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ABSTRACT
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A new history curriculum for Malaysian schools was developed and introduced in 1978. This study examined the strategy of using specially designated teachers, called key teachers, in facilitating the implementation of the revised curriculum. Specifically, it determined perceptions held by various actors about the role assigned to the key teachers by the Ministry of Education, about the activities of the key teachers in the schools, and about the factors affecting these activities.

A case study approach was employed. Perceptions were solicited by interviewing key teachers, administrators and teachers located in three schools in Selangor, Malaysia, and three officials from the Ministry of Education in Malaysia. Interviews were conducted in two stages, the first to obtain responses to questions structured by an interview schedule, and the second to verify the responses and interpretations of these responses with each person who had been interviewed. Descriptive, comparative and interpretive analyses were carried out on the data obtained.

The participants differed markedly in their perceptions both of the role expected of the key teachers and of the activities appropriate to that role. Six of the teachers reported that they were unaware that there were key teachers present in their
schools. Other participants held a wide range of expectations but agreed generally that key teachers ought to be able to bring about changes in classroom teaching and/or in disseminating information about the new history curriculum and helping other teachers to use it throughout the school.

It was found that the key teachers selected for this study taught the new history curriculum by emphasizing the content area in contrast to the changes in methods of instruction proposed by the new curriculum. Two of the key teachers informed their fellow teachers about the change in the history curriculum but made little or no effort to explain the nature of these changes. Helping activities, in the form of discussions regarding the new history curriculum, or advice and guidance to teachers, seldom took place. Most changes that took place were initiated by other teachers, not by the key teachers.

Although the key teachers' activities were perceived to be generally useful by teachers, the implementation of the new history curriculum in classrooms was less than optimal. The key teachers found that they were unable to carry out the role satisfactorily. They themselves were not equipped adequately with the knowledge and skill to teach the new history curriculum successfully nor to help others use it. The state-organized inservice course on the new history curriculum proved not to be effective. Expected administrative and professional support from the school administrators, the Ministry of Education, and the key personnel for district who conducted the inservice course for the key teachers, was not forthcoming. Interviews revealed that key
teachers, teachers, administrators, and Ministry of Education officials differed markedly in their perceptions of the role expected of key teachers, the role and value of inservice courses, the nature of the new history curriculum and its effect on teaching practices. Communication among school-level personnel, and between schools and the Ministry of Education, rarely took place. The examination-oriented environment of the school was judged not to be conducive to the introduction of the new history curriculum.

The findings of this study confirm that much of what is known about the process of implementing a new curriculum in a school system is valid when the process is introduced in another cultural milieu. The study provides detailed examples of the importance of such elements as clarity about the innovation and roles, ongoing communication and support, and effective staff development programs in implementation. The findings also indicate that the key teacher diffusion of information model requires modifications. The study suggests three alternative models for curriculum change and implementation that could be used as guidelines for government policies with respect to curriculum revision. Two factors are central to these models: (1) organizational structures that facilitate and support the implementation process, and (2) time schedules required for preparing teachers and school systems adequately for implementing a new curriculum in schools.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM

A new history curriculum was implemented in Malaysian schools in 1978, replacing a previous curriculum which was considered no longer adequate in meeting the needs of the country. The new history curriculum for primary and lower secondary schools was introduced in stages starting with Standard 4 (primary level) and Form 1 (lower secondary level) in 1978, followed by Standard 5 and Form 2 in 1979 and Standard 6 and Form 3 in 1980. By 1980, the replacement of the previous curriculum by the new history curriculum had been completed for Standards 4 to 6 in all the primary schools and Forms 1 to 3 in all secondary schools.

The decision to review the previous history curriculum was prompted by indications of the weaknesses of the old curriculum. These indications as listed in Siti Hawa's thesis (1977) came from three sources:

1) The Ministry of Education had been aware for some time that the old curriculum was no longer appropriate because the content was broad in scope and lacked inclusion of various aspects of local history.

2) School teachers and instructors from teacher training
colleges and universities had indicated the need to review the previous curriculum.

3) The Malaysian History Seminars in 1973 and 1974, sponsored by the Historical Society of the National University of Malaysia observed that the curriculum placed too much emphasis on the history of other countries and that the part comprising Malaysian history was viewed from the British rather than the Malaysian perspective. The lower secondary curriculum, in particular, was criticized because it lacked a clear set of objectives, and because pupils had to study the history of too many countries of Asia and Europe, thus precluding adequate study of the history of their own country.

The development of the new curriculum was hastened by the formulation of a national ideology, called Rukunegara, which has the ultimate aim of achieving national unity. The entire school curriculum is being shifted gradually towards this national goal. History is considered to be one of the subjects which can make a direct contribution to national unity. These subjects are believed to make their contributions to national unity by emphasizing the development of values, attitudes and knowledge necessary for the unity of the nation, the analysis of social problems of society, and the development of thinking and decision making in students. The teaching of local history, which forms a major component of the new history curriculum, was advocated by the Malaysian Cultural Congress in 1971 as a means of fostering the identity of the Malaysian nation.
The new history curriculum brought about changes in both ends (goals) and means (content, activities and resources). Introductory notes contained in the new curriculum state that these goals and content were formulated in line with the constitution and educational aims of the country so that the curriculum could assist efforts to achieve national objectives.

The guide for the new history curriculum contains general statements of goals and specific objectives for each level of schooling and content dealing directly with the history of Malaysia. Unlike the previous curriculum, the new one indicates the teaching-learning activities involved in achieving the stated goals and objectives, thus providing teachers with a more useful guide to classroom teaching. The new history curriculum emphasizes the development of critical thinking, attitudes and values, and the understanding of selected content. The teaching of the new curriculum, therefore, demands a more pupil-oriented approach and less of a textbook and teacher-centred approach.

The new history curriculum was implemented using a 'key personnel' and 'key teacher' strategy. The Ministry of Education of Malaysia recognized the importance of the teacher in implementing the new history curriculum, and so organized inservice courses to familiarize teachers with the new curriculum. The courses were carried out at two levels: central and state. At the central level, a group of teachers (termed district key personnel) specially selected by the State Departments of Education attended an inservice course organized by the Curriculum Development Centre, a division of the Ministry
of Education responsible for the development of the curriculum. The district key personnel then conducted similar courses in the various states for teachers (termed key teachers in this study) from each of the schools. These key teachers, in turn, were expected to disseminate the knowledge and skills gained from the inservice courses to other history teachers in their schools and to help them use the curriculum (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1977a).

Despite the use of key teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum in Malaysia, the effectiveness of this strategy is unclear. Specifically, answers to the following questions are needed.

- **What** are key teachers expected to do to facilitate the implementation of a new curriculum?
- **What** do key teachers actually do to facilitate the implementation of a new curriculum? and
- **Why** do key teachers do what they do in the process of implementation?

These are important questions because their answers provide useful information for those who plan to use or continue to use the key teacher strategy in the implementation of a new curriculum.
THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study examined the role of key teachers in the process of implementing the new Form 1 history curriculum in Malaysian schools. Specifically, the study determined

1) the perceptions of the various groups (the key teachers, the teachers, the school administrators and officials of the Ministry of Education) regarding the role expected of the key teachers in the process of implementing the new history curriculum;

2) the perceptions of the various groups regarding the activities which characterized the actual role of the key teachers in the process;

3) the discrepancies and/or congruencies between the expected and the actual role of the key teachers; and

4) the perceptions of the various groups regarding the factors affecting the activities of the key teachers.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Implementation: The process of facilitating the actual use of a new curriculum in the schools. Teachers need time to learn and to carry out the changes proposed by a new curriculum. This process of learning and changing can be guided and supported by key teachers who are expected to act as instructors and resource persons for teachers.

Curriculum: Statements about the assumptions, goals, content, teaching-learning activities and resources contained in
the guideline (syllabus) and other support documents published by the Ministry of Education.

**Role:** The behaviors expected of and actually carried out by persons who occupy a particular position. This study is concerned with the Ministry of Education's expectation of, and the actual activities carried out by, the key teachers.

**Key Teacher:** A teacher selected from among a group of history teachers in a school to attend an inservice course on the new history curriculum and who in turn was expected to help other teachers learn and teach the new history curriculum in their classrooms.

**THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

This study contributes to both knowledge about, and practice in, the process of curriculum implementation. Firstly, the study provides greater understanding of the process of implementing the new history curriculum in Malaysia. Specifically, information is provided about (1) the role expected of the key teachers in the implementation of a new curriculum; (2) the actual day-to-day activities of the key teachers in their efforts to help teachers implement the curriculum; (3) the perceived usefulness of these activities; and (4) factors which influenced the activities of the key teachers.

Secondly, the findings have implications for decisions regarding future use of the 'key teacher' strategy for curriculum
implementation in Malaysia.

Thirdly, the findings of this study will be relevant to knowledge of the importance of support agents in implementation and of taking into account both personal and contextual factors in planning implementation. The findings may also increase our understanding of the ways in which key teachers can contribute to the process of implementation and the factors which facilitate or constrain their activities.

Fourthly, the study provides recommendations for future research.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was based on a limited sample. Only the implementation of the new history curriculum at the Form 1 level was studied, and the sample was drawn from three schools in one State, Selangor. To be applicable for other schools in other states of Malaysia, the results and conclusions have to be seen in the light of the schools and the participants involved.

The use of self-report data is susceptible to problems such as the participants' selective perceptions, ability to recollect past events, or even deliberate attempts to supply misleading information. The researcher obtained only that information which the participants were willing and able to report.
ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

A review of the literature and an outline of the conceptual framework are presented in Chapter 2. The literature review discusses the role of key persons, the main approaches used in the study of implementation and the importance of staff development activities.

Chapter 3 describes the system of education in Malaysia: the development and structure of a national system of education, comprising the federal, state and school levels. The chapter also outlines the development and the strategy for implementation of the new history curriculum.

Chapter 4 describes the design of the study, the three sources of data (interviews, questionnaires and documents), the criteria for the selection of schools and officials of the Ministry of Education, the three stages of the study (initial preparation, pilot study and data collection), and the method of data analysis.

The data are presented in the next four chapters. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 contain data from the participants in Schools A, B and C, and Chapter 8 consists of data from the officials of the Ministry of Education. All data are analyzed in Chapter 9.

The summary, conclusions and implications are presented in Chapter 10.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study is on the role of the key teacher in facilitating the implementation of a new curriculum in the schools. To help understand the study four areas of the literature were reviewed and are presented in the first section of this chapter.

The first part of the review examines studies on the role of key persons in the process of implementation in order to assess current knowledge and to identify useful areas for research. The second part of the review describes the two main approaches to implementation and highlights the contribution of process studies to the understanding of implementation. The third part of the literature review examines the importance of teachers as curriculum users in the process of implementing a new curriculum. The fourth part examines the importance of staff development activities in facilitating teacher learning and use of a new curriculum and subsequently identifies several characteristics of a well-conducted staff development program. The last part of this section summarizes the findings of the review.

Existing knowledge about the role of key persons in facilitating implementation, and the factors influencing their
activities as revealed by the literature review are useful in helping to understand the focus and direction of this study. The review helps to justify and clarify the meanings of the concepts of key teacher, implementation, and role, used in the study. It also provides a basis for developing the conceptual framework of the study, outlined in the second section of the chapter.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Role of Key Persons in the Process of Implementation

Much of the research on implementation emphasizes the role of key persons, such as central or district office personnel, principals, and teachers. Gross et al. (1971, 1975), for example, highlighted the critical role played by both the teachers and the management in implementation. According to their study of an elementary school's attempt to implement an innovation, the innovation was not successfully carried out because teachers failed to perform the role prescribed by the innovation. Teachers failed to exhibit the new behavior patterns because they did not have a clear image of the role expected of them, and lacked the ability and motivation to perform the required role. The unavailability of appropriate materials and the incompatibility of the organizational arrangement to the innovation also affected the teachers' performance. Based on this finding, Gross et al. concluded that the degree to which an innovation is implemented is a function of the extent to which five conditions are present during the process of implementation.
These five conditions are teacher clarity, teacher ability, teacher motivation, availability of resources and compatibility of organizational arrangements.

They also concluded that the extent to which the five conditions are present is a function of the performance of the management. The failure of the teachers was attributed to the failure of the management to create and maintain conditions that facilitate implementation. Gross et al. (1971, 1975) cited the management's failure to recognize the complexities of the process of implementation as one of the reasons for their ineffectiveness. They found the implementation strategy used by the Project Director to be deficient in that it failed to take account of the various difficulties teachers were likely to encounter and did not establish and use any feedback mechanism to help identify and cope with the problems that arose during implementation.

The administrators' lack of awareness and understanding about the innovation, specifically the new teacher role and the administrators' role obligation to teachers, also contributed to many of the difficulties faced by teachers. The administrators' lack of clarity prevented them from helping teachers clarify any ambiguities they had, and hence prevented them from realizing the need to establish procedures that would provide teachers with opportunities for training. As a result, teachers received very little help in developing the competencies needed to implement the innovation. The administrators' lack of understanding also resulted in their failure to recognize the need to alter certain
organizational arrangements to suit the innovation, a condition that Gross et al. (1971) found contributed to the lack of success in implementation.

The importance of administrative personnel in implementation was also shown by the Rand Study (Greenwood et al., 1975; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978). Administrative support for the project at all levels of the district -- from the central administrators to the school principals -- was critical in enhancing project success. District level support and commitment were found to be vital in seeing the project through the first year. Projects, in which the central administrators were perceived to be indifferent or opposed to the projects floundered and failed to achieve momentum or staff enthusiasm. The support of the principals was found to have a more dramatic and immediate effect on implementation. In projects where the behavior of the principals was perceived as supportive, such as providing extra services for teachers and making schedule changes to accommodate project requirements, the teachers appeared to have gained professional pride and esteem, a condition found to be beneficial to successful implementation.

The Rand Study (Greenwood et al., 1975; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978) also found the local resource personnel to be critical to implementation. Their proximity to teachers and their familiarity with the classroom situation enabled them to understand clearly the problems faced by teachers. The local resource personnel were, therefore, able to provide teachers with the much-needed practical advice and on-going classroom
assistance viewed by teachers as critical in helping them through the difficult process of implementation.

The Rand Study pointed out that teachers' perceptions of the usefulness of the local resource personnel had positive effects on the percentage of goals achieved, on student performance, on teacher change and on the continuation of project methods and materials. Any assistance provided that was not perceived as useful did not have any effect on implementation; it in fact hindered implementation.

The importance of the role of key persons in the process of implementation was also highlighted in studies on organizational development. Fullan et al. (1980) after reviewing several works on organizational development, specifically in analyzing the conditions affecting the implementation of organizational development programs, concluded that 1) active involvement, support and understanding of programs by top management and by principals were essential during implementation, and 2) establishment and use of organizational development consultants combined with the use of external consultants were also important to implementation.

Fullan (1982), after reviewing some of the available research on the role of internal consultants concluded that internal support staff could play an important role by helping arrange frequent meetings with small groups of teachers to exchange ideas and information. They also contribute to the development of support, reassurance and clarity about the innovation among the teachers. However, factors such as the
consultants' lack of clarity and lack of preparation for their role have created problems in their role performance. Other problems faced frequently by the consultants include the lack of program knowledge, the lack of leadership support by principals, and difficulties in establishing ongoing communication with teachers in schools. Based on these findings Fullan (1982) came to the conclusion that the effectiveness of support staff could be facilitated if districts set up a deliberate system of ongoing assistance and support for implementation.

Fullan (1982) also pointed out that to be effective, leaders of educational change, including the support agents, have to possess three kinds of knowledge and skills: technical expertise related to substantive content area, interpersonal or human relation skills, and conceptual and technical skills pertaining to planning and implementation. Technical expertise includes knowledge about what comprises the change and skills to use it. Such expertise is essential to enable leaders to support the use of the new curriculum effectively. Interpersonal skills include the abilities to communicate with, to listen to, to motivate, and to gain the trust of, those involved. Conceptual and technical skills refer to "... the ability to comprehend and organize the process of educational change and our own and other's place in it" (Fullan, 1982:93). This includes understanding the culture of the school, the problems of communication, and people's relationship to the change process, values and motivations.

Fullan (1982) was especially concerned with the need to understand the realities of others: "... the values, ideas and
experiences of those who are essential for implementing any changes" (p.83). Such understanding exposes these key persons to the problems of implementation and provides them with ideas on how to facilitate implementation of the new program. This understanding could be enhanced through regular interaction with those involved with implementing the new curriculum.

The works cited above emphasize the role carried out by key persons in the process of implementation and factors that influence that role. These factors could be classified as role expectation, personal factors and contextual factors. Some of the personal factors include clarity about the innovation and the role expected of them; ability to use the innovation and to carry out their role; possession of interpersonal, conceptual and technical skills; and also commitment towards the project. Examples of contextual factors are the availability of materials, compatibility of organizational arrangements, regular interactions among those involved in implementation, and the amount of support and help received from the administrators and other supportive personnel.

Based on these works it appears that there are two types of key persons: administrative and nonadministrative. Each type can be further categorized into those internal and external to the system under analysis. Table 1 shows the resulting four types of key persons, using the school as the unit of analysis.

Our concern here is with the fourth group: the internal, nonadministrative personnel, who is called the staff person. Key teachers, the focus of this study, could be viewed as falling
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Central Office Personnel</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Administrative</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Staff Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

within this category. It should be noted that different terms have been used in the literature to represent this category of key person. Fullan et al.'s (1980) review listed several terms such as teacher leader, renewal coordinator, internal change agent, teacher advisor and internal staff leader. The term staff person is used here to represent all such nonadministrative personnel in the local school.

Though the title 'key teacher' is a Malaysian phenomenon, a review of research on the role of the staff person suggests several useful directions for research. It is evident from this review that greater attention has been given to the study of administrative personnel in the process of implementation. In addition to establishing the critical role played by administrators, these studies on the staff person also provide rich information on how the administrators could facilitate the process of implementation, and the factors that influence their behavior. They pointed out that teachers' perceptions of the administrators' behavior influence the outcome of implementation.

Very few studies have, however, focused their attention on the role of the staff person in the process of curriculum
implementation. Information about how they influence the process or factors that govern their behavior is limited and sketchy. For example, the Rand Study, while providing information regarding the activities of local resource personnel that are perceived as useful by teachers, did not highlight the fact that the ability to provide teachers with concrete advice and ongoing help is conditional upon the presence of certain conditions.

**Approaches to the Study of Implementation**

Two approaches have dominated studies on implementation: the product approach and the process approach. These represent different ways of looking at implementation.

The *product approach* is concerned with the extent to which the actual use of the innovation corresponds to its intended use. Its focus is on the degree of implementation. The degree of implementation is the criterion used to assess the degree of success of an innovation: the higher the congruency, the more successful the implementation of the innovation.

Implicit in studies employing this approach is the general input-output model which, as pointed out by Berman and McLaughlin (1974), emphasizes the relationship between the input -- the educational treatment which has been specified in advance -- and the output -- the outcome measured such as students' and teachers' performances. Information gained from employing this approach is useful in determining the extent to which a particular program has been implemented and in informing developers or decision makers of any necessary revisions to a
particular program (Leinhardt, 1980).

Several authors have pointed out the shortcomings of such studies. Berman and McLaughlin for example, argued that the findings of these studies "lack stability and exportability" (1974:5) because these findings did not identify important factors which influence relationships between the 'intended' and the 'actual' outcomes. These studies do not tell us whether the lack of success in implementation was caused by slippages between the goals and the treatment, premature evaluation, inappropriateness of the goals or the innovation, or problems encountered during implementation.

The process approach, on the other hand, is concerned with analyzing the course of implementation, a process which Fullan and Pomfret (1977) describe as highly complex and involving "... relationships between users and managers and among various groups of users ... characterized by inevitable conflict and by anticipated and unanticipated problems" (390). Process studies usually deal with three main questions: 1) What happened during the process?, 2) How did it come about?, and 3) Why did it happen the way it did? Answers to these questions provide detailed descriptions of how a particular innovation works, the activities that characterize the process and the conditions that influence it. Such studies help account for "... variations in the degree to which the same innovation is implemented by different individuals and organizations and the degree to which some components of an innovation are implemented more effectively than others" (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977:345).
An in-depth study of the implementation process is useful in providing rich insights and detailed descriptions of the complexities and dynamics of the process. Data uncovered through such investigation could be used to formulate models inductively or to develop theories about implementation. According to Berman and McLaughlin (1974), deductively formulated models, such as Havelock's four models (often used in studies on implementation) are of limited use to implementation since they rely heavily on the literature on diffusion, which emphasizes differential rates of adoption as the central issue for analysis. The usefulness of these models to implementation is also limited since they are concerned mainly with the relationship between the treatment and outcome, and do not focus on the process. An inductively formulated model of implementation may, therefore, be considered useful in helping us understand the complex nature of the implementation process and, consequently, in guiding efforts at implementation.

The Rand Study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1974, 1975; Greenwood et al., 1975; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978), which investigated the implementation of federally-funded programs in the United States, is an outstanding example of research utilizing the process approach. It should be noted, however, that though its emphasis was on the process of implementation, the Rand Study was also concerned with the outcome of implementation.

The case study approach was selected by the Rand Study to provide detailed understanding of implementation, specifically the activities that characterize the process, and the
institutional setting that influenced it. The case study yielded information about project outcomes, such as the impact of the change project on classrooms, teachers, students and the impact of federal money on project continuation.

Information about the process and the outcomes were obtained through open-ended interviews and classroom observations. To understand why a particular project was implemented the way it was, the Rand researchers talked to major participants involved in the process. The information gathered was used to put together a picture of what happened in the course of implementation and to identify the conditions that significantly affect the process (Greenwood et al., 1975).

Three important conclusions of the Rand Study are listed below.

1) Implementation is a process characterized by mutual adaptation.

2) The extent of mutual adaptation is influenced by the substantive design of the innovation and the motivations of those involved.

3) How adaptation occurs, why it occurs as it does, and the consequences of various activities are related to the attributes of the innovative strategy and the institutional setting.

Greenwood et al. (1975) noted that since the case studies were exploratory, the findings were tentative. The generalizability of the findings is limited. Firstly, the study
attempted to describe and to interpret only the processes that were common to the projects visited, not to make general statements about innovations in education. Secondly, the findings were drawn from projects believed to contribute most to an understanding of the change process; less weight was given to those projects perceived as less useful to such understanding. The findings and hypotheses that emerged from the study, therefore, needed to be refined and modified by subsequent work before they could be generalized.

The implementation literature reveals several ways of describing the implementation process. The Rand Study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1974, 1975; Berman et al., 1975; Greenwood et al., 1975; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978), as discussed earlier, concluded that implementation is characterised by a process of mutual adaptation. Hall and associates at the Texas Research and Development Centre (Hall and Loucks, 1977, 1978; Loucks, 1978; Loucks and Pratt, 1979; Pratt et al., 1980) and Leithwood and associates at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (Leithwood, 1979; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1980) view implementation as a developmental or growth process whereby users of a curriculum innovation move from their current practices toward preferred practices as prescribed by the innovation. Werner (1980a), from a planning viewpoint, described implementation as "a process of putting into practice something new" which comprises "... a learning process, a social process and an adaptive process on the part of the school staff" (p.7). The process of implementation could be facilitated by using strategies that provide for such things as regular interactions,
effective staff development programs, and resource and administrative support.

An increasing number of studies on implementation are utilising both the product and process approach. The concept of 'levels of use' (LOU) developed by Hall and associates, for example, is concerned with both the degree of implementation and its process. The eight 'levels of use' -- non-use, orientation, preparation, mechanical use, routine, refinement, integration and renewal -- suggest that users vary in their degree of implementation and that they may go through different stages as they develop the ability to use the innovation. The LOU are linked with corresponding stages of concern -- awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration and refocussing -- which need to be met if a given user is to proceed from a lower to a higher LOU.

This concept of 'levels of use' contributes to current thinking about the goals and the process of implementation. Leithwood and Montgomery (1980) point out that LOU's value lies in its operationalization of implementation as a process, empirical recognition of differentiated needs among implementors depending on 'levels of use', the provision of a well-tested set of instruments and procedures for diagnosing both 'levels of use' and stages of concern, and the general applicability of the concepts and procedures across different classes of educational innovations" (p.206).

LOU's contribution towards the planning for implementation was pointed out by Loucks (1978). According to her, information
about the different needs of teachers as shown in their LOU is useful in planning for differentiated staff development needs. LOU can also be used to help planners set goals for implementation. The assessing of LOU throughout the implementation effort helps contribute data for continuous and effective planning, and decision making.

The product and process view of implementation is also reflected in the work of Leithwood and associates who developed an 'Innovation Profile' after finding the LOU "... insensitive to important differences among innovations and thus frustrates ... attempts to facilitate implementation" (Leithwood, 1979:4). The 'Innovation Profile' is made up of a two-dimensional matrix: the dimensions of an innovation and the LOU, with each matrix cell containing the behavior considered appropriate for each stage. A comparison of the practices intended by a particular curriculum innovation and those actually practised by the schools in their attempt at implementing the curriculum, could facilitate the identification of obstacles that hinder teacher growth in a stipulated direction. Such information is of value in the planning of curriculum implementation.

**Teachers and the Process of Implementation**

Implementation studies have increasingly focused on teachers as curriculum users or key actors in the process of implementing a new curriculum. These studies showed that teachers have an important role in implementation. The success of any implementation effort is influenced greatly by the teachers'
knowledge and ability to use the curriculum and the way the teachers view the curriculum.

**Teachers' Knowledge and Ability.** Works on implementation have shown that to be able to use an innovation, a teacher needs not only to understand the new goals, activities, roles, resources or assumptions underlying the new curriculum, but also to possess the skills needed to carry out these changes (Gross et al., 1971, 1975; Giacquinta, 1973; Kritek, 1976; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977). Gross et al.'s (1971) study of an attempt by a small elementary school to implement a major organizational change, for example, showed that teachers needed to identify the essential features of the innovation and have a clear image of the role expected of them. Their ambiguity about the innovation could reduce their ability to implement the innovation and to exhibit the necessary attitude and behavior required by the innovation.

Benham (1977) and Werner (1980) specifically point to the importance of teachers understanding the beliefs upon which a curriculum is premised. Werner (1980) cited a case study which showed that a particular style of curriculum development, "mutualism", was not used because the assumptions implicit in the approach were not fully understood by the members of the development team. He also cited the study by Downey (1975) which found that though the teachers expressed their support and commitment to the social studies program they were using, the beliefs underlying the program were not reflected in their classroom behavior.
Teacher clarity about the innovation and the role expected of them is important to the success of implementation. The findings of the Rand Study suggest that teacher clarity needs to be fostered.

The conceptual clarity critical to project success and continuation must be achieved during the process of project implementation; it cannot be given to the staff at the outset.

(McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978:80)

Such clarity can be enhanced by setting up plans and procedures that promote the continuous explication of the innovation. This may include plans for regular interactions among the people involved in implementation, and effective staff development programs.

**Teachers' Views of the Curriculum.** The fate of a curriculum can be influenced by the way the teachers view the curriculum. Doyle and Ponder (1977) believe that innovations perceived as practical by teachers have greater chance of being incorporated into teachers' classroom plans than those perceived as impractical. An innovation is perceived by teachers as practical if it meets the following criteria.

1) It is clear, that is, communicated in "procedural, ecologically relevant terminology" (p.77);
2) it is perceived as congruent with prevailing conditions, and
3) it can be implemented with ease.

Fullan's (1982) review of the literature on innovations, however, showed that in most cases, the disincentives for using an innovation outweigh the incentives. The culture of the
school, the demands of the classroom and the way change is introduced do not permit or facilitate teachers' involvement in change efforts. Most of the strategies used by promoters of change do not work because "... they are derived from a world or from premises different from that of the teachers" (p.115). Fullan (1982) believes that understanding the teachers' world is, therefore, a necessary pre-condition for those who deal with teachers because such understanding could generate insights and ideas on how to facilitate change among the teachers.

According to Werner (1977), teachers' acceptance and use of a new curriculum is largely contingent upon their belief regarding its relevance and the extent to which they understand, share and feel committed to the beliefs underlying the intents, activities and resources that comprised the curriculum. Benham (1977) strongly believes that the failure of many of the educational reforms in the late sixties and early seventies could be attributed to the existence of a "fundamental philosophical difference between the reforms being proposed and the institution of public schooling... for which they were being proposed" (1977:205). In view of the importance of the need for teachers to share the beliefs underlying the curriculum, Werner (1980) suggested that these beliefs be made explicit to teachers and that continuous monitoring of the process be provided to ensure ongoing understanding of the curriculum.
Staff Development and Implementation

Studies on implementation such as those carried out by the Rand Corporation (McLaughlin, 1976; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978), Gross et al. (1971, 1975) and Giacquinta (1973) and those reviewed by Fullan and Pomfret (1977) show that a well-conducted staff development program is crucial to the success of any implementation effort. It fosters teacher learning and change and ensures the continuation of new projects. Research on staff development and implementation shows that an effective staff development program needs to possess three characteristics: continuity, flexibility and relevance, and the utilization of a variety of modes of delivery (Hall and Loucks, 1978; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978; Fullan, 1979b; Joyce, 1979; Nash and Ireland, 1979; Joyce and Showers, 1980).

Continuity. Most studies on staff development (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978; Hall and Loucks, 1978; Fullan, 1979; Nash and Ireland, 1979) view continuity as an essential ingredient for effective staff development programs. These programs need to be carried out before as well as during implementation. One-shot pre-implementation staff development programs, the traditional focus of many staff development efforts, are not considered adequate because they do not cater to the continuing needs and concerns of those teachers involved with implementing the curriculum (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978). Such continuity is critical in view of the findings of the Rand Study (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978) and the LOU research carried out by the Texas Research Group (Hall and Loucks, 1978) which show that an
innovation sometimes took one or several years to reach full implementation and that teacher learning or development took place throughout the process of implementation. Over this period of time, teachers needed to learn not only the new ideas contained in the innovation and the skills required to use it, but also how to apply these skills, knowledge and materials in their classroom and how to retain them once federal funding stopped.

A continuous staff development program can also help alleviate the problem of 'false clarity'; a problem that takes place "... when change is interpreted in an oversimplified way; that is, the proposed change has more to it than people perceive or realize" (Fullan, 1982:58). Teachers, for example, may perceive change only with respect to the goals and content while neglecting the teaching strategies and the assumptions underlying the change. 'False clarity', according to Fullan (1982), hinders implementation because it gives teachers a false sense of comfort and can also cause them anxiety and frustration.

Based on the findings of the Rand Study, McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) proposed that an effective staff development program be on-going and comprise two complementary elements: staff training activities and staff support activities. Staff training activities are skill-specific, usually involving instructions on how to carry out a new program or an introduction to new curriculum materials. Such training usually involves workshops and takes place prior to implementation or during implementation itself. Staff support activities refer to activities that help
teachers to assimilate and use the knowledge and skills acquired during the training sessions. These include assistance by resource personnel, the use of consultants and project meetings. Skill-specific training activities alone are inadequate in ensuring successful implementation because their effects were only transient in nature and thus do not support staff learning and change.

Skill specific training enabled teachers to implement new project methods and materials... But this implementation was often mechanistic and did not necessarily constitute teacher assimilation of the new techniques and procedures. Thus, when the supports of the funded project's operation were removed, teachers discontinued using the practices that apparently enhanced student performance because they had never really learned them in the first place. Skill specific training can affect project implementation and student outcomes, but it does not affect the longer term project outcomes of teacher change and continuation.

(McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978:77)

Thus staff support services are needed to sustain the gains from skill training and to provide teachers with the feedback necessary to help them modify their practices. The Rand Study (Greenwood et al., 1975), for example, found that frequent and regular project meetings tend to result in fewer serious problems, higher morale, greater cohesiveness, sharing of good ideas, and reduced staff friction. This is because such meetings, in addition to providing teachers with a forum to voice their problems, to communicate information and to decide on future plans, also provide them with the support and encouragement in carrying through their work.
The Rand Study also found project meetings and classroom assistance valuable in fostering conceptual clarity among teachers. According to the study, teacher clarity needed to be fostered through activities that promoted the continuous explication of the innovation; clarity could not be assured by specific project goal statements or by the use of packaged materials.

Staff support activities were also found by McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) to be important in providing teachers with feedback necessary to help them modify their practices to conform to project requirements and project technology. Kritek (1976) and Fullan and Pomfret (1977), after reviewing the factors influencing the process of implementation, came to the conclusion that the absence of feedback was critical to implementation. Gross et al. (1971, 1975) attributed teachers' inability to implement to the failure to establish a feedback mechanism that could help identify and cope effectively with unanticipated problems that might occur during the process of implementation.

Flexibility and Relevance. Staff development programs that are flexible, that are able to respond to the needs and concerns of the teachers, are also considered crucial to effective implementation (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978; Fullan, 1979b; Joyce, 1979). Berman and McLaughlin (1978) contend that the best staff development programs are those that address the specific needs of each individual teacher. They have also indicated the need for flexibility in the planning of staff development programs.

According to McLaughlin and Marsh (1978), even a carefully
planned staff training program cannot anticipate the nature or timing of staff-assistance requirements, especially as they relate to particular classroom problems. Teachers often do not perceive what they need to know until the need arises. Since teachers' needs are not always predictable "training programs that attempt to be comprehensive and cover all contingencies at the outset are bound to miss their mark and also to be less than meaningful to project participants" (McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978:344).

Ways in which staff development programs could be made more relevant and meaningful to teachers have been suggested by Hall and Loucks (1978). Their study on 'levels of use' and 'stages of concern' shows that at any given point different teachers may have different needs and concerns. To be relevant to teachers, staff development activities, therefore, need to be planned so as to be able to address the different needs and concerns of the teachers.

**Variety in the Mode of Delivery.** Huberman's statement that "it is not the amount but rather the configuration of training which counts" (1978:6) points to the need to use various types of methods of delivery to ensure an effective staff development program. He considers a combination of periodic training sessions and regularly scheduled meetings for feedback to be an effective staff development strategy because he feels that teachers are more sensitive to demonstrations under normal classroom conditions and tend to use and listen to other teachers.
Joyce and associates (Joyce, 1979; Joyce and Showers, 1980) also believe that an effective staff development program needs to include several training components. The five training components which they identified after analyzing about two hundred studies are presentation and discussion of theory, modeling, practice, feedback and coaching. After analyzing the impact of these five components on four levels of learning -- awareness, concepts and knowledge, principles and skills, and application and problem solving -- Joyce and his colleagues concluded that where the purpose of training is to master a new approach or to implement a new curriculum, the use of all five components is necessary. This is because the magnitude of change involved is very great; teachers are not only expected to learn, to think and to behave differently but also to help the children become comfortable with the new approach.

If the theory of a new approach is well presented, the approach is demonstrated, practice is provided under simulated conditions with careful and consistent feedback, and that practice is followed by application in the classroom with coaching and further feedback, it is likely that the vast majority of teachers will be able to expand their repertoire to the point where they can utilize a wide variety of approaches to teaching and curriculum. If any of these components are left out, the impact of training will be weakened... fewer numbers of people will progress to the transfer level .... The most effective training activities, then, will be those that combine theory, modeling, practice, feedback, and coaching to application.


The literature indicates that implementation involves the process of learning by teachers and that staff development
activities are critical to the success of any implementation effort. Teacher clarity about, and ability to use, the innovation, could be fostered through a well-conducted staff development program, one that is characterized by continuity, flexibility and relevance and that utilizes various methods of delivery.

Summary

The review of the literature focused on four areas: the role of key persons in implementation, the process of implementation, the teacher and staff development in implementation.

The studies reviewed emphasized the role of key persons such as the central office personnel and the principal in the process of implementation. The directions taken in studies of role behavior focus upon the congruency between actual behavior and expected behavior, the kinds of behavior that facilitate the process of implementation, and the factors that influence the behavior of these key persons. Role behavior is shaped by role expectation, and the extent to which this behavior matches the expectation is influenced by a number of personal factors such as knowledge and skills, awareness and clarity of the role expectation, and ability to perform the role, as well as contextual factors such as administrative support and commitment, availability of resources, interactions among the various people, and the compatibility of organizational arrangements.

The review indicates that there is a lack of studies on the role of the 'staff person', a concept which appears to come
closest to that of the key teacher. Except for findings that establish the importance of this role, little is known that could be used to understand the behavior of the key teacher in the process of implementing the new history curriculum in Malaysian schools. This situation is in contrast to that of the administrators who appear to have received much greater attention in studies on implementation.

Teachers' perceptions of the behavior of key persons have also been shown to have important bearing on the outcome of implementation. The Rand Study (Greenwood et al., 1975) showed that teacher implementation of projects introduced by change agents were influenced by their perceptions of the administrators' support for, and commitment to, the project; and also by their perceptions of the usefulness of the assistance provided by the local resource personnel. This finding is of significance to implementation. Since different teachers may perceive identical behaviors of key persons in different ways, what is perceived as useful in one setting may not be useful in another setting, depending on the characteristics of the role occupants and the context in which the interaction takes place (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977).

Studies on implementation follow two main approaches: the product approach which emphasizes the extent to which an innovation is being implemented, and the process approach, concerned mainly with describing and analyzing the complex nature of the process of implementation. The process approach was seen as useful in documenting implementation, since it allows for
probing into the complex and dynamic process of implementation. The detailed description of the process gained from such studies facilitates efforts to formulate models or theories on implementation inductively. It appears that the use of such an approach -- one which emphasizes the what, the how and the why -- could be useful in examining the role of the key teachers in the process of implementation.

Studies on implementation point to the importance of the teachers in the process of implementation. The success of implementation is dependent on teachers' understanding of the innovation and their ability to apply new knowledge and skills to their own classroom situation. Teachers' use of an innovation is also dependent on their judgement of the practicality of the innovation, and the extent to which they share the beliefs underlying the innovation.

It has also been pointed out in the review that implementation involves a process of learning for teachers. Teachers are continuously involved in learning about the innovation and the skills needed to put it into practice and in learning how to apply what has been learned to their own classroom situation. The literature on staff development activities indicate that a well-conducted staff development program, one that is characterised by continuity, flexibility and relevance, and that utilizes a variety of methods of presentation, could facilitate this learning process. This finding offers insights into the type of staff development activities that could be carried out or initiated by key teachers
to foster teacher learning.

This literature review provides a basis for developing the conceptual framework outlined below.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework of this study is shown in Figure 1. The implementation process considered in this study is that of putting a new history curriculum into practice. The process of implementation involves learning on the part of teachers. Teachers, as users of the curriculum, need to learn about the new goals, activities and resources proposed by the curriculum, the assumptions underlying it and the skills needed to carry it out. Teachers also need to learn to apply the knowledge and skills acquired to their own classroom situation.

In the implementation of the new history curriculum in Malaysia, this process of learning by teachers was to be facilitated by the key teacher. The key teacher referred to is a resource person selected from among a group of history teachers in a school to help other history teachers in the use of the history curriculum. Each school was to have one key teacher for each of the forms for which the new curriculum was being implemented.

The role of the key teacher encompasses two aspects: the role expected of them by the Ministry of Education and the role actually carried out by the key teacher. These two aspects of
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for the Study

N.B. Numbers in this figure refer to the aspects of the implementation process examined by this study.
the key teacher's role can be examined based on reports provided by the various groups of people involved in the process of implementation. This mode of inquiry, that of using perception as a source of data, is a viable alternative to first-hand observation of the key teacher's activities. Its use is especially applicable in studies where time is limited. All aspects of the key teacher activities may not be observable during the duration of the study. Certain activities occur at specific times during the period of implementation and at different times of the year.

Expected Role

The role of the key teachers was initially set out by officials of the Ministry of Education who were responsible for planning the implementation of the curriculum. This intended role was introduced at the inservice training session organized by both the Ministry of Education and the State Education Department prior to implementation.

Teacher experience or changes occurring since the introduction of the implementation plan could alter the original expectations that the Ministry had of the role of the key teachers. Thus, the current expectations may or may not be similar to the Ministry's original intent.

The same set of role expectations may be viewed differently by different groups of people. The way the key teachers perceive the Ministry's conception of their role influenced their behavior. In addition, the teachers' and the administrators'
perceptions of the Ministry's notion of the role of the key teacher had an effect on the ways they related to teachers.

Actual Role

The actual role of the key teachers refers to the staff development activities carried out or initiated by the key teachers to help teachers in the process of learning. The activities of the key teacher can be analyzed in terms of two components: staff training activities and staff support activities. Staff training activities are those aimed mainly at familiarizing teachers with the new curriculum and for providing instruction on how to carry it out. Inservice courses and workshops are examples of such activities. Staff support activities include the on-going help and support provided to teachers in their effort to implement the curriculum such as classroom assistance and project meetings intended to promote teacher understanding and ability, to identify and deal with teacher needs, concerns and difficulties.

Gross et al. (1971, 1975) showed that the extent to which the actual role of the key persons is congruent with the expectations of that role is dependent on certain individual and contextual factors. In this case study, the degree of congruency lies between the activities of the key teachers and the expectations for this role by the Ministry of Education. Individual and contextual factors may also account for the variations in the activities of the key teachers themselves. Individual factors are related to teacher clarity about the
innovation and the expectation for the role, as well as ability to perform the role. Contextual factors include support by key persons involved in the implementation process, availability of resources, and compatibility of organizational arrangements. These factors were identified in the research dealing with the involvement of various role occupants in the implementation of various types of programs, carried out in North America. It was deemed likely that the same factors would be applicable to the study of a specific role occupant (the key teacher) in the implementation of a specific program (the new history curriculum) in a specific situation (Malaysia).

The activities of the key teacher are examined in terms of the perceptions formed by personnel in the Ministry of Education, by key teachers, teachers and by the administrators of the usefulness of the key teacher activities in helping teachers learn about the curriculum and the skills required to use it in the classroom. The literature on implementation has indicated that teachers' perceptions of the behavior of key persons can have a very important influence on the outcome of implementation. It is possible that the perceptions of other individuals such as the Ministry of Education officials, the key teachers and the administrators might be equally important. Perceptions of the usefulness of the activities of the key teachers were, therefore, examined to determine the extent to which these activities were useful in fostering teacher learning.

This study of the role of key teachers in implementation examined the following aspects of the implementation process (see
1. Intents

1.1 Ministry's original expectations of the role of key teachers.

1.2 Ministry's current expectations of the role of key teachers.

2. Perceptions

2.1 Key Teachers Perceptions.

2.1.1 Key teachers' notion of the Ministry's original expectation of them.

2.1.2 Key teachers' notion of the Ministry's current expectation of them.

2.1.3 Key teachers' description of their own activities.

2.1.4 Key teachers' assessment of their own activities.

2.1.5 Key teachers' account of the individual and contextual factors affecting their behavior.

2.2 Teachers' Perceptions

2.2.1 Teachers' notion of the Ministry's original expectation of key teachers.

2.2.2 Teachers' notion of the Ministry's current expectation of key teachers.

2.2.3 Teachers' description of the activities of the key teachers.

2.2.4 Teachers' assessment of the activities of the key teachers.

2.2.5 Teachers' account of the individual and contextual
factors affecting the behavior of the key teachers.

2.3 Administrators' Perceptions

2.3.1 Administrators' notion of the Ministry's original expectation of key teachers.

2.3.2 Administrators' notion of the Ministry's current expectation of key teachers.

2.3.3 Administrators' description of the activities of the key teachers.

2.3.4 Administrators' assessment of the activities of the key teachers.

2.3.5 Administrators' account of the individual and contextual factors affecting the behavior of the key teachers.

2.4 Ministry's Perceptions

2.4.1 Ministry's description of the activities of the key teachers.

2.4.2 Ministry's assessment of the activities of the key teachers.

2.4.3 Ministry's account of the individual and contextual factors affecting the behavior of the key teachers.
CHAPTER 3
EDUCATION IN MALAYSIA

GENERAL BACKGROUND

Malaysia is situated in South East Asia (Figure 2). Established in 1963, Malaysia is made up of the eleven states in Peninsular Malaysia (Johor, Kedah, Kelantan, Melaka, Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Perlis, Pulau Pinang, Selangor and Trengganu) (Figure 3) and the States of Sarawak and Sabah located in the north western part of the island of Borneo. The capital city, Kuala Lumpur, is located in the Federal Territory, which was created in 1974.

The area of Malaysia is 33.3 million hectares and its population in 1980 was 14.3 million. Some 11.8 million (83.1 percent) lived in Peninsular Malaysia, 1.3 million (9.2 percent) in Sarawak, and 1.1 million (7.7 percent) in Sabah. The population consists of several racial groups. Of the 11.8 million people who lived in Peninsular Malaysia, 53.9 percent were Malays, 34.9 percent Chinese, 10.5 percent Indians and the remaining 0.7 percent belonged to smaller miscellaneous groups (Malaysia, Government of Malaysia, 1981). The ethnic composition for Sarawak and Sabah are different from that of Peninsular Malaysia. In 1975, the latest year for which figures are available, the population of Sarawak consisted of 63.5 percent
Figure 2: Malaysia and Adjacent Territories
Figure 3: Peninsular Malaysia
indigenous people, 31.0 percent Chinese and 5.6 percent others. In Sabah, 64.1 percent were indigenous people, 21.5 percent Chinese and 14.4 percent others (Malaysia, Government of Malaysia, 1976).

About 22 percent (3,152 thousand) of the population were of school-going age in 1980. This represents an increase of 40.7 percent from 2,240 thousand in 1970. The primary school age-group formed the largest group (63.7 percent), followed by the lower secondary age-group (25.7 percent) (Table 2). By 1985, the student population is expected to increase by an average of 19.3 percent from that of 1980. The largest increase is expected to occur in the upper secondary level (56.0 percent) (Malaysia, Government of Malaysia, 1981).

Malaysia has a parliamentary democracy form of government. The constitutional head of the country is called the Yang di-Pertuan Agong (King). He is elected by the Conference of Rulers from among themselves for a five-year term. The Malaysian Parliament comprises two Houses: the Senate (Dewan Negara) and the House of Representatives (Dewan Rakyat). The government is run by a Cabinet of Ministers, under the leadership of the Prime Minister. The Ministers formulate government policies and are assisted by Secretaries-General and Heads of Departments in the execution of these policies.

The Malaysian Constitution allocates the responsibility for education to the Federal government. The policy and the system of administration of education in Sarawak and Sabah, however, still remain under the control of the respective state
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Increase(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of students</td>
<td>(%) of school-going age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2,007 (63.7)</td>
<td>2,260 (60.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Secondary</td>
<td>812 (25.7)</td>
<td>961 (25.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Secondary</td>
<td>249 (7.9)</td>
<td>409 (10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary</td>
<td>31 (1.0)</td>
<td>41 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary level</td>
<td>54 (1.7)</td>
<td>84 (2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>3,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


governments¹. The educational systems in these two states are, however, in the process of being integrated into the national system of education. The following description of the system of education, its historical development, the administrative structure and the process of curriculum development and implementation, therefore, focuses mainly on the national system of education as it exists in Peninsular Malaysia.

¹ When Sarawak and Sabah joined Malaysia in 1963, it was agreed that the existing policies and systems of educational administration of the States would remain under the control of the States until their governments decide otherwise.
THE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION IN MALAYSIA

The system of education is organized in a 6-3-2-2 structure consisting of 6 years of primary education, followed by 3 years of lower and 2 years of upper secondary education, and another 2 years of post-secondary education (sixth form). Higher education in the colleges and universities, is available after 10 to 12 years of education. Figure 4 provides a detailed structure of the Malaysian school system.

Primary Education

There are three types of primary schools in Peninsular Malaysia: national, national primary and national-type primary. They differ in the medium of instruction used. The national schools use Bahasa Malaysia. The national primary schools formerly used English as the medium of instruction but have started to use Bahasa Malaysia in 1975. The national-type primary schools use Chinese or Tamil as the medium of instruction.

Students are promoted automatically from one level to another in the primary schools. Since 1964 students finishing their primary schools were automatically promoted to secondary level after the Malaysian Secondary School Entrance Examination was abolished in Peninsular Malaysia. However, to overcome the problems in learning and teaching that emerged with the system of automatic promotion, the Ministry of Education introduced the Assessment Test at the standard 5 level in 1967 to evaluate the students' achievement in subjects such as Bahasa Malaysia,
Figure 4: Malaysian School System 1982
Adapted from Malaysia, Ministry of Education (1977k:106-107)

Legend:
R Remove Class
LCE Lower Certificate of Education
MCE Malaysian Certificate of Education
MVC Malaysian Vocational Certificate
HSC Higher School Certificate
C Medium of instruction

Note: An extra year to be added to students enrolled in Remove Classes
English, Mathematics, Science and History. The Diagnostic Test for the Standard Three was introduced in 1973. However, because the results of these two tests were not being used for any remedial work as originally hoped, the Cabinet Committee studying the implementation of the education policy recommended that these two tests be replaced by criterion-reference tests (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a).

A common curriculum and a standard subject allocation are followed by all primary schools, regardless of their medium of instruction. The amount of instructional time stipulated by the Ministry of Education varies from a minimum of about 1260-1380 minutes per week at Standard 1 to 1720 minutes per week at Standard 6 (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1977k).

The primary school curriculum which the Cabinet Committee (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a) found to be too academic and too compact will be replaced by a new curriculum aimed at establishing a firm education foundation based on the 3Rs. This new curriculum, popularly known in Malaysia as the 3M — M refers to the initial letters of Membaca (Reading), Menulis (Writing) and Mengira (Arithmetic) — will be implemented in stages beginning with pupils in Standard 1 in 1983. This curriculum is made up of two phases. In the first phase (Standards 1-3), 75 percent of the students' time will be spent on acquiring the three Rs with the remaining 25 percent spent on other educational activities. In the second phase (Standards 4-6) basic academic elements would be introduced though the main thrust would continue to be the basic skills (Malaysia, Government of
Malaysia, 1981). This change to a new curriculum was based on the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee which argued that a curriculum based on the 3M would "... provide students with the skills that would enable them to function more effectively after finishing their primary education" (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a:18).

