



Research Article

# History Teachers and Curriculum Enactment: Examining the Social Component of the Subject Department

\*Charles Adabo Oppong<sup>1</sup>, Abubakari Razak<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Arts Education, College of Education Studies, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

This study examined the social component of the history subject department in senior high schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. The concurrent research design informed the methodological consideration of the study. A sample size of eighteen (18) history teachers was used. The instruments used for data collection were questionnaire and interview guide. The questionnaire data were put into frequencies and percentages while the interview data were analyzed into themes. The study revealed four types of history teachers' interactions in the history departments. These included collaboration, individualism, contrived collegiality and balkanization. The study also established that social interactions in the various departments influenced history teachers' curriculum enactment to benefit history teacher instructional practices. It is important that these interactions are regulated professionally to avoid any negative effect on teachers' professional work. It is also important for instructional leaders to ensure that those engagements among teachers in the history departments continue to be appropriate to enhance the effective teaching and learning of the subject.

**Keywords:** Social Component; Subject Department, History Teachers, Curriculum Enactment, Social Network Theory

## INTRODUCTION

In the school system, teachers always interface between curricular documents and classroom practices. Thus, teachers translate curriculum decisions and plans as outlined in the curriculum document into practical activities to bring about desired changes in students (Elmore, 1999). In an attempt to implement curricular policies, teachers mediate formal curriculum principles by adjusting curriculum directives in ways that they believe would benefit students. For instance, in most cases, teachers re-conceptualize the content and organization of curriculum document, the methodologies of implementing curriculum policies and the stipulated assessment techniques to reflect the contemporary needs of students. This means that teachers serve as filters through which mandated curriculum pass to students (Marsh and Willis, 2003).

Wang (2002) affirms that history teachers are not simply implementers of policies that are handed down to them but they interpret, modify and edit the formal curriculum prior to implementation. Several studies have shown that the interpretations and modifications done by history teachers in curriculum documents are shaped by the subject

departments in the school system (Little, 1990; Siskin, 1994; Harris, 2000). These studies have also shown that the subject department has a considerable influence on history teachers and can either make or mar teachers' conception of the formal curriculum. Further, it has been established that how history teachers individually and collectively perceive and enact the curriculum document is conditioned by the practices existing in the subject department, a claim McLaughlin (1994) had earlier made. He indicated that the subject department has the potential to impact on what is taught, how it is taught and assessed. This means that the nature and character of the subject department determine teachers' interpretational stance towards a curriculum document.

**\*Corresponding Author:** Charles Adabo Oppong, Department of Arts Education, College of Education Studies, University of Cape Coast, Ghana. **Email:** coppong@ucc.edu.gh

**Co-Author Email:** Razakrazak.abu@gmail.com

Harris (2000) provides some clues as to how the subject departments shape teachers' conceptualization of the curriculum. The subject department serves as a primary site where disagreements and misconceptions about the curriculum surface, and are discussed and corrected. In addition, subject departments provide a vehicle for teachers to attain the necessary acculturation to the curriculum and make tacit instructional decisions. This understanding has been a theme underlying several studies that investigated what constitutes the subject departments in high schools.

One school of thought suggests that the subject departments are political units where syllabuses are negotiated (Nias, 1998). Some portray high school subject departments as discursive settings embodying various kinds of discourses among teachers (Hargreaves 1992; Nias, 1998; Harris, 1999). Yet others (for example, Grossman, 1995; Giacquinta, 1998) see subject departments as subject enclaves and organizational bases forged within a higher level of system by subject culture. In the midst of all these views, Siskin (1994) identifies three components of the subject department: political, subject and social. The focus of the present study is limited to the social component of the subject department.

Cole (1991) sees the social component of the subject department as the characteristic patterns of relationships and forms of associations between teachers and their colleagues. Of course, high school subject departments serve as professional communities where teachers develop and share social ideas and norms (Hargreaves 1992), and form various patterns of relationships (De Lima, 1997). The social component of the subject department is, therefore, understood relationally to the viewpoint of Cole (1991) as the interactions existing among teachers in the subject department. Usually, these interactions exist among teachers due to the differing cultures of subject departments (Hargreaves, 1992). As such, Lovat (2005) suggests that the nature and pattern of these interactions within history departments play a critical role in the orientation of history teachers to the mandated curriculum. Similarly, other authors (Giacquinta, 1998; Harris, 1999) have noted that the ways in which history teachers interpret a syllabus are constructed in the patterns of interactions among teachers in the department.

