MONITORIAL APPROACHES: CONTEMPORARY AND CONVENTIONAL INITIATIVES

Guo Jing[1]♣, Suyansah Swanto[1], Irma Wani Othman[2]

[1] *Faculty of Psychology and Education, Universiti Malaysia Sabah*
[2] *Centre for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning, Universiti Malaysia Sabah*

ABSTRACK

A monitor has a role that has been understood as an invaluable help in aiding individuals to learn something different and new. The benefit and value of monitoring in the effort to aid one's process of learning is where the conception of the "more knowledgeable person" (the ones who aid another person to move from point A to point B and beyond what they could reach on their own) is shown repeatedly in the education field through practice. Conceptions that were generally introduced concerning monitorial system usually said to be parallel or in other words, combined with the ideas where it needs individuals with vast knowledge in the subject to make it a success as monitors. To guide involved novices however, a huge variety exists in the channels where these goals are being looked into monitoring programs. To bring greater clarity to the different perspectives, this paper discuss different approaches corresponding to the views in teaching and learning as well as the number of aspects that are involved in the mentioned teaching and learning process which is beneficial to school administrative thus for them to justify their mission for monitoring programs to guide, train and identify novices and monitors.

Keywords: Monitorial system, monitor, school management, teacher education

♣ Corresponding author: Guo Jing, *Faculty of Psychology and Education, Universiti Malaysia Sabah*. E-mail: iguojing99@hotmail.com

Introduction

Although programs of monitors and monitorial programs in teacher education are prevalence, a fragment of agreement can be looked at the definition of a monitor, where one is expected to contribute in the development of a novice in the sense of knowledge, beliefs, understanding and so on concerning teaching. There exists a general agreement where in a monitorial bond, the monitor is a superior when it comes to experience, knowledge, advice, support compared to a novice regarding a specific job or task in effort to aid a novice in reaching a goal or a level of competency (Smith and Ingersoll, 2004; Huang Changxun, 2008). Therefore it is so, a bit of consensus beyond the general mentioned description exist regarding functions, roles, tasks, abilities or goals of a monitor or a monitorial bond. Consequently, as the ideas of monitorial are articulated by a lot of different groups, the general grouping of "monitorial" is tough to be distinguished from positions such as "supervisors", "peer trainers" and "coach".

Literature Review

A literature review on monitorial prevailed a central component of all monitorial programs, which are the recognition and the awareness by the monitor of the obstacles encountered by novices as they learn to educate or teach. Instances of provided support by monitors include working with existing curriculum, building confidence, reflecting on educating, building and maintaining trust, creating enthusiasm, modeling and teaching lessons, navigating policies and procedures, exploring teaching strategies, helping with classroom management strategies, offering assessment and evaluation of teaching, providing resources, making observations, offering feedback, facilitating problem solving, and helping the novice transition to the culture of teaching (Hu Fengyang and Li Jie, 2003; Bradbury and Koballa, 2007).

A description by MsInerney and Hagger (1994) pictured supervision as a monitoring model. On the other hand, Lindgren (2006), monitorial, supervision, tutoring, and peer grouping have several different characteristics such as the monitor's (or supervisor's, tutor's, etc.) role in teaching; level of subject knowledge; and whether the monitor's responsibilities are contingent upon employment or the other way around. It was concluded that the characteristics that are prominent that distinguish monitorial from other supports such as monitoring as an honorary assignment and different from supervision, peer grouping or tutoring, mentoring is non-judgmental, non-evaluative, as well as an independent relationship between mentor and mentee". Meanwhile Jonson (2002) Li Cai-hong and Wang Hui (2008), depicted a monitorial program where the teacher/monitor is relieved all of the teaching responsibilities and serves a full-time paid monitor. As an addition, the monitor carries a role in evaluating his or her novice(s). As delineated by Knight (2009) on the other side of the agreement regarding the defining characteristics stated that monitoring is only a role played by a coach. While Maynard and Furlong (1994) explained that coaching is only an aspect of a monitor's work. Obvious disagreement exists in the subject whether monitorial and other forms of supports have different functions and definitions. The latest disagreement between the meaning of monitoring, and the other definitions that do not refer to monitoring, misses the characteristics shared between the terms or monitoring type supports for novices.

