

The Contribution Of Antecedent Variables In Encouraging Teacher Creativity During The Covid-19 Pandemic

Irfan Irfan¹, Hasmin Tamsah², Hasbi Hasbi³

¹Graduate Program Students Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi AMKOP, Makassar, Indonesia.

²Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi AMKOP, Makassar, Indonesia.

³Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi AMKOP, Makassar, Indonesia.

Abstract

This paper departs from the phenomenon where there are still many teachers whose creativity is still quite low, especially in teaching and learning activities. On the other hand, creativity is one of the important aspects that teachers must do when carrying out teaching and learning activities in schools so that the learning process is more optimal. The problem of teacher creativity is interesting to study because the school has tried to encourage creativity in learning, including some principals who are increasingly intense in supervising teachers. On the other hand, several schools give awards to creative teachers, as well as various ways that have been done to improve teacher creativity. However, this creativity problem is not easy to solve. Therefore, this paper tries to raise the various determinants affecting teachers' creativity in schools. Based on the existing problems, the authors attempt to elaborate and analyze the contribution of trainer quality, training effectiveness, and teacher quality as antecedent variables in encouraging the improvement of teaching creativity.

Keywords: trainer quality, training effectiveness, teacher quality, teaching creativity.

INTRODUCTION

The development of education today requires teachers to be more creative and productive. Although it is undeniable, there are still many teachers who have not yet reached that stage. They, as a teacher, only carry out their duties by teaching. This is a problem experienced by most teachers in this country. Given the importance of education, the government and various parties continue to strive to improve the quality of education through various means. These efforts include education and training, workshops, increasing the education budget, improving teacher welfare, implementing school-based management, and issuing several laws and regulations in education. Through these efforts, it is hoped that the quality of education will increase.

In line with that, the issue of creativity is exciting to study, especially for educators (teachers), who are also an important element in the world of education. Teachers as human resources who are very crucial in achieving educational success in schools are, of course, required to not only carry out their obligations to teach but are also expected to be able to show their creativity in teaching as creativity refers to ordinary abilities. Such as paying attention, remembering, seeing, speaking, hearing, understanding language, and recognizing analogies. Boden argues that the depth of knowledge in a particular discipline that creative people have set them apart from others (Boden, 2004). This argument follows research (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999), which found that mastery of certain areas of knowledge is the

primary and most important trait of creative people so that good creativity will produce better work.

The problem of teacher creativity in teaching needs to be a concern in improving teacher quality and performance. Therefore, through a literature review that researchers did, where researchers tried to uncover various antecedent factors that could have an impact on increasing teacher creativity in teaching. The author attempts to elaborate and analyze trainer quality in influencing training effectiveness and how the role of training effectiveness and teacher quality affects teaching creativity. On the other hand, researchers will elaborate on the indirect

effect of trainer quality on teaching creativity through training effectiveness and teacher quality.

Methods

This paper was compiled using library research, a theoretical study, references, and other scientific literature (Sugiyono, 2018) through a search on Google Scholar. In this case, the researcher examines various research results related to trainer quality, training effectiveness, teacher quality, and teaching creativity from several journal articles that are able to solve teaching creativity problems.

Table 1. Literature found concerning the searched theme

No	Writing Theme	Number of Relevant Posts	Description (year of publication)
1.	Teaching Creativity	21	1926 - 2010
2.	Teacher Quality	24	1982 - 2012
3.	Training Effectiveness	25	1990 - 2022
4.	Trainer Quality	18	1957 - 2005

Next, perform a content analysis of the selected references (Fraenkel et al., 2011) by observing the concepts that are the themes in this study, namely trainer quality, training effectiveness, teacher quality, and teaching creativity.

Results and Discussion

Teaching Creativity

Creativity has recently become a priority in education for several reasons. It is recognized that there is a strong relationship between creativity and education (Chappell & Craft, 2009; R. Gibson, 2010), especially when non-educational extrinsic factors from other fields strengthen the relationship. In contrast, creativity has been seen as a way of tackling many social, political, and economic problems facing the 21st century (R. Gibson, 2010); this problem appears to be due to the discrepancy between educational outputs and long-term requirements.

According to Feldman (1994), creativity is the achievement of extraordinary and new ideas that significantly change the course of a business. The term implies that this idea has a fresh and practical outcome (i.e., "something") in the growth of a particular business. According to (Amabile, 1983), creativity is the product of an individual or group of people who act appropriately and creatively. Creativity, according to (Sternberg & Lubart, 1999), is the capacity to produce new (ie, unexpected, unique) and appropriate (useful, adaptive tasks).

Feist (1998), in several empirical studies over the last 45 years, has made a convincing case that creative people will behave consistently over time and in different situations and differentiate themselves from others. Other authors have highlighted individual creativity's characteristics by defining the personal traits and characteristics associated with creative achievement. Literature review revealed that

intelligence, imagination, originality, curiosity, artistic nature, energy, risk-taking, and an open mind are qualities or characteristics of creative people (Barron & Harrington, 1981; Sternberg, 2009; Torrance, 2004)

Guilford (1950) defines that creative people are more related to the nature of a person. According to him, there are six characteristics associated with creativity: originality (i.e., the ability to generate unusual and satisfying thoughts); sensitivity to problems (i.e., ability to spot problems); redefinition (i.e., the ability to understand the problem from multiple angles); fluency (i.e., the ability to generate many ideas in a given period); flexibility (i.e., talent for changing mindsets without difficulty); and elaboration (i.e., ability to develop focus areas and solutions).

According to Boden (2004), everyone has the same characteristics as creative people. Boden argues that creative people are not a particular brand; instead, creativity refers to ordinary abilities, such as paying attention, remembering, seeing, speaking, listening, understanding language, and recognizing analogies. Boden argues that the depth of knowledge in a particular discipline that creative people have set them apart from others (Boden, 2004). This argument is in line with research (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999), which found that mastery of certain areas of knowledge is the main and most important trait of creative people.

