Chapter 2

Review of Literature

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is a review of related literature concerning in-service training for teachers in Malaysia. It includes of general background information on Malaysia in-service training, the history and political background of in-service training in Malaysia, the importance of in-service training, in-house training in school and its importance, and the training model, as well as the studies on the role of principal in Malaysia.

2.2 In-service Training for Teachers in Malaysia

In Malaysia, efforts toward in-service training for teachers are the government or government sponsored agencies responsibility, notably the Ministry of Education itself. Participation of private sector in in-service training for teachers in Malaysia is insignificant. The Ministry of Education remains the main agency to initiate the in-service training programs for teachers in primary and secondary schools, and local universities and other tertiary educational institutions playing a cooperation role.
After independence in 1957, Ministry of Education organized many in-service courses for primary and secondary school teachers to adapt with the rapid changes in the education policies and the need of society. In the 60s, the Ministry of Education conducted special courses to upgrade teachers in Malay medium schools who were teaching upper secondary classes to enable them to obtain a full certificate in the Federation of Malay Certificate of Education. This special course was extended to include Malay teachers teaching Arabic and Islamic Religious Knowledge in government assisted schools. Since 1967, the Ministry of Education has also been conducting a series of in-service courses for guidance teachers during the school vacations.

There were many in-service training courses conducted by the Ministry of Education, especially if there is a change in curriculum or introducing new subject to curriculum; change in the methods of teaching; and other innovations in curriculum, instruction, and management. During the late 1970s, the medium of instruction was changed from English to Bahasa Melayu in secondary schools. Therefore, English medium teachers were encouraged to attend in-service training in order to be proficient in Bahasa Melayu.
The Teacher Training Division was formed in 1979. The aims of the Teacher Training Division are to develop a teacher education system that produces teachers who are constantly striving for excellence, and working towards realizing the aspirations of the Nation. The role of the Teacher Training Division is to provide pre-service and in-service teacher training for primary and secondary schools. The Ministry of Education is responsible for the formulation of policy while its Teacher Training Division is in charge of the execution of policy. In-service training of teachers is conducted or co-ordinated by the Teacher Training Division, which, organizes refresher courses, in-service training, seminars, and workshop for both primary and secondary school teachers. Other departments in charge of this kind of training are such as Regional Training Center, DTC during the 1960's, and early 1970's and etc.

The objectives of in-service teacher training organized by the Teacher Training Division are as below:

1. To increase the number of professional staffs who are experts in certain fields such as science, mathematics, languages, and other subjects for primary and secondary schools.

2. To improve the knowledge, skills, and to cultivate the positive attitude of teachers in order to be able to confront:
   - Development and changes in world education
➢ Development and changes in curriculum
➢ Ministry of Education policy
➢ New tasks and responsibilities

3. To increase the number of trained resource teacher for each subject to become the expert reference for other teachers.

4. To increase the number of non-graduate teacher to follow the degree courses under twinning programs organized by teacher training colleges and local universities.

Since the establishment of the Teacher Training Division in 1979, the Division have organized various courses. There are two types of courses: long term and short term. Long term courses are such as Special Education Certificate Course (Kursus Sijil Perguruan Khas, KSPK), Special Education Diploma Course (Kursus Diploma Perguruan Khas, KDPK), Special Education Graduate Program (Program Khas Pensiswazahan Guru, PKPG), Education Diploma Course (Kursus Diploma Perguruan), and 14 weeks Professionalism Improvement Courses (Kursus Diploma Keguruan dan Kursus Peningkatan Profesionalisme 14 Minggu); short term courses are such as Computer Instructor Course (Kursus Kejurulatihan Komputer), Malaysian Trainers Development Program (MTDP), and courses organize with the cooperative from teacher training colleges and JPN.
Besides the long and short term courses organized by the Teacher Training Division, they also organized intensive courses to suit the need of current changes in education policies. Recently, the Teacher Training Division has organized training course to train selected secondary school teachers for implementing Smart School in 90 selected secondary schools.

