

Change models and strategies in the context of managing curriculum change: A case study of managing curriculum Year Four History Curriculum in the district of Kuala Selangor, Malaysia

Thangamalar Paramasivam*

Sekolah Kebangsaan Bukit Badong, Bestari Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia

Received: 5 February 2018; Accepted: 1 September 2018; Published: 1 December 2018

Abstract

This article is based on a case study of the management of curriculum change in primary schools. This was done by analyzing the management of curriculum change brought about by the introduction the History curriculum for the Year Four Primary Schools Standard-Based Curriculum. This instrumental case study employed a descriptive- interpretative approach grounded in the qualitative research tradition. Data was collected through analysis of documents, in-depth semi-structured interviews and the direct observations of teaching and learning of History lessons. It was located within the context of eight selected schools. A total of twenty eight participants (8 History teachers, 8 senior curriculum assistants, 8 headmasters, 1 National Trainer and 3 officers from Curriculum Development Division, State Education Department and District Education were interviewed. The process and procedures in managing curriculum change were analyzed in the context of characteristic of Havelock's model, Schon's models and Bennis, Benne and Chin's innovation strategy. The findings showed that the central agency did predominantly use Havelock's (1971) Research, Development & Diffusion model coupled with Schon's (1971) Centre Periphery Model and Bennis et al.(1969) power-coercive strategy. However, the overall analysis showed that empirical rational and normative re-educative strategies were less practiced in managing the curriculum change.

Keywords: Managing curriculum change, change model and strategy, primary schools, History curriculum

Introduction

The management of the education system in Malaysia is based on a centralized administrative system (Rao and Jani, 2017; Hussin, 2017; Abdullah and Asraf, 2017; Hussein, 2014 and Zamrus and Mokelas, 2000). This means that the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOEM) manages and controls all decisions involving education policy. The schools only follow instructions from the different agencies of MOEM, such as the Curriculum Development Division (BPK, being its acronym in the Malay language), the Textbook Bureau, the State Education Department (JPN, being its acronym in the Malay language) and the District Education Office (PPD, being its acronym in the Malay language). BPK is responsible for designing and disseminating the curriculum, providing training and resources. Whereas, JPN, PPD and the school management hierarchy manage changes at their respective levels. For example, JPN manages change at the state level; PPD takes care of change at the district level and school administrators take care of changes at the school level. However, MOEM, BPK, JPN and PPD are still involved in ensuring that the curriculum changes are implemented effectively at the school level through the provision of professional training, resources and monitoring.

In Malaysia, the Standards-Based Primary School Curriculum (KSSR being its acronym in the Malay language) was introduced in 2011 and revised in 2017. Subsequently, the Secondary School Standard -Based Curriculum (KSSM, being its acronym in the Malay language) was

* Email: malar9739@yahoo.com

implemented in 2017 after KSSR's first cohort moved into secondary school. The implementation of a new curriculum, such as KSSR, at the school level involves cooperation and management of change at every level of the MOEM, BPK, JPN, PPD and school organization. Within the organizational structure of the Malaysian education system, there is the Education Planning Committee (EPC), Central Curriculum Committee (CCC), curriculum implementation committee, state-level curriculum committees, district curriculum committees and curriculum committee at the school level. The success of curriculum implementation depends on the collaboration between each committee and the management of effective change (Hussein, 2014).

The changes that take place in the country's education curriculum are implemented through a systematic change management process between several organizations through curriculum leadership to ensure the desired results are achieved. As a process, change management encounters many challenges and this comes to light when evaluations are done to see the effects of the change within an organization (D'Ortenzio, 2012). It is therefore important to identify and understand the effectiveness of a change management in order to reduce risks and obstacles to the desired change and also to maximize the effectiveness of the change. Hence, the management of curriculum involves the deployment of appropriate change models strategies or approaches to avoid or address any issues and problems arising from the curriculum change. According to Sharifah (2001), curriculum management involves designing, planning and implementing the planned change through effective collaboration with relevant stakeholders and involved in effecting the change. Mitchell (2016), states that in order to implement curriculum change effectively in schools, effective leadership and guidance must be available. This implies that leadership and management are interrelated (Fullan, 2001). Nickols (2016) gives a general definition of change management as a single task in the field of professional practice involving body of knowledge and the control mechanism to manage change. Whereas, in referring to management of curriculum change in particular, Nickols offers two interpretations. Firstly, that change management refers to making changes in a planned and systematic manner. Next, change management as a response to changes in which the organization only holds little or no control (Nickols, 2016). The latter is the common practice in centralized education systems which operate based on a command and control system. On the other hand, MacLean et al. (2015) stated that a combination of factors such as teacher, socio-cultural context, resource agencies along with the capacity of the school as contributing towards the effective management of curriculum change and in enabling teachers to accept and sustain change. Hayes (2014) perceives change management as a process which is related to decision making, actions and responses that those who manage curriculum changes take in relation to less effective activities by seeking for measures to overcome problems and weakness that will enable the effective change management in line with the desired outcome.