However, some other researchers have categorized the same support systems in a different way. For the reason of this literature review, monitoring is taken as any sustained relationship between a more experienced and knowledgeable person and a novice where the main aim is the professional development and/or overall growth of the novice toward a wanted competency level. Monitors should possess teaching experience as far as the characteristics include, which would able the teachers to articulate their own teaching practices, accurately present the content, support essential instructional process, be able to be empathic and encouraging, be able to show concern regarding the success of the novice, possess string interpersonal skills, and monitor bonds that are sustained over longer periods of time (National Science Teachers

Association, 2009). Thus, the conceptions of supervision, monitoring, coaching, etc., are being considered in this review as a relative to the manner in which they contribute and inform to monitoring models. These different labels show a set of different purposes and emphases but the differences are not a crystal clear cut to the eyes of the ones who try to distinguish them.

As an output, the provided support by monitors reflects the obstacles encountered by novices as they learn to educate and serve as what focused by most monitorial programs. Because of that, as beginner teachers struggle with the mentioned aspects of teaching and learning equipped with the thought of the presence of a monitor that could always lend a helping hand, a framework for conceptualizing monitorial models should consider the initiatives in which certain models highlight the aspects of teaching and learning (Sun Taoli, 2008). Unfortunately, a test of the means in which models of monitorial address certain aspects of learning to educate is only one useful way to describe the mentioned models.

The mentioned obstacles include; but are not limited to, building deeper and more dynamic understandings of subject matter, learning and implementing a wide variety of pedagogical strategies, developing an understanding of the varied contexts in which teachers function, working with and developing curriculum, building and incorporating a knowledge of learners, utilizing effective assessment, and developing an awareness and comfort with classroom management strategies and techniques for motivating students (Wang and Odell, 2002).

Monitorial Approaches: Contemporary and Conventional Initiatives

Approaches to teaching and learning of the contemporary views reflect student-centered are surrounded by the active construction of ideas such as engaging students in the beliefs and concepts that are relevant to their lives perspective (Bybee, 1997) engaging in collaborative inquiry, sharing and examining ideas through discourse, challenging misconceptions, explaining and justifying conclusions and relationships, and exploring concepts and relationships (Wang and Odell, 2002). Looking from the point of view of a reform minded perspective, the educator or teacher believes and assumes the role of challenger, organizer, as well as the student learning facilitator.

On the other hand, the conventional initiatives to learning and teaching are stable beliefs concerning the role of the educator and the students in the classroom, including the view of the educator as the temporary main source of knowledge and judge of student learning and the student as the receiver of the given knowledge including culturally reinforced "texts" for the reason of sequencing lessons and planning (Stigler and Hiebert, 1999) transmission and "to teach by instruction" (Mellado, 1998). On the same page, Little (1990) suggested that as carrying a minimal role in aiding novice teachers are what the monitors are being perceived that teaching is understood to require basic skills beyond sound subject matter. Monitors can support novices through giving hints, helpful tips, advice and strategies in this matter. This view mirrors a positivistic perspective on learning and teaching (Palmquist and Finley, 1997) common of "traditional" initiatives to guides and unsuccessful to identify alternative models of instruction or to make a reflection about the current understanding of the way where individuals learn.

A severe contrast is what the conceptions are in to the contemporary opinions of learning and teaching that have the upper hand in possessing the research literature. A discussion on monitorial stated the change of nature in monitorial programs and said that, tracing back the history lane, monitorial was a straightforward endeavor. Based on willingness to work with a new teacher without the presence of any incentive and with the absence of release from other obligations, monitors were selected. As an addition, monitorial included little to the absence of training at all, as the skills that should be possessed by good teachers or educators were the same of a good monitor. Therefore, the aims of monitorial were being limited to emotional

support, a low level of technical assistance and an orientation to the local culture and in general include not any emphasis on curriculum or educating as well as teaching.

