



Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) Across MARA Learning Institutions: Retrieving Unpublished Evidence

Zuliana Mohd Zabidi¹, Zuraidah Abdullah² & Bambang Sumintono³
^{1,2,3} University of Malaya

Article Info

Received:
22 July 2020

Accepted:
30 August 2020

Publish
01 September 2020

E-mail address:

*corresponding Author :
zuliana.zabidi@mara.gov.my

e-ISSN 2682-759X

Abstract

Since 2015, MARA has introduced the idea of PLC to three of its education sectors (secondary education, higher education and TVET education). Despite best efforts, it is difficult to locate any evidence on the implementation of PLCs in MARA learning institutions via online, particularly due to inadequate dissemination of the results or findings. Hence, drawing on the results and findings of five potentially important unpublished research, this article offers some reflections on the implementation of PLCs across MARA learning institutions. The collective results of these studies suggest that MARA teachers are prepared to commit to PLC actions, but lack of knowledge on PLC could create unnecessary tension between teachers and school leaders and thus hamper the effectiveness of PLCs.

Keyword: Professional learning community, Teacher collaboration, MARA learning institutions, Malaysia

Introduction

The OECD, through the TALIS 2018 results, has highlighted that successful education systems across the globe today will do whatever it takes to narrow the gap between pedagogical vision and practice (OECD, 2019). Interestingly, the key features of these successful education systems show more commonality rather than differences (Adams, Kutty, & Zabidi, 2017). Contemporary literature indicated that there is an incremental interest in paradigm shift in teacher professional development. Findings from research on successful education systems are seeing a shift from external approach of developing teachers to job-embedded learning of teachers (Vescio et al, 2007; DuFour et al, 2016; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2013). Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) reviewed thirty-five studies on effective teacher professional development and came up with seven features of effective professional development. Darling-Hammond et al. found out that effective teacher professional development focuses on specific curriculum content, engages teachers in job-embedded learning, creates learning spaces that fosters collaborative activities, provides teachers with clear models for practice, sharing of

expertise through coaching, includes instructional time for reflective dialogues, and ensures all these features are continuously sustained within the context. In essence, these features are similar to the widely shared features of an effective professional learning community (PLC) (Vescio et al, 2007; DuFour et al, 2016; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Literature Review

A growing body of literature on professional learning community is showing more and more schools are claiming to embrace the PLC concept. However, with this claim comes the concern on the effectiveness of these self-claimed PLCs when PLCs are defined as program of the year, occasional meetings or even book clubs discussions (DuFour, 2004; Fullan, 2006; DuFour & Reeves, 2016). Moreover, Harris and Jones (2019) highlighted the educators' confusion over the difference of collaborative strategies from collaborative models. Most educators assumed that activities such as learning walks, lesson study or instructional rounds are collaborative models when in actual they are collaborative strategies used within a collaborative model such as PLC. All these confusion and lack of understanding about PLC are detrimental to the real intention for PLC movement. This is because schools that opted for PLC but do not commit to its substance is simply reducing PLC to the likes of a book club meeting in which members only talk and exchange ideas. This is clearly neither beneficial to the students nor the systems that serve the students as there is no real and meaningful differences made to the students' learning experience (DuFour, 2004; Fullan, 2006; DuFour & Reeves, 2016; Harris and Jones, 2019). Therefore, published empirical-based findings are central to the success of school reform as the findings can be the source of reference or guidelines to help improve in building teachers' capacity and capability in education systems across the globe (Vescio et al, 2007; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; DeMonte, 2013; Harris & Jones, 2019). Moreover, Guerriero (2017) believed that transforming tacit knowledge into storable and transmissible information is an important contribution to teachers' knowledge base in enhancing their professional practices. Through research findings that are well documented, policy makers and educators could make more informed decisions about the designs of teacher professional development that use clear PLC models that can have significant impact on teaching and learning.

