

## **Improving teacher competence through the new *Malaysian Teacher Standards*: Exploring the challenges for teacher educators**

Pauline Swee Choo Goh  
*Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia*

Teacher competence is recognised as an important requisite to improve students' academic performance and their experiences of schooling. The current strategy in Malaysia to improve this competency and outcomes of education culminated in the articulation of the *Standard Guru Malaysia* or the Malaysian Teacher Standards (MTS). Introduced in December 2009, the MTS is to establish high teaching standards and sets out to recognise accomplished teaching among the teaching profession. Although proponents of the standards have welcomed its introduction, this article argues that the MTS poses significant challenges for teacher educators as they set out to train new teachers to begin teaching in ways that are congruent to the standards. The article claims that the new MTS represent the standards towards which teacher educators must now aim for. In fact, this is an intentional element embedded in the MTS. The Malaysian government hopes that by initiating standards by which teachers are to be appraised upon, will in turn effect changes in how they are prepared. However, less understood are the challenges it presents for the teaching institutions. This article presents various challenges (and possibilities) for teacher educators. Although the article lacks empirical base for examining these issues, due to the newness of the MTS, it offers instead a logical analysis based on the authors' own (and others') experiences to illuminate the issues.

**Keywords:** Standards, Teaching standards, Malaysian Teacher Standards, Teacher education.

### **Introduction**

The *Standard Guru Malaysia* or the Malaysian Teacher Standards (MTS) was formulated in 2008 and was formally launched in December 2009 by the Minister of Education Tan Sri Muhyiddin Yassin. Malaysia has now become the first nation in Southeast Asia to adopt a competency-based teacher standard ("Malaysia First in Region to Adopt Benchmark", 2009).

Dialogues and debates about standards fill the air. Websites of most government school portals publish several links to the MTS to encourage teachers to adopt the MTS, align their practices to the vision of the MTS and gauge for themselves their own teaching effectiveness. Teachers in Malaysia must now concern themselves with the MTS.

Teachers are to use the standards as part of their own self-appraisal and to benchmark their teaching competency against the MTS. They must attempt to teach in the direction of the new standards and to meet the performance standards eschewed within the guidelines in the MTS. Along the way they must also be able to reason and reflect upon complex problems of practice and improve their teaching.

According to Mohamad Sabri Mohd Arsad, the President of the Malay Teachers' Union, the MTS has been touted as a model indicator for professional development and a system to ensure that the teaching profession gets the professional standing it deserves (Othman, 2007). Joint Teachers Union Committee Chairman Jemale Paiman adds that the MTS is a set of high and rigorous standards that teachers must demonstrate to achieve and it is not about ranking teachers (Idris, 2009). Lok Yim Pheng, the Secretary General of the National Union of the Teaching Profession concurs that it is a vision of quality in teaching that will guide teachers to be more innovative and to improve their teaching knowledge and skills (Idris, 2009). Proponents of the MTS also suggests that with the use of rigorous teaching standards will build an image of accomplished teaching thus instilling confidence and positiveness into the general perception of the public towards government schools (Asri, 2009). Other possibilities also include dispelling the negative perception that the teaching profession is a 'career of last resort' and attract qualified candidates into the profession (Idris, 2009); and promote teachers who are more reflective practioners (Malaysian Teacher Standards, 2009).

Along with the positive endorsements 'pro-MTS' have given to the standards, educators have also levied challenges to the MTS. Questions have been raised as to whether there is alignment of the competencies that teachers possess to the visions of an accomplished practioner put forth in the MTS (Goh, Wong & Masran, 2011). Others may question whether the MTS is able to distinguish between accomplished and mediocre teachers (Serafini, 2002; King, 1994). Some educators may see the application of standards to teaching as restrictive whilst others may question whether the standards can adequately capture a complex event such as teaching (Serafini, 2002). The use of standards is to reflect a vision of accomplished teaching that is hoped teachers will be able to demonstrate in the years to come. However, critics still challenge that the standardisation of teaching impedes the creativity, autonomy and flexibility of teachers to respond to individual student needs.

