

THE POLICY BRIEF NO. 7

Educational Policy in Malaysia

Implementation Challenges and Policy Proposals



Photos: Ministry of Education, Malaysia

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

Background

Many countries are seeking to improve their education systems to compete more effectively in what is increasingly a knowledge-based economy. Globalisation means that governments are well aware of how other economies and education systems are progressing. Governments may wish to emulate what appears to have succeeded in other countries despite the well-established view that the effectiveness of such 'policy-borrowing' is limited by contextual and cultural differences. The Malaysia Education Blueprint (Ministry of Education, 2013) provides an Asian example of an ambitious reform plan.

The Malaysia Education Blueprint (MEB) 2013-2025 is the country's main contemporary education policy reform document. It sets out an ambitious target to transform the education system so that Malaysia ranks among the top third of countries in international indices, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) by 2025, from its 2012 positions in the bottom quartile.

The effective implementation of policy intentions is critical if such bold aspirations are to be achieved. However, there is evidence in Malaysia (Bush et al 2018), and in Thailand (Hallinger and Lee 2014) that reform initiatives may falter because school-level implementation is flawed.

This policy brief relates to our study on the implementation of educational policy reform in Malaysia.

Policy Formation in Malaysia

There are three main features of educational policy reform in Malaysia. First, there is evidence of the impact of globalisation, manifested through policy borrowing. This is illustrated by the strong focus on international comparisons in the Blueprint, and by the aspiration to improve Malaysia's position in global league tables, such as PISA and TIMSS. Second, while

top-down processes are still dominant in this centralised country, there is increasing recognition that consultation with legitimate stakeholders is essential if reform is to be fully understood and accepted. However, there is only limited evidence about the impact of such consultation on the nature of policy reform. Third, there is emerging recognition that a 'one-size-fits-all' policy orientation is ill-suited to such a diverse country, and that a more customised approach may be necessary to achieve reform objectives.

Initiation of Educational Policies

Education in Malaysia is managed at four distinct levels; federal, state, district and school (UNESCO 2011):

Federal

Ministry of Education (MOE)

- Takes overall responsibility for developing policies and regulations, with the leadership of the Director-General of Education

State

State Education Departments (SED)

- Coordinate and monitor the implementation of national education programmes, projects and activities
- Provide feedback to the MOE on overall planning

District

District Education Offices (DEO)

- Provide links between schools and SEDs by coordinating and monitoring the implementation of programmes, projects and activities at grass-roots level.

School

Primary and Secondary Schools

- Principals and head teachers are responsible for providing professional and administrative leadership

Figure 1: The four levels of education management in Malaysia

Linking Policy Development to Planned Implementation

The authors conducted interviews with 49 key informants at the federal level, and with state, district and school level participants from six states and territories. Participants at all levels are aware of the complexity of implementing educational policy reform and the potential for an 'implementation gap' (Becher 1989: 54) between policy intentions and implementation in schools and classrooms; one participant from Sabah described the issue as

‘extremely significant’. The three “broad approaches” to policy implementation identified by Becher (1989) are all evident in Malaysia. First, there remains a strong emphasis on ‘top-down’ processes in this centralised system, described as ‘cascading’ by participants in contexts as diverse as Kelantan, Kuala Lumpur (KL) and Sabah. This leads to information being ‘diluted’ or being understood differently from that intended by policy-makers. Second, there is much less emphasis on Becher’s ‘bargaining model’, although the direct involvement of School Improvement Partners (SIPs) and School Improvement Specialist Coaches (SISCs) in schools appears to have led to some of the targets in the Blueprint being negotiated and modified. Third, Becher’s ‘persuasion’ model may be seen through the extensive consultation processes adopted in the development of the Blueprint. This appears to have been largely successful, as there is evidence of widespread support for the principles of reform.

School Improvement Partners (SIPs)

provide targeted support for lower-performing schools, through principal and teacher coaches, and increased monitoring from the District Education Offices.

School Improvement Specialist Coaches (SISCs)

are responsible for taking new curricula and assessments to the classroom, coaching teachers on pedagogical skills, and monitoring the effectiveness of implementation.

Policy Implementation and Dissemination

Given the Blueprint’s emphasis on raising standards, for example in relation to PISA and TIMSS, Malaysia requires successful policies that produce demonstrable improvements in student outcomes (Honig 2006). This means that effective policy implementation and dissemination are essential if the ambitious aspirations articulated in the Blueprint are to be achieved.