Beech & Macintosh (2012), opined that change management is based on skills acquisition to assess the situation, selecting and adapting previous practices in order to design new practices, analysis, and adapt to new practices in accordance with the organization. While Creasey (2009) states that change management is a process, tool and technique for managing change agents in order to achieve the desired outcome. This means that any change management involve "technical" aspects as well as "change agents". To manage technical aspects, we need project management while managing change agents we need change management. Thus, Creasey (2009) states that project management and change management are needed together to ensure that planned changes have been successfully implemented. Project management involves the process of planning and designing, implementing, evaluating and controlling, analyzing and finally deciding whether to continue the project, repair or abolish any project (Creasey, 2009). Therefore, project management is the application of knowledge, skills, materials and techniques to implement project activities in order to achieve the requirements of the project. While change management involves the role of organizational structure in assisting change agents to accept change by changing individual attitudes, practices and beliefs so as to create awareness about the importance of desirable changes. Thus, the definition of change management by Creasey (2009) is appropriate for use in understanding the

management of change and project management so that the curriculum changes can be managed effectively to achieve the goals of change.

It is therefore important to analyze the curriculum change management in Malaysia from the design stage of the curriculum to the implementation of the curriculum in terms of change management models and strategies used in Malaysia to identify implications and suggestions for improving management of change. For this study, curriculum change management was analyzed based on Havelock's (1971) change management model, Schon's model (1971) and change management strategy by Bennis, Benne and Chin (1969). Havelock (1971) has introduced Research, Development and Diffusion (RD&D) management models, Social Interaction and Problem Solving models. While Schon (1971) introduced the Center-Periphery Model (CPM), Proliferation of Centers Model (PCM) and the Shifting Centers Model (SCM) as models for the dissemination of innovation. Bennis, Benne and Chin's (1969) introduced typology of innovation strategies such as Empirical Rational, Normative Re-educative and Power Coercive. The characteristics of models and strategies are spelt out in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3.

Table 1. Havelock's (1971) Models for dissemination and utilization of knowledge

<i>RD&D</i>	<i>Social Interaction</i>	<i>Problem Solving</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centrally centralized • One-way management from center to user. • An organized process in identifying problems, solving problem and disseminating problem solving. • Curriculum change takes place to meet the needs of the national education system, learning theory and research findings. • Curriculum designers identify problems (Research), design curriculum (Development), and disseminate curriculum (Diffusion). • Teachers as passive curriculum implementers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User needs are still determined by the center. • Diffusion of changes, new ideas and new practices in social systems. • The spread applies through formal and informal social interactions. • Formal interactions- courses and conferences by central agencies and support agencies. • Informal interactions - between teachers, between schools, between teachers and administrators. • Building awareness, enhanced interest, information-seeking innovation, innovation, acceptance and rejection of innovation depends on the flexibility of the innovation. • The role of change agents and facilitators is important in the early and mid-term diffusion of innovation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • User centered. • Problems identified by users. • The change process is introduced after identifying the problem. • Research, identify needs, seek solutions, plan strategies, implement, evaluate and improve collaboratively. • Still requires consultation and expertise from the superior. • Innovation is built to achieve school and pupil's needs.

Table 2. Schon’s Models for dissemination of innovation (1971)

<i>Centre-Periphery Model (CPM)</i>	<i>Proliferation of Centres Model (PCM)</i>	<i>Shifting Centres Model (SCM)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The diffusion process is controlled and managed by the central system. • The central system designs and disseminates the curriculum. • Innovations are ready for diffusion. • One-way diffusion process from center to user. • Training, resources and intensive care is managed by the center and arranged by a central agency. • Effectiveness depends on resources and energy, the number of areas to cover and the distance from the central agency. So innovation is acceptable to the target group network system to monitor and generalize feedback. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcome shortages of CPM. • Just like CPM unless there is a primary centre and a secondary centre. • The secondary center is responsible for disseminating the curriculum. • The primary centre will provide training, support, monitoring and managing changes. • Secondary centre aims to multiply the effectiveness of diffusion. • Attention is given to the diffusion process and not just information about the innovation. • The effectiveness depends on the source, energy, communications network, quick response from the centre to overcome the shortcomings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not have a systematic basis for information / change development. • Not having a centre and a clear goal. • Centres will appear and disappear following new issues and leaders. • These centres will exist to achieve their goals. Once the goals are reached, these centers will be closed and replaced with other centers in the short term. • The goal will change.

Table 3. Typology of innovation strategies: Bennis, Benne and Chin (1969)

<i>Empirical Rational</i>	<i>Normative Re-educative</i>	<i>Power Coercive</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum designers bring change through demonstration on the importance of innovation. • The user knows the rationale of change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change agents make changes by changing attitudes, norms and values so that communication between teachers is improved and new skills are taught in order to implement change. • Change agents need to learn to work with users to solve problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The user will perform something if directed. • Authorities bring change with coercion. • New ideas and new approaches are disseminated through the direction of the superior. • Users have no rights and opportunity to give feedback about ineffectiveness of curriculum change management. • Only be passive implementers.

Let us now look at how curriculum change, particularly the introduction of History as a KSSR subject is facilitated at different stages and levels by different stakeholders.