Any efforts to change and improve teaching will always present significant challenges for the professional development of all teachers. To investigate the full spectrum of challenges of the MTS for the professional development of *all* teachers is beyond the scope of this modest article. However, pre-service teacher education does seem a reasonable place to begin the discussion, as it is here that new teachers begin to learn to teach in ways that are aligned with the MTS. This article specifically focuses on the challenges of teacher educators as they grapple with the best ways to align the standards to how they train and prepare pre-service teachers. Because the MTS is still new in Malaysia, the standards-based effort has not undergone much research and scrutiny, therefore, very little (if any) empirical data exist to indicate how effective it has been to improve teaching or how it has affected individual teachers or on teacher education. Instead, what this article offers is a logical discussion to examine some challenges to teacher education

based on the authors' own (and others') practices and experiences in teaching and teacher education.

Since the MTS has been formulated based on the intention to improve teaching competency, it may be appropriate at this point to briefly define the concepts of teacher competency that is the foundation for the introduction of the MTS.

### **Teacher competency**

Over a 100 years' work on the characteristics of high teacher competency has been conducted and is well documented in a series of Handbook of Research on Teaching (e.g., Richardson, 2001). In the late 1960s, it was conceptualised that teacher competency was linked to specific teacher actions and student learning based on behavioral psychology and child development, better known as the process-product approach. This process-product approach suggested that an effective teacher was able to: (a) monitor expectations, (b) provide clear objectives and learning guidelines, (c) encourage student responses during instruction, (c) break a large teaching unit to smaller tasks, and (d) provide regular feedback (Blanton, Sindelar, & Correa, 2006).

Research in the late 1960s continued towards research on teacher planning, teacher beliefs, teacher thinking, and these dominated much of the 1970s and beyond. The complexities of teaching, classrooms and schools began to be addressed and were referred to by different research names such as learning-to-teach research, and classroom ecology research (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005; Kagan, 1992). It was followed by various other research that looked at teacher planning (e.g. Reynolds, 1992), teacher thinking, beliefs and efficacy (e.g. Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) and novice versus expert teaching (Berliner, 1986).

More recently, researchers have started to focus on the multidimensional aspects of teacher competency and attempted to define it as: (a) good teaching, which encompasses a teacher meeting the expectations for the role of teaching (e.g. a degree holder; uses appropriate methodology), and (b) successful teaching which means a positive learning outcome as a result of the teachers' actions on student learning (Berliner, 2005; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005). However, Fenstermacher and Richardson (2005, p. 190) point out that good teaching also depends on three other conditions:

- Willingness and effort by the learner;
- A social surround supportive of teaching and learning; and
- Opportunity to teach and learn.

The literature on teaching and understanding teacher competency continues to expand. Changes continue to be made for better clarity towards the concept of effective or successful dimensions of teacher competency. However, regardless of how onerous it is to encompass the concept of teacher competency, educational stakeholders (e.g. students themselves, parents, educators, and educational administrators) need credible measures to judge competency, teaching performance or to help guide teacher education programs.

It is highly probable that accountability and performance standards will dominate the teacher quality agenda with teacher competency standards, teacher

appraisals, and teacher assessment standards as major quality control mechanisms for the teaching profession. International discourse concerned with educational effectiveness has centered on the importance of specifying standards of teaching competency and their evaluation for teacher accountability and on-going professional development (Griffin, Nguyen & Gillis, 2004; Pimpa, 2005). If the intention about improving teacher quality is to become a reality, then quality control mechanisms through standards must be in place (Ingvarson & Rowe, 2007). After all, the main aim of developers of teaching standards is to “articulate sound principles of instructional practice and what teachers should know and be able to do” (Ingvarson & Rowe, 2007, p. 9). Similarly, in Malaysia, the proposition that for high quality teaching to occur, a rigorous method of assuring teacher competency should also be in place (Malaysian Teacher Standards, 2009). The new MTS is here to stay.

## **THE MTS**

The MTS developed by the Teacher Education Division of the Malaysian Ministry of Education is described as a guideline to measure teachers’ practice which is rigorous and is beyond the minimum requirements of teaching. The MTS has been created to serve two distinct purposes, one being to serve as an early ‘warning system’ so that teachers themselves are aware of the need to undertake further strengthening, improvement and enhancement of their knowledge, skills and personality. According to Asariah Mior Shaharuddin, the Education Deputy Director General, the MTS: “serve as guidelines for teachers to develop professional values, knowledge and understanding while acquiring the relevant skills in teaching” (Chapman, 2009, para 2), and “this is something we have worked very hard for and is in line with the issue of teacher professionalism brought up during the teachers’ forum” (Chapman, 2009, para 7). The second purpose is to increase the professional development of the teaching profession and the overall quality of education in Malaysia (Malaysian Teacher Standards, 2009). The MTS is seen as an effort to elevate teaching excellence in Malaysia and is an attempt to remove misconceptions of what encompasses competent teaching and to uplift a rather eroded image of the profession (Othman, 2007).

