Implementation of Higher Diploma Program in Mekelle University (Ethiopia): A CBAM Perspective

Atakilt Desta Eshete[1]

Institute of Pedagogical Sciences, Mekelle University, Ethiopia, & PhD Candidate in Curriculum Studies at Haramaya University, Ethiopia, Email: atakiltidesta@gmail.com

Yilfashewa Seyoum Mekuria

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Haramaya University, Ethiopia,
Email: yilfa2014@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to examine the involvement of stakeholders in implementation of HDP, using Concern Based Adoption Model (CBAM) perspective. Hence, mixed concurrent research design was employed. In so doing, 185(25%) out of 726 instructors, 44 (68.8%) out of the 64 department heads, and eleven university academic leaders selected through multi-sage sampling were participated in the study. Data were collected through questionnaire, interview and observation. The questionnaire comprised 35 items on CBAM Likert- scale were employed to solicit pertinent data about respondents' stage of concern whereas checklist was used to determine their level of use and Innovation Configuration of the components of the HDP. Besides, the university leaders were interviewed to examine their involvement in the implementation success of HDP. Finally, data analyzed using percentages, means, and independent sample t-test revealed that the level of use of the HDP by the instructors and the department heads was at the intermediate level while they had personal, managerial, and consequence related stage of concerns. Hence, the data collected through the three dimensions of the CBAM showed that the stakeholders' involvement in the implementation success of the HDP was not planned, well performed, and assessed. Thus, it was suggested to develop contextual implementation policies and guidelines which can be used to steer the implementation of the HDP at the university. Besides, the pertinent leaders need to mainstream the implementation of the HDP outputs into their teaching and learning processes.

---

[1] *Corresponding author*

Introduction

The introduction of higher education in Ethiopia began in the mid-1950s (Amare, 2008). However, much of its development have begun lately in the first decades of the 21st century. This has been evidenced by the endorsement of higher education proclamation in 2003. According to the higher education proclamation, the Ethiopian higher education institutions are entitled to perform various functions. However, teaching, research and community services and consultancies are among the pertinent functions that derive the organizational structure and functions of the higher education institutions (FDRE, 2009).

Coupled with the increased demand for higher education legalization, the higher education expansion was derived by the National Capacity Building program accentuated by consecutive national plans such as Education Sector development Programs-ESDPs- strategic programs that pursue the development of education in general and higher education in particular (Mulu, 2012).The ESDPs remained cannon strategic plans in the development of education. The plans demonstrate the overarching development of education in terms of teachers, students, facilities and directions. As a result, Higher Diploma Program (HDP) was introduced in 2003 to develop the skills and professionalism of teacher educators (UNESCO,2007).

However, though HDP was initially designed to improve the quality of pedagogy in Teacher Education Institutions, these days, it is given to all higher education instructors regardless of their field of studies. The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia- Ministry of Education- FDRE-MoE, posited that the aim of the Higher Diploma Program for teacher educators is to improve quality of education in Ethiopia through a licensing program that will develop the skills and professionalism of teacher educators (MoE, 2011). This was done because most higher education instructors give much emphasis to the content of the curriculum rather than the methods of teaching such as active teaching methods, classroom management and students assessment (Yilfashewa, 2011). Cognizant of this, the issue of HDP has been subject of academic research since its introductions. For example, teachers' attitudes and implementation barriers (Monroe, et al, 2012), teachers' perception of the program (Zelalem, 2017), application of the training skills in to classroom instruction (Adula, 2008), its contribution to effective professional development opportunities for early career academics (Demewoz,2016) are amongst others. However, there seems to be limited evidence that trace graduates´ stage of concern (i.e. attitudes, reactions, and feelings). Besides, although HDP has remained pertinent tool for professional development strategy in the Ethiopian Public Universities, the approaches used to introduce the HDP lacks coherent monitoring and evaluation. This in turn could limit the stakeholders' (i.e. HDP graduate instructors, and the University academic leaders) involvement in the proper implementation of the program. Hall and Hord (1987) indicated that concerns-based professional development is vital when planning and implementing curriculum innovations that are supported with monitoring and evaluations.

