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Abstract

Like other parts of the world, in Malaysia ‘Lifelong Learning’ (LLL) is a ubiquitous discourse that also includes teachers as a category of workers/learners. Much critical scholarship on LLL, however, tends to focus on LLL as a more-or-less empty discourse, or as a discourse of social control. This study focuses on teachers as both subjects and agents of discourse. It examines teachers’ perceptions of themselves as learners (learner identity) as they participate in/undertake different kinds of formal professional development courses. To articulate the idea of learner identity, a scale was developed to measure teachers’ learning value, capacity, aspiration, barriers, contextual influencing factors, and perceived impact which are argued can feed into learning identity composite. Data were collected and comparisons made between those Malaysian teachers engaging in: (i) academic programmes, (ii) general professional programmes, and (iii) no formal professional development courses. In this paper, I present and examine one of the key constructs involved in measurement of teacher-learner-identity – ‘learning value’. From analysis of questionnaire data (using principal component analysis and frequency distribution) the findings suggest some distinctive differences in the dimensions of learning value between the learning groups. Even though type of course does not affect their overall learning value, detail analysis of each dimension reveals that the extrinsic value seems to drive the motivation of those teachers on undergraduate courses, more obviously than those of the other courses do. In light of these findings, I argue that learning value construct is possible to feed into teacher-learner-identity conception. These findings serve as a platform to inform the future steps in this ongoing research of the possibility to generate a portrait of which teachers are lifelong learners.

Introduction

This paper presents ongoing research findings on teachers and their learning identity. The overarching aim of the whole study has been to understand how Malaysian teachers view learning and to what extent this view could inform their learning identity. In other words,
it tries to articulate the extent to which teachers see learning as part of their professional identity. To achieve this aim, three research questions are phrased:

1. What value do Malaysian teachers attribute to their own learning as professionals?
2. How do Malaysian teachers perceive their ‘learning capacity’?
3. What are the factors shaping their learning value and capacity, hence their learning identity?

For this paper, I will focus on the first of these questions and will discuss the findings I have gathered so far to describe the value Malaysian teachers attribute to their own learning as professional, hereafter their learning value. The findings presented here are drawn upon the results from a series of statistical analyses of the Learning Value scale.

**Background**

As a teacher myself for more than twelve years, I experienced being a learner as I continued the development of my professional knowledge and skills. This was largely a consequence of reforms taking place in the Malaysian educational systems. Five years later, when I joined a teacher training institution (now superseded by Institute of Teacher Education or IPG being its acronym in Malay Language), I became involved in delivering and handling courses to practicing teachers who came to the institution for in-service training as part of their professional development programs. This was where I saw how other teachers learn. From the experience of teaching and interacting with teachers who differed widely in terms of their age, educational background and work experience, I sensed considerable variation in their motivation levels. Roughly, they could be classified into two types of teacher-learners: one group was those with a highly positive attitude towards completing any assignments given as course requirements; another appeared to be less enthusiastic in producing high quality work.

These experiences inevitably reflected my own dual role - as teacher and learner, and raised question on how teachers, in general view or in particular, value their learning. I argue that teachers need to have positive values in learning, hence, are responsible to master lifelong learning skills before they are able to nurture and assess these skills in their pupils. Thus, the above conviction was how the interest of this study sprung from coupled with my collective experience with these teachers. This circumstance has compelled me to explore teachers’ understanding of their own value on learning. In particular, there is an urging need to know whether it was possible to examine how teachers’ view (or value) learning in order to make professional development programmes more useful. Informing this inquiry are three major areas, which I have identified as complementary to each other as they have much in common in viewing teachers as change agents (particularly as role models to becoming lifelong learner) in achieving the goal of creating a learning society. These are lifelong learning, teachers’ professional development and teachers’ professional identity.
Literature review

As a result of lifelong learning agenda promoted by governments and international agencies (eg: Ofsted, 2004; ILO, 2000; OECD, 2007, 2008), interest in teachers as learners has also emerged. Given that creating a learning society - one of the goals of lifelong learning - has become a global educational issue over the past two decades, most scholars, politicians and economists see the role of educators as increasingly significant. In other words, a learning society needs a teaching workforce who can help contribute towards boosting world development - economically, educationally and humanely (eg: Day, 1999; Day and Sachs, 2004; Field, 2003; Jarvis, 2004, 2006a). In this case, Malaysia is not exceptional in its effort to promote lifelong learning to its citizen. In particular, Malaysian Government’s commitment to accelerate lifelong learning as a means to cope with globalisation and modernisation is evident in its 5-year development plans. The strategies outlined in these plans are within the goals and aspirations of National Mission Policy (or Vision 2020, see EPU, 2006). These strategies have led to great implication on teachers and their professionalism, which in turn result in action plans as identified in the Education Development Master Plan (EDMP) 2006-2010.