Secondary Education

Secondary education consists of two levels: three years of lower secondary (Forms 1-3) and two years of upper secondary education (Forms 4-5).

Lower secondary. On completion of their primary education at the age of 11, the students are automatically promoted to the lower secondary level. A three-year comprehensive type of education is provided at this stage. In this system the students are required to take the traditional core courses such as history, geography, science, Bahasa Malaysia and English. In addition they are given the opportunity to take one elective course that suits their interests and/or talents -- Industrial Arts, Home Science, Agricultural Science or Commerce. This system of education is primarily aimed at providing students with opportunity to take more courses in school and more choices in their future education and careers (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a). The minimum amount of time set aside for instructional purposes at this level of education is 1720 minutes per week.

Students from the national-type (Chinese or Tamil) schools
have to spend an additional year in the Remove Class before entering Form 1. The purpose of the Remove class is to help these students increase their ability to use Bahasa Malaysia, the language of instruction at the secondary level.

At the end of their three years of lower secondary education, students take a common examination known as the Lower Certificate of Education (LCE). Student performance in this examination is used as the main criterion for promotion to Form 4. The Cabinet Committee recommended that this examination be continued but its grading system changed from a system whereby a grade is given to indicate a student's overall performance to a system where grades are given for each subject passed (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a). Because many students leave school after their Form 3 education, the Committee recommended that students attend school for eleven years instead of the present nine years. This recommendation will be implemented subject to the capability and needs of the Ministry of Education.

Upper secondary. At the upper secondary level students are channeled into three types of schools: the academic schools, the technical schools and the vocational schools. In the academic schools, students are further streamed into the Arts or the Sciences. The main objective of the technical and the vocational schools is to "equip students with the basic skills which could help them in their search for jobs in the industrial sector" (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a:34). There were about nine technical schools and twenty-three vocational schools in Peninsular Malaysia in 1979 (Malaysia, Ministry of Education,
The present system of streaming students will, however, be replaced with a system whereby students would be channeled into either general or vocational education (Malaysia, Government of Malaysia, 1981), in line with the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a).

At the end of Form 5, students in the academic schools and the technical schools sit for a public examination known as the Malaysian Certificate of Education (MCE). Students in the Vocational Schools sit for the Malaysian Certificate of Vocational Education (MCVE). These examinations are used as bases for entrance into the Sixth Form and institutions of higher learning as well as into the job market in both the public and private sectors. The Cabinet Committee of 1979 has recommended that an "open certificate system", whereby grades are given for each subjects passed, be implemented to replace the present overall grading system in the MCE.

Post-Secondary Education

Two years of post-secondary education (Lower and Upper 6 forms) are offered to students who have reached a required standard of excellence in the MCE examination. The students are streamed into the Arts, the Science or the Technical programs, depending on their earlier streaming at the upper secondary level. At the end of the two years, students take the Higher School Certificate examination (HSC), the results of which are used as the basic criterion for entrance into universities.

In spite of the number of criticisms regarding the lack of
flexibility of streaming in the sixth forms, the Cabinet Committee recommended the continuation of this level of education (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a). Flexibilities, however, need to be built into the system to allow students in the Sciences the opportunity to take courses in the Arts and vice versa.

Tertiary Education

After completing their Form 5 or Form 6 education, qualified students could continue their education in one of the five local universities -- Universiti Malaya, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia -- pursuing either degree or diploma courses. These students could also enrol in other institutions such as Institute Teknologi MARA, Politeknik Ungku Umar, Kolej Tengku Abdul Rahman and the several Teacher Training Colleges in the country.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

The national system of education has its origin in the Report of the Education Committee of 1956, more popularly known as the Razak Report (Malaya, Government of Malaya, 1956). This committee was formed
to examine the present educational policy of the Federation of Malaya and to recommend any alterations or adaptations that are necessary with a view to establishing a national system of education acceptable to the people of the Federation as a whole which will satisfy their needs and promote their cultural, social, economic and political development as a nation, having regard to the intention to making Malay [Bahasa Malaysia] as the National Language of the country whilst preserving and sustaining the growth of the language and culture of the communities living in the country.

(Malaya, Government of Malaya, 1956:1)

As a means of achieving uniformity in the whole education system, the Committee recommended the setting up of a uniform educational structure, the use of the National Language as the medium of instruction, the introduction of a common content syllabus and a common examination system, and a standardization of the teacher training program.

These recommendations, which were subsequently legislated to become the Education Ordinance of 1957, were later endorsed by the Education Review Committee of 1960. The purpose of this committee was

to review the Education Policy set out in the Federal Legislative Council Paper No. 21 of 1956 (The Report of the Education Committee 1956) which was approved in principle by resolution of the Federal Legislative Council on the 16th of May, 1956, and in particular its implementation so far and for the future;

---

2 Prior to the formation of Malaysia in 1963, Peninsular Malaysia comprising the eleven states was better known as the Federation of Malaya.
to consider the national and financial implications of this policy including the introduction of free primary education; and to make recommendations.

(Malaya, Government of Malaya, 1960:1)

The recommendations contained in the Report were subsequently enacted into law as the Education Act of 1961. The major recommendations included the provision of six years of primary education and five years of secondary education. It also recommended the renaming of all schools to national or national-type schools. The former would use the National Language as the medium of instruction with English as a compulsory subject. In the latter, the language of instruction would be English, Chinese or Tamil at the primary level and only English at the secondary level; the National Language would be taught as a compulsory subject.

In line with the Razak Report which stated, and the Rahman Talib Report which endorsed, that "the ultimate objective of the educational policy in this country must be to bring together the children of all races under a national system of education in which the national language is the main medium of instruction" (Malaya, 1956:3), a gradual program of converting the language of instruction in the English schools to Bahasa Malaysia was started in 1970. This process, starting with students in Standard 1, was completed in 1975 in the primary level, in 1980 in the secondary level and in 1982 in Form 6.

This education program aimed at creating "a nationally integrated society among ethnically diverse groups" (Ahmad,
1980:210) was later incorporated as a part of the national strategy for nation building in the country's development plans. The first three five-year Malaysia Plans (1960-1980) specifically stated that education be used as a vehicle for promoting national integration and unity in addition to providing the manpower needs of the country. The objectives of these Plans with regards to education is provided in Appendix A.

The promoting of national consciousness and unity among the people and the development of human resources is guided by a statement of national ideology known as the RUKUNEGARA (Fundamental National Principles) formulated in 1969 after the tragic May 13 racial riots. This official declaration states that:

OUR NATION, MALAYSIA, being dedicated

- to achieving a greater unity of all her peoples;
- to maintaining a democratic way of life;
- to creating a just society in which the wealth of the nation shall be equitably shared;
- to ensuring a liberal approach to her rich and diverse cultural traditions;
- to building a progressive society which shall be oriented to modern science and technology;

WE, her people, pledge our united effort to attain these ends guided by these principles

Belief in God
Loyalty to King and Country
Upholding the Constitution
Rule of Law
Good Behavior and Morality.
In 1974, the Malaysian government set up a Cabinet Committee to review the implementation of the national system of education, specifically to

review the goals and the impact of the present system of education, including the curriculum in the light of the existing national education system, for the purpose of ensuring that the country's manpower needs, be it short-term or long-term, would be met, and specifically to ensure that our system of education could fulfil our national goals of producing a united, disciplined and trained society.

The Committee put forward several recommendations regarding the system of education, the curriculum of the schools, and the administration of education and educational facilities. These recommendations formed the basis of the educational programs contained in the Fourth Malaysia Plan (1981-1985).

THE STRUCTURE OF THE MALAYSIAN EDUCATION SYSTEM

The structure of the Malaysian educational system can be seen as consisting of three levels: federal, state, and school. Since education is the constitutional responsibility of the

---

3 It was recommended recently that a district-level administration be introduced to act as liaison between the State Education Department and the school. However, due to a lack of documentation, this level of administration will be left out of this discussion.
federal government, the control and administration of education is centralized at the Ministry of Education.

The centralized system of education has its origin in the Razak Report of 1956 which stated that "the Ministry [of Education] will be generally responsible for education policy throughout the Federation" (Malaya, Government of Malaya, 1956:6). This centralized system was further entrenched when the Education Report of 1960 recommended that "the executive and legislative authority in all educational matters should rest with the Federal Government and that educational policy in general should be directed by the Minister" (Malaya, Government of Malaya, 1960:15).

The recent Cabinet Committee recommended that the existing centralized system of administration be continued. According to the Committee, the continuation of such a system was necessary to ensure that the goal of national unity be achieved, and to guarantee the optimum use of physical and human resources in education and thus help to avoid wastage in terms of overlapping of functions (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a).

**Federal Level: Ministry of Education**

The Ministry is headed by a Minister who is responsible to Parliament for policies on education, the effective implementation of the education policies and the administration of the entire education system. The Minister is assisted by two Deputy Ministers and a Political Secretary. The Ministry of Education is administered jointly by a group of administrators
responsible for the operation of the Ministry of Education and a group of professionals who are responsible mainly for professional matters. The Secretary-General as the Chief Executive Officer is responsible for the overall control of the administrative and professional functions of the Ministry. The administrative division is headed by two Deputy Secretaries-General. The head of the professional group of the Ministry, the Director-General of Education, is assisted by two Deputy Directors-General. Both the Secretary-General and the Director-General are consulted by the Minister regarding policy matters and their implementation (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a).

The Ministry of Education is organized into nineteen Divisions, each having its own functions. The structure of the Ministry of Education is shown in Figure 5.

The highest policy making body in the Ministry is the Educational Planning Committee (EPC). It was formed in 1971 to coordinate the various activities and projects of the Ministry. This committee, which is chaired by the Minister of Education is made up of nine other members: the two Deputy Ministers, the Secretary-General and his or her two deputies, and the Director-General and his or her two deputies. The Director of the Educational Planning and Research Division (EPRD) acts as the Secretary to the Committee.

There are also three other committees responsible for finance, development and the curriculum, respectively. Formed in 1975, the Finance Committee is responsible for the Ministry's
Figure 5: Ministry of Education, Malaysia Organization Chart
expenditure. The Development Committee was formed in 1976 to ensure that the physical development of the Ministry of Education runs smoothly and systematically. A Central Curriculum Committee (CCC) responsible for making policies about the curriculum and its implementation was formed in 1967.

**State Level: State Education Department**

Each state has an Education Department headed by a Chief Education Officer, who is directly responsible to the Ministry of Education. He/she is assisted by a Deputy Education Officer (in the larger states like Selangor), several supervisors and assistant supervisors of schools and other professional staff. As the highest officer in the state, he/she is responsible for the implementation of educational policies, programs and projects at the state level and the management of almost all the schools in the state. He/she also performs administrative functions relating to such matters as examinations, finance and staffing.

The functions of the State Department of Education, as listed in the Cabinet Report are as follows:

1) to implement, on behalf of the Ministry of Education, the educational policy of the country as provided in the Education Act of 1961, and

2) to implement education programs in the states, to supervise and to attend to matters relating to things

---

*The fully-residential schools and the technical schools come directly under the control of the Ministry of Education.*
such as the curriculum, educational Radio and TV programs, school libraries, co-curricular activities, career and guidance services, language programs, health education, the School Sports Council and also matters related to service, finance and development.

(Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a:139-140)

In view of the importance of the State Education Department as an arm of the Ministry of Education, the Cabinet Committee recommended that a State Educational Planning Committee be set up in each state "... to provide the input and information needed by the centralized educational planners" (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a:41).

School Level

Each of the schools, primary or secondary, is administered by a principal who is assisted by a senior assistant (vice-principal). The tasks of the principal include the following:

1) to implement all educational plans specified by the Ministry of Education;

2) to supervise and guide the teachers in order to ensure the quality of teaching and learning in the school;

3) to control and supervise the students with regards to education and such matters as discipline, sports activities, societies, voluntary work; and

4) to create an effective relationship with the parents and the public via the Parent-Teacher Association and the School Board of Governors.
Most schools in Malaysia, especially those in the urban areas, have two shifts of students. One shift attends the morning and the other the afternoon sessions. The morning session usually starts around 7.30 am and ends around 1 pm and the afternoon session begins at about 1 pm and ends around 6.10 pm. A school day is usually made up of about five hours of academic work with a break of 15 to 20 minutes in the mid-morning or mid-afternoon. The school day is divided into 7 to 8 periods of about 40-45 minutes each.

In many of the primary schools, the morning and afternoon sessions are administered separately by their own principals and senior assistants. However, in the secondary schools, the two sessions are administered as one unit under a principal and a senior assistant, and the task of administering the afternoon session is usually delegated to an afternoon supervisor, selected by the principal of the school from among the afternoon teachers. He/she is responsible for the smooth running of the afternoon session and acts as liaison between the school's

---

5 This Board was first established following the recommendation of the Razak Report of 1956. Its powers was, however, considerably reduced following the recommendations of the Aziz Commission of 1968. It is now responsible only for the general welfare and progress of the school.

6 The school day and periods are considerably shorter in the primary schools.

7 Most schools have only one afternoon supervisor. School B, one of the schools in the study represents one of the few schools having two afternoon supervisors.
principal and senior assistant, on one hand, and the afternoon teachers on the other.

In addition to their administrative duties the principal, senior assistant and afternoon supervisor are also expected to teach. Their teaching responsibilities are, however, vastly reduced. In the Administrative Circular No. 3/67 (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1967), for example, principals are required to teach a minimum of nine periods per week over and above their supervisory and administrative duties.

Senior subject teachers are appointed to help the administrators coordinate the teaching of the various subjects. A senior subject teacher for history, for example, is appointed by the principal to be responsible for the teaching of history in the school and the teachers teaching the subject. Senior subject teachers are usually selected from among the graduate and experienced teachers who usually teach the upper forms placed in the morning session. To assist the school administrators in the enforcing of school rules and regulations, the principal appoints a Board of Prefects comprising the student leaders in the school.

The secondary schools are categorized into three categories, A, B and C, on the basis of their size (student enrolment) and the grade levels offered in the schools. Category A usually consists of schools with an enrolment of 2000 or more, and offering sixth form. Category B includes those schools with an enrolment of between 1000 and 1999 and having classes up to the Form 5 level, and category C consists of those having less than 999 students.
Fulfilment of the above criteria does not, however, lead to an automatic inclusion of the schools into their respective categories. The annual decision to grade a new school or to upgrade an existing school is carried out only after discussions between the School Division and the Service Division of the Ministry of Education, the Treasury and the Public Service Department. Upgrading of an existing school to a higher category involves financial implications such as the assignment of a more senior principal and senior assistant to the school. Thus, in addition to student enrolment and grade levels, the three types of schools differ in the seniority of their administrative staff; the higher the category, the more senior the administrators.

All schools except for the few private institutions, are fully funded by the government. The amount received by schools, however, varies in relation to the types of schools (regular, fully residential, vocational or technical schools), the levels of schooling (primary, lower secondary, upper secondary), total student enrolment and enrolment in certain subjects offered in the schools. All schools are given a recurrent fund, based on a per student allocation, to pay for water, electricity, printing supplies, equipment, teaching-learning materials and other needs approved by the State Education Office. At the primary level special allocations are given for mathematics, science, and arts and crafts and at the secondary level these allocations are given for mathematics, science, home science, agricultural science, industrial arts and commerce. The funding formula is stated in the Ministry of Education Circulars (Finance and Accounts) No. 4/1973, 1/1974 and 4/1977. Appendix B provides a summary of the
funding formula for both primary and secondary schools in Malaysia.

The basic framework of the school curricula is governed by the Schools (Courses of Studies) Regulation 1956. This regulation specifies the subjects to be taught and the minimum time per week allocated to the teaching of each subject. The curricula standards are given in Appendix C. Individual subject syllabuses detail the contents for each subject at each level. Students sit for common examinations: the assessment examination at Standard 3, the diagnostic examination at Standard 5, the LCE at Form 3, the MCE at Form 5 and finally the HSC at Form 6.

The number of teachers in a school, as determined by the Administrative Ruling for Staff Establishment, Administrative Circular No. 3/67 (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1967), is dependent on the levels of schools (primary or secondary) and also the number of approved classes in the school. For secondary schools, the staff entitlement ratio is as follows:

- Lower Secondary (10 classes or less) -- 1.43 teachers/class
- Lower Secondary (11 classes or more) -- 1.3 teachers/class
- Upper Secondary (Forms 4-5) -- 1.4 teachers/class
- Sixth Form -- 1.6 teachers/class

An approved class is one which has been endorsed by the State Education Office and conforms to the limits given below:

- Standards 1-6 -- 40-50 students/class
Remove - Form 5 -- 35-45 students/class
Form 6 -- 25-35 students/class

Students are usually grouped into classes on the basis of their academic ability, assessed from their performance in the last school examination. The classes are usually identified by alphabet (A,B,C) or numbers (1,2,3); the further one moves along the alphabets or the larger the numbers, the weaker the classes. In rare cases, students may be grouped into classes in alphabetical order on the basis of their initials.

All teachers are civil servants and are under the jurisdiction of the Education Service Commission. Teachers are divided into five categories -- D, T, C, B and X -- according to academic and professional qualifications. Category D teachers are university graduates and normally teach at the upper secondary and the sixth form levels. Category T comprises teachers who specialize in the teaching of technical and trade subjects. Category C teachers generally teach academic subjects at the primary and lower secondary levels and have undergone training at one of the Teacher Training Colleges administered by the Ministry of Education. They are holders of the MCE or HSC certificates. Category B are also college-trained teachers but possess academic qualifications lower than the MCE. Category X represents the very small number of Christian missionary

---

8 This is the result of the recommendations of the Aziz Commission which stated that all teachers should be government employees and that a Central Board be constituted to control and regulate the service of teachers (Malaysia, Government of Malaysia:1971a).
teachers. Teachers' salaries are differentiated according to these categories (Malaysia, Government of Malaysia, 1971a). These teachers are usually required to specialize in two teaching subjects during their training. This requirement provides the school with flexibility in determining the teachers' teaching schedules.

Teachers usually attend inservice courses during their teaching career. Inservice courses are carried out by the various divisions of the Ministry of Education such as the Teacher Training Division, the School Division, the Inspectorate, the Educational Media Services Division and the Curriculum Development Centre. A planning committee, chaired by the Director of Teacher Training, coordinate these courses. Three major types of courses are available for trained teachers: vacation courses to upgrade teachers in the various disciplines, courses to train teachers to use Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of instruction and to teach English as a second language, and supplementary full-time courses for trained teachers (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1974b; Wong and Chang, 1977).

---

9 Exceptions do occur. Two college trained teachers from school B, one specializing in commerce and the other in mathematics, are examples of such exception.
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The importance of the curriculum in meeting the social and economic needs of the country has been repeatedly emphasized in the 1956, 1960 and 1979 Education Reports (Malaya, Government of Malaya, 1956, 1960; Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a) and the four Malaysia Plans (Malaysia, Government of Malaysia, 1966, 1971, 1976, 1981).

[The] curriculum determines the type and quality of manpower needed for national development... [and] influences successes in social development... determines the elements to be taught to students in our efforts at shaping and promoting national unity.

(Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a:228 (trans))

Figure 6 shows the process of curriculum development and implementation in Malaysia. Curriculum development is mainly the responsibility of the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC)\textsuperscript{10}. All curriculum plans have to be approved by the Central Curriculum Committee (CCC) before it can be implemented. The CCC, which meets about once in three months, is the highest body in the Ministry of Education that makes decisions regarding the curriculum. It discusses matters such as the need for a new curriculum, the suitability of existing curricula and also proposals for change. It, however, does not have the power to make decisions on financial matters. All financial implications arising from their decisions have to be submitted to the

\textsuperscript{10} The Curriculum Development Centre will hereafter be referred to by its acronym, CDC.
Figure 6: Curriculum Development and Implementation in Malaysia
Adapted from Malaysia, Ministry of Education (1979b)
Education Planning Committee (EPC) for consideration.

The Implementation Committee plans the strategy to implement the curriculum. The Committee, which was formed on the recommendation of the Cabinet Committee (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a), also coordinates the curriculum-related activities of the various divisions of the Ministry of Education and the State Departments which are involved in the development and implementation of the curriculum.

The CDC was established in 1973 to improve the quality of education in Malaysian schools and make the school curriculum more relevant and effective for achieving the national education objectives. The Centre has two main activities. The first activity is curriculum development which involves planning, developing, producing, trying out and revising programs and materials for all levels of schooling in Malaysia, to ensure that all pupils are taught the same subjects. The second activity is planning for implementation, which includes training inservice course personnel and key administrators for the purpose of disseminating new and/or revised programs and materials.

The CDC is headed by a Director who is assisted by two Deputy Directors and organized into five areas, each headed by

---

The CDC is responsible for all subjects in the primary, secondary and post-secondary school levels except for technical and vocational subjects, and Islamic Knowledge, which are the responsibilities of the Technical and Vocational Education Division and Religious Education Division, Ministry of Education, respectively.
one or two Assistant Directors. These five areas are Language Curriculum, Primary School Curriculum, Secondary School Curriculum, Curriculum Research and Evaluation, and Training and Dissemination. Each area is, in turn, divided into units, each unit being responsible for planning and carrying out specific projects and activities. The organizational structure of the CDC is shown in Figure 7.

The CDC regards curriculum development as a continuous and dynamic process involving several stages: identification of needs, planning, development of resources and materials, try-outs and field trials, preparation for implementation and evaluation. Changes and revisions occur continuously. Development of teaching-learning materials proceeds even while the curriculum is being implemented in the schools.

Several activities and projects aimed at bringing the Malaysian School curriculum up-to-date with the situations and needs of the country have been or are being carried out by the various units in the CDC. The Social Studies Unit, for example, has developed a new history curriculum for the primary and lower secondary levels (the curriculum chosen for this study), and is in the process of developing a new history curriculum for the upper secondary level. For the latter task, a committee has been formed in the CDC and several task forces set up at the state level to study the present curriculum and to provide suggestions regarding the content area for the new curriculum.

The CDC is also involved in developing teaching strategies and teaching-learning materials aimed at facilitating the
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teaching-learning processes in the classrooms. Examples of such materials are syllabuses, teacher guides, resource guides, teaching aids and reading materials for students. The Social Studies Unit has produced a teacher guide for the new history curriculum for the Standard 4 teachers and, at the time of this study, is in the process of preparing a teacher guide for the Standard 5 teachers and of translating the Standard 4 teacher guide into Chinese and Tamil (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979a). The CDC also carries out the systematic testing of programs and materials before they are recommended for use in schools. Activities related to curriculum implementation include the exposure and training of administrators, teacher trainers and teachers to a new curriculum, and evaluation of its implementation in the schools.

The activities of the other divisions of the Ministry of Education and the State Education Department can be categorized into three groups: teacher preparation, the development of teaching resources, and the monitoring and evaluation of implementation activities. The various divisions of the Ministry of Education are involved in one or more of these activities. As seen in Figure 6, the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC), the School Division (SD) and the Teacher Training Division (TTD) are involved in all three activities. The Textbook Bureau (TB) and the Educational Media Services (EMS) are involved with the preparation of teaching resources, and the Inspector of Schools (IS) and the Examination Syndicate (ES) are responsible for evaluation and monitoring activities. These divisions and their functions which are related to curriculum development and
implementation are provided in Appendix D.

At the state level, the State Curriculum Committee and State Curriculum Officers are responsible for the orientation and training of teachers, the monitoring of the curriculum in the schools in their respective states and also in the development of materials for teaching. The Key Personnel assist the State Curriculum Officers in conducting inservice courses for the teachers.

THE NEW HISTORY CURRICULUM

A new history curriculum was developed to replace the older, outdated curriculum and was implemented in stages beginning in 1978. It was designed for students at the upper primary (Standards 4 to 6) and lower secondary (Forms 1 to 3) levels in Malaysia. The new history curriculum is a totally indigenous endeavour: its introduction essentially stems from conditions prevailing within the country. The curriculum materials include a syllabus which contains a statement of general aims and objectives (common to both the primary and lower secondary levels), specific objectives for each standard and form, and a detailed list of the content area. The history syllabus for Standard 4 to Form 3 is attached as Appendix E.
Description of the Curriculum

Orientation of the curriculum. The introductory notes contained in the new history syllabus explicitly state that the goals and content of the curriculum are consistent with the constitution, policy and educational aims of the country so that the curriculum may assist efforts to achieve the national objective of building a just and united society among people of different racial origins.

The goals of the new curriculum are as follows:
1) to develop an awareness of national identity through the study of local history,
2) to develop a feeling of oneness towards society and nation as a whole,
3) to develop a collective historical memory as a frame of reference, for national awareness among the people of Malaysia,
4) to develop international understanding,
5) to develop interest in history, and
6) to develop critical thinking.

(Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1977:2)

The general thrust of the curriculum is towards the reconstruction of society. The curriculum is expected to contribute directly towards the ultimate achievement of the societal goal of national unity through its emphasis on the development of certain values, attitudes and knowledge necessary for the unity of the nation, the analysis of societal problems, and the development of students' thinking power and process of
decision making. The teaching of history is, therefore, seen as a means for fostering the identity of the Malaysian nation. The new history curriculum also reflects the intellectual tradition of the history discipline. The concepts, generalizations and methods that characterize the discipline of history are an inherent part of the curriculum. Students become initiated into the historical mode of thinking while being informed about its subject matter. This emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge, the understanding of historical facts, the development of the principles of historical thinking and the moulding of desired values and attitudes demonstrates the curriculum's discipline-oriented nature.

At first glance, the history curriculum does not seem to provide personally satisfying consummatory experiences, in the terminology of Eisner and Vallance (1974), of each individual learner. The curriculum is intended for use in a classroom situation; it does not emanate from the interests of the student and as such the students do not have a hand in generating their own educational goals. It is obvious that the common goals and content of the curriculum reflect what adults believe students should accomplish.

However such homogeneity of goals does not preclude meaningful and satisfying personal experience or engagement for the students. The curriculum developers have suggested the use of activities or materials which will engage students affectively and intellectually, and which can be related to current life. The curriculum allows the teachers to select, organize and adapt
the goals, content, teaching strategies and curriculum materials to suit the students' abilities and interests. Thus, the history curriculum, besides emphasizing the need to meet societal goals, also focusses its attention on the students themselves.

The development of the curriculum is influenced by the ends-means relationship. The goals of the curriculum are stated in both general and specific terms (though not in the form of behavioral objectives). The goals cover both the cognitive and affective domains. The curriculum developers emphasized that the selection and organization of content, activities and materials are guided by these goals. For example, it was stated that topics that emphasize cooperation among the different races were selected to meet the goals of bringing about unity, a sense of belonging and love for the country.

The content for each level is organized so that it can be approached through concentric circles moving from the known to the unknown, from the present to the past and from the near to the far. Each of the six levels (Std 4 - Form 3) has its own themes (see Figure 8). The themes for each level represent a continuation of the themes in the previous level.

The components of the curriculum. The curriculum explicitly identifies two levels of goals: general aims and objectives, and specific objectives. General aims and objectives refer to statements of intent, describing the purpose of a course, intended to provide developers with a greater focus on anticipated outcomes and with a basis for the selection and organization of content, teaching strategies, learning activities
and curriculum materials. Specific objectives are statements of what students are to be able to do after experiencing the curriculum.

The curriculum developers have given much attention to the selection and organization of curriculum content because they considered the content to be instrumental to the attainment of curriculum goals. Since the emphasis is on local Malaysian history and in looking at history from a Malaysian frame of reference, materials selected are, therefore, those that deal directly with the history of Malaysia and are viewed from a
By providing a detailed list of topics to be covered, the history curriculum appears to be rigid; it does not seem to provide teachers and students with alternatives applicable to the different situations. This, however, is not the case. Many options are available to teachers. The new history curriculum provides a detailed list of topics to be covered to ensure that students receive the content relevant to the discipline and that the content promotes the attainment of the objectives. The list of topics is not meant to stifle the teachers' creativity. Teachers are free to decide on the ways a given topic is presented and also on the amount of time to be spent on each particular topic.

With regard to teaching-learning activities, the new history curriculum places a great deal of emphasis on the process of creating learning opportunities that introduce students to active inquiry. Students are encouraged to inquire, to think, to act, and in the process, to learn. The task of the teacher is, therefore, to create activities or learning opportunities that stimulate students to develop their thinking skills, and that are interesting and meaningful.

The curriculum thus requires a mode of teaching in which students are directly and actively involved in their own learning. One way is to conceive the subject matter as a series of problems to be solved, rather than as facts to be assimilated. The problem-solving approach to teaching provides the best
context for the free examination of social and other values, and is also particularly relevant for the development of intellectual skills. The teacher-centred approach, where the teacher talks while the students listen or where there is minimal teacher-student or student-student interaction, is not consistent with the goals of the curriculum.

The curriculum proposes that teachers use a variety of activities such as field trips or enacting of historical scenes. Such activities are more pupil-oriented and, therefore, more meaningful and interesting compared to the traditional book learning or expository approach. Teachers need not restrict themselves to the use of the written and verbal language. The lecture method or the use of the chalkboard are not the only means of presenting ideas to students. There are more effective ways of getting an idea across.

In-process evaluation has been a central concern of the curriculum developer. Pilot testing has been used to help them modify and improve the curriculum. This procedure includes evaluating the goals of the curriculum, the educational significance of the content, the appropriateness of the curriculum for the intended population, and the relevance of the learning activities and curriculum materials.

Since the national examinations and teacher-made tests have traditionally been used to measure students' achievement, the curriculum does not make any specific provision for the evaluation of student performance in order to find out what students have learned and experienced at school. Its developers
assumed that the LCE examination and school-made tests are used to determine if the curriculum objectives have been attained. It is essential that these examinations and tests evaluate not only students' mastery of the subject-matter but also acquisition of the values, attitude or skills advocated by the curriculum.

Field Trial

The new history curriculum was piloted before it was officially implemented in the schools. Ten schools from six of the thirteen states in Malaysia were selected as trial schools (see Table 3). Each school was required to try out two topics using methods determined by the CDC. Table 4 shows six of the topics chosen and the methodology specified for each topic. For the six schools in the four states in Peninsular Malaysia -- Johor, Kelantan, Perak and Selangor -- this trial was carried out.
Table 4
Topics and Methodologies Chosen for Try-out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Traditional Political System</td>
<td>Dramatization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Emergence and the Teaching of Islam</td>
<td>Questions and Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>System of Administration of Srivijaya</td>
<td>Use of Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Justice System - Adat Perpatih</td>
<td>Narration/Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Measurement System</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Culture - Marriage Among the Perak Malays</td>
<td>Pictures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Malaysia, Ministry of Education (1977c)

in two stages. One topic was tried in each stage. The first stage was carried out in July and the second in September-October 1977. For schools in the States of Sarawak and Sabah, the trials were carried out simultaneously.

The objectives of the trial project were:

1) to determine the extent to which the contents of the new history curriculum could be taught and the specified methodology be carried out effectively;

2) to determine the nature and the degree of difficulties faced by the teachers in both the content area and the methodology;

3) to determine the types of problems encountered by the teachers in the content area and the methodology used; and

4) to determine whether the contents and the suggested methods of teaching could help meet the objectives of the new history curriculum.
Three rationales for the trial project have been given. First, since a great deal of the content area and the methods of teaching were new, it was beneficial to know the extent to which the content and the methods could be carried out. Second, it was important to identify the problems encountered by teachers. The nature, origin and degree of seriousness of the problems could be used to try to overcome or mitigate these problems. Third, the results of the evaluation could be used to indicate the response of the teachers and the students to the new history curriculum.

To facilitate the execution of the trial project, the CDC organized briefings for the principals of the trial schools. At these briefings the contents of the new history curriculum and the implementation strategy for the trial project were explained. The State Organisers of Schools, the State Social Studies Officers and a teacher from each of the schools involved also attended these briefings.

Implementation Strategy

The strategy employed to implement the new history curriculum was the key personnel or "multiplier effect" strategy. Inservice courses were held in order to familiarise teachers with the new curriculum. The goals, content and teaching-learning activities specified in the new curriculum were presented and discussed. These courses were conducted at two levels: the central level for the district key personnel and the state level.
for the key teachers. The district key personnel who attended a two-week inservice course at the CDC were expected to conduct similar courses at the state level for the key teachers. The key teachers, in turn, were expected to disseminate the information acquired at the inservice course to the other teachers in the school and to help them use the new curriculum (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1977a). This 'multiplier effect' strategy was chosen because it was considered to be the fastest and the most convenient method of reaching a large number of teachers in the light of the shortage of personnel in the CDC to conduct inservice courses.

This strategy of implementation represents a standard procedure used by the Ministry of Education in the implementation of a new curriculum or other innovations in Malaysian schools. The strategy was first used by the CDC in 1976 to implement the new English communication curriculum, and had since been used for implementing other new curricula such as Bahasa Malaysia, and innovations such as modern audio-visual technology, in the schools. It is presently used to implement the new 3M curriculum at Standard 1.

Table 5 provides a detailed breakdown of the number of district key personnel, the inservice course centres and the key teachers involved in these courses, by states.
Table 5
1977 Inservice Course for the New Form One History Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>No. of Key Personnel</th>
<th>No. of Centres</th>
<th>No. of Key Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Perlis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kedah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>P.Pinang</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Perak</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Selangor/Fed.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>N.Sembilan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Melaka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Johor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Pahang</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kelantan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Trengganu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Sarawak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Sabah</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Malaysia, Ministry of Education (1977c: AppendixA)

The Key personnel and the centrally organized inservice course. Because the district key personnel were expected to conduct inservice courses at the state level for the key teachers, the CDC specifically suggested that the key personnel be chosen from among those who possess the following criteria:

1) taught history at the specified level;
2) permanent and trained;
3) dedicated and possess the potential to be a leader;
4) sons/daughters of the State in order to avoid the problem of teacher transfer; and
5) experience in conducting inservice courses.

(Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1977a)

Five objectives of the inservice course at the national level have been identified by the CDC. These objectives are:
1) to explain to the district key personnel the objectives and the content of the new history curriculum;
2) to introduce the district key personnel to several approaches used in the teaching of history;
3) to train and to guide the district key personnel in carrying out inservice courses at the state level;
4) to prepare samples of lessons based on the new approaches; and
5) to prepare examples of the evaluation of a history lesson.

(Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1977b, 1977e)

The inservice course for the district key personnel was held for eight days from May 4 to May 12, 1977 with one day off in between. In addition to the forty-five district key personnel for the Form 1 level, other participants at this course included the district key personnel for the Standard 4, the teachers from the trial schools, lecturers from the various teacher training colleges, State Social Studies Officers and representatives of the various divisions of the Ministry of Education (Table 6).

The inservice course discussed topics such as the objectives and content of the new history curriculum, approaches to the teaching of the new history curriculum, educational technology, evaluation, the role of the textbook and other resource materials in the teaching and learning of history, and the role of the district key personnel. Participants took part in activities such as visits to schools, workshops to prepare lesson plans, planning of inservice courses at the state level and the viewing
Table 6

Participants at the Centralised Inservice Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Personnel (Std. 4)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Personnel (Form 1)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers from Trial Schools</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(both primary and secondary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers of teacher training colleges</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Social Studies Officers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of other Divisions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Malaysia, Ministry of Education (1977e)

of films related to the content area.

The key teachers and inservice courses at the state level. Inservice courses at the state level were organized by the State Social Studies Officers assisted by the district key personnel on six consecutive Saturdays from July 9 to September 3, 1977. The objectives of these inservice courses, described below, were similar to the objectives of the inservice course held at the central level:

1) to expose the key teachers to the contents of the new history curriculum;
2) to expose the key teachers to several techniques used in teaching history; and
3) to prepare examples of several evaluation methods used in the teaching of history.

(Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1977c)

The number of inservice courses for each state depended on the number of schools and district key personnel in the state. Each district key personnel was usually in charge of one
inservice course. The number of teachers per inservice centre varied; the 119 key teachers representing the State of Selangor and the Federal Territory, for example, were divided into six centres, each centre having 12 to 26 teachers.

Each school was represented by one teacher, the key teacher, who was selected by the school principal based on the criteria specified by the State Director of Education. The key teacher must be:

1) a permanent teacher, qualified and experienced;
2) teaching history at the lower secondary level; and
3) the senior subject teacher for the lower secondary classes, if possible (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1977h).

An organizational structure for curriculum change is shown in Figure 9. The Central Curriculum Committee is the highest body in the Ministry of Education responsible for making policies and decisions regarding the school curriculum. The Committee works within the policy guidelines of the government as laid out in the Five-Year Malaysia Plans (Malaysia, Government of Malaysia, 1966, 1971, 1976, 1981). The Curriculum Development Centre is responsible for developing the approved curricula for all academic subjects in Malaysian schools and for planning the strategies for implementing the new curricula in the schools. All curriculum plans have to be approved by the Central Curriculum Committee before they can be implemented. The Examination Syndicate and the School Inspectorate are responsible for the evaluation and the monitoring of implementation.
activities in the schools. The former is responsible for ensuring that the examination system is in line with the new curriculum while the latter supervises teachers to ensure that their classroom practices are congruent with the changes proposed by the new curriculum.

The State Education Department is responsible for the implementation of the new curriculum in all schools in the state. The key personnel for districts, working closely with the State Education Department, organize inservice courses on the new curriculum for key teachers who, in turn, are expected to disseminate the information acquired at the inservice course to the school administrators and the other teachers involved in implementing the new curriculum. The key personnel for districts and key teachers are also expected to consult the Curriculum Development Centre on difficulties concerning the new curriculum that may emerge during implementation. In addition, the key teachers are to approach the key personnel for district for help and guidance.

Preparation of teachers' guide. The CDC is still in the process of preparing a teachers' guide for the Form One history teachers. Such a guide was considered critical in helping teachers in their teaching of the new history curriculum. As a preliminary step towards preparation of the guide, the CDC organized a five-day workshop attended by about nine teachers from several schools in Selangor and the Federal Territory. The purpose of the workshop was threefold:

1) to extract the main points of the topics found in the new
Figure 9
Organizational Structure for Curriculum Change
2) to prepare samples of lessons for each of the methodologies suggested; and

3) to prepare teaching resources for teachers.

(Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1978c)

However, this guide was not expected to be ready for distribution until the mid 1980's. To date, only the Teachers Guide for the Standard 4 has been produced. The Guide consists of two sections. The first section deals with the content area, while in the second section, the different techniques of teaching were discussed followed by examples of lessons using each technique (Malaysia, Ministry of Education, 1979d).
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

This chapter focuses on the research design and procedures used in the collection and analysis of data. It begins with a description of the various sources of data and of the sampling procedure. The stages of the study, comprising the initial preparations, piloting of the interview schedule, the collection of data and the analysis of data are then described.

A case study of three key teachers in three schools was employed to examine their expected role, their actual role, and the factors influencing their activities in the implementation of a new history curriculum, as perceived by four groups of participants: the three key teachers themselves, ten teachers and three administrators selected from three secondary schools in the state of Selangor, and three officers of the Ministry of Education involved in the implementation of the new history curriculum. Highlighted by this case are the similarities and differences among the perceptions of the various groups of respondents on the role of the key teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum in schools over a four-to five-year period. The major way of obtaining this information was through interviewing, where probing and extending of responses were possible. The interview method used for this study is presented in the next section.
SOURCES OF DATA

Data for the study were derived from three sources: interviews, questionnaire responses and documents.

Interviews

Interviews, whereby participants were encouraged to respond freely without being constrained overly by pre-determined categories, provided the main source of data for the study. This method was used because it provided abundant data and allowed the researcher "to explore the internal states of persons" and "what is in or on someone else's mind" (Patton, 1980:157, 196). These face-to-face and verbal interactions also enabled the researcher "to tap into the experience of...[the participants] in their own natural language (Guba and Lincoln, 1981:155).

Interview Schedule. The interview schedule used to guide data collection consisted of two sections (Appendix F). The introductory section explained the purpose of the interview and the background of the study, and indicated that anonymity of the respondents would be ensured. The second section contained the major questions to be asked, and some probe questions used to clarify, elaborate, or elicit additional information.

The decision to use this form of interview schedule, with a set of prepared questions arranged in a predetermined sequence, was based on three reasons. First, by giving the participants each a copy of the interview schedule (minus the probe questions)
prior to the actual interview, the participants could familiarize themselves with the questions, thus reducing possible anxiety. Second, the focused nature of the interview ensured completion within the allocated time, thus optimizing the use of participants' time. Third, it ensured that each participant was asked the same questions.

Though the interview schedule restricted the researcher to using the questions as they appear in the guide and asking them in the order suggested, the interview schedule allowed the researcher some flexibility in probing, exploring, and asking questions that helped elucidate and illuminate the subject.

Questions. The thrust of the questions asked of each participant was the same though the wording of the questions in the interview guide differed slightly among the four groups of participants. The questions were designed to elicit the participants' perceptions of the role expected of the key teachers, the activities carried out by the key teachers and factors influencing the activities of the key teachers. The formulation of these questions was guided by the following:

1. What should the role of the key teachers be?

1.1 What were the original expectations of the Ministry of Education with respect to the role of the key teachers?

1.2 What are the current expectations of the Ministry of Education with respect to the role of the key teachers?

1.3 How are the Ministry's original expectations of the key teachers perceived by the

• Key teachers,
• Teachers, and
• Administrators?

1.4 How are the Ministry's current expectation of the key teachers perceived by the
• Key teachers,
• Teachers, and
• Administrators?

2. How do the key teachers fulfil their roles?

2.1 What activities are actually carried out by the key teachers as perceived by
• Key teachers,
• Teachers,
• Administrators, and
• Ministry of Education officials?

2.2 What variations exist among the behavior of the key teachers?

2.3 What discrepancies and/or congruencies exist between the behavior of the key teachers and the role expected of them by the Ministry of Education?

2.4 How useful are the activities of the key teachers in fostering teacher learning, as perceived by the
• Key teachers,
• Teachers,
• Administrators, and
• Ministry of Education officials?

3. What individual and contextual factors are perceived by the key teachers, teachers, administrators and the Ministry of Education as influencing the behavior of the key teachers?

3.1 How do these factors account for the discrepancies and/or congruencies between the behavior of the key teacher and the role expected of them?

3.2 How do these factors account for the similarities and differences in the activities of the key teachers?
Questionnaires

Questionnaires (Appendix G) were used to gather background information regarding the teachers, key teachers and administrators. This information, which included the key teachers' and teachers' experience in teaching and, in particular, teaching the new history curriculum, and qualifications and subject options, was used to gain more insight into the data gathered through the interview. The limited time available for the interviews necessitated the use of the questionnaires for gathering the above information.

Documents

Documents and materials relevant to the study were examined to provide background information on the new history curriculum and the implementation strategy used and information to substantiate data collected through interviews (see Bibliography). These documents, most of which were available at the Ministry of Education, included descriptions of the new history curriculum, plans for its implementation, the relevant central and state inservice courses, and circulars to the various organizations and people involved in the implementation of the new history curriculum. At the school level, the available documents were those on the inservice courses which were supplied by the key teachers.
The school participants were selected on the basis of school size and the experience of the key teachers, whereas participants from the Ministry of Education were chosen for their familiarity with the development and implementation of the new history curriculum.

Selection of Schools

The school context in which the key teachers operated constituted an important criterion in the sampling procedure because, as explained by Bogdan and Biklen (1982), activities are influenced significantly by the work setting in which the activities are carried out. The study occurred in schools in only one state, Selangor, because of four factors. First, the state had over eighty secondary schools and thus offered ample choice for selection. Second, all the schools included in the study were administered by the same State Education Department and supervised by the same State Social Studies Officer, thus facilitating research arrangements. Third, the various divisions of the Ministry of Education were located in Kuala Lumpur and were only a few miles away from the Selangor State Education Office. Fourth, the schools were within travelling distance from the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia where the researcher set up temporary office.

Form 1 was the first secondary school level to implement the new history curriculum. The key teachers responsible for Form 1, therefore, had the most experience with the curriculum.
Consequently, only schools having Form 1 classes were considered for selection.

Three schools were selected on the basis of their size and the record of experience of the key teachers in those schools. This information was provided by the State Social Studies Officer.

The size of the school. One school was selected from each of the three school-size categories classified on the basis of their enrolment:

1) Category A school representing a large school (enrolment 2000 and above),
2) Category B school representing a medium school (enrolment 1000 to 1999), and
3) Category C school representing a small school (enrolment 999 and below).

The criterion of school size was used because it was assumed that the larger the school, the greater the number of Form 1 classes and, therefore, the greater the number of teachers assigned to teach the new history curriculum at that level. The smaller the student enrolment, the smaller the number of classes in the schools, at the Form 1 level. With the decreasing number of Form 1 classes, fewer teachers were, therefore, assigned to teach the new history curriculum in any given school year. Thus the number of teachers the key teachers had to deal with varied with the size of the schools: the smaller the schools, the smaller the number of teachers teaching the new history curriculum and, therefore, fewer teachers for the key teachers to
work with.

The experience of the key teacher. Only those schools where the same key teachers had been since 1978 when the new history curriculum was first implemented at the Form 1 level, were considered for selection. Key teachers with this four-year record were assumed to be able to reflect fully on that experience. Information about the availability of the key teachers in these schools was provided by the State Social Studies Officer responsible for the implementation of the new history curriculum in the schools.

Based on the criteria of school size and length of experience, three schools were selected from a total of ten schools in two districts. These two districts provided the researcher ample choice of schools for the study: two large enrolment schools, four medium size schools and four small schools. School A was chosen because the other large school had been used in the pilot study. School B was selected for the study because of its location. Unlike the other medium size schools, School B was located away from the town centre and School A and yet situated about the same distance from the Ministry of Education and the State Education Department as School A. One of the other three schools could not be considered for the study because the key teacher for the Form 1 new history curriculum was no longer in the school. Another reason for choosing School B was the fact that the key teacher in the school, unlike the other key teachers considered for the study, had responsibility for the new history curriculum for Form 2 as
well. This additional experience was thought to enrich the key teacher's perceptions and activities. School C was chosen out of three small size schools, after eliminating one school because of the absence of the key teacher in the school, and the second because it was located in a very rural area remote from both the Ministry of Education and the State Education Department. Descriptions of the three selected schools are provided in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

Each of the schools selected for the study had the following respondents: an administrator, a key teacher and one or more teachers who had experience with teaching the new history curriculum at Form 1. A breakdown of the school-level participants is provided in Table 7. The teachers comprised those who were teaching the new history curriculum at Form 1 at the time of the study and those who had, at one time or another, taught the new history curriculum at Form 1. The administrators were chosen from among the principals, the senior assistants and the afternoon supervisors of the schools. On the suggestions of the principals in School A and School C, the researcher chose the afternoon supervisors of the schools for the study because the principals considered them to be the persons most knowledgeable about the new history curriculum and its implementation. In School B the senior assistant participated in the study because he was the only available administrator familiar with the new history curriculum and the key teacher concerned. The principal was not in the school during the early part of the study while the afternoon supervisor declined to participate in view of his lack of familiarity with the new history curriculum.
Table 7
A Summary of School-level Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants/Schools</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of Ministry of Education Officials

Three officials from the Ministry of Education were included in the study, one each from the Curriculum Development Centre, the Inspectorate and the Selangor State Department of Education.

The Curriculum Development Centre, besides being responsible for the development of the history curriculum, was also responsible for planning its implementation in schools. An official from the Social Studies Unit of the Curriculum Development Centre was selected for the study because she was one of the most knowledgeable about the new history curriculum and the expectations that the Ministry had of the key teachers. She was responsible for developing the new history curriculum and planning the use of the key teacher strategy in the implementation of the new curriculum. The inclusion of a Curriculum Development Centre official provided, among other
things, valuable data regarding the role expected of the key teachers by the Ministry of Education.

An Inspector of Schools for history and an officer in the Selangor State Department of Education were also selected. The former was responsible for the supervision of instruction in schools and the latter for supervising the implementation of the new history curriculum in schools throughout the state. Their frequent visits to the schools and contacts with teachers and school administrators provided insight into the implementation of the new history curriculum, particularly the activities of the key teachers, the problems faced by the latter, and the factors that affected their work.

STAGES OF THE STUDY

The stages of the study consisted of the initial preparation, the pilot study, and the collection, analysis and reporting of data.

Initial Preparation

Contact was made with the State Social Studies Officer of Selangor State Department of Education, the officer responsible for overseeing the implementation of the new history curriculum in the state, for information on the schools, their categories, and the availability of key teachers in the schools. Schools to be included in the study were then selected.
Permission to carry out research in the four schools -- including one chosen for the pilot study -- and to meet with officers of the Ministry of Education was sought from the Educational Planning and Research Division (EPRD) of the Ministry of Education. Permission was subsequently sought from the Department of Education of the state of Selangor where the study was carried out. The department then informed the principals of the four schools selected for the study.

Permission was also sought from the Director of the Curriculum Development Centre, the Chief Inspector of Schools and the Director of Education, Selangor, to meet with the officers under their respective jurisdictions, who had been selected for the study.

Pilot Study

This stage of the study included the development and piloting of the interview schedule and questionnaires. The interview questions for each of the four groups of participants were written originally in English. They were then translated to Bahasa Malaysia, the official language and medium of instruction in Malaysia. Before being piloted, the translated version of the interview schedule was given to two lecturers at the Department of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, to be checked for clarity and accuracy of translation.