Cognizant of this gap, the researcher was interested in the current topic mainly for two reasons. Firstly, though HDP was introduced in 2003 as a compulsory certification program for all teacher educators at higher institutions (MoE, 2003), there seems to be dearth of research that examined its implementation success. Secondly, the researcher worked as as a Higher Diploma Program Leader (HDL) for about one year and, informally, understood that most of the instructors tend attend the program the fulfill the compulsory requirements rather than grasping the needed skills, knowledge and behaviors. The main purpose of the study was, therefore, to examine the implementation success of HDP using the CBAM perspective. In so doing, the research attempts to address the following research questions:

- *What concern (s) do stakeholders have regarding the implementation of HDP in Mekelle University?*
- *How are HDP graduates using the competencies gained from the HDP in Mekelle University?*
- *To what extent do stakeholders involve in the implementation of HDP in Mekelle University?*

Theoretical Framework

According to Miikka et al, (2017), CBAM is originally developed by Hall et al. (1973), and then expanded by Hall, George, and Rutherford (1977). Later it has been subjected to further development by Bailey and Palsha (1992) and Shoulders and Myers (2011). The CBAM perspective comprises three dimensions: stage of concern (SoC), level of use (LoU), and innovation configuration (IC). The SoC further has seven stages (i.e. unconcerned, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and focusing) that may relate to available resources, one's personal competence, and consequences for students, and support from colleagues. This in turn can be categorized based on self-concerns, task concerns, and impact concerns. Besides, while the LoU has seven stages that show current level of practice of the innovation by practitioners. The innovation configuration (IC) depicts to what evident variations were practiced by HDP graduates' in implementing each component of the curriculum innovation-i.e., the HDP.

Therefore, the three diagnostic dimensions of the CBAM were used as theoretical framework of the study. This is mainly because, as Hord and Huling-Austin (1986) put it, in the CBAM perspective, Implementation Success (IS) is the function of LoU, IC, and SoC about innovation. Anderson (1997) also asserted that CBAM reinforces several assumptions about classroom change in curriculum and instruction. These include: (1) change is a process, not an event; (2) change is accomplished by individuals; (3) change is a highly personal experience; (4) change involves developmental growth in feelings and skills, and (5) change can be facilitated by interventions directed toward the individuals, innovations, and contexts involved.

Eventually, it is clearly stipulated by MoE (2011) that the HDP is a compulsory program designed to equip all academic staff working in the higher education institutions. The program comprises four major areas that presumably enhance the exposure and competence of university instructors in their teaching and learning processes. These are: reflective teacher educator, managing learning, action research, and school or organization placement. Successful completion of the four modules (areas) is, therefore, a precondition for certification.

Hence, CBAM as a theoretical framework would enable to measure the implementation success of HDP by considering the involvement of stakeholders in the three dimensions of the model. As a result, the HDP graduates' attitudes, reactions and feelings is examined using SoC dimension of the CBAM whereas their actual use of the program approaches is assessed by the LoU dimension. Besides, the IC dimension was used to examine HDP graduates´ varied practice of the specific components of program.

Research Design and Methodology

Research design is the logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study's initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions (Yin, 2009). Therefore, the present study employed a mixed concurrent research design applied in case university. According to Yin (2009), case studies can be used to explain, describe or explore events or phenomena in the everyday contexts in which they occur. Thus, the mixed concurrent research design was used because it helps to triangulate the qualitative and quantitative data. The quantitative data gained from the HDP graduates' SoC was supplemented by the qualitative data gathered from their LoU, and the IC about their use of the specific components of the program. Furthermore, the data gathered from the HDP graduates was triangulated with the qualitative data gained from the University academic leaders.

Hence, Mekelle University was selected as a case to address the research questions. Accordingly, academic staffs that had been graduated or certified by the HDP starting from 2007/8 to 2017/18 were considered as target of the study. Although the program was delivered before the indicated periods, it was not able to extract data from the HDP training coordinating office. The data about the number of graduates were found only for the specified periods. Kumar (2006) suggested that one should select 10-20 percent of the accessible population for the sample. At the specified period, there were about 790 academic staff who were certified by the program and serving as instructors, department heads, and deans/directors. Hence, 185(25%) of academic staff certified by the HDP were selected using stratified random sampling technique by considering each college/Institute as a stratum. Moreover, since the university leaders were also responsible to the implementation success of the program, 44 (69%) out of the 64 (100%) department heads, and eleven Colleges or Institutes deans/directors, and the academic programs director as well as the vice-president for academics were included in the study.

The study employed questionnaire, interview, and checklist to collect the data. The questionnaire comprised 35 close- ended types of four levels Likert-scale adapted from the CBAM perspective. Accordingly, the items of the questionnaire were framed in line with the philosophical underpinning of the SoC of the instructors and the department heads. Besides, closed- ended items were developed by the researcher to solicit data about LoU of the HDP approaches by the respondents. Besides, a checklist comprising the four components of the HDP (reflective teacher educator, managing learning, action research, and organizational placement[2]) was developed to determine the IC of the program based on the HDP training manual of MoE, 2011. Finally, semi-structured interview was used to the Mekelle University academic leaders that explained the implementation success of HDP approaches as measured by the CBAM perspective.