A model developed by Wallas (1926) states that the creative process consists of four stages: (1) the preparation stage, which is concerned with collecting data, gathering information about the problem, and generating the most appropriate thoughts; (2) the incubation stage, where the person does not consciously work on the problem but uses cognitive abilities to work on the problem unconsciously; (3) the stage of illumination (illumination), when the person consciously works on new ideas to achieve unexpected insights, in which new thoughts are formulated; and (4) the verification stage when

the solution is practically confirmed and can be modified as necessary.

The complexity of creativity can be seen educatively through three conceptual scopes, namely, teaching creativity, teaching for creativity, and creative learning. According to (Ripple, 1999), creativity in education results from a meeting of talents, skills, points of view, stimulation, and other elements. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish between the three concepts to understand creativity in education. It is possible to distinguish between teaching creativity and teaching for creativity using individual orientations, such as teacher orientation, which encourages creative teaching, and student orientation, which emphasizes teaching for creativity (Cremin, 2009). Creativity teaching involves teachers using creative methods in the classroom to make learning more interesting and successful. In contrast, teaching for creativity involves teachers identifying children's creative strengths and encouraging their creativity (Cremin, 2009)

This distinction, however, is based on the findings of the National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE); this report creates a hallmark for distinguishing between teaching creativity and teaching for creativity. Teaching creativity is defined as "using an imaginative approach to make learning more interesting and effective" (Robinson et al., 1999). Teaching for creativity is a way of teaching related to nurturing students' creative abilities and behavior. Craft et al. (2001) discuss the interpretation that teaching creativity can be assumed to be more related to "effective teaching" while teaching creativity is associated with empowering students' creative potential. Teaching for creativity involves teaching creatively and suggests that students' creative abilities are more likely to become apparent when teachers' creative abilities are involved in the classroom. The relationship between the two ideas should be investigated objectively because such differences can lead to dangerous dichotomies,

such as formal and informal teaching, which have been criticized for establishing limiting pedagogical principles (Craft, 2005).

The NACCCE report attempted to distinguish between teaching creativity and teaching for creativity but ultimately showed how the two ideas were combined in actual classroom activities (Robinson et al., 1999). By concentrating on empirical studies of early-year schools renowned for their innovative approach, (Craft et al., 2001) analyze this relationship. The test uses four creativity traits to demonstrate the relevance of differences: relevance, ownership, control, and originality. According to his research, there is a relationship between encouraging creativity in students and teachers. The former is attached to the latter, and the former often leads directly to the latter. The two concepts appear to be interdependent; for example, if a teacher wants to foster his students' creativity, his activities may require creative and original teaching practices that students do not know and recognize. Due to their involvement in unusual activities, students can respond in new and creative ways to such innovative practices. Meanwhile, creative learning ideas can be reflected in student exchange and correspondence with creative teaching and teaching for creativity.

It is thought that various teaching initiatives and methods encourage creativity. Several programs and teaching techniques are believed to develop creativity. Cropley (2001) mentions some of these practices based on idea generation techniques, such as brainstorming, creative problem solving, morphological methods, hierarchical methods, imagery training, and mind maps, as well as on instructional approaches, such as buzz groups, flex study, lateral thinking, bridge building, idea production, SCAMPER, and CoRT Thinking program. However, (Cropley, 2001) states that, although this approach and other creativity programs are well presented and easy to read, criticisms can arise regarding their feasibility and workability. For example,

Hruby, as cited in (Cropley, 2001), argues that the weaknesses of this approach include assumptions and suppositions as fundamental facts, seeing correlations as causal relationships, generalizing without supporting empirical findings, and claiming workability regardless of the characteristics of the participating individuals. The approach is applied to the activity, context, or structural factors (Cropley, 2001) and proposes a comprehensive strategy that emphasizes students' cognitive aspects, motivation, personality, and interaction with the environment. He also challenges the researcher to consider all relevant variables. Cropley advises professionals to assess their classroom practice using a holistic model or strategy (Cropley, 2001).

Pedagogical practice should be designed with students' interactions and interests in mind so that the teacher's practice of teaching creates an environment in which students can engage freely with students. Offering space for students to act freely and participate is at the core of fostering creativity because it can support students' opportunities to showcase their interests and sources of strength. According to (R. Gibson, 2010), creativity in the classroom is based on students' reactions when actively involved with classroom activities, indicating opportunities for inquiry-based learning, collaborative learning, and constructivism. Therefore, collaboration and compromise between teachers and students can increase creativity (Sawyer, 2004). Thus, fostering creativity in the classroom seems to require addressing the tendencies and interests of students to bring about negotiation and cooperation between teachers and students. Kaufman & Sternberg (2006) stated that "when students are taught in a way that suits their way of thinking, they will perform better in school. Lesson after lesson, year after year, children with creative or practical talents who are rarely taught or evaluated in a way that fits their pattern of ability may be at a disadvantage.

Therefore, attracting attention to developing teaching creativity can transform students from passive to socially active recipients, developing their learning and personal effectiveness. As noted, (Cropley, 2001), creativity offers an engaging classroom approach and appears to be a more efficient way to encourage learning and personal growth among students. Teachers' teaching creativity helps children learn and develop.

Teacher Quality

Teacher quality is the most important feature of a school in improving student achievement and the second most important determinant of student learning. Students with good teachers teach more than those with poor-performing teachers. The quality of teachers is reflected in their performance in the classroom, namely the quality of teaching, and so outside the classroom (Haskins & Loeb, 2007; Ingvarson & Rowe, 2008; Kennedy, 2008). In general, teacher teaching quality focuses on teacher performance, knowledge, and creativity (Blanton et al., 2006).