2.3 The Importance of In-Service Training

In most organizations, training was organized essentially to update the knowledge of managers, to reinforce strengths and overcome weakness, to prepare them for transition to higher level responsibilities and to inculcate competencies for effective performance. In order to maintain sustainable growth, organizations have to continuously invest in sharpening and/or developing the skills of their employees so as to reduce the gap between the requirements of the organizations and the capabilities of the employees. Continuous training not only prevents obsolescence created by fast changing technology and the environment but also prepares them for absorbing the shock of future growth and diversification. Likewise, in education system, the principal, teacher and administrator also need continuous training. In-service training is an essential condition for good teaching, for the teacher needs to acquire new knowledge and skills to cope with the rapid development in education. In-service education is beginning to be
recognized as a critically important element in any strategy of educational reform and improvement. As pointed out in the Working Document of the Third Regional Conference of Ministers of Education of Asia Member State (Singapore, 31 May – 7 Jun 1971):

"as long as education is needed and knowledge about education and children continues to increase, the teacher has always something new to learn. Learning to teach is a lifelong pursuit and a teacher's education is a continuing education; otherwise it is no more than certification."

According to Harris et al. (1969), in-service education activities are planned and directed primarily towards the development of the teaching staff. This does not diminish the importance of professional growth that may occur as a secondary outcome. In-service education comprises a wide range of activities. At one end of the scale programs are designed for teachers whose academic or professional qualifications at the time of recruitment are below the prescribed standards. At the other end are a variety of programs by which teachers, otherwise qualified, can improve their personal and professional education and gain new insights into educational principles and practices.

By and large, in-service training is part of staff development. Shaw (1992) mentioned that staff development begins on the first day as a teacher and continues to the last day. It encompasses the immediate experience, learned at the "chalk face", courses and in-service training attended by the individual, professional reading, good practice in
teaching and management learnt from other colleagues both consciously and unconsciously, as well as individual and team. Staff development gained in meetings with other teachers to discuss matters of common concern. All these processes were to increase a teacher's expertise. Therefore, even if you find the people with the skills you need today, by tomorrow they would have to be fired because needs would be different. Moffitt, (in Chatirung, 1983, p.38), describes the need for in-service education for teachers due to the impact of change in society. He mentions that:

"This is an age of change. It requires new and rapid adjustment.... it is the basic reason in determining the need for continuous education of all people and particularly of all teachers. Without continuing study, teacher knowledge and teacher performance soon becomes obsolete. No one is ever completely educated. At most one can only be a student of the daily incidents as they occur. The important changes are too many to list. However, some are selected to indicate the need for in-service education of teachers."

Harris et al. (1969), noted that in-service education is needed for teachers, and it is very important for the following reasons:

1. Pre-service preparation of professional staff members is rarely ideal and may be primarily an introduction to professional preparation as such.

2. Social and educational change makes current professional practices obsolete or relatively ineffective in a very short period of
time. This applies to methods and techniques, tools and substantive knowledge itself.

3. Coordination and articulation of instructional practices require changes in people. Even when each instructional staff member is functioning at a highly professional level, employing an optimum number of the most effective practices, such as instructional program might still be relatively uncoordinated from subject to subject and poorly articulated from year to year.

4. Other factors argue for in-service education activities of rather diverse kinds. Morale can be stimulated and maintained through in-service education, and is a contribution to instruction in itself, even if instructional improvement of any dynamic kind does not occur.

Therefore, taking training more seriously not only helps produce more effective teachers, it also encourages the school to be more reflective about its own ways of working. However, Edelfelt (1974) found that in-service education has been inadequate, and it has not met teacher needs. It has been required by super-ordinates largely without consultation with teachers, and it has not served the major purposes of improving professional performance. Drummond (1979) also agree
that in-service education should be managed by the people who work in the building and should deal with the individual and group problems and aspirations found there. The motives of those involved in in-service education, both deliverers and receivers, need to be made apparent.