Studies have shown the link between patterns of teachers' relationship and preparation for lessons. In all the studies, the findings suggest a positive pattern of relationships and lesson preparations (Rizvi and Elliot, 2005; Retallic, and Butt, 2004; Cole, 1991). The findings seem to confirm that relationship, once developed, whether intended or mandated, enables or inhibits teachers' understanding of the syllabus document prior to implementation (Reynold, 2001). For instance, Hargreaves (2000) argues that teachers get better understanding of a curriculum document when they engage in discussions within the department. Similarly, there is the suggestion that collegial

interactions influence career commitment and motivation of teachers to the extent to which they are willing to modify the methodologies and teaching and learning resources that are selected in the lesson preparation (McLaughlin and Talbert, 2001; Retallick and Butt, 2004).

On a different wavelength, other authors suggest that social interactions in the subject departments inhibit teachers' initiative to enact the syllabus appropriately before classroom implementation. Of note, Johnson (2003) lends credence to this by specifying that collegial interactions may silence dissonant voices, initiative and the development of teachers' understanding of syllabus. He argues that teachers plan better and engage in critical and analytical thinking in solitude. Earlier, Leonard and Leonard's (1999) study had indicated that interactions among teachers about syllabus are always hostile and constrain teachers' choice of appropriate methods and resources to be used for a particular topic. As such, Sato and Kleinsasser (2004) argue that there is much success when teachers plan individually. They emphasize that collegial collaborations disoriented teachers on the best way to meet the diverse needs of students.

Reasonably, it appears that history teachers' interactions in their subject department may have an influence on history lesson planning. This suggests the critical nature of collegial collaboration in the history departments, given that the available literature seems not settled on the specific influence social interactions have on history teachers' enactment practices. Consequently, further research is needed to shed more light on the influence of history teachers' interaction on curriculum enactment. It is, therefore, quintessential to examine how the social interactions that exist among history teachers in the history departments influence syllabus enactment before classroom implementation in Ghana. Given that no such study has been conducted in Ghana, the different socio-cultural settings may lead to variation in the findings in previous studies. This provides the reason to focus this research in a Ghanaian context.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored mainly in social network theory. The social network theory is a theoretical concept that is concerned with the relationships between individuals, groups, institutions, or even entire societies. As Scott (2000) notes, the social network theory comprises two or more individuals that are bound together by a common objective. The individuals may be a group or an organization and the objective may constitute one or more relations such as 'seeking advice from' or 'works together with', 'depends on' and so on (Chung, 2011).

In the context of this study, the group or organization is the history department and the individuals are the history teachers in their respective departments. The objective of

history department is to plan and implement the history curriculum at that level of schooling. The objective through which any history department connects represents the convergence of the various social contact of that history department. The objective may constitute one or more relations such as seeking advice from colleagues to prepare history lessons, work together to prepare scheme of work, depend on others for the teaching of certain topics, among others. This theoretical approach is necessarily relational. However, a common criticism of social network theory is that individualism is often ignored (Wenlin, Anupreet, Amanda and Thomas, 2017).

The objective among the individuals in the department has important behavioural, perceptual, and attitudinal consequences for both the individual units and for the system as a whole (Knoke and Kuklinski, 1982). Thus, the theory provides mechanisms and processes that interact to yield certain outcomes for the individuals and the department as a unit. Individual benefits could be in the area of professional growth as a teacher, ability to improve planning and teaching as well as an effective teacher identity. Every member of the group has a right to benefit from the social interaction, irrespective of their contribution to its creation or maintenance (Katz, Lazer, Arrow and Contractor, 2004). For the unit (department), there could be an appropriate image building, an improvement in the teaching and learning of the history subject in the department, and also a healthy social engagement in the department. These benefits reflect mutual interest and collective action. Its main premise is that shared interests and the likelihood of benefits from coordinated action often outweigh individual self-interests in the department (Marwell and Oliver, 1993).