Fenstermacher & Richardson (2005) that good teaching by teachers means teaching that applies moral and rational principles in teaching practice. Thus, the material taught meets disciplinary standards regarding adequacy and completeness. The method used is also age-appropriate, carried out morally, and intended to improve students' abilities related to the material being taught. The notion of teacher competence is used to characterize effective teaching behavior, which serves as the basis for good teaching (teacher quality). A successful lesson plan will produce the desired results. When students are actively involved in the classroom, they acquire skills, information, and understanding at a respectable and acceptable level. Student test results are used as a starting point to determine whether a teacher is effective or ineffective. Successful teaching emphasizes certain types of teaching and learning settings and contexts.

In addition, (Berliner, 2005) argues that good and effective teaching are two different meanings that shape the quality of teaching. "A high-quality teacher shows evidence of good and successful teaching," according to (Berliner, 2005), defining quality in teaching. Good teaching occurs when the topic criteria are met, and it becomes normative. On the other hand, effective teaching is about achieving goals, student learning, and what they should be good at in a particular class or subject.

When activities, procedures, and techniques are created and used by instructors to promote selection, attendance, and processing, (Loughran, 2012) defines this as having high-quality teachers. Quality teaching involves adopting a particular teaching method for a specific purpose rather than simply following a standard classroom process. The same opinion is held by (Darling-Hammond & Ducommun, 2010), who claims that apart from being a function of quality teachers, the context in which they teach also impacts the quality of their teaching. Quality of teaching refers to strong instruction that enables students to learn. Discipline needs, learning objectives, and learners in the setting must be met through effective teaching. This suggests that effective teachers may not succeed when the demands of circumstances and the teacher's knowledge and skills are out of sync (Berliner, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Ducommun, 2010; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005; Ingvarson & Rowe, 2008).

Teachers should have a positive attitude towards their creative endeavors in teaching and encourage individual thinking. Haring-Smith (2006) argues that qualified teachers can motivate students to take risks and be independent and free in their work, which is a good aspect of pedagogy used to foster creativity. These points are agreed upon by (Ewing & Gibson, 2007), who also lists spontaneity, openness to new ideas, and openness to experience as requirements for teaching. Class activities that encourage student creativity are more likely to offer sufficient time

for creative thinking, appreciate unconventional thinking, encourage students to take risks, facilitate an approach to questions, and accept mistakes (Sternberg & Williams, 1996).

Teachers should embrace student involvement as an integral part of the learning process by increasing students' awareness of their fundamental role in classroom activities and teaching methods (Davis & Rimm, 1989). In addition, teachers should encourage students to take risks with their learning by increasing their comfort level with uncertainty and facilitating long-term assignments (Sternberg & Lubart, 1999). In addition, (Cropley, 1995) argues that teachers must consider knowledge, specific ways of thinking about them, discovery in solving problems, capacity to assess ideas, capacity and willingness to convey solutions to others, and evaluation of solutions in real-world scenarios.

Kagan (1992) argues that a teacher's professional knowledge can be considered more precisely as a belief recognized as fact through objective evidence. According to Kagan, there is a good correlation between teachers' experience in educational settings and their belief in personal and professional knowledge. He adds that as teachers gain experience in the classroom, their knowledge also grows, forming a strong belief system that governs their practice and decisions.

Many researchers argue that teacher quality strongly predicts student performance (Cheong Cheng & Tung Tsui, 1996; Rugraff, 2004; Stephens, 2003). Some researchers focus on the teacher's personality, traits, behaviors, attitudes, values, abilities, and competencies. However, other researchers are more inclined toward the teaching process (such as teaching style, teacher-student interaction, classroom management, etc.) or teaching outcomes such as student academic achievement, personal development, learning experience, etc.

Medley (1982) suggests that teacher competence refers to knowledge, abilities, and

beliefs. Ornstein (1991) asserts that every teacher has a teaching style that reflects their personality and philosophy, as evidenced by their behavior and attitudes. Brockner et al. (1986) argue that through their style, teachers integrate certain pedagogical backgrounds that define the practices they adopt in the classroom. Some literature on student achievement and measures of teacher intelligence has concluded that there is little evidence to support a possible relationship between intelligence as measured by teachers, generally measured by IQ, and student achievement (Laczko-Kerr, 2002).

The teacher's teaching process affects students' experiences and learning outcomes, and student learning outcomes are usually recognized as the result of the learning process in terms of cognitive, affective, and behavioral changes and development (Cheong Cheng & Tung Tsui, 1996; Rugraff, 2004). Therefore, by considering the three domains (cognitive, affective, and behavioral), the nature and characteristics of teacher quality must be analyzed in multi-domain and multi-level. Following this thinking, Cheng concludes that teaching quality is related to desert teaching processes (in this case, their creativity) and student learning processes. Thus, the concept of teaching quality presupposes three domains of change and development (cognitive, affective, and behavioral) with two main actors (teachers and students) at three different levels (individual, classroom, and school). Although teacher quality is important, variation in teaching quality is controlled by teacher characteristics which are difficult or impossible to measure (S. Gibson, 2004; Stephens, 2003). Therefore, the identification of qualified teachers requires student-teacher data in which teacher quality and student achievement must be analyzed.

The basis of expertise is good teaching because it is related to the behavior of successful teachers. Scientists have discovered various properties that can be divided into three categories (Wechsler, M. E. & Shields, 2008).