The implementation of PLCs in MARA learning institutions

PLC as a professional learning model that links to overall school success have been widely accepted in many education systems including Malaysia. As envisioned in Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025, the Malaysia education system aspires to consistently produce students and schools that are comparable to the best internationally. This national aspiration is shared by other Malaysian agencies related to providing education to young Malaysians and this includes MARA. Majlis Amanah Rakyat (commonly abbreviated as MARA or in English Language known as People's Trust Council), is an agency that is entrusted with the vision to produce young and bright Bumiputras (the Malay race and other indigenous people of Malaysia) in the field of education and economy. MARA education is seen as a continuous effort to develop holistic and balanced human capital and is divided into three education sectors (secondary education, higher education and TVET education). Table 1 shows the division.

Table 1: *MARA learning institutions according to sectors*

MARA education sector	Learning institutions
Secondary education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 54 Maktab Rendah Sains MARA (MRSM/secondary schools)
Higher education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 MARA Professional colleges • 4 MARA colleges
TVET education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 MARA Technical Colleges • 14 MARA Technical Institutes

Like many education systems, MARA too sees PLC as an approach to achieve school improvement and through MARA education strategic plannings, it can be seen that PLC was introduced into MARA education division prior to 2015 (GTHE 2016-2020). In fact, the idea of adopting PLC model into MARA learning institutions across sectors could be seen as an aggressive strategy in realizing the MARA education vision. This is because while MARA policy makers recognized PLC as a concept that could support system-wide teacher professional development, the same understanding by grassroot practitioners could not be said. Moreover, online search for such evidence was futile though it was known that there were previously MARA scholars who had conducted such research. Without the published findings, it is impossible to know the extent of PLC implementation in MARA learning institutions or how the idea of PLC is received or understood by school leaders and teachers. “Not all unpublished studies are of poor quality, and not all published studies are of high quality” (Conn et al., 2003, p.258). Hence, the aim of this piece is to collect, summarise, and synthesize the empirical works of previous researchers of PLC across MARA learning institutions.

Methodology

The limitation of the methodology for this review is acknowledged. Therefore, this review article is not meant to be a systematic literature review. Rather, it is meant to offer rich descriptions for the knowledge of PLC across MARA learning institutions to be explicit and could be shared with other educators. First, to retrieve the intended literature, a search on Google scholar was conducted but to no avail. Next, was a check on the list of MARA scholars against their dissertations' titles at the MARA human resource division. This decision was considered as a way of identifying potential studies since all MARA employees who were scholars, were required to report to the MARA human resource division on their academic status or progress. Most salient sources were identified through this checking process and it had successfully reduced the list to five dissertation titles within the PLC research area ranging from the year 2015 to 2016. These sources were then identified through the students' repository of the affiliated institution and manual scanning or handsearching of the dissertations was conducted at the library of the institution. This process of handsearching was supported by Vassar, Atakpo, & Kash (2016) who argued that handsearches are supplemental approaches to database searches and should be considered if found to be most practical. A manual page by page examination of the sources was conducted and relevant information were recorded into the evaluation matrix for further analysis. An extensive evaluation matrix to record source information, research description, methodology and results or findings of the five studies was developed (refer to Appendix A). Each element of PLC mentioned in the sources was indicated in Appendix A.

The five studies were conducted across all three MARA education sectors. Table 2 gives brief information on each study for reference. The review started with examination on the characteristics of PLCs within each context. Then the characteristics were analyzed and the potential factors were also identified. Besides the shared features of the PLCs, challenges and barriers on the implementation of the PLCs were also highlighted. PLCs' positive influences on teachers and suggestions by the five researchers were also discussed. In addition, the five-point continuum (DuFour et al., 2016) was also used to assess the PLC stage of the PLC within each context. Based on all five studies, collective knowledge on PLC across MARA learning institutions was subsequently offered.