Conceptualizing Monitorial System

Monitors provide and develop chances as well as conditions that promote the growth of the teacher based on their level of expertise and knowledge of the development level of the novice. The monitor urges the novice to confront obstacles of the practice and to put their experience into test in classroom as a chance to learn rather than providing affective or emotional support to comfort them and to help them getting better at teaching. From the action, novice could develop the skill to make use each and every aspect of learning to teach as an avenue for the development of growth. Thus, teaching and learning are the central components of any monitorial bonds as an assumption suggests that the views of learning and teaching as being reflected in the conceptions of monitorial which leads to the models of monitorial reflecting the conventional of learning and teaching.

The study discuss monitorial conceptuals in four arrears but it is aware that each arrear of monitorial may not fit perfectly into a category, specifically because of the blurred distinctions concerning that of which constitutes conventional versus contemporary points of view or perspectives. The mentioned views, paired with the different and many aspects of learning in order to teach as discussed earlier whereby elements such as transitioning to the culture of teaching, classroom management, reflection seen function as the spine of the conceptualization of the monitorial system. However, the corresponding distinctions and arrearrs function as helping tools in effort to consider the monitorial approach.

Wave 1 : Single Aspect Conventional Approach

The first wave contains process such as the monitor and novice plan a lesson together, but the teaching is divided with the novice having less portion of the teaching compared to the monitor. Wave 1 is to focus on a single aspect of learning to educate, or on a few, and that is implemented by conventional approach to learning and teaching. The models usually deployed upon those developed in contexts outside of education, mainly in the management areas (McInerney and Hagger, 1994). Commonly, they are system-wide and focus on the dominant stakeholders interests. As an instance, monitorial models that are created and implemented by the administrators of a school may rebound a perspective of a staff management, where the main focus is actually on the novice's effective socialization into the updated culture and practices of the school. Usually, these models generally counts on formal evaluation and observations by the department heads or administrators.

While maintaining the sight of the bigger picture, the teacher and the monitor can play different roles in this way. The observation is then added on with a conference of post-teaching, where the supervisor and the novice discuss about the lesson, deciding on whether changes are needed or not, and creating a plan in order to implement the changes. Repetition is then implemented on the process for the reason of subsequent lessons. Monitorial models are characterized and shaped by their narrow range of topics focus especially on enculturation, lesson planning, and delivery - conventional perspectives on learning and teaching, which are; the source and evaluator of knowledge is the monitor and the passive receiver of information and feedback is the novice. Commonly, observations are tailed by verbal or written feedback, mostly in the constructive criticism form, prescriptive advice, and evaluation. These models are largely influenced by clinical supervision models (Cogan, 1972), where the supervisors begin the process by giving an explanation to the novice about the purpose and sequence of the supervision (Sullivan, 1980). Then, the novice should plan a lesson and discuss about it with his

or her supervisor prior to a formal observation, when the supervisor is analyzing the teaching of the novice.

Wave 2: Single Aspect Contemporary Approach

Opportunities for the novice to gain access to the mentor's knowledge of the craft is provided in the second wave. This is done or implemented through the lessons' dissection, the questioning of the novice, and the monitor's explicit or deductive reflection as to the reason why the decisions were made in specific situations to get certain tasks accomplished. The second wave (Wave 2) retrieves views that are focusing on the few aspects of learning to educate but that just shows a reform-minded way to teach and learn. In this context, it explained humanistic stage in which the monitor's main function is to aid the newbie teachers to handle the transition in educating by mainly focusing on decreasing the conflict between their professional and personal lives (Wang and Odell, 2002). Because of that, the focus is not much on helping the novice to enhance and build understanding of the content or teaching strategies and more to aid the teacher transition to become the culture of teaching or educating by creating a healthy professional identity as well as positive self-esteem.