Data obtained from the instructors and the department heads pertaining the SoC and the LoU into SPSS version 23. Thus, analyses were made with the help of percentages, mean score values and independent samples t-test. The independent sample t-test was employed to compare the mean score values of the instructors and the department heads. Besides, data gained from the academic leaders through the semi-structured interview and observation checklist pertaining the IC were employed as a supplementary for the data gained for SoC though questionnaire.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the data collected through questionnaire, interview and observation checklist. In so doing, the demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented followed by the quantitative and qualitative data. The data presentation is guided by the key research questions.

---

[2] The modules included in the HDP were changed since 2017/18.

4.1.   Demographic Characteristics of the respondents

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

| No | Variables | Category | Current Position | | | |
| | | | Academic staff | | Department Heads | |
			Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Sex	Male	135	73 %	40	90.9%
		Female	50	27%	4	9.1%
		Total	185	100%	44	100%
2	Age	< 25 years	17	9.2%	-	-
		25-39 years	148	80.0%	39	88.6%
		40-49 years	11	5.9%	2	4.5%
		> 49 years	9	4.9%	3	6.9%
		Total	185	100%	44	100%
3	Level of Education	BA/BSc	44	23.8%	-	-
		MA/MSc	127	68.6%	36	81.8%
		PhD	13	7.1%	8	18.2%
		Post-Doctoral	1	0.5%	-	-
		Total	185	100%	44	100%
4	Year of Service	< 6 years	123	66.5%	23	52.3%
		6-12 years	50	27.0%	18	40.9%
		13-18 years	10	5.4%	2	4.5%
		19 year and above	2	1.1%	1	2.3%
		Total	185	100%	44	100%

As indicated in table one, majority of the academic staff, 135 (73 %), and the department heads, 40 (90.9%), were male while the rest were females. This depicts that the participation of female instructors in the managerial position of the university was minimal though their overall participation as an instructor was encouraging. Females´ representation in the leadership position seems much lower than their composition in the total number of academic staff in the universities. In the case of the leadership position, 10 percent is covered by females while their number in the academic staff is about 29 percent.

With regard to age of the participants, the majority of the instructors, 148(80.0%), and the department heads, 39 (88.6%), age were from 25 to 39 years. This in turn indicates us that the instructors and the department heads were at their young and energetic age to discharge their duties and responsibilities related to the higher diploma program approaches. It also reflects that much of the leadership post at the department head levels are handled by the young academic staff.

Besides, while 44 (23.8%) of the instructors were BA/BSc degree holders, majority of the

instructors, 127 (68.6%), and the department heads, 36 (81.8%), were MA/MSc holders. Hence, though the education policy of MoE states that students at the higher institutions should learn by MA/MSc holders and above, the practice at the higher education institutions is still dominated by the academic staff that hold bachelor degrees. This in turn might affect the education quality assurance and enhancement in the higher education sector. Concerning the year of service of the respondents, the majority of the instructors, 123 (66.5%), and 23 (72.2%) of the department heads have served less than six years. This also indicates that majority of the instructors and department heads were inexperienced to support their learners to learn to their best using the higher diploma program approaches.

Involvement of HDP Graduates in the HDP Approaches

Table 2

Respondents' LoU of the HDP Approaches

No	Variables	Category	Response based on Current Position			
			Instructors		Department Heads	
			Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Participants Involvement in the HDP Approaches implementation after graduation	1& 2 years	108	58.3%	23	52.3%
		3& 4 years	46	24.9%	11	25.6%
		5year and above	31	16.8%	10	22.7%
		Total	185	100%	44	100%
2	Participants Level of use of the HDP approaches	Non-user	10	5.4%	2	4.5%
		Novice	22	11.9	2	4.5%
		Intermediate	144	77.8%	30	68.3%
		Old-hand	4	2.2%	7	15.9%
		Past User	5	2.7%	3	6.8%
			185	100%	44	100%

* N.B. Non-user refers to the HDP graduates never employ the approaches after graduation whereas old-hand depicts that they are refining the approaches; and past users presently not using the HDP approaches.

As it is indicated in table 2, participants were asked to rate their LoU of the HDP approaches. Hence, majority of the instructors, that is, 108 (58.3%) were involved one and two years in applying the HDP approaches. Besides, almost half of the department heads, that is, 23 (52.3%) were also involved one and two years in applying the HDP approaches. This depicted that the involvement of the instructors and the department heads in higher diploma program approaches was a recent phenomenon of the University. This in turn might imply that both instructors and the department heads apply HDP principles in the years following their graduations. It seems that graduates' LoU of the HDP knowledge and skill diminishes with the elapse of time since graduation or certification.

With regard to the participants' LoU of HDP approaches, though the majority of the instructors, 144 (77.8%), and the department heads, 30 (68.3%), were using it intermediately; there were substantial number of respondents who were non-users, novices, and past users of the HDP approaches. Therefore, we can conclude that further effort is required by the university academic leaders to enhance the involvement of novice, non-user and past users HDP graduates' in order to enhance and motivate their involvement in the HDP approaches. This further depicts that trainings, seminars and workshops are required to capacitate and initiate the HDP graduates to involve in the implementation of the HDP approaches.