Table 2: *Brief information on each study*

Source	Context	Methodology
Khairiah, 2016	6 high performing MRSMs	QUAN qual approach
Norashdimah, 2015	1 MARA college	QUAN qual approach
Fazlina, 2015	1 MARA college	qualitative approach
Abdul Hafidz, 2015	1 MARA technical college	quantitative approach
Siti Khadijah, 2015	1 MARA college	qualitative approach

Summary of findings

All five studies investigated the development of PLCs within context using the five PLC dimensions defined by Hord (1997). The results and findings of the studies confirmed that the PLCs in all five contexts possessed most but not all characteristics of the five dimensions. It was found that the dimensions of shared values and vision, collective creativity, and shared personal practice were most significant in all contexts. All five studies reported the existence of strong teacher collaboration and their collective learning was focused on addressing student needs. Moreover, teachers were clear about their learning institutions' vision and their collaborative practices showed their undeviating focus towards achieving it. However, despite the strong teacher collaboration and strong focus on improving student achievement in all five contexts, the researchers reported average to poor quality of teacher collaboration within each context. Lack of understanding of the PLC concept, lack of systematic organization, and lack of dynamic were some of the factors attributed to the unfavorable quality of teacher collaboration (Khairiah, 2016; Norashdimah, 2015; Fazlina, 2015).

The other two dimensions, supportive and shared leadership and supportive conditions were found to be insignificant as observed by three researchers in the MARA college contexts. In the supportive and shared leadership dimension, it is interesting to note that studies in MARA colleges found that while most teachers reported that their leaders were supportive of the idea of teacher collaboration, these teachers also reported that their leaders did not display facilitative and collegial leadership style (Norashdimah, 2015; Fazlina, 2015; Siti Khadijah, 2015). In one study, Fazlina (2015) highlighted that her teacher participants reported that their leaders were not proactive and were not ready to support the initiatives made by teachers. Furthermore, Siti Khadijah (2015) highlighted that her teacher participants reported that their principal did not engage them in decision making. Siti Khadijah attributed this finding to the principal's transactional-transformational leadership behaviors. In spite of this, Siti Khadijah noted that physical structure for learning facilities of the college was well supported by the management.

Whereas in MRSMs, Khairiah (2016) found that the supportive and shared leadership dimension was fairly significant in her study. On one hand, Khairiah affirmed that principals' leadership styles did positively influence teacher collaboration. It is found that the principals developed and supported teacher collaboration by following through the commitment and promises made. Teacher participants also reported that their decisions were supported by their principals. On the other, Khairiah argued that this dimension could be very significant if the principals were willing to improve on building good rapport with their teachers. Khairiah highlighted that teacher participants reported much of their disappointment in this dimension was they could only feel little genuine care and recognition coming from the principals.

Meanwhile, the results from a MARA technical college attested PLC implemented in the college was effective as all five dimensions showed high level of significance. Abdul Hafidz (2015) stated that the PLC within context was an example of teachers leading their own learning. Abdul Hafidz asserted that teacher participants reported that they worked collaboratively in reviewing students' works and in doing so they were engaged in dialogues. They also reported that they shared common language during dialogues and this enabled them to share their experience. They agreed that this as an opportunity for them to improve their practices as this further allowed for coaching and mentoring to take place. Abdul Hafidz also argued that relationships among lecturers supported honest and respectful examination of data to enhance teaching and learning. The only suggestion from Abdul Hafidz was for college management to provide more space for teachers to do their reflective dialogues. Similar suggestion also came from the other four researchers.

Based on the results and findings of the studies, the PLC stage of the PLC within each context was assessed using the five-point continuum (DuFour et al., 2016). The conditions reported in the studies were used to reflect their alignment with the principles and practices of a PLC as described in the five-point continuum (refer to Appendix B). DuFour et al. (2016) suggested the use of the five point continuum as a tool for teachers and school leaders to assess their PLC stage so that they can move forward in a more purposefully manner. The evidences were used to support the conclusion of the identified stage (refer to Table 3). From Table 3, it can be concluded that PLC implementation were evident across MARA learning institutions. However, the PLC journey within each study was different. According to DuFour et al. (2016), schools should use this kind of assessment to reflect on their current reality. It is suggested that such finding is used by school leaders and teachers to begin a dialogue and explore the reasons for differences in opinions if there is any. DuFour et al. believed that this assessment process greatly helps school leaders and teachers to achieve authentic and effective PLC that would take the team closer to their school vision. This belief was also supported by Darling-Hammond et al (2017) who argued that "teacher professional learning that is context specific, job embedded, and content based is particularly important for addressing the diverse needs of students (and thus teachers) in differing settings"(p.7).