Several key points emerge from the data:

1. Weak feedback loops: Top-down expectations are reflected in the comments such as “disseminating mandates” (Johor) and “not questioning top officials” (Selangor). These perspectives suggest weak ‘feedback loops’ to

advise policy-makers about the practical implications of policy reform.

2. Inaccurate information: There is evidence of the limitations of the cascading process with information being ‘lost’ between administrative levels (Kelantan), and a lack of consistent messaging (KL). This may underpin teachers’ feelings of helplessness and lack of trust in policy-makers, as shown in the Sabah data.

3. Unrealistic policies: Some participants, for example those in Johor, mention the ‘disconnect’ from reality in respect of infrastructure limitations and teacher attitudes.

These issues need to be addressed if policies are to be ‘successful’ (Honig 2006) in the ways outlined in the Blueprint, notably in raising student outcomes to the top third in international league tables.



Image 1: Five system aspirations for the Malaysian Education System (Malaysian Education Blueprint)

Understanding of Policy Initiatives by School Leaders, Teachers and Other Stakeholders

Aida Suraya’s (2001) view that policy reforms ‘falter at lower levels’ is supported by the current data. This appears to be due to a weak understanding of policy initiatives by principals, teachers and other stakeholders, including state and district officials. This is illustrated most starkly by the Sabah official’s admission of limited awareness of the content of the Blueprint. This is also evident amongst school leaders and teachers, as found in Bush and Ng’s (forthcoming) study of school leadership and the MEB. National officials advocate a ‘mixed economy’ of cascading, showcasing, teacher development, and district support, notably through SIP+ and SISC+. Cascading is criticised by KL principals, for example, who say that this leads to teachers being informed ‘indirectly’, an example of policy ‘filtering’.

A more profound problem may be teacher attitudes to policy reform, described as ‘apathy attitudes’ (KL), being ‘resistant’ (Selangor), or being ‘too comfortable in their comfort zone’ (Sabah). While this may be partly due to weak professionalism, there is also an issue of the extent and nature of professional trust (Jahnukainen et al 2015: 162). Bringing about attitudinal change is an even bigger challenge than enhancing stakeholder understanding.

“ A more profound problem may be **teacher attitudes to policy reform**, described as ‘apathy attitudes’ (KL), being ‘resistant’ (Selangor), or being ‘too comfortable in their comfort zone’ (Sabah). ”

Factors Facilitating Effective implementation of Policy Reforms

The Malaysian MoE established the Education Performance and Delivery Unit (PADU) in 2013. PADU’s work is commended by national officials and some participants at state level. However, ‘delivery’ is a concept closely linked to top-down processes and seems less well-suited to the ‘contextualised’ implementation supported by participants at all four levels. The SIP+ and SISC+ appointments seem more appropriate for a contextualised model.

The primary role of the **Education Performance and Delivery Unit** is to facilitate, support, and deliver the Ministry’s vision in transforming Malaysia’s education system through the Malaysia Education Blueprint for 2013-2025.

The unit sets to effectively deliver strategies, oversee implementations, manage interdependencies, and introduce new approaches to propel Malaysia’s education system to become globally competitive.

Factors Hindering Effective implementation of Policy Reforms

Several Malaysian researchers identify the hierarchy of education management as a major factor inhibiting effective policy implementation. The MoE at federal level is perceived to be controlling, following a top-

down highly centralised approach (Musa 2003), with the State Education Department and district education offices helping to administer it (Ibrahim et al., 2015). Centralised policy-making poses challenges for teachers, who perceive the teaching policies from the top management to be unrealistic (Ibrahim et al., 2015).

The research participants identified several barriers to the effective adoption of policy reform:

1. Participants at all levels expressed concern about **teacher and leader attitudes towards change**. Education is a complex public service to lead and manage because implementation takes place in thousands of schools serving very different communities. The Ministry needs to consider how to respond to ‘inappropriate attitudes’, beyond expressing its disappointment.
2. Teachers perceive **teaching policies as unrealistic** (Ibrahim et al., 2015). Policy-makers need to consider whether its consultation processes, for example during the Blueprint development, constituted ‘seeking consent’ or whether this was just ‘window dressing’.
3. Concern was expressed by the research participants about the **centralised and ‘mandated’ nature of policy reform** and the need to contextualise implementation. While district-level initiatives, such as the appointment of SIP+ and SISC+, help to address this issue, it seems that this is insufficient to satisfy the concern that change is imposed rather than being ‘owned’ by schools and teachers.
4. There is perception of **limited resources**; infrastructure problems, lack of equipment, and cascaded teacher training, which all serve to limit effective implementation.



