STAGES OF CONCERN (SoC) QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage Total</th>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
<th>Stage 6</th>
<th>Total Raw Score</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43-55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61-66</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68-72</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73-74</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75-78</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79-80</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81-83</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84-86</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87-89</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90 - 92</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93 - 95</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96 - 98</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>99 - 101</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>102 - 104</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>105 - 107</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>108 - 110</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>111 - 112</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>113 - 114</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>115 - 118</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>119 - 122</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>123 - 125</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>126 - 127</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>128 - 132</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>133 - 136</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>137 - 141</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>142 - 144</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>145 - 150</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>151 - 156</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>157 - 161</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>162 - 173</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>174 - 189</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>191 - 245</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>