Planning Stage

In Malaysia, generally the management of curriculum change has a combination of characteristics of the RD&D, CPM and Power Coercive models and strategy. BPK actually is vested with the responsibility of designing and disseminating the curriculum. The curriculum is designed based on research findings and requirements of the context and needs of the stakeholders. BPK conducts

research to identify current problems and design the curriculum to meet the current needs of the community and the country. For example, a BPK officer stated:

We did an in-depth study of the subject of *Kajian Tempatan* (Local Studies) which contained aspects of history to be replaced with subject of History at the primary school level. Also there was an overlap in relation to contents pertaining to history between *Kajian Tempatan* and the new History curriculum. In line with the current needs of the nation, MOEM re-introduced the subject of History

Subsequently, BPK designed the curriculum in accordance with the requirements of education policies and curriculum change management processes. For instance, according to a BPK officer:

I was involved designing the curriculum. We had to ensure that the curriculum meets the requirements of national education policy. The curriculum is designed based on National Education Philosophy, the KSSR framework, and in consideration with the harmony of our country. We also had to ensure that the curriculum did not contradict the provisions of the Education Act (1996). The designing and implementation of the curriculum involved six steps. We started by doing a needs analysis, followed by planning, development which included refinement of the curriculum, piloting the curriculum on a limited scale, testing, dissemination and implementation, followed by monitoring and evaluation.

At the same time, BPK also prepares and provides the standards-based curriculum and assessment document (*Dokumen Standard Kurikulum dan Pentaksiran*, DSKP being its acronym in the Malay language), in the form of softcopy on the BPK website for all teachers in Malaysia. This means that BPK plans, controls the planning and designing of the curriculum, the preparation of supporting materials pertaining to standards and assessment, the nature and process of training to be provided and the curriculum dissemination strategies. The innovation moves from the center to the consumer in one way. Teachers are merely passive receivers and implementers of the curriculum adhering to the directions of the central authority, which is BPK. When teachers are passive implementers, they are less likely to report problems encountered during the implementation of the History curriculum in the context of the classroom. This has implications for the effectiveness of the implementation of the History curriculum as expected by the designers of the curriculum. The next section of this paper will discuss the problems faced by teachers as a result of the change management strategies practiced in the Malaysian education system.

Dissemination Stage

Although the actual management of the curriculum, in terms of its implementation, occurs at the school level, other agencies of MOEM, particularly JPN, PPD and the school curriculum management committee play a crucial role in ensuring the effective and correct dissemination of the curriculum according to the varying contexts of the school situation. MOEM uses its administrative and management system to cascade the dissemination and utilization of the curriculum in accordance with the purpose and principles of the curriculum. This is done following the characteristics, procedures and processes of the centre-periphery model. Monitoring, obtaining of feedback and suggestions for improvement of the management of the curriculum change is also orchestrated by the centralized system. For example, according to a JPN officer:

We were not involved in designing the curriculum. That is done at the level of the Ministry, BPK in particular. We function in a top-down system and are only involved at the dissemination and management of the curriculum change at the state, district and schools level.

Prior to curriculum dissemination at the national level, pilot studies were conducted to identify the effectiveness of the implementation of the primary school curriculum. Subsequently, the primary school history curriculum was disseminated from the centre to the implementers as a

package including a circular (Ministry of Education Release No. 1 Year 2014), DSKP for Year Four History and training through dissemination courses. Management of the curriculum change at the dissemination stage have the same features as the RD&D, CPM, PCM, and Social Interaction models. At this stage, the curriculum dissemination process is still controlled and managed by a central system (CPM) and organized by a central agency (PCM). For example, BPK plays role in dissemination, provision of resources and provide centralized support training while central agencies such as JPN and PPD are responsible for disseminating the curriculum at state and district levels. There are various centres (PCM) involved with the dissemination process and the training of teachers who will implement the curriculum at the school level. At this stage, the PCM model complements the limitations of CPM by collaborating and cooperating with BPK in facilitating the dissemination process together with central agency.

In the first stage, the curriculum dissemination process is organized by the central agency by providing training for national trainers (JUK, being the acronym for them in the Malay language) at the national level. Accordingly, the curriculum dissemination process takes place in a well-planned manner and has similarities with the features of the Social Interaction Model such as the dissemination of innovation and the new curriculum is disseminated in a planned and two-way social system between BPK and JUK. Prior to that, the BPK selects the potential JUK with the cooperation and recommendation from JPN and PPD. The JUK candidates are selected based on their expertise in the field of History. For example, according to a JUK:

JUK is usually nominated by PPD. PPD will select candidates who teach History. PPD will send their names to JPN, JPN will forward it to BPK. Subsequently, the selected candidates will be trained by BPK. The first batch of JUK were directed to conduct dissemination training for teachers in their respective districts.

After the selection and training of JUK, BPK plans a schedule for dissemination and training at the national, state and district levels. This indicates that BPK is still have the power of authority in disseminating the curriculum from the centre to users. This has similarities with CPM features. For example BPK officer state:

This is what we organize before the year the curriculum was introduced. For example, the Year 4 curriculum, was introduced in 2014. By 2013 we had already moved to the national level, where the JUK were trained at the national level.

This was also agreed by a JUK who said, *“this dissemination schedule is planned and compiled by BPK. It comprises schedule for JUK moving around Malaysia conducting courses”*. After the curriculum is disseminated at the national level, JUK plays a role in disseminating curriculum at the state level. JUK also train district trainer (JU being its acronym in Malay language) at the state level. At the state level, BPK shared responsibility with JPN to manage the dissemination of the curriculum. Transfer of responsibilities from the primary centre (BPK) to the secondary centre (JPN) shows that the management of curriculum change in Malaysia has similarities with features of PCM model management. According to a BPK officer:

JPN and PPD officers will assist the dissemination course conducted by JUK at national and district level.