Looking from this point of view, the monitor's role is almost the same as that of a counselor, facilitating the novice in identifying and working through any necessities, obstacles, or issues as confidence and motivation is built in the teacher's role. From this, monitors usually have stable and reliable interpersonal skills, including the trait of listening well, identifying needs, and aiding other people in building or creating confidence. Monitors from the perspective of humanism are urged to be more open-minded, non-judgmental, positive and understanding. Not only that, they are also equipped with the skills of guiding novices in the use of effective problem solving strategies and have the ability to aid other people to articulate their feelings and what they understand. Monitorial strategies are different within each bond or relationship. The differentiated coaching tails a process of steps where firstly, the coach draws a hypothesis regarding the teacher's natural style and identifies the beliefs of the teacher. The teacher and the coach then work side by side to identify the problem the teacher wants to solve and create a coaching plan in effort to annihilate the issue.

As described by Kise (2009), a monitorial system referred to as differentiated coaching. Unique is it centers on the types of monitor's and novice's personalities. Its results are rational and relevant from the argument that teachers usually form their practice around what they do best, whereby their strengths are related to their own personalities and learning styles. Thus their personalities and learning styles drive their core educational beliefs, and changing their teaching practices means changing those core beliefs. That makes changes become very difficult. Therefore, the monitor considers not the novice as being resistant to change but rather as trying to adjust their coaching style to meet their needs. Underscoring the approach is the intention that some individuals have different styles in learning and process information in different and various ways (Wei Jingzhu, DuanZhiyan and Chen Quanying, 2004).

Wave 3: Multi-Aspect Conventional Approach

Monitor helps the novice reflect upon his or her ideas about teaching and learning, including the effectiveness, practicality, educational merit, and acceptability of decisions in the third wave. Serving as the practical authority, the monitor focuses on getting new ideas together with the novice in lieu of providing the definitive verdicts. Wave 3 is a representation of the arrears in which the initiatives is conventional or traditional in nature, but the aim is widen to insert a wide variety of aspects of learning to educate or teach. An instance of this type of approach is a consultation model of monitorial, in which the monitor's role is to inform the novice processes and protocols which will provide advice based on well developed expertise and advocate for particular choices and actions (Lipton and Wellman, 2001). Characterised by the teachers

173

whom will be providing technical information about content, skills, student needs, teaching strategies, policies, and procedures are the conversations between the monitor and the novice. Because of the vast experience, novices can be provided with insight concerning the consequences of some certain choices.

In the world of consultation, monitors offer demonstrations, suggestions and recommendations in the attempt to help the novice to obtain something pedagogically such as pedagogical knowledge, skills and content knowledge (Duanhai-bin, Zhang-Ping, Guang-hong and Zhuo-ning, 2007). A description by Maynard and Furlong (1994) stated that there is a different model of monitorial called systematic training. The proponents of systematic training stated that learning to teach or educate happens by developing competencies on a predefined list. The monitor functions as a systematic trainer, observing the novice when he or she is teaching on a predefined schedule, giving feedback concerning to the competencies, as well as coaching on a list of behaviors that are mostly determined by other people. The suggestions and advices uttered by the monitor usually reflect ideas that are linked the current culture of learning and teaching. In order to reach success, it is thought that, a monitor must have permission from the teacher to consult, which requires a high degree of credibility and trust (Costa and Garmston, 2011). From time to time, the novice is urged to assume greater levels of responsibility for learning and teaching. In enhancing apprenticeship, skills for teaching are thought to be best learning by emulation of experienced practitioners and by supervised practice.

In this point of perspective, what more important than instruction is apprenticeship and the novice only needs to work with other experienced individuals in effort to learn to teach. The monitor functions as an interpreter and guide by aiding the novice in making sense of the experience and by providing articulating "recipes" that function. As an instance, the novice may work with the monitor to draft out a unit or lesson, but hold responsibility for teaching a small portion of the lesson only. From there, the novice obtains exposure to the role of the teacher while staying away from being overwhelmed. The primary focus of this model is on the skills, approaches, and techniques of the monitor and to involve the novice as minimal as possible in the construction and wrestle of ideas, challenging misconceptions, or practice evaluation.