The revised interview schedule was then piloted to help refine the questions and interview procedures. Three persons, all from the same school, were interviewed in the pilot project.
All three interviewees — a key teacher, a teacher and a senior assistant — had been involved in the implementation of the new history curriculum at Form 1. They were not included in the study proper. The procedure used to pilot the interview schedule and questionnaire was as follows:

1. The key teacher was interviewed first. The interview was taped and reviewed with the key teacher for suggestions and comments. Based on these comments, the schedule was revised by the researcher. Revisions included a rearrangement of the sequence of questions, a deletion of irrelevant probe questions and addition of new ones, and a rewording of those questions which the key teacher had difficulty in understanding.

2. The revised interview schedule and questionnaire were then used with a second person, the teacher, using the same procedure as with the key teacher. Revisions were made where necessary.

3. The same procedure was carried out on a third person, the senior assistant, using the revised instruments. The comments were used to design the final interview schedule and questionnaire.
Collection of Data

Data collection took place at the initial meetings with the participants and during the actual interviews.

Initial Meetings. Preliminary visits were made to the three schools to choose and meet the teachers and the administrators for the study. Similar visits were made to the appropriate divisions of the Ministry of Education. During the initial meetings, the researcher explained to participants the purpose and nature of the study, including the data collection procedures, and arranged suitable times for the first interviews.

Interviews with the teachers and the key teachers were scheduled to coincide with periods when they were free from any teaching assignment. Efforts were made to schedule the interviews when the teachers or key teachers had two consecutive free periods of 40 to 45 minutes each, or when their free periods fell immediately before or after the student recess.

During the initial meetings, copies of the schedule were distributed to the participants to familiarize them with the type of questions to be asked at the first interview. Questionnaires eliciting the professional background of the teachers, key teachers and administrators were also given out. The researcher requested that the participants complete the questionnaires, to be collected by the researcher at the first interview. Questions posed by the participants regarding the study, such as clarity of the interview schedule and the use of the findings of the study were answered by the researcher.
The Interview. The interview was carried out in two stages (Figure 10).

Experiences of the interviewees

Stage 1 Self-report by the interviewees

Collective Summary

Stage 2 Validation Clarification Elaboration

Final Report

Figure 10
Interview Procedure

In Stage 1, visits were made to the schools to interview key teachers, teachers and administrators. Similar visits were also made to the Curriculum Development Centre, the Inspectorate and the Selangor State Department of Education to interview the officers involved in the implementation of the new history curriculum. These interviews revolved around the questions as listed in the interview schedule. Each interview lasted approximately 40 minutes.

The data collected from the first round of interviews were analyzed to provide the researcher with a collective summary of
the views of each of the four groups of respondents: the ministry officials, key teachers, school administrators, and teachers. The teachers were grouped, and their responses analyzed, according to the schools where they taught. This summary comprised the following components: preliminary conclusions, the major features, patterns, relationships, differences or commonalities identified from the interviews. An example of the summary is provided in Appendix H.

Before the second round of interviews, the researcher again met with the participants individually to provide them with a collective summary of their responses, compiled after the completion of the first stage of the interview, and to make arrangements for the second interview. The researcher requested that each participant review the summary.

In Stage 2 of the interview, the participants were each asked to verify the information given by them in Stage 1 and validate the researcher's interpretation of that information, as contained in the collective summary. This was to ensure that the researcher had captured the perspectives of the participants accurately. The respondents were also asked to elaborate on certain aspects of their remarks and to clarify those which were still not clear to the researcher. These statements were used to put together the final report. Each interview lasted approximately 40 minutes.

After the completion of the data collection, letters of thanks were sent to the participants including those who participated in the pilot study, and to the principals of the
four schools involved in the study.

All of the interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed, and were coded to ensure anonymity. Upon completion of the study, all tapes were erased.

Analysis of Data

Analysis of data was started immediately following the first stage of data collection. Soon after each visit, the researcher made a collective summary of the data for each group of respondents. This summary was given to the respondents for verification, clarification and expansion.

Three levels of analysis were carried out: descriptive, comparative and interpretive.

Descriptive analysis. The data were analyzed (Chapters 5-8) to provide a description of:

- the role expected of key teachers,
- the activities of the key teachers (actual role) and the usefulness of these activities, and
- the factors that influenced the role performance of the key teacher, as perceived by the study participants.

Comparative Analysis. Data pertaining to the role expected of the key teachers, and their activities were analyzed (Chapter 9) in order to ascertain the existence of any variation within each of the four groups of participants, among the groups and also among the participants in each school. An analysis of the participants' judgements as to the usefulness of the activities
carried out by key teachers was also performed. A comparison of the activities of the key teachers and the role expected of them by the Ministry of Education was made to determine congruencies between the expected and the actual roles of the key teachers.

**Interpretive Analysis.** The data were analyzed further to provide possible explanations for the following:

- variations in the role expected of the key teachers,
- variations in the activities (actual role) of the key teachers,
- the perceived usefulness of the activities of the key teachers, and
- the congruency and discrepancy between the actual and the expected roles of the key teachers.

**PRESENTATION OF RESULTS**

The results of the study are presented in the next five chapters. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 provide descriptions of the schools and participants involved in the study, and the participants' perceptions of the roles and activities of the key teachers, and factors influencing these activities. Chapter 8 presents data from the three officers of the Ministry of Education. Chapter 9 describes the comparative and interpretive analyses of data.

The description of the participants' perceptions employs extensive use of direct quotations from the interviews with the participants. Quotations are used to explain parts of the
perceptions, and to provide evidence, illustrations and substantiations of statements made by the participants. Such extensive use was made of quotations in order to facilitate readers' understanding of the experiences and perceptions of the people involved.

The quotations were originally in Bahasa Malaysia. The translation into English involved some paraphrasing to capture the nuances of the meaning. A word-per-word translation was, obviously, not possible.
CHAPTER 5
SCHOOL A

DESCRIPTION OF SCHOOL A

The School: An Overview

School A is situated about two kilometers from the town centre and about 23 kilometers from the State Education Office and from most divisions of the Ministry of Education. It is categorized as an A school because of its high student enrolment (1996 students in 1981) and the availability of Form 6 classes. Since its inception in 1960, the school has grown from a secondary school having only Form 1 classes to a school that accommodates classes ranging from Remove to the Form 6. Started in 1979, only the Form 6 classes in the Arts were offered. Out of the total enrolment of 1996, 53 percent attend the morning session (Forms 3-6) and the rest (Remove-Form 2) attend the afternoon session. Forty percent of the students are males. The school has 60 classes, 32 of which were taught in the morning and 28 in the afternoon. A profile of these students and a breakdown of the classes are shown in Table 8.

School A has many and varied facilities. Besides the regular classrooms, other academic facilities include several science laboratories, home science rooms and industrial arts
Table 8
A Profile of the Students in School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rooms. The school also has a multi-purpose hall which could be used for school concerts, stage shows, indoor games and student assemblies. It was also used as a recruiting centre by the armed forces. The facilities for the staff are equally satisfactory. The principal's office and meeting room are air-conditioned, and the latter is equipped with a U-shaped table. There is a large staff room with a carrel for each of the 96 teachers in the school. According to the teachers, this "modernization" of the staff facilities took place within the past two years after the arrival of the present principal.

In spite of the large size of the school and the better-than-average facilities, School A still does not have sufficient classrooms to accommodate all of its students. Several floating classes exist in the school. The students of these classes do
not have a classroom which they can call their own; they move from classroom to classroom for their lessons, using those rooms that have been left unoccupied by those students who have their lessons in the more specialised rooms such as the science laboratories.

This school is the only school in the district that has hostel facilities for some of its students. The residential part of the school compound consists of the hostel with a block for boys and a block for girls, and a row of houses for the principal, senior assistant, and two teachers. Nearby is a playing field with facilities for soccer, hockey, netball and track-and-field sports.

The students in School A come from all over the district and some from outside the district. These students join the school when they complete their primary 6 programs in primary schools situated in the rural areas such as villages and rubber estates. Very few come from the area within or surrounding the town where the school is situated. Most of the students have low income backgrounds, their parents being self-employed or working as labourers. Unlike other secondary schools in the area, School A does not have its own feeder school to supply its incoming students.
School Personnel

Teachers. The school is staffed by 96 teachers, 52 of whom are teaching in the morning. Fifty-two percent of the teachers have teaching certificates, 40 percent are graduate teachers and the remaining 8 percent are diploma teachers. The women teachers outnumber the men teachers by a ratio of 2 to 1.

The teachers interact during their free periods; these interactions occur mainly in the staff room. Interactions between the afternoon and morning teachers appear to be constrained by time and by their perception of each other. Teachers tend to interact more with colleagues in the same session; the only time the two groups of teachers have to interact are in the mid-afternoons when the two sessions overlap. Relationships between the two groups are also strained by the perception among the mostly college-trained, afternoon teachers that they are being looked down upon and treated like second class teachers by the morning teachers who are predominantly university graduates.

Interactions among the afternoon teachers, four of whom participated in the study, is greatly influenced by their teaching schedule, work load and sex. At any one time, the staff room is used by approximately fifteen teachers who are not teaching at the time. Of the 15, some would be busy in their respective carrels, correcting students' work or preparing their lessons or examination questions; others might find time to congregate in groups to discuss topics ranging from school related matters such as the school's Open Day and student games,
to personal matters such as hobbies, families and even general conversations. The only times most of the 45 teachers are together in the staff room occur before they start work around midday and just before they leave for home in the evening. All the teachers are not able to be in the staff room during student recess because the school adopts a staggered system of recess whereby the younger students are given an earlier break. Interactions also seem to follow sex grouping. The men teachers have their carrels located in groups, thus reinforcing all-male interaction. Likewise, the women teachers tend to group among themselves in discussing issues, be these school or personal in nature.

Among the three teachers and the one key teacher involved in this study, teacher A2 seems to prefer to keep to herself; the other two teachers, A1 and A3 and the key teacher appear to be always in contact with each other. All four are teaching the new history curriculum at Form 1 during the study. They are teaching an average of three classes each, each class being allocated three periods for history.

The administrators. The principal, a man in his forties, occupies an air-conditioned office adjacent to the general office. This is not his first administrative position; he has been a principal and a vice-principal in other schools prior to his assignment to School A. Not much more is known about him because the researcher's meeting with him was very brief. After explaining the nature of the study, he suggested that the researcher come back in the afternoon to meet the afternoon
supervisor.

The vice-principal, a lady in her late thirties, occupies an outer office (not air-conditioned) which forms part of the general office. She has been a vice-principal since 1980; prior to that she was teaching in a neighbouring school.

The afternoon supervisor who occupies the room next to the senior assistant, has been occupying the position of afternoon supervisor in the school since 1977 and is due to retire in 1982. He was selected for this study on the basis of his long administrative experience in the school and because he was perceived to be quite familiar with the key teacher selected for the study, and the curriculum under study.

THE KEY TEACHER AND HER PERCEPTIONS

Key teacher A, hereafter referred to as KA, is college-trained with History as one of her teaching options. She has been teaching for the past 13 years, a substantial part of her experience being in the teaching of history. In fact, she was teaching history at the Form 3 level when she was selected to attend the inservice course in 1977; she continued to teach at that level in 1978 when the new history curriculum was first implemented at Form 1. Since 1979 she has been teaching the new curriculum.

The inservice course, which she attended as a key teacher, was the first one in which she participated in her 13 years of
teaching. She did not know why and how she was selected and was also not very keen about attending it. These facts are substantiated in conversation between the researcher, denoted below as R, and KA.

R: Why were you selected for the course?
KA: I don't know. Probably, at that time, the other teachers gave excuses for not wanting to go.
R: Who suggested that you go?
KA: I also do not know; I did not want to go. I tried to avoid going by saying that I was not teaching Form 1. But the principal persisted in asking me to go.

The Role Expected of Her as a Key Teacher by the Ministry of Education

KA felt that her role as a key teacher was two-fold: to inform the other teachers in her school of the Ministry of Education's intention to adopt a new history curriculum beginning in 1978 and to teach it when it was implemented. The request to inform teachers of the change, according to KA, was made by the key personnel during the inservice course she attended in 1977.

At the inservice course we were requested to inform teachers that our history curriculum was going to be changed. That is all.

The perceived role of teaching the new curriculum resulted from her thinking that it was only logical for a person who had attended the inservice course aimed at exposing teachers to the new curriculum to teach the new curriculum when it was
implemented. According to her, this role was, however, not explicitly stated during the inservice course.

She firmly believed that except for teaching her own classes and informing other teachers of the change, nothing much was expected of her. When asked if she was ever expected to help the other teachers with the new curriculum or to disseminate information on the new curriculum, KA responded by saying, "I am not aware of anything like that." She viewed the inservice course as an experience aimed at her own professional development.

It seemed to me that what was taught [at the inservice] was for my own use only, for myself. It is definitely not to be disseminated to the others. These books [textbooks] are for my own personal use too.... Nobody told us to explain the new curriculum to the other teachers.... We were never asked to explain to the principal or the senior assistant about the course.

The inservice course was the only means by which KA was familiarized with the role she was expected to play on her return to her school. According to KA, even the letter she received regarding the inservice course was very brief. It informed her of her selection to the inservice course; nothing was said about her role as a key teacher in the process of implementing the new history curriculum.

KA continued to maintain her views—of her role as a key teacher since, according to her, nothing had happened to her to make her change or modify her perceptions. She had not received any visits from the officers of the Ministry of Education to see
to the implementation of the new curriculum since the inservice course of 1977. Nor had she received any letters, circulars or directives which, KA felt could have initiated her to think about what she had been doing or ought to be doing in her capacity as a key teacher.

Her Activities as a Key Teacher

KA has been involved in several activities including informing teachers of the adoption of the new curriculum, showing them sample textbooks, selection of a textbook for the new curriculum, teaching the new curriculum, participating in informal discussions and preparing teaching materials. She did not furnish this list of activities spontaneously when the researcher inquired about the kind of activities that she had been engaged in and/or initiated as a key teacher. In fact, she appeared surprised when asked, and her immediate response was "Nothing." "I have not carried out any activities." It was only after further probing that she revealed that she had been involved in the activities listed above; these activities were either directly or indirectly related to the implementation of the new history curriculum in the school.

Immediately after attending the inservice course in 1977, KA informed the Form 1 history teachers of the Ministry's decision to adopt a new history curriculum for the lower forms (1-3) beginning with the Form 1 the following year. However, according to her, she only did this after the teachers concerned asked her about the inservice course. The main reason she gave for not
taking the initiative to talk about the inservice and the curriculum change to the teachers was that she was not teaching the subject at that time and that she had little contact with the teachers. She was teaching in the morning while the history teachers concerned were teaching in the afternoon session. She viewed this activity of informing teachers of the change to be of limited use to the latter. It was superficial; teachers did not learn about the new curriculum in great detail.

Besides informing teachers of the change in the curriculum, KA showed the teachers the sample textbooks she acquired at the inservice course. The attempt to get teachers to view the textbooks, however, was not received with much enthusiasm by the teachers. This, according to KA was because the teachers did not perceive the viewing of these books to be an immediate need.

Teachers did not see the need to read the books because they felt that it was still too early. It was not time yet. When the time comes for them to teach the subject then they would look at these books. [Moreover] these books were not theirs to keep.

KA was also involved in selecting a textbook for the new history curriculum. This activity was carried out in 1977, just after she returned from the inservice course.

I was asked by the principal to select a suitable textbook for the school. Together with the other history teachers, and the senior subject teacher, we selected this book. To a certain extent the course did provide me with certain guidelines on how to select a textbook... I based my selection on such things as the language of the book and its content.

KA viewed the selecting of the textbook as a very important and
useful activity considering the teachers' heavy reliance on textbooks for their teaching. As she pointed out, "Teachers are using the textbook as their main guide to teaching."

KA's most obvious activity was her teaching of the new curriculum. She found this very important as it provided her the opportunity to discuss, exchange ideas and work closely with the other teachers teaching the new curriculum.

In her three years of teaching the new curriculum, KA has also been involved in informal discussions with the teachers on the new curriculum.

We usually use our free time to discuss problems that arose or any issues of interest to us.

Most of the discussions deal with concerns and problems over the content area, for example, the insufficiency of the textbook in providing teachers with some of the necessary content, misinterpretation of facts by authors or differences in interpretation of historical events by the various authors. These discussions were carried out on a colleague-to-colleague basis. KA noted that her involvement in these discussions was in her capacity as a teacher teaching the subject, not as a key teacher; and that these discussions took place only when she was assigned to teach the subject.

KA was also involved with the other teachers in the task of preparing lesson notes, teaching aids and examination questions. She volunteered in preparing the scheme of work for the years she taught the subject. As she explained,
Usually the senior subject teacher asked the teachers to discuss the scheme of work among themselves. We normally choose the more experienced teacher to organise [the scheme of work] and then we change those [aspects of the scheme of work] that the teachers did not agree. I offered to do it because I have been teaching history for quite sometime. Moreover, history was my option at college.

Factors Influencing her Activities as a Key Teacher

**Key teacher-related factors.** KA's perception of her role as key teacher led her to carry out only activities which were related to those perceptions. Specifically, KA interpreted the key personnel's instruction "to go back to your school and inform teachers of the change to a new curriculum" to mean simply that - to inform - and nothing more. This was precisely what she did on her return to the school from the inservice course. She believed that the second perceived role, that of teaching history after attending the inservice course dealing with the teaching of the subject, could be fulfilled only with the help of the school administrators who assign teachers to teach the various subjects.

KA's activities were also affected by her knowledge of the new curriculum and her ability to teach it to the students and to disseminate the information about the new curriculum to other teachers, if asked. Regarding the new history curriculum, KA believed that its only new aspect was a slight change in focus and hence content area. She explained that,
sixty percent of the content deals with our own history while forty percent deals with the history of other countries. This differs from the previous curriculum whereby the reverse is the case: forty percent our history and sixty percent others.

KA pointed out, therefore, that she did not see anything different about the new curriculum with respect to its techniques of teaching. She felt that the teaching methodology recommended at the inservice course was similar to what she learned at college. This perception led her to continue with her usual methods of teaching, for example, narration and the question and answer technique, with maps and pictures as her most common teaching aids.

KA stated that she did not feel confident and capable of enlightening the teachers on the new curriculum or helping them use it in the classroom, even if the Ministry of Education had expected her to do so.

Even if I were asked to explain the new curriculum to the teachers, I have not the confidence to do it. There is nothing much I could tell them because I do not know much about it myself. I learned very little during the short inservice course. The course was not adequate.

KA's activities were also limited by her own guidelines of not offering help unless she was being asked to. KA made it clear that she would not offer help or guidance regarding the new curriculum to the teachers, unless the latter requested it. She did not want to take the initiative because she was afraid that her effort might be misconstrued by the teachers.
I feel much more comfortable if the teachers themselves approach me instead of me going to see them first.... They might not be interested in what I have to say or to offer... They might think that I am showing off, especially now that we have a number of graduate teachers around.

KA also expressed reluctance at providing aid in the form of ideas and suggestions if these were unrequested. This was because she found teachers were not happy at receiving suggestions from other teachers regarding their own teaching. She recalled, for example, showing the teachers a large picture she found in one of the books she had been reading that she thought the teachers could use for their teaching. Though she offered to loan the book to those teachers who wanted to use it, none of the teachers had so far approached her for the book. KA noted that the teachers' confidence in and dependence on the textbook could have resulted in their being less receptive to new ideas and suggestions that could be used to improve their teaching.

**Teacher-related factors.** KA was of the opinion that the history teachers did not approach her to seek her help or advice, or to discuss about the new curriculum because the teachers did not have problems in implementing the new history curriculum in the school. These teachers, according to her, need not have to know much about the new curriculum to be able to teach it; she considered that the textbook and other reference books were adequate guides and aids to teaching. As she explained:
I do not think the new curriculum presents much problems to the teachers because they could easily teach by using the textbook and other books.... Even without sufficient knowledge of the new curriculum, the teacher could teach because history could be taught by just relying on the textbook; the teacher need not possess additional information about the curriculum. There are teachers who are not history teachers by training teaching the subject and they did not appear to have any problems.... Teachers are using the textbook as their main aid to teaching.... I think the authors know more about the curriculum than we do. The only time we need to refer to other sources is when the topics are not dealt with adequately or not discussed at all in the textbook.

The nature of the inservice. KA stated that she was not confident and capable of enlightening teachers and helping them with the new history curriculum because she felt that the inservice course had failed to provide her with adequate information about the new curriculum. The mode of presentation at the inservice course was poor, and there were no follow-up activities after the inservice course. The following excerpts demonstrate KA's disappointment with the inservice course, the way it was conducted and the key personnel who organised it.

We did not learn much about the new curriculum during the six days of inservice course. We were informed of the various teaching methods; methods that we had learned in college. As a result, the participants got bored and tended not to take the course seriously. It [the course] did not leave any deep impact on the teachers.

He [the key personnel] lectured most of the time. He did not explain much. It was boring.... He distributed notes and working papers to the course participants but these were very few in number. He should have given more copies to us to be
distributed to the other teachers. He should not expect us to reproduce these notes.... I use those notes and files for my own reference.

KA was also critical of the inefficient use of time during the inservice course.

Sometimes we sat there doing nothing. It looked as though the key personnel did not know what to do. He [the key personnel] invited the textbook writers to explain the content of their books to entice us to buy their books.... Sometimes each of the representatives of these textbook publishers took as much as two hours to try to convince us to choose their books for our schools.

KA believed that the inservice course was primarily aimed at her professional development. That was why, KA explained, she was reluctant to explain to the other teachers what she had learned about the new curriculum at the inservice course or to offer any kind of help or advice to them. She suggested that,

perhaps it would have been more effective if all the history teachers were required to attend the inservice instead of sending only one person.

Professional support. KA also reported the absence of any follow-up activities after her return to the school following the inservice course. She was of the view that the failure of the Ministry of Education to organise further inservice courses, for example, had deprived her of the opportunity to discuss any problems that emerged during the course of implementing the curriculum and hopes of finding solutions to these problems. As she explained,
the inservice course alone was not adequate. It is difficult to resolve some of the problems that arose. These problems emerged only when we started teaching it [the new curriculum]. One problem, for example, concerned the lack of clarity of the textbook we used which resulted in a certain amount of confusion among the teachers. I usually do my own research on such matters.... There is nobody I can turn to for help.... I was on my own right from the beginning.

KA revealed that nobody from the Ministry had visited her or the other teachers in the school to see how they were doing with their teaching of the new curriculum. She also explained that she had never been informed, either during or after the inservice course, of the possibility of approaching the key personnel or officers of the Ministry of Education for help or guidance on the new curriculum.

The administrators and the administration of the school. KA felt that the school administrators did not show adequate interest and support in the implementation of the new history curriculum, and she believed that this lack of interest and support was caused by the administrators' lack of exposure to the new curriculum and their lack of attention to the teaching of history. KA felt that the school administrators should have shown some interest in the inservice course she attended dealing with the new curriculum. "The principal did not ask me anything about the course. I think nobody really took it seriously." KA argued that "the principal should have attended the course too, so he would know what to do." Had the principal been familiarized with the new curriculum and its implementation in the school, he would have shown more interest and support for the
project. The support would include the showing of concern and interest in the KA and her activities.

The second reason for the lack of support for KA was that the administrators were not giving much attention to the teaching of history.

History is given less emphasis compared to subjects like mathematics because history is considered much easier to understand and to teach compared to mathematics.... We even have non-history teachers teaching the subject.

THE TEACHERS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS

Three teachers in School A participated in the study; they will hereafter be called A1, A2 and A3. A1 is a certificate teacher specializing in the teaching of home science and had attended three inservice courses on the subject throughout her teaching career. She came to School A in 1978 after having been teaching for about 13 years. Her first experience with teaching history was in 1979 when she was assigned to teach the new history curriculum at Form 1 and she had been teaching it since.

A2, a graduate of a local university specializing in the teaching of economics and geography, came to the school in March 1981. This was when she got her first taste of teaching history; soon after her arrival she was assigned to take over the teaching responsibilities of a teacher who had just left the school. One of these responsibilities was teaching history at Form 1.
According to A2, she inherited the teacher's record book and the schemes of work of the teacher that she took over from, and with these she settled down to teach. Nobody had explained to her anything about any of the subjects she was to teach; she was left entirely on her own from the start and had been managing well since.

A3 is a certificate teacher with history as her major subject. Though she obtained her teaching certificate only in 1980, she had about eight years of teaching behind her. She had just completed her special Teacher Training Program whereby she taught during the regular terms and went back to college during the school holidays to do her course work. When transferred to School A in 1979, A3 was in her third year of training. Unlike A1 and A2, A3 was exposed to the new history curriculum during her teacher training. She had been teaching the new history curriculum ever since she came to the school.

Despite the great differences in their professional background, these three teachers shared one common characteristic: they had never taught history and specifically the new history curriculum prior to coming to School A. The professional background of these three teachers together with that of KA is given in Table 9.
# Table 9
Professional Background of KA, A1, A2 and A3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Total Experience</th>
<th>In Present School</th>
<th>Teaching Experience in Years</th>
<th>Teaching History</th>
<th>Teaching (Year Awarded)</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Teaching Options</th>
<th>Inservice Courses Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>certificate</td>
<td>B.Malaysia</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1977 - NHC* (Key Teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Degree+</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>certificate</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * = new history curriculum at Form 1
The Roles Expected of the Key Teacher by the Ministry of Education

Both A1 and A3 stated that the Ministry of Education expected the key teacher to be able to teach the new curriculum well, that is, be able to use new and varied methods that promote students' interest in the subject. The feeling was that the inservice course should make the key teacher a better teacher. As expressed by A1,

after all the inservice was for the key teacher's own consumption - a means to promoting the teachers' professional development.

A2 did not perceive anything of KA because she was not aware of KA's existence as a key teacher.

A1 based her perceptions on her experience as a teacher who had attended three previous inservice courses. Unlike A1, teacher A3 had never attended any inservice course during her teaching career. She based her expectations on what she thought the Ministry would expect from a teacher who had attended an inservice course on a new curriculum. Both A1 and A3 revealed that their perceptions had remained unchanged throughout the years as nothing had happened to make them change their views on the matter. As A1 pointed out,

I do not know if the inservice course [attended by the key teacher] is any different from the usual inservice course or those I attended.
Activities of the Key Teacher

The only two activities which two of the teachers recalled the key teacher participating in were teacher-initiated discussions dealing with routine matters and specific problems and concerns in the teaching of the subject, and shared activities in the teaching of history.

None of the three teachers interviewed could recall the key teacher having initiated any kind of activities to explain and to discuss the new curriculum or the problems encountered by teachers in their use of the new curriculum. A1 and A3 did, however, recall having initiated some discussions with the key teacher to discuss problems and concerns and the day-to-day teaching of the subject. They approached the key teacher only when they encountered difficulties in their teaching or in their preparation for teaching. This did not happen very often because as pointed out by both A1 and A3, they did not have much difficulty with their teaching. The following conversation, for example, illustrates A1's ability to cope with her teaching right from the beginning.

A1: I received my syllabus from the office.... The scheme of work was already prepared. I just have to follow it.

R: Do you know who prepared it?

A1: No. I don't.

R: Did you ever change it to suit yourself?

A1: No. I simply follow it.

R: Did anybody explain the curriculum to
you?

A1: No. I was left on my own... I just read [the textbook] and teach. I used my own initiative to teach.

There was a time, however, when A1 met KA in the hope of finding a method or methods that she could use to teach the new curriculum to the weaker classes. The following excerpt throws some light on the circumstances that led to A1's decision to approach the key teacher.

I was having a great deal of difficulty in getting these students to understand what I was teaching. Some of these students could not even read or write. I could not use those methods that I usually use for the better classes. I have to think of other ways of teaching the subject. I have to get them to be interested. So I approached...[KA] for help. I thought she might be able to help me since history is her option.

A1 was not too pleased with the outcome of the discussion. She felt that she had not learned much since no good ideas had emerged out of the discussion.

A3 met with KA to discuss routine matters for the purpose of coordinating her teaching. She claimed that it was important for teachers to check with one another to find out what topics they were teaching or what they had already covered. According to A3, such discussions helped her to take the necessary steps to ensure that she was in line with the other teachers' teaching. She regarded this activity important to the extent that it facilitated the task of the teachers who had been assigned to prepare the mid-year or the end-of-year common examinations for the subject. She, however, did not find it at all useful in
helping her with her teaching. A2 was also concerned with coordinating her teaching to ensure that she was in step with the other teachers. For this, she reported having checked only with A3.

A1 pointed out that the teachers and the key teacher also engaged in activities aimed at reducing their workload.

We shared in the task of preparing notes that we would distribute to the students.... Sometimes I would prepare it, while...[KA] and [A3] typed it. After that we distribute them. [However] we don't share our teaching aids.

According to A1, this joint effort was prompted by what she described as the perceived need among the teachers to provide students with notes on each of the topics taught. Such effort was considered by A1 to be very helpful in lessening her workload.

Both A1 and A3 did not regard any of the activities described above as special or unique. To them, the key teacher was a colleague who shared in the teaching of the new curriculum. Informal discussions among teachers are expected to happen all the time.

Factors Influencing the Activities of the Key Teacher

Teacher-related factors. The teachers identified three teacher-related factors that influenced the activities of the key teacher. These were the teachers' awareness of the presence of the key teacher in the school, their lack of need for the key teacher and their views of the new history curriculum.
(1) **Teacher awareness of the existence of the key teacher in the school.** Whether the teachers were aware that a key teacher existed in the school influenced whether or not these teachers approached the key teacher for help or discussion. A2, for instance, was not aware that KA was a key teacher until told by the researcher.

I did not know that she is a key teacher and that she had attended the inservice course.... I am new here. I had never taught history and therefore do not know that there is such a thing as a key teacher.

Her contact with KA was limited; she has been in the school for six months. The nature of their relationship was best expressed by A2 who said, "We are friends. We talk but not about the new history curriculum." When she had problems, A2 sought the help of the teacher who sat next to her in the staff room.

If I have any problem, I ask .... It is convenient; she sits next to me. I do check with... [A3] to see which topic she is teaching. It is just for the purpose of coordinating my teaching.

A1 and A3 appeared to be closer to KA than was A2 because they had known KA for the past three years and had shared in teaching the new curriculum during that period. Both of them also knew that KA had attended an inservice course on the new history curriculum from the other teachers in the school, as shown in the following excerpts.

A1: heard the other teachers talking about her [the key teacher] having attended the inservice course but I never asked her about it.... I knew about it long after I started teaching the new curriculum.
A3: knew about... [KA] when I first came to the school... through a friend.... Actually, I had a problem then and I asked a friend on how to overcome the problem. My friend asked me to refer it to [KA], but I was very new to the school then and did not know [KA] well enough to approach her.

A1 and A3 expected KA to be able to teach the subject more effectively after attending the inservice course, because in their opinion, an inservice course was for the professional development of its participants.

(2) The teachers' need for the key teacher. All three teachers said that they would have brought up problems to be discussed with KA had they known that she was the key teacher for the new history curriculum; however, the need for such consultation would have been minimal because the teachers were of the opinion that they were managing satisfactorily with their teaching. The three teachers pointed out that their main emphasis in teaching of the new history curriculum was the content area; their objectives were to teach all the topics that appeared in the syllabus and in their schemes of work, and to ensure student understanding of the content. The following excerpts represented the responses of two of the teachers when asked about what their emphases were when teaching history and the reasons for the emphases.

A1: emphasize... the contents and the topics contained in the syllabus... the important dates and events.... I feel that I should try to complete the syllabus. The Form 1 syllabus contains an outline of all the topics that must be completed every term. [However], I seldom
complete the syllabus because it is too long. I could finish it with the better classes but I find that difficult with the weaker classes.

A2: My teaching is based on the contents to be covered.... The students must understand what is being taught: what happened, when it happened etc.... The syllabus must be completed; otherwise the Form 2 [history] teachers would face a great deal of difficulties when teaching the subject.

These teachers considered the textbook an adequate guide to teaching. They felt that in most cases, the textbook was sufficient in providing them the content needed for their teaching. A1 indicated that the scope of her teaching depended largely on how long and detailed the topic was dealt with in the textbook and that the sequencing of the topics in her scheme of work which she inherited also reflected the sequencing of the topics as found in the textbook. The following conversation threw some light on the extent of A1's dependence on the textbook for her teaching.

R: How closely do you follow the textbook?

A1: Topic by topic; the length of each topic ranges from one day [one period] to three days [three periods]. Some even took more than a week [three periods].

R: How do you determine how much to teach per topic?

A1: It depends on the textbook.

The following excerpts provide a description of the methods used by the three teachers to teach the new history curriculum.
A1: First, I explained the facts to the pupils, then I read the textbook and finally I give them notes.... With the weaker classes, I usually read [the textbook] and then explain to them topic by topic.... I use my previous years notes.... The only aid I ever use are the maps.

A2: I discuss the topic with the students and then question them to assess their understanding: to check if they understand what have been taught. Then I give them notes or written exercises to give them practise in answering questions.... I have to find out if the students understand what I have been teaching.... I always use the board [and also] charts and pictures which I make myself.

A3: It all depends on the class. For the better classes...the explanation method is adequate. It could capture the students' interests. After all, they are always ready to hear what you have to say. However, when teaching the A class, I have to provide the students with more examples. I have to be more detailed.... The question and answer session is a must even with the good classes.... I usually use maps.

Reference books were used when the teachers discovered that the topics they were going to teach were not adequately dealt with or not covered at all by the textbook. As explained by A1, I used to refer to books such as objective-type books to prepare notes.... Some topics such as the Perak Laws, the Pahang Laws and the Melaka Laws are not found in the textbook.

A2 noted that the textbook and the guidebooks were all that she needed for her teaching.
I can teach by just using the textbook and other guidebooks.... I just read the textbook and the guidebooks and used them for my teaching.

A3 indicated that she was involved in some group work whereby students were divided into groups and each group was given an assignment. Other techniques have not been used due to various difficulties. When asked why she had not used techniques such as inviting a guest speaker, quiz or dramatization of historical events, A2 responded by saying,

> it is difficult to carry out.... It is difficult to get outsiders to come to the school.... Moreover, I am teaching the weaker classes and it is very difficult to carry out any activities with them.... The best way to teach them is to explain the topic and then question them.

A3 tried to organize a trip to the museum for the students. However, the trip had to be called off because, as she claimed, "there were not enough forms to go round." (In Malaysia a teacher needs to get the permission of the parents and the State Education Department to bring students on field trips). Such requests for permission are to be made on special forms.

In the last few years, each of the teachers has found ways of solving problems that were occasionally encountered. A1 discussed the problems with other teachers including KA. A2, out of convenience, discussed problems with her neighbour in the staff room. A3 brought problems to her lecturers at the training college she attended during the school holidays, or discussed them with her colleagues at the school.
(3) Teachers' understanding of the new curriculum. The understanding of the new history curriculum between A3, on one hand, and A1 and A2, on the other, varied considerably. However, they were all satisfied with their teaching and, therefore, would not have any great need for the help of the key teacher. A3 was familiar with the new history curriculum as she had been exposed to it during her teacher training. However, A1's understanding of the new curriculum was limited, as illustrated in the following conversation,

R: Can you explain the difference between the previous curriculum and the present one?

A1: No. I cannot differentiate them because I do not know anything about the previous one.

She had, however, been teaching for the past three years without much problem. A2's understanding of the new history curriculum was equally limited, but she did not seem to think that knowledge of the new curriculum would make any difference to her teaching. The following conversation highlights this view of hers.

R: Can you explain the difference [between the present and the previous curriculum]?

A2: I don't know the difference. To me, everything is new.

R: What do you think, is the goal of the present curriculum?

A2: To teach the students more about Malaysia, about its people.

R: Where would you go if you want to know more about the curriculum?

A2: So far I do not feel the need to ask
anything about the curriculum.... I have no problem. I can teach the subject.

Key teacher-related factors. All three teachers thought that KA might have been too burdened with other work to enable her to carry her activities as a key teacher. A3 was of the opinion that the lack of key teacher-initiated activities could be attributed to the lack of a suitable time and KA's busy schedule.

Probably she does not have the time to discuss with the other teachers, no suitable time.... She has other responsibilities, sports, for example.

A2 agreed with A3 when the former observed that KA was "always busy, being the sports secretary." A1, reasoned that if KA was to have other roles other than teaching (the only role A1 expected of her), then the key teacher would need a lot of time to carry those other activities, as evident in the following excerpt:

It could be that she had a lot of other responsibilities to carry out. Maybe she feels too pressed for time; she is in charge of sports. I do not know why she is given this responsibility; it is actually not her option. She is in charge of the sports equipment.... She is also a class teacher; it is a heavy responsibility. I know it because I am also a class teacher. You have to prepare students' report cards, collect fees, distribute and collect the books loaned to the students, [and] mark attendance.

KA was perceived by at least two of the teachers to be accessible. A2, for example, perceived KA was "easy to contact, just like the other teachers." A3 added that KA was not only approachable and friendly but also receptive to inquiries and
ideas from the teachers. She considered such qualities an asset; they made teachers feel at ease about approaching the latter to discuss things or to seek her help and advice regarding matters related to their teaching. However, as her statements below also show, the teachers seldom approached KA.

I feel that I could approach her anytime. She is a nice person to talk to.... If we ask her, she is sure to respond. She might be too shy to talk about it. She would not tell us unless we ask her.

A1 considered that, if the key teacher was expected to perform other roles besides teaching, the key teacher should

be easy to talk to and to discuss, and one you can feel comfortable with.... Diligent and liked to share her knowledge.... Liked to help others.

KA's lack of interest in her role as a key teacher and her lack of initiative were perceived by A3 as one reason for the lack of key teacher-initiated activities in School A.

She does not seem very interested in her role [as key teacher]. She, however, seems interested in her role as a sports teacher. I do not know about her interest in history because we never talk about the subject. One of the few times I talked to her was to find out where she was at in her teaching because I wanted to set the examination questions.... Actually she should have explained it [the new curriculum] to us, and not waited for us to ask her first. She ought to have told us about having attended the inservice course...[and] to take the initiative to plan certain activities.

A2 and A1 included interest in the role as one essential quality of a key teacher (emphases added).

A2: She must have at least three years
experience teaching the subject and be interested in the subject which must also happen to be her teaching option.

A1: She must be experienced.... Should be really interested in the subject and not forced to attend the inservice course.... A degree is not essential.

Clarity of role was seen as an essential ingredient for the success of a key teacher. A1 pointed out that perhaps KA lacked clarity regarding the role expected of her. Together with her lack of free time, this could have resulted in her neglect of her other roles, if any are expected of her. This was indicated by the following excerpt,

It is possible that she was not clearly informed of her role at the inservice course. She may have perceived that the inservice course she attended was for her own development.

The administrators and the administration of the school. The teachers had mixed opinions on the administrators' attitudes towards, and interest in, the teaching of history, the key teacher and the teachers. Most of the views expressed by the teachers regarding the school administrators concerned the afternoon supervisor, the administrator with whom the teachers came into contact most frequently because these teachers were teaching in the afternoon session.

On being asked whether they perceived the administrator to be helpful and supportive towards the teachers the response varied from 'No' to 'Yes' to 'I don't know'. A1's negative view of the administrator's support, for example, was the result of her bad experience with the latter. As she explained,
I was having problems with one of my students. I sent him to see our supervisor hoping that he could help deal with the situation.... At the teachers' meeting he brought the matter up - about teachers sending students to him.... I was very embarrassed and disheartened. So I promised myself that under no circumstances will I ever send any students to see him. I will deal with them myself.

A2, however, felt that the teachers could get whatever they needed from the afternoon supervisor. She was referring to materials that teachers needed for making teaching aids. A3, on the other hand, was unable to give her views on the matter because so far she had not approached the afternoon supervisor to ask for any teaching aids or resources for the new curriculum.

The administrator's lack of support for the key teacher was mentioned by A2. Commenting on KA's lack of visibility, A2 felt that the administrator could have supported the key teacher by making her the subject leader for the new history curriculum. The following excerpt provides a description of A2's concept of subject leader and its origin.

In my former school we have this system whereby each form has its own subject leader who held discussions with the other teachers teaching the subject for the purpose of preparing our schemes of work. He also checks with teachers to ensure that they follow their schemes of work.

Another form of support mentioned was to assign the key teacher to teach the new curriculum. As A1 put it, "I would not have approached her [the key teacher] had she not been teaching the subject." A3 also said she approached KA for consultation
because KA was like one of them, a fellow teacher teaching the same subject in the same form.

The teachers were initially reserved when asked about their perceptions of the administrator's attitude towards the subject. A3, for example, responded by saying "No comment, I do not really know." In spite of her initial view on the administrators' attitude towards history, A3 felt very strongly about the administrators having to provide teachers with a suitable environment in which to work.

We must have an environment that encourages us to explore and look for more.... We don't even have a history room. Probably there aren't enough rooms in the school. The only room I know is for the career and guidance teacher.... We have a history society but it is not functioning. I have never been called to take part in any of its activities.

A2 who was also unable to give her views on the matter, pointed out that the assignment of non-history teachers to teach the new curriculum should not be taken to mean that the administrators were not very interested in the subject. There could be other reasons such as the lack of history teachers in the school which could have forced his decision. A2 pointed out that as far as her case was concerned, the afternoon supervisor had to give her the timetable of the teacher she replaced so as to avoid a major reshuffle in the school's timetable.

All three teachers cited the lack of subject meetings where curriculum-related matters could be discussed. As the following excerpt shows:
A1: For the past three years that I have been teaching, I have not attended any subject meeting.... As far as I know we have a senior subject teacher who was supposed to supervise the subject. As far as history is concerned, the senior subject teacher had, so far, not called any meeting.

A2: There is no subject meeting since I have been here.

A3: We do have a senior subject teacher for history but so far we have not had any meeting.

School meetings were held, as evident in A3's statement, so far this year, we already have two meetings: one at the beginning of the year and another one last Tuesday to discuss the Parents' Day. We usually discuss school matters in general.

All three teachers stressed that the only time all the teachers and the administrators got together was at these school meetings. However, curriculum-related topics were seldom discussed.

THE ADMINISTRATOR AND HIS PERCEPTIONS

The administrator, hereby denoted as AA, was a man in his fifties and had been an afternoon supervisor for the past five years. He had a sense of humour and was an easy person to talk to. He was a Hostel Master for five years prior to being appointed an afternoon supervisor. He was also given certain teaching responsibilities in addition to his administrative duties.
The Role Expected of the Key Teacher by the Ministry of Education

AA was of the view that the only role the Ministry would expect of the key teacher was that of teaching the new history curriculum satisfactorily.

The Ministry expects the teacher to be able to teach better than before since she had attended the inservice course. She has learned new things that she could use. She ought to carry out what she had learned at the course.

He believed that nothing else was expected of the key teacher. His experience with past inservice courses and his experience with teachers who had attended previous inservice courses convinced him that these teachers, the key teacher included, were only expected to be better teachers on their return to the schools after having attended inservice courses. The fact that the key teacher had not talked to him about the inservice course she attended and the role she was expected to perform as a key teacher, AA noted, further strengthened his viewpoint.

He did not think that the key teacher was capable of carrying out other roles such as explaining the new curriculum to the other teachers or helping teachers with their teaching even if the Ministry of Education expected her to. The following excerpt represents AA's response to questions regarding other roles that might be expected of the key teacher.
It is normal for teachers who attend inservice courses not to be directed to disseminate what they have learned.... Usually teachers are sent for inservice courses for the interest of the subject they are teaching.... I do not see how the key teacher could disseminate what she learned to the other teachers. As far as I can see, she teaches and disseminates the new curriculum only to her class.... I say this because we have all kinds of teachers: young teachers and older teachers, the experienced as well as the newly qualified teachers. A newly qualified teacher who is sent for the course would find it difficult to explain [what she had learned at the inservice course] to the other teachers because the more senior teachers do not really want to hear what the teacher has to say. This is especially the case if the senior teachers are graduates; they just would not hear what the junior teachers have to explain. Because of this, I think it is very difficult for her [the key teacher] to explain the new curriculum to the other teachers.... [Moreover], the teachers who attended the inservice courses feel shy about helping or guiding the more experienced teachers. That is why these teachers, on their return to the school, are unable to disseminate what they have learned.

In view of the difficulties described above, AA indicated that,

all the history teachers should have attended the inservice course. Every teacher would then have the chance to learn new things or new topics from the lecturers.

The Activities of the Key Teacher

AA pointed out that the key teacher had been teaching the new history curriculum since her transfer to the afternoon session in 1979. He did not quite know the reason for not assigning the key teacher the new curriculum in 1978 when the new
curriculum was first implemented but his guess was that the key teacher's service was badly needed in another area.

She was then the specialist in Physical Education. At the time, we did not have any qualified Physical Education teacher to teach in the morning. So we had to push her to the morning. After that year, she was sent back to teach in the afternoon because the Ministry sent a qualified Physical Education lady teacher to the school.

He was, however, unable to recall seeing the key teacher carrying out other activities related to the implementation of the new curriculum. According to him, as an afternoon supervisor, he dealt only with the administrative matters and was responsible only for ensuring that the school functioned smoothly. The senior assistant and the senior subject teacher were the ones responsible for curriculum-related matters.

Actually, I do not know what this teacher did or what she taught. For every subject we have a senior subject teacher who supervises the teachers. He is the one responsible for the syllabus, any new knowledge gained from the inservice course and other related matters. I am not involved at all; my job is simply to make sure that things run smoothly. I do not know what a teacher does in great detail.

Moreover, since it was the senior assistant who selected the key teacher for the course, it was, therefore, his responsibility to find out about the course, what had been discussed [and] the preparation given to the teacher.... The senior subject teacher is not involved. She does not know anything about it. The senior assistant keeps a copy of the school's timetable and a record of the teachers' activities which he constantly refers to.
AA was unable to make any judgement on whether the key teacher had done a good job of teaching the new curriculum during the past three years, since he had never observed KA teaching. He, however, believed that the key teacher would have used the new ideas or skills acquired at the inservice course to improve her teaching.

Actually, I have not seen her teaching. I believe that if she had attended an inservice course, she would be able to teach more satisfactorily.... I only observe trainee teachers or those teachers on attachment, not those teachers who have been teaching for sometime. We have not been directed to observe these teachers teaching. [Moreover], teachers feel very uneasy about having people observing them teach.... For every subject we have a senior subject teacher who supervises the teachers teaching the particular subject.

Factors Influencing the Activities of the Key Teacher

The Administration of the School.

(1) The arrangement of the timetable. AA explained that it was not always possible to assign teachers to teach their subject options or to accommodate to teachers' requests to teach subjects of their choice. According to him, the needs of the school should be given top priority in the arrangement of the school's timetable. The teachers' teaching option came in second.
Usually, we do not really consider the teachers' options when assigning them to teach certain subjects. In this school, the question of option is of secondary importance.... We cannot entertain the teachers' options here.... We lacked history teachers. That is why we have teachers whose options are not history teaching the subject.

AA also pointed out that he would try to schedule the teachers' teaching to fit those subjects dealt with at inservice courses recently attended by the teachers. However, at times, it was just not possible to take advantage of the knowledge that the teacher acquired at the inservice course. KA, for example, was unable to teach the new curriculum in 1978, in spite of having attended the course in 1977 because her expertise in another area was more urgently needed by the school.

Though he was responsible for planning and arranging the timetable for the afternoon session, AA explained that he had no say as to which teachers would teach in the afternoon: the senior assistant was the person responsible for allocating these teachers to the two sessions.

I prepare the timetable for the afternoon and I am assisted by a number of teachers. She [the senior assistant] allocates the teachers; sometimes they are not enough. It is up to us to make do with what we have. We have to assign these teachers their responsibilities.... She [the senior assistant] chooses the teachers for us. This has been her policy for the past two years.

He went on to explain that the school's timetable was usually prepared the year before to ensure minimum disruption during the beginning of the school year. For those teachers already in the school who were expected to be around the
following year, their teaching subjects would have been decided during the time. Teachers new to the school would have to fit into the system and had very little choice in what subjects they would teach. A2 was a case in point. After she arrived in the school in March 1981, she was asked to take over the teaching responsibilities of the teacher she came to replace; she was assigned to teach the new history curriculum even though history was not her teaching option.

(2) The senior subject teacher as subject leader. AA indicated that the key teacher would have to work very closely with the senior subject teacher for history if she hoped to get anything going in the school. This was because, according to AA, the senior subject teacher occupied a very important position in the school, having been appointed by the principal to take charge of the subject, its teaching and the teachers teaching it. His duties, among others included that of coordinating the teaching of the subject and other activities related to teaching, organising subject meetings, keeping a close watch on students' performances and helping the subject teachers with their needs, concerns or problems.

To be able to carry out any meetings or seminars involving the other teachers teaching the subject, the key teacher would have to discuss her plans with the senior subject teacher. The senior subject teacher's cooperation was essential. However, AA felt that organizing activities such as meetings, in order to explain the new curriculum was not an easy task.
First she [the key teacher] has to discuss with the senior subject teacher. Then the senior subject teacher would have to call a meeting where he will explain it [the new curriculum] to the teachers.... This is seldom carried out [because] it is difficult to get teachers together. The senior subject teacher is in the morning while the Form 1 teachers are in the afternoon. By 1 pm the former would go home. So how would one expect him to call a meeting. In the end everything simply quietens down.

Support for the key teachers. According to AA, he was always ready to throw in his support for the key teacher and respond to the latter's needs if only the latter had approached him. However, so far, the key teacher had not gone to see him to talk about matters related to the new history curriculum and its implementation in the school.

