

THE APPRENTICESHIP DIFFICULTIES MANAGED BY SEAFARERS WHILE TRAINING ONBOARD

MAXIMO V. HERRERA¹,HAZEL CORTEZ²

¹College of Maritime Education

²College of Arts and Sciences

ABSTRACT

Apprenticeship is a system of training new generation of practitioners of trade or profession with on-the-job training parallel with classroom learning and activities. This enables practitioners to achieve measurable competencies to gain a license to practice the full profession. This descriptive survey aimed on the apprenticeship difficulties managed by seafarers while training onboard which utilized ninety-seven (97) seafarers from Manila. Weighted mean and t-test were employed as statistical tools for data interpretation. The significant findings are (1) majority of respondents aged 26 years old and above of which a great number belong to above high monthly income group, (2) The respondents strongly agree with “seafarer experience homesickness” as the prevalent difficulties encountered while training onboard, and (3) The respondents recognize that negligence on duties is the primary cause of the difficulties encountered, and (4) there is no significant difference in the apprenticeship difficulties managed by the various respondents. Thus, despite of variation in respondents’ profile, same difficulties felt by the seafarers were all the same.

Keywords: Apprenticeship, difficulties, training, seafarer

Introduction

Apprenticeship is a system of training new generation of practitioners of trade or profession with on-the-job training parallel with some classroom work and study. Likewise, this enables the practitioners to gain a license to practice in a regulated profession. The apprentices or protégés build their careers from apprenticeship and how apprenticeships can benefit career changes (Mileharn, 2015). From the viewpoint of Thomson, 2007, apprenticeship is an education and training system that teaches trade knowledge and skills through on-the-job training and formal instruction usually provided by an employer and supervised by a journeyman (Cozanet, 2003). Apprenticeship have been promoted as an educational alternative that leads to the development of valuable skills, allows for the opportunity to earn an income while learning and helping youth to gain a head start into lucrative, creative and in-demand careers (Lehmann, 2014).

The Policies, Standards and Guidelines governing the seagoing service requirement is embodied under CMO No. 20, series of 2014 entitled “Revised Implementing Guidelines on the Approved Seagoing Service Requirement for the Conferment of the Degree in Bachelor of Science in Marine Transportation and Bachelor of Science in Marine Engineering Programs” and STCW Circular No. 2014-02 entitled “Daily Journal of Bridge Watchkeeping Duties and Daily Journal of Engine Room Watchkeeping Duties. (CMO No. 20 s.2015)

The apprenticeship program is compulsory when gaining a trade credential which was described as “epistemic access” with a potential impact on progressive opportunities for apprentices and ability to provide valuable input at the workplace (Hordem, 2015). An

apprentice works on the job while he or she learns a trade. About 80 percent of the apprentice training takes place on the job while the other 20 percent of training is formal instruction. Most of the trainings are done while working for an employer who assists them in the course of the apprenticeship to learn the trade or profession and achieved measurable competencies. An apprentice has an apprenticeship contract with an employer in exchange for the continued labor at a particular period. However, since contracts are not as binding as standard contracts, the obligations and liabilities of the principal are reduced turning the apprentices and trainees receiving minimal rates or wages.

Apprenticeship experienced a steep, and apparently permanent, decline in the wake of industrialization. Insofar as it functioned as an economic exchange, its transformation into a wage relationship had several benefits. Wages greatly enhanced the freedom of the young, permitting them to limit their hours of work, bring an end to onerous household chores, escape the master's household and round-the-clock surveillance, and change employers freely. They also permitted poorer families to keep their older children at home by pooling incomes. Masters, too, were often happy to rid their homes of unruly and unreliable adolescents. Moreover, wage relations allowed them to hire and fire young since employment relations implied no training, employers had no obligation to instruct the young beyond what was required to perform the work at hand (Arcita et al, 2011). However, training was a by-product of work, not the primary object of the exchange. Although masters promised to instruct their charges in a trade, they had an economic incentive to maximize work and skimp on training. Further, they often withheld crucial trade secrets from apprentices in order to prevent future competition. In the absence of guild regulation or influential parents, apprentice exploitation was widespread (Douglas,. 2005).