The original 2009 published edition of the Malaysian Teacher Standards establishes the “professional competencies that should be achieved by the teachers and what needs to be provided by training institutes to help teachers achieve the prescribed levels of competency” (Malaysian Teacher Standards, 2009, p. 3). The MTS comprises three content standards which are:

- Standard 1: Professional values within the teaching profession. This standard refers to those values teachers hold and that should be developed so that teachers can more effectively contribute to the teaching profession to achieve the aims of the national education system.
- Standard 2: Knowledge and understanding of education, subject matter, curriculum and co-curriculum. Teachers should have sound knowledge to improve professionalism in teaching, carry out their duties efficiently and effectively and be more creative and innovative.
- Standard 3: Skills of teaching and learning. This standard focuses on the ability of teachers to plan, implement and evaluate teaching and learning, and extra-curricular activities.

Each content standard is divided into three to eight competencies. The competencies address the unique teaching characteristics of each content standard that reflect the vision of accomplished teaching. For example, in Standard 3, the competencies are: (a) planning for teaching and learning, (b) implementing teaching and learning, (c) evaluating and assessing, and (d) managing the classroom (Malaysian Teacher Standards, 2009, p. 25). The standards are not subject specific.

The standards will require teachers to assist their students to meet the standards for learning outcomes; be innovative in their teaching; and assess students at a much higher level of thinking such as problem solving, decision-making and being able to continually learn, think, do and create (Zakaria, 2000; Abd Rashid, 2002). Teachers must also understand that different learning diversities can exist within their classrooms; they must show that they are able to demonstrate, select and design good instructional tasks. Moreover, they are also required to teach more complex content at a deeper level of understanding and integrate teaching and learning with technology, whilst covering the national curriculum. Teachers must act more as a facilitator by initiating classroom discussions, attending to students' understanding, using new ways of assessing, effectively managing the classroom and student behavior, and at the same time, ensuring that all their students achieve meaningful and effective learning.

In addition to fulfilling the duties of high quality teachers as espoused in the MTS, they must be seen to uphold the cultural values of the country and possess a strong sense of patriotism. Teachers must also ground their teaching in the belief that all students have the capacity to learn and should therefore be treated fairly, with integrity and compassion (Malaysian Teacher Standards, 2009). A tall order indeed for experienced teachers and even more so for beginning teachers who are just starting out.

If standards are to be applied in the quest to improve teachers' teaching competency, then teacher educators need to lead the way. If teaching is going to be defined in these ambitious manner, then teacher educators need to be able to lead in defining, measuring and improving teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2009). Teaching institutions play a significant role in assisting pre-service teachers and newly qualified teachers begin learning to teach that are congruent with the standards effort to improve teacher quality. It would be safe to claim that the new standards also represent the standards towards which Malaysian teaching institutions must now aspire. What is less sure, however, are the challenges that lay ahead as teacher educators grapple with the best ways to align the standards to how they train and prepare pre-service teachers and to get pre-service teachers ready to face the new standards era.

### **Challenges for teacher educators**

What would be the likely response to the introduction of standards? History has demonstrated that when a new and attractive idea is initiated in the educational system, there is always an excited buzz of happenings - seminars, road shows, training, and re-training. Alternatively, the easiest way to respond is by tweaking the current teaching curriculum by adding a course or two, changing some components, inserting some new experiences and installing it as a new re-packaged curriculum. However, if the education effort to improve teacher competence is to succeed, perhaps teacher educators need to re-formulate and re-

shape the curriculum's structure and content at the core. This change does raise three challenges for teacher educators. The first is the issue is the widening gap between what student teachers bring to their training with what they must be prepared for. The second centres on preparing student teachers for an uncertain practice, while the third challenge is the rhetoric-reality gap of the MTS.