The intent of the social interaction and collective action of history teachers suggest that the outcome of the social interaction in the department would maximize the exchange value between individual teachers in the department. The motivation to forge ties and interact is to further maximize their collective ability to leverage instructional practices and mobilize for collective action in their departments. Such collective action is made possible because the teachers, each with their own set of skills, knowledge and expertise, develop communication networks that help them identify and leverage the skills and expertise of others in the department. As the skills, knowledge and expertise of individual teachers play out in the interactions; history teachers' curriculum enactment would be influenced.

## TEACHERS' INTERACTIONS

Several authors have different classifications of teachers' interactions. For Taylor (1967), there are two types of teacher interactions: interpersonal interactions and intrapersonal interactions. Hargreaves (1992) presents

four kinds of interactions expanding on Taylor's classification. These include fragmented individualism, collaboration, contrived collegiality and balkanization. Hargreaves' classification has been the basis of contemporary studies on teacher interactions. Some studies present evidence supporting the forms of teachers' interactions.

In a study on "Teachers' workplace" in New York, Rosenholtz (1993) reports that teachers planned, designed and prepared teaching materials together. Such interaction was also characterized by help-giving, emotional support and collectiveness. Lieberman (1994) also reveals the existence of collaborative interaction among teachers. This interaction among teachers was administratively regulated, rather than development-oriented; and meant to be predictable rather than unpredictable in its outcome. As administrative requirement, novice teachers in the schools were expected to consult the most experienced teachers when taking critical decisions related to lesson planning. These decisions ranged from selection of teaching methods to assessment of students' learning. Teachers in such schools were required to work together to improve practice.

Wang (2002) reports that teachers participated in smaller sub-group interactions within the school community. Thus, teachers were 'balkanized' into different cliques with different ideological demarcations. The first faction represented those who were receptive to changes. They took initiatives to formulate strategies in order to meet students' needs. These teachers were likely to plan their lessons to meet the broad spectrum of learning styles and needs that learners come to class with (Oppong, 2009). The other faction of teachers was apparently isolated-oriented. They were conservative and kept themselves away from the imposed innovations. These teachers may be susceptible to new ways of planning instructional practices. In the end, modern approaches to instructional planning may not be adhered to.

De Lima's (1997) study also reveal that teachers' interactions was more of support-giving; joint planning and enquiry-based teachers' interactions. Supportive planning included group planning of lessons, joint development of materials for use in the classroom and deliberations on teaching practices and instructional strategies that elicit students' critical thinking skills. This collaboration among teachers is likely to improve instructional practices of teachers. One will, therefore, expect that improved instructional practices will also possibly elicit students' analytical and synthetic skills. Similarly, Munthe (2003) shows that teachers in their attempt to implement changes in the curriculum had a round table discussion on what ought to be included in the syllabus and the irrelevant topics in the syllabus; the appropriate pedagogies that appealed to students' needs and how to develop the

thinking abilities of students. The findings of the study demonstrate that teachers shared and developed their expertise through the round table interaction.

The findings of the studies reviewed above show that teachers' interactions could be collaborative, isolated-oriented, or administratively regulated. Apart from these, it could be deduced from the literature that teachers engage in sub-group interactions.

### **The Influence of Teachers' Interaction on Curriculum Enactment**

The existence of social interaction among teachers in subject departments may influence teachers' instructional decisions. For instance, several authors (Lieberman, 1994; Pennel and Firestone, 1996; Vukelich and Wren, 1999) indicate that true collegial and collaborative interactions are those which have impact on teachers' practices. McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) observe that collegial support and interaction helped teachers to adopt appropriate methodologies for new topics, relevant learning aids and effective strategies before classroom implementation. The study also shows that collegiality influenced the motivation and career commitment of teachers to the extent to which they were willing to modify the methodologies and teaching and learning resources that were selected in the lesson preparation.