Stakeholders' Stages of Concern

Table 3

Unconcerned Stage of Concern

Items about the Unconcerned Stage of Concern	Current Position of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value	Sig
Concern about another innovation.	Instructors	185	1.62	1.004	.074	227	-0.637	0.525
	Department Heads	44	1.73	.924	.139			
Concern about HDP at this time.	Instructors	18-	.89	.928	.068	227	-1.272	0.205
	Department Heads	44	1.09	1.074	.162			
Occupied with things other than HDP Approach.	Instructors	185	1.48	.939	.069	227	-0.686	0.493
	Department Heads	44	1.59	1.019	.154			
Little time spend thinking about HDP.	Instructors	18-	1.46	.938	.069	227	-0.834	0.405
	Department Heads	44	1.59	.948	.143			
Other priorities prevent them from focusing on HDP Approach	Instructors	185	1.72	.986	.073	227	-0.834	0.405
	Department Heads	44	1.70	.904	.136			

Table 3 presents participants' response with regard to the level of concern of the HDP graduates. Hence, the independent samples t-test result showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the instructors and the department heads in terms of the different items used to measure their level of concern. Therefore, we can infer that there is worth evidence that the instructors and the department heads were unconcerned about their involvement in the HDP approaches. Strengthening this, the interview conducted with the academic leaders showed that there was no follow up mechanism on how teachers were involved in the HDP approaches apart from instructors' graduation from HDP. For instance, some of the interviewees depicted that follow up of the HDP graduate's status or how they were implementing it was the missing part of the curriculum innovation.

Furthermore, the data gained from the IC check list showed that both the instructors and the

department heads did not conduct single action research across the university. Nevertheless, there was an attempt to involve students in active learning, in assessing students somewhat continually, and employing reflective teaching. Therefore, one can infer that the "unconcerned" stage of concern (SoC) of the stakeholders' involvement was affected by other priorities rather than HDP; and by lack of proper leadership by the University management.

Table 4

Information on Respondents´ Stage of Concern

Items about Informational Stage of Concern	Current Position of participants	N	Mean	Std. Devia tion	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value	Sig
Very limited knowledge about HDP Approach.	Instructor	183	1.04	1.221	.090	226	0.543	0.588
	Department Head	44	.93	.900	.136			
Discussion about possibility of using HDP Approach.	Instructor	185	2.25	.844	.062	227	1.281	0.201
	Department Head	44	2.07	.950	.143			
Resources available if they decide to adopt HDP approach	Instructor	185	2.35	.794	.058	227	1.218	0.224
	Department Head	44	2.18	.843	.127			
knowledge what the use of Higher HDP will require in the immediate future	Instructor	185	2.19	.867	.064	227	-1.063	0.289
	Department Head	44	2.34	.776	.117			
know on how HDP Perspective is better than what they have now	Instructor	185	2.08	.935	.069	227	-0.806	0.421
	Department Head	44	2.20	1.025	.154			

As it is indicated in table 4 above, respondents were asked about information Stage of Concern of the CBAM perspective. Thus, the independent samples t-test result indicated that both the instructors and the department heads had knowledge about HDP approaches ($t_{(226)}$ = 0.543, p=0.588> 0.05). Besides, they would like to discuss about HDP approaches at this time ($t_{(227)}$ = 1.281, p=0.201> 0.05), they knew what resources were available to involve in HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = 1.218, p=0.224 > 0.05; they knew the use of HPD requires in the immediate future ($t_{(227)}$ = -1.063, p=0.289> 0.05), and they knew how HDP was better than the approaches they used to involve ($t_{(227)}$ = -0.806, p=0.421> 0.05). Therefore, there is sound evidence that both the instructors and the department heads had knowledge about the HDP approaches. But they seek to have information on the resources available, the possibility of using HDP approaches, and to share information with others for the successful implementation of the program.

Strengthening this, in the LoU interview, it was found that there was no follow up mechanism on how teachers were involved in the HDP approaches. But, they believed that the changes observed these days on the part of teachers were involving their students in the teaching and learning process, the attempt to exercise continuous assessment, and reflective action. These in turn were the result of the curriculum innovation, in this case HDP. For instance, the

interviewees witnessed that teachers were trying to involve their students in the cooperative learning, active learning, and providing feedback of their assessment on time. However, the data gained from the IC checklist indicated that both the instructors and the department heads seem to have limited knowledge on continuous assessment since they consider it similar with continuous testing.

Ornstein and Hunkins (1998) posited as "creating a well-informed group with a clear sense of mission and confidence that it can bring about change is one way to make individuals receptive to the notion of change (p.269)" Therefore, one can infer that the University was not in position of harmonizing the knowledge and skills gained by the academic staff from the HDP approaches with the CPD plan of the University for its Continuity, and enhancement.