At the state level, the JPN is responsible for managing the dissemination process to increase the effectiveness of the dissemination. At this stage, attention was also given to the dissemination process as well as disseminating information about the innovation. According to a JPN officer,

We are more on the academic sector. In the academic sector, we have several units. I am from the social studies unit which is under the Academic Management Sector. We always support and assist

JPN to ensure that JPN curriculum management and all MOEM programs and instructions can be implemented smoothly and effectively

At the state level, the dissemination process is still controlled and managed by the central system where BPK draws up schedule for the state trainer. Similar to the characteristics of the CPM management model, the central system still controls the process of disseminating the curriculum by providing training and resource provision at state level for state trainer. According to a JPN officer, planning pertaining to dissemination and training at the state level is done by BPK.

After receiving training from the JUK (national trainer), the state trainer will go to their respective states to train the district trainers, who operate at the district level regarding the dissemination of the curriculum and on how to prepare and guide the teachers to implement and manage the curriculum in their respective schools. At this stage, JPN gives the letter of appointment to the district trainer who are nominated by an officer in the PPD. At this district level, PPD and JPN officers assist in the planning and conducting the training courses for district trainer. For example, a JPN officer stated:

We will manage with PPD where JUK have been trained by the BPK. We have JUK, state JU and District JU. They will attend the training and will go back and share. JUK will train state JU. JU state will train JU district. In the training, the trainers assisted by PPD officers who will give a briefing on DSKP History of Years 4, 5, and 6 at their level. At the state education level, the social unit officers from JPN will help.

After district trainer received training from the state trainer at the district level, JPN will manage the curriculum change by distributing the curriculum materials received from the BPK to PPD officers. Next, JPN instructs PPD officers to distribute the curriculum materials, such as the DSKP for History subject to schools at the district level. Based on JPN officers:

The distribution of curriculum materials is included in our job specifications. The first is to receive the curriculum materials from BPK and the second we will provide the accompanying letter and confirmation letter of the curriculum materials to be distributed to PPD. Then inform the PPD about the curriculum materials and request them to take the curriculum materials and distribute it to the schools involved. We also inform the related teachers that they are required to attend the dissemination course on the curriculum changes.

After the dissemination of curriculum materials, PPD begin planning to disseminate curriculum at the district level upon instructions from JPN. The management of change at the district level began with the distribution of the letter of instruction to the district trainer about the curriculum dissemination course at the district levels. We will request for participants from schools and normally the Head of the History subject committee or a History teacher to attend the dissemination course held at the district level. Based on interviews with PPD officers:

For this dissemination course, we can direct the departments that will instruct PPD and PPD will then request schools to send the relevant teachers for the dissemination course. We called teachers from 70 primary schools involved with the teaching of History for grades 4, 5 and 6 or the head of the History subject committee chairman.

In the district of Kuala Selangor, changes were introduced to the dissemination course of the History subject for primary school curriculum. The changes were in terms of the dissemination course being conducted jointly by BPK officers, national trainers, lecturers and district trainer. Prior to this, the dissemination of information that was given by trainers was unclear. This shows that BPK adhered to the principles and processes of Havelock's RD&D model to ensure that the curriculum change was disseminated effectively. According to a BPK officer,

In 2015 and 2016 we used the on-site method where we went to every district and gave the dissemination directly to teachers in every school. This was because there were complains that the information about innovation given was rather unclear. Hence, we as curriculum officers together with JUK went down to the districts. The trainers that we appointed at the national level constituted of lecturers from teacher training institutes and subject expert teachers who did on-site training or dissemination of the curriculum.

This means that changes in the dissemination course were introduced after the BPK identified the problem. The problem pertaining to the unclear dissemination of information was also identified through a research by the Malaysian Examinations Board (2014). As mentioned earlier, BPK has sought solutions by designing strategies to disseminate curriculum at the district level together with JUK, lecturer from teacher training institutes and subject expert teachers. This involved features of the Social Interaction model. BPK's action demonstrates accountability for their designed curriculum so that the written curriculum is effectively disseminated and the teachers are able to implement the curriculum as was intended by the designers of the curriculum.

However, the findings from the interviews with history teachers showed that the inaccurate of information occurs due to the lack of clarity pertaining to the assessment structure for history subject. This relates to the lack of understanding by the teachers about the division of questions based on the percentage of marks for objective, subjective and coursework questions. According to a History teacher (GSSK3):

Monthly test for history does not exist. But we assess our teaching and learning. In the assessment, part A is for objective questions and part B is for subjective questions. In Part A there are 30 questions which carry 30 marks. Section B has 20 marks.

Therefore, to avoid lack of clarity, the information disseminated in particular on the assessment (40% objective questions, 30% subjective questions and 30% course work) should be in written format and distributed to the teachers. In Malaysia, the information about managing the assessment is still based on verbal communication. In the KSSR (2011-2016) dissemination courses and up to now, KSSR Revision of Year 2018, lack of clarity happens in assessment because lack of clear written information on how to manage the assessments. The implication is teachers are still being confused on how to manage the assessment in their subjects. Therefore, if RD&D model is re-used, the dissemination has to be done properly and with clarity. The best suggestion is information about how to manage the assessment should be stated in written format.