First, the quality of teachers—what they contribute to the classroom—determines teaching success. The ability to cultivate higher order thinking skills, which can be demonstrated by training and credentials, understanding of topics in the subjects they teach, teaching experience, general intelligence, and verbal skills are some of the teacher traits that have a significant impact. In addition, adaptive skills are used to solve pedagogical problems that allow teachers to judge what might work in each context in response to student needs (Darling-Hammond & Ducommun, 2010). Teachers who are verbally gifted and intelligent are better able to pay attention, think diagnostically, and organize and explain concepts (Wechsler, M. E. & Shields, 2008). (Kennedy, 2008) explains how teachers can be used as personal resources. Beliefs, attitudes, and values, as well as personality traits, are examples of personal resources. The first is based on a culture that embraces diversity in the classroom and thinks that all students can learn. Personality qualities include extroversion and introversion, calmness and anxiety, assertiveness, and indecision.

Second, effective teaching is based on the teacher's classroom behavior or teaching practice. Using ethical and logical teaching strategies is good teaching. These techniques are categorized by (Fenstermacher & Richardson 2005) into three components of effective instruction. Each element has a standard that assesses the performance and performance of teachers who are not good, thus revealing the nature of quality in teaching. The definition of each component can sometimes be part of a teaching exercise. Defining, demonstrating, explaining, constructing, correcting, and interpreting are just some of the tasks involved in the first component, the logical act of teaching. Generally, these categories are judged using their internal standards, especially the norms of solid justification. The act of logic is the most important component in creating sound teaching ideas among the other two. The second

element, the psychological act of teaching, includes motivating, encouraging, rewarding, punishing, planning, and evaluating. The learning process is understood by qualified teachers, who also know how to assess learning, integrate it into lessons, support students with learning difficulties, and help native speakers of the language of instruction learn the language and materials (Darling-Hammond & Ducommun, 2010). The third component, the moral act of teaching, is to model and encourage moral virtues, including integrity, steadfastness, tolerance, compassion, trust, respect, and justice. The scoring criteria for this section are more internal and driven by analysis and argument rather than perception, more in line with the logical act of teaching.

Kennedy (2008) states that quality teachers appear as efficient teachers, become good role models, are organized, provide clear goals and standards, and keep students in their duties. Teachers provide learning activities such as giving students memorization tasks or tasks that require complex problem solving and reasoning or tasks that draw an understanding of the material and tasks that require deeper knowledge. Loughran (2012) argues that successful teaching involves allowing students to make decisions about how their knowledge should be organized and reconstructed to increase the effectiveness of their learning.

Third, good teaching is defined as what students get from learning: the desired outcome. Indicators of good teaching are practices found to be related to students' test scores. The test can be used to accurately determine how many students study each year to become a key measure of teacher effectiveness using the value-added model (Darling-Hammond & Ducommun, 2010). Teacher quality is not a unified concept but can mean many things, namely encouraging students to learn, motivating students, and fostering personal responsibility and social awareness (Kennedy, 2008). Thus, it can be assumed that qualified teacher can encourage their creativity in teaching so that all the material being taught can

be conveyed, especially during the current pandemic.

Training Effectiveness

Training " provides conditions in which people can learn effectively" (King, 1998). Training with the verb "to train" comes from the Old French trainer, which means "to pull." In English, it is defined as pulling together, alluring, causing, growing in the desired way, preparing for performance according to instructions, exercises, and so on.

Through training, knowledge is acquired, which refers to the information we acquire and store in memory, how it is organized into the structure of what we already know, and our understanding of how and when to use it. Consequently, there are three categories of knowledge: declarative, procedural, and strategic (Kraiger et al., 1993). Declarative knowledge is the storage of one's information about a material. Procedural knowledge is understanding how and when to use previously learned facts. Awareness of one's knowledge and internal mechanisms for finding related information are components of strategic knowledge. This strategic knowledge is used to plan, monitor, and revise goal-directed activities (Blanchard, 2008).

The training aims to ensure that the company's workforce has the right combination of qualities by creating the best learning opportunities and inspiring students to achieve the best level of quality and service (Bentley, 1990). Training management should be prioritized. The company's plans increasingly include investing in its human resources in terms of developing and maintaining the right capabilities. Training expenditures must, like any other investment, deliver tangible and verifiable results. Knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors can all be improved through effective training.

The measurement of training effectiveness was first introduced by Donald L. Kirkpatrick, who published it in a 1959 US Development and Training Journal article (Aragón-Sánchez et al.,

2003; Hrmo et al., 2020). The level of satisfaction with the training activities, the impact of the training on the development of skills, knowledge, and attitudes, the changes in performance seen after the training, and the evaluation of business results are all included in this significant model. According to (Donald L. Kirkpatrick, 1996), the most important thing is to examine the last aspect, namely increasing productivity, sales, and reducing costs, which proves the training meets the targeted goals. Several studies, such as those (Farjad, 2012; Tseng & Hsu, 2022), have examined the modified Kirkpatrick model framework. Due to the complexity of training evaluation, high cost, and lack of direct methods (Mollahoseini & Farjad, 2012), the fourth level is sometimes not evaluated.

Organizations use various training methods, and currently emerging are methods using the internet and digital technologies, such as e-learning and self-education, or methods that provide enhanced education and training in virtual reality environments (Călin, 2015). The advantages are mainly in the availability and flexibility of time (Tymoschuk et al., 2020). Self-education methods, which have become part of the learning process and the basis for knowledge transfer, are among those commonly used. Organizations should consider training to develop intellectual capital consisting of specialized and advanced abilities. Using a combination of satisfaction, learning performance, individual performance, and organizational performance, training effectiveness can be defined as the extent to which training objectives are achieved and are beneficial to both the organization and the trainees (Holton, 2005; D L Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2010; Noe, 2010). Various theories or models have been developed by research to explain how to evaluate training effectiveness, of which Kirkpatrick's model is the most recognized model by HRD researchers and practitioners (Giangreco et al., 2010; Griffin, 2010).

Cannon-Bowers et al. (1995) explained that the effectiveness of training is intervened by training motivation and can be evaluated on four levels: learning, training performance, job performance, and outcomes. Meanwhile, (Holton, 2005) developed a more complex model to evaluate the effectiveness of training using human performance improvement as the basis for model development, and he emphasized the importance of training motivation. Holton redefines the next three levels of Kirkpatrick's model: learning performance, individual performance, and organizational performance.