Wave 4: Multi-Aspect Contemporary Approach

The final wave, contains something like; the monitor helps in managing the novice's learning, which probably include giving chances to observe or work with other teachers in the department, providing exposure to the teaching of a wide variety of subjects, and including colleagues in the training and informal evaluation of the novice's growth development. The novice then takes the lead in creating agendas and providing judgments when around two thirds of the experience has happened and implemented. The fourth waves that focus on a wide variety of aspects of learning to teach and that shows a contemporary approach to learning and teaching. Previously described as an educational monitorial as a model rooted from conception of educative experiences or experiences that promote future growth and lead to richer subsequent experiences (Feiman-Nemser, 2012).

On the other hand, the monitors' role as the beginning teachers present worries, questions, and purposes without not batting an eye of the long-term goals for teacher development. This is including interactions that promote an inquiring perspective and the skills and habits development of learning from practicing. This process includes learning to teach and the corresponding levels of performance, measuring of the progress is done by the students whom develop an agenda prior to the lesson which outlines the sequence and the content of the episode of the teaching and one of the teaching dimensions is to be focused on (Ding, Yunxia, Chen and Hengfang, 2014). Annotation of the agenda is done by the teachers whom cooperate while observing the lesson. After that, a conference on the post-teaching based on the subsequent conversations with supervisors and co-teachers and also the agenda is followed. A

few agendas (two to three) and the cycles of observation are needed every week, at least five conferences with supervisors and co-teachers.

The highlight of the conversations with the monitor teacher is on knowledge of the craft. The focus of the conversations is implemented among the supervisor and co-teacher and this is needed because of the practical reasoning about teaching based on explanation, description, reformulation and justification. Monitors are asked to produce conversations revolving an institutional design model that is divided into a few domains of knowledge which are; the way in which children learn, dimensions of teaching, subject matter knowledge, research and theory on teaching processes, curriculum knowledge, and craft knowledge. These domains are where teachers are expected to draw and teach at the same time explained as the basis for monitor's training and is developed into university courses or fields in effort so that students will be familiar with it as a tool for developing skills and knowledge (Abulajiang, 2014).

Conclusion

General conceptions concerning the nature of monitorial have the tendency to coalesce around the idea that monitorial needs a more knowledgeable and experienced individual who could provide any form of support to guide a novice. Although it is the common conception that usually revolves around our ears, great variance does exist in the manner where these aims or goals are being aware of. It is described in this article that the framework for monitorial waves has the ability to support school leaders and administrators deductively by identifying the desired outcomes or outputs and the design of the monitorial programs. By articulating the monitorial perspectives more clearly, monitors and those who are being monitored have the tendency to benefit from the programs that are developed.

The conceptualizing monitorial approaches has the chance and potential to guide and support school administrators and leaders during the process of identification of needs concerning monitorial and program development to meet the needs. The insufficient amount of framework could result in monitorial programs which occurs from any number of views of learning and teaching and is focused on any number of aspects of learning to teach. Even though it is so, more effectively targeting the specific needs of newbie teachers and the wanted outcomes of a mentoring program by the leaders and administrators could likely contribute to the effectiveness of the program. As an instance, induction programs in school usually include mentoring component even though the programs can range from single orientation meetings at the beginning of a school year to highly-structured comprehensive programs that include a large number of supports over a period of several years.

Nevertheless, because of the presence of the variance, the aims of monitorial are not the same as the one context to the next. Due to that, to maximize the benefits of monitorial, leaders and administrators should identify the wanted outputs of an induction program and compile those outputs with corresponding models that can be found in the approaches. If the inductive desire is that a monitor functions as a teacher consultant for exploring a bit of ideas , this can be transformed into deductive or explicit and a monitorial program can be developed that focuses on a small number of aspects from a more conventional or traditional view of learning and teaching. However, a program from another perspective can actually be developed such as if the implicit desire is that a mentor helps teachers to understand a large number of aspects of teaching and learning using reform minded approaches. The same case with another situation, the mentoring framework can support administrators and school leaders in the selection, training, and support of mentors.