Table 5

Respondents´ Personal SoC

Items about the personal Stage of Concern	Current Position of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value	Sig
Effect of reorganization on their professional status (in relation to HDP).	Instructor	184	2.11	.905	.067	226	-0.965	0.336
	Department Head	44	2.25	.719	.108			
Know who will make the decisions (in relation to HDP).	Instructor	185	1.76	1.043	.077	227	-1.533	0.127
	Department Head	44	2.02	1.000	.151			
Know on how their teaching is supposed to change (in relation to HDP).	Instructor	185	2.39	.860	.063	227	0.521	0.603
	Department Head	44	2.32	.934	.141			
Information on time and energy commitments required by HDP.	Instructor	185	2.23	.850	.063	227	0.353	0.724
	Department Head	44	2.18	.870	.131			
Know on how their role will change when using HDP	Instructor	185	2.34	.742	.055	227	0.484	0.629
	Department Head	44	2.27	.872	.132			

Table five shows that the respondents were asked about personal SoC of the CBAM perspective. Thus, the independent sample t-test result also revealed that there was no difference in response between the instructors and the department heads about the effect of reorganization on their professional status due to HDP involvement ($t_{(226)}$ = -0.965, p=0.336> 0.05); who have major responsibility to make decision about HDP ($t_{(227)}$ = -1.533, p=0.127> 0.05), know their teaching is supposed to change ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.521, p=0.603> 0.05); time and energy requirements by HPD ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.353, p=0.724> 0.05); and the role change when HDP approaches were employed ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.484, p=0.629> 0.05).

Cognizant of this, the interview on the LoU interview conducted with the academic leaders revealed that there was no attempt made to make teachers accountable for their lack of involvement in the HDP approaches. Besides, the data gained from the IC checklist depicted that both the instructors and the department heads seem to have limited engagement in the HDP approaches due to the time and energy commitments required by the HDP. Therefore, it is possible to infer that their personal stages of concern hinder the stakeholders' involvement in the successful implementation of the HDP approaches.

Table 6

Management of Stage of Concern

Items about Managerial Stage of Concern	Current Position of participants	N	Mean	Std. Devia tion	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value	Sig
Concern about not having enough time to organize themselves each day (in relation to HDP).	Instructor	183	1.61	1.026	.076	225	-1.37	0.1 72
	Department Head	44	1.84	.987	.149			
Concern about conflict between their interests and their responsibilities.	Instructor	185	1.47	1.048	.077	227	-0.04	0.9 68
	Department Head	44	1.48	1.000	.151			
Concern about their inability to manage all the HDP requires	Instructor	185	1.70	.991	.073	227	0.949	0.3 44
	Department Head	44	1.55	.975	.147			
Concern about time spent working with nonacademic problems related to HDP.	Instructor	184	1.57	1.041	.077	227	-2.404	0.0 17
	Department Head	44	1.98	.902	.136			
Coordination of tasks and people (in relation to HDP) is taking too much of my time.	Instructor	185	1.74	.891	.065	227	-0.396	0.6 92
	Department Head	44	1.80	.978	.147			

Table six above indicated that the respondents were asked about the Management Stage of Concern of the CBAM perspective. Hence, it was indicated in the independent sample t-test result that both the instructors and the department heads had similar concern about not having enough time to organize themselves in implementing HDP approaches each day($t_{(225)}$ = -1.37, p=0.172 > 0.05); had conflict between their interest and their responsibility ($t_{(227)}$ = -0.04, p=0.968> 0.05); inability to manage all HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.949, p=0.344> 0.05); and coordination of task and people is taking too much of their time ($t_{(227)}$ = -0.396, p=0.692> 0.05). Whereas there was significance difference in response between the instructors and the department heads about time spent working with nonacademic problems related to HDP ($t_{(227)}$ = - 2.404, p=0.017 < 0.05).

Supporting this, in the LoU interview carried out, it was revealed that there was no specified office or focal person at the University that manage the implementation of the HDP approaches

after teachers have graduated from HDP. Besides, the data gained from the Innovation configuration (IC) checklist depicted that both the instructors and the department heads seem to have limited engagement in the HDP approaches due to time constraint, conflict between their self-interest and their responsibility, and inability to manage all the approaches required by the HDP. This might be due to lack of skill to involve in it.

Therefore, one can infer that the implementation success of the Higher Diploma Program was not properly monitored and evaluated for its successful implementation by the University.