Implementation Stage at the Schools Level

PPD manages the curriculum change at the school level by conducting a briefing session for school administrators on KSSR, including the introduction of the subject of History. In general, PPD officers facilitate the management of change at the school level. Features of social interaction model can be identified in the processes and procedures used by PPD in their briefing course and involvement of school administrators, regarding the changes that have been introduced in KSSR particularly, in terms of content, pedagogy, assessment and the technical element in the curriculum. Moral and leadership aspects as emphasized in the change model of Fullan (2001) are less emphasized. Management and curriculum leadership courses that emphasize the human side of change management are not greatly emphasized. Therefore, headmaster manage the change in a technical and "power coercive" manner. At the school level, the management style by of a headmaster (GBSK2) has similarities with the characteristics of the "power coercive" strategy in the effort to bring change among teachers. For example, the headmaster (GBSK2) said:

Exposure to the management was also included exposure to the subject of History. The PPD officer briefed the headmaster, senior assistant and history teacher. The briefing covered the syllabus, budget, teaching and learning and also the expectations of PPD that we provide space for teachers to carry

out History activities more effectively. As a school manager, I have to ensure that the intended outcome of the change in curriculum occurs in accordance with the requirements of the ministry. However, I have to take the context of my school into consideration and also that the teachers carry out their role effectively when managing the curriculum change.

After the headmaster receives general briefing on the curriculum change, the History teachers who attend the training on the dissemination of the primary school subject are required to conduct in-house training for other teachers, as required by PPD. So that, in the case of the particular teacher being transferred to another school the other teachers who received the in-house training can teach the subject. For example, according to another headmaster (GBSK3):

We have to make sure that the teachers who attended the training by PPD conduct in-house training for other teachers. It means that there will be a sharing of knowledge and skills and also it makes it possible for the other teachers to teach the subject if the History teacher is transferred or is unable to come.

At the same time, the senior assistant curriculum also ensures that teachers who attended the KSSR dissemination course conduct in-house training to achieve the goals of the curriculum. For example, according to the Senior Assistant Curriculum(GPKSK3),

I make sure that the History teacher who attended the course shares what she knows with other teachers so that all teachers know what is going on in the teaching of History at the KSSR level.

It indicates that the school administrators at the school level demonstrated the use of the "power coercive" strategy. Teachers implement curriculum changes when instructed by school administrators. The findings from observation showed that teachers are implementing curriculum changes technically without changes in values, norms and practices. In reality, the teaching of History in KSSR and the principles of KSSR in general involve a change in the norms underlying the existing practice of teachers. Therefore, power coercive strategies or empirical rational strategies are not suited to ensure that the change in mind set and practice of teachers happen. A more appropriate strategy is the normative re-educative strategy. There is a need to reeducate the teaching-learning norms of the teachers. Any curriculum change will carry values too which is often implicit. If the teachers just focuses on the explicit written curriculum, she/he will approach the subject in a technical and not reflective manner. The teacher may not engage in collaboration and cooperation with other teachers who teach the same subject.

As directed by the JUK, PPD, GB and GPK Curriculum, teachers perform in-service training for all teachers in their schools. Teachers share important information regarding the implementation of the Fourth Year History curriculum. For example, according to a History Teacher in a national school(GSSK1),

After attending the KSSR dissemination course, we are all required to explain what we learned in the course to all teachers and I shared with them by conducting in-house training session.

A History teacher of Tamil type National Primary Schools (GSST6) stated,

I did not go for the History course. But teachers who attended the courses have shared a lot their knowledge with the other teachers in my school. Through the information obtained from the in-house course, I teach.

This demonstrates internal internship at the school level conforming to the social interaction model. Through social interaction models, information exchange takes place in formal channels among school teachers. Next, Senior Assistant Curriculum requested teachers in the History committee panel to meet atleast four times in a year to discuss issues and problems pertaining to the

management of the History curriculum and also to find solution to overcome the issues and problems. For example, the Senior Assistant Curriculum (GPKST6) uses her authority to ensure that teachers do their work, particularly teaching and learning process in an effective manner. According to GPKST6:

The committee meeting will be held 4 times a year. In the first meeting a working committee was appointed. They will plan the annual plan for managing the subject, including that which is related to teaching, teaching resources and planning of strategies that will create interest in History subject for students. I have to make sure that it all goes according to plan.

Based on the instruction of the Senior Assistant Curriculum, the History Committee's Chairman held the first committee meeting before the school session began to make plans. At the same time, the Chairman of History Committee ensures that all History teachers are prepared to implement the History curriculum effectively. For example, according to a History teacher who also serves as chairman of the History Committee (GSST7) said that:

Yes. The meeting will be held 4 times. Four times a year according to the calendar. The first involves the appointment of the committee members(AJK). I will check to see if all History teachers have prepared their annual teaching plan, Daily Teaching Plan and have referred to the Standard-Based Curriculum and Assessment Document and also discuss any problems encountered. That's all.

However, the outcome of the observation showed that the first committee meeting was implemented as directed by the school administrators, but the next meeting was not held because there was no rationale and no change in teacher's values and norms on the importance of organizing committee meetings. Therefore, the use of empirical rational strategy was not effective because the teachers did not deem it necessary to follow all the instructions. Hence, it is better to use the normative re-educative strategies to educate teachers and the committee chairman on the importance of organizing committee meetings four times a year. There should also be a "space" for teachers to discuss any good and weaknesses in managing History curriculum so that committee chairman informed about the problems and take action by reporting to their superiors. The nature of the management strategy used in the education system should be bilateral so that the impact of the implementation of the new curriculum at the school level is known to the top management and appropriate action is taken to improve the quality of primary school curriculum change management.

