



## **A Study of Contemporary Chinese Teachers' Views on Their Work and Professional Development**

WANG FENGYUAN <sup>1</sup>, DR. NIDHI AGARWAL <sup>2a</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD. Research Scholar Education, Lincoln University College, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup> Professor in Lincoln University College, Malaysia

Contact Details: [dr.nidhi@lincoln.edu.my](mailto:dr.nidhi@lincoln.edu.my)

---

### **Abstract**

In-service teachers in Guangzhou public schools will be polled about their perspectives on professional development opportunities. Until recently, the Chinese government exercised strict control over any and all training programs designed to advance an employee's career. China has only recently begun to decentralize education to its provinces and cities, but the impact has been significant (Chinese Embassy of Nepal, 2012; Xiaojiong, 2012; MOE, 2000).

This research is useful for architects, engineers, and other professionals who plan and design new developments. It will also help to determine how faculty members feel about pursuing advanced degrees.

**Keywords:** Professional Development, Opportunities, Teacher Training, Programs

### **INTRODUCTION**

Evidence of Chinese educational reform can be found dating back to the Shang Dynasty (1523–1027 B.C.). Changes have occurred over the course of this extended period as societal demands have shifted. These two ideologies emerged in China during the Warring States Period (770–220 BC), when the country was at war with itself. These ideas shaped Chinese educational thought and practice for the remainder of the twentieth century. During the final years of the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911), steps were taken to ensure universal education for all Chinese citizens. Improved teacher training is one way China's government has worked toward universal education since 1977.

The Ministry of Education's five-year plans are currently in their eleventh iteration. The Ministry of Education believes that these initiatives will address several pressing issues. To be sure, many plans are unrealistic due to the sheer size of China's economy and social structure, making it difficult to address the issues that arise. Goals were unrealistic and sometimes not based on the reality of the available funds because resources were not allocated appropriately to ensure achievement.

These strategies had been in development for several years prior to their implementation. According to the Chinese National Plan for Medium-Term Education Reform and Development



(2010-2010), the outline was first published in August of that year (Na & Jing, 2010). There were lots. of ideas collected, and it underwent forty changes before being released in July 2010. The primary school curriculum was first developed in the United States in 1950. To keep up with curriculum changes, they were updated four times: 1956, 1963, 1978, and 1986. It was decided to impose stringent requirements on elementary and senior institutions. The People's Education Press also produced eight textbook sets while new standards were being established. Since 1949, the federal government's approach to education has changed numerous times. In 1980, there were two significant shifts in professional development for teachers. For starters, instructors now have more decision-making power in the classroom. In other words, they had complete control over the way the material was presented. As a second benefit, local leaders now have more leeway in determining the best path for their schools to serve their students and communities.

When it came to teacher education reform, the Nepalese Embassy of China issued a report in 1985 based on the Fourth National Conference's findings. This paper emphasised the importance of teacher education as a strategic development measure. The Chinese educational system makes use of in-service programs for teachers.

Programs Mentorship and professional development are key components for in-service teachers. Mentoring is a time-honored method of assisting novice instructors by pairing them with an experienced colleague. China is a relative newcomer to teacher professional development in comparison to other developed countries. They have, however, made significant financial and intellectual investments to meet the political and societal demands of producing better-prepared students.

In May 2011, researchers Xiaomei Song and Liying Cheng published an article in the Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education titled "Investigating Primary English Immersion Teachers in China: Background, Instructional Contexts, Professional Development, and Perceptions".

Several research gaps were identified in relation to immersion instructors, including educational backgrounds, instructional settings, professional development, and their perspectives on English immersion. Majority of immersion Teachers were found to be under 30 years old and with only five years of teaching experience at the time of the study. According to data, these teachers taught an average of 50 students and spent 5.8 hours per week in the classroom. A little more than one-third of the professors had a master's or doctorate degree. The teachers describe their teaching style as communicative, interactive, and learner-centered. Professional development opportunities for immersion instructors were severely limited. China's immersion programmes must improve if in-service and continuous programme development are to be considered.