Relating to teachers, the notion that equates teachers as ‘lifelong learners’ was found implicitly in much overseas literature. Exemplifying this, Nicholls (2000) argues that due to the nature of current teachers work which constantly faces changes and demands from external forces, teachers are placed with demand to continue enhancing their knowledge and skills parallel with the drastic and dynamic changes in education (ILO, 2000). However, it is argued that ascribing ‘true’ lifelong learners for teachers is problematic, as Doring (2002) puts it- a ‘rhetoric’. The notion has fueled further debate witnessing growing awareness of teachers’ professionalism within the LLL agenda. This has led to more issues pertaining to their continuing professional development (eg: Hargreaves, 2005) and gradually on their professional identity (McNess et al, 2003; Osborn, 2006).

However, despite a rich body of literature on teacher-development and teacher-identity, there is little or no explicit evidence in discussing teachers as being a learner in terms of the value they placed on learning. In general, this circumstance provides a vacuum between teacher-learning and teacher-identity discourses of which I argue can be bridged together to allow for conceptualisation of teacher-learner-identity. My argument is that to enable the articulation of teacher-learner-identity conception, there is a need to understand teachers’ value on learning based on the following stance:- in order to produce a generation of citizen who value learning from as early as primary school age, of whom require the skills of learning over a lifelong process, there is a need for a qualified teaching workforce who knows or understand the value of (lifelong) learning themselves.

Referring to Malaysian context, teachers’ participation in professional development programmes are increasing as a result of government’s supports in CPD provisions and restructuring inspired by the National Mission. The increased participation reflects
teachers’ positive response towards the policy call for learning. However, it appears that little attention has been focusing on exploring teachers’ quality as learners. By quality that resides in a learner, I specifically address his/her learning value while undertaking learning. With regards to the relationship between learning value and learner-identity which is the subject of the study, research done enthusiastically on teachers’ professional identity only tend to define teacher-learner-identity in the limited scope of teaching practices, namely on the subject-based knowledge. In other words, their identity is never described beyond the classroom practices (eg: in Beijaard, 1995; Beijaard et al, 2000, Beijaard et al, 2004; Sachs, 2001). The scarcity of effort to define learning value for teachers or to emphasize on how teachers see learning as part of their professional identity in Malaysian context compels me to assess the value they attached to the meaning of becoming learners again while undertaking professional development programme.

To strengthen this need, I draw upon Chapman et al. (2003), who write that teachers need not to be “sceptical” in becoming lifelong learner, and need to have a set of skills and positive value in learning. This echoes the observation by Van der Berg (2002) with regards to teachers’ decision to learn. He comments that if there are various interpretations in how teachers see the meaning of their educational practices (by the educational practice, here, I view it as ‘undertaking learning’), conflict may arise as a result of there being no dominant interpretation: “clear values, objectives, and preferences are more or less absent” (p599). Thus, this article seeks to explore the value teachers attached or attribute to their learning. In so doing, questions on whether learning value is measureable comprise the succeeding sections.

**Development of the Learning Value scale**

In spite of a huge body of research on teachers and learning, it was surprising to find that literally, there was no research done on teachers learning value per se. Nevertheless, in general, there are a large number of studies, where values can be interpreted or understood to have embedded in them, as in learning attitudes, perceptions, style, effectiveness, capacities, reasons for participations or barriers to learning. The common subject involving teachers is on their teaching practices rather than their learning, let alone studies on their learning value. Noting the gap, I therefore expanded my search to consider teachers as workers in an organization. This has brought me to studies on teachers’ work value. Even though not focusing on teachers, they nevertheless contain similar areas that are of my interest- values in workers (Super, 1995; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975).