If the teacher comes to us informing us that she had to carry out certain things, we will give her 100 percent support. We will supply her whatever she needs even if this means that we have to spend money to buy aids, for example.... [but] so far there has not been any request from the key teacher for permission to disseminate new information or materials acquired at the inservice course...we will not stop her.

He emphasized that the lack of inquiries about the inservice course or the absence of any follow-up activities on his part should not be taken to mean that he was not interested and supportive of the key teacher. It had been the practice in the school that those responsible for selecting teachers for inservice courses were the ones to inquire about the inservice course and do other follow-up activities. He did not ask the key teacher to report on the inservice course or issue circulars
regarding the inservice course since he was not the one who selected the key teacher for the course. According to AA, the absence of any follow-up activities on his part was also due to the fact that he viewed the inservice course purely for the development of the key teacher.

**Teachers and inservice courses.** AA regarded inservice courses as a tool for helping teachers to improve their teaching. He also pointed out that selecting teachers for inservice courses was an important but a very difficult task. It was important to ensure that teachers be properly selected in order that the inservice course would benefit the teachers who would then use the ideas and skills learned at the inservice course in their classrooms.

A variety of criteria had been used by the administrators in the school to choose teachers for inservice courses. AA explained that in cases where the course organiser provided the criteria for selection,

> We would follow the guidelines as best we could. After all, the organisers, being more knowledgeable about the course must have their own reasons for providing those guidelines.

Most of the other criteria used by AA to select teachers for inservice courses emphasized the teachers' teaching experience and/or qualifications. Teachers who had never attended any inservice course or who had not been trained to teach the subject they were teaching would be given priorities since AA perceived that such inservice courses would increase their exposure to the subject and provide them the opportunity to learn new things.
The following excerpt illustrates the point.

 Usually, these teachers are chosen based on, first, experience. A teacher who just started teaching history, for example, would be sent to the inservice course first.... We give priority to those teachers whose option is not history since they do not have the foundations needed to teach the subject.... They did not receive any kind of training from the College. Their knowledge of history is based on their MCE.... If the teacher's option is history, this means that he already has the necessary foundations.

Though important, AA considered the task of selecting teachers for inservice courses to be problematic; something that he did not look forward to, as not all teachers were eager and interested in attending it.

We have lots of problems in the school. Most of the teachers here are lady teachers with families and they are reluctant to go.

AA cited 'family problems' as the main reason behind the unwillingness of these married lady teachers and their lack of interest in taking time away from their families and homes. AA indicated that he did not believe in forcing such teachers because he felt that such teachers "would continue to practise their usual ways of teaching even after having attended the inservice course." As a result those who attended the inservice courses were mostly the newly-qualified, young unmarried teachers, and these, according to AA might not be the teachers who best meet the criteria set by the course organizers or those teachers who the administrators felt would gain most from the inservice courses. AA explained that "sometimes we leave it to the teachers to select from among themselves. It's all up to
them." The teachers' candidates, AA revealed, were also usually the young, the unmarried and the newly-qualified.

Despite the reluctance of teachers, AA believed that every teacher should attend at least one inservice course within a period of three years, and that the inservice courses attended by each teacher should be limited to two subject areas.

I feel that every teacher should attend an inservice course at least once in three years. Even the senior assistant should go.... We do not allow teachers to attend inservice courses on too many subject areas; the most should be two, for example, History and Bahasa Malaysia. If he is a science teacher, then he only goes for science courses. He cannot take other types of courses.

AA, however, clarified that,

we allow certain exceptions. In the case of the Home Science teacher, for example, we sent her for an inservice course on Physical Education because we felt that she could teach the subject. Moreover she is very interested in Physical Education.

AA was unable to say, when asked, if KA was interested in attending the inservice course in 1977 as a key teacher. The reason given by AA was that he was not the one who selected her. He did not know for sure the real reason for selecting KA for the course or even KA's reaction when informed by the senior assistant of the decision to send her to the course. His opinion on the above matter, however, can be seen in the following remark.
She just started teaching and being new and not having attended any inservice course, she was the obvious choice for the inservice course.

Attitude towards history and its teaching. AA believed that history could be an interesting subject if well taught. Though he considered the textbook to be an important aid in the teaching of history, AA made it clear that teachers should not depend solely on the textbook for their teaching. The following excerpt provides the rationale behind AA's thinking.

The content and the stories found in the textbook are inadequate. These stories are dead and not interesting. They cannot arouse the interest of the students. The teachers ought to expand and present them in a more interesting way.... The teachers should use other sources such as newspapers and local legends. This is very important especially when teaching the higher forms.

AA was of the opinion that emphasis on the method of teaching was important and critical only when teaching history in the upper forms. Teaching history at Form 1 was not a difficult or demanding task; any teacher could teach the subject regardless of their teaching options. AA's views on the teaching of history in the lower forms is presented below.

History is a subject whose main objective is to instil feelings of nationalism.... This objective is not very important at the Remove and Form 1. However, at the Form Two, Three levels and upwards, we need the more experienced teachers to be able to instil that feeling among the students.... History at the Form 1 level is mainly a foundation course, not to be taught in great detail. So long as a teacher takes history at the MCE level, he could teach Form 1 history.
AA seemed satisfied with what the teachers were doing with the new curriculum. He felt that these teachers were able to cope and were doing a good job of teaching the new curriculum even though some of them might not have history as their teaching options, since, in AA's own words, "the teachers do not seem to have any problems with their teaching." He attributed the teachers' ability to cope to the fact that not much was expected of them in terms of their methods of teaching and their depth of knowledge in the subject area. The teachers could teach even without the help and guidance of others.
CHAPTER 6
SCHOOL B

Introduction

This chapter describes School B and the perceptions of the key teacher, the teachers and the administrator of the school. The organization of data is similar to that used in Chapter 5. This chapter highlights data that are similar and those that are in contrast to those in Chapter 5. The same procedure will be used to describe the data for School C and for the Ministry of Education.

DESCRIPTION OF SCHOOL B

The School: An Overview

School B is a Category B school and located in a rural community. It is situated about 23 kilometres from the district town centre, where most of the other secondary schools in the district are found, and a similar distance from the national capital where the State Education Office and the Ministry of Education are located. Being the only secondary school in the area, School B takes in students "graduating" from the various primary schools situated within a radius of about ten kilometres. These students come mostly from low income families, their
parents being rubber smallholders, fruit growers or workers in factories or tin mines, earning an average of about M$200 per month.

School B was until 1976 a lower secondary school accommodating only Forms 1-3 classes. It was then upgraded to a full secondary school with the addition of both Forms 4 and 5 classes. By 1981 the school has a total of 36 classes, distributed equally among the morning and afternoon sessions. Students in Forms 3 to 5 attend school in the morning and those in Remove classes to Form 1 in the afternoon. The Form 2 classes are split with four of the ten classes being in the morning. The number of students is also quite evenly distributed; out of a total of 1193 students, 51 percent attend the morning session and the rest in the afternoon. Forty six percent of the students are males. A profile of these students and a breakdown of the classes are shown in Table 10.

In addition to the basic facilities such as classrooms, science laboratories and Home Science rooms, School B has a school hall which is converted into three classrooms. When the hall is needed for special use, such as the Prize-Giving Day, the students who occupied these classrooms would have to seek alternative classroom spaces. The students would then have to compete with the already existing floating classes, thus greatly worsening the problem of classroom shortage. During such times, even a portion of the canteen (cafeteria) is converted into a classroom which is subject to many distractions.

This shortage of classrooms may be eased when a new two-
Table 10
A Profile of the Students in School B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>(51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>(49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

storey classroom block under construction is due to be completed by the end of 1982. However, the senior assistant was of the view that floating classes would continue to exist even after the eight-classroom block is completed because the school population is increasing at a much faster rate than the physical expansion of the school. These floating classes only occur during the morning session. None exist in the afternoon session because the four Remove classes are held in a neighbouring primary school building, which holds classes only in the morning.

School Personnel

Teachers. Out of a total of 61 teachers in the school, 31 are teaching in the morning. The majority (69%) of these teachers are college-trained whereas the graduates constitute only 25 percent. The rest are Diploma teachers. Only 24 (39%) out of 61 teachers are men.
The teachers' common room or staff room is the easiest and most convenient place for the teachers to meet and talk. The room has four rows of tables joined together. Teachers sit on either side of the tables, their books piled up in the middle section of each row of tables. Interactions are, therefore, facilitated because teachers can see and talk to each other from their respective seats without anything blocking their views. This ease of communication applies to teachers sitting in the same rows and to those sitting at different tables.

The teachers interact mostly during their free periods and during recess time; this occurs mainly in the staff room or in the canteen where teachers have their coffee breaks. Interactions between the teachers of both morning and afternoon sessions are restricted to the mid-afternoons when the afternoon teachers start arriving in the school.

The afternoon teachers, six of whom are included in the study, comprise mainly the young, newly-qualified, college-trained teachers; they seem to be happy and mix very well with each other. The physical separation limits, to a certain extent, the interactions between the Remove class teachers and the others. It does not prevent these teachers, from the neighbouring school where they are teaching the Remove classes, from walking to the staff room to interact with the other teachers.

Interactions between the six teachers included in the study occur quite frequently. Though B5 and B6 are no longer teaching the new history curriculum at the Form 1 level at the time of the
study, they are frequently approached by the four teachers (B1, B2, B3 and B4) who are teaching the subject. These four teachers each teach an average of six periods of history for two classes per week.

The administrators. The principal has been in the school since the beginning of 1980. This is his first appointment as a school principal. He adheres to a regular office schedule, spending about eight hours, roughly from 7 am to about 3.30 pm, in the school. Thus the principal is usually found in his office in the morning and in the first half of the afternoon sessions.

The senior assistant, like the principal, has been in the school since January 1980. He was a senior assistant at another secondary school in the district prior to his transfer to School B. He shares an office, adjacent to the principal's, with the school clerk. He was selected to participate in this study because he is largely responsible for the curriculum and curriculum-related matters in the school.

THE KEY TEACHER AND HIS PERCEPTIONS

Key teacher B, hereafter referred to as KB, graduated from a teacher training college in 1970 with history as one of his teaching options, and has a lot of experience teaching history in the lower forms. He has been teaching for the past eleven years, most of them in School B.

KB has attended about eight inservice courses throughout his
teaching career, two of which were related to the new history curriculum. In 1977 he attended an inservice course as a key teacher for Form 1 and in 1978 he went as a key personnel for Form 2. In 1980, he attended a six-month long course on the teaching of English as a second language and in the following year he attended two more courses both of which were related to his job as the school's career and guidance teacher.

As a career and guidance teacher, KB is assigned a lighter teaching load to give him the time to counsel students and to carry out other activities such as organizing career talks for the students. Most of KB's free time is spent in the career and guidance room located on the second floor just above the staff room. He seldom stays in the staff room with the other teachers.

The Role Expected of him as a Key Teacher

KB indicated that the Ministry of Education expected him (1) to teach the new curriculum, (2) to inform the other teachers in the school of the Ministry's decision to change to a new history curriculum for the lower forms, (3) to explain the new curriculum to those teachers involved in the teaching of the subject, and (4) to help them use the curriculum in their classrooms. KB emphasized that it was important for the key teachers "to teach the new history curriculum more effectively". He felt that the objectives of the new curriculum could best be achieved "by making the subject more interesting and understandable to the students".

These expectations, KB pointed out, were made known to him
at the beginning of the inservice course by the key personnel. KB assumed that the above expectations still hold true at the time of the study because "I have not been informed of any changes to these expectations." KB felt that some of these expectations were unachievable, especially the last two: explaining the new curriculum and helping teachers with their teaching.

The Activities of the Key Teacher

KB pointed out that his activities as a key teacher were mostly carried out immediately after the inservice course and when he was teaching the curriculum during the first year of implementation.

Immediately after his return from the inservice course, KB, on his own initiative, informed teachers of the change. He also helped the principal select a textbook for the new curriculum. For this KB involved the other teachers in helping him select a textbook.

The first thing I did was to contact all history teachers, regardless of the form they were teaching, and the senior assistant to a small meeting to select a suitable textbook for the school. At the time we had seven textbooks that had been approved by the Ministry [of Education]. It would have been a problem if I were to scrutinise all the textbooks myself. I selected this textbook after discussing the books and getting the approval of the teachers.

The criteria he used to select the textbook were, however, similar to the ones adopted by KA.
In 1978 KB conducted several informal meetings with the teachers to discuss "more effective" way(s) of teaching the new history curriculum.

I often met with the teachers to discuss with them how we could teach the new curriculum more effectively and make it easily understood by the students because that was the first time we used it.... I also met with teachers to get their opinion and give them my views and ideas when asked. Many of the teachers were using the usual traditional methods when teaching the new history curriculum. We discussed ways and means of making the new curriculum a success; what we could do to make the subject more interesting and understandable to the students.

KB initiated these activities himself. His activities were, however, limited to providing a forum for discussion because, as he explained, "I did not feel competent about explaining and showing the teachers the various methods that they could use to make the new history curriculum more interesting and understandable."

KB made it clear that he would offer the teachers advice and guidance on matters relating to the new curriculum and its teaching only when requested by the latter. He explained that he felt more at ease in situations whereby the teachers approached him first because he was afraid that his sincere effort might be misconstrued by the teachers.

I prefer teachers to approach me instead of me going to them. Probably they might not be interested in what I have to tell them. They might even think that I am showing-off or trying to act smart.

According to KB, most of the teachers who sought his help
were concerned with the method of teaching the new history curriculum and not the content area. The advice and guidance given to the teachers were either based on his own ideas or gained from his "long experience in teaching history" and his preservice training. Very little was based on the inservice course. KB generally felt satisfied with the help he gave to these teachers.

I think they were very useful to the teachers because they have never attended the inservice course. At least they learned something from me.... The teachers were able to teach the subject better. They were usually able to complete whatever they planned to teach.

One such advice was related to the preparation of a scheme of work for the subject.

I explained to them what ought to be taught first and what ought to be taught later. Problems would arise during the mid-term examination if this [the sequence] is not determined earlier and followed by the teachers. Some teachers like to jump around from one topic to another when teaching.

Factors Influencing His Activities as a Key Teacher

Key-teacher related factors. KB indicated that the nature and extent of his activities as a key teacher were influenced greatly by his lack of knowledge of the new history curriculum, and higher priorities assigned to his other responsibilities. He was unable to explain and to show teachers the various methods because he did not know enough about it to be able to carry out these activities with confidence. He believed that to the
teachers the methodology formed the most important component of the new history curriculum.

I think the first thing the teachers ought to know about the new curriculum is the methodology; techniques of teaching that are compatible with the ability of the students.

KB indicated that though he knew about the various techniques that he could use such as field trips, most of the time he would use the traditional narrative and the question and answer methods because of the difficulties in using these methods.

It is very difficult to use other methods because we do not have enough aids. I think more suitable teaching aids should be made available to us. I do not think that even the ETV [Educational Television] offers any history program for the Form Ones. We cannot be talking all the time; the students get bored very easily, and to organize a field trip we have to inform the State Education Office about our plans, at least about a month before the trip. This is difficult. Sometimes we do not even know for sure whether we could carry out our planned field trips.

KB attributed his lack of knowledge of the new curriculum and inability to use a variety of methods in his teaching to the fact that he learned very little at the inservice course. "The inservice course failed to explain the new curriculum clearly and to equip us with the skills needed to teach the subject effectively". The absence of any follow-up activities further aggravated his inability to explain the new curriculum and to help the teachers satisfactorily.

KB was also of the opinion that his other school
responsibilities had prevented him from fulfilling his role as a key teacher. He was unable to give much time to helping the teachers because he had more important things to do. He considered it was "only natural for me to give more attention and emphasis to subject(s) that I am teaching and to those responsibilities that have been assigned to me by the principal". In 1981, for example, a great deal of his free time was used to carry out activities related to the teaching of English, one of the subjects he was assigned to teach following his return from an inservice course on the subject. A great deal of his time was also spent carrying out the work of a career and guidance teacher, a responsibility which KB viewed as important and time consuming. His concern with his responsibilities, therefore, prevented him from giving any time or effort for subjects he was not teaching.

Anticipation of future visits by the course organisers also prompted KB to give more attention to English.

After I came back from the inservice course on English [in 1980] I had to teach the subject. It was indicated at the course that the lecturers would come around to the schools to see how we were doing and to see how far we had been able to put into practice what we have learned at the inservice course.

Teacher-related factors. KB perceived that the teachers were not very willing to approach other teachers, himself included, to ask questions about the new history curriculum and the various teaching techniques and/or to seek help in overcoming their problems even though the teachers were having problems with their teaching and that history was not a teaching option for
most of these teachers. KB attributed this reluctance to two factors: the teachers' negative attitudes and their perceptions of their own teaching abilities. These factors are elaborated in the following excerpt.

I do not think these teachers put much emphasis in their teaching of history. They do not seem to take it seriously. After all history is not their teaching option.... one would expect teachers whose teaching options do not include history to encounter some problems when teaching the subject. These teachers, however, seemed very reluctant to seek help and guidance from others. They probably felt superior and, therefore, do not need the help of others.

KB remarked further that the teachers' attitudes of not taking history and its teaching seriously often led to an unwillingness on their part to put in much time and effort towards their teaching, a lack of effort in seeking ways and means of improving their teaching and/or in overcoming difficulties that they encountered. KB also thought that "the teachers possibly perceived themselves as better qualified" and, therefore, "more knowledgeable than the key teacher". The teachers, therefore, would not need the key teacher's help or advice. Even when these teachers encountered difficulties in teaching the new history curriculum, they would, in most cases, approach the senior subject teacher for history for help. "Only about one or two came to see me in the last three years".

KB believed that the teachers did face problems in their teaching of the new history curriculum and that one of the problems most commonly faced by these teachers concerned the method of teaching.
In this school, students are streamed according to their ability - the better students are put in the A, B and C classes. The weaker students are left behind and we have to use different methods to teach them. We can use the narration method for the better classes but not for the weaker classes because the latter cannot understand what we are saying. We need different ways of teaching these weaker classes. The Ministry, ...[through] the CDC could show us the various methods that could be used for these weaker classes.

KB was also of the view that the reluctance could be due to the teachers' general unwillingness to change their usual method(s) of teaching the subject.

Even if we get the teachers to try new methods of teaching, this would not last long. After a while, the teachers would revert to their usual methods of teaching.

The nature of the inservice course. KB perceived the inservice course to be ineffective in preparing him for his role as a key teacher. The only benefit he gained from the inservice course was in providing him with guidelines on how to select a textbook for the school.

KB was disappointed with the inservice course he attended because it failed to provide him with adequate information about the new curriculum, especially its methodology, and the skills needed to use the curriculum in the classroom successfully. This disappointment is reflected in the following excerpt.
Actually, I do not know much about the various methods of teaching the new curriculum because at the inservice course we were not informed of the best way to teach the subject. [Moreover] the person who conducted the course did not show us the various techniques that the teachers should use .... I do not think those working papers that were given to us helped us with our techniques of teaching.... Those papers were mostly concerned with the syllabus.

KB was of the view that the inservice course was poorly conducted. There was no variety in the mode of presentation. Only a few of the scheduled workshops materialised, and even those that did were far from satisfactory.

In the original schedule we were supposed to have workshops. This, however, was not carried out. I remembered being put into groups of six or seven to discuss a particular topic. It ended there. There was no follow-up to this.

This lack of variety, according to KB, was because only one person, the key personnel, was responsible for the inservice course.

There were not enough lecturers. Only one person [the key personnel] conducted the course from the beginning to the end. He either lectured or read his notes. It was boring.

KB criticised the key personnel for his lack of experience and ability to conduct the inservice course satisfactorily.

He was inexperienced.... He was unable to express himself clearly. The notes that he gave us were mostly in English.... Sometimes we could not even understand what he was saying because he was using direct translation [from English].
The location and the scheduling of the course was also not satisfactory to KB. He did not consider the school, where the inservice course was held, to be conducive to the learning of a new curriculum.

I feel that the place was unsuitable because the classroom used for the inservice course was not specially catered for the course. Sometimes we had to look around for available rooms if the designated room was being used or needed to be used by the students of that school.... [Moreover], the classrooms did not have the facilities needed for the course. The only thing available was the board. There was no such thing as slides or pictures.

KB also found the six days of inservice course inadequate in exposing teachers to the new curriculum.

Usually it [the inservice course] lasted from 8 am to 12.30 noon, when we had our lunch break. Since it was a new curriculum requiring new techniques of teaching, we had a lot that we wanted to ask and to discuss at the course. But there just was not enough time.

KB also pointed to the disadvantage of scheduling the inservice course for six consecutive weekends. According to KB, his past experience had convinced him of the effectiveness of having a continuous inservice course.

I once attended an inservice course at the university.... We were provided food and lodging and transportation to and from the lecture halls. This, I feel is more effective and a more adequate arrangement.... We could, [therefore], give our full attention to what was being taught [at the inservice course].

KB felt that the inservice course had been misused by the various textbook publishers and their representatives. He also felt very strongly about the amount of time spent discussing the
various working papers, thus leaving little time for discussions on the methodology.

We spent a great deal of our time discussing working papers on the new curriculum written by the various experts. Sometimes it took us two hours to discuss each paper.... I do not think this left much impact on us. We attended the course in order to learn and know more about the various methods of teaching, but we got very little from it [the inservice course].

In spite of the above shortcomings, KB found the inservice course useful in helping him with the task of selecting a suitable textbook for the school. This view is expressed in the following statement.

At the inservice course we were briefed on how to select textbooks for the new curriculum. We were also given a list of the textbooks that had been approved by the Ministry of Education.... The publishers gave us copies of their textbooks and this made our task easier.

Professional support. KB noted that the lack of professional support shown by those responsible for the implementation of the new history curriculum, in general, and for his role as a key teacher, in particular, was detrimental to his efforts in overcoming some of the problems faced by the teachers in the implementation of the new curriculum.

KB provided two reasons as to why he did not approach anybody for help or guidance. First, he was not aware at the time of the possibility of approaching people in the CDC or the State Education Office for help. Only late in the year (1978), that is, after attending the inservice course for key personnel
for the Form 2 new history curriculum did he know of the availability of such services. Second, though he knew the key personnel was available, KB made no attempts to contact the latter because he had no confidence in the ability of the key personnel.

The key personnel was unable to answer questions that were raised at the inservice course. Even if he could, the answers given were far from satisfactory. Since he could not help us then, there was no point approaching him later.

KB was also critical of the fact that no effort was made to help and to ensure that the key teacher performed his role satisfactorily. He was not informed of future visits by the course lecturers for the inservice course for the new history curriculum, unlike another inservice course which he attended later. KB considered these visits critical because "they help ensure that the ideas presented and discussed at the inservice course were carried out" as well as provide them with "the avenue to discuss problems that we face in the course of putting these ideas and suggestions into practice."

Administrative support. KB was of the opinion that even though the administrators of the school were "generally ready to give teachers the necessary support and encouragement" they failed to show much interest and concern for the new history curriculum. KB could not recall the principal asking him anything about the inservice course or requesting him to explain the new history curriculum to the other teachers in the school. KB claimed that other teachers returning from inservice courses also received the same treatment.
KB attributed the administrators' lack of interest in the key teacher and his activities to their lack of familiarity with the new history curriculum and its strategy for implementation. He thus suggested that

the principal and the senior assistant should have been asked to attend the course so that they could be more familiar with the new curriculum and its implementation in the school.

KB also felt that the administrators' lack of interest and concern could also be attributed to their practice of delegating the supervision of the various subject areas to the respective senior subject teachers. He was convinced that the administrators would only contact the senior subject teacher directly in matters relating to the teaching of the subject under the latter's supervision. This emphasis and importance placed on the senior subject teacher could, according to KB, stand in the way of closer contact between the administrators and the other teachers in the school. KB recalled an incident which led him to believe that the principal of his school was generally unwilling to meet teachers other than the senior subject teachers.

Once I prepared a daily lesson plan which included the teaching of three topics in one period. Instead of seeing me, he [the principal] called in the senior subject teacher asking him to explain the reason for my plan to teach too many topics in one day [period] and whether these could be completed in 35 minutes. The senior subject teacher, in turn, approached me for clarification.

The importance of the senior subject teacher was also recognized by the teachers in the school. According to KB, "the teachers would approach the senior subject teacher [for history] if they
had any problems with their teaching." In view of the leadership provided by the senior subject teacher for history in matters relating to the teaching of the subject, KB suggested that perhaps "the senior subject teacher should have attended the inservice course instead of myself, or both of us should have gone". He believed that by becoming a key teacher, the senior subject teacher could play a more effective leadership role in the implementation of the new history curriculum in the school.

The Administration of the school. KB observed that the nature of his teaching assignment -- whether or not he was assigned to teach the new history curriculum -- influenced his ability to fulfil his role of teaching the new curriculum as well as to carry out other key teacher-related activities. He believed that most of the teachers would seek his ideas and help only when he was teaching the new curriculum along with them.

They [the teachers] came to see me when they had problems, but this mostly took place only in 1978 when I was teaching the subject. They hardly approached me after that.

Through teaching, KB was able to maintain constant contact with the teachers teaching the subject as well as be familiar with the problems faced by the teachers. Teachers, therefore, felt more at ease about seeking his help or advice or about discussing the new history curriculum with him. KB also pointed out that contact between him and the teachers became increasingly rare since his assignment to the morning session.
There is very limited contact between the morning and the afternoon teachers. We seldom meet each other. By the time the afternoon teachers arrive in the school, it is nearly time for the morning teachers to go home. We do not have much opportunity to interact and to develop a closer relationship.

Key teacher B gave several reasons as to why he thought he was not assigned to teach the new curriculum.

First, due to the inadequate supply of certain types of teachers, the school administrators had been forced to juggle teachers around to ensure that all the subjects offered by the schools were being taught to the students.

Sometimes the Ministry did not really inquire into the needs of the schools before sending teachers to these schools. As a result, we sometimes had too many teachers who specialized in a particular subject and not enough teachers in other subjects. To avoid some subjects not being taught because of a lack of qualified teachers, teachers were assigned to teach subjects that were not even their option.

Second, he was assigned to teach English in 1980 and 1981 after attending a six-month inservice course on the teaching of English. It was inevitable that he should be teaching the subject which was dealt with in the latest inservice course he attended. The commitment to assign him to teach English was further enhanced because the inservice course lecturers would be coming around to the schools to see how the former course participants were faring in teaching the subject.

Third, he was assigned to teach in the morning session even though the new curriculum was taught in the afternoon session.
because "as a career and guidance teacher I have to teach in the morning".

Fourth, he was teaching Form 2 in 1979 after teaching the new history curriculum at Form 1 in 1978. KB claimed that it was normal for those preparing the timetable to follow a procedure whereby teachers would follow their students into the next form in the following year. This procedure is explained in the following excerpt.

Usually, those responsible for preparing the timetable would assign a teacher who had been teaching the Form 1 history to move up with the students and teach them history the following year. Thus a teacher is not expected to teach the same form for several years. After teaching at Form 2, the teacher would be asked to teach at Form 1, that is, if he has the ability to teach at that level. If not, he would go back to teach at Form 1.

KB also noted that the time which he could spend on the new history curriculum depended on his other teaching assignments. He felt that if he, or for that matter any of the other history teachers, were to give more emphasis and attention to the subject, he should have been given a more manageable teaching load.

The administrator could either assign us to teach history only, or if the teachers need to be given other subjects, let these be the less important ones such as civics and physical education. Sometimes, besides history, we have to teach language which is a heavy subject. We have a lot of correction to do.
THE TEACHERS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS

Six teachers from School B were involved in the study. They will hereafter be called B1, B2, B3, B4, B5 and B6. The first four teachers were teaching the new history curriculum at the Form 1 level at the time of the study while the last two taught the subject the previous year. B2 was the only teacher who had taught the new history curriculum for two years.

The professional background of the teachers is given in Table 11. The teachers differ in their professional qualifications, teaching options and their experiences in teaching the new history curriculum. Except for B3, who is a graduate teacher, the other teachers are all college-trained. Only B5 and B6 have history as one of their teaching options during training. Their teaching experience range from less than a year to more than eleven years. All have not attended any inservice course. Other pertinent features of each teacher and their awareness of the existence of the key teacher (KB) are outlined below.

B1 has been teaching the new history curriculum ever since she came to the school in early 1981. This was her first teaching assignment after completing her teacher training at one of the colleges where she specialized in the teaching of commerce. According to B1, her contact with KB was limited to the occasional encounters and smiles of acknowledgement along the school corridors. She knew from friends that KB had attended an inservice course on the new history curriculum. However, she did not know KB was a key teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Total Experience</th>
<th>Years in Present School History</th>
<th>Teaching NHC* (Year Awarded)</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Teaching Options</th>
<th>Inservice Courses Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| KB   | 11+              | 5-10                           | 5-10                          | 1 (1978)      | Certificate B. Malaysia History | 1970 - Special Malay Classes  
1971 - ESL**  
1972 - B. Malaysia as second language  
1978 - NHC* (as key teacher)  
1979 - NHC* (as key personnel)  
1980 - ESL**  
1981 - Guidance & counselling |
| B1   | 1                | 1                              | 1                             | 1 (1981)      | Certificate Commerce | None |
| B2   | 2                | 2                              | 2                             | 2 (1980-81)   | Certificate English Arts Education | None |
| B3   | 1/2              | 1/2                            | 1/2                           | 1/2 (1981)    | Degree +Diploma Islamic Studies Civics | None |
| B4   | 5-10             | 1                              | 1                             | 1 (1981)      | Certificate Modern Maths | None |
| B5   | 11+              | 11+                            | 11+                           | 1 (1980)      | Certificate B. Malaysia History | None |
| B6   | 3                | 3                              | 2                             | 1 (1980)      | Certificate B. Malaysia History | None |

Notes: ** = new history curriculum at Form 1  
** = English as a Second Language
B2 has been teaching in School B since her graduation from a teacher training college in 1980. She has been assigned to teach the new history curriculum at Form 1 ever since she started teaching even though it is not her teaching option. She knew KB as one of the teachers in the school only after she (B2) has been teaching for about a year.

B3, the only graduate teacher among the teachers from School B who participated in the study, has been teaching in School B ever since she graduated in May 1981. Like B1 and B2, she has been assigned to teach the new history curriculum even though history is not one of her subject options. She did not know KB, not even as a teacher in the school because KB was teaching in the morning session and she in the afternoon.

B4 is a college-trained, mathematics teacher who has been a teacher for the past six years. When she came to School B in January 1981, she was assigned to teach the new history curriculum. This is her first experience at teaching the subject. Like B2, the only thing she knew about KB was the fact that the latter was one of the teachers in the school.

B5, also a college-trained teacher, has been teaching since 1965 but has not attended any inservice course in those sixteen years of teaching. She has many years of experience teaching history, it being one of her teaching options. Her experience with the new history curriculum at the Form 1 level was, however, limited to one year in 1980. She knew KB quite well, having been teaching together for a number of years. She also knew about KB's attendance at the inservice course but not as a key teacher.
and had consulted the latter regarding the new history curriculum.

B6, whose teaching option includes history, had her first exposure to the new history curriculum while undergoing her teacher training at college. She taught the new history curriculum at Form 1 for only a year in 1980. She knew KB ever since she came to the school in 1979, the year she was assigned together with KB to teach the new history curriculum at Form 2. As a newly-qualified teacher, B6 had approached KB several times for assistance with her teaching. Despite such contact, B6 was unaware of KB's attendance at the inservice course on the new history curriculum and of his role as a key teacher.

Thus, the teachers differed in their awareness of the key teacher in the school. Nobody knew KB as a key teacher. Only B1 and B5 were aware that KB had attended a course on the new history curriculum. B2, B4 and B6 knew KB only as a fellow teacher. B3 did not even know that KB existed.

The Role Expected of the Key Teacher by the Ministry of Education

Out of the six teachers in School B who were included in the study, only B5 had some form of expectation for the key teacher in the school. She perceived that the Ministry of Education would expect KB to disseminate knowledge about the new history curriculum to the other teachers teaching the subject and to help them in their effort at using the curriculum in their classrooms. In her own words:
He [KB] should show teachers how to implement the curriculum. He is more knowledgeable than any of us because he is the only one who has attended the inservice course.... He needs to show teachers better and more effective ways of teaching the subject; ways that could help overcome the difficulties faced in teaching the weaker classes. This is very important because history can easily become boring if not taught well.

This expectation represented B5's own perception of what she thought the Ministry of Education would expect from a teacher who had attended an inservice course on a new curriculum. These expectations emerged in early 1980 when she first learned of KB's attendance at the particular inservice course and when she was assigned, for the first time, to teach the new history curriculum at the Form 1 level. B5 continued to maintain these expectations.

B1 was the only other teacher in the school who was aware of KB's attendance at the inservice course. However, unlike B5, she admitted having expected nothing of KB because she felt that it was "customary for teachers who attended inservice courses not to do anything on their return to the school".

The other four teachers did not expect anything from KB because none of them was aware of his attendance at the inservice course or his status as a key teacher.
B5 was the only teacher in School B who reported the existence of key teacher-related activities in the school. These activities included that of explaining the new history curriculum to the senior subject teacher and helping B5 with her scheme of work. The other teachers were unable to recall any activities, be these key teacher-initiated or teacher-initiated.

B5 assumed that the key teacher, being the most knowledgeable about the new curriculum must have explained the new history curriculum to the senior subject teacher who in turn "showed us the new syllabus and the new textbook. He [the senior subject teacher] explained to us the new syllabus and its emphasis on local studies such as our culture and customs". B5 noted that the task of explaining the new curriculum fell on the shoulders of the senior subject teacher. Since the key teacher was no longer teaching the subject at the time, he was in no position to carry out the explaining. To enable the senior subject teacher to do this, the key teacher "must have briefed the senior subject teacher about the new history curriculum prior to the subject meeting", where the explaining took place. This meeting was held in the beginning of 1980, the year B5 taught the subject.

The other activity was related to B5's effort at preparing a scheme of work for the new history curriculum. According to B5, KB had helped her with the task in response to her queries on the matter. The following excerpt shows the events which led to the above activity.
During the subject meeting, I was assigned by the senior subject teacher to prepare the scheme of work for the form. Since this was the first time I taught the subject, I went to see...[KB] to ask him for the syllabus and how to plan the scheme of work. He [KB] showed me the new syllabus and how to use the syllabus to guide me in drawing up the scheme of work.

B5 considered KB's guidance useful to the extent that it "provided me with guidelines on how to prepare the scheme of work", her immediate need. But overall "it did not leave much impact on me, on my teaching" because "the meeting was too short" and that "the discussion was limited to the syllabus and the scheme of work". According to B5,

I was mostly on my own ever since that meeting. I simply used the textbook and the syllabus to help me prepare the scheme of work, which I later distributed to the other teachers.

Factors Influencing the Activities of the Key Teacher

Teacher-related factors. Teacher-related factors which influenced the activities of KB include the teachers' awareness of the existence of the key teacher, their satisfaction with their teaching, their tendency to cope with problems by approaching teachers from within their small group, working on their own or by ignoring the problems, and their lack of knowledge of the new history curriculum. These factors made the key teacher almost irrelevant.

Teachers have to be aware of the existence of the key
teacher to be able to stimulate his activities beneficially.

None of the teachers knew of KB's special role as a key teacher for the new history curriculum. Most of these teachers noted that they might have sought the help and advice of the key teacher had they known of his existence as a key teacher.

The teachers, except B1, were generally satisfied with their teaching and, therefore, did not need any help and guidance. This satisfaction is well illustrated in the following statements by B3, who said:

I feel that I could teach the subject....
I use my own techniques.... I followed the scheme of work that I found in the record book of the teacher who left the school. I just continued where the teacher left off.

They perceived that it was important to understand the new content area, and that the textbook was adequate in providing them with this information. Additional information could be obtained from other books.

The teachers in School B also believed that the understanding of methodology was also important to teaching. For those teachers whose options were not history, the main problem was in finding more effective ways of teaching, in order to make the subject interesting and lively especially to the weaker classes. The existence of the problem is evident in the following statements.

B1: I tried several ways so as not to make the students bored. I narrate the stories and events to them. If they did not understand, I would then ask them to explain certain terminologies or words.
If they are unable to explain I would then try to explain by using gestures. Sometimes I ran out of ideas. I did not know what else to do. What I did recently was to ask them [the students] to read paragraph by paragraph [from the textbook] and after each paragraph I explained the contents to them. The students seemed more interested in following my teaching. ....I have been using this approach for the past four or five days. But I was told by one of the history-option teachers that it was not the right way to teach the subject.

B3: My problem is with the techniques of teaching; how to capture the interests of the students. I am teaching the F and G classes [the weakest classes].... I tried to motivate them by giving them notes and asking them questions.

The two history-option teachers, B5 and B6, did not, however, perceive methodology to be a major problem. They employed whatever methods they thought were feasible.

B5: I always try to find out what they [the students] know. However, this [technique] could not be used with the weaker classes. It is very difficult to capture the interest of these students because some of them could not even read or write. So I ended up by doing the talking most of the time: giving them but not getting anything back.

B6: I question the students, use their responses as starting points, and then provide them the contents. I usually ask the students to read at home first. After explaining to the students I would then question them. I tried to get the students to act out certain historical scenes but I was unable to get any response from them. They are too shy.

Besides the textbook, only teaching aids such as maps and charts were used, the teachers did not have much choice in the
aids they used because there were only a few types of aids available.

B5: We do not have too many teaching aids for history available in the market. There are no films.... There are very limited aids and resources that we can use to capture the students' interests. If a teacher wants to use pictures or charts in her teaching, she has to make them herself.

B6: Most of the time, I use charts drawn on manilla cardboards.... As far as I know, there are no ready-made aids available for history. Those maps that we usually use belong to geography.

B3 was not aware of the availability of other aids in the school. Her choice of teaching aids was limited to those she could get hold of or make herself.

I only use these [maps and charts]. I do not know if there are any other aids available for our use. I have never been to the room where all the teaching aids are kept.

The feeling of satisfaction with their teaching was enhanced by the conviction that they have done their best in view of the many constraints they encountered and that their problems could eventually be settled one way or another. When problems related to content area or methodology arose, the teachers approached the other teachers for help or tried to overcome these difficulties by themselves or even ignored them. Most of the teachers approached other teachers teaching the new history curriculum, or others whom they knew to have experience teaching the subject.

B3: Whenever I have problems I would ask...[B4] and...[B2]. I also inquired
about how they taught certain topics....
They are more experienced than I am.
....[B2], for example, has been teaching
the subject for the past two years. So
she knows the content and the techniques
of teaching better than I do.... She
explained the various techniques she used
and at times she even gave me her notes.

B1: I receive help mostly from my friends.
Sometimes I asked my housemate because
history is her option. She showed me
several methods that I could use to teach
the subject.

Most of the time the teachers appeared to consult B5, the
most senior teacher among the group of history teachers teaching
in the afternoon session and whom the group regarded as their
"informal leader".

B3: I always ask...[B5]. She is like our
leader.... Being the most senior history
teacher around. She taught the new
history curriculum at Form 1 last year
[1980].... [Since] history is her option
she is able to help us with our problems.
[Moreover], she is always around. She is
teaching in the afternoon too.

B4: I usually approach...[B5] for help in
overcoming my problems.... She is a
history teacher by training and has been
teaching for many years. She is also
very easy to contact because she is always around.

In addition to consulting B5, B6 would also try to overcome
whatever difficulties on her own.

I try to overcome them [the problems]
myself. I constantly refer to these
books [reference books] that I bought
myself. I also discuss my problems
with...[B5]. She is a very experienced
teacher.

B5 claimed that teachers have been told by the senior
subject teacher to manage on their own.

The senior subject teacher left the teaching to us. At the subject meeting, he told us to use our own initiative.... We did not discuss anything about teaching aids. Each teacher was expected to use whatever aids he thought best. She just told us to coordinate our examinations, to use similar schemes of work and to use aids for our teaching.

Discussions and consultations about the new history curriculum and its teaching were, therefore, restricted to the small group of teachers teaching the subject and those teaching in the afternoon session who had previously taught the subject. They did not approach teachers such as the key teacher who were 'outside' the group.

B3 ignored her problem of lack of information on certain topics. She taught with whatever information was available.

If I could not find the additional information, I would teach whatever I could find in the textbook.... I teach whatever I know.... I put more emphasis on...[my subject option]. I consider my assignment to teach history as just to fulfil the requirements of the timetable.

B5 argued that the teachers' lack of knowledge about the new history curriculum prevented them from asking the key teacher, and others, for explanation or clarification about the new history curriculum. As he put it, "if the teachers did not know anything about it [the new history curriculum], how could they ask questions?" The teachers in School B, except for B5 and B6, felt that an indepth knowledge about the rationale, assumptions and goals of the new history curriculum was not critical to teaching.
Key teacher-related factors. The teachers in School B perceived KB to be very busy with his teaching and counselling responsibilities. KB's assignment to the morning session rendered him inaccessible to the teachers teaching the new history curriculum offered in the afternoon session. His non-teaching of the new history curriculum was seen as reducing his obligation and responsibility to the subject. Most of the teachers thought that KB was reserved and uninterested in his role as key teacher.

(i) The workload of the key teacher. Most of the teachers in School B felt that the key teacher's teaching responsibility as well as his responsibility as a career and guidance teacher had kept him very busy. He had very little time to indulge in other activities. The teachers also considered that the key teacher's participation in many other inservice courses had increased his responsibilities. The views about the key teacher's busy schedule are evident in the following excerpts.

B1: He probably felt pressured for time. He had attended other courses after the one on the new history curriculum. He must be busy. With so many things to do, he must have forgotten about his responsibility as a key teacher.

B4: He has other responsibilities to shoulder and these are obviously more important to him. After attending that English course, he has to carry out whatever he has been assigned to do.... He needs a lot of time to carry out that very time consuming job as a career and guidance teacher.

B5: He is always ready to help but I do not think he could find the time to get the teachers together for discussions.
(2) The key teacher's teaching assignment. Most of the teachers were of the opinion that the key teacher's assignment to teach a different subject at a different level and in a different session reduced the opportunity for them to meet and to get to know the key teacher and consequently to get his advice and help on the new history curriculum. The following statements testify to this.

B1: We never had the opportunity to meet him because he never came to the school in the afternoon.

B2: We seldom meet or come into contact with each other.

B3: How could we approach him when he is not teaching the subject.

Even if the key teacher were to teach in the afternoon session, neither the teachers nor the key teacher have the time to get together. The reason for this is best explained by B5 who said,

We do not have the time to discuss. Everybody is busy with their own teaching responsibilities. [Moreover], our free periods do not coincide. Even if they do, I do not think we could use that time for discussions with the key teacher. We have too many other things to do such as correcting students' work.

In addition to decreasing the opportunity for key teacher-teacher interaction, the key teacher's non-teaching of the new history curriculum was also seen as reducing the key teacher's obligation, responsibility and attention towards the subject.
B3: He probably feels that since he is now teaching other subjects, he is no longer responsible for the subject [the new history curriculum].

B5: He is not giving much attention to the subject because he is not teaching it. He would have given the subject more emphasis had he been teaching it.

(3) **Personal characteristics of the key teacher.** Almost all the teachers suggested that the key teacher's very reserved nature constituted a major obstacle to closer contact between the teachers and the key teacher. The teachers indicated that they hardly knew the key teacher because the latter seldom mixed with them.

B1: He is a very quiet person and very shy too. That is why he would not ask or approach other teachers.

B6: He is very quiet and reserved. He keeps to himself most of the time. He is seldom seen in the staff room; he is in the general office most of the time. This prevents us from seeing or meeting him. He should not feel shy about approaching teachers and discussing things with them.

Despite his very reserved nature, B5 found KB to be responsive and helpful when approached. B5, the only teacher who had approached KB to get his advice on the new history curriculum believed that KB
is always willing to help....[but] the teachers do not approach him. You would not expect him to come forward to explain without being asked.

The teachers argued that a key teacher should be interested in his role and in the new history curriculum and its teaching. These teachers, however, perceived that KB did not possess the above quality. According to B3,

He is simply not interested.... He could have contacted the teachers if he wanted to. But he did not make any effort to contact the teachers teaching in the afternoon.

The teachers gave two reasons for the key teacher's alleged lack of interest in carrying out his role: lack of interest in attending the inservice course and KB's emphasis on English.

B1: He must have been forced to go to the course. It is like us too; if somebody forced us to do something we would just ignore it.

B6: I think he is more interested in English. After all it is his teaching option.

Administrative Support. The teachers thought that the school administrators were not interested in, and did not provide support for the key teacher and his role. This perceived attitude was evident in the administrators' failure to inform teachers of the presence and role of the key teacher in the school, to supervise the activities of the key teacher, and to provide the opportunity for regular key teacher-teacher meetings to discuss the new history curriculum and its teaching. The teachers also identified the administrators' lack of emphasis in
the teaching of history and the complete delegation of curriculum-related matters such as subject meetings to the senior subject teacher, as contributing to the administrators' apathy toward the key teacher.

The teachers felt that the administrators' negative attitude toward the key teacher and the new history curriculum was evident in their failure to introduce the key teacher formally to the teachers and to suggest that they contact the key teacher to discuss their concerns or problems relating to the teaching of the new history curriculum. Such neglect, according to the teachers, was a sharp contrast to that involving the senior subject teacher. The senior subject teacher was not only formally introduced to the teachers but his responsibility was also elaborated. This contrast led B1 to observe that:

if the key teacher had been the senior subject teacher he would have succeeded in getting more things done. He might have taken his role more seriously.... We all know who the senior subject teacher is because the principal formally introduced him to us.... It would have been better had the senior subject teacher been the key teacher too.

The teachers considered the announcement or directives from the principal or the senior assistant important because, as B6 put it,

We have to follow directives. We cannot do something unless we have been directed to do so by the principal.

The administrators' lack of interest in the key teacher was also apparent in their failure to take the necessary steps to ensure that the key teacher performed his role. According to B4,
"If the principal had supervised the key teacher, he [the key teacher] would have been pressured to carry out the necessary activities". B4 went on to say that this lack of recognition and supervision of the key teacher by the administrators "could have encouraged him [the key teacher] to remain silent because he perceived that nobody really cared whether he performs his role".

The lack of support, according to the teachers, was also evident in the administrator's neglect to provide the teachers and the key teacher with the time to meet and to discuss the new history curriculum. The teachers claimed that closer contact between them and the key teacher was not only hindered by the administrator's failure to assign the key teacher to teach in the same session as the teachers but also by the latter's failure to allocate a special time whereby the teachers could get together regularly with the key teacher to discuss ways of alleviating whatever problems and concerns they had.

The teachers also noted that the administrator's apparent lack of interest in the key teacher and his activities could, in part, be attributed to the former's attitude towards history and its teaching. These teachers felt very strongly about the importance of assigning the key teacher and history-option teachers to teach the new history curriculum.

B6 was concerned about the need of a special room for history. "It is difficult to organize activities for the students or discussions or even to store out teaching aids if we do not have a room for history". She viewed the absence of such a room in the school as evident of the administrator's lack of
interest in the subject.

The administrator's assignment of low priority for the subject was also evident in the manner the principal treated B1 when the latter approached him about a change in her teaching assignment. The following excerpt is B1's description of that encounter.

I was new here. History is not my option. So when I was assigned to teach history, I approached the principal and told him 'history is not my subject option. I do not know how to teach it'. Guess what he said; 'It is all right. You are only teaching at the Form 1 level. It is just like eating peanuts'. He thinks it is very easy and that I would not have any problem. I have to follow what he said.

Despite the administrators' low priority for history, B5 felt that the administrators were generally responsive to teachers' needs for resource materials for teaching.

The school provides materials such as magic pen, manilla cardboards... maps and charts. There is no problem getting the school to buy teaching aids; the only problems is that there is nothing available for sale.

The teachers also felt that the administrator's lack of interest in the key teacher could be because the former had delegated matters pertaining to history and its teaching to the senior subject teacher. The senior subject teacher was the one responsible for the scheduling and chairing of subject meetings.

\[12\] A Malaysian expression which means 'very easy'
and also in determining the agenda. Teachers who have attended these meetings, had not, so far, found them helpful to their teaching. They have not benefited much from these meetings because the meetings dealt mainly with routine matters such as examinations and schemes of work instead of providing teachers with the opportunity to discuss the new history curriculum, their concerns and problems with the other teachers and to seek suggestions and solutions to these problems. Despite their dissatisfaction with the outcome of these meetings, the teachers were reluctant to make known their views on the matter. According to B5, teachers tended to adhere to any decisions made by the senior subject teacher.

It is up to the senior subject teacher whether or not to call subject meetings because he [the principal] had delegated this responsibility to the senior subject teacher. We teachers are simply the followers.

THE ADMINISTRATOR AND HIS PERCEPTIONS

The administrator, hereby denoted as AB, has been a senior assistant in the school since the beginning of 1980. He has been in the teaching profession since 1958; during his 24-year service, he took a three-year leave to pursue a degree course in a local university and has graduated.
The Role Expected of the Key Teacher by the Ministry of Education

AB's perception of the role expected of the key teacher was expressed in very general terms: "to carry out successfully whatever he [the key teacher] had been directed to do on his return to the school". He assumed that the organizer of the inservice course attended by the key teacher, and for that matter any other inservice course, would have assigned the key teacher certain tasks or responsibilities which he had to carry out. The Ministry of Education had hoped to see changes taking place in the schools. Such a change could be in the form of delivery of a new content area to the students as was the case with the new history curriculum.

AB, pointed out that the Ministry would likely expect the key teacher to teach the new history curriculum. AB's emphasis was, however, more on the teaching of the new content area and not the key teacher's ability to teach the subject more effectively.