The idea of apprenticeships still has great appeal since successful businessmen, celebrities and professionals have waxed lyrical about the good start their apprenticeships gave them. Many regard the apprenticeship as the best route into work, combining technical education with practical experience, while enabling business and industry to acquire skilled labour. Today, it has added appeal because it counters growing fears of entrenched youth unemployment as the effects of the recession continue to be felt and the unskilled are left further behind. Apprenticeship facilitates transitions to skilled work and employees concerns about labour shortages. The impact participation in the programs has had on their education and occupational pathways (Lehmann, 2014).

Apprenticeship training provides access to well-paying jobs that demand a high level of skill, judgment and creativity. Apprentices are paid while gaining work experience, and their wages increase with their level of skill. Apprentices are workers, so you will need to find an employer who will train you. The first step in becoming an apprentice is to find a training sponsor or employer who is willing to engage the individual in an apprenticeship program. The students will have to complete their 12 months apprenticeship usually at last year of their chosen program. The students maintained with training record book and journal to enter the progress of their apprenticeship which eventually submitted upon successful completion of the program. (Schoenfeld, 2005). However, dropping out from the apprenticeship program are frequently related to employment experiences which somehow include trouble with the superior or workmates. Additional common reasons are leaving to pursue other opportunities, such as a better job, and personal reasons, such as illness or transport problems and even work environment.

These training programs make available to ratings and cadets who have gained their experience and qualifications onboard a vessel, to acquire their knowledge. Evidently, a cadet/trainee appreciates the owner who presents him with the opportunity to start his career through these programs and that throughout his career he will demonstrate that appreciation in loyalty to the owner's company. Each vessel employing Filipino regular crews provide five apprentices: two deck cadets, two engine cadets one steward trainee, one deck trainee and one engine trainee at a reduced cost and at no risk.

Expert practice in these domains rests crucially on the integration of cognitive strategies. It is believed that it can best be taught through methods that have traditionally been employed in apprenticeship to transmit complex physical processes and skills. In traditional apprenticeship, the expert shows the apprentice how to do a task, watches as the apprentice practices portions of the task, and then turns over more and more responsibility until the apprentice is proficient enough to accomplish the task independently. That is the basic notion of apprenticeship: showing the apprentice how to do a task and helping the apprentice to do it (Arcita et al, 2011).

There are four important aspects of traditional apprenticeship: modeling, scaffolding, fading, and coaching. In modeling, the apprentice observes the master demonstrating how to do different parts of the task and ensures that target processes visible to explicitly show the apprentice what to do. Such that much of the learning occurs as apprentices watch others at work. Scaffolding is the support the master gives apprentices in carrying out a task which can range from doing almost the entire task for them just giving occasional hints as to what to do next. Fading is the notion of slowly removing the support, giving the apprentice more and more responsibility. Lastly, coaching is the thread running through the entire apprenticeship

experience. The master coaches the apprentice through a wide range of activities: choosing tasks, providing hints and scaffolding, evaluating the activities of apprentices and diagnosing the kinds of problems they are having, thus, challenging them and offering encouragement, giving feedback, structuring the ways to do things and working on particular weaknesses. In short, coaching is the process of overseeing the student's learning, this serves the interplay among observation, scaffolding, and increasingly independent practice aids apprentices both in developing self-monitoring and correction skills and in integrating the skills and conceptual knowledge needed to advance toward expertise where observation plays a surprisingly key role (Lave, 2009).

This apprentice perspective was anchored from Webb's (2010) educational theory of apprenticeship which concern on the process of the learning through physical integration into practice associated with the subject. An apprentice will come to understand the tacit (informally taught) duties of the position. In the process of creating this awareness, the learner also affect their environment; as they are accepted by master practitioners, their specific talents and contribution within the field taken into account and integrated into the overall practice. Unlike most other perspectives of education, the apprenticeship perspective is rarely formally taught. This is because the concepts communicated through apprenticeship are often practical, tacit strategies for achieving goals that do not always conform to standard procedure.

In literature review, it has been observed that there are limited studies for local research. The University of Perpetual Help System Laguna, College of Maritime Education has no previous study pertaining to the difficulties encountered by seafarers in their apprenticeship

program, hence, the researcher take the initial step in pursuing this study and establish a benchmark for further studies.

With such realization, this study generally focused on the apprenticeship difficulties managed by seafarers while training onboard. Specifically, the study aimed to answer the following: (1) What is the respondents' profile in terms of age and monthly family income?; (2) What are the apprenticeship difficulties managed by the respondents while training onboard?; (3) What are the perceived causes of apprenticeship difficulties managed by the respondents while training onboard?; and (4) Is there a significant difference on the apprenticeship difficulties managed by the respondents when grouped according to profile variables?