Encouragingly, I also found one study investigating work value of practicing teachers undertaking a course as part of their professional development program at one public university in Malaysia (Zakaria and Abdul Rahman, 1997). This study features the closest to the one I am searching. It also employed the same scale by Super and Neville (ibid). However, their study focuses on the relationship of work value with demographic factors
Defining value
The definition of ‘value’ has been the subject of a number of debates concerning the multiplicity of meanings and perceptions. It has been variously defined as things which are considered ‘good’ in themselves, for instance - beauty, truth, love, honesty and loyalty (Halstead, 1996: 5). An earlier definition was given by Raths et al (1966: 28, in Halstead, ibid) who suggest values are ‘beliefs, attitudes or feelings that an individual is proud of, is willing to publicly affirm, has [sic] been chosen thoughtfully from alternatives without persuasion, and is [sic] acted on repeatedly’. Alternative definitions are also given by Fraenkel (1977: 11, in Halstead, ibid) and Shaver and Strong (1976:15, in Halstead, ibid) who consider value as emotional commitment, ideas, standards or principles for judging ‘worth’. From these definitions, the gist of understanding value for me resides in a set of criteria which form beliefs, attitudes, intention and behavior, that an individual possesses, and which is then used to judge his/her agreement on what he observes, feels, experience or does, based on his/her own principles, ideas or standards. These principles, ideas or standards, in turn, are the said ‘value’ that s/he possesses. This definition sounds somewhat polyvalent, suggesting in turn that it is likely to be difficult to find one absolute definition to explain the meaning of value that is agreeable universally. Drawing upon these definitions, Learning Value in my scale encompasses the beliefs or attitudes towards the importance of learning to these teachers, mirrored in their degree of agreement on the reasons, intentions or motivations as well as expectations and impacts of learning. In other words, as an exploratory study, it considers the meaning of value in a broad sense of learning encompassing the motivation, benefits, expectations or impacts to a learner as to provide richness to the studied phenomenon.

Adapting Work Value Dimensions to Measure Learning Value
The 1986 version of Super and Neville (Super, 1995) work value scale suggests 12 dimensions of values in workers. It is worthy to note that due to commercial reasons, the original manuscript for this scale was unavailable. This has meant that a complete set of items were not able to be adapted, aside from only on the dimensions. Hence, the value statements (items) were built by taking into account the context of Malaysian teachers’ learning. In order to ensure a solid foundation of learning value principles, prior to the scale development, I conducted exploratory interviews with teachers at my institution, exploring their view in learning. A semi-structured format was used and guided by a predetermined set of questions. Among the questions I asked were: Why did you undertake this course? How does this course benefit you? How important is it? What motivates you? What do you expect to gain from your learning? How do you view the impacts of your learning? From the information gathered, thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998) was carried out which revealed three major themes namely: ‘value’, ‘capacity’ and ‘influencing factors’. Under the ‘value’ theme, several more subthemes were analysed which then led to the foundation of dimensions of learning value. These subthemes of
values were then mapped onto the dimensions proposed by Super and Neville (Zytowski, 1994, 2006). The findings suggest that learning values and work values operate along similar orientation. In light of this, it has suggested the appropriateness of building my learning value scale through modification and adaptation from the existing work value proposed dimensions. The final scale consists of nine dimension of value: Professional Advancement, Religious, Altruistic-Professional Responsibility, Aesthetics, Prestige, Economic Rewards, Achievement, Ability Utilisation and Social Relationships. After the scale was constructed, it underwent a few series of refining (preliminary surveys) with a total of five different groups of teacher-learners.

The data gathered from these preliminary surveys were subjected to reliability analysis immediately after each series. Prior to pilot stage, the scale was translated from English to my native language, Malay, and back translated again to English. This stage involved three judges who were English lecturer and native speaker of Malay Language. The translation to Malay was done to avoid any misconception which might arise due to inconsistencies between English and Malay terms. This was crucial in order to achieve internal validity among respondents whose native language is Malay. The translated version of the questionnaire, consisting of 21 items, was then piloted to another group of twenty four teachers undertaking an in-service course at my working institution. A reliability analysis was performed which produced a Cronbach’s Alpha value of 0.935, revealing three items with low correlation. After refining, the final version consisted of 18 items with reliability coefficient, Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.835.