Teaching and Learning Methods

The effectiveness of the implementation of the new curriculum depends on the quality and expertise of teachers. Teacher's quality is the ability of teachers to implement curriculum change effectively based on Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK), that is mastering the knowledge or subject matter of a subject and mastering the pedagogical competencies pertaining to the teaching of the subject. Mastery of PCK is important for the effecting implementation of the curriculum. This is because the teacher's control over the PCK is important in ensuring that students gain an understanding of the subjects they are studying. The Year 4 History subject introduced under KSSR is a new field of knowledge that has knowledge, skills and values that teachers need to master before implementing the curriculum. Problems arise when teachers have not been trained to teach History in primary schools. This is because History as a subject was only introduced in 2014. Prior to that, the teachers were only trained to teach the subject of Local Studies. Hence, this resulted in many non- History option teachers teaching History. In addressing the problem of shortage of teachers to teach History, the Ministry of Education Malaysia has adopted a power-coercive model by issuing a circular No. 1 Year 2014 which states that teachers who will teach History should meet some criteria such as those trained to teach Local Studies (*Kajian Tempatan* acronym in Malay language), Civics or teachers who have obtained a credit in History at the SPM (Malaysian Certificate of Education) level

(equivalent to O level) and teachers who attended the KSSR dissemination course for History. As a result problems arose during the implementation or teaching of the History curriculum at primary level. According to a History Teacher (GSST7) from Tamil National Type Primary Schools, teachers who are not History option are said to have problems in implementing the teaching and learning process of the History subject. This is because teachers who do not have the PCK to teach History, have to refer to the textbooks to recapture the knowledge they learned during their secondary school days. For example, a History teacher (GSST7) states:

Without training in the History option, the teacher is suffering, the teacher have to read the secondary school textbook again so that have content competency to teach the subject. That's all.

When a teacher is not a History option, the findings showed that there are problem in terms of content mastery, Historical Thinking Skills and implementing case studies as a pedagogical approach. As a result, primary school teachers still practice teacher-based teaching methods. Therefore, the importance of pedagogical courses at the PPD and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) at the school level should be conducted so that teacher communication and collaboration is enhanced to improve the skills and motivate teachers to change values, norms and practices. Therefore, empirical rational and normative re-educative strategies should be used so that teachers are aware that the curriculum changes are for the benefit of students, community and nation. Thus, the teacher will understand the rationale for the curriculum change. Although the teacher knows the rationale for change, if not accompanied by a normative re-educative strategy which involves a change in values, norms and practices of teachers, teachers will still practice traditional teaching methods which may not be suited to develop the necessary knowledge, skills and values as intended by MOEM.

Teaching Aids

The central level (BPK) plays an important role not only in the dissemination and training, but also in providing resource material to facilitate the effective implementation of the subject of History at the school level. These management features demonstrate similarities with the Center Periphery Model where the MOEM controls and manages all activities related to the process of dissemination and provision of resources. Nevertheless, problems remains in terms of shortage teaching-learning resources for the teaching of History at school level. The problem of teaching aids (BBM being its acronym in the Malay language) was also pointed out by school administrators. The school administrators plays a role in ensuring that adequate learning resources and materials are available. Problem solving steps were also taken by school administrators to assist History teachers in implementing the Fourth Year History curriculum requirements. For example, headmaster of National Schools (GBSK2) shared his views as follows:

When there is a problem getting materials, we ask at the local community for help, we mail out a letter. So, some members of the community and parents will provide some form of aid. Apart from that, we also request help from dignitaries, individuals, to cover the cost of providing a room or facilities for a History Corner. So far we got the room, we got the material and we got the allocation to manage. Everything from collaboration from parents.

At the same time, other History teachers also help overcome of shortage of teaching resources, by preparing their own teaching aids either individually or as a group. This is where the problem solving model comes into play. When they are faced with such a problem, they collaborate and prepare materials that are shared by them.

Assessment

In terms of implementation of the assessment, teachers are required to follow the Ministry of Education's instruction by applying 40% elements of Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) in the assessment. This is determined by the Ministry through their authority and has resemblance of features in a power-coercive strategy. The change in assessment leads to a change in the role of teachers in formulating HOTS questions that test the quality of student thinking skills. However, the problem exists when the application of HOTS questions in the History subject is less applied because teachers face problems in terms of lack of understanding and skills in forming HOTS questions. For example, the findings from observations indicated that the History teacher requested the students to produce prehistoric stone tools as they are in textbooks by using clay. After the teaching and learning activities, the History teacher stated that his students had used HOTS in producing ancient tools. The teachers do not have a good understanding and knowledge on how to teach for HOTS. This is because a power-coercive strategy is based on top-down strategy. Although empowerment is given to teachers but empowerment without enablement will not produce the desired results. There is a need for teachers to be trained on how to teach for HOTS. This can be done more effectively by encouraging teachers to collaborate and cooperate to devise better strategies for teaching HOTS. At this point, the social interaction model can be used to build communities of learners among teachers through PLC. In terms of the ability of students to answer HOTS questions, some students find it difficult. According to a History teacher (GSST7) from a Tamil type National Primary School:

Some of the students managed to answer HOTS questions. Someone cannot do it. Their thinking skills cannot do it. They hand in empty test papers. That's all.