The effectiveness of training refers to the achievement of the desired goals or expected results set by human resources because training is an important part of HR activities (Sitzmann & Weinhardt, 2018). It has been widely demonstrated that training should improve the capabilities of a person and their organization's capabilities. First, it shows that training in achieving its objectives should consider conducting training. For this reason, the content of the training and the quality of the training course must be clearly defined before conducting the training, and for this reason, it is considered a key factor. Otherwise, training can lead to different objectives from the original plan, resulting in ineffective training and adding pressure to the organization, such as costs incurred and loss of reputation; thus, trainees get bad experiences and feelings of failure (Wenger et al., 2019). Another factor that affects training effectiveness is trainees' motivation, which must always be respected as the main element in increasing the effectiveness of training outcomes (Sitzmann & Weinhardt, 2018).

There is no absolute procedure for measuring training effectiveness; however, indirect methods can yield estimates of the relative effectiveness of training (Postolache et al., 2017). For this reason, several models have been proposed to measure training effectiveness starting from the very beginning (D L Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2010) and

followed by other studies whose focus is on various fields such as education and others (Landers & Armstrong, 2017)—identified four levels in evaluating the effectiveness of training, namely reaction, learning, behavior, and results.

1. Level-1, the trainee's reaction is evaluated based on the trainee's attitude.
2. Level-2 learning (learning) obtained from training materials by training participants following the specified program.
3. Level-3 behavior (behavior), where the evaluation emphasizes the extent to which the trainee adopts the values of the training into behavior or, in simple terms, how the trainee's performance is improved.
4. Level-4 describes the results (results) or outcomes of the program given to the training participants and improvements to their organization.

Motivation can be described in two ways: motivation to learn and motivation to transfer training (Homklin, 2014). The second concept of training effectiveness is demonstrated by (Noe, 2010), where motivation is added to Kirkpatrick's model. The model shows that motivating trainees to perform tasks and feel high effort leads to high-performance, high-performance leads to high work performance, and high work performance leads to achieving desired results and avoiding unwanted results.

Motivation to learn combined with self-efficacy affects Level-1 (reaction). Motivation to transfer training combined with social support affects Level-2 (learning). Meanwhile, Level-3 (behavior) interacts with individual and organizational characteristics leading to an increase in overall behavior. Level-4 Outcomes are divided into several impacts, one affecting the individual and the other affecting the organization. Therefore, Noe's proposed model is highly correlated with the motivations implicitly mentioned in Kirkpatrick's model. In addition, (Swanson & Slezzer, 1997) proposed another simplified model to measure training effectiveness by establishing a plan and

necessary tools and conducting an evaluation report.

The effectiveness can be the result of good training of training. The trainees can be identified with the ability to remember, additional knowledge, increased workability, decision-making ability, and managing time (Tamsah & Nurung, 2021). Furthermore, training effectiveness can produce two meaningful outputs: the formation of quality teachers and, of course producing teachers who are creative in teaching (a major need, especially during a pandemic like the current one).

Coach Quality

It is very important that a trainer is aware of and meets the needs of every participant in a training session, regardless of their background. How participants are helped to cope with learning sometimes determines whether they decide to continue or leave the learning process (Tovey & Tovey, 1997). Dedicated trainers must be genuinely concerned about participants' needs and resist the temptation to seek instant solutions. Participants' ability to solve problems and solve problems more effectively increased because of training in problem-solving approaches (Goldbeck et al., 1957).

Several skills support the quality of trainers; many reasons can be concluded why these skills are considered essential such as trainers who are seen as being able to convey material creatively and in an organized manner, through understanding knowledge about target habits, which allows effective delivery of learning outcomes. Communicating material and expectations effectively is very important so that participants learn the material (Thompson, 2001). The skills displayed by the trainer are also important to the participants about the trainer. The Greek philosopher Socrates said, "I do not teach; I awaken." The Roman philosopher Cicero paraphrased that the purpose of learning was to enable people to free

themselves from the tyranny of today. Organizations cannot delegate responsibility for education to people with limited or no understanding of the learning process. Researchers such as (Leach, 1996) find that leaders in an organization believe that the skills of professional trainers contribute more to success than simply presenting the content of knowledge or skills.

Many authors suggest that trainers should be more than just experts in the subject matter. For example, (Quick, 1991) states that if trainers do not have a good theoretical and conceptual basis, they cannot design relevant, realistic, and effective training. According to (Carnevale, A. P., Gainer, L. J., & Schulz, 1990), trainers need to understand and apply adult learning principles in their training delivery, for example, involving participants to identify their own specific learning needs.

In the study in Finland, trainers wanted closer collaboration with future "teachers" regarding learning new methods for education, teaching, and guidance (Lasonen & Learning, 2005), to incorporate the training methods that best achieve learning objectives. This conclusion is in line with (Harris et al., 2000) that improving the quality of training with a formal training course of trainers will be very beneficial. As a result of this investigation, official training requirements are now required for them to become trainers.

Studies conducted (Leach, 1996) reveal that less than a third of exemplary trainers are material experts in the area they are training in before taking on the coach role. Most of the exemplary trainers in the Leach study indicated that they were experts in training materials while working in the training department, beyond their pedagogical skills as trainers and developing their teaching skills.

According to (Olson, 1994), the quality of trainers is seen in process skills with various advantages, including presentation and communication skills, group facilitation skills, and adult teaching methods. Similarly, he

argues that a lack of process skills will limit and hinder the effectiveness of a trainer. In contrast, an effective trainer will find a way to make the change into something positive and energizing and not confusing and demoralizing for the participants. The trainer's pedagogical and pedagogical knowledge of the conceptual framework for identifying adult learning paradigms better equips the trainer to develop and implement training strategies that promote best practices and meet needs.