Methodology

The research conceptual framework

A number of variables/constructs identified from the literature and exploratory interviews are treated as the main constructs in the whole study. Their relationships form a conceptual framework as depicted in Figure 1 below. This initial framework shows the mapping of the whole concepts involved in the study, which acts as a springboard from which further modification on research questions, was done as the study progressed and findings emerged.
The methods of data collection and analysis
The actual study was designed using a mixed-methods approach with data collected (using questionnaire and interviews) and analysed using both quantitative and qualitative methods. To answer research question 1 which is the aim of this paper, the quantitative analysis and findings on Learning Value Scale (LVS) is presented. The following example (as in Table 1) demonstrates how the learning value was measured:

Table 1: Example of items used in the Learning Value Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe that by undertaking further learning,</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am able to get a job promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel myself closer to God</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collection
The main data was collected at two public universities and two IPGs of which offered programs for teachers’ professional development. Using convenience and purposive sampling, a total of 599 sets of completed questionnaires were obtained. The selected sample included teachers undertaking three types of formal long-term in-service courses ranging from twelve weeks to two years. These are: undergraduate (UG) and the postgraduate (PG) learning programs leading to the award of a higher academic qualification, and generic professional (Generic) learning programs which were non-award bearing. To enable a comparison, a control group comprising teachers who were not undertaking any formal long-term in-service courses during the fieldwork period was also included. Hence altogether, there were four groups of teacher-learners.

Data analysis
The following analysis is based on dataset of 599 respondents. The aim of the statistical analysis is to provide an early picture of the structural dimensions of learning value that Malaysian teachers placed on learning. Thus, the first step is to identify the key pattern of the data which was carried out using Principal Component Analysis (PCA).

Results
Principal Component Analysis (PCA)
Principal Component Analysis is a data reduction technique for exploring the underlying structure of a set of correlated variables. PCA transforms the original correlated 18 items to 18 uncorrelated components. Since the main aim of PCA is data reduction to aid interpretation, care was taken that whilst extracting considerably fewer than 18 components, much of the information contained in the original set of items would still be preserved.

The scree plot and eigenvalue criteria suggested a four or five factor solutions for this dataset. Part of the aim was to see whether the predicted dimensions emerged in nine meaningful components by which the scale was initially proposed. Thus, the first attempt started with nine-component solution, which was then found less meaningful in the conceptual structure of the learning value dimension. The interpretation on these nine components reveals some inconsistencies with the proposed dimensions. It thus signalled the need for reinterpretation through series of relabeling and renamings the emerged components. After a series of further attempt using Varimax rotation, a four-component solution is found to be the most meaningful structure. Table I shows rotated loadings for the first four components.
Table 1: Rotated loadings for the first four principal components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe that by undertaking further learning,</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get a job promotion</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel myself closer to God</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to help those with problems</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to mingle in a group of scholars</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make myself seen as an important person</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get an advancement in my career</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can have a better salary</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can be a role model to others</td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel my life becomes more meaningful</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be acknowledged for my updated knowledge or skills</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do the things that I am really expert in</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to have the latest information in my field</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will be an expert in my field or in my subject of interest</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can feel the sense of belonging or accepted by the community</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can foster a good relationship with colleagues through work</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will gain credit for my updated knowledge or skills</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can prove my potential to accomplish tasks excellently</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can develop more ideas of what I can do in my job or life</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loadings in bold (above 0.4) mark the selected high loadings for interpretation. Loadings less than 0.1 were suppressed.

Component 1: Achievement. The eight highest loading items on the first component range from 0.445 to 0.818. This component features multiple perspectives of achievement; it embodies aspects of cognitive (or intellectuality) and affective (or emotional/feeling) contentment that embody Sense of Achievement, Ability Utilisation and Altruistic-Professional Responsibility. This dimension accounted for the largest proportion of the scale variance (36.9%).

Component 2: Humanitarian Concern. The second component contributed 10.1% of the total variance. It clusters together five items, with loadings ranging from 0.499 to 0.814, that relate to Religious and Social Relationships. All the elements in these items stem from spiritual and humanitarian concern. Three items, which involve ‘sense of belongings”, “foster good relationship with colleagues through teamwork”, “able to help those with problems” and “able to mingle in a group of scholars” reflect an underlying
value about altruism and social relationships. Another item “feel closer to God” indicates that spirituality also falls under humanitarian conception.