Figure 2: Factors affecting effective implementation of policy reforms

Professional and Stakeholder Involvement in Policy Formation and Implementation

Given that implementation of policy reform largely takes place in schools and classrooms, stakeholder involvement, especially from teachers, is likely to enhance the prospect of successful policy adoption. Professional ‘ownership’ of the reform agenda is a pre-requisite for effective implementation, even in centralised education systems, as the discussion above indicates. This is widely acknowledged by the participants. However, as noted in KL, professional involvement in the Blueprint consultations largely involved principals and district officers, rather than classroom teachers. The involvement of lay stakeholders appears to be mainly about resource provision rather than direct engagement with policy-making.

“

Professional ‘ownership’ of the reform agenda is a pre-requisite for effective implementation, even in centralised education systems.

”

Vision and Major Reforms

Major policy reforms require a clear and widely supported vision if they are to capture stakeholder imagination and to have a good prospect of successful adoption. The concept of vision is defined by its long-term orientation (2013-2025) and through its aspirations to improve access, quality, unity, equity and efficiency. This ‘vision’, especially for enhanced

quality, was reinforced by the national officials but a mixed picture emerged from the participants in the six states. Selangor officers and principals agreed that the Blueprint is visionary and ‘forward thinking’, a view shared by participants in KL. However, one Kelantan principal argued that there is ‘no clear vision’ and criticises the MEB as being ‘difficult to read’. Similarly, one Johor district official claimed that the MEB is too complex and that ‘school leaders do not have the time to read it’. Participants in Sabah focused on what they regarded as the ‘obstacles’ to achieving the vision, notably inadequate resources. A related issue is the question of ‘whose vision’? Despite the extensive consultation, including numerous road shows, it appears that the vision was set by national politicians and officials, and passed down to other levels.

Monitoring Policy Reforms

Measuring performance is regarded as a means to assess policy effectiveness. It is clear that PADU has a major role in monitoring the implementation of policy reform, and many participants welcome the clarity of the processes it introduced. However, it is clearly an example of new public management (NPM) (DeGroff and Cargo 2009), with its focus on measuring performance using standardised instruments, rather than focusing on the processes. Given the aspiration for a ‘step-change’ in student outcomes, a strong focus on outputs seems to be inevitable to achieve much higher places for Malaysia in PISA and TIMSS.

Requirements for Effective Adoption of Policy Reforms

The Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025) envisages the empowerment of the State Education

Department and district education offices (MoE, 2013; Ibrahim et al. 2015) as a partial response to the critique of top-down decision-making. They have both gained more autonomy in making key operational decisions in budgeting and personnel matters but these changes may be regarded as ‘deconcentration’ of central power rather than decentralisation and genuine empowerment.

Three main points emerge from the data on policy adoption:

1. The intention to **decentralise the implementation of policy is welcomed** at all levels because of widespread recognition that diverse school and community contexts require customised, rather than standardised, responses. The roles of SIP+ and SISC+ in decentralising adoption appear to be particularly valuable.
2. **Limited resources**, including weak infrastructure in some contexts and mixed teacher quality and commitment, are seen as impediments to effective adoption.
3. The need for **teacher professional learning** was stressed by some participants. The challenge here is how to promote teacher professionalism with a prescriptive curriculum, policed through PADU and other delivery monitoring mechanisms.

Policy on English Language Education

A review of English language policy since the end of the colonial period in 1957 shows three main developments. First, English changed from the medium of instruction to just one subject within the curriculum. Bahasa Malaysia, the national language, replaced English as the medium of instruction, although Chinese-medium and Tamil-medium primary schools have retained English as the medium of instruction (Lee 2004). Second, globalisation led to greater recognition of the importance of English (Phan et al 2013). Third, there have been several policy changes about the teaching of Science and Mathematics in English, leading to criticisms of policy inconsistency.