(Walter, 2001) found that to teach an individual, an effective coach must know the individual. Although coaches can learn about topics, methodologies, and presentation techniques, they cannot learn about a person's personality (Thomas, 1999). Coaches must be willing to train, have tolerance for differences in learning styles, and respect these differences (Walter, 2001). Instead of hiding their positions of power, trainers should show their individuality to the trainees and come across as "real people." More effective trainers show more concern for their students and offer more helpful help.

Herzberg (1966) identified two needs of trainees: avoiding uncomfortable or unsatisfactory situations and engaging in something that is believed to be meaningful. Trainers for participants are internal, which ultimately leads to self-actualization (Herzberg, 1966). When people are inspired to learn, they will. To empower participants, teachers and trainers must control their egos because intimidated or stressed people are less motivated to learn. To believe that they can learn, people need to be persuaded somehow. In the early stages of interaction between trainers and participants, developing this trust is very important. If a trainer steps in and starts training, this relationship-building process becomes important, to the point where maximum learning can be achieved (Ashton & Sung, 2002).

Training managers believe "the skills of a professional coach contribute more to success than the content of knowledge or skills" (DiGeorgio, 1982). Learning methods are more

important than subject matter (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990). More than subject matter expertise is needed to teach (Draves, 1984). In addition, knowledge of how people grow and learn is required (Olson, 1993). Most of the time, trainers with process skills have better attitudes about learning methods and materials (Hiemstra & Sisco, 1990). Therefore, if a coach does not implement a process, the trainer's credibility is in doubt, and the organization's reputation is questioned.

A large body of literature (Pachnowski & Olson, 1999; Thompson, 2001) suggests the assumption that a trainer who practices and demonstrates competencies, processes, and personal characteristics will become a more effective trainer, producing more competent participants. Identifying opportunities and activities that promote learning transfer before, during, and after the training process, including a thorough evaluation of training success, qualifies a trainer in addition to their knowledge of various assessment methodologies.

The delivery of training embedded in the broader instructional system, in the perspective of the Instructional System Design (ISD) model proposed (Goldstein, 1980), shows that for trainers to be effective, they must organize research with the actual application of training, including (1) managing the instructional system (as a process), (2) conduct a training needs assessment to determine training content, (3) design training, (4) provide training, (5) manage the transfer of training back to work, and (6) evaluate the impact of training and revise the instructional system based on these data. As noted above, it identifies a series of stages in which the trainer in training moves from identification of potential training problems through needs assessment or analysis, training design, training delivery, ensuring training transfer, and finally, training evaluation and feedback on evaluation results to addressing whether training needs have been met. Fulfilled, this paradigm is a heuristic that helps to organize and manage training projects from an instructional design perspective. But

many modern training programs often neglect measures (e.g., skipping a needs assessment or training evaluation). The expectation of the entire training series to improve the quality of the trainers is that it is expected to produce quality training. Because a series of training is useless if the training carried out does not produce results. And training that can produce good outputs is effective training (Tamsah et al., 2020).

Conclusion

Based on the library research results, it can be concluded that teaching creativity has a very large role, especially during the current COVID-19 pandemic. The author assumes that various variables can improve teaching creativity, especially during this pandemic. The author hypothesizes that there is a strong relationship between the quality of trainers in implementing training, training effectiveness, and teacher quality as antecedent variables with teacher teaching creativity. In this case, the quality of a good trainer will be able to increase the effectiveness of the training, so that when the effectiveness of the training is getting better, it will have an impact on teaching creativity which will also get better. On the other hand, the effectiveness of training can also encourage improvement and improvement of teacher quality, which can influence teacher teaching creativity, especially during the current COVID-19 pandemic. Nevertheless, the results of this study still need to be analyzed further in the form of quantitative research in the future to prove the results of this study from library research so that it will provide a stronger finding in solving the problem of creativity in teaching teachers in schools.

Bibliography

1. Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), 357–376. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.357>
2. Aragón-Sánchez, A., Barba-Aragáon, I., & Sanz-Valle, R. (2003). Effects of training on business results. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(6), 956–980. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0958519032000106164>
3. Ashton, D. N., & Sung, J. (2002). Supporting Workplace Learning for High Performance Working. International Labour Office.
4. Barron, F., & Harrington, D. M. (1981). Creativity, Intelligence, and Personality. In *Annual Review of Psychology* (Vol. 32, pp. 439–476). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203814840>
5. Bentley, T. J. (1990). *The business of training: Achieving success in changing world markets*. McGraw-Hill.
6. Berliner, D. C. (2005). The near impossibility of testing for teacher quality. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 205–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105275904>
7. Blanchard, P. N. (2008). *Effective training: Systems, strategies and practices*. Pearson Education India.
8. Blanton, L. P., Sindelar, P. T., & Correa, V. I. (2006). Models and measures of beginning teacher quality. *Journal of Special Education*, 40(2), 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669060400020201>
9. Boden, M. A. (2004). The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms. In *The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms: Second Edition* (Second Edi). Taylor & Francis.