Component 3: Status. The third component clusters two items with loadings of 0.672 and 0.854. Both items imply the dependency on others’ evaluation to get the desired recognition or credit. The variance explained by this component is 7.08%.

Component 4: Economic-driven career security. The final component consists of three items of which two of them load very high (above 0.8) while the last item loads with a much smaller loading of 0.448. Referring to the high loaded items, one of them (‘job promotion’) is professionally based while the other (‘better salary’) is economically based. Notably, the latter (I can have a better salary) was a measure of the economic reward dimension. While, the third item, ‘career advancement’, relates to the professional advancement dimension like the item of ‘job promotion’. The merging of economically-based elements with the professional development elements indicates that career advancement is valued as the security aspect which is embedded in monetary benefit. This component accounted for 6.0% of the total variance.

Examining individual item responses using the percentage distribution
To get some insights on how each group differ from each other, comparison on the responses distributions was carried out on each individual items. From the results, distinctive differences were detected only in the salary and job promotion items. Obviously, the difference is distinctive between UG and Generic teacher-groups (see Table 2). Nearly all UG teachers (99.8%) agree that learning will lead to a better salary while less than half of Generic teacher-group (33.3%) agrees on this. Similarly, a large proportion of UG (76.0%) teachers and only a small proportion of Generic teachers (12.5%) agree that learning has an impact on their being able to be promoted in job.
Table 2: Distribution of responses (%) on Economically-driven career security value items across groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Economically-driven career security value</th>
<th>Agree (A+SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get a job promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get an advancement in my career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to have a better salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA
From the percentage distribution above, though difference were not very distinctive across groups (except for UG and Generic in two items above), it nevertheless motivated me to do further comparisons on the group differences. For this purpose, summary of learning value index (the unrotated first principal component) which had been derived from PCA was taken as the dependant variable to test for group differences using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The result has suggested that there was a significant difference in learning value between the UG and the control group (B = 0.258, t= 2.207, p= 0.028). Post hoc test revealed that there was no significant difference between any pair of learning groups themselves. This result led to a conclusion that the type of courses teachers enrolled in does not affect their learning value.

Further ANOVA was performed on each dimension derived from four-component solution. The result shows that there is a significant difference in the mean score on the economic rewards between the postgraduate and the control group (B= -0.202, t=-1.969,
between the undergraduate and the control group (B= 0.540, t=5.134, p=0.000) and between the generic and the control group (B= -0.757, t=6.527, p=0.000). This finding suggests that teachers enrolling in undergraduate course placed higher value on economic impacts while teachers enrolled in a postgraduate course or generic training were less likely than undergraduates or non-participating teachers to value economic rewards.

Discussion
The result of these analyses provide us with some preliminary ideas of the extent to which Malaysian teachers who undertook professional development programmes value learning. Since the analysis is still ongoing, the results will be discussed by placing on hold efforts to develop a more holistic analysis which will come from triangulation with qualitative data.

Results from PCA suggest that learning value for Malaysian teachers is conceptually meaningful in four dimensions. The observation proposed that there are inconsistencies between what were predicted (nine proposed dimensions) and what were practiced (four emerged dimensions) by teachers in how they value learning. The following summarises the results from the subsequent analysis done based on the four dimensions:

1. Sense of Achievement Value:
   - No significant group differences found using ANOVA.
   - Distinctive lower agreement in response pattern observed in the Generic group on the item ‘[enables me] to be acknowledge for my updated knowledge’ item compared to other groups.

2. Humanitarian-Social Relationship Value:
   - No significant group differences found using ANOVA
   - No differences between groups are found in responses on the individual items.

3. Status Value:
   - No significant group difference found using ANOVA
   - No distinctive difference in individual items’ responses across the groups

4. Economic Value and Professional Advancement value:
   - Significant difference between each learning group with non-learning group found using ANOVA
   - Distinctive difference found between UG with other groups on the responses of each individual items.
From the above summary, we can propose or interpret the following initial findings:

1. Malaysian teachers, especially those without a university degree (as shown by UG teacher-group), value job promotion for its *economic* benefits. This shows that the value that drives the undertaking of professional learning for these teachers is primarily monetary-based.