Therefore, normative re-educative strategies should be used through Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and advanced courses so that teachers share ideas, receive knowledge and skills in order to be able to produce HOTS questions. In Malaysia, curriculum dissemination courses are only implemented once and there is no advanced course for teachers to enable teachers to be more skilled in implementing HOTS and the problems encountered during the implementation of the History curriculum, particularly in relation to teaching and assessing for HOTS are still existing at school level. Teachers need to be guided by the appropriate teaching methods to help the students in developing their HOTS. At the same time, the problem solving model also needs to be used to develop strategies for further courses to be implemented three times at the beginning, middle and end of the year so that any problems in the teaching and learning process of the History subject are identified and reported to stakeholders such as BPK and Malaysian Examination Board to take action. There must be two-way communication for the flow of feedback from teachers to stakeholders and vice-versa.

The next problem that exists in the assessment is related to inaccuracy in the recording of classroom assessment results. Based on the RD & D model, standardized assessment has been implemented at the classroom level after the central agency conducted research on abroad curriculum. The Malaysian Examination Board has devised a manner of reporting classroom assessment result and teachers are expected to follow it. The way to report results of assessment at classroom has been disseminated to teachers to implement. There are two ways: a) providing a transit form to record the acquisition of learning standards for each pupil every time after the teaching and learning process and b) after teaching a theme which covers various standards of learning, teachers are required to report student achievement and fill out in offline format for each theme. For example, History subjects covers five themes. The filling of classroom assessment report in offline system continues until the teacher finishes teaching five themes. Thus, teachers need to implement the assessment as directed by the Ministry of Education. All instructions regarding classroom assessments are to be followed and implemented by teachers. These management features have similarities with the use of RD& D, CPM models and Power Coercive strategies. The implication is the teachers are not in a position to comment about the weaknesses in the assessment

system employed by the Ministry to manage the reporting of classroom assessment results. This has led the teachers to implement alternative way by recording students achievement in offline system simply without actual assessment when requested by the School Assessment Secretary. This is happened because of a large number of students (40 students) in a class, high teacher burden and the benefits to pupils in terms of increased student learning remains unknown (Nooreiny Maarof & Malani, 2015). The teachers fill in transit forms for record purposes but in actuality they do not follow the actual recommended way because of class size and teacher workload. This shows that transit forms and offline recording systems need to be abolished as it is less helpful in improving pupils learning because teachers just fill and record without any validity and reliability to meet the needs of both the school and the superiors. Therefore, the RD & D model needs to be re-used to know how far the teachers supports the abolition of classroom assessment which requires offline recording and the use of transit forms. Ideas from teachers should be sought to find alternative ways for student assessment so that the teachers time and energy is not wasted.

Evaluation

Stakeholders such as BPK, JPN, PPD and school administrators also carry out monitoring to assess the effectiveness of curriculum implementation at school level. According to BPK officer, monitoring results showed that History teachers can deliver the curriculum well. For example, a BPK officers said:

Our BPK level has always been monitoring the level of curriculum implementation in schools. Whether teachers understand or not? As far as we see this is okay. No problem. Teachers know what to teach, they can deliver the curriculum well.

Meanwhile, JPN as a secondary centre, is responsible for ensuring the management of the curriculum of primary school is based on the requirements of the Ministry of Education. JPN officers also plays a role in doing observations. For example, based on JPN officer:

We are involved with ensuring the effective management of the school curriculum. Ensuring that teaching and learning is implemented in a conducive and effective environment. Ensure that the school is implementing the curriculum according to the act/circulars/syllabus set by MOEM. Our important task when we visit schools is to make our observations...no problem in the implementation of History.

Furthermore, PPD officers also play a role in ensuring the management of curriculum change is implemented effectively at the school level. The goal is to strengthen the effectiveness of the implementation of the curriculum at the school level. For example, according to a PPD officer:

We are monitoring at the school level. Usually we will call the subject teacher, the subject committee head and check their files. Maybe we also will observe their teaching.

Monitoring results by BPK and JPN showed there is no problems exist during the implementation of the primary school History curriculum. However, the findings from the interviews, observation of the teaching and learning process and the analysis of the documents indicated that problems do exist in the implementation stage of History subject in the primary school curriculum. The use of CPM and Power Coercive strategies cause problems at school level but the stakeholders from higher levels are less aware of such problems because the teachers do not have a chance to report the problems to them. The results of the interviews and observation findings suggest that there are problems in terms of the ability and competence of History teachers who are not History option teachers, lack of time, classroom based assessment, time allocation, too compacted curriculum and less teachers who are less skillful in implementing HOTS among students. Therefore,

there is a need to a model that can identify problems at the school level and bring it to the attention of PPD, JPN and BPK so that the problem can be addressed effectively by the relevant authorities. For example, RD & D can be combined with problem-solving model and social interaction strategies. If this done, the problems in managing History will be solved and the teachers will be more motivated to teach History.

Recommendations

In conclusion, the curriculum change management process in Malaysia involves four processes such as planning, dissemination, implementation and evaluation. The process of change management has similarities with the features of change management models such as the Center Periphery Model (CPM) and The Proliferations of Center (PCM) by Schon (1971); Research Development and Diffusion Model (RD & D), social interaction and problem solving model by Havelock (1971) and power coercive strategy by Bennis, Benne and Chin (1969). However, the overall analysis of the curriculum change management shows that empirical rational and normative re-educative rational strategies are less practiced in the Malaysian education system. The use of empirical rational strategies serves to bring about change through the dissemination of information regarding the importance of innovation to consumers so that users can know the rationale of change. Whereas, the use of normative re-educative strategies aims to bring about changes by changing the values, norms and beliefs of older teachers so that communication between teachers is improved and new skills are taught so that teachers can accept, adapt and implement the curriculum change requirements as desired. Data from interviews, observations and document analysis showed that attention should also be given to the curriculum's dissemination process in terms of the use of strategies and the curriculum change management model and not only focusing fully on information relating to curriculum innovations.