In support of the above statement, Stephen found four weaknesses in teacher preparation program:

1. Teachers are expected to be practitioners, but their preparation tends to emphasize knowledge rather than application.

2. Teachers are expected to individualize instruction, but they are not prepared in functional assessment tactics. Yet, it is not possible to individualize instruction without assessing students' performances prior to teaching them.

3. Teachers often are not trained to use systematic instructional tactics.

4. Teachers often lack the ability to evaluate the condition of students following instruction. This ability is essential for individualizing instruction.
Ainsworth (1976) argued that the teacher knows better than the others about what is needed to improve teaching, but does not act on doing so. In addition, many in-service programs are planned for the teacher rather than with or by the teacher. According to Ainsworth (1976), in the early months of 1974, teachers in Prince George's County, MD., were asked to share their feelings about in-service programs with a researcher. Sixty percent of the 732 participating teachers indicated a greater concern for quality in-service presentations than about the possibility of pay credit for their attendance. In order to determine more closely what "quality" in-service education meant to these teachers, 146 were interviewed. The five qualities mentioned by more teachers were: practicality (79.5%), support and encouragement (56.2%), systematic program (48.6%), variety (45.9%), and teacher-sharing (42.5%). Practical referred to an individual idea of what would be considered helpful to that particular teacher; support and encouragement is not direct terms of money or even credit toward certification, request for more time for either attendance at or implementation of in-service programs and the accompanying new ideas was the major consideration; and teacher-sharing is referred to exchange information on techniques with other teachers.

Harris et. al.(1969) supports that in-service programs are greatly needed, but the existing programs are severely inadequate, the
programs were dull and useless because they are too general, poorly timed, or devoted mainly to administrative housekeeping. These are due to the failure:

- to relate in-service program plans to genuine needs of staff participants.
- to select appropriate activities for implementing programs plans.
- to implement in-service program activities with sufficient staff and other resources to assure effectiveness.

2.4 In-house Training in School

Since teacher in-service training organized and implemented by the central office has weaknesses, it is advisable that the teacher in-service training should shift away from the central office and into the school itself. According to Shaw (1992, p.11):

"...increased involvement in initial teacher training must be added a growing responsibility for the delivery of school-based in-service training, the introduction of appraisal and an increased emphasis on support for probationers. It is clear that in future all schools will have to see themselves as 'training school', taking key role in the professional development of their staff throughout their teaching career."

Shaw (1992) also argued that experienced teachers should be involved in initial training course, planning, and evaluation as well as student selection, supervision and assessment; they should be invited to
contribute to initial training by giving lectures and seminars; all teacher trainers should have recent and relevant teaching experience of not less than one term every five years; all training courses should include "a sustained period of teaching practice", theoretical studies should be closely linked to practical experience in schools; institutions should have a policy statement defining clearly the respective roles of school and higher education staff; final award of successful teaching practice.

The school-based training or in-house training is an irreversible trend, in future the onus will be on schools to prepare themselves for this new role. There will be many challenges but, as the benefits will be legion. Each school will formulate policies to meet its own needs and to ensure consistent expectations and approaches across all teams. Schools have always been involved in teacher training and there seems to be an inescapable logic in the argument that training should happen in the workplace rather than in the ivory tower. Professor Hargreaves (in Shaw, 1992) put forward the rationale for placing initial training in schools. He referred to a growth in confidence and skill among school teachers in all aspects of training and professional development and a growing demand for school based in-service training, or in-house training.