Wu Hua's article, "Prospects of Private Education in China," appeared in the journal Chinese Education and Society in November/December 2009. According to Hua, there is an increase in the number of private schools. In 2002, the United States had 61,200 private schools at all levels



(excluding private training institutes). There were 93,200 of them in 2006, a 52% increase. The total number of pupils increased by 107 percent, from 11.16 million in 2000 to 23.13 million in 2010.

In 2010, the Ministry of Education issued an outline of China's National Plan for Medium and Long-Term Education Reform and Development 2010-2020. The plan's ultimate goal is to transform the country into a human resource powerhouse. This report focused on the following areas: (a) increasing the number of quality teachers; (b) promoting teacher ethics; (c) improving teachers' professional efficiency; (d) raising teachers' social status; and (e) simplifying teacher administration. Building a large number of great instructors is the first step, because high-quality education requires excellent teachers. Teachers' status should be elevated, their rights protected, and their pay competitive with other professions. This would help to elevate teaching to a respectable level. Teachers' social status would increase as a result of this decision.”

### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

As technology advances, the world becomes more connected. To keep up with the pace of change, national populations must adapt to technological advances. Having a well-educated population is not the only advantage; a recent trend has been to diversify populations in order to gain a competitive advantage in the global market. To remain competitive in an increasingly competitive job market, many countries are reconsidering and retooling their education systems to keep up with societal changes and technological advancements. Any educational reform should prioritize teacher development (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon, 2001). To meet this demand, China enacted the Compulsory Education Law of 1986, which included objectives for test results and a range Surowski (2000) proposes policy measures to improve scores. The ultimate goal was to create more productive individuals with superior educational backgrounds. Examining pupils' test scores is a widely accepted procedure. Chinese officials see professional development as a critical tool in the country's efforts to improve its education system. China has prioritized professional development to improve students' exam scores (Huang, 2004).

### **THE STUDY AIMS**

To identify any significant differences in teachers' attitudes toward professional development based on their years of experience.

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Do years of experience affect teachers' attitudes based on their age?



## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study will use statistical assessments to determine whether there are statistically significant differences between groups based on gender, participant age, and number of years of teaching experience.

## **RESEARCH DESIGN**

This study will take a quantitative approach. Dr. Kathleen Flanagan-Hudson created the Attitude Toward In-Service Scale (Trueblood, 1986).

Permission to use the survey will be required from Dr. Flanagan-Hudson, who may grant it. Teachers will be asked to complete surveys using Qualtrics Survey Research Suite at the University of Arkansas. Once downloaded, the survey was distributed to all of the school's instructors.

The first survey included 25 in-service questions and 6 demographic ones. In contrast, the instrument will be re-created in Mandarin for use by Mandarin-speaking teachers.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

In order to answer the following research questions, this study used statistical analyses to determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between groups defined by gender, participant age, and years of teaching experience.

- What impact does a teacher's age have on their classroom approach?
- How do you think instructors' perspectives change with experience?
- How can teachers' perspectives differ based on a student's gender?
- Does an instructor's age affect their attitude towards students of different genders?
- Does age affect how instructors approach their jobs?



*Breakdown of Demographics by Age, Mean and Standard Deviation*

Level of Age	<i>n</i> (Percent)	Mean of Answers	Std. Dev. of Answer
1	61 (.13)	3.21	0.54
2	160 (.34)	3.63	0.45
3	136 (.29)	3.89	0.21
4	108 (.23)	3.90	0.20

*note.*  $n = 435$ ; numbers rounded to nearest hundredth.

The age range of respondents is shown in a table with four distinct categories. Teachers who were 30 or younger were given the nominal identification 1. This group comprised 13% (61) of all educators. The median age of respondents was 3.34 years. This indicates that the median response to all survey items in this age bracket was 3.34. There was only 0.56 standard deviation in the data. Teachers between the ages of 31 and 40 were given the nominal identifier 2. There were 160 educators who identified themselves as such. The variance was 0.47 standard deviations. There were three professors aged 41 to 50, which is what the nominal identification 3 represents.