The Activities of the Key Teacher

AB noted that since coming to the school in 1980, he has not noticed the key teacher carrying out any kind of activities that were related to the teaching of the new history curriculum at Form 1. He has not seen KB approaching any of the teachers to help them or initiating discussions with the teachers. He had, however, seen one or two of the teachers teaching the new history curriculum approaching KB during their free periods. He was uncertain about the purpose of these encounters; "these teachers
could have gone to see KB to seek his advice or opinion on the new history curriculum.

AB was unable to say much about the activities involving the key teacher because "I worked mostly during the morning session and my contact with the afternoon session teachers is restricted to assigning subjects for them to teach". With regard to KB's teaching of the new history curriculum, AB explained that "in my two years as senior assistant, I have not assigned him [KB] to teach history at Form 1".

Factors Influencing the Activities of the Key Teacher

AB felt that the key teacher never lacked the support of the school administrators and that the key teacher's teaching assignment should not influence his ability to carry out his role. He considered the key teacher's lack of self-confidence, negative attitude and heavy workload to be the main reasons behind the inability of the latter to carry out his role as a key teacher.

The administration of the school. AB indicated that conditions in the school were a major determinant in the arrangement of the school's timetable. The shortage of qualified teachers in certain areas had forced him to shuffle teachers around in order to ensure that all subjects were being taught to students. According to him, it was not uncommon to see teachers teaching subjects that were not their teaching options. AB pointed to the case of KB who was asked to teach English even though English was not KB's teaching option. AB continued to
assign KB to teach English because the latter "had attended an inservice course on the subject and is, therefore, qualified to teach English" at the lower secondary level.

AB, however, viewed KB's first assignment to teach in the morning session as coincidental.

The teacher who taught English at Form 3 [morning session] had just left to attend a course at the time, he [KB] came back from the [English] course...[and] happened to be suitable for the position that had just been vacated. So we put him there in the morning.

AB did not perceive KB's non-teaching of the new history curriculum at the Form 1 level or his assignment to teach in the morning instead of in the afternoon to be an important barrier to the latter's fulfilment of his role as a key teacher. AB contended that KB "is still in touch with the subject. He is teaching history at Form 3 and quite a number of classes for that matter". The difference in teaching schedule "could have made contact difficult but not impossible". The fact that no specific time was allocated to the key teacher to enable him to plan his activities or to meet the teachers was also not perceived by AB as an important barrier.

I do not think you could consider his [KB's] assignment to the morning session to be a major obstacle. True, he might have less time to meet the teachers but he could have taken one period to get the teachers together and explain the curriculum to them.... We always give our full cooperation. We do not have any problem about lack of cooperation from the teachers.

AB also expressed his readiness to support the key teacher.
and provide him with whatever facilities needed, so long as the school could afford them. He indicated his willingness not only to "grant the key teacher permission to take time off to meet the other teachers, [but also] to buy teaching aids and provide facilities such as for field trips, if the teachers requested them".

AB was satisfied with the teaching of the new history curriculum in the school even though most of the teachers were not history-option teachers.

We follow closely whatever is found in the syllabus. The teachers have succeeded in their teaching. They have not deviated from the goals of the Ministry of Education with regard to the teaching of the new history curriculum in the school.

**Key teacher-related factors.** AB pointed out that KB's lack of self confidence, negative attitude and heavy workload could have prevented the latter from carrying out his responsibility as a key teacher.

AB was of the opinion that KB lacked the confidence to explain the new history curriculum to the teachers and help them with their teaching because he did not possess adequate knowledge and skills to do it. Based on the information that he obtained from KB about the inservice course, AB was convinced that the inservice course had failed to prepare KB adequately for his role.
He [KB] told me that he did not feel that he learned much from the course because the person who conducted the course was at the same level as the other teachers. He [the key personnel] should have been better qualified. Since the course did not provide him with anything new, he [KB] was unable to explain [the new history curriculum]. It would have been better had the course organisers explained the curriculum to the teachers.... The [inservice] course was concerned mainly with explaining the content of the new curriculum.... I do not think the teacher [KB] would have neglected his responsibility had the course been of a higher quality. If he did not learn anything, how would you expect him to explain it [the new history curriculum] to the teachers.

AB was also of the opinion that KB's lack of interest towards his role and the inservice course could have prevented him from carrying out any activities related to the implementation of the new history curriculum. "Probably he did not regard the course too seriously. He attended the course just for the fun of it".

AB also considered KB's heavy workload as a factor contributing to the latter's inability to give much attention to the new history curriculum and his role as a key teacher. He pointed out that KB "must be pressed for time" and "probably has too much responsibilities to shoulder".
CHAPTER 7
SCHOOL C

DESCRIPTION OF SCHOOL C

The School: An Overview

School C, a Category C school and one of two secondary schools in the district, is situated about 54 kilometres south of Kuala Lumpur. The school offers Remove Class to Form 5. Its Form 4 class started in 1980 followed by a Form 5 class in 1981. Since its establishment in 1971 until 1979, the school has only catered to the lower secondary level. Students who wished to continue with their education had to attend upper secondary schools elsewhere.

Out of the total enrolment of 791, 54.6 percent attended the morning session (Forms 2-5) and the rest (Remove-Form 1) attended the afternoon session. There are almost as many male as there are female students. The school has 25 classes, 14 of which are in the morning session. A breakdown of the students and the classes are provided in Table 12.

As with Schools A and B, School C faces a shortage of classrooms. Since there are fourteen classrooms to accommodate the fourteen classes in the morning session, there is, therefore, no space available for non-teaching activities. School C also
Table 12
A Profile of the Students in School C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lacks science laboratories; therefore, only Forms 4 and 5 arts classes are offered. Students who wish to pursue their studies in the sciences have to transfer to other schools.

The students in the school mostly come from low-income families, their parents being self-employed or working as labourers in rubber estates or tin mines and earning around M$250 per month.

School Personnel

Teachers. The teaching staff comprises 6 graduate, 1 diploma and 33 certificate teachers. Twenty four of the teachers are teaching in the morning session. There are 22 male teachers. School C is the only school involved in the study where male teachers outnumber female teachers.

The teachers congregate in a small staff room located
adjacent to the school cafeteria. The former staff room which is larger compared to the one they presently occupy and which is situated in the main school building has been converted into a classroom. Relationships among the teachers seem cordial. Interactions between the morning and afternoon teachers and among the afternoon teachers are, however, constrained by the size of the staff room. Since the present staff room is too small to accommodate both morning and afternoon teachers, the afternoon supervisor and a few of the afternoon teachers, including the key teacher and the teacher included in the study (C1) use other available space to rest and to prepare for their lessons. The afternoon supervisor and the key teacher occupy a partitioned back part of one of the classrooms which is located on the second floor of one of the classroom blocks. Teacher C1 and two other colleagues make use of a very small room located adjacent to the room occupied by the afternoon supervisor and the key teacher.

The administrators. Both the principal and the senior assistant have been in the school since 1980. They assumed similar administrative posts in other schools prior to coming to School C. The afternoon supervisor, the administrator involved in this study, was appointed to the position in 1980, after he returned from a year-long inservice course. As with the afternoon supervisor in School A, he was selected to participate in the study because of his familiarity with the key teacher and the teacher included in the study, and with the key personnel strategy used for implementation.
THE KEY TEACHER AND HIS PERCEPTIONS

The key teacher, hereafter referred to as KC, is college-trained and specializes in history as one of his teaching options. He has been teaching in School C ever since he graduated in 1977. In his five years of teaching he has attended three inservice courses, two of which are related to the teaching of the new history curriculum. In 1977, he attended a course for key teachers on the implementation of the new history curriculum at Form 1 and a similar course for Form 2 the following year.

The Role Expected of him as A Key Teacher

KC perceived his role as a key teacher to include that of informing teachers of the forthcoming change in the curriculum and teaching the new curriculum. According to KC, nobody told him to carry out any of the above two activities. His perception of what he was expected to do on his return to the school was the result of his own interpretation of what ought to be done to help the Ministry achieve the objectives of the new history curriculum.

Nobody told us to do anything after the course.... At the inservice course we were informed of the [Ministry's] hope that the objectives of the new history curriculum would be achieved.

Moreover, KC perceived that it was only natural to expect a teacher to teach the subject dealt with at the inservice course that he recently attended if the teacher was to utilize whatever knowledge and skills he acquired at the course.

KC's perception remained unchanged from the time he attended
the course until the time of this study. He continued to believe that nothing much was expected of him as a key teacher. His view of the inservice course as a means of improving only the teacher's knowledge and ability also has not changed throughout the years. KC attributed the absence of any follow-up activities that could have changed or modified his views as the main reason behind his unfaltering perception of his role as a key teacher for the new history curriculum.

His Activities as a Key Teacher

The activities that KC engaged in were similar to those carried out by the other key teachers included in the study. KC taught the new history curriculum in 1980 and 1981 and helped in the selection of a textbook.

KC also provided help and guidance to the teachers when requested by the latter. The nature of the help was, therefore, dependent on the needs and problems of the teachers concerned. According to KC, he helped to explain and clarify the contents of the new history curriculum which were unclear or which the teachers found to be inadequate for teaching. Informal discussions with the teachers about the new history curriculum and its teaching took place frequently. KC further noted that these discussions or helping activities took place anywhere and anytime there was a need for them, such as on the way to classes, during breaks and free periods and also at home. Most of these activities, however, took place after July 1981, that is, when the school's timetable was revised to allow for another teacher
to teach the new curriculum with him at Form 1. For the first half of 1981 and the whole of 1980, he was the only teacher teaching history at Form 1. Before 1980, he helped when requested by the teachers teaching history at Form 1 at the time.

KC viewed the helping activities to be of great help in overcoming the problems faced by the teachers in the preparation for, and the teaching of, the new history curriculum in the classroom. KC noted that these activities were aimed at helping teachers overcome whatever problems they were facing because the activities originated with the teachers, that is, they arose out of the needs of the teachers.

KC also mentioned helping his colleague by offering the latter the use of his notes and teaching aids, such as maps and charts. He felt that "by making these resources available to other teachers, I could help them save time and energy towards their preparation".

KC was also involved in helping teachers with the preparation of a scheme of work for the subject.

When this teacher approached me for help in drawing up his scheme of work for the new curriculum in 1978, I gave him my own draft copy. I prepared this scheme of work in anticipation of being assigned to teach the subject.

KC regarded his efforts at helping the teachers with their schemes of work as very useful because schemes of work formed an essential component of a teacher's work.
This scheme of work is required for all teachers. It has become a tradition. The same scheme of work can be used every year. Changes are made only when there is a change in the curriculum.

KC also considered the scheme of work useful in ensuring that teachers follow a similar sequence of topics in their teaching of the subject.

It helps ease the task of those teachers entrusted with preparing the mid-term or end-of-year examination for the subject. These teachers had to make sure that only topics that have been taught to the students would be included in the examination. Teachers could help ensure some degree of uniformity in what they are teaching if they follow their scheme of work closely.

Though KC perceived the above activity as useful in facilitating the setting of examination questions, he did not feel that it helped the teachers in their teaching of the subject and in learning of the new curriculum.

Factors Influencing His Activities as a Key Teacher

In Malaysian schools, teachers are required to have a scheme of work for every subject they teach at the various levels. It has become part and parcel of the teachers' job. A scheme of work represents a working plan for teachers and consists of a sequence of topics scheduled on the basis of school terms (three per year), months and weeks.
**Key teacher-related factors.** According to KC, his activities were mostly related to the teaching of the new history curriculum because he believed that, through teaching he would be able to help the Ministry achieve the objectives of the new history curriculum. His concern with teaching was also influenced by his views of the inservice course as a vehicle for exposing him to the new history curriculum and his conviction that "the course... was only for my own self". KC pointed out that other, non-teaching activities such as helping teachers, were, therefore, carried out on his own initiative.

KC explained that he would not offer to explain the new history curriculum or to help teachers with their teaching of the new history curriculum because not only did he not perceive it to be his role but also because he did not feel capable of doing so. Like the other key teachers, he would wait for the teachers to approach him first. If approached he would try to help these teachers the best way he could.

When this teacher approached me about the new curriculum, I showed him the new syllabus, the available textbooks and the inservice file containing my notes and the working papers on the new curriculum. I told him to continue with the usual ways of teaching. That was all that I could offer him.

KC attributed his shortcomings with regard to the new history curriculum to the failure of the inservice course in equipping him with the necessary knowledge and skills.

KC, however, felt that his close relationship with his colleague (C1) had enabled them to talk and discuss their problems, concerns and ideas with ease, anywhere and anytime they...
felt the need for these discussions.

The nature of the inservice course. KC believed that the inservice course failed to provide him with enough information about the new history curriculum to enable him to explain it to the teachers or to help them with their teaching. KC's dissatisfaction is portrayed in the following excerpt.

When you attend an inservice course on a new curriculum you expect to learn a great deal about the curriculum. But the only thing I learned was the existence of a new history syllabus.... I do not think it [the Ministry] has to organize an inservice just to inform us about the new syllabus. I could just buy the syllabus and read.... I can tell, by just looking at the [two] syllabuses, which is the old and which is the new. ....The course did not produce any effect at all. I attended the course in the hope of learning about the curriculum and how to teach it. I learned very little.... The inservice course did not help me in the methods of teaching.

KC was also disappointed with the key personnel, the mode of presentation, and utilization of time at the inservice course. He found the key personnel's explanation of the new history curriculum inadequate and stale. There was nothing new; he had already learned the techniques in college. He also found the presentation too abstract and too general to be of much benefit to him.

It would have been more effective if the key personnel and the teachers, for example, had chosen a particular topic to teach, prepare a step-by step lesson plan of the topic and then discuss in greater detail its content, the various teaching strategies and teaching aids that could be used. Perhaps each teacher would be assigned to teach each topic. Then at the course, we would discuss [the work of
each teacher] and make changes or corrections where necessary. We could then circulate these revised works and use them for our teaching. I think this is a more effective way.

KC was also critical of the manner in which the course was conducted. KC complained about the lack of variety in the mode of presentation. The key personnel, the only person conducting the course, utilized the lecture and note reading methods almost throughout the entire course. Many of the scheduled workshops did not materialise. Those that did were not particularly successful. KC also pointed to the lack of fruitful discussions of topics and issues about the new history curriculum and its implementation in the schools.

KC found the key personnel lacking in qualification, experience and fluency. These characteristics also contributed to the ineffectiveness of the inservice course.

He is just like us. There is nothing extraordinary about him. Some of the teachers who attended the course were better qualified than the key personnel.... His command of the language [Bahasa Malaysia] is limited. He spoke mostly in English.... This could be why he did not want to discuss in Bahasa Malaysia.... [Even] the working papers he passed on to us were mostly in English.

Professional support. KC also reported the absence of any follow-up activities by the Ministry of Education to help him with his problems or concerns. He had to resort to other sources of help.
I refer to the textbooks; I have about nine of them with me. I also refer to the notes left over from my teacher training days... [and] discuss with my friends.... I even got some help from my brother who happened to be a history teacher.

The lack of follow-up activities confirmed KC's belief that nothing much was expected of him. He cited the case of the inservice course on audio-visual aids attended by one of the teachers in the school, following which the school was supplied with aids and equipment such as slides and tape recorders. Such follow-up action necessitated some form of action on the part of the teacher who attended the course. KC felt that had such activities occurred after his return from the inservice course, he would have been awakened to the fact that a lot more was expected of him by the Ministry.

The administrator and administration of the school. KC indicated that the principal did not show any interest and concern about what he had learned at the inservice course and what he was expected to do. KC added that he would have become more aware of his role and consequently would have taken it more seriously if the principal had shown some interest and concern. The same situation was experienced by KA and KB.

KC also pointed out that the administrators' lack of support, as evident in their failure to assign him to teach the new history curriculum during its first year of implementation, reduced the likelihood of teachers approaching him for help with the new curriculum. In addition, KC found that the two years of not teaching the new history curriculum had caused some loss of
familiarity with the new history curriculum.

I had to dig up my files to refresh my memory of what I had learned about the new history curriculum at the inservice course I attended about two and a half years earlier.

KC revealed that even after he was assigned to teach the new history curriculum, he was unable to share his knowledge with or help the other teachers because he was the only teacher teaching the subject for the following year and a half. It had been the practice of the school to assign only one teacher to teach the new curriculum at any one time. The opportunity to work with another teacher only presented itself in late 1981 when the school administrators decided to revise the timetable to allow for another teacher to teach the subject.

KC made it clear that whatever activities he carried out with the teachers were informal in nature. There was no formal avenue through which he and the other teachers could meet to talk about their problems or concerns. At subject meetings, only routine matters such as schemes of work and students' workbooks were discussed. KC felt that since the senior subject teacher was the person responsible for calling these meetings and for determining the agenda, he did not see it fit to suggest topics for discussion to the senior subject teacher or to request a special meeting to discuss specific curriculum issues.
THE TEACHER AND HIS PERCEPTIONS

Only one teacher from School C participated in the study. He will, hereafter, be referred to as C1. C1 specializes in history as one of his teaching options and has been teaching in School C ever since he received his teaching certificate in 1979. He has only one year experience with teaching the new history curriculum. In his three years of teaching, C1 has attended three inservice courses, one of which is related to the teaching of the new history curriculum at Form 3. These inservice courses formed the basis of his perceptions regarding the role expected of the key teacher and the factors that hindered or facilitated the key teacher in the performance of his role. He came to be aware of KC as key teacher when he was chosen by the principal in 1979 to attend the above inservice course; the principal explained to him that KC had attended similar inservice course for the past two consecutive years and that it was time for C1 to go.

The Role Expected of the key teacher by the Ministry of Education

C1's perceptions of the role expected of the key teacher, to explain the new topics to be taught... [and] to help teachers with their schemes of work and with what they did not understand,

was not a unique one. As has been described earlier, these expectations had been mentioned many times over, in whole or in part, by the other people included in the study.

There was, however, something different about the origin of
these expectations. Unlike other teachers or the administrators, C1 based these perceptions on his own experience as a key teacher who had attended an inservice course with purposes similar to the one attended by KC. These perceptions were, therefore, similar to those which he thought the Ministry of Education expected of him as a key teacher for the new history curriculum for Form 3.

C1's perceptions have remained intact from the time of the inservice course to the time of this study. He attributed this constancy of perceptions to the absence of follow-up activities that could have made him change his perceptions.

The Activities of the Key Teacher

C1 recalled three activities which the key teacher had carried out: helping him with the scheme of work for the new history curriculum, providing information on and explanation of the topics to be taught and preparing mid-term examination questions for the subject. The first two activities were initiated by C1 himself because he perceived that the key teacher's role was to help teachers in these two areas, whereas the last was initiated by others in the school.

According to C1, the scheme of work which he was using was given to him by KC after C1 requested for it. He found the scheme of work useful in helping him determine sequencing of topics, in ensuring a uniformity in the topics taught, and consequently, in the preparing of common examination questions. He also found it useful in helping him select the necessary reference books.
Since the scheme of work contained the topics to be taught, it helped me to select what books I need to refer to.... I could not just depend on the textbook [because] sometimes the topics covered in the syllabus could not be found in the textbook.

C1 was of the opinion that KC needed very little effort to provide him with the scheme of work.

I think he [KC] got the scheme of work from the inservice course; he definitely did not discuss the scheme of work with the other teachers. He also informed me that it [the scheme of work] had not changed at all and that he had been following the same scheme of work every year.... It is also natural that when you are assigned to teach a subject, you would approach the relevant teacher to get the scheme of work. He would give you the scheme of work; there is no discussion.

C1 pointed out that informal meetings between KC and himself to discuss the new history curriculum occurred anywhere and anytime he felt he needed the opinion and guidance of KC. These meetings were mostly motivated by C1 when he needed to get KC's help in providing further information or in clarifying certain content area, or in providing him with the necessary reference books.

I approached him [KC] when I have difficulties. It is very informal.... I referred whatever topics in the scheme of work that I do not understand to KC.... I asked him whenever I find that the particular topic was not covered in the textbook or could not be found in two or three other books that I have referred to. He would supply me with the names of the other textbooks that I need to refer. Sometimes he gave me his notes.... These meetings are usually very short. For example, I would take down notes while he [KC] explained the topic to me. These
notes were helpful. I used them for my teaching. The explanation he gave me helped me to understand the topic better.

C1 had no problem with the techniques of teaching the subject because he was a history teacher by training.

C1 also mentioned the key teacher having prepared the common mid-term examination for the new history curriculum for Form 1. He, however, felt either one of them could have been assigned to do that. The school administrator gave the responsibility to KC because he was then quite free to do it. "I have been asked to prepare the examination questions for another subject".

Factors Influencing the Activities of the Key Teacher

Key teacher-related factors. C1 believed KC had not been adequately prepared for the role. If the inservice course he attended in 1979 was any indication of the type of inservice course attended by KC, it was highly probable that KC, like himself, was not equipped with enough knowledge about the new history curriculum and not clearly informed about the activities he was to carry out as a key teacher. According to C1, the inservice course suffered from several shortcomings: monotony in the mode of presentation, the Ministry's dependence on the key personnel, the inadequacies of the key personnel, the lack of information on key teacher roles and the failure to equip the key teachers with the necessary skills to perform their roles. The inservice course also failed to provide the key teachers with specific suggestions on the kinds of activities that they could
carry out in their role as key teachers.

I think he [KC] experienced the same thing I did when I attended the course. The key personnel did not explain the activities that we need to carry out in the schools.... I did not know what I was supposed to do.

Administrative and professional support. C1 also viewed administrators' recognition of, and support for, the key teacher, as critical to the key teacher. C1's own experience as a key teacher showed him that the lack of interest and support shown by the school administrators, especially the principal, for the key teacher and the inservice course he had just attended, could discourage the key teacher from carrying out his role.

C1 felt that a timetable which failed to accommodate the key teacher could have similar negative effects on the latter; a key teacher who was not assigned to teach the new history curriculum would not be able to come into contact with the teachers teaching the subject. According to C1, a young key teacher might not be asked to teach the new history curriculum because the school gave priority to a teacher's seniority in assigning subjects to teach and neglected other factors. Because of this emphasis on seniority, C1 argued for the choice of the senior subject teacher as the key teacher. The fact that the senior subject teacher was appointed and, therefore, duly recognized by the principal would facilitate the key teacher's tasks.
I think that the senior subject teacher, being more experienced, should have been the one to attend the course. I do not think that she would have any problem when she comes back from the course. [Moreover], since she had been nominated by the administrators to be the senior subject teacher, nobody would criticize her. But look at me, a young teacher and a newcomer to the school and sent to the course soon after I arrived here.

C1 believed that the lack of contact between the Ministry of Education and himself as key teacher for Form 3, might also be true for KC. C1 complained that the absence of any further in-service courses or contacts with the Ministry of Education officials or the key personnel, deprived him of the opportunity to discuss problems, especially those problems that emerged during efforts at implementing the curriculum. This complaint was also echoed by the other three key teachers.

Teacher-related factors. C1 approached KC for help and advice only regarding the content area and the scheme of work for the subject. He did not need the key teacher to explain the new history curriculum or the techniques of teaching because he has been exposed to the new curriculum as well as the various ways of teaching during his teacher training. "I had a copy of the syllabus ever since I was in college". C1 made it known that he had no difficulties with the methodology.

We never discuss the methodology. I think we are all familiar with it. He [KC] did not tell me anything about what method to use because we are about the same [in qualification and experience]. ... I have no problem. I used the methods that I learned in college.

C1 would usually resort to using narration and the question-
and-answer methods because of their feasibility. He would not use the methods he learned at college because these methods were fraught with difficulties.

Like most of the key teachers and teachers, C1 felt comfortable with his teaching. He considered the methods that he used not only practical but helpful in enhancing student understanding of the contents. As he put it, "we put more emphasis on the contents that need to be taught". C1 used the more common teaching aids such as maps and charts because these were the most readily available. He believed that the lack of money for the purchase of aids for history had resulted in the very dismal amount of aids for use by the teachers in the school.

Only subjects such as industrial arts, agricultural science and home science have their own special allocations. Other subject are only given about $15-25 per year. What can you buy with that amount?

C1 also pointed out that he had not requested the school to purchase any teaching aids because he felt,

the senior subject teacher is the one who is responsible for teaching aids. It is up to the senior subject teacher to approach the principal to get the necessary allocations.

Though C1 was quite concerned with his teaching of the weaker classes, he did not feel any need to discuss it with KC because he was able to cope with the situation. "I went very slowly because this was the only way that I can make sure that the students understood what I taught".

THE ADMINISTRATOR AND HIS PERCEPTIONS

The administrator, hereby denoted as AC, is an afternoon supervisor for School C and has been occupying the position for the past two years. This represents his first administrative responsibility after being a teacher for about fourteen years.

Besides being an afternoon supervisor, AC is also a key personnel for audiovisual technology for schools in the area. He assumed this position after having been selected in 1979 to attend a year-long inservice course at one of the teacher training colleges in the country. His experience at the inservice course, as key personnel and as a teacher, formed the basis of AC's perceptions of the role expected of the key teacher, and the factors that facilitated or impeded the key teacher in the performance of his role.

The Role Expected of the Key Teacher

AC believed that the key teacher, not unlike any other teachers who had just attended inservice courses, was expected to bring changes in the method of teaching of the subject, history in this case, at both the personal and the school level. According to him, everybody was aware of this expectation.

It is customary for a teacher who had just attended a course to be expected to carry out or implement some changes. Everybody knows the purpose of attending an inservice course: first, to improve the teacher's own teaching and second, to carry out changes in the methods of teaching in the school.
Changes at the school level could be achieved by explaining to teachers, and helping them use, new and more effective methods of teaching the subject.

Besides bringing in changes in the methodology, the key teacher was also expected to explain the other characteristics of the new history curriculum to the teachers teaching the subject. This role, according to AC, should, however, be treated as secondary; it should not be allowed to override the more important role of bringing about change in the method of teaching.

What we are interested in is how to make history, irrespective of whether it is an old or a new syllabus, a better and more interesting subject, different from the way it has been taught previously.... [The key teacher] should not be concerned only with exposing the new syllabus [content] to the teachers. I do not think that content is the most critical aspect. It is important to know local history, but I think we would be better off if the techniques of teaching were also emphasized.

The Activities of the Key Teacher

AC noted his lack of awareness of the activities of the key teacher in his school with regard to the implementation of the new history curriculum at Form 1. The only activities he could recall seeing KC engaging in were that of teaching the subject and making the necessary teaching aids and resources. He noted that KC had only taught the new history curriculum since 1980 because prior to that, KC was needed to assume the responsibility
of supervising the school prefects". He, therefore, had to teach in the morning, while the new history curriculum was taught in the afternoon.

AC noted that though he did not observe other activities of the key teacher, he expected the latter to be involved in frequent discussions and consultations with C1 on such matters as the preparation of examination questions and the scheme of work. These, according to AC, represented the principal's expectations of every teacher in the school. "Such discussions could help ease the task of the teachers in the preparing of examination questions as well as help ensure fairness to the students".

AC also pointed out that, based on his talks with KC and C1, discussions about methodology seldom took place between the KB and C1. This could be because both of them were trained as history teachers and were familiar with the various approaches to teaching the subject.

Factors Influencing the Activities of the key teacher

The administration of the school. AC commented that preparing the school's timetable was a complex task, which involved taking into consideration a myriad of factors. One of these factors was the need for a particular teacher, in this case KC, to assume a responsibility that in effect took him away from

---

14 A group of students from the upper forms who are selected by the principal to help in maintaining school discipline.
teaching the new history curriculum during the first two years of implementation. Due to his assignment as the teacher responsible for supervising the prefects, KC had to teach in the morning session, when the prefects were studying, instead of in the afternoon session during which the Form 1 classes were held.

AC agreed that such a scheduling could have hindered communication between KC and the teacher teaching the new history curriculum. However, he argued that the appointment must have been a necessity; at that time KC must have been the most appropriate person for the job.

AC noted that even if this lack of contact could have prevented the key teacher from sharing whatever knowledge he had about the new history curriculum with the other teachers -- something that KC found to be a hindrance to his role -- it should not keep the key teacher from being active in the school's history society. He could still carry out whatever activities that would enhance students' interests in the subject.

AC also pointed out that even though KC had not been assigned to teach the new history curriculum during the first two years of implementation, every effort was made to ensure that only history teachers were designated to teach the subjects. Competency and interest were the main reasons for assigning teaching load, as evident from the following excerpt:
History has its own techniques of teaching and those history-option teachers have been exposed to more effective methods of teaching: methods that could arouse the interest of the students in learning history.... It is, therefore, unfair to ask any teacher to teach history.... Many of the non-history teachers who are teaching it are not really interested in teaching the subject, simply because it is not their field.... The situation could get really bad if these teachers were given to teach the weaker classes such as the F, G and H classes. They would not even be able to control the class.... I have been asked, once, to teach history. What I did then was to read the book [textbook], pick up the important points and then explain them to the students. I tried several ways of teaching including those that I recalled being employed by my history teacher.

AC admitted that his view that history has its own techniques of teaching and that not anybody could teach it effectively was not shared by a majority of the teachers and the administrators.

AC did not consider the system of scheduling only one teacher to teach the new history curriculum for the three and a half years since its implementation to be a major hindrance to the KT. This situation could make contact between the key teacher and the teacher teaching it more difficult, but not impossible. Only one teacher was assigned to teach history in order to help ease the workload of the teachers. This rationale is elaborated in the following statements by AC.

[Such scheduling] eases the workload of the teacher; he does not have to teach too many subjects.... He is [therefore] spared the task of preparing extra schemes of work... [and] lesson preparations. It is much easier to prepare and teach one subject for the whole form. Some teachers, however, do not like the idea of teaching the same
thing over and over again. It gets boring. These teachers like variety and, therefore, prefer to teach about two or three classes per subjects per form. The principal has to take this factor into consideration too. We do not have any fixed system of arranging the timetable.

AC made it known that there was no doubt in his mind about the school administrators' readiness to support the key teacher, or for that matter, the other teachers in the school, as long as specific suggestions are forwarded and money is available.

The principal will provide the money to finance a particular project if you ask for it. The amount of money, however, is limited.... If he has the money, he will buy them for us [teachers].

AC also pointed out that the lack of follow-up activities on the part of the principal and senior assistant, for example, was basically the result of their lack of awareness of what was expected of them. It was not because the principal and the senior assistant were not interested in the key teacher or the role he was to carry out. Somebody should have told them what to do.

The teacher who attended the [in-service] course should have informed the principal. Preferably the Ministry ought to have sent circulars to the principal asking him to carry out certain things.

AC also shared the views of the other administrators when he said that the key teacher should know what he was expected to do and carry them out without having to be told by the school administrators.
He [the key teacher] needs not wait for the principal to tell him to do this or that. It is up to him to inform the principal what he needs because sometimes he [the principal] does not know what he [the key teacher] is expected to do.

Views on the inservice course. AC viewed inservice courses as an important vehicle for improvement in the schools and that these inservice courses have to be effective if the teachers and consequently the schools were to benefit from them. AC identified the selection of teachers for an inservice course, the content of the inservice course, the adequacy of the purpose of the inservice course, the interest and competency of the key personnel, the scheduling of the inservice course and the need for follow-up activities after the inservice course as factors contributing to the making of an effective inservice course. These characteristics were raised by AC on the basis of his own experience as a key personnel for audio-visual technology. He attended, as a key personnel, a year-long inservice course on the topic and consequently conducted courses for the key teachers of the various schools under his jurisdiction. Feedback from KC had provided AC with insights into the type of inservice course that the former had attended.

AC did not feel that the purpose of the inservice course -- to explain the content of the new history curriculum -- was adequate in bringing about improvement in the teaching of history in the schools. He considered it more important to expose and train teachers in the use of teaching techniques that could upgrade the status of history from being a dull and boring subject to an interesting and captivating one. Methodology was,
however, not dealt with adequately in the inservice course.

If the purpose of the inservice course was simply to inform teachers (key teachers) what to teach, then what these teachers would do would be to go back to the school and tell the other teachers just that. What is the use? After all the syllabus has been completed by the Ministry and sent to the schools.... I do not think the inservice course would bring much benefit to the teachers if its sole intention is to expose teachers to the new syllabus.... The teachers should have been taught techniques such as the use of audio-visual aids, the preparation of graphics and slides, and the use of appropriate pictures or charts for teaching.

AC used the Integrated Science curriculum\textsuperscript{15} to illustrate the emphasis on methodology.

Look at the new science. For every experiment there is a work sheet. This helps to arouse the interest of the students.... As for history... you are always burdened with dates and events, have to copy notes from the blackboard and be prepared for questioning by the teacher. Occasionally, if you are lucky, you will see pictures.... Sometimes you could see the students yawning or drowsing during history lessons, especially in the afternoon. A lot could be done to make the subject more interesting, for example updating the methods.

AC also pointed out that the success of the inservice course

\textsuperscript{15} Integrated Science which has its origin in Scotland was introduced into Malaysian secondary schools in stages starting in 1969, to replace the then general science curriculum. This new curriculum was developed with the intent of moving away from an emphasis on recall of factual information towards a focus on understanding of methods and attitudes of the scientists through inquiry (Charlesworth: 1975).
was highly dependent on the key personnel. His own experience as a key personnel convinced him that a key personnel's lack of interest in his role and a lack of experience, knowledge and skill in the subject area could impede efforts at helping teachers improve their teaching. In the following statement, AC expressed his views regarding the competence and interest of the key personnel for the new history curriculum.

I fear that the key personnel might not be genuinely interested in helping teachers improve their methods of teaching.... It is probable that the key personnel might have been selected and subsequently directed by the State Education Department or the Ministry to attend the course [at the national level] and consequently to conduct the course [at the state level]. Another point is whether the key personnel was really experienced and knowledgable. My experience suggests to me that a key personnel has to have the expertise and sufficient knowledge about history.

AC also found the six consecutive Saturdays allotted for the inservice course inadequate and unsatisfactory.

You spend so much time travelling that you get exhausted by the time you reach the place [in-service course centre]. You have only a few hours of discussion before you adjourn for lunch. Sometimes it [the inservice course] became a half-day session only, with the teachers dispersing at about 1 pm. Then it would be another week before the teachers got to meet again. They did not even remember what had been discussed the previous week.... A week of full-time inservice course would be more effective. The teachers could go back to the college during the school holidays [to attend such course].

AC viewed the absence of any form of follow-up activities on the part of the Ministry of Education or the key personnel -- as
told to him by KC -- as an obstacle to the key teacher's attempts at performing his role. In the following statement, AC compares his experience with that of KC.

There did not seem to be any follow-through from above. In my case, the organizers of the inservice course sent me questionnaires asking this and that. It kept me informed about what needed to be done [and] about what was going on. They would send me a reminder if I failed to return it within a week.

Part of the reason for leaving the key teacher on his own, AC noted, could be attributed to the inability of the State Social Studies Officer to give the appropriate time and attention to history. He was very busy because besides history, he was also responsible for the teaching of subjects such as geography and civics in all primary and secondary schools in the states.

Key teacher-related factors. AC believed that the key teacher's lack of seniority and experience created what he termed as 'social problems' for the key teacher. A description of this problem and how it impeded the key teacher is presented in the following statement by AC.

He [KC] could get very frustrated if he has to work with teachers who were more senior than himself. He would feel very uneasy about advising teachers, offering suggestions or even showing them what to do if these teachers have been more senior and more qualified than himself.

The key teacher could also, as a result, perceive the inservice course as simply for his own benefit. This was in spite of the common knowledge that a teacher attended an inservice course for himself as well as for the school.
CHAPTER 8

THE OFFICERS OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS

Three officers of the Ministry of Education, hereby noted as M1, M2 and M3, participated in the study. M1 has been a State Social Studies Officer since 1977 and is responsible for the implementation of the new history curriculum in the state. He was first exposed to the new history curriculum in 1977 when he attended the centralized inservice course organized by the Curriculum Development Centre. His participation at the inservice course, his collaboration with the key personnel in organizing inservice courses at the state level, and his regular contacts with the schools provided him insights into the activities of the key teachers and factors that influenced their efforts at carrying out activities pertinent to their role as key teachers for the new history curriculum.

M2 has been an Inspector of Schools for about two years. His visits to schools and observations of teaching have provided him with information regarding the status of the new history curriculum in the schools and activities of the key teachers and insight into factors influencing the key teachers' activities. His perceptions were also influenced by his experience as State Deputy Director of Education, which he had held prior to joining the Inspectorate.

M3, an officer in the Curriculum Development Centre, has been actively involved in the development of the new history
curriculum and in planning for its implementation in the schools. She is familiar with the key personnel strategy and the centralized inservice course which she helped to organize. She was not involved beyond the stage of planning for implementation and, therefore, is not aware of the activities of the key teachers and factors that could have influenced their activities.

The Role Expected of the Key Teachers by the Ministry

All three officers of the Ministry of Education included in the study were in unison regarding what they believed to be the role expected of the key teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum. They agreed that the key teachers were expected to perform three major roles: to expose teachers to the new history curriculum, to guide and help teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum, and to teach the new history curriculum the way it had been suggested by the developers. These expectations were not unique to these three people. Other people in the study, with the exception of those who expected nothing of the key teachers, had perceived one or more of the above expectations. Several terminologies had been used by the three officers to describe the second role: advisor, helper and inititator (M1), leader and guide (M2), and resource person (M3). M1 and M3 felt that all three roles were of equal importance and should be carried out by the key teachers. M2, on the other hand, indicated that teaching was the minimum role expected of the key teachers.
Even if, for some specific reasons, the key teachers were unable to carry out the first two expectations [disseminating and helping teachers], we would expect them to, at least, teach the new curriculum. We hope that if he is unable to help others, he could at least implement the curriculum by teaching it the way he is expected to. He could use several approaches to make it more interesting.

These expectations were based on their knowledge of the key personnel strategy generally used by the Curriculum Development Centre in the implementation of any innovations in the schools. M1, for example, was made aware of this strategy and the roles of the various actors and agencies involved in the implementation of the new history curriculum when he attended the central inservice course. M3 made it known that the new history curriculum was not the first or the only one to utilize this strategy; it had been used earlier in the implementation of the new English curriculum.

The three officers also agreed that it was up to the key teachers to decide on the kind of activities that they could carry out in their efforts at familiarizing the teachers with the new history curriculum and at helping them teach the new history curriculum in their classrooms. According to M3, the key teachers could organize workshops and discussions, preferably immediately after returning from the inservice course. The best time to give teachers their first exposure to the new history curriculum, according to M1, was after the inservice course and immediately after the Lower Certificate of Education when teachers were more free and relaxed. These activities, M1 and M3 noted, should be carried out throughout the implementation period, that is, every year if teachers who have not been
previously exposed to the new history curriculum were assigned to teach the subject. M1, on the other hand, argued that it was adequate for the key teachers to just do it before or during the first year of implementation. The other teachers could be depended upon to explain the new history curriculum to teachers newly assigned to teach the subject.

M1 described several activities which the key teachers could initiate when they returned to their schools. These activities, clarified M1, had been suggested to the key teachers during the inservice course.

The key teacher could get himself involved in the selection of a textbook for the school. He could suggest the purchase of books for the library to the school librarian. We also suggested that the key teacher set up a 'bank' of examination questions.... At the course we discussed the different purposes and types of evaluation. This could provide easy reference for preparing students for the LCE. This would be very convenient for the teachers; they would no longer have to prepare directly from the textbooks. They could pull out questions that they need from this pool.

M1 also stated that besides initiating the above activities, the key teacher could help the teachers prepare a detailed scheme of work for the new history curriculum.

We prepared a scheme of work according to terms' and then circulated it to the schools. We leave it to the teachers to break it down into weeks and to determine the sequencing of the topics to be taught.
Both M1 and M2 believed that the key teachers could use subject committees or subject panels to help teachers with their teaching.

The committee could act as a vehicle to help teachers implement the new curriculum. Through the committee, the key teacher could guide and provide teachers with suggestions. This is useful especially if the key teacher finds it difficult to do it on his own.... The key teacher could persuade the panel to organize meetings, discussions, projects and other activities. Through the subject panel, the key teacher could get the teachers together.

According to M1, problems regarding the curriculum could be brought to committee meetings and would then be referred to the key teacher. "If he is unable to resolve the problems, he could meet me or contact the Curriculum Development Centre directly".

The Activities of the Key Teachers

The perceptions of the three officers regarding the activities of the key teachers varied substantially. M1's optimism that a majority of the key teachers carried out their role as key teachers, in some form or other, contrasted sharply to M2's pessimism. M3 pleaded ignorance about the key teachers' activities because she was only responsible for the development

---

16 Schools in Malaysia start in January and end in November. The school year is divided into three terms, with two weeks break between the first and second term and between second and third. There is a six-week holiday at the end of the year.
of the new history curriculum and planning for its implementation. Evaluation activities were carried out by the evaluation unit of the Curriculum Development Centre.

M1 pointed out that about 80 percent of the key teachers have, at one time or another, carried out one or more activities aimed at exposing or helping teachers with the new curriculum. The most common activities were meetings to explain and to discuss the new history curriculum and circulating notes or materials to the other teachers. All these activities were carried out informally.

M2 was, however, not as optimistic as M1. He felt that only a few of the key teachers carried out any of the activities described by M1. Even those who did, failed to carry them out satisfactorily. For example, those who explained the new curriculum to the teachers did so mainly on the request of the principals. M2 also found the above activities unsatisfactory. They were unorganized and unsystematic. The key teachers had not put in much time and effort towards the planning and organization of these activities.

Only a small group briefed the teachers on the new curriculum. Even this small group of teachers admitted that they could not do it fully.... Their activities were haphazard and incomplete.... From my own research on the teaching of the new history curriculum, I came to the conclusion that the percentage is very small. Even those who carried it out did not do it satisfactorily.

M2 also expressed his disappointment with the key teachers' teaching.
They were not teaching the way they were expected to. Most of them were still using their old methods. A small number tried [to use the desired techniques] but were not up to expectation. Many of them still relied fully on the textbooks.

Factors Influencing the Activities of the Key Teachers

The three officers identified four main factors which they perceived as having influenced or could have influenced the activities of the key teachers. These factors, most of which have been mentioned by other interviewees, are (1) the attitude and ability of the key teachers, (2) the attitude of the teachers, (3) the support and interest of the school administrators, and (4) the availability of administrative, financial and professional support. Variations, however, exist between the three officers in their perceptions of the importance of some of these factors.

The attitude and ability of the key teachers. Both M1 and M2 believed that the key teachers' failure to view their role as important and the key teachers' emphasis on formalities accounted for the key teachers' lack of initiative in carrying out activities related to their role. According to M1, this lack of initiative could also be attributed to the key teachers' lack of ability. He, in contrast to M2, however, believed that only a very small number of the teachers suffered from a lack of initiative.

M1 and M2 also believed that the key teachers did not attach
much importance to their role because of their lack of interest in attending the inservice course and/or their lack of awareness of their role as key teachers. Both M1 and M2 agreed that it was not uncommon to find uninterested, unwilling and unsuitable teachers attending inservice courses. They talked about the difficulties in getting 'suitable' candidates to attend the inservice courses.

Some of the teachers who attended the course were there not because they were interested in history or in teaching history, but because they were asked to go by the principals. Sometimes, the teachers were not even teaching history in the schools. The principals did not have much choice in who they sent because we have so many inservice courses going on around the same time. He had to select a particular teacher just to fill up the spot.

The lack of interest on the part of the key teachers in the inservice course could have made them oblivious to the role they were to play in facilitating the implementation of the new history curriculum. M1 was convinced that a few of the key teachers were completely unaware of their role. "These key teachers did not do anything because they believed that they were not expected to do anything".

M2, however, disagreed with the above observation by M1, saying that the key teachers' lack of awareness was "merely an excuse given by the key teachers to account for their lack of action". Instead, he considered the key teachers' emphasis on formality to be one of the prime reasons contributing to the lack of key teacher-initiated activities in the school.
Our teachers are too tied to the formal structure of the school. They would carry out something only if formally directed to do so. They would not do anything voluntarily.... Everything has to be directed.

M1 also observed that the key teachers' abilities in carrying out their role was also crucial. According to M1, the key teachers' lack of ability and self-confidence had confined the key teachers to carry out only simple activities such as circulating notes. It could prevent them from doing a decent job of explaining the new history curriculum to the teachers. M1 pointed to the inservice course and its attendant weaknesses as mainly responsible for the key teachers' feelings of inadequacy and lack of self-confidence. He was especially critical of the length and the scheduling of the course, and the ability of some of the key personnel.

The ability of the key personnel was very important because according to M3, the key personnel strategy of implementation "relied very heavily on the competency of the key personnel". The key personnel's lack of ability in conducting inservice courses could aggravate the problem of "content dilution", which could result from the filtering down of information through several levels before it finally reached the teachers. Thus, the lack of ability on the part of the key personnel in transmitting the "second-hand information" to the key teachers could result in the latter's reduced ability to carry out their role.

M2 did not, however, consider the shortcomings of the inservice course as a major factor contributing to the key
teachers' lethargic state.

It is possible that the courses conducted by the key personnel have not succeeded in increasing the key teachers' knowledge significantly. As a result they [the key teachers] did not have the confidence to carry out their role. But I believe that this is merely an excuse. Even though the key teachers did not feel confident, they could still carry out their role given the necessary efforts.

The attitudes of the teachers. Both M1 and M2 observed that the teachers did not need the services of the key teachers in helping them implement the new history curriculum because they were generally satisfied with their teaching. Based on their visits to classrooms and talks with teachers, key teachers and principals, M1 and M2 found that the teachers were generally content with their teaching.

The teachers explained that they already knew everything. They had no problem. They did not need any help from anybody because they felt they could deliver whatever they were supposed to, satisfactorily.

M1 and M2 did not, however, share the teachers' or the administrators' feeling of satisfaction about the teaching of the new history curriculum in the schools. Both felt that the teachers could have done more than just relying on the textbook for their teaching.

Teachers are still bound by the textbooks. Some teachers would take the textbooks, ask the students to read and then explain the contents to the students. Sometimes they would read the textbook to the class. Some teachers are unable to complete the syllabus because they tried to teach everything that is found in the textbook.... There are so many other methods that the teachers
could use.... The teachers could get together for some kind of project work, such as preparing scripts, maps and charts, and slides. These could then be used by all the teachers.... We have prepared and circulated pamphlets on the various types of teaching aids that the teachers could use and ways of making them.

Two reasons were given to account for the teachers' sense of satisfaction with their teaching: the teachers' lack of professionalism and their conviction of the adequacy of their methods of teaching. The following excerpt describes what M2 meant by lack of professionalism.

Our teachers generally have a very low sense of professionalism. They are not interested in improving the quality of their teaching such as in exchanging views and in searching for ways to teach better.... They are satisfied with what they are doing.

The teachers did not try to learn from, or help, each other through observing each other's teaching because, as M1 explained, the teachers feel uneasy about being observed because they perceive that somebody is there only to see their weaknesses.

M1 associated this lack of interest in self-improvement among the teachers with their attitude towards teaching. "They became teachers just to earn a living. They are not really interested in the job".

The teachers were convinced of the adequacy of the methods they were using. Experience has proved to them that their methods work; these methods have been helpful in preparing
students for examinations and, therefore, need no changing. This belief, according to M3, was prevalent among the more senior teachers who have "over the years, discovered and got used to certain methods of teaching which they found to be effective". The teachers' emphasis on examinations and examination results and the effect of the emphasis on the teachers are explained in the following statements by M1.

Examination results are used as a yardstick to measure the success of a school, a teacher and a pupil. Teachers [therefore] feel that they should focus their attention on preparing students for examinations. They are skeptical about using the various methods suggested by the Curriculum Development Centre because these methods might take up too much time and come examination time, the students would not be able to answer the questions.

According to M2, this emphasis on preparing students for examinations and the teachers' conviction that they would be better off if they stuck very closely to, and tried to complete, the syllabus or their scheme of work have, in turn, pressured the key teachers to conform to the traditional techniques of teaching. The key teachers "do not want to be the only teacher to appear busy. After all, none of the other [history] teachers are busy preparing teaching aids". Unable to break loose of such tradition the key teachers, therefore, continued using traditional techniques of teaching history. M2 found this situation disappointing and disconcerting because the key teachers were unable to act as models for the other teachers.
We were hoping that the key teachers would teach using the various approaches suggested. The other teachers could observe them... [But] the sad thing is, most of these key teachers are not teaching the way we expected them to. They are still using the traditional methods of teaching.

M1 noted that the teachers' lack of need for the key teachers was not only attributed to their general satisfaction with their teaching but also their reluctance to ask for help or advice when faced with problems or difficulties. The teachers were either "too shy to ask" or were reluctant to ask because "the key teachers were not in their cliques".

The school leadership. All three officers expressed their agreement about the importance, to the key teachers, of the school administrators' support, encouragement and cooperation. The "spirit and enthusiasm of the administrators could filter down to the teachers" (M2) and "help to sustain the key teachers' interests in their role" (M1). M1 and M2 observed that, as leaders in the schools, the principals could initiate activities such as meetings to discuss teaching strategies and teaching-learning activities, or use the information they received from the Ministry of Education or State Education Office about the new history curriculum to help teachers improve teaching. In addition, the principals could help by supervising the teachers, but as M2 indicated, supervision represented a "new task for the principals". Only recently did the Ministry emphasized this role to the principals. Moreover, "the abilities of the principals or the senior assistants are still questionable".
M3 argued that the administrators could also show their support by providing opportunities or by creating conditions that help the key teachers in performing their role. This could be done by "assigning the key teachers to teach the new history curriculum and by reducing their teaching load and other responsibilities". The principals could encourage the key teachers and the teachers to use a variety of teaching methods by "allocating money for the subject for use towards the purchase of teaching aids".