### *In-built beliefs, values and old ideas*

Student teachers who enter teaching institutions often come with years of experience. They have watched their own teachers teach, they have built-up ideas about what teachers do, how they themselves behaved in classrooms, what is worth learning, and how to assess students. Student teachers will most likely have formed a personal image of themselves as a teacher who is helpful, kind, correcting mistakes, instructing new knowledge, explaining, showing and providing knowledge. They feel that they know what it is to be a teacher, they are confident to lead discussions and to assess well. They have seen it all a hundred times in their own lives as students in schools (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). When they enter the teaching institutions, they become impatient when their educators now ask them to think differently and to reconsider how teachers should behave in the new standards based era. Therefore, teacher educators are faced with an issue, how best to prepare their student teachers for situations that are different from what their students have experienced. Student teachers are asked to re-consider what they know, and this can make teacher education difficult work (Feiman-Nemser & Featherstone, 1992).

Student teachers must now learn to become facilitators, they now allow their own students to find the solution and to learn to guide rather than dictate, instead of merely 'completing the syllabus', they are required to ensure that a problem is worked through in greater depth. Teachers are also required to pose a problem that is likely to necessitate higher order thinking skills and unconventional responses. Teachers are to move away from structuring students' work to help them avoid mistakes or merely providing answers to problems. Teachers would also be required to treat their students differently, instead of forming ability groups, teachers must expect high levels of performance from all their students regardless of ability.

As the MTS is formed based on the goals of access and equity (Malaysian Teacher Standards, 2009), teachers are challenged to serve the needs of their students whose cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds which are different from their own. A challenge then to teacher educators is to breakdown student teachers' developed values, norms and habits of learning along diverse cultural and ethnic lines. Student teachers must learn to teach for diversity. When student teachers are in conflict with their own beliefs, expectations and understandings about learning, they may teach in ways that will fail to serve their diverse students (Banks et al., 2005), possibly then compromising the competency that promotes good teaching as espoused in the standards.

Possibly, there would be a rift with what student teachers bring with them from their own experiences in schools and the kind of teaching which they must now prepare for. Teacher educators are required to help student teachers deconstruct their old habits, inherited ideas and beliefs and replace it with a broader array of alternatives, else skewered images and perceptions of good practice may function as barriers to change (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). The inherent

perceptions and beliefs student teachers bring into their education may function as a barrier towards their ability and willingness to change. They may be misled into thinking that what they know about teaching from their own experiences would be enough. They may find it hard to break old habits and become inflexible to learn new ways and receive new ideas (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Murray, 1995).

This puts onus on teacher educators to adopt the new policies themselves if institutions are to produce competent future teachers. Preservice training needs to change with the approaches advocated by the standards. Student teachers must break free from their traditional and predictable images of teaching and learning. Teacher educators may need to provide opportunities and avenue for teacher candidates to analyse and reflect upon those in-grained perceptions and beliefs so that these beliefs can be discussed and dispelled. Through student teachers' own self-evaluation of their beliefs, what may develop are new images of good teaching and the formation of fresh beliefs about good teaching to propel and sustain them through their teaching careers.

### ***Training student teachers for uncertain practice***

A more experienced teacher may find it easier to transform teaching and to teach creatively, innovatively and knowledgeably as espoused in the MTS. It may prove harder for a beginning teacher just starting out. Moreover, in the current Malaysian norm of 'spoon-feeding' type of teaching that embraces a drill and practice approach for examination (Raja Musa & Nik Yusoff, 2000; "UPSR and PMR may be abolished", 2010), the MTS will require beginning teachers to move away from the 'conventional' mode of teaching and learning, which is defined as emphasising teaching as telling and learning as listening (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). The other spectrum of 'conventional' mode are learner-centred teaching which emphasises conceptual understanding and provide opportunities to all students to think critically, solve problems and make meanings of their learning (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). The Malaysian government has made plans to abolish the Primary Six and the Secondary Year Three National Examinations in an effort to move the school system away from an 'examination-centric' structure ("UPSR and PMR may be abolished", 2010). The challenge then is the training of new teachers that will require them to move away from the popular drill and practice mode and away from an 'examination-centric' form.