Bibliografi

Abulajiang. (2014). The Transplantation and Application of the Monitorial System in the

Guo, J., Suyansah, S., & Irma Wani, O.

Management of Student Education in Contemporary Universities. Modern Economic Information, 23:258-259.

Bradbury, L. U., and Koballa, T. R. (2007). Mentor advice giving in an alternative certification program for secondary science teaching: Opportunities and roadblocks in developing a knowledge base for teaching. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 817-840.

Bybee, R. W. (1997). Achieving scientific literacy: From purposes to practices. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cogan, M. L. (1972). Clinical supervision. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Costa, A. L., and Garmston, R. J. (2002). Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools (2nd ed.). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Ding,Yunxia., and Chen,Hengfang. (2014). Research on Monitorial System of Undergraduate student issues. Journal of Zhejiang Institute of Communications, 1st edition, volume15.

Duanhai-bin, Zhang-Ping, Guang-hong and Zhuo-ning. (2007). Practice and Research on Monitorial System of Undergraduate. Journal of Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 2ndedition, volume20.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. Journal of Teacher Education,52, 17-30.

Hu Fengyang. and Li Jie. (2003). Reviewing the history of monitorial system development and thoughts. Tianjin teach science college journals.

Huang Changxun. (2008). A Study on the Monitorial System Applied in College Student Education and Supervisal in our Country. Journal of Fujian moral university.

Li Cai-hong, and Wang Hui. (2008). The Exploring on Class Monitorial System. Journal of Shenyang college of education, 1stedition, volume10.

Jonson, K. F. (2002). Being an effective mentor. Thousand Oaks, CA:Corwin Press.

Kise, J. A. G. (2009). Differentiated coaching. In J. Knight (Ed.), Coaching: Approaches and perspectives (pp. 145-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Knight, J. (Ed.). (2009). Coaching: Approaches and perspectives. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Lindgren, U. (2006). Mentoring in the academic world. In C. Cullingford (Ed.), Mentoring in education: An international perspective (pp. 153-165). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Lipton, L., and Wellman, B. (2001). Mentoring matters: A practical guide to learning-focused relationships. Sherman, CT: MiraVia.

Little, J. W. (1990). The mentoring phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. In C. B. Cazden (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 279-351). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Maynard, T., and Furlong, J. (1994). Learnnig to teach and models of mentoring. In D. McInerney, H. Hagger, & M. Wilkin (Eds.), Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education (pp.69-85). London, England: Kogan Page.

McInerney, D., and Hagger, H. (1994). Teachers' expertise and models of mentoring. In D. McInerney, H. Hagger, and M. Wilkin (Eds.), Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education (pp.86-102). London, England: Kogan Page.

McInerney, D., Hagger, H., and Wilkin, M. (Eds.). (1994). Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education. London, England: Kogan Page.

Mellado, V. (1998). The classroom practice of preservice teachers and their conceptions of teaching and learning science. Science Education, 82, 197-214.

National Science Teachers Association. (2009). Science teacher induction programs: NSTA position statements. Retrieved October2, 2009.

Palmquist, B. C., and Finley, F. N. (1997). Preservice teachers' views of the nature of science during a post-baccalaureate science teaching program. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34, 595-615.

Smith, T. M., and Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? American Educational Research Journal, 41, 681-714.

Stigler, J. W., and Hiebert, J. (1999). Teaching gap. New York, NY: Free Press.

Sullivan, C. G. (1980). Clinical supervision: A state of the art review. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sun Taoli. (2008). A thinking about implementation of monitorial system in university lower grade classes. Journal of Simao Teachers' College, 1st edition, volume 24.

Wang, J., and Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. Review of Educational Research, 72, 481-546.

Wang, J., Strong, M., and Odell, S. J. (2004). Mentor-novice conversations about teaching: A comparison of two U.S. and two Chinese cases. Teachers College Record, 106, 775-813.

Wei Jingzhu, and DuanZhiyan, & Chen Quanying. (2004). Monitorial system—A new Higher school student management model. Journal of Hulan Teacher College.1st edition, volume 20.