Cohen and Hill's (1998) indicate that teachers were able to reconstruct their practice to align with the principles of new professional standards for teaching. Cohen and Hill conclude that teachers gained experience from their participation in content-focused interactions with their colleagues. This suggests that collaborative interactions influence teachers' curriculum enactment. This observation emphasizes the belief that, how teachers interpret and further enact the curriculum would be somewhat dictated by effective collegiality at the departmental level. It is, therefore, useful to note that the implementation of the formal curriculum in any classroom situation may allow the discussion of teaching methods, instructional resources and other issues by teachers (Sosu, 2018). Shah (2012) surveys elementary teachers' professional relationships in Kuala Lumpur and found that professional interactions with colleagues enhanced teachers' knowledge and pedagogical skills needed to teach specific content areas. The study confirms that constructive feedback from colleagues enabled teachers to get a holistic understanding of a planned curriculum document.

Sato and Kleinsasser's (2004) study, however, show how interactions among teachers in their department could be problematic for teachers' curriculum enactment practices. It was reported in the study that teachers became confused on what method was deemed appropriate, the best teaching and learning aids to use and the best way to meet the diverse needs of students. The study concluded that collaborative interactions hinder teachers' innovations

in the classroom practices. Similar observations have been reported by Leonard and Leonard (1999) and Johnson (2003). These authors detailed in their research reports how collegiate interactions could stifle teachers' initiative and creativity in curriculum enactment. The outcomes of these studies suggest that interaction among teachers in subject departments for purposes of curriculum enactment could be negative oriented. The literature, therefore, is not conclusive on the issue. That is, the literature seems to be a mix-bag. The social interaction among history teachers in their departments may help confirm or refute the claims in the literature. Perhaps, as noted in the introduction of the study, the current study may help shed more light on the state of affairs. The findings of this study will help situate the debate within an appropriate context.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The concurrent research design was used for this study. The design was deemed appropriate for this study because it allows the collection of different but complementary data on the same topic on one field visit (Morse, 1991). The sample for the study was made up of eighteen (18) purposively selected history teachers from all public senior high schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis in the Central Region of Ghana. The selection of these teachers was informed by the fact that they had taught the subject for a long period of time in a particular school which put them in the position to know the influence social interactions have on history teachers' enactment practices.

Questionnaire and interview guide were used to collect the relevant data. The questionnaire items were designed on two-point Likert scale format: "Agree" and "Disagree". The questionnaire data were put into frequencies and percentages with the use of SPSS. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Thereafter, the transcripts were read with the aim of developing understanding of what was entailed in each and every transcript. Having done that, the transcripts were given to the participants to check and verify if what have been transcribed reflect what they said correctly. After this, to create manageable units for analysis, transcripts were divided into two area units related to the objectives of the study. An inductive approach to develop codes was employed. Broad categories were developed based on the information gathered in response to the questions posed. These categories of responses were repeatedly refined, augmented, eliminated, and further refined until the final narratives emerged.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section is organised under two areas, namely (i) the interactions that exist among history teachers in their departments and (ii) how the interactions influenced history teachers' curriculum enactment.

## Teachers' Interactions

The first objective was to find out the kind of interactions history teachers engage in their departments. The quantitative result is presented in Table 1.

Statement	Agree F (%)	Disagree F (%)
Teachers in the department do discuss their academic work with their colleagues	16(88.9)	2(11.1)
Teachers in the department participate in sub- group interactions with their colleagues	3(16.7)	15(83.3)
Teachers in the department are mandated to work together	4(22.2)	14(77.8)
I do not discuss my academic work with my colleagues	6(33.3)	12(66.7)

The results in Table 1 indicate that the majority (16, 88.9%) agreed that they do discuss their academic work with their colleagues while only a few teachers (2, 11.1%) disagreed. Again, a few (3, 16.7%) respondents agreed that teachers in their departments work in cliques while most of them (15, 83.3%) disagreed. Very few (4, 22.2%) of the respondents indicated that teachers in their departments are mandated to work together while the majority (14, 77.8%) indicated otherwise. Lastly, on the statement that teachers did not discuss their academic work with their colleagues, six (33.3%) respondents agreed while twice this number (12, 66.7%) of teachers disagreed. The data point to the fact that, in general, even though some history teachers did not collaborate in their department, a considerable portion of teachers engaged their colleagues in the history subject departments for academic work. The results, therefore, suggest that some history teachers, at least shared ideas in their respective departments.