Granted, some aspects of good teaching researched during the past four decades about learning to teach (e.g. Fuller & Bown, 1975; Grossman, 1990; Murray, 1995) have helped inform the development and implementation of teacher education programs. Moreover, some facets of teaching practice may remain relevant such as students working in groups and providing remedial work, but possibly others may need to change. For example, in the 'conventional' mode, the teacher plans a lesson to provide information. However, in the teaching promoted by the MTS, planning a lesson may change, for example, to one that engages students in open-ended problems, accepting different answers, allowing students to struggle with confusion, and at the same time managing a productive discussion. In the first scenario, a teacher plans by analysing the subject material, devices steps to provide clear explanations, considers a strategy or uses teaching aids that can better clarify the information, and decides on the best assignment. In the standards era scenario, a teacher must now explore a problem within a subject more carefully, expands what is stated in the written text and links it to students'

'real-life' situations. The teacher tries to put herself/himself in the shoes of the students and imagine how the students may explore the problem, how the students may think and solve the problem. Assessments take the forms of students presenting the work and justifying their best solutions. A teacher may find it hard to plan a series of steps, as the lesson will be dependent on what her/his students do and say. A teacher teaching towards the standards is akin to be on a 'voyage' rather than on a clearly mapped out journey. Nevertheless, during this 'voyage', a teacher must also be confident with the terrain she/he is in - a teacher must be alert to what the students are saying, at the same time - allowing constructive responses and drawing out ideas from the other students. If an example of lesson planning may need to change, may it also mean that teacher educators' understanding of how student teachers learn to plan need to change, and that other aspects of learning to teach need to change too? What can teacher educators do?

Teacher educators have important roles to play in increasing student teachers' insights, teaching skills, and assisting them to seek and make sense of pedagogical information in the context of teaching and learning (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Teacher educators are required to introduce new ideas to challenge popular assumptions, processes, and outcomes in teacher education. Clearly too, in preparing student teachers for the standards-based era, teacher educators need to also practice new curricular materials in their programs, be they case studies, using CD-ROMS, creating actual teaching environment, or immersing their students into actual school environments. Sometimes in the excitement of new designs and ideas, teacher educators tend to forget that they have at their disposal a method that is inexpensive, yet effective - they can 'walk the talk', that is, to teach student teachers as they would have them teach. Teacher educators use their own teaching to help their students learn to teach. Student teachers develop teaching skills by observing how their educators facilitate and teach and at the same time analyse what impact those instructions have on them. If carried out as part of the teacher educators' teaching process, the teaching activities may help foster a common understanding of what 'new' teaching should be and to strengthen shared standards.

Student teachers have very little exposure to actual teaching and even less insights into the workings of teaching practices such as professional reasoning, analysis or decision-making (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). As previously discussed, student teachers carry with them images of teaching from their own experiences in schools as students. Their schools have provided them with an expected view of teaching and learning. Chances are that student teachers who enter teaching institutions have very little perspective of what is expected of them or what is promoted in the current standards framework. Therefore, teacher educators need to consider constructing an environment in which student teachers are able to apply new representations of practice and provide them with opportunities to investigate approaches to teaching and learning that are compatible with the idea of a standards-based agenda. One way in which this may be achieved is to situate work in the schools by developing resources and opportunities for teacher candidates to examine new images of practice in schools. No matter how good a teacher education program is constructed or no matter how high the quality of the teaching curriculum, student teachers will still not experience the new images of teaching if they do not have the opportunity to try it out in a real environment. Critics may argue that the mandatory teaching practicum that student teachers are required to undergo is already in practice. However, this time around, teacher educators must



seek out schools and teachers who teach and think in ways that support the efforts in the new standards framework. Since most schools are probably also struggling to understand the requirements of the MTS, the visions of teaching and learning towards the MTS do not, at least for now, exist in many schools. There will not be many teachers who are ready to help new teachers with the kind of practice and ways of working which is in line with the standards. Such predicament in itself creates new implications for teacher educators.

Teacher educators need to move out of the teaching institutions and to work with selected schools to help start and incubate school practices that align with the standards. In addition, teacher educators could work closely with experienced teachers in developing the kinds of teaching and learning envisioned by the reformers. There, student teachers on teaching practice can then be sent to these schools and will have the opportunity to observe experienced teachers working with the transformation effort in mind. There will be sharing of teaching practices and student teachers will have the opportunity of listening to commentaries from experienced teachers about the difficulties and rewards of teaching in new ways (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Moreover, they can also work and try out the new roles that will be required of them as teachers. They can be assimilated to the new ways through their own capacity to form, experiment and interpret their own practices.

In addition, teacher educators need to start developing teaching and learning exemplars such as videos, CD-ROMS and written materials of 'good teaching', or 'good class management and discipline' to show student teachers what they are not yet able to practice in reality. These paraphernalia come with their own limitation as they cannot completely depict the correct enactment of a class teaching, but it would be a start.