M1, however, observed that the school principals were generally not very interested in the new history curriculum.

In most schools, the principals are more concerned with the general administration of the schools. They usually leave the implementation of the curriculum in the hands of the senior assistants.

M1 also noted that a principal is usually interested in the new history curriculum if "history happened to be his subject area".

All three officers agreed that one way of stimulating the principals' interest and support for the new history curriculum and the key teachers was by familiarizing the former with the new history curriculum and the implementation strategy used, and by making them aware of what they, as principals, could do to facilitate teachers' use of the new curriculum. Such awareness and understanding could be promoted through inservice courses, meetings or briefings organized by the Curriculum Development Centre, the State Education Office or even by the key teachers of the respective schools. There was, however, no plan by the
Curriculum Development Centre to orient the principals. According to M3, everything was left to the initiative of the individual State Education Office and their state curriculum committees. "We got involved in the inservice courses for principals which were organized by the states only when invited to give lectures or to present a paper". The Curriculum Development Centre also communicated with the principals via the principal's local association. As with the inservice courses organized by the State Education Office, "we [the Curriculum Development Centre] would brief these principals only when requested to do so by the association". M3, however, found this arrangement unsatisfactory.

We should have got all the principals together and brief them. Every principal would then have the chance to become familiar with the new history curriculum and their role, and [consequently] be able to provide the necessary support to the key teachers.

Administrative, financial and professional support. The activities of the key teachers could be enhanced greatly by regular contacts with, supervision by or visits from, the Ministry of Education, the State Education Office and the key personnel. This would help to offset the weaknesses of the key personnel strategy, and provide those responsible for implementation with feedback information on the prevailing situations, specifically the problems faced by the key teachers and the teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum.

M3 felt that visits to state inservice course centres by the
Curriculum Development Centre and close monitoring and supervision of the whole implementation by the State Education Office or the School Division of the Ministry of Education could help minimise the shortcomings of the key personnel strategy, the heavy reliance on the ability of the key personnel and the dilution of information. M1 agreed that though he found school visitations valuable in providing him information about what was going on in the schools, with respect to the implementation of the new history curriculum, he was unable to visit all the schools in the state.

We lack the personnel. We are responsible for all primary and secondary schools... and other subjects like geography and civics.

M1, therefore, had to rely a great deal on the reports by the Inspectorate and the school curriculum committees for the decisions and actions to be made. M2 also pointed to the lack of personnel as the reason behind the inability of the Inspectors to visit all the schools in the country though "our target is to visit all the schools at least once a year".

M2 believed that the key teachers would have benefited from regular meetings with, and visits from, their respective key personnel. However, for administrative and financial reasons, such meetings were difficult to organize. Moreover, initiative for such meetings had to come from the State Education Office and be supported by the principals of the schools where the key personnel were teaching.
The key personnel could not meet the key teachers regularly because we have no provision for staff replacement when they are away from the school and their teaching. There is also no provision for reduced teaching load for the key personnel. The Department [State Education Department] would organize such a meeting only when there is a real need for it. This cannot be done often because the school could ask for one more teacher. If the teacher [the key personnel] is unable to teach full-time... then the students will suffer.

Moreover, no provision was made to cover for the expenses incurred by the key personnel during their visits to schools or meetings with teachers. The money had to come from the State Education Department's own budget.
CHAPTER 9

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter begins with a comparative analysis of the role expected of the key teachers and the reasons behind the similarities and differences in the perceptions of the participants. This is then followed by a comparative analysis of the activities of the key teachers, the usefulness of these activities and the congruencies and discrepancies between the expected and actual role of the key teachers. Finally the chapter discusses factors that influenced the key teachers' activities.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE EXPECTED OF THE KEY TEACHERS

This section analyzes the participants' perceptions of the Ministry of Education's expectations of the role of the key teachers. The role expected of the key teachers is first analyzed within groups, and then within schools. An overall comparison is then presented, followed by a discussion of the factors contributing to the similarities and differences in perceptions.
Within Groups

The expectations are analyzed for each of the four groups of participants, namely the key teachers, teachers, school administrators and Ministry of Education officials.

The key teachers. All three key teachers, KA, KB and KC, perceived two common roles expected of them. These were to teach the new history curriculum and to inform other history teachers of the intention of the Ministry of Education to adopt a new history curriculum beginning in 1978. Only KB had additional perceptions. He emphasized that the key teachers should not only teach the new history curriculum but be able to teach it effectively. According to him, the objective of the new curriculum could be best achieved by making the subject more interesting and understandable to the students. In addition, he believed that he was expected to disseminate the knowledge, acquired at the inservice course on the new curriculum, to the other teachers in the school who were involved in the change, and to help other teachers in implementing the curriculum.

The teachers. Only four of the teachers, A1 and A3 from School A, B5 from School B and C1 from School C, had expectations of the role of the key teachers in their respective schools. A1 and A3 believed that the key teachers were expected to teach the new curriculum well. C1 perceived that the Ministry expected the key teachers to explain the new history curriculum to the teachers as well as help the latter overcome any difficulties or problems related to their teaching of the new curriculum. Though B5 and C1 did not specifically mention teaching, their perception
of it as part and parcel of the key teacher role was evident from their response which emphasized the importance of the key teacher teaching the new curriculum in order to ensure closer key teacher-teacher relationship, and in order to make it easier for the key teacher to help the teachers.

The school administrators. All three administrators agreed that the key teachers were expected to bring changes to their respective schools upon their return from the inservice course on the new history curriculum. However, their perception of what these changes involved varied greatly.

To AA, changes involved the key teachers teaching more effectively than before, improving their method of teaching by utilizing whatever knowledge and skill they acquired at the inservice course. To AB, changes involved the teaching of a new content area by the teachers in the school, meaning that the key teacher's role was to help ensure that the new subject matter was being taught in the school. AC, however, viewed changes as occurring at both the personal and school levels. The former involved improvements in the key teacher's own methods of teaching, and the latter could be brought about by explaining to teachers and helping them use the new and more effective methods of teaching. AC was the only administrator who felt that the key teachers were expected to explain to teachers the goals of the new curriculum and the various techniques of, and aids used in, teaching the new curriculum, in addition to explaining the new subject matter.
The officials of the Ministry of Education. All three officers, M1, M2 and M3, agreed that the key teachers were expected to teach the new history curriculum, to familiarize teachers with the new curriculum and to guide teachers in using it. They stated that the key teachers were free to carry out whatever activities they thought were pertinent to their role. The officers did not, however, agree on when and how often the key teachers were expected to explain the new history curriculum to teachers. M1 and M3 indicated the need for it to be continuous while M3 considered it adequate to limit it just to the first year of implementation.

Within Schools

School A. The key teacher (KA), teachers (A1 and A3) and the administrator (AA) had one perception in common, namely that the key teacher was expected to teach the new history curriculum; the latter three, A1, A3 and AA, perceived it to be the only role expected of KA by the Ministry of Education. These three participants also felt that the key teacher was expected to be able to teach the new history curriculum well. In addition to teaching, KA perceived that as a key teacher, she was also expected to inform teachers of the forthcoming change in the history curriculum. Teacher A2, unaware of KA's existence as a key teacher, had no expectation at all of the key teacher's role.
School B. Only KB, B5 and AB perceived some roles expected of the key teacher by the Ministry. KB noted four roles that he perceived the Ministry expected of him. These roles consisted of teaching, informing teachers of the change in the curriculum, explaining the new curriculum to teachers, and helping teachers use the curriculum. B5, the only teacher who had some expectations of KB, shared KB's perception of the last two expectations. The other teachers expected nothing from KB because they were not aware of his position as a key teacher, or of his attendance at the inservice course on the new history curriculum, or even of his existence in the school. The administrator's expectation was expressed in terms of bringing about changes in the school through the teaching of the new content.

School C. The three participants in School C identified altogether four expectations of the role of the key teachers: teaching, informing teachers of the change to the new curriculum, explaining the curriculum, and helping teachers use the curriculum. The first two expectations were KC's and the last two were C1's. AC perceived the first, third and fourth expectations. Through teaching the key teacher was expected to bring change at the personal level, and by explaining the new curriculum to the teachers and helping them use the new methods of teaching, the key teacher was expected to bring changes at the school level.
Overall Comparison

The participants could be grouped into four categories according to their perceptions of the key teachers' role. The first category of participants had no perception whatsoever of the key teachers' role. This category includes teachers A2, B1, B2, B3, B4 and B6, who did not know of the existence of the key teachers in their schools.

The second category of participants perceived the key teacher's role only in terms of bringing about changes in their teaching. These participants included teachers A1 and A3 and administrators AA and AB. Changes brought about by the key teachers were, therefore, expected to occur only at the personal level.

The third group perceived that the key teacher's role was to teach the new history curriculum and to inform teachers of the impending change in the curriculum. This group was represented by key teachers KA and KC.

The fourth category believed that the key teachers were expected to act as change agents in the schools, by disseminating information on the new history curriculum gained at the inservice course and by helping teachers in using the new curriculum in their classrooms, in addition to bringing about changes in their own teaching. The three officials of the Ministry of Education, school administrator AC and key teacher KB constituted this category. The key teachers were regarded as being capable of facilitating the implementation of the new history curriculum in
their respective schools. These participants believed that the task of informing teachers of the change in the history curriculum must have been carried out together with the role of disseminating information from the inservice course on the new history curriculum. They did not think that the role of informing others of the curriculum change was important because, as M3 explained, "each school received a letter from the School Division informing them of the new history curriculum and the schedule for its implementation."

The above categories showed that the participants' perceptions of the role of the key teachers varied within the groups of participants and schools as well as among groups and schools. Within group and within school variations have been discussed in the last two sections. The teachers, as a group, had the least expectations. Six of the ten teachers who participated in the study had no perception at all of the key teachers' role. Two of the teachers singled out teaching as the only role. The officials of the Ministry of Education, as a group, had the most expectations. In addition to teaching the new history curriculum, all three officials believed that the key teachers should disseminate information gained at the inservice course on the new history curriculum and provide help and guidance to teachers.

The various perceptions of the role expected of the key teachers are shown in Table 13. Six of the participants, all of them teachers, did not perceive anything of the key teachers. The perceptions of the other thirteen participants were very
diverse in nature. Such diversity is found within the groups, as well as between groups and schools. The role expectations shared one common component; they were all related to the key teacher's role of bringing about changes at the personal and/or the school levels. The personal level involved the key teachers themselves. The emphasis here was on the teaching of the new history curriculum by the key teachers. Eleven out of the thirteen participants with expectations stated this explicitly. B5's and C1's expectations were stated implicitly in their responses to related questions. Out of the eleven participants who explicitly stated their perceptions with regard to the teaching of the new history curriculum by the key teachers, three of them (KA, KC and AB) expected the key teachers to bring changes to their teaching through the teaching of the new content area. The remaining eight felt that changes in teaching could only be achieved through the use of improved methods of teaching.

Changes at the school level involved the use of the new history curriculum by teachers in the schools. The key teachers could help bring about such changes by disseminating information about the new history curriculum and/or helping teachers use the new curriculum in their classrooms. Dissemination involved carrying out one or both of the following activities: informing teachers of the change in curriculum and explaining to them the changes proposed by the new curriculum. The first function which seemed to be the easier and simpler of the two was perceived by all three key teachers and also represented the only expectation, other than teaching, for KA and KC. KB, together with teachers B5 and C1, administrator AC in School C and all three officials
Table 13

The Role Expected of the Key Teachers as Perceived by the Key Teachers, Teachers, Administrators and Officials of the Ministry of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants/Expected Role</th>
<th>Personal level Changes</th>
<th>School level Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach the NHC*</td>
<td>Inform Teachers of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Teachers</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KB</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KC</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers***</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE**Officials</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = New History Curriculum  
** = Ministry of Education  
*** = Teachers A2, B1, B2, B3, B4 and B6 had no expectations at all.

of the Ministry of Education shared the perceptions of the key teachers' role in explaining the new history curriculum and helping teachers use the curriculum.

Another striking similarity among the perceptions was that they had remained unchanged from the time of their conception to the time of the study. The main reason given was the fact that nothing happened during the intervening period that would cause
Factors Influencing perceptions of role expectations

Three factors could be identified as contributing to the similarities and differences in the perceptions of the various participants. These factors are the participants' awareness of the implementation strategy and of the existence of the key teachers, the origin of their perceptions and contact among the various participants.

Awareness of the implementation strategy and of the presence of the key teachers in the schools. The participants' perceptions of the role expected of the key teachers were related to their familiarity with the strategy used to implement the new history curriculum and consequently their awareness of the existence of the key teachers in the schools. Participants such as the three officials of the Ministry of Education, who were familiar with the strategy, appeared to share similar views of what the key teachers were expected to do. To them the key teachers were not only expected to teach the new history curriculum using methods recommended by the Ministry of Education, but also to act as change agents in the schools. Those unfamiliar with the strategy perceived the key teacher's role in diverse ways. Those participants who knew the key teachers only as teachers in the schools or were completely unaware of their presence even as teachers in the schools, were void of any expectation. The perceptions of those who knew the key teachers only as teachers who had attended inservice courses
on the new history curriculum were, however, varied.

The data indicated that the participants' familiarity with the implementation strategy and with the concept of key teacher diminished as one moved from the Ministry to the school levels. Those at the higher hierarchy level of the education system were more acquainted with the implementation strategy than those at the school level, that is, the key teachers, teachers, or the school administrators. Information about the implementation strategy had obviously not filtered down to those in the schools where implementation took place. There was no systematic plan of making the strategy known to the people at the school level. For example, administrator AC learned about the implementation strategy by virtue of being a district key personnel for an innovation project which utilized a similar strategy. It was highly likely that KB also learned about the implementation strategy not from being a key teacher or from attending the inservice course on the new history curriculum in 1977 as experienced by the other two key teachers, but by being selected a district key personnel for the new history curriculum at Form 2. At the centrally-organized inservice course for district key personnel which he attended in 1977, KB could have been exposed to the implementation plan by the staff of the Curriculum Development Centre, the organizer of the course. The other two key teachers, KA and KC did not attend this centrally-organized inservice course for district key personnel.

The participants' familiarity with the implementation strategy and consequently their awareness of the key teachers
varied with their position in the education system and the implementation hierarchy. The further they were from the source of innovation, the less the knowledge of the strategy and awareness on the part of the key teachers and the greater the diversity on role expectations.

**Origin of perceptions.** The data revealed that the nature of the participants' perceptions seemed to be closely related to their origin. Perceptions that originated from the participants' knowledge of the implementation strategy were somewhat similar. The perceptions of those who, either in full or in part, based them on their experience or knowledge of past inservice courses, including the one on the new history curriculum were, however, varied. A1 and AA, for example, believed that teachers were only expected to be better teachers after their return from any inservice course. KB who attended the same inservice course as KA and KC, believed that as a key teacher he was expected to explain the new curriculum and to help teachers use the curriculum in their classrooms, in addition to teaching and informing teachers of the curriculum change, as perceived by KA and KC.

Those expectations that originated from the participants' own perceptions did not seem to adhere to any commonality, despite the participants' belief that these perceptions represented what they viewed as customary or as regular features of the school. This shows that the participants differed in what they viewed as a regular practice in the school and that these different views consequently coloured their expectations of the
key teachers. A3, for example, expected the key teachers to be better teachers, B1 expected the key teachers to do nothing, and B5 expected them to be teachers as well as change agents.

Contact among the participants. The absence of any implementation-related activities following the inservice course on the new history curriculum may explain the constancy of the expectations of those participants in the schools. There were no follow-up activities during the four years of implementation to cause the participants to review or modify their expectations. The teachers were generally left alone to carry out their own activities. The lack of contact between the school and the Ministry of Education could be seen in the absence of any visits or circulars to, and further inservice courses or briefings for, the key teachers and teachers. Contact between the key teachers and teachers, and the school administrators was also sparse. The key teachers and teachers believed that regular contact could have increased their awareness and understanding of the key teachers and their role in the implementation of the new history curriculum. Teachers, key teachers and administrators who believed that the inservice course attended by the key teachers was basically aimed at the latter's own professional development continued to expect very little of the key teachers.

The perceptions of the Ministry of Education officials, like those of the participants at the school level, had also remained unchanged. The three officials interpreted the absence of any news from the Curriculum Development Centre, the division responsible for the planning for implementation, as indicative of
the absence of any changes or revisions to the implementation strategy employed by the Ministry.

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE KEY TEACHERS

This section highlights the similarities and differences in the activities of the key teachers as described by the key teachers themselves and as perceived by the other three groups of participants. The section also discusses the usefulness of the activities of the key teachers and the congruencies and discrepancies between the role expected of, and carried out by, the key teachers.

Variations Within the Groups of Participants

The activities are described as perceived by the key teachers, teachers, school administrators and officials of the Ministry of Education.

The key teachers. Two groups of activities emerged from the key teachers' descriptions of their activities: common activities and individual activities. Common activities are those carried out by all three key teachers and individual activities represent activities unique to individual key teachers. A summary of these activities is given in Table 14.

(1) Common activities. These activities comprised the key teachers' teaching of the new history curriculum, the selecting of new textbooks and those aimed at helping teachers with their
Table 14
Summary of Key Teachers' Description of their Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Key Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Text-Books</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Advice and Guidance</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Discussions</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform Teachers of curriculum change</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showed Teachers Sample Textbooks</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-initiated Activities</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

use of the new curriculum. All three key teachers had been teaching the new history curriculum but at various times and for various durations. The involvement of the key teachers with teaching the new history curriculum varied from 1-3 years.

All three key teachers were involved in the selection of history textbooks for Form 1. This activity was carried out in late 1977. Textbooks for the following year were selected before the end of the current school year to ensure that these books would reach the schools before the beginning of the next school year. The key teachers explained that they had been specifically requested by the principals to be responsible for the task of selecting the new textbook. The way these key teachers went
about selecting the textbooks, however, differed. Key teacher KB called a meeting of all the lower form teachers and the senior subject teacher specifically for the purpose. Key teachers KA and KC, however, chose the textbooks themselves and then informed the principals of their choices. A key teacher selected one textbook out of a list of about seven textbooks approved by the Textbook Bureau of the Ministry of Education. The selection was based on criteria which the key teachers learned at the inservice course. These included simplicity and clarity of language used in the textbook, the sequencing of the topics and the usefulness of the illustrations. The key teachers were also influenced by impressive advertising conducted by the representatives of the textbook publishers at the inservice course.

Most of the activities of the key teachers revolved around helping teachers with their efforts at using the new curriculum in their classrooms. The key teachers provided help in the form of advice and guidance or through informal discussions with the teachers. The key teachers made it known that they would offer the teachers advice and guidance on matters relating to the new curriculum and its teaching only when requested by the latter because they felt more at ease in situations whereby the teachers approached them first. They were afraid that their sincere effort might be misconstrued by the teachers. Moreover, they felt that teachers were generally not receptive to suggestions and ideas from others. The key teachers also made it known that the advice and guidance given to the teachers were based on their own ideas and experience in teaching the subject and/or their preservice training. Very little was based on the inservice
course. The teachers sought help from the key teachers usually when faced with problems related to the use of the new curriculum. These included problems related to the preparation of schemes of work and their lack of understanding of historical facts and concern over the insufficiency of the textbook in providing them with the content necessary for teaching.

The key teachers also helped the teachers through informal discussions of matters related to the new curriculum. These discussions acted as a forum for giving of help and guidance, or for exchange of views among the teachers, including the key teachers. KB, for example, initiated several informal meetings with teachers to discuss "more effective" methods of teaching the new history curriculum, that is those that could capture the students' interest as well as promote student learning. KB was, however, the only key teacher out of the three key teachers in the study who initiated such a discussion. Most of the discussions occurred as the need for history teachers to discuss among themselves everyday problems and concerns arose.

(2) Individual activities. The key teachers also carried out activities in response to the need of specific situations and/or which were motivated by various characteristics of the key teachers. Key teachers working in different situations or having different characteristics carried out different activities. These activities included informing teachers of the change in the curriculum, showing teachers the textbooks for the new curriculum, sharing of teaching tasks and preparing notes and aids for the subject.
After attending the inservice course in 1977, both key teachers KA and KB informed the Form 1 history teachers of the decision of the Ministry of Education to adopt a new history curriculum for the lower Forms (Forms 1-3) beginning with the Form 1 the following year (1978). The circumstances in which this happened, however, differed. KB, who was teaching history at Form 1 at the time, immediately informed his colleagues of the change. KA, however, waited till he was asked by the teachers because she was not teaching the subject at the time and, therefore, had little contact with the teachers. KC, on the other hand, kept quiet about the change though he was aware of his role because the opportunity or the need to inform teachers of the change did not arise. Being the only teacher teaching history at Form 1, there was no other teachers to be informed.

KC, on his own initiative, offered teacher C1 the use of his notes and teaching aids because KC perceived that the teacher could gain by using them. KA prepared lesson notes, aids and examination questions because of the mutual needs of the group of teachers teaching the new history curriculum of which she was a member. She volunteered the scheme of work for the years she taught the new history curriculum because she felt confident and capable doing it. She not only specialized in the teaching of history but also had considerable experience teaching the subject.
The teachers. An analysis of the teachers' responses revealed two groups of teachers: teachers who recalled some activities of the key teachers and those who were not aware of any such activity. Six out of the ten teachers included in the study made up the latter group, five coming from School B. The activities of the key teachers as perceived by the four teachers that comprised the first group could be classified into four categories depending on whether they were initiated by the key teachers, teachers, administrators or group of teachers. A summary of the activities of the key teachers as perceived by the teachers is summarised in Table 15.

Table 15
The Activities of the Key Teacher as Perceived by the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teach the NHC*</th>
<th>Explain the NHC*</th>
<th>Helping Activities</th>
<th>Routine Activities Related to Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Help and Guidance</td>
<td>Informal Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = New History Curriculum
Teachers A2, B1, B2, B3, B4 and B6 did not recall any activities of the key teachers

(1) Key teacher-initiated activities. Only two teachers, B5 and C1, were able to recall activities initiated by the key
teachers themselves. B5 believed that key teacher KB explained the new history curriculum to the senior subject teacher, who in turn, briefed the teachers. C1 reported that the key teacher did provide him with a scheme of work with which he was, however, not very impressed. He did not feel that such an effort demanded much of the key teacher. The scheme of work was a by-product of the inservice course on the new history curriculum, and KC had not made any changes or revisions to it. Moreover, C1 perceived the handing of a scheme of work to a teacher newly-assigned to the subject as a routine in the school.

(2) Teacher-initiated activities. Four teachers, A1, A3, B5 and C1, had initiated meetings with the key teachers to discuss matters related to the teaching of the new history curriculum and/or to seek the latter's help with their problems and concerns. These meetings were usually short and informal. They were also few in number because the teachers did not perceive themselves as having many problems with their teaching. The teachers also met with the key teachers for the purpose of coordinating their teaching and preparing the common mid-year or final examinations for the subject. This act of checking with other teachers regarding the topics that have been or were being taught, however, represented routine activities in the school.

(4) Administrator-initiated activities. The key teachers were assigned by the administrators to teach. KC was requested by the one of the administrators in the school to prepare questions for a mid-year examination for history. C1, however, did not seem to attach too much significance to this activity.
He believed that it was circumstances and not the fact that KC as key teacher that prompted the administrator to give the task to KC. At the time, KC was the only person available for the job.

(4) **Group-initiated activities.** These activities were carried out jointly by the teachers teaching the subject, including the key teachers, and motivated by a common need to lessen their workload. Preparing notes for distribution to the students is an example of such activity.

The school administrators. Except for teaching, the administrators were generally quite unaware of the activities of the key teachers in the schools. A summary of the activities of the key teachers as perceived by their respective administrators is shown in Table 16. In two of the schools, School A and School C, the key teachers were teaching the new history curriculum at the time of the study. AB, in his two years as senior assistant in School B, did not assign KB to teach the new curriculum. The administrators in School A and School C were unable to say much about the key teachers' teaching because they had not observed the latter teaching. Nonetheless, both AA and AC believed that the key teachers would have used the new ideas and skills acquired at the inservice course to improve their teaching.

AB and AC recalled witnessing discussions between the key teachers and the teachers in their respective schools. AC took it for granted that they discussed matters related to the preparation of examination questions and the scheme of work because the school expected the teachers to talk to each other about such routine matters. Unlike AC, AB was uncertain about
Table 16
The Activities of the Key Teacher as Perceived by the School Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teach the NHC*</th>
<th>Informal Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = New History Curriculum

the purpose of the discussions, what transpired between the key teacher and the teachers and whether the discussion had anything to do with the new history curriculum.

The administrators attributed their apparent lack of awareness of the activities of the key teachers to two main factors: the lack of contact between the administrators and the key teachers and the very recent appointments of AB and AC as afternoon supervisors. AA and AC had very little direct contact with the teachers including the key teachers because as administrators they were responsible mainly for the general administration of the afternoon sessions. AB had very little contact with the teachers teaching the new history curriculum in the afternoon because as senior assistant, he worked mostly in the morning. Moreover, AB's responsibility in the administration of curriculum-related matters in the school did not entail the need to come into direct contact with the teachers in the school.

The administrators' task also did not include the supervision of teachers and their teaching. They considered teachers to be qualified and responsible professionals and,
therefore, capable of carrying out their work without having to be supervised. Moreover, the senior subject teachers for history have been delegated the responsibility of coordinating the teaching of history and of helping teachers teaching the subject with their concerns and problems.

Two of the administrators, AB and AC, also attributed their general lack of awareness of the key teachers' activities to their very recent appointments as administrators in their respective schools. Both of them assumed their respective administrative positions only in 1980. Any recollections of the activities of the key teachers, therefore, covered only those activities that took place during their two years as administrators in the schools.

The officials of the Ministry of Education. The three officials of the Ministry of Education who participated in the study differed in their perceptions and awareness of the activities of the key teachers. M3 was unable to say much about the activities of the key teachers because of her lack of involvement in the use of the new history curriculum at the school level. M1 perceived that about 80 percent of the key teachers carried out one or more activities such as organizing meetings and discussions and circulating notes and materials. M2 was more pessimistic. He claimed that only a very small group of key teachers carried out such activities and that these activities were carried out haphazardly.
Overall Comparison

The above analysis revealed that the activities of the key teachers varied both in type and origin. There were four types, namely teaching, disseminating, helping and routine activities. The activities were initiated by the key teachers, teachers, school administrators or by the group of teachers teaching the new curriculum. This framework for categorization of key teachers' activities is shown in Table 17.

Teaching. Teaching appeared to be the most-mentioned activity of the key teachers. The key teachers had at one time or another taught the new history curriculum. Participants in School A and School C, where KA and KC were teaching the new history curriculum at the time frequently cited teaching as the activity carried out by KA and KC. In School B only KB was able to recall having taught the new history curriculum during its first year of implementation. The administrators and most of the teachers interviewed were not working in the school at the time.

The decision on whether the key teachers were to teach the new history curriculum was dependent entirely on the administrators or their appointees, who prepared the timetable for their respective schools. The key teachers did not seem to have much input into the decision. The Ministry of Education or the State Education Department could have suggested to the school administrators that these key teachers be assigned to teach the new history curriculum.
Table 17
Categories of Key Teacher Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Origin</th>
<th>Key Teacher initiated</th>
<th>Teacher initiated</th>
<th>Administrator initiated</th>
<th>Group initiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate NHC*</td>
<td>Inform Teachers of Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain NHC*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Activities</td>
<td>Informal Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Help and Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Activities</td>
<td>Coordinate Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare Exam. Questions and Scheme of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare Notes and Aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select a Textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * = New History Curriculum

Disseminating activities. Activities such as informing teachers of the change to a new curriculum and explaining the new curriculum to teachers are categorized as disseminating activities because these activities were aimed at exposing and familiarizing teachers with the new curriculum.
(1) **Informing teachers of the change.** This activity was carried out only by two of the key teachers, KA and KB, soon after their return from the inservice course of 1977. While KB carried it out of his own initiative, KA needed some prompting from the teachers. KA was reluctant to approach the teachers because she was not teaching at Form 1 then and, therefore, had very little contact with the teachers. KC did not inform teachers of the change because there were no other teachers teaching history at Form 1 at the time.

(2) **Explaining the new history curriculum to teachers.** Except perhaps for B5, no other study participants mentioned anything about the key teachers having enlightened the teachers on the characteristics of the new history curriculum based on what the key teachers had learned at the inservice course that they attended. B5 believed that KB must have enlightened the senior subject teacher about the new history curriculum to have enabled the latter to explain the new curriculum to the teachers at a subject meeting. However, B5 did not witness personally KB disseminating the information to the senior subject teacher. Her belief was based on circumstantial evidence, namely, that KB was the most logical person to have briefed the senior subject teacher. However, judging from the reportedly superficial explanation from the senior subject teacher on the new history curriculum, it is highly probable that the senior subject teacher's knowledge about the new history curriculum could have been acquired by reading the syllabus. Moreover, the senior subject teacher was teaching the new history curriculum in Form 3 at the time.
Helping activities. Helping activities refer to those activities aimed at helping teachers with the new curriculum. This category included participating in informal discussions with teachers, and providing teachers with help and guidance in using the new curriculum in the classrooms.

(1) Informal discussion. The key teachers and teachers were often engaged in informal discussions initiated by either the key teachers or the teachers. These discussions possessed five characteristics. (i) They were informal in nature and took place anywhere and anytime the need for them arose. (ii) The key teachers were involved in such discussions only when they taught the new history curriculum together with the other teachers. (iii) The discussions were carried out on a collegial basis. The key teachers were involved in their capacity as teachers teaching the subject and not as key teachers. (iv) Most of the time, the discussions were conducted on a one-to-one basis. The only exception seemed to be the discussion organized by KB and attended by the teachers teaching the new history curriculum, aimed at searching for alternative ways of teaching the subject. (v) These discussions were mostly related to teacher concerns and problems about the content area. Discussions over the methodology also took place though not as frequently as those related to the subject matter.

(2) Providing help and guidance. The type of help and guidance provided to teachers by the key teachers varied depending on the nature of help sought. KB advised B5 on how to prepare her scheme of work, KC explained and clarified the new
content area to C1 and KA helped A1 with her methodology. These activities were carried out at various times and places.

Most of the helping activities mentioned above were initiated by the teachers. The only activity that appeared to originate with the key teacher was that of KC letting C1 use his notes and teaching aids. Two factors helped explain this similarity in origin. First, all the key teachers were reluctant to offer any help or guidance unless specifically asked to do so by the administrators or unless approached by the teachers. Second, the two teachers (B5 and C1) who approached their respective key teacher for help did so without hesitation because they perceived that the key teachers were there to help them.

Routine activities. Routine activities refer to those activities that were usually carried out for all subjects in the schools mainly for the purpose of facilitating the teaching of these subjects. Such activities included coordinating the teaching of the new history curriculum; the preparation of schemes of work, common examination questions and teaching notes and aids; and selecting textbooks for the new curriculum. A3 and C1, for example, consulted or discussed with their respective key teachers regarding topics that have been or were being taught by the latter to ensure that the former was in step with the others. KA indicated that he had been involved in preparing schemes of work and examination questions while C1 reported KC having been assigned to prepare the latter. All three key teachers reported being asked by the school principals to be responsible for selecting new history textbooks for their schools.
Summary of Characteristics of Key Teachers' Activities

Five characteristics of the key teachers' activities could be identified. Firstly, the activities carried out by the key teachers represented usual school activities. These activities would have taken place even without the key teachers in the schools. Teachers were assigned to teach the new history curriculum regardless of whether they were designated as key teachers for the new history curriculum or just ordinary history teachers. Informal discussions among teachers teaching a particular subject was a common occurrence. Teachers would still continue their practice of checking with each other and preparing schemes of work and examination questions regardless of whether the key teachers were there teaching the new history curriculum together with them. The fact that the key teachers' activities occurred mainly when the key teachers were teaching the new history curriculum was indicative of the 'traditional' nature of these activities.

Secondly, the key teachers did not seem to have much control over their activities. Most of the activities carried out by the key teachers were determined or initiated by the school administrators or the teachers. There was an evident lack of any conscious effort on the part of the key teachers to help teachers use the new curriculum in their classrooms.

Thirdly, teaching of the new history curriculum acted as a catalyst to other key teacher-related activities. Activities such as informal discussions and the preparation of examination
questions were so closely tied to the teaching-learning process that the key teachers would not have been involved had they not taught the new history curriculum together with the teachers.

Fourthly, interactions between the key teachers and the teachers were collegial. In most cases, the key teachers were viewed by the teachers and administrators simply as one of the teachers teaching the subject, and not as a source of help for the teachers.

Fifthly, the activities of the key teachers in the various schools were somewhat similar. The differences in geographical setting, school size, the seniority of the school administrators, and the number of teachers teaching the new history curriculum did not seem to cause much variation in the activities carried out by the key teachers.

The Usefulness of the Activities of the Key Teachers

A majority of the participants who were able to recall activities carried out by the key teachers perceived these activities to be generally useful. An activity was perceived to be useful if it met one or more of three criteria: (1) it facilitated key teacher-teacher interaction; (2) it facilitated the performances of activities routinely associated with teaching such as preparing schemes of work; and (3) it helped teachers in their teaching and preparation for teaching.
Facilitating key teacher-teacher interaction. The data clearly showed that unless teachers were fully aware of the presence of the key teachers in the schools and unless the key teachers were also teaching the new history curriculum, the teachers tended not to approach the key teachers for consultation or to involve them in any of their teaching-related activities. The teachers appeared to prefer to discuss matters relating to the new history curriculum and its teaching among fellow-teachers teaching the subject. This observation was confirmed by key teacher KB's recollection that teachers approached him for help more frequently when he was teaching the new history curriculum than when he was not, and teacher A1's view that she would not have approached key teacher KA had the latter not been teaching the new history curriculum at the time. Teaching provided the key teachers and teachers with more and better opportunities for meeting and communicating with one another.

The school administrators, however, did not view teaching the new history curriculum as an important factor in key teacher-teacher interaction. Teaching could facilitate communication, but according to AB and AC, the key teachers and teachers could still contact each other even though the key teachers were not assigned to teach the new history curriculum. They reasoned that the key teachers would still be in the same school and possibly teaching the new history curriculum at another level.
Facilitating the performance of activities routinely associated with teaching. Activities such as preparing and helping teachers prepare their schemes of work, discussions and consultations for the purpose of coordinating their teaching of the subject and preparing of examination questions, and preparing notes and aids for teaching were considered useful by the key teachers, teachers, and school administrators. According to them, these activities were useful because they helped in the fulfilment of important school tradition and requirements, namely the schemes of work, examinations, and notes to be handed to the students. Teachers are required to prepare schemes of work for every subject they are teaching and to provide notes to students. These notes served to help students prepare for examinations and to indicate to parents and school administrators the coverage of the syllabus by the teacher. Students are required to sit for common mid-year and end-of-year examinations. The results of these examinations are used as a criterion to stream students into the various classes in the following year.

Helping teachers in their teaching of, and preparation for teaching, the new history curriculum. Activities that were perceived to have succeeded in helping teachers with their teaching of the the new history curriculum and preparation for teaching it were viewed favourably by the participants.

- Teacher C1 claimed that the discussions with, and help provided by, key teacher KC regarding the content area, namely the notes and the list of references, helped him to teach better because they enhanced his knowledge and understanding of certain
topics in the syllabus. Key teacher KB believed that the discussions on methodology that he initiated were useful to teachers because, through such exchange, teachers learned new teaching methods and gained new ideas that could be used to improve their teaching, and consequently make the subject more interesting to the students. KB cited the teachers' ability to complete their lessons as planned as proof of an improvement in their teaching.

The key teachers perceived activities aimed at helping teachers cope with their concerns and problems as helpful to the teachers because these activities were geared towards meeting the specific needs of those who approached the key teachers. However, teacher A1 was not very pleased with the outcome of her discussion with the key teacher because she felt that she had learned nothing new or useful that she could use to overcome her problems in teaching the weaker classes. B5 also had reservation about the guidance provided by key teacher KB on how to prepare a scheme of work for the new history curriculum. She was completely on her own in the actual preparation of the scheme of work; the guidance was brief and limited.

Activities such as helping teachers prepare their work or those which provided them with schemes of work, or offered teachers the use of their notes and teaching aids were also judged as useful because they aided the teachers both in their teaching and in the preparation for their teaching. Other similar useful activities were those which helped the school select suitable textbooks for the new history curriculum were
also judged as useful. Schemes of work, for example, helped to guide the teachers in the choice of topics to be taught and to maintain some uniformity in the teaching of the subject. KC felt that by offering teachers the use of notes and aids, he could help them save valuable time and energy in their preparation. Teachers' belief regarding the adequacy of the textbooks and their resultant dependence on them as their main aid to teaching underscore the importance of the key teachers' task of selecting appropriate textbooks for the school.

The key teachers viewed their activity of informing teachers of the change to a new curriculum as useful only to the extent that it made the teachers aware of what was to come. The activity did not prepare the teachers for the eventual use of the new curriculum in the classrooms.

**Expected versus Actual Roles**

A comparison of the role expected of, and the role performed by, the key teachers revealed several congruencies and discrepancies. These are discussed under the headings of the three main roles expected of the key teachers: teaching, disseminating and helping.

**Teaching.** All three key teachers had experienced teaching the new history curriculum though the time and duration of their teaching varied. Key teachers KA and KC and Ministry officials M1 and M2 expected the key teachers to teach the new history curriculum in its first year of implementation. However, only KB was assigned to teach the new curriculum in its first year of
implementation. For those who expected the key teachers to bring changes through the teaching of a new content area, this expectation was realised. Teachers in all three schools were teaching the contents as contained in the syllabus. However, the expectation of those participants who perceived that the key teachers were expected to teach more effectively by using new and/or improved methods of teaching, did not materialize. The key teachers were unable to use the various methods advocated by the new curriculum.

**Dissemination of the new history curriculum to teachers.** Two of the three key teachers, KA and KB, informed the teachers in their schools of the change to a new curriculum, on their return to the schools after the inservice course. KC was, however, prevented from doing this by his timetable schedule, even though like the other key teachers, he perceived that it was expected of him.

Except for the alleged effort by KB in explaining the new history curriculum to the senior subject teacher, as reported by B5, the key teachers did not seem to go beyond the informing stage, to the explaining stage. The key teachers were unable to explain or familiarize teachers with the rationale, assumptions, objectives or the methods of teaching and evaluating the new history curriculum.
Helping teachers use the new curriculum in their classrooms. All key teachers were involved in some form of helping activities such as participating in informal discussions, and providing advice and guidance, or instructional aids for use by teachers. KA and KC helped teachers even though they did not perceive it to be their role because the teachers approached them. Most of the helping activities were initiated by the teachers; the exceptions were the informal discussion initiated by KB and KC's offer to C1 for the use of his instructional materials.

M2 believed that the key teachers could help teachers by being models. According to him, the majority of the key teachers were, however, unable to help teachers via their own teaching, because the key teachers were themselves using the traditional ways of teaching the new history curriculum.

In addition to the three roles described above, the key teachers were also perceived as carrying out activities that were part of the school's routine and, therefore, were not perceived to be part of the role of the key teachers. These activities were carried out by all three key teachers though the frequency, type and timing of these activities differed.
FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE KEY TEACHERS

The participants identified five factors which influenced the activities of the key teachers: the nature of the inservice course, the support given to the key teachers, the diversity in perceptions, the environment of the schools, and communication among the participants. These factors are discussed below together with the reasons that accounted for the existence of these factors and how the factors accounted for the similarities and differences in the activities of the key teachers, and between the role expected of, and the role performed by, the key teachers.

Nature of the Inservice

The inservice course was the only vehicle by which the key teachers were familiarized with the new history curriculum and their role as key teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum in the schools. The course, however, failed to prepare the key teachers adequately for their role. The key teachers attending the course learned very little about the new curriculum and the role expected of them. The inservice course did not equip the key teachers with adequate skills to use the curriculum in the classrooms and to carry out their role in the schools. As a result, the key teachers were unable to show teachers new teaching methods nor become models to the teachers because they themselves continued to use traditional ways of teaching and were not sure about new ones. They were also unable to explain the new curriculum adequately due to their limited
knowledge of the curriculum.

The inservice course did not explain clearly the role expected of them as key teachers, nor was their role mentioned in the letters informing them of their selection to attend the inservice course. Their role could have been clarified by giving examples of specific activities to be carried out by the key teachers. At the time of the study, key teachers KA and KC seemed to have only a vague idea of the role expected of them and had difficulties expressing them. Even KB, who was aware of what was expected of him as a key teacher remained vague on the kind of activities that he could carry out to fulfil his role. The only major contribution of the inservice course was in providing the key teachers with guidelines on how to select suitable textbooks for their schools.

The failure of the inservice course in providing the key teachers with the necessary information and skills to enable them to carry out their role satisfactorily, was attributed to several factors: the inadequacy of the subject matter covered, the lack of variety in the mode of presentation, the perceived lack of ability of the district key personnel, and the inappropriateness of the inservice course schedule and the unsuitability of the location of the course.

Inadequacy of the subject matter. The content of the course was limited and superficial. Discussions dealt mainly with the new content area and the change in the focus of the new curriculum. The district key personnel gave a lecture on the various teaching techniques and strategies that could be used by
the teachers in the teaching of the new curriculum but the key teachers considered it to be stale and inadequate. The key teachers claimed that they learned no new teaching methodology from the in-service course; the method discussed was similar to those they had learned during their teacher training. It was too abstract and too general to be of use; it lacked concrete examples such as lesson demonstrations or group teachings that could be used as examples for everyday situations. This explained why the key teachers were only able to see or to point to changes in the subject matter and focus. The key teachers failed to see any changes in the methodology because techniques recommended for use by the Ministry of Education were techniques they were already familiar with.

The topics to be covered in the in-service course as they appeared in the course timetable were, as key teacher C put it, very impressive. However, more often than not, the actual course bore very little resemblance to the original course outline. The general feeling among the three key teachers seemed to be that had the district key personnel followed the course outline more closely, the key teachers would have learned a lot more from the course.

Lack of variety in the mode of presentation. The manner in which the course was conducted was also a source of discontent among the key teachers. According to them, there was no variety in the mode of presentation. The district key personnel's dependence on lectures and reading from notes resulted in boredom among the key teachers. Scheduled workshops did not materialise,
and those that did were far from being satisfactory.

The inservice course also lacked fruitful discussions of topics and issues relevant to the key teachers' understanding of the new curriculum and their efforts at implementing it. According to the key teachers, though they were given working papers on the new curriculum, written by experts in the field, they were not given enough time to read and to understand the contents of these papers before discussing them. They were, thus, unable to contribute much towards the discussions. Quite often, and to the dismay of the key teachers, some papers were never discussed or referred to in the lectures and discussions.

The discussion of the methodology in the inservice course, as indicated by KC, was too general and abstract to be of much help to his teaching. He would have preferred to see the district key personnel organize practical sessions, where teachers prepared a lesson plan for a particular topic, taught the topic utilizing one or more of the recommended methods and then discussed their performance. He considered these sessions to be a more superior way of learning the skills required to teach the new history curriculum than the district key personnel's lectures. He found learning by doing to be more effective than learning through lectures.

One reason for the lack of variety in the mode of presentation was the fact that only one person, the district key personnel, was responsible for carrying out the whole inservice course.
Lack of ability of the district key personnel. The key teachers were not impressed with, and did not have confidence in, the ability of the district key personnel who conducted the inservice course they attended. They perceived that the district key personnel's lack of knowledge, experience, qualification and fluency had contributed to the inadequacies of the inservice course, namely the lack of variety in the mode of delivery, the lack of instructional materials used or exhibited for use in teaching the new history curriculum, and the limited amount of knowledge and skills acquired by the key teachers.

The key teachers felt that the district key personnel's lack of competence had resulted in the inefficient use of time at the inservice course. Disproportionate amounts of time were allocated to advertising by textbook publishers and to discussing a particular working paper. A substantial amount of time during the inservice course was not utilized; though the course was supposed to last from eight o'clock in the morning through to four o'clock in the afternoon, it was not uncommon to see teachers dispersing at around lunch time. The district key personnel's lack of fluency and ability to express his ideas clearly made it difficult for the key teachers to follow and to understand the lectures. The district key personnel was also perceived as having nothing much to offer because he did not possess any extra qualification that would make him more knowledgeable than the key teachers.
Inappropriateness of the course schedule and location. The schedule for the inservice course and the place where it was conducted were inappropriate. As noted by KA and KB, six days of inservice course was inadequate in exposing teachers to a new curriculum and, consequently, in preparing them for their role as key teachers. More time was needed to enable the key teachers to clarify their thinking, to raise and to discuss matters that they felt were critical to their understanding of the new curriculum and their roles.

The scheduling of the inservice course on six consecutive Saturdays resulted in a lack of continuity in the discussions; the six day break in between each inservice course days was too long and this presented certain difficulties in the key teachers' attempts at trying to recollect previous discussions. Such time gaps also prevented teachers from getting to know each other well enough to feel comfortable with each other, and from developing the group feeling considered essential for any fruitful discussion. The poor utilization of time has been discussed in the previous section.

The key teachers and others familiar with the inservice course also found the school where the course was conducted to be less than conducive for learning. The school not only lacked the facilities and resources needed for learning of a new curriculum but was also incapable of providing a room specifically for the inservice course. There was no doubt that the key teachers would have preferred a week-long inservice course held at a place with a more conducive learning environment.
Considering that the key teachers and the Ministry of Education viewed the inservice course as an important vehicle in familiarising the key teachers with the new history curriculum and in preparing them for their role as key teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum in their respective schools, it would be important to ensure that the inservice course was capable of preparing the key teachers for their role. The analysis shows how important it was for the key teachers to understand the new history curriculum, namely its assumptions, objectives, content and techniques of teaching and evaluation, and their role as key teachers, and to possess the skills needed to use the curriculum in the classrooms and to carry out their role, for them to be able to perform their role successfully.

In addition to the content area, the inservice course should have emphasized the rationale for changing the history curriculum, the differences between the previous and the new curriculum, the techniques of teaching the new history curriculum and how they differed from the traditional practice of teaching history in the schools, the use of objectives to guide teaching, and the demands of the new history curriculum on the teachers. The course should also have been concerned with providing the key teachers with the skills to use the new curriculum. Key teachers need to be able to use the various techniques of teaching and to make use of local resources and materials for teaching, as suggested by the new history curriculum. Unless the key teachers understood the new history curriculum fully and possess the skills needed to teach it, they would not be in a position to explain the new history curriculum to the teachers or the school
administrators, to help teachers with their concerns and problems or to be expected to teach the new curriculum the way the developers had in mind.

The Curriculum Development Centre and the State Education Department could ensure that the inservice course equip key teachers with the above knowledge and skills by taking the following steps. The first step is to ensure that the district key personnel are well prepared and capable of conducting the inservice course at the state level. The district key personnel need to understand fully the new history curriculum to enable them to transfer the information to the key teachers, and to possess the necessary skills to help the key teachers acquire them. The district key personnel should also be familiar with the implementation strategy to be able to explain clearly to the key teachers their role. The Curriculum Development Centre also needs to expose and train the district key personnel in using a variety of ways of conducting an inservice course for them to carry out an interesting and meaningful inservice course for the key teachers.

The second step is to schedule the inservice course such that it provides sufficient time for the key teachers to gain an indepth knowledge of the new history curriculum and to acquire the skills needed for teaching as well as those skills needed to carry out their role successfully. Instead of the six weekends, the inservice course could take place within a one-week span held during the schools holidays, or during or after the LCE examination when teachers usually have fewer commitments. The
course could be held in places such as the Teacher Training Colleges or the Universities. When schools are chosen as a possible location, steps need to be taken to ensure that they possess the necessary facilities.

Support for the Key Teachers

Administrative support. The key teachers, teachers and Ministry of Education officials agreed that the support from the school administrators, be it moral or physical, was very important to the key teachers. The encouragement given, and the enthusiasm and interest shown, by the administrators, to the key teachers and the new history curriculum could increase the key teachers' awareness of the importance of their role, sustain their interest in their role as well as motivate them to carry out their role successfully. The administrators could encourage the key teachers and the teachers to use a variety of methods, and to meet regularly, and to remind the teachers to utilize the key teachers as resource persons for the new history curriculum.

The administrators could also support the key teachers by creating conditions that would facilitate the key teachers performance of their role, namely by assigning the key teachers to teach the new history curriculum, reducing their teaching load and other responsibilities, initiating meetings where key teachers and teachers could discuss the new history curriculum and its teaching. By supervising the key teachers and disseminating any available information about the new history curriculum to the key teachers and teachers, the administrators
could also contribute tremendously to the key teachers' performance of their role.

Such support was, however, lacking. Though the administrators were perceived as generally supportive and helpful to the teachers, as confirmed by the administrators themselves, they did not show much support for, and interest in, the key teachers and their activities and the implementation of the new history curriculum in the schools. The administrators treated the key teachers like any other teachers in the school and the new history curriculum like any other subjects. No special attention was given to the key teachers as resource persons in the implementation of the new curriculum and to the new history curriculum as a newly implemented subject.

This lack of support and interest was, according to the key teachers, teachers and Ministry of Education officials, evident in the administrators' failure to take one or more of the following actions: (1) to make inquiries about the inservice course and to request that the key teachers discuss the inservice course and the new history curriculum with teachers, (2) to assign the key teachers to teach the new history curriculum, (3) to allocate time for the key teachers and teachers to meet and to discuss their concerns and problems, and ways of alleviating them, (4) to recognize and consequently to inform teachers of the presence of the key teachers in the schools, and (5) to supervise the key teachers and their activities. The failure of the school administrators to carry out the above activities was perceived as being detrimental to the efforts of the key teachers in carrying
out their role. In fact this lack of activities on the part of
the administrators helped explain for the key teachers' lack of
awareness and interest in their role, and their failure and/or
reluctance to carry out activities pertinent to their role.