Discussion

Although the five studies provided modest evidence of PLC across MARA learning institutions, this review is still useful as it could provide a general framing of PLC implementation and its effectiveness in MARA education sector, irrespective of context. It also can be treated as a knowledge base to provide better learning opportunities for school leaders and teachers to be more successful at their attempt of any reform effort. More importantly, the evidence came from the practitioners themselves and this makes the information very relevant in improving practices within the profession.

Table 3: *PLC stage according to the five point continuum*

Source	Context	PLC stage & evidence
Khairiah, 2016	6 high performing MRSMs	<p>Developing stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teachers were receptive to the collaborative practices. • teachers' improved their practices around issues of their student learning • their schools' results influenced their commitment to their PLC
Norashdimah, 2015	1 MARA college	<p>Initiating stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collegial relationship & sharing of best practices were evident • but collaboration was not systematic and dialogues were not followed through with actions • teachers even mentioned the need for effective collaboration
Fazlina, 2015	1 MARA college	<p>Implementing stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strong teacher collaboration & interaction were evident • trust and sharing of personal practice were also reported • but leaders' lack of knowledge on authentic PLC impeded teachers' learning • leaders were not supportive of teachers' initiatives
Abdul Hafidz, 2015	1 MARA technical college	<p>Sustaining stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teachers leading their own learning • all 5 Hord's PLC dimensions showed high level of significance • student data was used to examine the focus of teachers' reflective dialogues
Siti Khadijah, 2015	1 MARA college	<p>Initiating stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shared personal learning & collective learning were significant • teachers were not given much space for reflective dialogues • poor teacher empowerment • lack of trust on the principal's part

Moreover, teachers are the “creators and implementers of educational change” therefore, “they should play a far more central role in decision making and policy formation” (Harris & Jones, 2019, p.123). Sufficient attention must be given to these findings to further understand how relationships between teachers and school leaders can lead to change in practice. School leaders can reflect on the nature of their leadership and how to play their roles to be more involved in providing high quality instructional leadership. Principals need to understand that they are the source of leadership in schools that consequently permeates to all levels of the school stakeholders (Liu & Hallinger, 2018; Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2019).

Characteristics of the five dimensions of Hord's PLC model were evident across MARA learning institutions. The dimensions of 1) shared values and vision, 2) collective creativity, and 3) shared personal practice showed the most evidence of development in all contexts. This shows that teachers were moving away from traditional way of working in isolation to working collaboratively with other colleagues and signals that most of the collaborative culture had been embedded into the teachers' instructional routines. This is a significant finding because it shows that the implementation of PLC in MARA learning institutions "contributes to a fundamental shift in the habits of mind that teachers bring to their daily work in the classroom"(Vescio et al., 2007, p.84). All evidence on these dimensions suggested that teachers understood that their professional learning would contribute to the change of their practice that could influence their students' achievement. In fact, what is more encouraging is the discovery that these teachers understood that their learning together was not only meant to make them better teachers, but to focus more on addressing student needs within context. Ensuring that students learn is after all the heart of authentic PLCs and the most central of all PLC tenets (DuFour, 2004; Vescio et al., 2007; DuFour et al., 2016; Harris, Jones, & Huffman, 2017; Day, & Lieberman, 2017; Hairon, & Tan, 2017; Doğan, & Adams, 2018).