English language policy provides a significant test for policy-makers at all levels. There is a tension between supporting the national language, Bahasa Malaysia, and acknowledging the global significance of English. The state participants attribute policy shifts to ‘politics’ (Johor) or regard the termination of English for Teaching Mathematics and Science (ETEMS) as a ‘setback’ (Sarawak).

All participants at national and state levels critique the cancellation of ETEMS and the introduction of the Dual Language Programme (DLP). Significantly, the participants from the two states in East Malaysia, Sabah and Sarawak, are more receptive towards the Ministry’s English language initiatives than those in peninsular Malaysia. Although DLP has replaced ETEMS, the implementation challenges remain, notably in respect of the monitoring process and the problem of inadequately prepared teachers.

Policy on Instructional Leadership

The Blueprint gives considerable prominence to instructional leadership, arguing that ‘an outstanding principal is one focused on instructional and not administrative leadership [and that] effective school leaders can raise student outcomes by as much as 20%’ (E-27). However, the limited evidence cited in the Blueprint derives from international literature and this ‘policy borrowing’ raises questions about the suitability of imported findings to underpin reform in a different cultural context (Bush et al 2018).

The normative shift from administration to instruction is an ambitious strategy that has to overturn decades of leaders being regarded primarily as administrators, as civil servants within the formal hierarchy, with vertical accountability. Hallinger and Lee (2014) show that a similar initiative in neighbouring Thailand largely failed. Bush et al’s (2018) systematic review of the English and Bahasa literature shows partial adoption of this model, mainly focused on control aspects such as monitoring, rather than empowerment dimensions such as modelling and mentoring.

The research data indicate three main points about instructional leadership. First, there is significant support for the construct but with some caveats, notably the need to balance administrative and instructional roles. Second, there are mixed views about the requirement for heads and principals to teach at least five periods a week, because it arguably reduces the time available for them to carry out instructional leadership activities. Third, there is disagreement about whether NPQEL has enhanced instructional leadership, with some state and district participants claiming that this has not led to enhanced instructional leadership practice.

Overview of the Data

Three main over-arching points emerged from the data:

- Relationships between actors at different levels
- The influence of hierarchy
- Fixed or flexible policy implementation

Relationships between Actors at Different Levels

Malaysia has a complex and distributed educational system with many levels and policy is 'filtered' down through these levels with the potential for misunderstanding and differential interpretation by the participants at each stage. The data show two problems arising from this complexity. First, the messages received by professionals may be different from those intended by senior policy-makers because of the cascading approach. Many participants attested that school-level understanding of policy often did not match national expectations. One reason for this is that most practitioners have not read the Blueprint and thus rely on perceptions of policy from more senior colleagues in states and districts, leading to inconsistent messaging. Second, weak understanding led to variability in implementation and limited 'ownership' of policy initiatives.

The Influence of Hierarchy

There is a contrast between strongly hierarchical and centralised education systems, such as that in Malaysia, and more devolved systems, where more decisions are made at local or school level. The evidence from the international literature is that 'ownership' of interventions, and successful adoption, is more likely when local actors, including education professionals, are involved in policy formation and not simply implementing policy imposed by national politicians and senior officials.

The data suggest emerging recognition of the limitations of implementing policy solely through the formal hierarchy. The national policy-makers acknowledge that top-down policy-making and implementation have limited effect and that a more nuanced approach is required. Instead of relying mainly on circulars, the Ministry has re-balanced its staffing, with fewer people at the national headquarters in Putrajaya, and more located in states and districts. This was done to provide more support to principals and teachers, and to monitor the

implementation of key policies. It was also recognised that all staff, including head teachers, principals, and teachers, need to understand and 'own' new policies if they are to be implemented enthusiastically and successfully.

The regional data offered a more mixed picture of the influence of hierarchy. While the opportunity to localise policy adoption was welcomed, some participants, for example in Sarawak, still followed the hierarchy 'strictly'. It was evident also that participants were cautious about acting autonomously, because of 'fear' (Johor) of acting inappropriately, or because they were concerned about being 'wrong' (Sarawak).

Fixed or Flexible Policy Implementation

Top-down approaches to policy change tend to assume a 'one-size-fits-all' adoption model, with prescriptions about how policy should be implemented. Ministry circulars offer detailed instructions on how interventions should be introduced, leaving little or no scope for adaptation to local or school contexts. An alternative approach would be to explain the aims of new policies, with 'broad brush' guidance on implementation rather than tightly defined prescription. This would also lead to greater professional ownership of change, with the potential for more effective but less rigid implementation.