The use of curriculum change management strategies and models is aimed in managing the curriculum change effectively from the central level to the user to ensure that the implementation of the History subject curriculum is successfully implemented as expected by the Ministry of Education. Nevertheless, the problems faced by History teachers during the implementation of the Fourth Year History curriculum are less known by the BPK. For example, BPK officers said that *"so far as we see this is okay. No problem"*. At the same time, the observation of the teaching and learning process showed that some History teachers still practice the one-way teaching and learning process without changing the values, norms and practices. This shows that there are weaknesses in the curriculum change management model and strategy used in the management of curriculum change in Malaysia. Thus, as stated by Creasey (2009), project management and change management are needed together to ensure that planned changes have been successfully implemented. The combination of RD & D, problem solving, empirical rational, normative re-educative and social interaction strategies (critical management) are essential to improve the quality of curriculum change management in Malaysia as well as the implementation of new primary school subjects. The irony is that BPK does not have an explicit model for curriculum design and management. It only has a flowchart. However, in practice the models and strategies come into play. It will more effective if the models and strategies can be clearly identified and their role be explained to stakeholders, particularly the teachers so that they have a better understanding and sense of direction of their role in managing curriculum change.

References

- Abdullah, H., & Asraf, R. M. (2017). Bringing the Malaysian Curriculum into the 21st Century. *Advanced Science Letters*, 23(8), 7706-7709. Diperolehi daripada <https://doi.org/10.1166/asl.2017.9558>.
- Beech, N. & Macintosh, R. (2012). *Managing Change: Enquiry & Action*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

- Bennis, G. W., Benne, D. K., & Chin, R. (1969). *The Planning of Change*. (5th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Creasey, T. (2009). *Defining Change Management*. Prosci and the Change Management Learning Centre. Diperolehi daripada <http://www.change-management.com/Prosci-Defining-Change-Management-2009.pdf> pada 28 March 2017.
- D'Ortenzio, C. (2012). *Understanding Change and Change Management Process* (Tesis Doktor Falsafah yang Diterbitkan). Australia: University of Canberra.
- Fullan, M.G. (2001). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Havelock, R. G. (1971). *Planning for innovation through dissemination and utilization of knowledge*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Hayes, J. (2018). *The Theory and Practice of Change Management* (5th ed.). United Kingdom: Palgrave.
- Haji Ahmad. (2014). Implementation of Strategic Education Policy Plan at Micro- Level Context: Management and Leadership Challenges. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 2(2), m.s 1-21. Diperolehi daripada <http://mojem.um.edu.my>.
- Hussin, S. (2017). Spiral Dynamics in the Implementation of Performance Based Teacher Evaluation Policy in a Centralized Education System. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 2(2), 22-37. Diperolehi daripada <https://jice.um.edu.my/index.php/MOJEM/article/view/6125>.
- Sharifah Maimunah Syed Zin. (2001). *Kepimpinan dan Pengurusan Kurikulum Sekolah Rendah*. Kuala Lumpur: Pusat Perkembangan Kurikulum.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. (2014). Surat Siaran Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia Bilangan 1 Tahun 2014: Pelaksanaan Mata pelajaran Sejarah KSSR Tahap Dua Mulai Tahun 2014. Putrajaya: Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Lembaga Peperiksaan Malaysia. (2014). *Informasi Pentaksiran Berasaskan Sekolah*. Putrajaya: Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- MacLean, J., Mulholland, R., Gray, S., & Horrell, A. (2015). Enabling curriculum change in physical education: The interplay between policy constructors and practitioners. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 20(1), 79-96. Diperolehi daripada <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17408989.2013.798406> pada 26 Februari 2017.
- Mitchell, B. (2016). Curriculum Construction and Implementation. *International Journal of Liberal Art and Social Science*, 4(4), 45-56. Diperolehi daripada www.ijlass.org/data/frontImages/gallery/Vol._4_No._4/7._45-56.pdf pada 27 Februari 2017.
- Nickols, F. (2016). *Change Management 101*. Diperolehi daripada <http://www.nickols.us/change.pdf> pada 10 Mac 2017.
- Nooreiny Maarof & Malani Munusamy. (2015). Teacher's Beliefs of the New Standard for Primary Schools (KSSR) in Teaching English as ESL in Malaysian Schools: A Qualitative Approach. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(5), 92-98. Diperolehi daripada <http://ajms.co.in/sites/ajms2015/index.php/ajms/article/view/1109/816> pada 12 Januari 2017.
- Rao, R., & Jani, R. (2017). Teacher Allocation and Equity in Malaysian Schools. *Institutions And Economies*, 3(1), m.s 103-112. Retrieved from <https://jice.um.edu.my/index.php/ijie/article/view/4778>.
- Schon, D. (1971). *Technology and change*. New York: Dell Publishing Co.
- Zamrus & Mokelas. (2000). Malaysia: Curriculum Planning, Development and Reform. In *Globalization and Living Together*, 176-179. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.