Table7

Consequence of Stage of Concern

Items about Consequence Stage of Concern	Current Position of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value	Sig
Concern about students' attitudes toward the HDP requires	Instructor	185	2.46	.814	.060	227	0.532	0.595
	Department Head	44	2.39	.841	.127			
Concerned about how HDP affects students.	Instructor	185	2.15	.983	.072	94	-2.278	0.025
	Department Head	44	2.43	.661	.100			
Concern about evaluating impact on students (in relation to HDP).	Instructor	185	2.37	.818	.060	227	-0.481	0.631
	Department Head	44	2.43	.695	.105			
Exciting students about their part in HDP	Instructor	185	2.09	.883	.065	227	-0.93	0.354
	Department Head	44	2.23	.803	.121			
Using feedback from students to enhance, modify or change the HDP.	Instructor	185	2.33	.900	.066	227	-0.226	0.821
	Department Head	44	2.36	.865	.130			

Table seven shows the consequence SoC. Hence, the independent sample t-test result showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the response of the instructors and the department heads about students' attitude towards HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.532, p=0.595> 0.05); using feedback from students to enhance, modify, and change the HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = -0.226, p=0.821 > 0.05); evaluating their impact on students ($t_{(227)}$ = -0.481, p=0.631> 0.05); and exciting their students about their part in HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = -0.93, p=0.354> 0.05). Whereas, there was significant difference between the response of the instructors and the department heads about their concern on how HDP perspective affects students ($t_{(94)}$ = -2.278, p=0.025 < 0.05).

Conversely, interview made focusing on the LoU revealed that there was no impact assessment

study at the university to see students' attitude and the impact of HDP on students' performances. But from the data gained through the IC checklist, it is revealed that both the instructors and the department were in a position of understanding attitudes of their students as well as creating students' excitement on the HDP approaches contribution of their part. Therefore, it is possible to infer that the components of the HDP approaches were not geared towards enhancing student learning and thereby to the improvement of their academic achievement.

Table 8

Collaboration Stage of Concern

Items about the Collaboration Stage of Concern	Current Position of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value	Sig
Helping other staff in their use of HDP.	Instructor	185	2.06	.939	.069	227	0.089	0.929
	Department	44	2.05	.914	.138			
Developing working relationships with both their staff and other staff using HDP.	Instructor	185	2.36	.862	.063	227	0.151	0.888
	Department Head	44	2.34	.745	.112			
Familiarizing other departments or persons with the progress of HDP.	Instructor	185	2.14	.960	.071	227	- 1.021	0.308
	Department		2.30	.823	.124			
Coordinating their efforts with others to maximize the effects of HDP.	Instructor	185	2.41	.803	.059	227	0.304	0.762
	Department	44	2.36	.892	.134			
knowing what other staff members are doing in the HDP	Instructor	185	2.05	.999	.073	227	0.059	0.953
	Department Head	44	2.05	.834	.126			

Table eight demonstrated respondents' level of agreement on the collaboration SoC. Thus, the independent sample t-test result showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the response of the instructors and the department heads concerning about their help to other staff in the use of HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.089, p=0.929 > 0.05); developing working relationship with both their staff and other Colleges and/or institutes using the HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.151, p=0.888> 0.05); familiarizing other departments or persons with the progress of HDP ($t_{(227)}$ = -1.021, p=0.308> 0.05); and coordinating their efforts with others to maximize the effect of HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.304, p=0.762> 0.05); and knowing about what other staff members are doing concerning to HDP approaches($t_{(75)}$ = 0.059, p=0.953 > 0.05). Therefore, we can claim that there is evidence that both the instructors and the department heads had encouraging concerns at the collaboration SoC since they showed their commitment to collaborate with other staff members in using and sharing experiences about the HDP approaches.

On the other hand, interview conducted revealed that there was no collaboration sessions created at the University and/or at the College or institute levels about HDP approaches, with the exception of some workshops and seminars conducted as a result of research and seminar works. But, nowadays, there is an attempt to involve other College and /or institute instructors in HDP training facilitation as a team teaching between pedagogical science instructors with those of subject matter specialists. Besides, from the data gained through the IC checklist, it is revealed that both the instructors and the department lack or almost forgotten the basics of the HDP approaches. This could be improved by collaboration among them through team teaching, and by involving them in collaborative action research that could enhance their understanding of the HDP approaches.