Abraham (1997) delineated that in-house training is an extremely powerful tool for competitiveness as:
➢ It is based on the company's needs and the technological changes taking place in the environment
➢ It is founded on practice on the company's hardware and software
➢ It instills in the employees an intimate knowledge of the company's methodologies and systems
➢ It involves the generation of thorough documentation of procedures so that quality is ensured routinely
➢ It has significant potential in helping employees assimilate the company's professional culture
➢ It builds effective interaction and communication across the board
➢ It offer a valuable means of feedback from the employee to management and vice-versa

In Malaysia, all in-service courses are organized by the Ministry of Education and only selected teachers have the opportunity to attend the training courses, and a in-house training course will be held by those teachers for their school teachers. Anyhow, it is time now to shift the onus to the principal to organize in-house training for the benefits of teachers. The Ministry of Education should formulate the policy of in-house training programs and the principal role is implementing and executing the duties.
Every school is unique and is different in its climate and its culture. The principal as the manager in school organization should initiate in-house training programs with the assistance of the experienced teachers, to plan, organize, implement, and evaluate the in-house training programs. The principal should survey the need of teachers before carry out the in-house training, or realized the need for change, and organize training to solve certain problems as well as for staff development.

2.5 Training Model
The principal as the manager who manages the in-house training programs should construct a training model in order to achieve the in-house training programs' objectives, and improve the effectiveness of in-house training programs. There are many training models proposed by researchers. The Sheffield training model involves four primary activities:

1. Diagnosis. Once a production or management problem has been recognized, steps must be taken to determine its nature and to discover its causes.
2. Planning. Now that a diagnosis has been made, it is possible to decide how the problem can best be rectified, and what form the training program should take.

3. Construction. Steps can now be taken to design an appropriate training program likely to realize the learning objectives, and harness student motivation.

4. Evaluation. Finally, the training program should be constantly evaluated in order to determine its successes and failures.

The Four Stages of the Sheffield System

Define the problem

Plan a solution

Carry out the plan

Check the effectiveness of the solution

Diagnosis

Prescription

Construction

Evaluation

What are the symptoms can they be overcome by training?

A plan to solve the problem by training

Developing the most effective training course

Determine whether the course solved the problem
Wood et. al. (1981) suggested five stages regarding in constructing the training model. These five stages are as below:

Stage 1: Preparation – school feels the need to change and realizes the problem faced by them, and choose a suitable program and process. The teachers are committed and understand the change for the desired professional attitude.

Stage 2: Planning – this stage is important for clarifying the specific objective, conduct a survey for the need to have the training, planning the development activities, identified the sources to be used.

Stage 3: Training – when implementing the plan, the content, expertise, and attitude which need to change for professional attitude was learnt.

Stage 4: Implementing – Whatever is learned during training must be implemented. Therefore, the environment that encourages the transition from what had been studied during the staff development program to every day activities in school is needed.
Stage 5: Maintenance – the new professional attitude would not remain the same even though it had been implemented. This stage is meant to make sure that the new professional attitude is in practice and achieve the objectives.

Training model is a guide for the principal to organize effective in-house training programs in orders to response the need and the vision of education system.

2.6 The Role of Principal in Malaysia

In Malaysia, there were quite a number of studies on the role of principal in school, especially on leadership, and the principal’s role in terms of in-service training, but there haven’t had any studies on the principal’s role in term of in-house training in school. Mohd. Sani (1979) studied the role of school in staff development, Sukumaran (1984) suggested that staff development courses should be held at district level, and Haris (1992) mentioned that the principal should play his/her role in staff development courses in school (from Sakhiyah Abdul Manaf, 1997).
2.7 Conclusions

The review focused on the background of Malaysia in-service training, and the important of in-service training. The review had succeeded in provided a general information in term of history and political background of in-service training in Malaysia.

Information gained from the review generally indicated that the principal can plays his/her role effectively if get the teachers involvement regarding the programs content, course evaluation, and etc.

The review had succeeded indicated that the principal shouldn't depends on the Education Department to initiate the in-service, or in-house training, but run the in-house training when he/her feel the need to implement the in-house training. Besides, the principal even can plan to implement pre-service for his/her school, because the principal know well their school, and teachers' need. The review on training model, however, had given insight into how to carry out the in-house training programs.

Nevertheless, it was evident that there were studied done in the role of principal in in-service training in Malaysia, but there wasn't any studied done in the role of principal in in-house training.