The lack of inquiries about the inservice course and the new
history curriculum, and the lack of supervision by the
administrators into the activities of the key teachers resulted
in the key teachers' continued lack of awareness or clarity of
their role and in a reinforcement of the belief that nothing much
was expected of them. This seemed to have encouraged the key
teachers to remain silent and to continue doing nothing more than
their regularly scheduled activities such as teaching and those
activities associated with teaching. The decision of the
administrators not to assign the key teachers to teach the new
history curriculum resulted in alienating the key teachers from
the teachers teaching the subject. The others tended not to
approach them for help or discussion regarding the new curriculum
because the key teachers, when not teaching the new history
curriculum, were perceived as inaccessible, and less able to
understand their problems and concerns and to help them. The
reduced visibility and accessibility of the key teachers to the
teachers could become worse with the constant change in teachers
and with the assignment of new teachers to teach the subject.

The failure of the administrators to allocate a special time
for the key teachers and teachers to meet provided little
opportunity for them to get together regularly to discuss their
teaching, concerns or problems, to seek solutions to their
problems, and to exchange views and ideas. Some encouragement from the school administrators could lead to more interactions between the teachers to help them implement the new curriculum.

None of the administrators accorded the key teachers the status and recognition similar to that given to the senior subject teachers or informed teachers of the key teachers' existence in the schools and their role in the implementation of the new history curriculum. The key teachers needed to be recognized and accepted by both the administrators and teachers, and to be formally informed of their role and of the activities they were to perform. Without such recognition, the key teachers tended to continue to think and to behave the way they were accustomed to, that is like the other teachers. They were reluctant to organize meetings with teachers or to offer teachers help with the new curriculum because they had not been directed to do so by the administrators. The teachers did not approach the key teachers for help unless the key teachers happened to be teaching the new history curriculum or were known to have taught the new curriculum because the administrators had not informed them of the availability of the key teachers.

Several reasons have been given to explain the lack of administrative support for the key teacher and the implementation of the new history curriculum. These factors include the administrators' lack of familiarity with the new history curriculum and the implementation strategy, attitudes towards history and its teaching, and the importance accorded the senior subject teachers in the schools.
(1) Lack of familiarity with the new history curriculum and the implementation strategy. Most of the administrators appeared to have very limited knowledge of the new history curriculum and the strategy used to implement the new curriculum in the schools. The administrators had not attended any inservice course, meetings or briefings that would help familiarise them with the new curriculum and with their role as well as the role of the key teachers in the process of implementing the new curriculum in the schools. No formal plan was made by the Curriculum Development Centre or the other divisions of the Ministry of Education responsible for curriculum implementation to orientate the school administrators. Any effort at familiarizing them with the new curriculum and its implementation strategy had to be initiated by the respective State Education Departments or the local association for school administrators.

The data underscore the importance of ensuring that the administrators are knowledgeable about the new history curriculum and its strategy for implementation as well as understanding their role as leaders in the school, and the role of the key teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum. Only through such awareness and understanding can the administrators provide the support needed by the key teachers in the performance of their role in the implementation of the new curriculum.

(2) Administrators' attitude towards history. History was generally considered an easy subject to teach and to understand, compared to other subjects like science and mathematics. Two of
the administrators, for example, believed that most teachers could teach the subject because the teaching of history, particularly at Form 1, does not require an indepth knowledge of the subject matter; the subject matter could easily be acquired from textbooks and other additional sources. The administrators assigned some teachers who had never taught history and/or who had not chosen history as their teaching option, to teach the new history curriculum. This assignment was interpreted rightly to mean that the administrators were indifferent towards the teaching of history, particularly the new history curriculum. For example, in schools A and B, out of a total of nine teachers included in the study, only three had undergone training in the teaching of history. The administrators' failure to ensure that the key teachers were assigned to teach the new history curriculum, especially during its first year of implementation, also reflected the former's lack of emphasis on the new history curriculum.

(3) The importance accorded to the senior subject teachers in the schools. In all three schools covered in the study, senior subject teachers had been appointed by the school administrators to be responsible for matters related to history and its teaching. The senior subject teachers' responsibilities included calling of, and preparing agenda for, subject meetings, coordinating the teaching of the subject and helping teachers with their concerns and problems. The importance and emphasis given to the senior subject teachers by the administrators resulted in the senior subject teachers getting the support from the administrators and recognition from the administrators and
teachers, thereby hindering closer contact between the key teachers and the administrators.

The teachers accepted the senior subject teachers as their leaders because the latter were appointed, duly recognized, and formally introduced to them by the administrators. The senior subject teachers' position as chairmen of subject meetings also added to the teachers' perception of the importance of the former. Teachers would, therefore, approach the senior subject teachers for advice or guidance because they knew of their availability. The recognition, support and visibility enjoyed by the senior subject teachers should have been accorded to the key teachers to enable them to carry out their role successfully.

The administrators' emphasis on the senior subject teachers and their practice of contacting only the latter in matters relating to the teaching of subjects under their supervision prevented closer contact between the administrators and the teachers, including the key teachers. KB, for example, believed that the principal of his school was unwilling to deal directly with the teachers other than the senior subject teachers. The principal would only communicate with the senior subject teacher for history because he had delegated the responsibility of supervising the teaching of history to the latter.

The key teachers did not appear to have any place in the school hierarchy. They were regarded only as one of the teachers in the school and, therefore, came directly under the supervision of the senior subject teachers. The key teachers, therefore, had to work closely with the senior subject teachers to get their
cooperation if they were to carry out their role successfully. The key teachers and the senior subject teachers had to be made aware of the need for such cooperation.

Professional Support. Support in the form of help or advice from those responsible for the implementation of the new curriculum was also perceived by the key teachers as critical to the satisfactory performance of their role. The Ministry of Education officials also agreed that support in the form of regular contact with, and supervision or visits from, the Ministry of Education, the State Education Department and the district key personnel could alleviate the problems associated with the implementation strategy employed, namely the problem of dilution of information and the dependence on the ability of the district key personnel. Such contact could also provide those responsible for implementation with information on what was going on in the schools, for example, the activities of, and the problems faced by, the key teachers in carrying out these activities and the problems encountered by teachers in the process of implementing the new history curriculum.

Such support was, however, lacking. The key teachers had nowhere to turn for help in overcoming problems in curriculum implementation. They were either not made aware of the availability of help or chose not to seek help from sources of which they might have been aware. Key teacher KB, for example, made no attempt to contact the district key personnel because he had no confidence in the ability of the former to help him.

The three key teachers were disappointed by the absence of
any follow-up activities. There was no contact between the key teachers and the officials of the Ministry or the State Education Office since the inservice course of 1977. There was no correspondence of any kind between them, no circulars, no request for progress reports and no visits to the schools. Though the School Inspectors did visit some of the schools, these visits were not specifically for the purpose of seeing to the implementation of the new curriculum; they were there either to see the other subjects or to see to the overall running of the schools. The key teachers were left entirely on their own. The inservice course of 1977 was the only form of contact they had with the people responsible for the implementation of the new curriculum.

According to the key teachers, the absence of any form of inservice course following the first one deprived them of the opportunity to discuss any problems that emerged during the course of implementing the curriculum. The key teachers were also critical of the fact that no effort was made to ensure that the key teachers carried out their roles. This, according to key teacher KB, differed from the inservice course he attended later where he was informed of future visits by lecturers to see if the ideas presented and discussed at the inservice course had been carried out and also to discuss any problems that the teachers faced in the course of implementing it. Key teacher KC also cited the case of the inservice course on audio visual aids attended by one of the teachers in his school. Following the inservice course, the school was supplied with aids and equipment such as slides and tape recorders. Such follow-up necessitated
some form of action on the part of the teacher who attended the inservice course. Had such follow-up activities occurred after the inservice course which he attended, he would have been awakened to the fact that a lot more was expected of him by the Ministry.

The key teachers interpreted the absence of follow-up activities such as visits and inservice courses to mean a lack of interest and concern by those responsible with the whole implementation process. It did not take long for the key teachers themselves to adopt a similar attitude towards the whole project.

Two reasons have been given to account for the lack of professional support, namely a shortage of personnel at the Ministry and a lack of time and money for implementation efforts. The lack of personnel prevented those responsible for overseeing the implementation of the new history curriculum from visiting all schools under their jurisdiction. There was only one State Social Studies Officer responsible for all three social studies subjects -- history, geography and civics -- taught in all primary and secondary schools in the state. The Inspectors of Schools for history were responsible for the teaching of history in all schools in the country as well as responsible for ensuring the smooth running of these schools.

A lack of provision of time and money prevented regular meetings between the district key personnel and the key teachers, on one hand, and the key teachers and teachers, on the other. The key teachers could benefit tremendously from regular meetings
with, and visits from, their respective district key personnel. Such meetings were, however, sparse because no provision was made for reduced district key personnel's teaching load or for teacher replacement to cover the time when the district key personnel were away from their teaching. The State Education Department and the principals were hesitant about allowing the district key personnel regular time off from their teaching because such arrangements were perceived as being unfair to students being taught by the district key personnel. Meetings between the district key personnel and the key teachers have reportedly been held in the past only when the State Education Department perceived a real need for them. The key teachers were also not given time off to meet regularly with the district key personnel, the key teachers of other schools and the teachers in their own schools, and to prepare for activities that could facilitate the implementation of the new history curriculum in the schools. No money was allocated to cover expenses incurred by the district key personnel for visits to schools or meetings with the key teachers.

The existing support system was inadequate. It was incapable of providing the key teachers and teachers with the support needed for implementation. The Ministry of Education could help the key teachers by elevating the district key personnel from being one of the regular teachers in the school to a consultant-type or advisory position, without any teaching responsibility. The district key personnel would work out of the newly-created District Office of Education and would be responsible for the implementation of the new history curriculum.
at the district level. Their duties could involve meeting key teachers and teachers in their districts and organizing inservice courses for the key teachers, teachers and administrators. The creation of this new post would obviously incur great cost to the Ministry of Education but the costs should offset the benefits of having a person whose sole responsibility is to help teachers implement the new curriculum. The creation of a full-time district key personnel would also help lessen the pressure on the Ministry of Education and the State Education Department. This post may be limited initially to a few districts or states, and then expanded gradually to the rest of the country. This stage-by-stage implementation would provide the Ministry with the feedback needed to improve the scheme, as well as provide the Ministry with time to find replacements for the district key personnel.

The school administrators could support the key teachers by giving them one or two fewer teaching periods per week, the extra time to be utilized for meetings with the district key personnel, for attending short courses, for planning and for meetings with teachers in the schools. After all, the decision to assign lighter teaching load to the key teachers is entirely left to the discretion of the school administrators. The other teachers would not have much problem accepting the key teachers' reduced load once they were made aware of the fact that the key teachers would be expected to use those extra free periods to carry out activities as key teachers.
Diversity of Perceptions and Meanings

The data revealed great diversity of perceptions regarding the role expected of key teachers, the purpose and usefulness of inservice courses, and their views and meanings of curriculum, the new history curriculum, teaching and implementation. This diversity among the various participants, which cuts within and across groups and schools, influenced greatly the types of activities carried out by the key teachers. It also helped to account for the congruencies and discrepancies between what the participants perceived to be the role of the key teachers and what actually took place.

The expected role of the key teachers. The enormous variations in the participants' perceptions of the role expected of the key teachers helped to account for the similarities and differences in the activities of the key teachers and between the key teachers' activities and the role expected of them by the Ministry of Education. The key teachers would only carry out activities that they perceived to be part of their role. KA and KC, for example, were reluctant to explain the new history curriculum to the teachers and to offer to help them partly because they did not perceive it to be their role. KB's emphasis on the effective teaching of the new history curriculum and his efforts in searching for better ways of teaching the subject were prompted by his view that he was expected to teach effectively and that teachers needed help in finding better ways of teaching the subject.

Teachers would approach the key teachers for help if they
perceived that the latter were there to help them. Those teachers who expected nothing of the key teachers did not take advantage of the key teachers' presence in the schools.

The school administrators did not perceive the key teachers to be of great importance, and consequently did not accord appropriate recognition, support and encouragement to enable them to carry out their role. The administrators' lack of physical and moral support discouraged the key teachers and led them to neglect their role, even though they might be aware of it. The key teachers, therefore, only carried out activities that were perceived to be part of their role, even if these were not, or were only part of, what the Ministry had in mind for them. The few helping activities, for example, were initiated by the teachers themselves because they perceived that the key teachers were out there to help them, and not so much because the key teachers' perceived it to be their role.

The variations in perceptions among the various participants could be attributed to three main factors: the lack of familiarity with the implementation strategy used, the various origins of the participants' perceptions and the lack of contact between the Ministry of Education and the participants in the schools. It is, therefore, imperative that every participant involved in the implementation process, especially those at the school level, understand the implementation strategy used and the role of the key teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum in the schools. Explicitness and continuous clarification of the role expected of the key teachers are
necessary. Every effort needs to be taken to ensure that the key teachers know clearly what is expected of them, that teachers know of the availability of the key teachers as resource persons in the schools, and that the administrators are aware of the key teachers and what they are expected to do, and what they as administrators could do to help the key teachers carry out their role.

The purpose and usefulness of inservice courses. The participants viewed the purpose of the inservice course attended by the key teachers in two different ways, depending on their familiarity with the implementation strategy used. For those participants familiar with the strategy, the inservice course was seen as a vehicle for preparing the key teachers for their role. The main objective of the course was to expose the key teachers to the new history curriculum and to prepare them for their role on their return to their respective schools after the course. However, for the majority of the participants who were unaware of the implementation strategy, all of whom came from the schools, the main purpose of the inservice course, not unlike any other inservice courses, was to help teachers improve their own teaching.

These different views about the inservice course gave rise to different expectations of the key teachers, influenced the key teachers' interest in their roles and help to explain the variations in the activities of the key teachers and similarities and differences between the expected and the actual roles of the key teachers. To the first group of participants, the key
teachers functioned as change agents in addition to being better teachers. The latter group perceived only the latter role. Such differences explain the incongruencies between the expectations of one group of participants and the activities of those key teachers that belonged to the other group, and also variations in the activities of the key teachers.

The above analysis points to the importance of making sure that all those involved in the implementation process are clear about the implementation strategy used and the purpose and nature of the inservice course. The letters received by the administrators and the key teachers on the inservice course ought to contain more information about the inservice course, especially the role to be played by the key teachers on their return from the course.

The participants' varied perceptions regarding the usefulness of inservice courses also have some bearing on the key teachers' activities. It appeared that most teachers, the key teachers included, did not perceive much value in inservice courses and were, therefore, reluctant to attend them. They viewed inservice courses as more of a burden than a help to them. Teachers were obliged to spend time and effort in carrying out whatever they have learned at the inservice course. Attending inservice courses was considered not worth the time, especially by the female teachers, who according to administrator AA, preferred to spend the time with their families. Moreover, inservice courses were often perceived as dull and irrelevant; most of what they learned, especially those on new approaches to
teaching, were difficult to carry out. It was, therefore, not surprising to find people such as key teacher KA and teacher B5 who had not attended any inservice course despite their long years of teaching.

Teachers who liked attending inservice courses represented either those who were really interested in what the courses had to offer or those who used the inservice course as means of getting away from their daily teaching and of meeting other teachers, or those who had been 'forced' by the administrators to attend. According to the administrators and the Ministry of Education officials, the number of interested teachers was very small. More often than not, teachers who were selected for the various courses were not interested and, consequently, failed to take the course seriously. Key teacher KA, for example, explicitly stated her lack of interest and reluctance to attend the inservice course on the new history curriculum. The administrators and the Ministry of Education officials believed that the key teachers' lack of awareness of, and their lack of interest in, their role as key teachers could have been the result of their lack of interest in attending the inservice course.

Interest in attending the inservice course is an important prerequisite for every key teacher. Efforts should, therefore, be taken to ensure that teachers have a positive view of inservice courses and are interested in attending these inservice courses. One way is to provide teachers with incentives. Inservice course organizers need to find ways and means of making
the inservice course more interesting, meaningful and relevant to the teachers. One way is to solicit feedback from teachers who had attended previous inservice courses. Incentives should be provided at the school level to help teachers carry out whatever they are expected to do on their return from the inservice course. For example, such incentives could be in the form of recognition of their status as key teachers, and support and encouragement from the school administrators and those concerned with the implementation of the new history curriculum.

Views on the curriculum, the new history curriculum, teaching and implementation. The participants shared several similarities and differences in their views of what constituted a curriculum. These views, in turn, influenced the participants' perceptions of the new history curriculum and what they meant by its teaching and implementation.

Explicitly or implicitly, most participants seemed to agree, that a curriculum is made up of several components: the subject matter, methodology, resources and evaluation. They, however, differed in what they viewed as the most important component. One group of participants emphasized the content area while another group emphasized both the methodology and the content.

(1) Emphasis on content area. To this group of participants, made up mostly of teachers, administrators and the key teachers, the two main objectives of teaching history, including the new history curriculum, were to teach all the topics that appeared in the syllabus or the scheme of work, and to enhance students' understanding of the subject matter. The
narrative and question-answer methods were the most common techniques of teaching used because these methods were perceived as the most effective ways of meeting the above objectives. The most widespread instructional aid used was the textbook, which was regarded as an adequate guide to teaching. Teachers used the textbook as a source of reference for the content area, as a guide for determining the scope of their teaching and the sequencing of the topics to be taught, and as a reading material for the students in the classrooms. Guide books and other reference books were also used by teachers to supplement the textbook. Besides these books, the teachers used the usual form of teaching aids such as charts and maps. The teachers also relied very heavily on the above aids because of the unavailability of other types of teaching aids.

Their lack of understanding of the new history curriculum or awareness of the existence of a new curriculum, had led these teachers to continue to teach the new history curriculum the way they had been accustomed to or the way they had been taught previously. The fact that it was the new history curriculum that the key teachers or teachers were teaching did not change their perceptions. The majority of the participants at the school level failed to see any changes in the new curriculum except for the new content area. For most of the administrators, their attitude towards the subject and its teaching remained the same. They continued to believe that any teacher could teach the new curriculum because, to them, teaching entailed only the mastering of the new subject matter, the only change they saw in the new history curriculum. This attitude often resulted in the
assignment of non-history teachers to teach the new history curriculum.

The key teachers' and teachers' limited knowledge of the new history curriculum resulted in their continued emphasis on student understanding, neglecting other aspects such as the acquisition of attitude and skills emphasized by the new curriculum. The teachers' past learning and teaching experiences made them so accustomed to thinking of history as a subject concerned with mastery of facts and dates.

Implementation was, therefore, viewed in terms of the teaching of a new content area. The success of implementation was assessed in terms of the ability of the teachers to complete the teaching of the topics as outlined in the syllabus. The new history curriculum was viewed as having been implemented successfully because teachers were able to teach the content as prescribed by the Ministry of Education, without much problem.

(2) Emphasis on methodology and content. This group of participants, which consisted mainly of the Ministry of Education officials, believed that the most important aspect in the teaching of the new history curriculum was the methodology. The content area was also important in that it helped achieve the objectives of the new curriculum. The objectives of the new history curriculum, especially those related to the acquisition of skills and attitudes could best be achieved by using more effective ways of teaching the new content area. Teachers need to use a variety of techniques to encourage teacher-student interactions and active student participation. The traditional
lecture, narration and question-answer methods were no longer adequate for teaching the new history curriculum. Implementation, therefore, involved the teaching of the new content area using a variety of effective ways of teaching. The extent to which teachers use a variety of techniques to teach the new content area in order to achieve the objectives of the new history curriculum appeared to be the criterion used to determine the success of implementation.

The views subscribed by the first group of participants were obviously not congruent with the spirit of the new history curriculum. It is essential that the participants understand the new history curriculum fully if they were expected to use the new curriculum the way the Ministry expected them to. They have to be made aware of the fact that the new history curriculum demands that they emphasize both the content area and the methodology in their teaching. Teachers need to diversify their methods of teaching the subject if they want the students to acquire the skills and attitudes as stated in the objectives, in addition to understanding the subject matter. The new history curriculum and the Ministry's expectations of what is involved in the implementation of the new curriculum also have to be explained and made explicit to the school administrators if the Ministry expects to get the full support and cooperation of the schools.
The Environment of the Schools

A successful implementation of a new curriculum requires the creation of an environment that encourages teachers to put their knowledge and skills into practice. The examination-oriented environment of the schools, with its emphasis on the performance of students in examinations, has led the administrators, teachers, parents and students to create a teaching-learning environment geared mainly towards preparing students for, and passing, these examinations. The concerns of teachers and administrators for the examinations are understandable in view of the fact that the examination results are used as a yardstick for measuring the success of a school and its teachers. The better the results, the better would be the image of the schools and the teachers. For the students and their parents, the results are important because these form the main criteria for promotion to higher forms, and for entry into institutions of higher learning and the job market. Good performance also helps the students gain scholarships for further studies.

Teachers are, therefore, in the unenviable position of being pressured by almost everybody -- the administrators, parents and students -- to produce good results. The extensive coverage given by the local press to good examination results, outstanding students and schools places further weight on the shoulders of the teachers.

Teachers emphasized the teaching of content, relied heavily on the textbooks, and used traditional techniques of teaching and teaching aids because they were convinced that such an approach
helped enhance students' understanding as well as facilitate the completion of the syllabus. Student understanding was important because the examinations were traditionally concerned with assessing the students' ability to recall facts and events.

Teachers, administrators and parents viewed the completion of the syllabus as an important aspect of teaching. They felt that students would be better prepared to answer questions in the examinations because they had been taught all the topics listed in the syllabus. Teachers generally felt that by completing the syllabus, they would help the history teachers teaching these students in the following year; there would be no need to cover preliminary topics before starting the syllabus.

The implementation of the new history curriculum was not effective enough to influence teachers to change their ways of teaching to conform to the demands of the new curriculum. Teachers taught the new content according to what they had been accustomed to or the way they had been taught. This practice was perpetuated further by those administrators who continued assigning non-history teachers to teach the new history curriculum. The administrators, who continued to regard the teaching and learning of history as involving purely the delivery and mastery of historical facts and events and who felt that any teacher could teach the subject, contributed indirectly to the continuation of these customary practices.

Teachers could be encouraged to use a variety of teaching techniques and aids and to emphasize the acquisition, by the students, of both cognitive and affective skills, if the LCE
examination is changed to accommodate both skills. The onus is, therefore, on the Examination Syndicate, the division in the Ministry of Education responsible for all public-school examinations, to devise a system of examination that evaluates both the cognitive and affective skills, to replace the existing written, multiple-choice examination. Such a change should help increase the teachers', administrators', parents' and students' understanding of the actual nature of the new history curriculum and change their thinking and practice to be consistent with the needs of the new curriculum. Teachers, administrators, parents and students would begin to realise that more is involved in the teaching and learning of history than the traditional emphasis on the delivery and understanding of facts, and that history could be an interesting subject if taught well.

**Lack of Communication**

The data also revealed that the participants involved in the implementation of the new history curriculum hardly communicated with each other prior to, or during the implementation process. This may have partly contributed to the variations in the activities of the key teachers and their ability to carry out some of the role expected of them by the Ministry of Education.

Several factors were responsible for the lack of communication among the various groups of participants. These factors are discussed under the headings of key teacher-teacher contact, and teacher-administrator contact.
Key teacher-teacher contact. The key teachers and teachers seldom met to talk about the new history curriculum or to discuss concerns and problems associated with its teaching. Almost all the contacts that took place were informal, collegial and irregular in nature and mostly represent a one-to-one relationship. Four factors appear to have contributed to the lack of contact between the key teachers and the teachers.

(1) The teachers' lack of awareness of the key teachers. Only C1 knew of the presence of the key teacher in his school and frequently approached the latter for help and advice. Contact between the rest of the teachers and their key teachers was limited because the former were not aware of the key teachers' presence in the schools. Only three of the key teachers had, at one time or another, approached the key teachers. These teachers approached the key teachers because the latter were teaching the new history curriculum at the time and/or because the key teachers were perceived as being knowledgeable by virtue of having attended the inservice course. Most teachers, however, noted their readiness to seek the help and advice of the key teachers had the presence of the latter been made known to them.

(2) The teachers' lack of need for the key teachers. The teachers did not need the key teachers to explain the new history curriculum or to help them with their teaching because the teachers were generally satisfied with their teaching. They felt that they needed to know only the new content area to enable them to teach the new history curriculum, and this they could get easily from reading the textbook. Their notion of teaching was
to be able to cover most, if not all, of the topics listed in the syllabus. To most of the teachers, the textbook and other reference books were sufficient in providing them with the necessary content to be taught. To them content consisted of a list of historical facts and events. Their traditional methods of teaching seemed satisfactory to them. These methods included narration of facts and events, question-and-answer sessions, providing notes to students and the use of chalkboard, charts, maps and the textbook.

The feeling of satisfaction among the teachers in their teaching stemmed from their conviction that their methods were adequate in helping students understand the subject matter and in preparing them for examinations. The teachers perceived that the other methods were simply infeasible. Methods such as enacting of historical scenes were considered to be time consuming and demanding on the teachers. Teachers feared that the use of such techniques would make it impossible for them to complete the syllabus. Moreover, teachers did not feel that they had the time needed for the extra planning and preparation. The teachers were also reluctant about using other techniques because of the problem of getting student participation in the classrooms. Students were reluctant to get involved because they were perceived to be shy or passive. The teachers also felt that they were unable to use a variety of instructional aids because of the unavailability of such aids in the schools or on the market.

When they had problems the teachers were usually capable of coping with them even without the help of the key teachers.
Teachers utilized several ways of dealing with their problems. A number of teachers in School B, for example, overcame or reduced their concerns or problems by discussing or consulting one of the history teachers whom they regarded as their informal leader. Some teachers discussed their problems with the other teachers teaching the subject or approached people they perceived could help them, such as the senior subject teacher, or overcame their problem through a trial-and-error method. A few of the teachers, who were not trained to teach history and, therefore, not really interested in teaching the subject, would simply overlook the problems if help or solutions to the problems were not readily available. Some teachers were either too shy or reluctant to seek the help of others.

Two officials of the Ministry of Education, however, felt that teachers' satisfaction with their teaching was related to their lack of professionalism. The teachers were perceived as a contented lot, not interested in improving their teaching or in taking extra time and effort to prepare for their teaching or for self-improvement.

On the whole, the teachers felt that they could teach the new history curriculum satisfactorily. They did not have many problems that necessitated approaching others, specifically the key teachers, for help. The problems that they encountered were minor ones and could either be alleviated easily or ignored. Teachers' satisfaction with their teaching was also related to their lack of interest in improving their teaching.

(3) Organizational arrangements. The responses of the
teachers showed that the opportunity for key teacher-teacher interaction increased greatly when the key teachers taught the new history curriculum together with the teachers. The non-involvement of the key teachers in teaching the new curriculum had resulted in the loss of contact between the key teachers and the teachers and this, in turn, had reduced the teachers' opportunity to seek the ideas and/or help of the key teachers on matters relating to the implementation of the new curriculum in their classrooms. It also limited the key teachers' opportunity to help the teachers because by not teaching the subject, the key teachers appeared less visible to the teachers, and were perceived as less capable of understanding their problems and concerns and of helping them.

Teachers' opportunity to meet the key teachers and vice versa was also constrained by the unavailability of any provision that would allow the key teachers and the teachers to meet regularly to discuss the new history curriculum and its teaching. The key teachers and the teachers were also unable to meet because of the lack of coincident free periods. Teachers had to depend on their own free periods to meet, and to exchange ideas and discuss their concerns and problems because no special time had been set aside by any of the school administrators to enable the key teachers and the teachers to get together. These free times were, however, usually utilized to plan for their teaching, to check students' works and to plan or to carry out extra curricular activities.

The key teachers and teachers viewed a timetable arrangement
that excluded the former from teaching the new curriculum and/or that assigned them to teach in a session different from the teachers assigned to teach the new curriculum as an obstacle to closer teacher-key teacher contact. This lack of contact reduced the opportunity for the teachers and the key teachers to meet to discuss the new curriculum and its implementation.

The key teachers and the teachers need to be encouraged to meet regularly to air their problems, to discuss their teaching, to exchange ideas and to find ways and means of improving their teaching and of alleviating their concerns and problems. The school administrators could support them by ensuring that the key teachers teach the new history curriculum, by reducing their other school responsibilities, and by scheduling one common free period for the key teachers and the teachers and encouraging them to use the time to meet regularly.

(4) The personal characteristics of the key teachers. The participants indicated that the key teachers ought to have possessed certain characteristics if they were to promote and maintain close and regular contacts with the teachers. The characteristics most often mentioned were the key teachers' interest in their role and the new history curriculum, their sociable nature, their qualification and teaching experience, their approachability and receptiveness to teachers' ideas, concerns and problems and willingness to help. Contact between the key teachers and the teachers in the schools could be restricted if one or more of these characteristics were missing or perceived to be missing in the key teachers.
The teachers, administrators and Ministry of Education officials believed that the key teachers' lack of interest in their role resulted in their lack of effort to contact and/or to help teachers, and to initiate meetings with, or briefings for teachers, and other activities related to their role as key teachers. Teachers in School B, for example, were either not aware or not familiar with key teacher KB because the latter preferred to keep to himself and was seldom seen in the staff room socializing with the other teachers. For most of the teachers in the school, their contact with KB was limited to those occasional encounters and greetings along the school corridors or the canteen. KB's quiet and reserved nature, therefore, may help to explain the teachers' lack of familiarity with the key teacher and, consequently, their failure to approach the key teacher.

Lack of familiarity with the key teacher could also lead to misunderstanding or lack of understanding of the key teacher. B5, for example, felt comfortable about seeking the help of KB because she knew KB to be approachable and helpful. However, those teachers who did not know KB well were reluctant to approach him because they perceived him to be distant and unresponsive.

The teachers felt that the key teachers would be in a better position to help if they had long teaching experience, experience in teaching the new history curriculum, and also specialized in the teaching of history because these experiences would give the key teachers more credibility in the eyes of the teachers.
Without such background, the key teachers would have great difficulty gaining the respect of the teachers, especially the more experienced. B6, for example, did not think very highly of KB because the latter was not perceived as being a history teacher. A lack of the above qualifications caused the key teachers to be reluctant to offer help and guidance to teachers. Key teacher KC was reluctant about initiating any kind of helping activities because he did not feel that he was any more qualified or experienced than the teachers he was expected to help.

The above analysis highlights the need to ensure that the key teachers possess certain characteristics if they are to be expected to interact and to work closely with the teachers. If the strategy of using key teachers to facilitate the implementation process is to succeed, specific guidelines need to be given to those responsible for selecting the key teachers. Only teachers who meet the set criteria should be selected as key teachers and the importance of these qualities should be stressed to these key teachers.

Teacher-administrator contact. Communication between the teachers, including the key teachers, and the school administrators was unsatisfactory. This was evident from the responses of most of the participants at the school level. Teachers were left mostly on their own after being assigned to teach the new history curriculum. Only one or two of the teachers, for example, had approached the administrators to request supplies to be used for making teaching aids or to talk about their teaching assignments. The administrators had not
called in the key teachers to inquire about the inservice course, the new history curriculum or their role as key teachers; nor had they asked the key teachers to submit reports on the inservice course.

The paucity of communication between the school administrators, on one hand, and teachers and key teachers, on the other, could be attributed to the administrators' lack of familiarity with, and their attitude towards, the new history curriculum, the implementation strategy and the role of the key teachers; the conflicting expectations among the participants; and the unaccommodating structure of the school. The school administrators, as described earlier, were quite indifferent to the new history curriculum and the key teachers because they were not very familiar with the new history curriculum, the implementation strategy used, their own role as leaders in the schools and the role of the key teachers in the implementation of the new history curriculum. Administrators went about their work as usual, oblivious of the fact that the new history curriculum and the key teachers needed their support to make the new curriculum a success. It appeared that administrators' support for the new curriculum and its teaching tended to surface only if the administrators themselves specialized in history. Most of the administrators treated the new history curriculum no differently from any other history curriculum, and the key teachers like any other teachers in the schools.

The lack of communication could also be the result of conflicting expectations that the participants had of each other.
The administrators felt that the teachers should have more initiative, and should do things on their own without having to be directed to do so by the administrators. After all, according to the administrators, the teachers, being qualified professionals, should be capable of teaching without encountering too many problem. The administrators expected the key teachers to carry out whatever role had been assigned to them. They should not wait for instructions from the administrators. The administrators, therefore, did not see the need to communicate regularly with the teachers.

The teachers, on the other hand, felt that it was unthinkable for them to carry out activities without being asked to or endorsed by any of the school administrators. The key teachers, for example, were afraid that their colleagues might misinterpret their actions if they were to carry out or initiate activities that did not fall within their designated job of teaching or did not represent activities that had been officially assigned to them by the school administrators. The key teachers felt that, as teachers in the schools and directly under the supervision of the administrators, they needed the administrators' green light before embarking on activities that were 'out of the ordinary'. Only after the activities had been legitimimized by the administrators would the key teachers be able to get the cooperation of, and recognition from, the other teachers.

Opportunities for teacher-administrator interactions were also limited by the structure of the schools. Teachers, the key
teachers included, were expected to approach the senior subject teachers and not the administrators about any concerns and problems the teachers had regarding the new history curriculum. The school principals and afternoon supervisors were concerned mainly with administrative matters; the former were responsible for the overall running of the schools while the latter were responsible for only the afternoon sessions. The senior assistants were responsible for curriculum-related matters, but mostly the administrative side of it, namely arranging the timetable and assigning teaching responsibilities. Teachers were, therefore, expected to approach the senior subject teachers with their concerns and problems. The frequency of such contact, however, varied among schools. Teachers in School B, for example, reported having approached the senior subject teacher several times because they had been formally introduced to the senior subject teacher by one of the administrators. In contrast, no such contact was reported in School A because the teachers did not know who the senior subject teacher was and had never attended any subject meeting during the period they were teaching the new history curriculum.

None of the three administrators, including the afternoon supervisors, had been entrusted with the responsibility of supervising the teachers and their teaching. Supervision had, so far, only been carried out on student teachers or beginning teachers because the supervisors' reports were needed for assessment of the student teachers and for confirmation of beginning teachers.
The above analysis highlights the importance of regular communication among those involved in the implementation process. The lack of communication among the people within the schools played a role in the continued lack of understanding of the new history curriculum and the implementation strategy, and the lack of awareness of the key teachers and their role among the school-level personnel, plurality in perceptions and meanings, and the key teachers' inability to carry out their role as expected of them by the Ministry of Education. The teachers went about their work without having to interact with the key teachers, other teachers and the administrators. The administrators could perform their administrative task without coming into direct contact with the teachers. This communication network was inadequate in meeting the needs for implementing a new curriculum. For the new curriculum to succeed, all the school-level participants need to communicate frequently with each other and with the Ministry of Education prior to and during the implementation process, to familiarise themselves and to increase their understanding of the new history curriculum, the implementation strategy, the key teachers and their role and also the roles of the other participants. Such communication was also necessary in providing the key teachers the necessary environment and support to enable them to carry out their role successfully. Frequent communication could also help to alleviate the problems of diversity in perceptions and meanings that could impede implementation efforts.

The participants at the school level, however, failed to see the need for communicating regularly with each other. The
teachers felt that they could teach satisfactorily without having to consult the key teachers. The administrators did not see any differences in the new history curriculum compared to any other history curriculum and, therefore, did not see the necessity of making any special effort to get the key teachers to teach the new history curriculum or to allocate a time for the key teachers and teachers to meet. They also did not feel the need to communicate with the key teachers and teachers to find out about their teaching or their problems.

The practice of non-communication continued despite its inability to cope with the demands of implementing a new curriculum because the participants failed to see the need for such communication. This lack of sensitivity to implementation demands was attributed to, and could lead to the participants' continued ignorance of the new history curriculum, the implementation strategy and the role of the key teachers. This analysis underscores the need for every participant to have a clear understanding of the above-mentioned aspects. Only through such understanding could these school-level personnel see the importance of regular communication and for the administrators to provide an environment that facilitates such communication.

The administrators could encourage teacher-administrator interaction by becoming more open and available to the teachers and key teachers, by showing openly their support for the teachers and the key teachers, and by diversifying their responsibilities from the traditionally administrative and financial aspects to include the school-curriculum and teacher-
supervision. The increased contacts would allow the administrators and teachers to understand each other better thus reducing the 'distance' that exists between the school administrators and the teachers and, consequently, encouraging the teachers to approach the administrators whenever there is a need for it.

The study also showed that the choice of key teachers is important. Steps need to be taken to ensure that the key teachers possess certain qualities to enable them to interact and to work closely with the teachers, the senior subject teachers and the administrators. Guidelines for the selection of key teachers have to be given to, and followed by, those directly responsible for selecting the key teachers. The importance of these qualities also needs to be emphasized to the key teachers.

The findings of the study showed that there was a breakdown in the lines of communication between the Ministry of Education and State Education Department on one side, and the district key personnel for districts and the schools on the other. A comparison of the intended and the actual organizational structures for change (Figure 11) shows that there is a lack of communication between the school and the School Inspectorate and also between the school and the State Education Department. Communication among the people in the school, the key teachers, administrators, and teachers, rarely took place. The key teachers did not appear to consult anybody about the new curriculum and its implementation. The district key personnel's contact with others in the district seemed to end with the
in-service course for key teachers. The findings of this study also revealed that this breakdown in communication was the result of two main factors. First, the intended lines of communication were not established in the minds of the people. Second, the lines of communication were not used due to the lack of resources.
Figure 11: Intended and Actual Organizational Structures for Curriculum Change
CHAPTER 10
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the study, and discusses the implications of the study's findings for implementation planners and suggestions for future research.

SUMMARY

The Purpose of the Study

A new history curriculum was developed by the Government of Malaysia to replace a curriculum that was no longer suitable. The curriculum was to be implemented using the 'key personnel' and 'key teacher' strategy. The strategy involved the introduction of the new history curriculum to selected teachers in each district at a centrally-organized inservice course. After attending the course these teachers, termed the key personnel for the district, organized state-level inservice courses for history teachers, who were selected to represent each of the secondary schools. These teachers, designated as key teachers, were expected to inform the other teachers in their own schools of the decision to change to a new history curriculum, to disseminate information about the new curriculum and to help teachers with the curriculum. By 1980, the new history curriculum had been introduced officially in secondary Forms 1 to
Little research has been carried out on the key teacher strategy for curriculum implementation. This study is the first attempt to examine such a strategy. Specifically, it investigated the perceptions of the role expected of key teachers by the Ministry of Education, the key teachers' actual activities and factors affecting these activities.

Methodology

Three schools in the state of Selangor were selected for the study on the basis of their size and the experience of the key teachers in the schools. In each school, an administrator, a key teacher and one or more teachers were selected to participate in the study. Three officials from the Ministry of Education also participated in the study including one official each from the Curriculum Development Centre, the Inspectorate and the Selangor State Education Department.

Data were collected through two stages of interviews with the participants. In the first stage, the participants were asked to respond to questions listed in the interview schedule. The data collected were analyzed to provide collective summaries of the views of each of the four groups of participants. During the second stage, the participants were asked to verify the information given by them in stage 1 and to validate the researcher's interpretation of this information as contained in a written summary. Descriptive, comparative and interpretive analyses were carried out on the data obtained.
The Findings of the Study

The study showed that different people involved in the implementation of the new history curriculum held different perceptions of the role expected of the key teachers by the Ministry of Education. Further, these perceptions were both similar to, and different from, the role originally intended by the Ministry of Education.

Altogether, four aspects of the key teachers' role were identified by the participants, namely to teach the new history curriculum, to inform teachers of the change in the history curriculum, to explain the new history curriculum to teachers, and to provide help and guidance to teachers in the implementation process. The first can be seen as bringing changes at the key teachers' personal level, whereas the latter three bring changes at the school level. The perceptions of all participants were reported to have undergone little change from the time of the inservice to the time the study was carried out because of the absence of implementation-related activities following the initial inservice course on the new history curriculum (in 1978) and the lack of communication among the participants since that time.

The three key teachers carried out quite similar kinds of activities, categorized as (1) teaching, (2) disseminating, (3) helping teachers with the new curriculum, and (4) activities routinely carried out by teachers such as preparing schemes of work and examination questions. These activities, in most cases,
took place while the key teachers were teaching the new history curriculum, and were planned or initiated mainly by the teachers themselves and the administrators in the schools. There was little conscious effort on the part of the key teachers to change or modify these activities. The relationships between the key teachers and the teachers were generally collegial in nature. The key teachers' activities were broadly perceived as useful because they facilitated key teacher-teacher interactions and helped teachers in their preparation for teaching.

A comparison of the key teachers' expected and actual roles revealed several congruencies and discrepancies. The expected role of teaching the new history curriculum with an emphasis on the new content area, informing teachers of the curriculum change, disseminating information on the new history curriculum, and helping teachers in using the curriculum was fulfilled to varying degrees. However, the use of new methods to enhance more effective teaching did not materialize. Only one key teacher was thought to have disseminated information on the new history curriculum, and most of the helping activities were initiated by other teachers, not by the key teachers.

The study also showed that these key teachers were unable to carry out their role satisfactorily for several reasons.

First, the key teachers, teachers and administrators did not develop a clear understanding of the new history curriculum and the implementation strategy, specifically the role of the key teachers in facilitating implementation. The key teachers, in addition, did not have the skills needed to use the new
curriculum, and to carry out their role satisfactorily.

Second, the key teachers' lack of understanding and skills was related to the failure of the inservice course to prepare them adequately for their role. The course was perceived to suffer from several weaknesses: the inadequacy of the subject matter covered, the lack of variety in the mode of presentation, the lack of ability of the key personnel who conducted the course, the inappropriateness of the inservice course schedule and the unsuitability of the course location.

Third, the key teachers were perceived to lack both the moral and physical support of the school administrators and the Ministry of Education because of the failure to create conditions conducive to the implementation of the new history curriculum. The administrators failed to accord the status and recognition needed by the key teachers and to carry out appropriate actions to help facilitate the implementation process. The Ministry of Education did not make any form of financial or administrative provision for the use of this strategy of implementation. It also failed to provide professional support for the key teachers to enhance their understanding of the new curriculum and their role as key teachers, and to discuss and seek solutions to their problems.

Fourth, there was diversity in the participants' perceptions of the role of the key teachers, the role of inservice courses, the nature of the new history curriculum, and the meaning of implementation. This resulted apparently from the participants' lack of understanding of the curriculum and the implementation
strategy. These differences in perceptions influenced the behavior of the key teachers in the schools and how the key teachers, teachers and administrators related to each other.

Fifth, the examination-oriented environment of the school with its emphasis on teacher delivery and student recall of subject matter encouraged the continuation of practices not compatible with the goals of the new curriculum. The key teachers were unable to use the curriculum as suggested by the Ministry, and the services of the key teachers were irrelevant to the teachers who felt that they were able to teach the curriculum satisfactorily based on examination results.

Sixth, the lack of communication among the school-level personnel and between them and the Ministry of Education during implementation led to a continued lack of understanding of the curriculum and the role of the key teacher and increasingly divergent perceptions held by the various people involved in implementing the curriculum.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The implications of the findings are discussed in terms of their contributions to an understanding of the curriculum implementation process in schools by those who plan strategies for implementation.

These findings are in line with findings reported in the literature on curriculum implementation regarding the need for
all those involved in the process to have a clear understanding of (1) the changes proposed by a new curriculum whether these be in goals, resources, teaching-learning activities, or the underlying assumptions; (2) the implementation strategy to be used; and (3) the roles of the various people involved. The key teacher, both as user of the new curriculum and support agent for implementation, needs to acquire the knowledge, understanding and skills to teach a new curriculum, to demonstrate such knowledge, understanding and skills, and to explain the curriculum to teachers. In addition to this knowledge and skills, the key teacher as facilitator of the implementation process, also needs to possess qualities such as confidence, interest in the new curriculum, and commitment to the role, and the ability to communicate and work closely with teachers and other support agents.

This study also underscored the importance of paying attention to contextual factors found to be critical to the success of any implementation effort:

(1) The study supports findings that staff development activities are critical to implementation and implies that teacher learning and use of a new curriculum would be facilitated by a continuous staff development program that caters to the needs of the key teachers and teachers and that utilizes a variety of methods of presentation. The findings of the study also support a contention found in the literature that key teachers, to be useful, have to carry out both staff training activities and staff support activities.
(2) The study demonstrates the need to make administrative and professional support available to both key teachers and teachers. The key teachers and teachers need the moral and physical support of the school administrators and the Ministry of Education as well as the continuous help and guidance from Ministry officials and others responsible for implementation.

(3) The study also supports the need for establishing a favourable environment in the schools toward the ongoing implementation process. The schools, for example, need an examination system that is in line with the changes proposed by a new curriculum because it helps facilitate changes in teachers' classroom practices.

(4) The study further confirms the importance of regular communications among those involved in the implementation of a new curriculum prior to, and during, the implementation process. Implementation of the new curriculum could be facilitated if regular communication among all the actors is maintained. Regular discussions could, for example, help enhance key teachers' and teachers' understanding, alleviate misunderstanding or concerns, thus facilitating the use of the new curriculum in classrooms.

Implications for Implementation Planners

The findings of this study suggest three revised alternative models of implementation strategy that could be used to implement a new curriculum. These revised models are based on several assumptions supported by the literature on implementation and/or
the findings of this study. These assumptions are:

(1) The unit of change is the school. For implementation to succeed a change agent has to work closely with the school administrators, teachers and others in the school who are affected by the change.

(2) School administrators play a vital role in effecting change successfully (Gross et al., 1971, 1975; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1981; Fullan, 1982).

(3) All of the people involved in the change process need to be clear about each aspect of the new curriculum, particularly its components and the policy underlying the change (Gross et al., 1971, 1975; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Fullan, 1982).

(4) All people involved in the change process have to be clear about the roles expected of them and their relationships to other actors (Gross et al., 1971, 1975; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Fullan, 1982).

(5) Regular and ongoing communication among the various people involved in the change process is critical to implementation (Fullan, 1982). The present study showed that the lack of communication among the school-level personnel and between them and the officials of the Ministry of Education was dysfunctional in implementing the new curriculum. Open and regular communication is essential for productive working relationships, and for enhancing clarity and for eliminating misunderstandings about the new curriculum.
(6) An inservice program that is continuous, flexible and that utilizes a variety of modes of delivery facilitates learning and use of a new curriculum (Hall and Loucks, 1978; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978; Fullan, 1979b; Joyce, 1979; Nash and Ireland, 1979; Joyce and Showers, 1980).

(7) The selection of key personnel for districts and key teachers is critical to implementation. The criteria for selection need to be explicit; be made clear to, and followed by, those involved in the selection process.


(9) The examination system shapes the curriculum content and teaching methods. As shown by this study, an examination system that is in line with the changes proposed by a new curriculum helps facilitate changes in teachers' classroom practices. A change in the examination system could also help modify the expectations, attitude and/or practices of administrators, parents and students so as to be congruent with the changes suggested by the new curriculum thus providing teachers with the encouragement and support needed in their efforts at changing their customary practices to conform to those proposed by the new curriculum.

(10) Shorter lines of communication are more effective than longer lines of communication because there is less likelihood of distortion and breakdown.

Three alternative models of implementation strategy are presented below with a description of the appropriate
organizational structure and change process for each model.

Alternative I: The Consultant Model

(1) Organizational structure for change. The position of key teacher, because of the problems associated with the role, is to be discontinued. The key personnel for the district, who hitherto have functioned as full-time teachers in the schools in addition to carrying out inservice course for key teachers, will become full-time consultants for the schools in their districts.

In this model (Figure 12) the consultant for the district will be expected to work closely with administrators and teachers in various schools in the district to facilitate implementation of the new curriculum in these schools. The consultant is to be appointed by, and directly responsible to, the State Education Department. The consultant is to work closely with the State Social Studies Officer as well as the Curriculum Development Centre. The State Education Department which is responsible for the implementation of the new curriculum in all the schools in the state will make the role of the consultants clearly recognizable by the schools.

This revised structural model has several advantages. First, with the removal of the key teachers more time and resources could be invested in the fewer number of district consultants. Second, the key personnel, as full-time consultants, better prepared and knowledgeable about the new curriculum, are able to offer a better quality inservice program for administrators and teachers. Third, the accumulated
experience, skills and knowledge of the consultant can be used to improve other implementation efforts in the district. Fourth, the problem of selection is eased as fewer people need to be selected.

(2) The process of change. Time is needed for the revised strategy to work. To facilitate implementation, the strategy needs to go through four phases, with the length of each phase depending on the magnitude of the change involved.
Phase 1 involves the preparation of the consultants for their role, the preparation of curriculum and instructional materials for use by schools and the orientation of those Ministry and State personnel involved with implementation. The consultants need to learn about the new curriculum in terms of such things as its components, the differences between the new curriculum and the previous one, the policies underlying these changes, how these changes affect teachers' regular classroom practice, and how to use the new curriculum in the classroom. The consultants also need to learn about their roles and ways of working with schools. Only with sufficient knowledge and skills can the consultants be expected to carry out their role of explaining the new curriculum to the administrators and teachers and of facilitating the implementation of the new curriculum in the schools.