Evidence from the qualitative studies elaborated on the importance of the dimension of shared values and vision. Evidence showed that shared vision was an important dimension that motivated teachers to improve their practice through their professional learning. The shared vision guided most of their decision making on the instructional matters and to the teachers, the shared vision was a mental image that led them to demonstrate strong collaboration among them. This camaraderie they shared put values into their actions and these values created the desired behaviors (Hord,1997; Schaap & Bruijn, 2018). In general, the evidence from the five studies tell that the teachers were involved in collaborative activities such as discussion over student needs and also coaching and mentoring. There was also a mention on the teachers' willingness to learn together despite their different programs and seniority. They demonstrated of having a mindset that Schooling, Toth, and Marzano (2013) defined as deliberate practice which required them to fine tune their instructions to ensure their students learn. Specifically in Abdul Hafidz's study, the PLCs were found to be effective as teachers were able to dialogue through a common language among them. Schooling, Toth, and Marzano (2013) argued that a common language of instruction is critical in teachers' reflective dialogues because its use indicates teachers' shared understanding in articulating their knowledge on effective practice. When teachers were honest in learning with their colleagues, reciprocal influence occurred. Moreover, Abdul Hafidz (2015) reported that with the use of student data, common language enhanced teachers' learning and aligns the teachers to their shared vision. Contemporary researchers on educational change believed that if this learning process is properly executed, then dramatic improvement can be seen (Hattie, 2009; Harris & Jones, 2012; Zuraidah & Muhammad Faizal, 2014; DuFour & Reeves, 2016, Doğan, & Adams, 2018). Furthermore, strong teacher collaboration that focuses on improving practices "is one of the highest yielding strategies to boost student, school and system performance"(Fullan, Rincon-Gallardo, & Hargreaves, 2015, p.8). This argument is driven by the belief that when teachers learn together, they build collective capacity and a strong sense of shared responsibility that ensure their actions are in line with societal expectations. This is impactful as it is embedded into their daily routines for continuous improvement (Fullan, Rincon-Gallardo, & Hargreaves, 2015).

PLC characteristics exhibited across MARA learning institutions

However, the first step to achieve the internal accountability among teachers is to provide them with a conducive environment in which they feel safe and empowered to develop their profession. And it is the responsibility of the principals to help define this (Hord, 1997; Voelkel & Chrispeels, 2017). The studies conducted by Norashdimah (2015), Fazlina (2015), and Siti Khadijah (2015) documented teachers reporting their professional learning as receiving poor support from the leaders and principal. Teachers reported as requesting more active facilitation on the leaders and principal's part for their PLC to be effective and impactful. In one specific study, teachers reported the need for their principal to trust them to make their own instructional decisions and to avoid micromanaging them (Siti Khadijah, 2015). These evidence indicate lack of trust and shared leadership in the MARA college contexts. Norashdimah (2015), Fazlina (2015), and Siti Khadijah (2015) suggested that for teachers to achieve the full potential of PLCs, leaders and principals must support their teachers with the appropriate resources and to a certain extent, relinquish their power for teachers to make their own instructional decisions. This suggestion is worthy of further consideration as evidence from successful systems shows that school leadership and greater trust can positively influence the quality of instructions and make a difference in student learning (Hipp & Huffman, 2003; Hallam et al., 2015; Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2019; Hallinger, Heck, & Murphy, 2014).

Nonetheless, Khairiah (2016) documented that the presence of principal leadership, to a certain extent, contributed to school improvement. The principals were seen as leaders who developed the school shared vision and were also supportive of teachers' instructional initiatives and this led to stronger instructional norms. Khairiah argued that this could be further facilitated if the principal would spend more time communicating and building rapport with teachers. This argument should be taken seriously as principals who were able to show the importance of 'relational leadership' through their openness, mutual trust, and communication with their teachers were more successful in supporting and encouraging teachers to enhance their learning (Vanblaere and Devos, 2016; Liu & Hallinger, 2018).

Another point that is interesting for discussion is teacher-led PLC documented in the study by Abdul Hafidz (2015). Although Abdul Hafidz did not define teacher leadership in his study, this finding was presented as an evidence of teacher leadership and positive practice change. However, lack of clarity on the underlying process of PLC requires further qualitative research to afford a deeper understanding of the teacher-led PLC in the context. More studies on teacher-led PLC will be imperative to teachers, school leaders, and policy makers to clearly define the concept of teacher leadership and empirical evidence would help to suggest the extent of roles of teachers in improving their practices and enhancing their student learning (Wenner & Campbell, 2017; Harris & Jones, 2019).