10. Brockner, J., Houser, R., Birnbaum, G., Lloyd, K., Deitcher, J., Nathanson, S., & Rubin, J. Z. (1986). Escalation of commitment to an ineffective course of action: The effect of feedback having negative implications for self-identity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 109–126.
11. Călin, R.-A. (2015). Self-Education through Web-Searching - An Exploratory Study. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, 58(2), 47–58.
12. Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Salas, E., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Mathieu, J. E. (1995). Toward Theoretically Based Principles of Training Effectiveness: A Model and Initial Empirical Investigation. *Military Psychology*, 7(3), 141–164. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327876mp0703_1
13. Carnevale, A. P., Gainer, L. J., & Schulz, E. R. (1990). *Training the Technical Work Force*. Jossey-Bass.
14. Chappell, K., & Craft, A. (2009). Creative Science Teaching Labs: New dimensions in CPD. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 4(1), 44–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2009.01.001>
15. Cheong Cheng, Y., & Tung Tsui, K. (1996). Total teacher effectiveness: New conception and improvement. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 10(6), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513549610151659>
16. Craft, A. (2005). Creativity in schools: Tensions and dilemmas. *Creativity in Schools: Tensions and Dilemmas*, January 2005, 1–192. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203357965>
17. Craft, A., Jeffrey, B., & Leibling, M. (2001). *Creativity in education*. A&C Black.
18. Cremin, T. (2009). Creative teachers and creative teaching. In *Creativity in Primary Education* (pp. 36–46). Learning Matters.
19. Cropley, A. J. (1995). *Fostering Creativity in the Classroom: General Principles*. 1, 83–114.
20. Cropley, A. J. (2001). *Creativity in education & learning: A guide for teachers and educators*. Psychology Press.
21. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). 16 implications of a systems perspective for the study of creativity. *Handbook of Creativity*, 313.
22. Darling-Hammond, L., & Ducommun, C. E. (2010). Recognizing and developing effective teaching: What policy makers should know and do. Policy Brief, May.
23. Davis, G. A., & Rimm, S. B. (1989). *Education of the gifted and talented*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
24. DiGeorgio, R. M. (1982). Training needs of people new to training. *Training and Development Journal*, 36(6), 16.
25. Draves, W. A. (1984). *How to teach adults*. Learning Resources Network.
26. Ewing, R., & Gibson, R. (2007). Creative teaching or teaching creatively? Using creative arts strategies in preservice teacher education. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 13.
27. Farjad, S. (2012). The Evaluation Effectiveness of Training Courses in University by Kirkpatrick Model (Case Study: Islamshahr University). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 2837–2841. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.573>
28. Feist, G. J. (1998). A Meta-analysis of Personality in Scientific and Artistic Creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(4), 290–309.

29. Feldman, D. H. (1994). Creativity: Proof that development occurs. *Changing the World: A Framework for the Study of Creativity*, 85–102.
30. Fenstermacher, G. D., & Richardson, V. (2005). On making determinations of quality in teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 107(1), 186–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00462.x>
31. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education — 8th ed.* Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data. <http://library1.nida.ac.th/termpaper6/sd/2554/19755.pdf>
32. Giangreco, A., Carugati, A., & Sebastiano, A. (2010). Are we doing the right thing?: Food for thought on training evaluation and its context. *Personnel Review*, 39(2), 162–177. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481011017390>
33. Gibson, R. (2010). Points of departure: The “art” of creative teaching: Implications for higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(5), 607–613. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.493349>
34. Gibson, S. (2004). An Investigation of the Relationship Between Sustained Teacher Professional Development and Student Achievement. In Barry University School of Education.
35. Goldbeck, R. A., Bernstein, B. B., Hillix, W. A., & Marx, M. H. (1957). Application of the half-split technique to problem-solving tasks. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 53(5), 330–338. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040139>
36. Goldstein, I. L. (1980). Training in work organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 31(1), 229–272.
37. Griffin, R. P. (2010). Means and ends: Effective training evaluation. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 42(4), 220–225. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197851011048582>
38. Guilford, J. P. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist*, 5, 444–454.
39. Haring-Smith, T. (2006). Creativity research review: some lessons for higher education. *Peer Review*, Vol. 8, No. 2, Spring. Gale Academic OneFile, link.gale.com/apps/doc/A144874993/AONE?u=anon~be2aaef8&sid=google Scholar&xid=e95a08d0. Accessed 17 Aug. 2022.
40. Harris, R., Simons, M., & Bone, J. (2000). More than meets the eye? Rethinking the role of workplace trainer.
41. Haskins, R., & Loeb, S. (2007). A Plan to Improve the Quality of Teaching in American Schools. *Future of Children*, 17(1), 1–7. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,cookie,uid&db=eHH&AN=24821233&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
42. Herzberg, F. I. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*.
43. Hiemstra, R., & Sisco, B. (1990). *Individualizing Instruction. Making Learning Personal, Empowering, and Successful*. ERIC.
44. Holton, E. F. (2005). Holton’s Evaluation Model: New Evidence and Construct Elaborations. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(1), 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422304272080>
45. Homklin, T. (2014). Training Effectiveness of Skill Certification System: The Case of Automotive Industry in Thailand Training Effectiveness of Skill Certification System: The Case of Automotive

- Industry in Thailand. March, 1–182.
46. Hrmo, R., Mistina, J., Jurinova, J., & Kristofiakova, L. (2020). Software Platform for the Secondary Technical School E-Learning Course. In *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing* (Vol. 916). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11932-4_79
47. Ingvarson, L., & Rowe, K. (2008). Conceptualising and evaluating teacher quality: Substantive and methodological issues. *Australian Journal of Education*, 52(1), 5–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000494410805200102>
48. Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of Research on Teacher Belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65–90. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2701_6
49. Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (2006). *The international handbook of creativity*. Cambridge University Press.
50. Kennedy, M. M. (2008). Sorting out teacher quality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(1), 59–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170809000115>
51. King, D. (1998). *Training within the Organization*. Cox & Wyman Ltd.
52. Kirkpatrick, D L, & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2010). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* ([Nachdr.]). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
53. Kirkpatrick, Donald L. (1996). Invited reaction: Reaction to holton article. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7(1), 23–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920070104>
54. Kraiger, K., Ford, J. K., & Salas, E. (1993). Application of Cognitive, Skill-Based, and Affective Theories of Learning Outcomes to New Methods of Training Evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 311–328. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.2.311>
55. Laczko-Kerr, I. I. (2002). Teacher certification does matter: The effects of certification status on student achievement. Arizona State University.
56. Landers, R. N., & Armstrong, M. B. (2017). Enhancing instructional outcomes with gamification: An empirical test of the Technology-Enhanced Training Effectiveness Model. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 71, 499–507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.031>
57. Lasonen, J., & Learning, A. (2005). *Workplaces as Learning Environments : Assessments by Young People after Transition from School to Work*. *Learning*, 7, 1–14.
58. Leach, J. A. (1996). Distinguishing Characteristics Among Exemplary Trainers in Business and Industry. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.21061/jcte.v12i2.506>
59. Loughran, J. (2012). *What expert teachers do: Enhancing professional knowledge for classroom practice*. Routledge.
60. Medley, D. M. (1982). Teacher competency testing and the teacher educator. Association of Teacher Educators.
61. Mollahoseini, A., & Farjad, S. (2012). Assessment Effectiveness on the Job Training in Higher Education (Case Study: Takestan University). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1310–1314. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.817>
62. Noe, R. A. (2010). *Employee Training and Development*, 5e (B. Gordon (ed.).