There were 136 educators who identified themselves as such. The standard deviation was calculated to be 0.22. Teachers who were 51 or older were given the notional identifier 4. Specifically, 108 educators identified as such. The sample standard deviation was 0.21. According to the table, the vast majority of respondents aged 35 and older agreed or strongly agreed. The standard deviation for children aged one to four decreased from 0.56 to 0.21.

*Breakdown of Demographics by Level of Years of Experience, Mean and Standard Deviation*

Levels of Years of Experience	n Percent	Mean of Answers	Std Dev of Answers
1	91 (0.2)	3.25	0.53
2	158 (0.34)	3.74	0.38
3	109 (0.24)	3.89	0.21
4	105 (0.23)	3.90	0.21

*note.* n= 463; Numbers rounded to nearest hundredth.

Table 12 categorizes test takers' total years of experience into four groups based on how long they've been using the tool. When asked how many years of classroom experience they had, instructors with five or fewer years were assigned the notional identity 1. 91 educators self-identified as belonging to this group. The nominal identity of 2 indicates instructors with six to fifteen years of experience. In total, 158 educators self-identified as such. For instructors who reported having between 16 and 25 years of experience, the nominal identification 3 fits this range. In total, 109 educators self-identified as such. Nominally, four represents the number of professors who reported 26 years of experience or more.

The majority of the 105 educators who self-identified as such were female.

The average for the first group is 3.38, with a standard deviation of 0.55. The average for Group 2 is 3.9, but the standard deviation is only 0.4. The average number of years of experience in Group 3 is 4.05, while in Group 4 it is 4.06. This suggested that experienced educators agreed with the questions more frequently. Group 3 teachers had a 0.21 standard deviation, whereas Group 4 teachers had a 0.22 standard deviation, indicating that they were more likely to respond with agree or strongly agree.

## CONCLUSION

Researchers in Guangzhou, China, conducted this study to learn more about how teachers there perceive their opportunities for professional development. We used their employment data to



contact one-third of educators and request their participation in the study. If that's the case, they should have received an email containing the survey URL before arriving on campus. It has been proposed that the study include 479 participants. The survey was completed with 100% participation from teachers, and the results are now being reviewed to ensure that all questions have been answered.

### **LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The study will only include high schools in Guangzhou. This means that the researcher may need to rely on school officials. Collect data when respondents are not present during survey administration. Cecil Trueblood and Kathleen Flanagan Hudson created the Attitudes Toward In-Service Education Scale in 1981. (True Blood, 1986). Kathryn E. H. Race created the Teacher Attitude Survey to Gauge Instructional Strategies and Classroom Pedagogy in Support of Larger Outcome-based Evaluation Efforts to represent the research findings from her study. Liao translated Dr Races' survey into Mandarin and discovered that when administered in Taiwan, the reliability value was 0.93. (Liao, 2003). It was necessary to contact Dr Kathleen Flanagan Hudson, who gave her consent for the study to be conducted. This sample includes all of Guangzhou's instructors. It is possible that the title The original survey research will be modified to reflect cultural differences. The survey questions will be used to collect information. The questionnaires were filled out entirely by the respondents themselves.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Ashmore, R. A. & Cao, Z. (1997). Teacher education in the People's Republic of China. Bloomington, Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation.
2. Bodycott, P., Walker, A., and Lee Chi Kin, J. (2001, Spring). More than heroes and villains: Pre- service teacher beliefs about principals. *Educational Research*, 43(1), 15-31.
3. Boshier, R. & Huang, Y. (2006, Jul-Aug). Building for the future by expatiating the past: High drama from the summit of China's Learning Mountain. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 25(4), 351-367.
4. Brunswick Group. (2013, November). China & the third plenum: A review of the third plenary communiqué. China & The Third Plenum. Retrieved from <http://www.brunswickgroup.com/media/229230/Brunswick-China-Analysis-CPC-Third-Plenary-Session-November-2013.pdf>
5. Cheung, R. (2012, September). Teaching for creativity: Examining the beliefs of early childhood teachers and their influence on teaching practices. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 37(3), 43-51.
6. Cheng, Y. & Manning, P. (2003). Revolution in education: China and Cuba in global context, 1957-76. *Journal of World History*, 14(3), 359-391.