Conclusion

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that PLCs in MARA learning institutions are still in their nascent period of implementation even though the PLC documented by Abdul Hafidz (2015) showed that it was in a sustaining stage. Lack of clarity on the details of PLC characteristics and muddiness on the link between PLC and student achievement are indicators that more research are needed to properly implement and sustain PLC in MARA education system. There are many areas on PLCs that are still not well understood based from the findings of these five studies. Furthermore, the methodology of this review is not without limitations. Having said that, this does not mean that these five studies and this review are unimportant. On the contrary, the findings from these studies helped to reveal what is already in practice and

therefore inform future researchers on what areas to probe and give more attention to. There is much that can be learned from these studies to make meaningful difference to the MARA education. All empirical evidence will help policy makers to make clear policy that will be useful for school leaders to address the directions to inculcate culture of continuous learning and improvement among their teachers (Hallinger, 2018). As such, this review has summarised the findings and pointed to the importance of PLC specifically to MARA education. Hence, this review is an investment that contributes to the development of PLC knowledge in MARA context.

References

- Adams, D., Kutty, G. R., & Zabidi, Z. M. (2017). Educational leadership for the 21st Century. *International online Journal of educational leadership*, 1(1), 1-4.
- Abdul Hafidz, H. (2015). PLC Practices Through Teacher Leadership For Student Achievement At Mara High Skill College In Peninsular Malaysia. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Conn, V. S., Valentine, J. C., Cooper, H. M., & Rantz, M. J. (2003). Grey literature in meta-analyses. *Nursing research*, 52(4), 256-261.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- Day, C. & Lieberman, A., (2017) In Harris, A., Jones, M., & Huffman, J. B. *Teachers Leading Educational Reform: The power of professional learning communities*. Routledge.
- DeMonte, J. (2013). High-quality professional development for teachers: Supporting teacher training to improve student learning. Center for American Progress.
- Doğan, S., & Adams, A. (2018). Effect of professional learning communities on teachers and students: reporting updated results and raising questions about research design. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 29(4), 634-659.
- DuFour, R. (2004). What is a professional learning community? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8). 6–11.
- Dufour, R. & Reeves, D. (2016). The Futility Of PLC Lite. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 97(6), 69-71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721716636878>
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., Many, W., & Mattos, M. (2016). *Learning by Doing A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work*. Bloomington, Indiana: Solution Tree Press.
- Fazlina, M. S. (2015). The Role Of Teacher Leadership In Implementing Professional Learning Communities: Challenges And Barriers. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Fullan, M. (2006). Leading professional learning. *School Administrator*, 63(10), 10.