2. As opposed to the above finding, the dimensions of predicted *aesthetic* and *altruism* could not be identified which propose that Malaysian teachers do not perceive these value as explicitly important.

In light of these findings, it opens up rooms to investigate the factors behind this scenario. With regards to instrumental learning as shown by UG teachers, it signals a need to follow up with this group using triangulation with the qualitative data. In light of this, I draw upon Silverman (2000) who writes that *interpretation is part and parcel of transcribing*. Although he actually refers to qualitative data, it very much reflects on what I needed to do to allow me to move further in the analysis as to provide answers to my query. This sets a framework within which revision on analysis technique or research questions can be done to improve the research process. In light of this, my next step is to illuminate what factors shaping the learning value particularly for the UG teacher-group.

One potential explanation could be derived from the following circumstance. The UG programme is a special programme for non-graduate teachers to upgrade their academic qualification. Upon completion, they will be conferred with Graduate Education Service Officer (GESO) Scheme by which they would move from the Support Group to Management Group and Professional, which in turn made them eligible for the benefits of the management and professional group. This new scheme will affect their current salary by double increment. This upgrading is considered as a job promotion in Malaysian teaching service. In contrast, for existing graduate teachers who underwent postgraduate programmes (i.e. the PG teacher-group), a salary increment did not mean as much as for non-graduate teachers, for they were already in the GESO Scheme. As for the Generic teacher-group, the programmes they undertook were not a means for salary increment as it was offered as a pedagogical skill enhancement without leading to any higher award in academic. In other words, these courses carry no job promotion opportunity.

Hence, from this circumstance, it appears that the economic value of learning seems to be more appreciated by the non-graduate teachers rather than the value of altruism or aesthetic. In other words, the monetary-laden or the extrinsic value seemingly overshadowed the intrinsic value of learning. However, as the interpretation was only derived from the statistical data, further analysis through triangulation with interview data...
will be carried out to illuminate these statistical findings. This will be performed when factors influencing their learning value is analysed for Research Question 3. In a crude perspective, we could initially say that the course undertaken was not the factor that shapes their learning value. Rather the course was only a vehicle to enable us to explore the conditions within which teachers learning was situated, that in turn, made teachers behave or value learning in a particular way. Presumably, the way the course was structured (in terms of the incentives, benefits and so forth) was subjected to the governmental policy and national context. Thus, the statistical findings offer some insights on the need to look at the potential influences from external factors that might shape the teachers’ value for learning.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to explore the dimensions of value that Malaysian teachers placed on their learning through a personally developed scale. Though the findings reported in this paper have only involved the statistical analyses, its aim to give insights on the differences in the value held by different groups of teachers engaged in professional development activities was considered achieved. In addition, with regards to the purposes of building the scale which is two-fold - to identify the structural component of learning value and to test the utility of the scale in measuring Malaysian teachers’ Learning Value - the findings were illuminative of the meaningful structural components that Malaysian teachers value, thus can be utilized to measure the learning value of Malaysian teachers.

The most distinctive finding that can be drawn upon is that the UG teacher-groups comprising non-graduate teachers placed their learning more on instrumental orientation. The result gives rise to a question of whether instrumental learning should be seen wrong compared to learning for the sake of learning which is not transparent in the analysis. Within the perspective of lifelong learning, as knowledge-based economy or employability underpins its aspiration, embracing instrumental learning can be understood as aligning with lifelong learning goal. However, there raises a question to this phenomenon: are teachers still willing to invest their time or energy, when extrinsic rewards for their learning are not available in future? Of equal important, is to emphasise on a more holistic goal of lifelong learning i.e. to nurture social cohesiveness among society members and to produce active citizenship who place more concern on humanistic aspects of living rather than just instrumental.

In light of this, the next step is to illuminate and identify the factors that shape their instrumental learning using interview data. The findings have suggested that their portrayed learning value is still arguable and that it needs further reconsideration within the context of their learning situation or condition. In other words, these statistical findings have served as a springboard onto considering a suitable method of analysis using qualitative approach.
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