Findings from the interview revealed that respondents had varying views on the kind of interaction (s) existing in their departments. For example, some of the respondents admitted that they engaged in collegial exchanges which may or may not be regulated. Two quotes illustrate this: "I will say our interaction is cordial and voluntary; we interact both as teachers and learners. Out of genuine interest, we share stories, plan instructions and even assist beginning teachers specifically, during their first years in the classroom"; "The head of department has established teams of two or three teachers with specific responsibilities....The greatest concern with this arrangement is that we have no say in the formation of the teams.....my team is tasked with co-planning of lessons and thematic teaching." The first comment shows that history teachers engage in collegial exchanges and joint planning of activities. The second comment also shows that teachers' collegial exchanges are mandatory. In such a situation, teachers' interactions are regulated by the

authority, which Wang (2002) describes as the 'Balkanized System' within the school community. Others noted that they made use of the 'inquiry group' of (2-4 teachers) cohorts in their departments. The respondents gave responses like: "I prefer consulting my colleagues rather than hold (sic) on to my own way of thinking, so do my colleagues", "... teachers in the department are supportive.... we offer instructional support to each other even though everyone in the department belongs to a learning community which meet regularly outside the department to discuss students' progress". The existence of sub-group interaction in some history departments indicates that history teachers experienced collegial engagement differently. It appears that collegial collaboration is common in most high school history subject departments. This is noteworthy because the teachers displayed a general lack of knowledge about individualism in their departments.

From the responses to the questionnaire, one can reasonably assume that history teachers engage in mandated interactions, collegial collaboration, and individualism and sub-group interactions. But the interview data, to some extent, contradict this assumption. While the questionnaire data revealed that some teachers plan their academic work in solitude, during the interview, all the teachers demonstrated a general lack of awareness of individualism in their departments. Given the lack of corroboration between the questionnaire and interview data, it maybe that the wording of the questionnaire made it easy for teachers to select any response. But after much probing in the interview, these teachers were unable to adequately account for their engagement in the perceived interactions. In this respect, the interview data served as an effective mechanism for cross-referencing teachers' knowledge of the information on the questionnaire.

Notwithstanding the differences in the findings, the collaborative culture finds support in the perspective of Dillenbourg (1999) that in supportive and trusting collaborative environment, it is difficult to recognize any form of isolation. Again, if, in reality, only few teachers engage in sub-group interactions as the findings suggests, it can be assumed that differing ideological demarcations or group compositions do not exist in most high school history departments. Indeed, in adaptable and successful schools, interactions about teaching tend to be inclusive and homogenous (Cole, 1991). This implies that collegial conversations and exchanges improve teachers' classroom practices. The teachers may perhaps collaborate not only to improve teacher performance, but to also improve student performance. The engagement will put the history teachers on the same page in terms of planning and delivery of instruction. That practice will motivate history teachers to engage in positive interactions with their colleagues. These benefits of collaboration among teachers confirm Ronfeldt, et al.'s (2015) study, which concludes that teachers' collaboration has positive

effects on teachers and their students. As such, it may be reasonable to suggest that subject departments which engaged in better collaboration may have higher achievement gains in history curriculum enactment practices.

It should also be noted that interaction is not always a concept that is welcomed with open arms as the questionnaire data revealed. The data suggested the existence of individualism though, as noted, the interview data did not confirm. Albeit the lack of confirmation, some teachers who have had success working in isolation may view collaboration as an invasion of their pedagogy and a waste of time. Such teachers are likely to be accustomed to their individualism in their departments regardless of the benefits of collegial interaction.