- Fullan, M., Rincón-Gallardo, S., & Hargreaves, A. (2015). Professional capital as accountability. *Education policy analysis archives*, 23, 15.
- Gateway To Holistic Education 2016-2020. (GTHE 2016-2020). Bahagian Pendidikan Menengah. Majlis Amanah Rakyat.
- Guerriero, S. (ed.) (2017). *Pedagogical Knowledge and the Changing Nature of the Teaching Profession*, OECD Publishing, Paris
- Hairon, S., & Tan, C. (2017). Professional learning communities in Singapore and Shanghai: Implications for teacher collaboration. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 47(1), 91-104.
- Hallam, P. R., Smith, H. R., Hite, J. M., Hite, S. J., & Wilcox, B. R. (2015). Trust and collaboration in PLC teams: Teacher relationships, principal support, and collaborative benefits. *NASSP Bulletin*, 99(3), 193-216.
- Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5-24.
- Hallinger, P., Heck, R. H., & Murphy, J. (2014). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: An analysis of the evidence. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 26(1), 5-28.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2013). The power of professional capital. *The Learning Professional*, 34(3), 36.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2012). Connecting professional learning.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2019). Teacher leadership and educational change, *School Leadership & Management*, 39:2, 123-126, DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2019.1574964
- Harris, A., Jones, M., & Huffman, J. B. (2017). *Teachers leading educational reform: The power of professional learning communities*. Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*, London, Routledge
- Hipp, K. K., & Huffman, J. B. (2003). *Professional Learning Communities: Assessment--Development--Effects*.
- Hord, S. (1997). *Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved September 12, 2006, from <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/change34/2.html>
- Khairiah, A. (2016). *The Role of Principals within the Professional Learning Communities of High Performing Maktab Rendah Sains MARA in Malaysia*. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2019). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited, *School Leadership & Management*, DOI: 10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077
- Liu, S., & Hallinger, P. (2018). Principal instructional leadership, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher professional learning in China: testing a mediated-effects model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(4), 501-528.
- Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025. Pelan Pembangunan Pendidikan Malaysia 2013–2025.
- Norashdimah, M. (2015). PLC: Opportunities To Promote Teachers' Collaboration Practice. A Case Study. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- OECD (2019), TALIS 2018 Results (Volume I): Teachers and School Leaders as Lifelong Learners, TALIS, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Schaap, H., & de Bruijn, E. (2018). Elements affecting the development of professional learning communities in schools. *Learning environments research*, 21(1), 109-134.
- Schooling, P., Toth, M., & Marzano, R. (2013). The critical importance of a common language of instruction. Learning Science International.
- Siti Khadijah, M. D. (2015). Reinforcing The Practices Of Professional Learning Communities In MARA Higher Educational Institution: Challenges Towards Effective Implementation. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Vassar, M., Atakpo, P., & Kash, M. J. (2016). Manual search approaches used by systematic reviewers in dermatology. *Journal of the Medical Library Association : JMLA*, 104(4), 302–304. doi:10.3163/1536-5050.104.4.009
- Vanblaere, B., & Devos, G. (2016). Relating school leadership to perceived professional learning community characteristics: A multilevel analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 57, 26-38.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2007). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 80-91. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004
- Voelkel Jr, R. H., & Chrispeels, J. H. (2017). Within-school differences in professional learning community effectiveness: Implications for leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 27(3), 424-451.
- Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A review of the literature. *Review of educational research*, 87(1), 134-171.
- Zuraidah, A. & Muhammad Faizal, G. (2014). Professional learning community in secondary schools community in Malaysia. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(3), 227-248.

APPENDIX A

Author & study description	Methodology & findings
<p>Khairiah, A. (2016). The Role of Principals within the Professional Learning Communities of High Performing Maktab Rendah Sains MARA in Malaysia. (Unpublished master’s dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.</p> <p>Description: Explored the roles of principals towards PLC in 6 high performing MRSMs (PKP) particularly on principal leadership style and principals’ supporting teachers in PLCs. Also the challenges & barriers in implementing PLCs.</p>	<p>Methodology: Sequential mixed-method multi-site case study (QUAN qual approach) using Kouzes & Posner’s Leadership practices inventory – observers (2013) & Harris & Jones (2010) Collaborative learning impact assessment questionnaire with 429 teacher respondents (218 returned). In addition, self-designed 7 item open ended survey (Hord’s PLC) to 43 teacher leader respondents (all answered & returned). Respondents from 6 PKP MRSMs in 6 different states.</p> <p>Findings: Very high level of existence and importance of PLCs found in all six MRSMs. Principal leadership style influenced teacher collaboration in particular inspiring a shared vision, encouraging the heart, challenging the process, enabling others. Principal followed through the commitment and promises they made by developing & supporting teacher collaboration & teachers’ decisions. However, principals had weak rapport with teachers. Teachers also reported poor recognition from principals and that they were not appropriately awarded.</p>
<p>Norashdimah, M. (2015). PLC: Opportunities To Promote Teachers’ Collaboration Practice. A Case Study. (Unpublished master’s dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.</p> <p>Description: Investigated how PLC practices expand teacher collaboration and in-depth exploration of collective learning that promoted teacher collaboration</p>	<p>Methodology: Mixed method QUAN qual approach using PCLA questionnaire with 41 teacher respondents and open ended survey with 8 teachers in one MARA college.</p> <p>Findings: PLCs were a) focused on students, b) collegial relationship & sharing of best practices, c) best strategies to collaborate, and d) elements of teacher collaboration. It was found that PLCs lack systematic organization and did not promote much dialogue. In fact, more unfinished actions after dialogue. Teacher collaboration was ineffective despite strong teacher collaboration.</p>
<p>Fazlina, M. S. (2015). The Role Of Teacher Leadership In Implementing Professional Learning Communities: Challenges And Barriers. (Unpublished master’s dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.</p>	<p>Methodology: In-depth analysis of a single case. Investigated the perception of teacher leaders & teachers through interviews (4 teacher leaders participants) & open-ended surveys (26 teachers samples) via purposeful sampling.</p>