Probably, teaching institutions should consider establishing some kind of developmental school, rather like the Laboratory Schools situated in the University of Chicago in America. The early laboratory schools housed in the University of Chicago were envisioned by John Dewey to challenge traditional and conservative attitudes about education. The schools were not only committed to delivering new and different experiences for students in the classrooms then, but were also as an avenue to assist in the preparation of prospective teachers. Today, these laboratory schools have become ambitious learning communities with both teachers and students engaged in shared learning and inquiry (Harms & DePencier, 1996). If similar institutions can be developed in Malaysia, it can be a site for teacher education to develop resources and at the same time provide opportunities for student teachers to meet and examine new ways of practice.

### ***Rhetoric-reality gap of the MTS***

Teaching is a complex undertaking and not easily defined. However, it is found that the competencies promoted by the MTS are somewhat rigid and less prescribable in actual practice. The MTS attempts to establish underlying conceptions of competent teaching. The underlying conception of competent teaching emphasises the importance of perceived action and decision making on the part of the teacher. For example, in one of the question pertaining to managing class discipline, teachers are asked to choose from a scale numbered 1-4 if they are capable of: 'implementing classroom rules based on the school's rules', 'undertaking appropriate action on negative student behaviour', 'referring the case of a severe discipline to discipline teacher / counselor / teacher guidance', and

'discussing the case of a severe discipline with parents' (Malaysian Teacher Standards, Standard 3. Question 24). As statements of good class management, there is little to dispute. However, what should a teacher, confronted with a disciplinary issue that has prevented the lesson from proceeding, *do*? And how should the teacher decide? There appears to be a large chasm between those competency statements about what a teacher is capable of doing as part of the teacher's role and the actual enactment of it. In addition, teachers are afforded no opportunity to explain those actions or decision, and scoring did not allow for the reality that good class management could take many forms.

Probably the gap that exists between the rhetoric of the competency statements and the reality of classroom teaching lies in MTS's newness. Ng (2008) has argued that sometimes, rhetorical statements are not necessary all that bad as they symbolise an ideal that is ambitious and hopefully inspirational. Rhetorical statements "can signal various desiderata or directions but may not rigidly determine which concrete actions to be embedded within" (Ng, 2008, p. 600). In the case of MTS, this rhetoric-reality gap will continue to exist, at least until there is more evidence collected about whether and if those competent teaching advocated by the standards work. Probably with time and experience, this novelty will diminish and there will be more evidence on which to compare and a clearer perspective will emerge to drive teaching development. Meanwhile can teacher educators afford to wait too long before propelling change in teacher education?

### **Concluding remark**

Although challenges for teacher educators have been raised - and they are by no means comprehensive, teacher educators can decide to remain in the periphery and not make any significant effort or they can take this opportunity to change boldly and be guided with new ideas of what is possible. The current attraction with performance standards in Malaysia can work in favour for teaching institutions. It offers opportunities for teacher educators to break with the past and reformulate new methods, investigate new ways of doing things and explore new kinds of teaching. Teacher educators will need to work through the standards and begin to reflect and critique their own practices from different perspectives, they must courageously make appropriate changes and decision for the training of their graduates. Teacher educators must also start to share the same goals, standards and knowledge base for the successful engagement in improving teacher learning and practice. Teacher educators play a significant role in assisting pre-service teachers and newly qualified teachers begin learning to teach that are congruent with the standards effort to improve teacher competence. (Darling-Hammond, 2009). Probably, not every student teacher who begins teaching will be able to meet the high demands of the MTS, but teacher educators *must* ensure that they are given the right preparation to do so.