### The Influence of Teachers' Interaction on Curriculum Enactment

The study further sought to find out how social interaction among history teachers influenced curriculum enactment in the history department. The responses of teachers are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2:** The Influence of History Teachers' Interactions on Curriculum Enactment

Statement	Agree F (%)	Disagree F (%)
Social interactions influence my choice of assessment techniques	14(77.8)	4(22.2)
Social interactions help me choose relevant instructional resources	15(83.3)	3(16.7)
Social interactions expose me to relevant content knowledge	16(88.9)	2(11.1)
Social interactions help me know how to formulate realistic lesson objectives	12(66.7)	6(33.3)
I get to know appropriate methodologies for each topic when I engaged in positive interactions with my colleagues	17(94.4)	1(5.6)
Social interactions help me plan my lessons to reflect current trends in the teaching industry	13(72.2)	5(27.8)
Interactions with my colleagues enable me plan lessons in more practical manner	14(77.8)	4(22.2)
Social interactions enhance my knowledge in instructional strategies	17(94.4)	1(5.6)
Social interactions widen my knowledge of the purposes, values and philosophical ground of the subject history	11(61.1)	7(38.9)

The majority of the respondents in Table 2 agreed that social interactions in the subject department influenced how they enact the curriculum. For instance, 17 (94.4%)

teachers agreed to the statement that collegial exchanges help them to select relevant methodologies during history lesson planning. Another 17 (94.4%) of them indicated that the social engagements in the department exposed them to varied instructional practices in the planning of their lessons. The agreement levels of all the items suggests, to a greater extent, that interactions in the history departments influenced history teachers' curriculum enactments at that level of curriculum planning. This implies that the social interaction among history teachers in the history departments enhance their lesson preparation at the departmental level.

From the interviews, it was noted, generally, that the social interaction among history teachers had an influence on the planning of their lessons. The respondents provided comments that social interaction in the departments afforded them a better orientation on the nature, and the purposes of the history subject. One of the responses reflects this position: "I think the engagements in the department with my colleagues widen my scope of knowledge on the principles and nature of the subject". This means that respondents acknowledged that interactions enhance their subject matter knowledge. Besides the content issues, the interviewees indicated that social interactions influenced their selection of, for example, appropriate assessment instruments, relevant instructional materials, and student-centered strategies and methodologies. One teacher puts it as: "The discussions we have in the department help us identify suitable assessment strategies". Another had this to say "the ideas we share as colleagues in the department influence my selection of appropriate instructional practices. In fact, these practices have ensured students involvement during history lessons". These engagements in the history departments have therefore improved teachers' lesson planning. For instance, the comments that: "our interaction as teachers have ensured that we formulate realistic and achievable lesson objectives and make lesson more practical" and "sharing views in the department makes our lesson plans more comprehensive with different ideas across board" suggest that the social interaction influence and benefit teachers' curriculum enactment at that level in the school. This observation makes teachers' interactions very critical in curriculum enactment process at the departmental level.

The two data sources, the questionnaire and interview data, converge on the same point. Both established that social interactions influence teachers' practices of curriculum enactment. Given this level of corroboration, it appears that history teachers are inclined to pedagogical influence through social interactions. It implies that history teachers' ability to enact the history curriculum is somewhat determined by collegial engagements in history departments. This argument confirms the social network theory which views authentic teamwork as very influential to members' understanding of a task and the performance of it. For instance, Cole (1991) attests that collective

generation of ideas and suggestions enhance teachers' development of varied and high quality instructional resources. Again, holding fast to the finding that social interactions widen history teachers' content knowledge, teachers believe that inter-collegial exchanges enhance their understanding of the subject matter, skills or the substance of what is taught, a position that reflects the thinking in the social network theory. As noted in the theory, social interaction and collective action of history teachers suggested that, the outcome of the social interaction in the department would maximize the exchange value between individual teachers in the department. The motivation to forge ties and interact is to further maximize their collective ability to leverage instructional practices and mobilize for collective action in their departments.

It could, therefore, be argued that for history teachers to achieve the laudable objectives of the history subject, and improve on instructional planning and delivery, their interactions in the history department are critical. Perhaps, positive interaction with their colleagues will enable them exploit the usefulness, essence and benefits of each topic in the syllabus. This argument finds support in the words of Miller (1980). The author notes that social interactions influence teachers to an extent that they are able to understand the purposes of their educational practices. Several studies (e.g., Cole, 1991; Hargreaves, 1992; Shah, 2012) provide similar findings. All these studies concluded that social interactions play a vital role in augmenting teachers' instructional practices. Even the essence of discussions of any curriculum document is to give ears to teacher's classroom problems and also proffer solutions to such problems so as to improve instructional delivery. As Little (1990) argued earlier, collegial discussions increase teachers' capacity to reflect on instructional challenges for remediation. Social interaction among teachers in the history departments is, therefore, beneficial for curricular discourse.