<p>Description: Identified the extent of challenges & barriers faced by teacher leaders in implementing PLC in one department in MARA College. The focus was on 5 dimensions of PLC (Hord, 1998).</p>	<p>Findings: It is found not all 5 dimensions have been strongly implemented. Strong collaboration & strong interaction were identified among teachers. Collective learning was strong and teachers were found willing to learn together despite different programs & seniority. Their teamwork was focused on student and personal practice sharing was strong. However, dimension of 1) supportive & shared leadership, 2) supportive conditions, & 3) structures & relationship were found to be weak. Individual & organizational factors were found to be the main challenges. Teacher leaders were not proactive & were not ready to support initiatives by teachers mainly because teacher leaders did not understand concept & purpose of the implemented PLCs. Distributed leadership was absent. Teachers and teacher leaders could not agree on many matters and this made the collaboration ineffective.</p>
<p>Siti Khadijah, M. D. (2015). Reinforcing The Practices Of Professional Learning Communities In MARA Higher Educational Institution: Challenges Towards Effective Implementation. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.</p> <p>Description: Investigated the characteristics of PLC & challenges in implementing PLCs in one MARA college.</p>	<p>Methodology: Case study in 1 MARA college. Interviewed (semi-structured) 8 lecturers from 4 different departments. Document analysis was also included.</p> <p>Findings: Most participants never heard of PLC but naturally been practicing PLCs which was driven from past experiences. PLCs were focused on students and teachers believed it was their accountability. The facilities for learning were well supported by management (supportive conditions) and shared personal learning & collective learning were significant. However, the principal's transactional-transformational leadership behaviors had strong influenced decision making thus limiting the authority of teachers. Time constraint was found to be the biggest challenge and teachers reported they needed the school management to provide flexible time table. They also reported that the principal needed to put more trust in teachers.</p>
<p>Abdul Hafidz, H. (2015). PLC Practices Through Teacher Leadership For Student Achievement At Mara High Skill College In Peninsular Malaysia. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.</p> <p>Description: Determined the PLC practices among teachers in one KKTm.</p>	<p>Methodology: Quantitative approach using questionnaire with 45 teachers from 6 departments.</p> <p>Findings: All 5 dimensions of Hord's showed high level. It was found that the PLCs in this college were teacher-led PLCs. School vision was focused on students.</p>

	<p>Teachers shared common language to share their experiences and engaged in dialogues. They collaboratively reviewed student work & improved their instructional practices. This relationship among lecturers supported honest and respectful examination of data to enhance teaching and learning. It also offered opportunities for coaching and mentoring. however, they reported they needed allocated time for reflective dialogue.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX B

Five Point Continuum (Dufour et al., 2016)

PLC stage	Principles and practices
Pre-initiating stage	The school has not yet begun to address this PLC principle or practice.
Initiating stage	The school has made an effort to address this principle or practice, but the effort has not yet begun to impact a critical mass of staff members.
Implementing stage	A critical mass of staff members is participating in implementing the principle or practice, but many approach the task with a sense of compliance rather than commitment. There is some uncertainty regarding what needs to be done and why it should be done.
Developing stage	Structures are being altered to support the changes, and resources are being devoted to moving them forward. Members are becoming more receptive to the principle, practice, or process because they have experienced some of its benefits. The focus has shifted from “Why are we doing this?” to “How can we do this more effectively?”
Sustaining stage	The principle or practice is deeply embedded in the culture of the school. It is a driving force in the daily work of staff. It is deeply internalized, and staff would resist attempts to abandon the principle or practice.