During this phase the Curriculum Development Centre as developer of the curriculum needs (1) to explain the changes brought about by the new curriculum to the School Inspectors who are responsible for the supervision of teachers, and (2) to work closely with the Examination Syndicate in order to ensure that the examination is in line with the demands of the new curriculum.

Phase 2 involves the State Education Department informing the schools about the implementation strategy used and the consultants working with the various schools in the districts for which the consultants are responsible. The consultants organize inservice courses for school administrators and those teachers
who are expected to teach the new curriculum in the schools. Administrators need to be exposed to the strategy, the role of the district consultants, their role as instructional leaders in the schools, and the new curriculum because the cooperation and active support of the administrators are critical factors in the success of any implementation effort. The consultants have to depend on the administrators to set the stage for implementation to occur in the schools. Only with such understanding can the administrators show their interest and commitment to the new curriculum, and provide the physical, moral and resource support needed for the successful use of this revised implementation strategy.

Inservice courses are also carried out for teachers (1) to expose them to the new curriculum and their role as users of the new curriculum, and (2) to provide them with the knowledge, understanding and skills needed to use the new curriculum in their classrooms. The consultants will also work with teachers in the preparation of instructional materials.

The consultants are also to work closely with the administrators and teachers to help them devise their own school plan for change, such as by building on the strengths of the schools and on ways of doing things that are most appropriate to the schools concerned. Schools, for example, could select their own leaders, co-leaders or committees to be responsible for the implementation of the new curriculum in the schools.

Phase 3 involves initial implementation activities. During this phase the consultants provide teachers with continuous
support in the form of regular visits and meetings, and ongoing consultations; and the provision of instructional resources. Such support activities are useful in helping to enhance teachers' understanding of the new curriculum and acquisition of skills, and to facilitate the transfer of the acquired skills to their classrooms. This in turn helps avoid the growth of misconceptions about the new curriculum and the continuation of practices that are contrary to the demands of the new curriculum and that impede its implementation. These activities could also provide teachers avenues to discuss their progress and the problems that emerge during the process of implementation and ways of dealing with these problems.

During this phase the new examination system will be introduced in the schools and the School Inspectors will be making their visits to the schools.

Phase 4 involves the consultants providing the schools with ongoing support to help teachers adapt the new curriculum to suit their local situations and to help administrators and teachers maintain the program in the schools. The feedback information provided to the consultants by the schools based on the reports by the school Inspectors and the examination results would facilitate the consultants' work with the schools.

Alternative II: The Key Teacher Model

(1) Organizational structure for change. A second alternative is to abolish the position of key personnel in the
district and at the same time strengthen the position of the key teacher in each school. As this study shows, the position of the key teacher could be strengthened by overcoming the problems faced by the key teacher strategy. This alternative strategy (Figure 13) is based on the findings of the study which showed that the problems of key teachers' lack of understanding of the new curriculum and their role, and their lack of skills in using the curriculum and in carrying out their role were perceived to be largely the result of the district key personnel's inability to carry out an effective inservice course for these key teachers. The elimination of the district key personnel would bring the key teachers directly under the supervision of the State Education Department, thus facilitating communication between the State Education Department, the agency responsible for implementation at the state level and the key teachers as persons responsible for the implementation of the new curriculum at the school level. This change in the structure could be the means of providing key teachers with improved inservice course training because more resources could now be expended towards conducting only one level of inservice course. Moreover, the key teachers' knowledge and ability would no longer be dependent on the district key personnel. This strategy assumes that the Inspectorate and the Examination Syndicate will work in cooperation with the schools in revising the expectations for pupil achievement in history.

(2) The process of change. As with alternative I, the strategy would pass through the four phases. The main difference between this alternative and alternative I is that, instead of
Figure 13
Model Organizational Structure for Curriculum Change: The Key Teacher Model

emphasizing the key personnel or consultants, the emphasis now is on the key teachers. The key teachers are the persons responsible for coordinating implementation efforts at the school level. The phases are:

Phase 1 involves the preparation of key teachers.

Phase 2 involves the key teachers working with the administrators and classroom teachers, by organizing inservice
courses to familiarize them with the new curriculum and their roles. Key teachers also work with teachers to ensure that students and teachers who may be affected by the new curriculum are made aware of the changes proposed by the new curriculum.

**Phase 3** involves the key teachers teaching the new curriculum together with the other teachers and the provision of ongoing administrative and professional support to both the key teachers and teachers.

**Phase 4** is concerned with providing the administrators, key teachers and teachers with ongoing support in order to facilitate the continued use of the new curriculum in the schools.

**Alternative III: Adapted Key Teacher Model**

(1) **Organizational structure for change.** This third alternative (Figure 14) proposes that the present model of implementation strategy be retained but with certain modifications as suggested by the findings of this study. To enable the key teachers to function effectively implies changes or improvements in their level of understanding and skills, the support system, the communication network, and the inservice program offered. To be able to provide key teachers with ongoing support, the key personnel in the district have to be partially or fully relieved of their teaching responsibilities and be placed in a consultancy role (full-time or part-time) at the district level. The district key personnel work with the key teachers and the school administrators to help them understand
the new curriculum, and their roles and their relationships with others. This change in the status of the district key personnel may be limited initially to a few districts or states and then expanded gradually to the rest of the country. This stage-by-stage implementation would provide implementation planners with the feedback needed to improve the strategy, as well as provide the Ministry with time to find teachers to replace the key personnel in the schools.

This model strategy has the advantage of having a structure already in existence. The difference between this model and the existing one is only in terms of the modifications designed to improve its workability. The continued use of this improved strategy for implementation would require fewer changes compared to the first two alternatives but has the disadvantage of appearing to be much the same as the unsuccessful strategy which has been tried.

(2) The Process of change. This model differs from alternatives I and II in that both the positions of district key personnel and key teacher are retained. The process of change, therefore, has to be modified to incorporate the preparatory phase for both key personnel and key teachers. The revised process is as follows:

Phase 1 involves the preparation of key personnel in the district.

Phase 2 involves the preparation of key teachers in the schools. During this phase the key personnel organize inservice
courses for both the key teachers and the administrators in their districts.

Phase 3, the initial implementation phase, involves the
provision of continuous support to the key teachers, administrators and teachers and ongoing communication between the school and the district key personnel and among the people in the school.

**Phase 4** is concerned with providing ongoing support to the schools to ensure the continued implementation of the new curriculum in the schools.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR RESEARCH**

This study has shown that many of the problems surrounding the use of the key teacher strategy in implementing a new curriculum originated with, or were related directly to, procedures adopted by the Ministry of Education and the State Education Departments who were responsible for initiating and implementing the curriculum. The problems include the lack of communication between the government (the Ministry of Education and the State Education Department) and the school, the lack of support for the key teachers and teachers, and the lack of understanding of the new curriculum.

The nature of these problems could be understood better by studying the role of the government and the orientation to curriculum implementation at both the federal and state levels. Such a study would encompass communication, interactions and relationships: (1) among the various divisions of the Ministry of Education responsible for implementation, (2) between these divisions and the State Education Departments which have direct
authority over, and access to, the schools, and (3) between the Curriculum Development Centre as the initiator of change and those responsible for implementation such as the School Division, the Inspectorate and the Examination Syndicate. There should also be an examination of the role and workings of the various divisions of the Ministry of Education and the State Education Department, and the ability of their personnel in carrying out their role as implementers. Further understanding of how the government could affect the use of any curriculum implementation strategy could also be obtained by studying the reasons behind the inadequate resources allocated for implementation, for example, the lack of personnel and financial provisions for the key teacher strategy as revealed by the present study.

A study that focuses on the role and orientation of the government in implementation efforts would provide implementation planners with information as a basis for guidelines on what needs to be done at both the federal and state levels to ensure that any model of implementation strategy used would be more effective in making government policies for revised curriculum a reality in the schools.

To sum up, the findings of this study extend professional knowledge about the process of introducing and implementing a new curriculum in the context of the culture of Malaysia. The study provided detailed examples of the importance of elements such as clarity about the curriculum innovation and professional roles, ongoing communication and support, and effective staff development programs in school systems. Three models of
curriculum change were developed. These alternative models for implementation strategy were formulated to facilitate the process of translating government's policies for a revised curriculum into a reality in the schools for students and their teachers.
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APPENDIX A

A COMPENDIUM OF STATEMENTS OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES IN THE FOUR MALAYSIA PLANS
A Compendium of Statements of Educational Objectives in the Four Malaysia Plans

**First Malaysia Plan 1966-1970**

1. To consolidate further the educational system in order to promote social, cultural and political unity;

2. to meet the needs of the increasing school-going population;

3. to improve the quality of education and to spread educational opportunity evenly throughout the country in order to correct imbalance between urban and rural areas;

4. to diversify educational and training facilities by increasing such facilities in vital fields; especially those relating to agriculture and industrial science and technology

5. to accelerate teacher training in order to produce the necessary number of qualified and skilled teachers.

(Malaysia, Government of Malaysia: 1966: 166)

**Second Malaysia Plan 1971-1976**

1. Consolidation of the educational system to promote national integration and unity;

2. orientation and expansion of education and training programs towards meeting the manpower needs of the country;

3. improvement of the quality of education for the building of a progressive society oriented towards modern science and technology;

4. improvement of the research, planning and implementation capability to meet the above objectives;

5. the implementation in stages of Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of instruction in schools;

6. closing the gap in educational opportunities among the regions and races;

7. eventual integration of the educational systems of Sabah and Sarawak with the national system

(Malaysia, Government of Malaysia: 1973:183)
Third Malaysia Plan 1976-1980

1. To strengthen the educational system for promoting national integration and unity through:
   a. the continued implementation, in stages, of Bahasa Malaysia as the main medium of instruction at all levels;
   b. the development of personality, character, and citizenship and the promotion of moral discipline through curriculum and extra-curriculum activities;
   c. narrowing the gap in educational opportunities between the rich and the poor, and among the various regions and races in the country, through a more equitable distribution of resources and facilities; and
   d. the eventual integration of the educational systems in Sabah and Sarawak into the educational system;

2. the orientation and expansion of the education and training system towards meeting national manpower needs, especially in science and technology;

3. the improvement of the quality of education in order to reduce wastage and increase its effectiveness for nation building; and

4. the expansion of the research, planning and implementation capacity to meet the above objectives.

(Malaysia, Government of Malaysia: 1976:391)

Fourth Malaysia Plan 1981-1985

1. The emphasis of education and training programs...will be to expose and increase further their efficiency as an important instrument in meeting manpower requirements and achieving the New Economic Policy (NEP) objectives. The recommendations contained in the Report of the Cabinet Committee to Review the Implementation of the Education Policy 1979, as agreed to by the government, will form the basis of these programmes.

2. The use of Bahasa Malaysia as the main medium of instruction will continue to be progressively implemented such that by the end of the eighties, it will be the main medium of instruction at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels.... Measures aimed at strengthening the teaching of English as the second language will be continued.

APPENDIX B

MALAYSIAN SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA
MALAYSIAN SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Enrolment</th>
<th>Recurrent*</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Sc. &amp; Math</th>
<th>Arts/Crafts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 250</td>
<td>800 + 6.00/p*</td>
<td>200 + 1.60/p</td>
<td>200 + 1.80/p</td>
<td>100 + 1.00/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 - 500</td>
<td>1700 + 5.00/p</td>
<td>440 + 1.20/p</td>
<td>470 + 1.60/p</td>
<td>250 + .60/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 501</td>
<td>2950 + 4.00/p</td>
<td>7400 + 1.00/p</td>
<td>870 + 1.20/p</td>
<td>400 + .40/p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Enrolment</th>
<th>Depends on Total Enrolment</th>
<th>Recurrent</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Subject Enrolment $/pupil (electives)</th>
<th>Hostel $/pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 250</td>
<td></td>
<td>1500 + 12.00/p</td>
<td>300 + 2.61/p</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 - 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>3300 + 10.00/p</td>
<td>590 + 2.0/p</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 750</td>
<td></td>
<td>5800 + 8.00/p</td>
<td>1190 + 1.4/p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 751</td>
<td></td>
<td>7800 + 7.00/p</td>
<td>1540 + 1.0/p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary School

*/p = per pupil
APPENDIX C

CURRICULA STANDARDS
APPENDIX C
CURRICULA STANDARDS

Curricula standards for schools at all levels are established by the Ministry of Education. The Ministry’s Course of Study outlines the basic framework for curricula, and syllabuses detail the contents of each subject and each standard. Group Activities are compulsory and include Club activities, Literary activities, Athletics and Games, and Youth Training activities.

The accompanying tables show the minimum number of minutes which each pupil must have for the various subjects per week.

Table I
Primary School Curricula
Prescribed Subjects in Number of Minutes per week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Language</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium of Instruction</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (2nd Language)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Crafts</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Health Education</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activities</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils Own Language</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Studies</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmasters’ Discretion¹</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Religious Knowledge²</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. This may be used to increase the minimum times allocated or the teaching of optional subjects:
   (a) Needlework
   (b) Music & Singing
   (c) Any other subject approved by the Registrar of Schools

2. This is compulsory only for Muslim pupils.
### Table II
Secondary School Curricula
Prescribed Subjects in Number of Minutes per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Medium of Instruction</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One at least of the following:—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) National Language/Malay Language for National Type Secondary Schools.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Islamic Religious Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Pupil’s Own Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Crafts/Music</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education &amp; Health Education</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History &amp; Geography Or Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (unless doing Social Studies)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(80)i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One at least of the following:—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Industrial Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Home Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Commercial Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Agriculture/Agricultural Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Art and Craft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Technical Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Religious Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Foreign Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) History/Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Any other subject approved by the Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the discretion of the head teacher (excluding Group Activities)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activities</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minimum Number of Minutes Per Week</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: The table provides a comprehensive overview of the prescribed subjects for Lower Secondary School (Forms I-III) and Secondary School (Forms IV-V), including the number of minutes per week for each subject or activity category.
### Secondary School (Form VI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Language/English Language</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other subject approved by the Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Craft, Music, Debate, Drama, Camera etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Language, English, Science, Agriculture, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper, Magazines, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field, Football, Tennis, Swimming, Indoor Games, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouts, Guides, Red Cross, Cadets, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the discretion of the Head Teacher* (Excluding Group Activities)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activities*</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minimum Number of Minutes Per Week</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
1. The time allocation in brackets is not included in the total and must be adjusted where necessary against the time to be used at the discretion of the head teacher. Where extra time is required as in Forms IV and V, the Registrar of Schools may authorise a substitution of subjects, or an increase in weekly teaching time, to meet the need.
2. Compulsory only for Muslim pupils.
3. If this is not the medium of instruction of the school.
4. This time shall be used either to increase the time for compulsory subjects or to introduce the teaching of Optional Subjects or both at the discretion of the head teacher.
5. These will include:
   - Clubs:
   - Subject Clubs/Societies: National Language, English, Science, Agriculture, etc.
   - Literary Activities: Newspaper, Magazines, etc.
   - Athletics and Games: Track and Field, Football, Tennis, Swimming, Indoor Games, etc.
   - Youth Training: Scouts, Guides, Red Cross, Cadets, etc.
6. Commercial Studies—In Forms I and II the minimum time for the subject is 120 minutes. The extra 40 minutes will be left to the discretion of the head teacher.
7. Additional periods should be assigned for practical work in the afternoons.
8. Where General Science and Additional General Science are done in lieu of Physics, Chemistry and Biology there will be a surplus of 240 minutes which may be used at the discretion of the head teacher.
9. National Language is compulsory for all pupils other than those offering Malay as a subject.
10. English Language is compulsory for all pupils in Malay Medium Classes.
11. Pupils in the Arts Stream will study any four subjects in this Group.
12. (a) Pupils in the Science Stream will study any four subjects in this group.
   (b) Pupils in the Technical Stream will study Technical Drawing and any three other subjects in this group.
   For these streams appropriate opportunity should be given for developing pupils' interest in Art and Crafts and or music, possibly through group activity.

### General
A. In this notification "National Language" shall mean the Malay Language.
B. "Head teacher" shall include any teacher discharging the duties of head teacher.
C. The teaching of the pupil's own language, if it is not the language medium of instruction of the school, shall mean the teaching of Chinese and/ or Tamil and shall be made available in accordance with the 1961 Education Act, where the parents of fifteen or more pupils of the school so request.
D. Where Bible Knowledge is taught as a subject approved by the Registrar, the cost of such instruction shall not be defrayed from public funds.
E. A class for an Optional Subject may not be constituted with less than 10 pupils, except with the written approval of the Registrar.
### Table III

**Secondary Vocational School Curricula**

*Prescribed Subjects in Number of Minutes per week*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Engineering Trades</th>
<th>Home Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malay Language/English Language (medium of instruction)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Language/English Language (whichever is not the medium of instruction)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Religious Knowledge¹</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils' Own Language²</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Mathematics³</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies (Including Civics)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Skills⁴</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Activities⁵</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total minimum number of minutes per week</strong></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. Compulsory only for Muslim Pupils.
2. The teaching of the pupils' own language, if it is not the medium of instruction of the school.
3. The Syllabus relevant to the chosen vocational field will be used.
4. The distribution of time for *Vocational skills* is shown in the Appendix. Visits to places of employment and training in simple commercial practice relevant to the vocational field will form an integral part of the course. About two-thirds of the time allocation will be devoted to practical work by the pupils.
5. These will include:
   - **Clubs:** Art and Craft, Music, Debate, Drama, Camera, etc.
   - **Subject Clubs/Societies:** National Language, English, Science, Agriculture, etc.
   - **Literary Activities:** Newspapers, Magazines, etc.
   - **Athletics & Games:** Track and Field, Football, Tennis, Swimming, Indoor Games, etc.
   - **Youth Training:** Scouts, Guides, Red Cross, Cadets, etc.
6. Additional periods if necessary should be assigned for practical work in the afternoons.

Source: Malaysia, Ministry of Education (1968:26-29)
APPENDIX D

DIVISIONS OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION INVOLVED IN CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION AND THEIR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION
Divisions of the Ministry of Education Involved in Curriculum Implementation and their Functions Related to Curriculum Implementation

Curriculum Development Centre

1. To identify and translate national needs and aspirations into curriculum specifications.

2. To plan and develop curriculum programs for continuous, systematic and qualitative development in education.

3. To develop and produce curriculum materials such as syllabuses of instruction, teacher guides, learning materials for the students, evaluation instruments, and teaching aids.

4. To disseminate information on curriculum innovations and practices to teachers in schools and others in the community.

5. To organize inservice courses for teachers in order to communicate innovations, changes and revisions to the curriculum and to increase their ability to implement the curriculum in their classrooms.

6. To conduct surveys and analyses of significant world-wide trends and developments in curriculum specifications and teaching practices.

7. To function as the secretariat for the Central Curriculum Committee.

(UNESCO: 1977; Malaysia, Ministry of Education: 1979)

The School Division

1. To coordinate and implement all professional activities such as educational plans and projects including curriculum projects.

2. To coordinate and implement activities related to the administration of the schools, such as organization, supervision, services and finance.

3. To assign teachers and to arrange for teacher transfers throughout Peninsular Malaysia.

4. To study reports received from the Inspector of Schools and the State Education Departments and to take whatever steps deemed necessary.
Teacher Training Division

1. To train future teachers in order to fulfil the needs for teachers to teach in the primary and secondary schools.

2. To organize inservice courses for teachers, which comprises two main types:
   a. a three-year training for temporary teachers who have been teaching a minimum of three years, and
   b. training for the qualified teachers aimed at updating their knowledge or methodology and techniques of teaching, and at facilitating their use of Bahasa Malaysia as the medium of instruction.

Examination Syndicate

1. To administer the Lower Certificate of Education (LCE), the Malaysian Certificate of Education (MCE), and the Higher School Certificate (HSC) examinations and other examinations at the school level.

2. To conduct workshops for teachers on the procedures for the writing and correction of examination papers.

Inspector Of Schools

To observe, supervise and advice teachers for the purpose of maintaining and/or improving the quality of teaching and learning and the administration of the schools.

Educational Media Services

1. To enhance the quality of education through the use of demonstrations and by making available additional teaching aids to the teachers.

2. To facilitate the implementation of curriculum innovations through the use of more effective methods of teaching.

3. To help teachers motivate students through the use of interesting teaching aids.

4. To produce teachers' guides and learning materials for students in the form of graphics, cassettes, films and others.

5. To enhance the teaching of social studies.
Textbook Bureau

1. To evaluate textbooks for all subjects taught at the primary and secondary levels.

2. To implement the Textbook Loan Scheme started in 1975.

Source: Malaysia, Ministry of Education (1979)
APPENDIX E

HISTORY SYLLABUS FOR PRIMARY AND LOWER SECONDARY SCHOOLS
History Syllabus for Primary and Lower Secondary Schools
(English Translation)

General Aims and Objectives

1. To create national consciousness and identity through the history of Malaysia.

2. To develop a sense of belonging to society and nation as a single entity.

3. To create a collective historical memory as a means to national consciousness among the people of Malaysia.

4. To cultivate international understanding.

5. To arouse interest in the learning of history.

6. To evoke and develop critical thinking.

STANDARD FOUR

Specific Objectives

1. To understand history.

2. To understand the beginnings of social life and co-operation.

Syllabus Contents

1. Why we learn history

Use examples familiar to the pupils e.g. chairs, fire, wheel, medicine, gunpowder, cars and other examples of things found in the classroom. The aim is to show that every object has its beginning and development (from its very beginning to the present day situation). This is to show that every object has its own history and is related to the present, i.e. continuity.

2. Human Shelter

a. Need for shelter

b. Types of shelter

Begin with houses at present time and go backwards in time to the beginnings of shelter (caves, trees and houses). Caves - Niah and Cha; trees - aborigines; houses - Leanto and tents (Arabs and Red Indians; Igloo (Eskimo).
3. Living Together

Evolution of village to town, reasons for need of human shelter and living together. E.g. longhouse (for security, economic and social factors) - Babylon and Nile (for cooperation and irrigation) - use Kuala Lumpur city as an example of an evolution from riverine village to town.

4. Food and Occupation: Types of Food and How to Procure them

a. Food gathering and hunting: fruits and roots
b. From hunting to domestication of animals
c. Cultivation of land
d. From raw, uncooked food to cooked food - discovery of fire (friction and flint) for safety and warmth. Discovery of sulphur (for matches), petrol and gas.

5. Basic Tools

Stone, wood and metal - Uses: for cutting, hunting and for protection. (Tasadai community does not possess metal tools). Agricultural equipments and its development till the present day. Cooking utensils.

6. Need for clothing (types of clothing and their uses)

For protection and adornment (bark of trees, animal hide, cotton, wool, silk and synthetic cloth).

7. Language

a. Need for language (for communication) and the importance of National Language
b. Types: signs, oral and written (pictorial) language (example: Chinese), ideograph, pictoral writing, short stories, Roman and Jawi scripts, Braille, Semaphore (sign language), Morse code and numbers.
c. Differences: according to geographical and mother tongue.

8. Means of transport: need for different methods and changes

a. Land: Man himself, different ways of carrying things, use of animals (Bajau horses in Sabah), wheels, steam power, gas, petrol, electricity and jet.
b. Water and air: raft, boat and ship (types of wood); steam power (wood and petrol); and jet (Hovercraft and aeroplane).
c. Space travel: voyages to outer space, satellite, etc.
9. Religious/Cultural Activities and Beliefs

a. Religious activities/beliefs

• Hari Raya Puasa (end of fasting month festival)
• Hari Raya Haji (Pilgrimage festival)
• Deepavali (Festival of lights)
• Chinese New Year
• Christmas
• Puja Pantai (Festival to appease spirits of the sea)
• Pesta Menuai (Sabah, harvest festival)
• Pesta Gawai Dayak (Sarawak, harvest festival)

b. Cultural activities/beliefs

• Top spinning
• Kite flying
• Cave painting
• Shadow play
• Congkak (a traditional indoor Malay game)
• Buffalo race (Sabah)
• Native drums (Sarawak and Sabah)
• Sepakraga (a type of court game)
• Folklores
• Music and dances

STANDARD FIVE AND SIX

Specific objectives

1. To identify political, social and cultural aspects of history in the States of Malaysia.

2. To identify common social and cultural norms of other countries.

3. To understand the idea of development and progress.

4. To identify some aspects of development and progress in Malaysia.

5. To identify the role and contributions of leaders of other countries.

6. To identify and develop values leading to self-discipline.
Syllabus Contents - Standard Four

1. History of the Malacca Sultanate (Empire)
   a. Founding of Malacca.
   b. Development of Malacca through trade, geographical location, articles of trade, types of ships and currency.
   c. System of government and administration: role of Sultan, Bendahara (Prime Minister), Bendahari (Treasurer), Temenggong (Police chief), Syahbandar (Mayor), and Laksamana (Naval chief).
   d. Relations with China (stress the common traditions and heritage), importance of Ming visits (Ying Chin and Cheng Ho), and Malacca's reciprocal visit.
   e. Tun Perak: life history, relationship with the Sultans, and achievements.
   f. Malacca as a religious and cultural centre.
   g. Hang Tuah: symbol of heroism, loyalty and supremacy of Malacca.
   h. The inhabitants of Malacca: stress on the multi-racial society pattern - Chinese, Indians, Javanese, Bugis, etc.

2. Aspects of local history
   a. Bujang Valley: commercial and religious aspects.
   b. Bunga Emas (a kind of tribute): as a symbol of unity and friendship, not sovereignty.
   c. Mat Saman Canal: agricultural economy.
   d. Langkawi and Mahsuri: local legends (refer to Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa legends).
   e. Gangganegara (Bruas): Differentiate legends from history.
   f. Origin of name of Negri Sembilan.
   g. Trengganu rebellion in the 1920's.
   h. Stone inscription and the history of the spread of Islam in Trengganu.
   i. Raja Chulan.
   j. The struggle of Tok Janggut (Kelantan).
   k. Dato Bentara Luar (Johor)
1. Sultan Abu Bakar (Johor)

m. History of Kuala Selangor and Kuala Lumpur.

n. Datu Patinggi Ali (Sarawak).

Syllabus Contents – Standard Six

3. Malacca and the coming of the Portuguese

a. Background to the underlying factors for their coming and conquest of Malacca by the Portuguese (Gold, Glory and Gospel): stress on economic factors (Prince Henry the Navigator, voyages of Vasco da Gama and Alfonso).

b. Opposition by local inhabitants and the Muslim traders.

c. Consequences of the fall of Malacca: declining role as a centre for trade and Islam.

d. Portuguese legacy: music, Catholic religion, a Famosa.

4. The kingdom of Johor-Lama


5. Dutch in the Malay Peninsula

a. Dutch in Malacca and Perak, including Pangkor Island.

b. Role of Dutch in the tin industry and trade.

c. Dutch legacy: examples – building and language.

6. Disintegration of the Johor-Rhio kingdom

a. Coming of the British to Singapore, 1819.

b. London Treaty 1924 (Anglo-Dutch Treaty) and the disintegration of the empire system. The emergence of Malay states like Perak, Johor, Trengganu and Pahang.

7. Malaya, Sabah and Sarawak, and the coming of the British

a. Pangkor Treaty 1874

b. Residential system

c. Formation of the Federated Malay States and Unfederated Malay States.

d. Sabah and Sarawak and the coming of the British.
e. Resistance of local leaders towards the British
   • Dol Said - Naning War
   • Maharajalela - murder of Birch
   • Struggle of Mat Kilau, Tok Gajah and Bahaman
   • Rentap: Sharif Mashahur
   • Mat Salleh

f. Durbar (conference of Malay Rulers)

8. Economic, social and political developments in Malaya, Sabah and Sarawak till the formation of Malaysia

a. Economic (change from traditional to modern system, rubber, padi, sago, pepper and fishing), petroleum industry (Sarawak), timber industry (Sabah).

b. Social conditions in Malaysia
   • Educational developments
   • Health and medicine
   • Transport and communication

When necessary, include personalities who have contributed in specific fields, e.g.
   • R.N. Ridley - rubber
   • Za'aba - education and language
   • Ronald Ross - malaria
   • Joseph Lister - anti-septic surgery
   • George Stevenson - railway
   • John Macadam - roads
   • Alexander Graham Bell - telephone

FORM ONE

Specific objectives

1. To study the origin and the early development of the country, its people, types of government and administration, economy, culture and religion.

2. To study the origin and the early development of Southeast Asian society and to be conscious of the similarities present.

3. To cultivate the feeling of pride towards the country.

4. To achieve regional understanding.
Syllabus contents

1. System of government

Srivijaya, Majapahit, Chempa, Angkor and Ayuthia (Stress on origin, development of administration and relationship with the Malay states).

2. Traditional social, economic and political systems of the Malays and the Indigenous people (pre-western influence)

a. The history of social development

   Indigenous people in Malaysia - customs, basic rights, language (as a means of communication amongst the people of Southeast Asia), literature, music and informal education.

b. The history of economic development

   - Fishing, farming, mining, trade (inter-Southeast Asia trades)
   - Weights and measures
   - Transport and communication systems
   - Currency.

c. Politics

   - Traditional political system - discuss the hierarchy and its functions, similarities, and differences among the states in Malaysia.
   - Judicial system - customary law - differences between 'Adat Pepatih' and 'Adat Temenggong', Undang-undang 99 Perak, Mahkamah Syariah (Muslim Court) and tribal courts (Sarawak).

3. The history of cultural development and regional inter-relationship

a. The origin and main teachings of religions - Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Islam, and Christianity.

b. Cultural heritage of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Islam in Malaysia.

c. The role of Islam in the economic, political and social fields and its contribution to Malaysia.

d. Contributions of West Asian and Greco-Roman civilizations towards world civilizations in the fields of ideology, astronomy, mathematics, medicine, philosophy, literature and astrology.
FORM TWO

Specific objectives

1. To understand the reaction of the Malay states towards foreign powers.

2. To be conscious of resistance towards foreign powers and to realize the emergence of the Malaysian society.

3. To identify the important aspects of reactions among Southeast Asian countries towards foreign powers.

4. To know the social development of East Asian and South Asian societies and their reaction towards changes in politics, economics and culture.

5. To appreciate and feel committed in the national struggle.

6. To achieve an understanding and mutual respect towards others regardless of race.

Syllabus Contents

1. Malaysia's relations with the West

   Reasons for the coming of the Westerners (related to development in Europe, Industrial Revolution, and the need for raw materials and market).

2. British activities in Malaysia
   a. Political:

      Relations with the Kedah sultan (Penang), settlement at Balambangan, Sultan Hussein (Johor and Singapore), Anglo-Dutch Treaty 1824, formation of Straits Settlements, Federated Malay States, Unfederated Malay States, Sabah and Sarawak, Residential/Adviser system.

   b. Economic:

      Tin, rubber, pepper, petroleum, sago, gold and bauxite (including historical development of equipments).

   c. Social:

      Educational system and language, development of health services.

3. Malaysian society
   a. Origins of our society
b. similarities and differences

4. National reaction - the emergence and revival of nationalism
   a. External factors
      • Russo-Japanese War
      • Influence of Turkey
      • Islamic Reformist Movement by Sheikh Mohd. Abduh
      • Syarikat Islam Movement in Indonesia.
   b. Internal factors
      • Student Movements
         - in the Middle East
         - in the Malay States, e.g. Student Youth League at the Sultan Idris Teachers' Training College.
      • Union Activities
         - Singapore Union 1926
         - Singapore Malay Union 1938
         - Malay Youth Union (KMM) 1937
      • Role of individuals
         - Ibrahim Yaakub, Ishak Haji Muhamad, Dr. Burhanuddin, Syed Sheikh Alhadi, Za'aba, and Ahmad Boestamam.
   c. Anti-cessionist movement 1945-51
      • Role of 'Sarawak Malay Society'

5. Reaction towards the West in the neighbouring countries: Southeast Asia
   a. Indochina - Ho Chi Minh
   b. Burma - Aung Sun
   c. Siam - Mangkut
   d. Indonesia - Sukarno
**FORM THREE**

**Specific objectives**

1. To understand the concept of nation and citizenship.
2. To understand government efforts in bringing about modernization.
3. To evaluate the concept of progress and development.
4. To understand the concept of international relationship.
5. To be proud of being a Malaysian citizen.
6. To attain mutual understanding towards other nations.
7. To be determined of achieving world peace.
8. To respect differences and appreciate similarities.

**Syllabus contents**

1. Towards the formation of Malaysia
   a. Malayan Union: origin, reaction and abolishment, Dato Onn's struggle.
   b. Federation of Malaya: development of political parties, activities of Tan Cheng Lock and Thuraisingam.
   c. Emergency in Malaya.
   d. Constitutional changes.
   e. General election 1955.
   f. Independence and its constitution.
   g. General election 1959 (the first fully elected government).
   h. Brief history of Sabah and Sarawak 1948-1963.
   i. Formation of Malaysia: reasons for, reaction to, and formation of (September, 1963), confrontation and its effects.

2. Nation and nation building: Development towards Malaysian nationhood
b. Rukunegara (national ideology).

c. National symbols - national anthem, national flag, national day celebrations, Yang Di pertaun Agong's (King's) birthday celebrations, etc. to bring about collective historical memory.

3. Other nations as comparison

a. Role of Bismarck in uniting Germany, Economic system, authoritarian rule (blood and iron policy), language and nationalism.

b. United States of America: Emphasize aspects of nationhood, e.g. National leaders, economic development and stability, collective historical memory, united efforts towards nationalism, common ideology, common language and so forth.

• American Revolution and external aggression (Britain and France).
• American Civil War.
• Unification of America - a state with a multiracial society.

4. Malaysia and international relations


5. Political ideologies that influence the world

a. Democracy - Britain

b. Facism - Hitler and Mussolini

c. Communism - Marx, Lenin, Mao Tze Tung

6. Towards the formation of Modern Malaysian society

a. National Education Policy

• Comparison of educational policy during colonial rule (did not aim at building nationhood) with present day education policy (main objective: nation building through education).
• Razak Report 1956
• Rahman Talib Report 1960

b. Towards national culture

• Implementation of Malay as the national language (building nationhood) with present day education policy (main objective: nation building through education).
• Establishment of Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports.
• Themes of National Day Celebrations which help to bring
out these objectives.

c. First and Second Malaysia Plans
   • Restructuring of Malaysian society with present day education policy (main objective: nation building through education).
   • To correct economic imbalance among the different races - the New Economic Policy.
   • To create a united and harmonious Malaysian society.
APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES: ENGLISH VERSION

(Original Interview Schedules were in Bahasa Malaysia)
Key Teacher Interview Schedule

The purpose of this interview is to seek your views regarding the role of the key teacher in the implementation of the new history curriculum at the Form One level. The focus is on the role expected of, and the activities actually carried out by, the key teacher. This interview will also seek your views concerning the factors that influence the activities of the key teacher.

This interview will take approximately 40 minutes.

NOTE:
YOUR IDENTITY WILL REMAIN ANONYMOUS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1: Your expected role as a key teacher</th>
<th>Examples of Probe Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What activities does the Ministry currently expect you to carry out?</td>
<td>If yes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Is this current expectation different from the original expectation of the Ministry?</td>
<td>• How is it different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How did you learn of the original expectation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When and how did you learn of the change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did you receive any circulars on this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why do you think it differs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No: Why do you think it remains the same?</td>
<td>Learning about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The components of the curriculum (goals &amp; content, learning activities and teaching strategies, resources and materials, and assumptions)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the necessary skills and how to apply them to the classroom?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 2: Your actual role as a key teacher</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 What do you think teachers needed to learn about the history curriculum for the Form One in order to be able to implement it?</td>
<td>Possible activities that the key teacher has carried out?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 What activities have been or are being carried out to help teachers implement the new history curriculum? Who determined these activities? Why these activities?</td>
<td>• Classroom visits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classroom assistance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meetings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 When, where and how often are these activities carried out? Who determined these? Why?

2.4 How useful are these activities in fostering teacher learning?

2.5 What activities do you find to be most useful in helping teachers learn? Why?

Item 3: Comparison between your actual role and the role expected of you by the Ministry

3.1 What similarities do you see between what you actually do and the role expected of you by the Ministry?

3.2 What differences do you see between what you actually do and the role expected of you by the Ministry?

Item 4: Factors influencing your role as a key teacher

4.1 What sort of things help you to perform according to the expectation of the Ministry? How do these help you?

4.2 What sorts of things interfere most with your ability to perform according to the expectations of the Ministry? How do they interfere?

• Workshops?
• Lectures?
• Discussions?
• Dev. of teaching materials?
• Simulations?
• Others?

• Overall effect on learning (positive/negative)?

• Individual factors:
  . inservice training?
  . selection?
  . motivation?
  . clarity of role?
  . competence?
  . confidence?

• Contextual factors:
  . support (administrative and professional)?
  . time?
  . feedback mechanism?
  . organizational arrangements?
  . resources

• Others
  WHY?
Teacher Interview Schedule

The purpose of this interview is to seek your views regarding the role of the key teacher in the implementation of the new history curriculum at the Form One level. The focus is on the role expected of, and the activities actually carried out by, the key teacher. This interview will also seek your views concerning the factors that influence the activities of the key teacher.

This interview will take approximately 40 minutes.

NOTE:
YOUR IDENTITY WILL REMAIN ANONYMOUS.

Item 1: Your perception of the actual role of the key teacher in your school

1.1 What activities have been or are being carried out by the key teacher to help teachers implement the new history curriculum?
   - Who determine these activities?
   - Why these activities?

1.2 When, where and how often are these activities carried out? Who determined these? Why?

1.3 How useful are these activities in fostering teacher learning
   - about the curriculum?
   - the necessary skills and how to apply them to the classroom?

1.5 Which of those activities do you find most useful in helping teachers learn? Why?

Examples of Probe Questions

Possible activities of the key teacher
- Films?
- Classroom visits?
- Classroom assistance?
- Meetings?
- Workshops?
- Lectures?
- Discussions?
- Development of teaching materials?
- Simulations?
- Others?
- Overall effect on learning (positive/negative)?
- the components of the curriculum (goals & content, learning activities and teaching strategies, resources and materials, and assumptions).
Item 2: Your perception of the expected role of the key teacher in your school

2.1 What activities do you think the Ministry currently wants the key teacher to carry out?

2.2 Has this expectation changed from the original expectation of the Ministry?

Item 3: Comparison between the actual role of the key teacher and the role expected of him/her by the Ministry

3.1 Do you think the key teacher has been able to do what the Ministry expects of him/her?

3.2 If yes, which expectation has he/she been able to meet?
   If no, which expectation has he/she not been able to meet? What has he/she done instead?

Item 4: Factors influencing the role of the key teacher

4.1 What do you think have been most important in making the job of being a key teacher possible or feasible? How have these help the key teacher?

4.2 What have interfered with his/her performance? How do they interfere?

If yes
- How is it different?
- How did you learn of the original expectation?
- When and how did you learn of the change?
- Did you receive any circulars on this?
- Why do you think it differs?
If No: Why do you think it remains the same?

- Individual factors:
  . inservice training?
  . selection?
  . motivation?
  . clarity of role?
  . competence?
  . confidence?
- Contextual factors:
  . support (administrative and professional)?
  . time?
  . feedback mechanism?
  . organizational arrangements?
  . resources?
- Others?

WHY do they help/hinder?
Administrator Interview Schedule

The purpose of this interview is to seek your views regarding the role of the key teacher in the implementation of the new history curriculum at the Form One level. The focus is on the role expected of, and the activities actually carried out by, the key teacher. This interview will also seek your views concerning the factors that influence the activities of the key teacher.

This interview will take approximately 40 minutes.

NOTE:
YOUR IDENTITY WILL REMAIN ANONYMOUS.

Item 1: Your perception of the actual role of the key teacher in your school

1.1 What activities have been or are being carried out to help teachers implement the new history curriculum? Who determine these activities? Why these activities?

1.2 When, where and how often are these activities carried out? Who determined these? Why?

1.3 How useful are these activities in fostering teacher learning about the curriculum? the necessary skills and how to apply them to the classroom?

1.4 Which of those activities do you find to be most useful in helping teachers implement the curriculum? Why?

Examples of Probe Questions

Possible activities of the key teacher:
- Films?
- Classroom visits?
- Classroom assistance?
- Meetings?
- Workshops?
- Lectures?
- Discussions?
- Devt. of teaching materials?
- Simulations?
- Others?
- Overall effect on learning (positive/negative)?
- the components of the curriculum (goals & content, learning activities and teaching strategies, resources and materials, and assumptions).
Item 2: Your perception of the expected role of the key teacher in your school

2.1 What do you think the Ministry currently expects the key teacher to carry out?

2.2 Do you think this expectation is any different from the original expectation of the Ministry?

Item 3: Comparison between the activities carried out by the key teacher and the role expected of him by the Ministry

3.1 In what ways has the key teacher met the Ministry's expectation?

3.2 Where has it been impossible for the key teacher to do so?

Item 4: Factors influencing the role of a key teacher

4.1 What do you think the key teacher needs to enable her to perform according to the expectation of the Ministry? How do they help the key teacher?

4.2 What sort of things prevent the key teacher from doing his job? How do they hinder the key teacher?

If Yes:
• How is it different?
• How did you learn of the original expectation?
• When and how did you learn of the change?
• Why do you think it differs?
• Did you receive any circulars on this?
If No: Why do you think it remains the same?

• Individual factors:
  • Inservice training?
  • Selection?
  • Motivation?
  • Clarity of role?
  • Competence?
  • Confidence?

• Contextual factors:
  • Support (administrative and professional)?
  • Time?
  • Feedback mechanism?
  • Organizational arrangements?
  • Resources?
• Others

WHY do they help/hinder?
Interview Schedule for the Ministry Staff

The purpose of this interview is to seek your views regarding the role of the key teacher in the implementation of the new history curriculum at the Form One level. The focus is on the role expected of, and the activities carried out by, the key teacher. This interview will also seek your views concerning the factors that influence the activities of the key teacher.

This interview will take approximately 40 minutes.

NOTE:
YOUR IDENTITY WILL REMAIN ANONYMOUS.

Item 1: Your perception of the actual role of the key teacher

1.1 What activities have been or are being carried out by the key teachers to help teachers implement the new history curriculum? Who determined these activities? Why these activities?

1.2 When, where and how often are these activities carried out? Who determined these? Why?

1.3 How useful are these activities in fostering teacher learning?
   • about the curriculum?
   • the necessary skills and how to apply them to the classroom?

1.4 Which of those activities do you find to be most useful in helping teachers learn? Why?

Examples of Probe Questions

Possible activities of the key teachers:
• Films?
• Classroom visits?
• Classroom assistance?
• Meetings?
• Workshops?
• Lectures?
• Discussions?
• Devt. of teaching materials?
• Simulations?
• Others?

• Overall effect on learning (positive/negative)?

• the components of the curriculum (goals & content, learning activities and teaching strategies, resources and materials, and assumptions).
Item 2: The expected role of the key teacher

2.1 What does the Ministry currently expects the key teachers to carry out?

2.2 Has this expectation changed from the original expectation of the Ministry?

Item 3: Comparison between the actual activities of the key teachers and the role expected of them by the Ministry

3.1 In what ways have the key teachers met the Ministry's expectation?

3.2 Where have it been impossible for the key teachers to do so?

Item 4: Factors influencing the role of the key teacher

4.1 What factors enabled the key teachers to perform according to the Ministry's expectation? How do they help the key teachers?

4.2 What factors prevent them from doing their job? How do they hinder the key teachers?

If yes
- How does it differ?
- How did you learn of the original expectation?
- When and how did you learn of the change?
- Did you receive any circulars on this?
- Why do you think it differs?
If No: Why do you think it remains the same?

• Individual factors:
  - inservice training?
  - selection?
  - motivation?
  - clarity of role?
  - competence?
  - confidence?

• Contextual factors:
  - support (administrative and professional)?
  - time?
  - feedback mechanism?
  - organizational arrangements?
  - resources?

• Others

WHY do you think they help/hinder?
APPENDIX G

QUESTIONNAIRES: ENGLISH VERSION

(Original Questionnaires were in Bahasa Malaysia)
Key Teacher Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to acquire background characteristics of the key teacher. Please provide answers which best describe your situation.

1. Teaching Experience

How many years of experience have you had in each of the category below? Please check one box opposite each of the categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience (including this year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 As a teacher

1.2 As a teacher in this school

1.3 As a teacher of history

1.4 Teaching the new history curriculum at the form one level.
   - In this school?
   - In other schools?

2. Teacher Training

Please describe the type of teacher training undergone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution(s)</th>
<th>Degree/Diploma/Certificate Obtained</th>
<th>Year Obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>....................................</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>....................................</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>....................................</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Area of Specialization

Please indicate the subjects for which you specialized during your training.
• Major: .............
• Minor: .............

4. **Inservice Courses Attended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name of Inservice Course</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ...... | ................................ | ...........
| ...... | ................................ | ...........
| ...... | ................................ | ...........
| ...... | ................................ | ...........

Teacher Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to acquire background characteristics of the teacher. Please provide answers which best describe your situation.

1. Teaching Experience

How many years of experience have you had in each of the category below? Please check one box opposite each of the categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience (including this year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 As a teacher

1.2 As a teacher in this school

1.3 As a teacher of history

1.4 Teaching the new history curriculum at the form one level.

- In this school?
- In other schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Teacher Training

Please describe the type of teacher training undergone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution(s)</th>
<th>Degree/Diploma/Certificate Obtained</th>
<th>Year Obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Area of Specialization

Please indicate the subjects for which you specialized during your training.
• Major: ...............  
• Minor:...............  

4. **Inservice Courses Attended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name of Inservice Course</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>......</td>
<td>________________________</td>
<td>..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>......</td>
<td>________________________</td>
<td>..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>......</td>
<td>________________________</td>
<td>..........</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrator questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to acquire background characteristics of the administrator. Please provide answers which best describe your situation.

1. **Position** (circle the one applicable to you)
   
   a) Principal
   
   b) Senior Assistant
   
   c) Afternoon Supervisor

2. **Educational Experience**

   How many years of experience have you had in each of the categories below?

   2.1 As a Principal in this school ............ years
   
   2.2 As a Senior Assistant in this school ............ years
   
   2.3 As a Afternoon Supervisor in this school ............ years
   
   2.4 As a Principal/Senior Assistant/Afternoon Supervisor in other school(s) ............ years
   
   2.5 Other administrative experience. Please specify?
   
   ........................................... ............ years

   2.6 As a teacher ............ years

2. **Education and teacher training**

   Please describe the type of education and teacher training undergone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institutions</th>
<th>Degree/Diploma/Certificate Obtained</th>
<th>Year Obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Area of Specialization**

Please indicate the subjects for which you specialized during your training.

- Major: ...............  
- Minor: ...............  

4. **Inservice Courses Attended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name of Inservice Course</th>
<th>Organizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>......</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>......</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>......</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

SUMMARY OF KEY TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS: ENGLISH VERSION

(Translated from Bahasa Malaysia)
Summary of Key Teachers' Perceptions

A. Activities Carried out by the Key Teachers

1. Very limited activities have been carried out.

2. At the beginning, key teachers helped in the selection of text books.

3. Most of these activities revolved around informal discussions with other history teachers at form 1. The frequency of such activities depended on:
   3.1 the extent to which the teachers needed the opinion of, or guidance and clarification from, the key teachers, and
   3.2 whether the key teachers taught history at form 1 or whether they taught during the same session (morning/afternoon) as the teachers affected by the change.

These activities were carried out anytime and at any place. The key teachers felt more comfortable if teachers approached them for advice, help or discussions.

4. Other activities that were carried out include:
   4.1 preparation of a scheme of work for the subject,
   4.2 meetings to discuss the new curriculum,
   4.3 preparing notes, maps and other teaching aids that could be used by other teachers if needed, and
   4.4 shared activities such as the sharing of notes, aids, examination questions, reference books.
Whether these activities were carried out or not depended greatly on the initiative of the key teachers and also on the situation existing in the school.

B. Perceptions of the Role Expected of the Key Teachers by the Ministry

1. Teaching the new history curriculum the way the Ministry wanted them (as understood from the inservice course attended).

2. There was a lack of agreement and/or clarity among the key teachers as to whether they were expected

   2.1 to disseminate the knowledge gained during the inservice course to other history teachers in the school, and

   2.2 to help and guide other teachers in implementing the new history curriculum in their classroom.

3. Key teacher understanding of the role expected of them in the implementation of the new history curriculum at form 1 had not changed over the years. This consistency of perceptions can be attributed to

   3.1 the absence of any visits or communications from the relevant people (eg. the Inspectorate, the CDC officers and the State Social Studies Officer), and

   3.2 the absence of any form of follow-up activities after the inservice course of 1977.

C. Factors Influencing the Activities of the Key Teachers
1. Relationship between the key teachers and the relevant parties.

1.1 Relationship between the key teachers and the teachers in their schools is influenced by:

• the arrangement of the school timetable,
• the initiative of the teachers and their need to meet and discuss with the key teachers, and
• the work load of the key teachers.

1.2 Relationship between the key teachers and the school administrator(s) depended on the attitude of the administrator(s) towards inservice courses, in this case the inservice course on the new history curriculum attended by the key teachers in 1977.

1.3 Relationship between the key teachers and the Ministry of Education. Depended on:

• the extent to which the course was perceived as useful and effective in explaining to the key teachers the role expected of them and in preparing them for that role, and
• the follow-up activities carried out after the inservice course.

2. The inservice course was generally perceived as unsatisfactory because of:

2.1 its very short duration,
2.2 the poor utilization of available time,
2.3 the unsuitability of the venue,
2.4 its poor delivery - boring and lacking variety,
2.5 its limited and superficial content, and
2.6 Its failure to explain clearly the role to be played by the key teachers after the inservice course. As a result, the key teachers felt that the course failed to prepare them for carrying out their role satisfactorily.