The participants offered some evidence of a less rigid approach to policy adoption. One important example of greater flexibility lies in the role of SIP+ and SISC+, professional district-level colleagues whose roles are to support principals and teachers, respectively. They also have the power to modify targets in response to local variables, an important example of flexible policy implementation. This flexibility was welcomed, for example in KL and Selangor, and perceived to be an effective approach to implementation approach. Principals and district officials can be more innovative and creative in finding solutions, making policy implementation less rigid and more relevant for the schools.

Acceptability and Feasibility

The success or failure of policy reform depends on two overlapping considerations, acceptability and feasibility. First, the extent to which stakeholders, professional and lay, accept and 'own' the new policy is critical to its successful implementation. The Blueprint development process involved extensive consultation but it is not clear if this process led to significant changes to the Blueprint or was just

designed to enhance awareness of it; ‘selling’ rather than meaningful consultation. The data show that, while the broad vision underpinning the Blueprint has wide support, school and classroom-level implementation was sometimes passive rather than enthusiastic.

The second consideration relates to the feasibility of the policy. This has both ‘big picture’ and local dimensions. While there is broad support for the Blueprint’s vision, as noted above, it is becoming clear that achieving a position in the top-third of PISA and TIMSS rankings is unlikely. Given the centrality of this commitment, the lack of feasibility may be regarded as a serious weakness as this provides much of the rationale for this far-reaching reform. An alternative interpretation is that this is a legitimate aspiration and that setting the ‘bar’ high is better than accepting the current modest position of Malaysia in the international league tables.

Another example of feasibility relates to the aspiration to achieve 100% access for pupils at all levels from pre-school to upper secondary by 2020. This is appropriate because access to education is a fundamental human right but it is clear from the research data that Malaysia does not have sufficient school places for this aspiration to be achieved in this time-scale, a point made by several participants in different parts of Malaysia. Failure to achieve such targets leads to disappointment and apathy, exacerbating rather than resolving the problems.

“
The success or failure of policy reform depends on two overlapping considerations, acceptability and feasibility.
”

SECTION 2: RECOMMENDATIONS

Hierarchy and Professionalism

Malaysia is one of many centralised countries to employ teachers as civil servants. As a consequence, teachers are part of the administrative hierarchy. This also explains, in part, why the role of principals and head teachers has been traditionally viewed as primarily administrative, implementing the Ministry’s policy imperatives. This emphasis on vertical accountability helps to tighten links between levels and means that there is little overt opposition to policy

initiatives. However, the research shows that implementation may be unenthusiastic and, hence, only partial. The normal expectation is that professionals exercise a great deal of discretion when working with their clients. Teachers have subject and pedagogical expertise but the evidence suggests that this has been subordinated to the expectations of the hierarchy. A priority for policy-makers is to consider how to promote professionalism by empowering teachers and leaders to interpret and adapt policy rather than simply implementing it. This is what distinguishes professionals from administrators.

Communication

Malaysia has traditionally adopted a top-down communication model, with policies and decisions being communicated to schools via states and districts, usually through Ministry of Education circulars. This ‘cascade’ model has several limitations. First, it is apparent from the research data that the messages received and understood by teachers can be different from those intended by senior policy-makers, a consequence of selective ‘filtering’ at state, district and school levels. Second, cascading is unsuited to major policy reforms, such as the Blueprint. It is evident from the data, and from previous research (Bush and Ng 2018), that many teachers have not read the document, leaving them to rely on interpretations from district officials and principals who may also have not read it carefully. National policy-makers recognise this challenge and have developed alternative communication methods such as road shows and use of social media but it is not yet clear if these approaches have been more successful in engaging school-level professionals.

Feedback Loop

Given the continuing prevalence of top-down communication, it would be valuable to build in effective feedback loops to enable practitioners to advise policy-makers of the operational aspects of policy reform. A clear example from the research findings is the aspiration to achieve 100% access for pupils at all levels from pre-school to upper secondary by 2020. This aim is widely supported but there are insufficient school places to make it a reality. Sound feedback loops might have enabled the Ministry to modify this policy and to link it to a school building programme. Similarly, lack of suitable hardware or, in some rural areas, lack of electricity, make some of the ICT policies unrealistic. Establishing policy forums in each district would enable school leaders and teachers to explain the implications of new policy initiatives but

this would also require re-culturing to give practitioners the confidence to critique policies rather than simply accepting them, followed by passive implementation.