7. Chi-kin, L. J. & Feng, S. (2007 August). Mentoring support and the professional development of beginning teachers: A Chinese perspective. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 15(3), 243-262.
8. China Educational and Research Network. (2006, February 28). Teacher education reform and development for the 10th Five Year Plan. retrieved from [http://www.edu.cn/news\\_1461/20060228/t20060228\\_164200.shtml](http://www.edu.cn/news_1461/20060228/t20060228_164200.shtml)
9. ChinaToday.com (2010). China Education. Retrieved from <http://www.chinatoday.com/edu/a.htm>
10. China to promote equality in education. (2013, November 13). Xinhua English news. Retrieved from [news.zinhuanet.com/english/china.htm](http://news.zinhuanet.com/english/china.htm)
11. Dikotter, F. (2010, November). The Great Leap backward. *History Today*, 60(11), 3-4.
12. Ding, X. (2012). Policy metamorphosis in China: A case study of minban education in Shanghai. Lanham: Lexington Book.
13. Education Office of the Embassy of the People's Republic of China in USA. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.sino-education.org/english/index.htm>
14. Eighth National People's Congress. (2010, March 1). Education Law of the People's Republic of China (1995). Asia Catalyst. Retrieved from <http://asiacatalyst.org/laws/2010/02/education-law-of-the-peoples-republic-of-china.html>
15. Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the United States of America. (2009).
16. Retrieved from <http://www.china-embassy.org/eng/gyzg/xsjl/>
17. Embassy of the People's Republic of China in Nepal. (2012). Retrieved from <http://np.china-embassy.org/eng/>
18. Fan-Tang, S.-Y., Hung-Cheng, M.-M., & Mui-So, W.-W. (2006, July). Supporting student teachers' professional learning with standards referenced assessment. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(2), 223-244.
19. Fang, Y. & Hui, Y. (2012). The external path of professional development for old teachers under the new curriculum reform in China. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 8(3), 17-20. DOI: 10.3968/j.ccc.1923670020120803.1152
20. Friedman, E. (2008, June/September). Raising sheep on wolf milk: The politics and dangers of misremembering the past in China. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, 9(2- 3), 389-409. DOI: 10.1080/14690760802095054
21. Garet, M.S., Porter, A.C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K.S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers.
22. *American Education Research Journal*, 38(4), 915-945.





23. Gu, Wei. (2008, Summer). New horizons and challenges in China's public schools for parent involvement. *Education*, 128(4), 570-578.
24. Hatcher, L. (2003). *Step-by-step basic statistics using SAS*. North Carolina. SAS Institute Inc.
25. Hoyt, M. W. (2006). John Dewey's legacy to China and the problems in Chinese society.
25. Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 3(1), retrieved from <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci>
26. Hansen, V. (2000). *The Open Empire: A history of China to 1600*. New York. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
27. Huang, F. (2004). Curriculum reform in contemporary China: Seven goals and six strategies.
28. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 101-115.
29. Hua, W. (2009, November - December). Prospects of private education in China. *Chinese Education and Society*, 42(6), 40-66.
30. Ivanhoe, P. J. & Norden B. W. V. (2005). *Readings in classical Chinese philosophy*. Indianapolis IN, Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
31. Knowledgerush. (2003). Dengism. Retrieved from <http://www.knowledgerush.com/kr/encyclopedia/Dengism/>
32. Kuhn, D. (2009). *The age of Confucian rule: The Song transformation of China*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
33. Kuo, P. W. (1915). *The Chinese system of public education*. Teachers College, Columbia University: New York.
34. Jiang, W. (2005, Nov-Dec). Creating a quality higher education teacher base and measures for undertaking reforms. *Chinese Education and Society*, 38(6), 7-16.
35. Jun, H. and Zhuzhu, W. (2010). Capability building in educational technology for teachers in China. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(4), 607-611. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01089.x