Methods

This study, which concentrated on the apprenticeship difficulties, managed by seafarers while training onboard, utilized descriptive research design. Ninety-seven (97) out of one hundred (100) seafarers from Manila consented to be the respondents of this study.

A self-made questionnaire consists of three (3) parts to find out the apprenticeship difficulties faced by seafarers. Part I contained the profile of the respondents, Part II focused on the apprenticeship difficulties managed by the seafarers, while Part III entailed the causes of apprenticeship difficulties managed by the seafarers while training onboard. The prepared questionnaire was presented and validated by the panel of experts in research, statistics, and maritime education with all suggestions and comments, well noted and considered.

The 4-point Likert Scale which reflected the assigned points for its corresponding categorical responses (4- Strongly Agree, 3- Agree, 2- Disagree and 1- Strongly Disagree) was created to measure the respondents' feedback. For in-depth treatment of the data gathered, the frequency, percentages and weighted mean were computed from the average responses of the respondents, then interpreted and further ranked. T-test was used to identify the significant difference in the apprenticeship difficulties managed by the seafarers together with the causes of such difficulties in their apprenticeship training program.

The researcher conformed to the ethical standards through series of communication. The purpose and importance of the study were clearly explained and well understood by the respondents so as not to inhibit them in cascading the vital information needed. Moreover, the researcher assured the respondents that whatever feedback drawn from the study has nothing to do with their work and salary grade performances and everything will be held in strict confidentiality. The activity was conducted with prudence to ensure 100 percent retrieval of accomplished questionnaires. The answered questionnaires were tallied, tabulated, and subjected to quantitative analysis using frequency and percentages, weighted mean, and t-test for the statistical treatment and interpretation.

Results and Discussion

In reference with the problem statements, the following data were collected for significant findings of general analysis. Statistical treatments were done to analyze each variable for major results. Data evaluation was further elaborated.

1. Respondents' Profile

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
26 and above	59	60.8
19-25	38	39.2
Total	97	100.0
Monthly Family Income(in Peso)		
20,001 and above	49	50.5
20,000 and below	48	49.5
Total Number of Respondents	97	100.0

Table 1 presents the profile of the respondents, fifty-nine out of ninety-seven (97) or 60.8 percent were 26 and above while the remaining thirty-eight (38) or about 39.2 percent of the respondents belonged to 19-25 age bracket. It was evident that majority of the respondents were from 26 years old and above. Likewise, it was perceived that there were forty-nine (49) or 50.5% that belonged to 20,001 and above monthly family income, while the forty-eight (48) or 49.5% had 20,000 and below monthly family income. This further shows that the respondents are predominantly under the 20,001 and above monthly family income group.

2. Apprenticeship Difficulties Managed by the Respondents while training onboard

Table 2. Apprenticeship Difficulties Managed by the Respondents while training onboard

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1. Seafarers experience homesickness	3.75	Strongly Agree	1
2. Lack of experience onboard affects the apprenticeship.	3.56	Strongly Agree	4
3. Lack of interest in work affects their apprenticeship.	3.55	Strongly Agree	5
4. Lack of motivation affects their apprenticeship.	3.52	Strongly Agree	6
5. Personal or Family problems affect		Agree	

their apprenticeship.	3.44		9
6. Discontent with the company affects their apprenticeship.	3.62	Strongly Agree	2.5
7. Difficulty to join ships affects their apprenticeship.	3.38	Agree	10
8. Communication behavior affects their apprenticeship.	3.48	Agree	8
9. Multinational crew affects their apprenticeship	3.49	Agree	7
10. Shortage of man power affect their apprenticeship	3.62	Strongly Agree	2.5
Average Weighted Mean	3.54	Strongly agree	