Ownership

The literature reviewed for this research shows the importance of teachers and school leaders 'owning' policy initiatives, if they are to implement them enthusiastically and effectively. However, the research data indicate very limited ownership of the Blueprint and linked policy thrusts. It is disappointing, but perhaps not surprising, to record that the research participants reported that most professionals have not read the Blueprint and know very little about it, a finding also reported by Bush and Ng (forthcoming). The perception is that the reforms are 'owned' by the political and administrative elite and not by the professionals who have to implement them. It might be sensible for the Ministry to consider inverting the pyramid to allow policy initiatives to emanate from teachers and principals. One way to achieve this would be to survey professionals with open questions such as 'what do you recommend to improve the quality of teaching and learning in your school?' If this recommendation for a survey is accepted, it should be implemented by an independent body, such as a university, reporting to EPRD.

Policy Overload

A consistent complaint from the research participants was that there were too many policy changes, creating overloads for principals and teachers. The Blueprint, with its wide-ranging aspirations, has contributed to this perception. The Ministry of Education should prioritise initiatives to reduce overloading and to boost the prospect of effective implementation. The national-level interviews indicate that the Ministry is aware of this problem and has already begun to ration new initiatives.

Implementation or Interpretation

The term 'implementation' implies a linear approach where policy reform is accepted and adopted without question. This is consistent with New Public Management (Honig 2006), where the aims of reform are taken for granted and the focus is on 'delivery', epitomised in Malaysia by the creation of PADU. An alternative approach would be for ministers and senior officials to indicate the intended policy aims, for example to enhance student outcomes, but leave it to states, districts and schools to decide the most

appropriate ways of achieving these aims. This would increase 'ownership' and also enable adoption to be 'interpreted' and customised for specific school and community contexts. A linked approach would be to invite schools to participate in pilot schemes, which would be subject to independent evaluation. The role of SIP+ and SISC+ might be seen as a starting point for a customised approach but this proposal would extend this orientation. Another advantage of this stance would be that it would focus more on empowerment and less on monitoring; inspiration rather than control.

Conclusion

The Malaysia Education Blueprint is a very impressive document with aspirations to transform the education system. It has led to a raft of policies, linked to the Blueprint's eleven shifts, each designed to improve specific aspects of schooling. There is evidence of successful implementation in several respects, for example in improving access for students. However, many challenges and limitations have been identified in the present research, as discussed in this policy brief. The recommendations presented here are intended to offer a new approach to policy reform. We hope that they will stimulate debate about how to improve educational opportunities and quality. Malaysia's children and young people need and deserve the best possible education and our suggestions should be understood as contributions to this important aim.

AT A GLANCE

MALAYSIAN EDUCATION BLUEPRINT (2013 – 2025)

Goal:

Malaysia to appear in the top third of countries in international rankings by 2025

Features of reform:

- Globalisation
- Increasing consultation with stakeholders
- Recognition that customised approach is necessary



FROM POLICY INITIATION TO IMPLEMENTATION: ON-GROUND SENTIMENTS ON POLICY REFORMS

Positive:

- Education Performance and Delivery Unit introduces clear processes and helps facilitate, support and deliver the Ministry's vision in transforming Malaysia's education system through the Blueprint
- School Improvement Partners and School Improvement Specialist Coaches customise, contextualise and decentralise adoption of policies e.g. Modifying targets in response to local variables

Negative:

- Top-down, cascading approach leads to information being diluted and stakeholders having a weak understanding of policies
- MEB is difficult and complex to read
- Weak feedback loop
- Unrealistic policies
- Change is viewed as imposed rather than owned by stakeholders
- Teachers and leaders not embracing change; lack of trust in officials
- Perceived limited resources



RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Hierarchy and professionalism:** empower teachers and leaders to interpret and adapt policy rather than simply implementing it
- **Communication:** develop alternative communication methods to engage school-level professionals
- **Feedback loop:** build in effective feedback loops to enable practitioners to advise policy-makers of the operational aspects of policy reform
- **Ownership:** invert the pyramid to allow policy initiatives to emanate from teachers and principals
- **Policy overload:** prioritise initiatives to reduce overloading and to boost the prospect of effective implementation
- **Implementation and interpretation:** ministers and senior officials to indicate the intended policy aims but leave it to states, districts and schools to decide the most appropriate ways of achieving these aims; invite schools to participate in pilot schemes