Table 9

Refocusing Stage of Concern

Items about the Refocusing Stage of Concern	Current Position of participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	df	t-value	Sig
knowing of some other approaches that might work better than Higher HDP	Instructor	185	1.57	.954	.070	227	-0.856	0.393
	Department Head	44	1.70	.954	.144			
Concern about revising their use of HDP.	Instructor	184	1.84	.959	.071	226	0.57	0.569
	Department Head	44	1.75	.991	.149			
Revising the HDP approach.	Instructor	185	1.81	.990	.073	227	0.507	0.613
	Department Head	44	1.73	.949	.143			
Modifying their use of Higher HDP based on the experiences of their students.	Instructor	185	2.11	.872	.064	227	0.119	0.906
	Department Head	44	2.09	.830	.125			
Determining how to supplement, enhance, or replace HDP	Instructor	185	1.96	.952	.070	227	-0.523	0.601
	Department Head	44	2.05	.939	.142			

Table nine depicts respondents refocusing SoC. Therefore, it was depicted in the independent sample t-test result that there was no statistically significant difference between the response of the instructors and the department heads on their knowledge about other approaches that might work better than the HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = -0.856, p=0.393> 0.05); revising their use of the HDP approaches ($t_{(226)}$ = 0.57, p=0.569> 0.05); revising the HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.507, p=0.613> 0.05); and modifying their use of HDP approaches based on their experience ($t_{(227)}$ = 0.119, p=0.906> 0.05). And they would like to determine on how to supplement, enhance or replace the HDP approaches ($t_{(227)}$ = -0.523, p=0.601> 0.05). Therefore, we can confirm that there is sensible evidence that both the instructors and the department heads had developing concerns to supplement, to enhance or to replace the HDP approaches.

On the other hand, the interview revealed that there was a tendency of implementing the HDP approaches though there were no attempts made to align them with the subject matter methodology instructors teach. Besides, from the data gained through the IC checklist, it was revealed that both the instructors and the departments were aligning their teaching methodologies with the specific subject matter they taught although their involvement in continuous assessment, action research, reflective teaching, and organizational placement after graduation from HDP was minimal.

Therefore, it is possible to assert that the University management was not in a position of contextualizing the HDP training. This might help to make the program compatible with the subject specific approaches, and with the interest of the HDP candidates' mode of delivery. Besides, it could attract the untrained staff to attend the higher diploma program training or the curriculum innovation.

Discussions

The purpose of the study was to examine the implementation success of higher diploma program in Mekelle University (Ethiopia) using a CBAM Perspective. The study used mixed research concurrent. The study considered HDP graduate instructors, department heads, college/institute deans or directors, academic programs director, and academic vice-president.

With regard to the stakeholders' involvement in the HDP approaches, majority of the instructors, 144 (72.4%), and the department heads, 29 (65.9), were involved only for the first three years (after graduation - not including this year). Whereas, the majority of the College/Institute dean's or director's involvement in the HDP approaches was above five years. Nevertheless, the majority of the instructors, 144 (77.8%), and the department heads, 30 (68.3%), level of use of the HDP approaches was at the intermediate level while the university leaders' level of use was minimal. Therefore, it is possible to claim that the involvement of the senior academic staff in the HDP approaches was minimal. This might be because they forgot the knowledge and skill of the HDP approaches and have lack of motivation to involve in the curriculum innovation or HDP.

Moreover, the HDP graduates' involvement in the HDP approaches, both the instructors and the department heads had concerns on the seven SoC of the CBAM perspective such as unconcerned (M=1.54, and M=1.43), informational (M=1.95, and M=1.98), personal (M=2.21, and M=2.17), managerial (M=1.73, and M=1.62), consequence (M=2.23, and M=2.20), collaboration (M=2.22, and M=2.20), and refocusing (M=1.68, and M=1.86) stages, respectively. This was depicted in their response of the little time spend thinking about HDP; other priorities prevent them from focusing on HDP; involving in HDP approaches had conflict between their interest and their responsibility; concerned about revising their use of HDP approaches, and using feedback from students' to enhance, modify or change the HDP. Therefore, one can infer that the

implementation of the HDP is constrained by the personal, task/managerial, and outcome concerns the HDP graduates had.

In addition to this, the instructors and the department heads LoU of the different components of the HDP such as course planning, reflective teaching, using active learning techniques, and awareness of gender and special inclusion was remarkable or at the developing level although they did not conduct any action research, and did not prepare session plans after their HDP graduation. Besides, the data gained through the observation checklist or IC about the instructors' involvement in the HDP components showed that the stakeholders' involvement in the implementation success of the HDP was minimal.

Conclusions and Implications

The result of the study revealed that both the instructors and the department heads were medium in using the HDP approaches though the management body of the University had no idea about their LoU. Besides, the instructors, and the department leads had personal, task/managerial, and outcome related concerns in their involvement in the HDP approaches as measured by the SoC of the CBAM perspective. Likewise, the data gained through the observation checklist on IC showed that the stakeholders' involvement in the implementation success of the HDP approaches was not planned, well-performed and assessed.

Thus, it is possible to conclude that though the attempt made by the instructors and the department heads to involve in the HDP approaches was encouraging, the management was not in a position of monitoring, evaluating, and providing support in the implementation success of the HDP approaches. This in turn might infer that the implementation success of the HDP approaches was constrained by lack of involvement of the pertinent stakeholders of the University. This may eventually hamper the achievement of the HDP program.