Table 2 provides the different indicators of apprenticeship difficulties managed by the seafarers while training onboard. From the foregoing data: indicator #1 which states that “Seafarers experience homesickness” with a weighted mean of 3.75 and interpreted as “Strongly Agree” ranked first. Ranked second & third were indicators #6 which states that “Discontent with the company affect their apprenticeship” and indicator #10 mentions that ”Shortage of man power because of less crew affects their apprenticeship” have the same verbal interpretation of “strongly agree” and weighted mean of 3.62. The fourth rank was indicator #2 which states that “Lack of experience onboard affects the apprenticeship” with a verbal interpretation of “strongly agree”, and a weighted mean of 3.56. On the fifth was indicator #3 which mentions that “Lack of interest in work affects their apprenticeship” with a verbal interpretation of “strongly agree” and a weighted mean of 3.55. Sixth was from indicator #4-“Lack of motivation affects their apprenticeship” with a verbal interpretation of “strongly agree”, and a weighted mean of 3.52. Seventh in ranking was from indicator #9 which states that “Multinational crew affect their apprenticeship” with a verbal interpretation of “agree”, and a weighted mean of 3.49. In rank eight was from indicator #8 which states that “Communication behavior affect their apprenticeship” with a verbal interpretation of “agree”, and a weighted mean of 3.48. Ninth in ranking was from indicator #5 which states that “Personal or Family problems affect their

apprenticeship” with a verbal interpretation of “agree”, and a weighted mean of 3.44. The lowest in ranking was indicator #7 which states that “Difficulty to join ships affects their apprenticeship” with verbal interpretation of “agree”, and weighted mean of 3.38. Over-all, the difficulties encounters by the respondents in their apprenticeship training obtained an average weighted mean of 3.54 and categorically interpreted as “strongly agree”.

3. Causes of apprenticeship difficulties managed by the Respondents while training onboard

Table 3. Causes of difficulties managed by the Respondents while training onboard

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1 Negligence towards duties	3.65	Strongly Agree	1
2 Not Following instruction	3.61	Strongly Agree	2
3 Frustration	3.54	Strongly Agree	5
4 Careless mistakes onboard	3.44	Agree	10
5 Short Temperament	3.46	Agree	8
6 Lack of Seriousness towards one duties	3.45	Agree	9
7 Long working onboard	3.48	Agree	6.5
8 Work pressure	3.48	Agree	6.5
9 Dissatisfaction with the family provided	3.60	Strongly Agree	3
10 Unfriendly working environment	3.57	Strongly Agree	4
Average Weighted Mean	3.54	Strongly Agree	

Table 3 reveals, in Indicator #1 that ranked first states that ”Negligence towards duties” obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.65 with verbal interpretation of “strongly agree” and it affirms that the respondents agreed on the difficulties encountered by the respondents in indicator #1. The next in line was indicator #2 which states that “Not following instruction” with a weighted mean of 3.61 and verbal interpretations as “strongly agree”. The third in ranking was indicator #9 which states that “Dissatisfaction with the family provided onboard” with a weighted mean of 3.60 and a verbal interpretation of “strongly agree”. In the fourth rank was indicator #10 which states that “unfriendly working environment” with a weighted mean 3.57

and a verbal interpretation of “strongly agree”. Fifth rank was indicator #3 which states that “Frustration” with a weighted mean of 3.54 and verbal interpretation of “strongly agree”. Sixth and seventh in ranking were indicators #7 and #8 with similar weighted mean of 3.48 and verbal interpretation of “agree”. Eight in rank was indicator #5 which states that “Short Temperament” with a weighted mean of 3.46 and verbal interpretation of “agree”. Ranked nine was indicator #6 which states that “Lack of Seriousness towards one duties onboard” with a weighted mean of 3.45 and verbal interpretation of “agree”. The lowest rank among all the indicators was indicator #4 which states that “careless mistakes onboard” with a weighted mean of 3.44 and a verbal interpretation of “agree”. On the over-all, for the difficulties encountered by the respondents in their apprenticeship program obtained a average weighted mean of 3.54 and verbally interpreted as strongly agree. This implies that the seafarers who had completed their apprenticeship program had undergone rigorous trainings and experiences necessary onboard the ship.

4. Difference in the Apprenticeship Difficulties Managed by the Respondents while training onboard When They Are Grouped According to Profile Variables

Table 4. Difference in the Apprenticeship Difficulties Managed by the Respondents while training onboard When They Are Grouped According to Profile Variables

Profile	Statistical Test	p-value	Interpretation
Age	t test t = 0.526 X ₁ (19-25) = 3.5289 X ₂ (26 and above) = 3.5508	0.600	Not Significant
MonthlyFamily Income	t test t = 0.886 X ₁ (20000 and below) = 3.5604 X ₂ (20001and above) = 3.5245	0.378	Not Significant

0.05 level of significance

As shown in Table 4, for the difference in the apprenticeship difficulties managed by the respondents while training onboard when the respondents are grouped according to age and monthly family income, the p values of 0.600 and 0.378, obtained were higher than the 0.05 level of significance. This shows that there is no significant difference in the difficulties encountered by the respondents in their apprenticeship program when the respondents are grouped according to age and monthly family income. This implies that the apprenticeship difficulties managed by the respondents while training onboard are the same regardless of their age and family income.