References

- Aida Suraya, M. Y. (2001), *Education Reforms in Malaysia*, Paper presented at the International Conference on Educational Research: Understanding Educational Issues in the Asia Pacific Region. Seoul, Korea, 25–26 October, 2001. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.edu.gov/PDF/ED464406.pdf>
- Becher, T. (1989), 'The national curriculum and the implementation gap', in Preedy, M. (Ed.), *Approaches to Curriculum Management*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Bush, T. (2011), *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management: Fourth Edition*, London, Sage.
- Bush, T. and Ng, AYM (forthcoming), Distributed leadership and the Malaysia Education Blueprint: From prescription to partial school-based enactment in a highly centralised context, *Journal of Educational Administration*
- Bush, T., Ng, A., Abdul-Hamid, S. and Kaparou, M. (2018), School leadership theories and the Malaysia Education Blueprint: Findings from a systematic literature review, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 32 (7): 1245-1265.
- DeGross, A., Cargo, M. (2009), Policy implementation: Implications for evaluation, *New Directions for Evaluation*, doi:10.1002/ev.313, 47-60.
- Hallinger, P. and Lee, M. (2014), Mapping instructional leadership in Thailand: Has education reform impacted principal practice, *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 42 (1): -29.
- Honig, M.I. (2006), Complexity and policy implementation: Challenges and opportunities for the field, *New Directions in Education Policy Implementation* 1-23
- Ibrahim, M. S., Razak, A. Z. and Kenayathulla, H. B. (2015), *Strategi implementasi: Pelan pembangunan pendidikan Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Penerbit Universiti Malaya.
- Jahnukainen, M., Pesonen, H., Itkonen, T., Kontu, E., Kokko, T., Ojala, T. and Pirttimaa, R. (2015), The Implementation of New Special Education Legislation in Finland, *Educational Policy*, 29: 162-178
- Lee M.N. (2004), Malaysian teacher education into the new century. In: Cheng Y.C., Chow K.W., Mok M.M.C. (Eds), *Reform of Teacher Education in the Asia-Pacific in the New Millennium. Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues Concerns and Prospects*, Vol 3. Springer, Dordrecht
- Ministry of Education (2013), *Malaysia Education Blueprint*, Putrajaya, Ministry of Education.
- Musa, M. B. (2003), *An education system worthy of Malaysia*. Petaling Jaya: Strategic Information Research Development.
- Phan, L. H., Kho, J. and Chng, B. (2013), Nation building, English as an international language, medium of instruction, and language debate: Malaysia and possible ways forward, *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, 2 (2): 58-71.
- United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organisation (2011) *Secondary education regional information base: country profile – Malaysia*. Bangkok, UNESCO
- United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organisation (2014), *Educational Systems in ASEAN and Six Countries: A Comparative Analysis of Selected Educational Issues*, Bangkok, UNESCO.
- Wongwanich, S., Piromsombat, C., Khaikleng, P. and Sriklau, K. (2015), Policy Delivery Strategies for Education Reform: A Formative Research and Development, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 171: 1365-1372

About This Policy Brief

This policy brief was written by Professor Tony Bush, Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Nottingham, with Dr. Ashley Ng Yoon Mooi, Dr. Wei Keong Too, and Josephine Chay at the University of Nottingham Malaysia, Dr. Derek Glover at the University of Nottingham, UK, and Dr. Lei Mee Thien, at Universiti Sains Malaysia. This document has arisen from a research study on the implementation of educational policy reform in Malaysia led by Prof Tony Bush and funded by The HEAD Foundation.

The positions taken in this policy brief are not representative of the views of The HEAD Foundation but are those of the authors.



The
HEAD
Foundation

Human Capital & Education for Asian Development

20 Upper Circular Road
The Riverwalk #02-21
Singapore 058416

www.headfoundation.org

E: info@headfoundation.org

T: +65 6672 6160

Facebook: [TheHEADFoundation](https://www.facebook.com/TheHEADFoundation)

Twitter: [@HEAD_Foundation](https://twitter.com/HEAD_Foundation)

LinkedIn: [headfoundation](https://www.linkedin.com/company/headfoundation)