## References

- Abd Rashid, A.R. (2002). Dasar inovasi pendidikan dalam konteks agenda wawasan 2020 [Innovation policies of education in the context of Vision 2020 agenda]. In S.Hussin (Ed.), *Inovasi Dasar Pendidikan - Perspektif Sistem dan Organisasi* [Innovative Systems - Perspectives from Educational Policy and Organization] (pp.19-47). Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya Press.
- Asri, S.(2009, December 21). SGM jadi peringatan kepada pendidik [MTS to be a reminder to educators]. *Harian Metro*. Retrieved June 24, 2010 from [http://www.nib.com.my/archives/text/view/2937129?pos=1&hide\\_header=1&resultset=nstpec%3Awww/cross-search/search.php%3A\\_1310553357%3Aresultset](http://www.nib.com.my/archives/text/view/2937129?pos=1&hide_header=1&resultset=nstpec%3Awww/cross-search/search.php%3A_1310553357%3Aresultset)
- Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P., et al. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & B. Johns (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 232-274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berliner, D.C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher*, 15(7), 5-13.
- Berliner, D.C. (2005). The near impossibility of testing for teacher quality. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 205-213.
- Blanton, L.P., Sindelar, P.T., & Correa, V.I. (2006). Models and measures of beginning teacher quality. *The Journal of Special Education*, 40(2), 115-127.
- Chapman, K. (2009, June 28). Measuring up to new standards. *The Star Online*. Retrieved October 1, 2010 from <http://thestar.com.my/education/story.asp?file=/2009/6/28/education/4201502&sec=education>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). President Obama and education: The possibility for dramatic improvements in teaching and learning. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(2), 210-223.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teacher College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Featherstone, H. (Eds.) (1992). *Exploring teaching: Reinventing an introductory course*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fenstermacher, G.D., & Richardson, V. (2005). On making determinations of quality in teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 107(1), 186-213.
- Fuller, F.F. and Bown, O.H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher Education: Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 25-52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goh, P.S.C., Wong, K.T., & Masran, N. (2011). *Beginning teachers' conceptions of competency and its alignment to the 'Standard Guru Malaysia' for improved teacher education*. Unpublished report, Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia.
- Griffin P., Nguyen, T.K.C., & Gillis, S. (2004, November). Developing and Validating Primary School Teacher Standards in Vietnam. Paper presented at the *Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education*, University of Melbourne.
- Grossman, P.L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Harms, W., & DePencier, I. (1996). *Dewey creates a new kind of school*. Retrieved October 12, 2010 from <http://www.ucls.uchicago.edu/about-lab/history/index.aspx>
- Idris, R. (2009, December 6). SGM iktiraf profesion guru, bukan bebanan [MTS recognises the teaching profession and is not a burden]. *Berita Harian*. Retrieved June 24, 2010 from <http://perkhidmatanpelajaran.blogspot.com/2009/12/sgm-iktiraf-profesion-guru-bukan.html>
- Ingvarson, L., & Rowe, K. (2007). Conceptualising and evaluating teaching quality: Substantive and methodological issues. *Australian Journal of Education*, 52(1), 5-35.
- Kagan, D.M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 129-169.
- King, M.B. (1994). Locking ourselves in: National standards for the teaching profession. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 10(1), 95-108.
- Malaysia first in region to adopt benchmark for educators. (2009, December 3). *The Star Online*. Retrieved October 1, 2010 from <http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2009/12/3/nation/5225720&sec=nation>
- Malaysian Teacher Standards (2009). Putrajaya: Teacher Education Division.
- Murray, F.B. (1995). Beyond natural teaching: The case for professional education. In F.B. Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers* (pp. 3-13). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ng, P.T. (2008). Educational policy rhetoric and reality gap: A reflection. *Instructional Journal of Educational Management*, 22(6), 595-602.
- Pimpa, N. (2005). Teacher performance appraisal in Thailand: Poison or panacea. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 4(2-3), 115-127.
- Raja Musa, R.M.F., & Nik Yusoff, N.M.R. (2000, November). The Malaysian smart school: a new hope for the philosophy of education. Paper presented at the *International Conference on Teaching and Learning*, Renaissance Palm Garden Hotel, Putrajaya, Malaysia.
- Reynolds, A. (1992). What is competent beginning teaching? A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(1), 1-35.
- Richardson, V. (Ed.) (2001). *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.). Washington: American Educational Research Association.
- Serafini, F. (2002). Possibilities and challenges: The national board for professional teaching standards. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(4), 316-327.
- Othman, S.S. (2007, May 31). Piawaian bertaraf dunia angkat imej guru [World class standards lift the image of teachers]. *Berita Harian*. Retrieved October 12, 2010 from <http://ddms.usim.edu.my/handle/123456789/1957>
- UPSR and PMR may be abolished: Muhyiddin. (2010, June 20). *The Star Online*. Retrieved October 12, 2010 from <http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2010/6/20/nation/20100620133714&sec=nation>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783 -805.
- Zakaria, A. (2000). Educational development and reformation in the Malaysian education system: challenges in the new millennium. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 1(1), 113-133.