Others have also argued on the limitation of social interaction in subject departments in schools. For example, Sato and Kleinsasser (2004) observe that interactions among teachers in their department could be problematic for teachers' curriculum enactment practices. Leonard and Leonard (1999) earlier suggested that collegiate interactions could stifle teachers' initiative and creativity in curriculum enactment practices. These arguments seek to advance the course of individualism over the social network theory. One common criticism of social network theory is that individualism is often ignored although this may not be the case in practice (Wenlin et al., 2017). The lack of initiative and creativity may be perhaps associated with introvert teachers, because any discussions among teachers in the subject department should enable individuals share their innovations and not otherwise. However, the elements of initiative and creativity could possibly be stifled when the interaction

among teachers in the department is not receptive. One mechanism that can hinder initiative and creativity of individuals in the department is reciprocal altruism (Trivers, 1971). Conventional knowledge suggests that a group should have important effects on the development of cooperation by mutual altruism.

Regardless of the fillip side of social interaction in any association, it is evident in this study that interaction among history teachers in their respective departments influence curriculum enactment practices for the benefits of the teachers. The current study therefore re-echoes the quintessential nature of social interaction in curriculum enactment. The findings provide a firm confirmation of the literature that suggests that social interaction in subject departments is important for curriculum enactment discourse. Perhaps, the socio-cultural settings of the current study and those previous studies bear semblance.

## CONCLUSION

It has been established that various interactions exist in the history departments in the various senior high schools where the study was conducted. These include mandated interactions, collegial collaboration, and individualism and sub-group interactions. The existence of these forms of interactions indicates that curriculum enactment may not take place in a vacuum. However, it is important that these interactions are regulated professionally to avoid any negative effect on teachers' professional work. Again, the element of individualism should be managed properly to avoid isolationism while ensuring that teachers' initiative and creativity are not curbed.

The study further recognized that the social interaction among history teachers in their departments influenced curriculum enactment practices at that level of schooling. This implies that history teachers' classroom practices are usually informed by the social engagements that take place in the history departments. It is, therefore, important for instructional leaders to ensure that those engagements among teachers in the history departments continue to be appropriate to enhance the effective teaching and learning of the history subject.

## REFERENCES

- Cohen DK, Hill HC. (1998). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematics reform in California. CPRE Research Report. Retrieved from <http://repository.upenn.edu/cpre-research-report/4>.
- Chung P. (2011). Service leadership definitions. URL: <http://hki-slam.org/index.php>.
- Cole A. (1991). Relationships in the workplace: Doing what comes naturally? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(5/6), 415-426.