Therefore, in line with the research findings, it would be appropriate to develop contextual implementation policies and guidelines which can be used to steer the implementation of the HDP at the university. Besides, the pertinent leaders need to mainstream the implementation of the HDP outputs into their teaching and learning processes.

Limitation and Future Research

HDP implemented across all higher education institutions in Ethiopia that have differences in age and academic reputability. However, the present research was undertaken in one public university. Therefore, research that considered different universities (at least from each age category) may further strengthen the outputs of the present research. Research that considered various universities in Ethiopia on the case of HDP implementations would further strengthen the discussion on the impact of HDP in the quality of teaching and learning processes.

Cite this article as:

Atakilt Desta Eshete and Yilfashewa Seyoum Mekuria (2020). Implementation of Higher Diploma Program in Mekelle University (Ethiopia): A CBAM Perspective *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Sciences,* 3(1), 1-18.

References

Adula Bekele. (2008). Application of higher diploma program training skills in classroom instruction: The case of education faculty, Jimma University, *Ethiopia. J. Educ*. & Sc.4 (1), 51-72.

Allan C. Ornstein, & Francis P. Hunkins. (1998). *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues*, *7th Edition*. Pearson Education Limited Edinburgh Gate Harlow Essex, England.

Anderson, S. E. (1997). Understanding teacher change: Revisiting the concerns based adoption model. *Curriculum Inquiry Journal*, 27(3), 331-367, https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1997.11075495

Amare Asgedom. (2008). *Academic freedom and higher education in Ethiopia*: The case of Addis Ababa University 1950-2005. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Berhanu Bogale. (2017). Teaching and learning in higher education: The role of the higher diploma program, department of foreign languages and literature. *Addis Ababa University, UNESCO IICBA Newsletter,* 9 (2), 9-10.

Crowe, S., Creswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach: BMC medical research methodology. BioMed Central Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100

Demewoz Admasu Gebru. (2016). Effectiveness of higher diploma program for early career academics in Ethiopia. *Journal of Studies in Higher Education,* 41(10), 1741-1753. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1221652

FDRE (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia). (2009). Higher education proclamation: Proclamation No. 650/2009. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Ferrara, J.P. (2013). Teacher concerns associated with the implementation of project/problem based learning (A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty of the college of education Texas Christian University), Texas.

Hall, G.E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in schools facilitating the process. New York: State University of New York Press.

Hall, G. E., George, A. A., & Rutherford, W. L. (1979). Measuring Stages of Concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the SoC Questionnaire. Austin, TX: University of Texas.

Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R., & Mills, J. (2017). Case study research: Foundations and methodological orientations: *Forum Qualitative social research*. 18(1),1-17, http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1701195

Hord, S. M., & Huling-Austin, L. (1986). Effective curriculum implementation: Some promising new insights. University of Texas at Austin: Research and development center for teacher education. *The Elementary School Journal*, 87(1), 96-115,http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c

Kumar, S. (2006). *Fundamentals of research methodology and statistics*: New Age International (p) Limited, New Delhi, India.

Miikka de Vocht, AnttiLaherto & IlkaParchmann. (2017). Exploring teachers' concerns about bringing responsible research and innovation to European science classrooms, Journal of science teacher education, 28(4). 326-346,https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1343602

MoE (Ministry of Education). (2011). Higher diploma program HANDBOOK for teacher educators. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

MoE (Ministry of Education). (2015). Education sector development program V (ESDP V) 2008 - 2012 E.C. or 2015/16 - 2019/20 G.C. The federal democratic republic of Ethiopia: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Monroe S., R.; Kumar; R.; & Aklilu, H. (2012). *Attitudes and implementation barriers:* HDP teacher education program at Aksum University, Ethiopia.

Mulu Nega. (2012). *Quality and quality assurance in Ethiopian higher education institution: Critical issues and practical implementations* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Enscheda, the Netherlands), ISBN 978-90-365-3315-7

UNESCO. (2007). Teaching and learning in higher education: The role of the higher diploma programme: contributed by Berhanu Bogale department of foreign languages and literature, Addis Ababa University. Newsletter, 9(1), www.unesco-iicba.org

Yilfashewa Seyoum. (2011). Invigorating quality through professional development programs in Ethiopian higher education institutions: Implications for curriculum enactment at Haramaya University. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 1(4), 380-404.

Yilfashewa Seyoum. (2016). Analysis of faculty members attitude towards academic development endeavors in some selected Ethiopian universities. International *Journal of Instruction,* 9 (1), 49-64.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods,* 4th ed. SAGE publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, California.

Zelalem Zekarias Oliso. (2017). Teachers' perception of higher diploma program as opportunity for promoting professional development in Arba Minch University (Ethiopia): A qualitative inquiry. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research* (IJIR),3(6), 213-236 http://www.onlinejournal.in