- Paul Ducham.
63. Olson, S. J. (1993). A New Source for Teachers: Can Business and Industry Fill the Gaps in Tomorrow's Teacher Pool?. *Vocational Education Journal*, 68(6), 36–37.
 64. Olson, S. J. (1994). Competencies of two-year college technical instructors and technical trainers: Similarities and differences.
 65. Ornstein, A. C. (1991). Problems facing school superintendents and school board presidents of large school districts. *The Urban Review*, 23(3), 207–214.
 66. Pachnowski, L., & Olson, S. J. (1999). An experience in preparing technical instructors for the virtual classroom: Lessons learned. *ATEA Journal*, 26(2), 6–8.
 67. Postolache, O., Lourenco, F., Dias Pereira, J. M., & Girao, P. S. (2017). Serious game for physical rehabilitation: Measuring the effectiveness of virtual and real training environments. *I2MTC 2017 - 2017 IEEE International Instrumentation and Measurement Technology Conference, Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/I2MTC.2017.7969978>
 68. Quick, T. L. (1991). *Training managers so they can really manage*. Jossey-Bass.
 69. Ripple, R. E. (1999). Teaching creativity. In M. A. Runco & S. R. Prirzer (Encycloped). CA: Academic Press.
 70. Robinson, K., Minkin, L., & Bolton, E. (1999). National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education *All Our Futures : Creativity , Culture and Education*. DfEE Report, 16(May), 1–243.
 71. Rugraff, D. R. (2004). The Relationship of Teacher Salaries, Teacher Experience, and Teacher Education on Student Outcomes. In *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*. Saint Louis University.
 72. Sawyer, R. K. (2004). Creative Teaching: Collaborative Discussion as Disciplined Improvisation. *Educational Researcher*, 33(2), 12–20. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033002012>
 73. Sitzmann, T., & Weinhardt, J. M. (2018). Training Engagement Theory: A Multilevel Perspective on the Effectiveness of Work-Related Training. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 732–756. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315574596>
 74. Stephens, A. D. (2003). The Relationship between National Board Certification for Teachers and Student Achievement. University of South Carolina.
 75. Sternberg, R. J. (2009). The nature of creativity. *The Essential Sternberg: Essays on Intelligence, Psychology and Education*, 103–118.
 76. Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1999). The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. *Handbook of Creativity*, 1(3–15).
 77. Sternberg, R. J., & Williams, W. M. (1996). *How to develop student creativity*. ASCD.
 78. Sugiyono. (2018). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. In ke-26. Bandung: Alfabeta.
 79. Swanson, R. A., & Sleezer, C. M. (1997). Training Effectiveness Evaluation. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 11(4), 7–16.
 80. Tamsah, H., Ansar, Ilyas, G. B., & Yusriadi, Y. (2020). Training, Knowledge Sharing, and Quality of Work-Life on Civil Servants Performance in Indonesia. *Journal of*

- Ethnic and Cultural Studies, 7(3), 163–176.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/514>
81. Tamsah, H., & Nurung, J. (2021). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Makassar, Media Indonesia.
82. Thomas, B. (1999). How to hire instructors who love training. *Training & Development*, 53(3), 14–16.
83. Thompson, K. D. (2001). Adult educator effectiveness with the training context: A study of trainee perception of effective trainer characteristics. University of Wyoming.
84. Torrance, E. P. (2004). Great expectations: Creative achievements of the sociometric stars in a 30-year study. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 16(1), 5–13.
85. Tovey, M. D., & Tovey, M. D. (1997). *Training in Australia: Design, delivery, evaluation, management*. Prentice Hall Australia.
86. Tseng, Y. C., & Hsu, H. Te. (2022). Investigating the influence of experiential training on the ability to anticipate risks of caught-in accidents. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 28(1), 494–500.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2020.1785183>
87. Tymoschuk, N. A., Ryabinova, E. N., Sapova, O. A., & Oddo, V. (2020). Matrix model of cognitive activity as one of the meta basis of digital education. In *Digital Transformation of the Economy: Challenges, Trends and New Opportunities* (pp. 481–493). Springer.
88. Wallas, G. (1926). *The art of thought* (Vol. 10). Harcourt, Brace.
89. Walter, D. (2001). *Training on the Job: A New Team-Driven Approach That Empowers Employees, Is Quick to Implement, Gets Bottom-Line Results*. American Society for Training and Development.
90. Wechsler, M. E. & Shields, P. M. (2008). *Teaching quality in California: A new perspective to guide policy*. CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
91. Wenger, M., Sauli, F., Gross, V., & Berger, J. (2019). Apprentices' Perceptions of Teachers' and In-Company Trainers' Skills at the Core of Training Quality. May, 88–91.