- Dillenbourg P. (1999). Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches. *Advances in Learning and Instruction Series*. New York: Madison Square
- De Lima J. (1997). *Colleagues and friends: professional and personal relationship among teachers in two Portuguese secondary schools*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada.
- Elmore R. (1999). *Leadership of large-scale improvement in American education*. US: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Giacquinta J. (1998). *Seduced and abandoned: Some lasting conclusions about planned change from the Cambire school project*, pp. 163-180. In A. Hargreaves, A Lieberman MF, D. Hopkins (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Educational Change*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Grossman PL. (1995). Teachers' knowledge. *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education*, 2, 20-24.
- Hargreaves A. (1992). *Cultures of teaching: a focus for change*. In A. Hargreaves, M. Fullan (Eds.), *Understanding teacher development*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Hargreaves A. (2000). *Mixed emotions: Teachers' perceptions of their interactions with students*. *Teaching and teacher education*, 16(8), 811-826.
- Harris DA. (1999). *Online distance education in the United States*. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 37(3), 87-91
- Harris A. (2000). *Effective leadership and departmental improvement*. *Westminster Studies in Education*, 23, 81-91.
- Johnson B. (2003). *Teacher collaboration: Good for some not so good for others*. In *Education Studies*, 99,337-350.
- Katz N, Lazer D, Arrow, H, Contractor N. (2004). *Network theory and small groups*. *Small Group Research*, 35 (3), 307-332.
- Knoke D, Kuklinski JH. (1982) *Network Analysis*. Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-028
- Leonard L, Leonard S. (1999). *Reculturing for collaboration and leadership*. *The Journal of Educational Research* 92,237-242
- Lieberman A. (1994). *Teacher development: Commitment and challenge*. *Teacher development and the struggle for authenticity*, 15-30
- Little JW. (1990). *The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations*. *Teachers college record*, 91(4), 509-536
- Lovat T. (2005). *Values education and teachers' work: a quality teaching perspective*. *New Horizon of Education*, 122, 1-13
- Marsh C. J, Willis G. (2003). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches, ongoing issues*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merrill Prentice-Hall.
- Marwell G, Oliver P. (1993). *The critical mass in collective action: A micro-social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- McLaughlin MW. (1994). *Strategic sites for teachers' professional development*. *Teacher development and the struggle for authenticity: Professional growth and restructuring in the context of change*, 31-51.
- McLaughlin MW, Talbert JE. (2001). *Professional communities and the work of high school teaching*. Chicago: IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller GE. (1980). *Educating Medical Teachers*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA
- Morse JM. (1991). *Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation*. *Nursing research*, 40(2), 120-123
- Munthe E. (2003). *Teachers' workplace and professional certainty*. *Teaching and teacher education*, 19(8), 801-813
- Nias J. (1998). *Why teachers need their colleagues: A developmental perspective*. In A Hargreaves, A Lieberman, M Fullan, D Hopkins (eds), *International Handbook of Educational Change*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1257-1271
- Oppong CA. (2009). *An evaluation of the teaching and learning of history in senior high schools in the Central Region of Ghana*. Unpublished Master's Thesis submitted to the University Cape Coast, Ghana
- Pennell J, Firestone W. (1996). *Changing classroom practices through teacher networks: matching program features with teacher characteristics and circumstances*. *Teacher College Record*, 98, 46-47.
- Retallic J, Buth R. (2004). *Professional well-being and learning: A study of teacher-peer workplace relationships*. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 5(1), 85-99.
- Reynolds R. (2001). *A model for researching syllabus development and curriculum change*. Paper presented at the Annual Australian Association for research in education Conference, Sydney, December 2-6.
- Rizvi E, Elliot V. (2005). *Teachers' perception of their professionalism in government primary schools in Karachi, Pakistan*. *Asian Pacific Journal Teacher Education*, 35-52.
- Ronfeldt M, Farmer S, McQueen K, Grissom J. (2015). *Teacher collaboration in instructional teams and student achievement*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52 (3), 475-514.
- Rosenholtz SJ. (1993). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.
- Sato V, Kleinsasser R. (2004). *Beliefs, practices and interactions of teachers in a Japanese high school English department*. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20, 797- 816
- Scott J. (2000). *Rational choice theory. Understanding contemporary society: Theories of the present*, 129.
- Shah M. (2012). *The importance and benefits of teacher collegiality in school- a literature review*. *Social and Behaviour Sciences*, 46, 1242-1246.

- Siskin LS. (1994). *Realms of knowledge: Academic departments in secondary schools*. London: Falmer Press.
- Sosu E. (2018). *History teachers and syllabus enactment: An examination of the issues in the middle ground curriculum among selected teachers in the Central and Greater Accra Regions of Ghana*. Unpublished Master's Thesis submitted to the University of Cape Coast, Ghana.
- Taylor FW. (1967). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Norton.
- Trivers RL. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *The Quarterly review of biology*, 46(1), 35-57.
- Vukelich C, Wrenn L. (1999). What do we think we know? *Childhood Education*, 75(3), 153-158.
- Wang H. (2002). A survey of maintenance policies of deteriorating systems. *European journal of perational research*, 139(3), 469-489.
- Wenlin L, Anupreet S, Amanda MB, Thomas WV. (2017). Social network Theory. In P. Rössler, CA. Hoffner, L. Zoonen (Eds). *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

**Accepted 7 November 2018**

**Citation:** Opong CA, Razak A (2018). History Teachers and Curriculum Enactment: Examining the Social Component of the Subject Department. *International Research Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 4(2): 080-088.



**Copyright:** © 2018 Opong and Razak. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are cited.