CONCLUSIONS

With reference to the findings of the study the following conclusions were extracted: (1) majority of respondents aged 26 years old and up have above high monthly income group, (2) The respondents strongly agree in the difficulties experienced while training onboard, and (3) The respondents identified that negligence on duties is the main factor of the difficulties they experienced, and (4) there is equal apprenticeship difficulties managed by the respondents while training onboard when the respondents are grouped according to profile variables.

Evidently, respondents exhibited similarity in negligence towards duties as the leading indicators for the apprenticeship difficulties managed while training onboard. This is further reaffirmed by the majority of seafarers who belongs to the 26 and above age bracket strongly agreed on such difficulties which is already a good start to review closely the indicators in order to find ways to eliminate the hindrances.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of significant findings of the study, the following are hereby recommended:

(1) Seafarers should be provided with intensive training, workshop, and lessons by their onboard shipboard training officer (2) Progress evaluation should be closely monitored to make apprenticeship as effective as possible, (3) Provide sufficient coordination to guarantee uniformity in the degree of skills required based on the tasks stipulated in the training record book and (4) Future researchers may conduct a similar study that would verify the results of this research. Furthermore, suggested that a modification and inclusion of other variables or factors be considered in future.

REFERENCES

- Afzali A., Motahar I A., & Hatamo- Shirkouhi L. (2013). Investigating the influence of perceived organizational support, psychological empowerment and organizational learning on the job performance: An empirical investigation. Issn 1330-3651 (print), issn 1848-6339 (online) udc/udk 65.012.013.122.015.25:336.71(55)
- Algozzine, B., Wang, C., &Violette, A. S. (2011).Reexamining the relationship between academic achievement and social behavior. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 13, 3-16.
- Battaglia M. (2008). Convenience Sampling. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods* by Paul J. Lavrakas Pub.date: 2008 | DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963947Print> ISBN: 9781412918084 | Online ISBN: 9781412963947
- CASEL (Producer). (2009). SEL: What is it and how does it contribute to students' academic success? Retrieved from http://casel.org/wp-content/uploads/Tool2_2009.pdf
- CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 20 Series of 2015
- Douglas, Paul. (2005). *American Apprenticeship and Industrial Education*. New York: Columbia University.
- Hordem, J. (2015). *Higher Apprenticeship & The Analysis of Vocational Knowledge*. Research in Post Compulsary Education. March 2015.
- Jennings, P.A., & Greenberg, M.T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. Review of

- Educational Research, 79, 491–525. Malinauskas, R, Dumciene A., & Lapeniene D. (2014). Social skills and life satisfaction of Lithuanian first- and –senior year university students. *Social behaviour and personality*, 2014, 42(2), 285-294 © Society for Personality Research <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.2.285>
- Khan, M. R., Ziauddin, Jam, F. A., and Ramay, M. I., The Impacts of Organizational Commitment on Employee Job Performance, *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(3), 2010, pp. 292-298.
- Lehmann, W. (2014). Go West Young Ones! Youth Apprenticeship and Opportunity structures in Two Canadian Province. *Journal of Education & Work*. 2014.
- Lehmann, W. (2014). Canada on their inferior structures despite skills labour shortages.. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*. Dec. 2014.
- Marquez B. et al., (2014). The Iterative Development and Initial Evaluation of We Have Skills! an Innovative Approach to Teaching Social Skills to marine Students. *Education and treatment of children* Vol. 37, No. 1, 2014.
- Mileham, R. (2015). All about for Older Apprenticeship. *Engineering Technology*. July 2015.
- Mostert, J., & Loxton, H. (2008). Exploring the effectiveness of the FRIENDS program in reducing anxiety symptoms among South African children. *Behaviour Change*, 25, 85–96.
- Quazi T., Shafique M. & Ahmad R., (2014) Unveiling Leadership–Employee Performance Links: Perspective of Young Employees Pak. *j.stat.oper.res.* Vol.468 X No.4 2014 pp467-473