Can Increasing Faculty Professionalism Raise Instructional Quality
at a Chinese University?

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Jeffrey D. Lindgren

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dr. David W. Chapman, Advisor

December, 2013

Acknowledgements

I would like to express sincere appreciation to my advisor, Dr. David Chapman. His availability, insightful feedback, and encouragement throughout this process were integral to my completing this study. I am very grateful for his willingness to take time from his sabbatical to help me through the final stages of this project.

I would also like to thank Dr. Darwin Hendel, Dr. Carol Carrier, and Dr. Bob Poch for reading my dissertation and serving on my committee. I have appreciated their interest, feedback, and insights regarding this study.

I'm grateful to Hui Bi, who helped me pilot the study and translate the instruments. Her availability and expertise were timely and instructive.

I'm very appreciative of the participants in this study and everyone at Guangdong X University.

My parents, Clayton and Emmy Lou Lindgren, have always been there to support me, academically and personally. Thank you for your unwavering encouragement and prayers all these years.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Katie. Thank you for your encouragement, for editing my paper, and for everything else you did during this time. I dedicate this paper to you and our daughters, Hannah and Annika.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if increasing faculty professionalism is a viable strategy for raising the quality of instruction at a Chinese university. In this study, increasing faculty professionalism refers to increases in regards to six areas of faculty work: academic freedom, work balance, governance, reward systems, salary, and professional development. A mixed-methods approach was used in this study. 30 faculty and 15 administrators were interviewed using a standardized open-ended approach and 27 faculty and 21 administrators responded to a questionnaire with 26 Likert-type questions.   Study findings suggest that faculty and administrators at Guangdong X University agree that instructional quality needs to be raised. In addition, the findings suggest that faculty and administrators at Guangdong X University agree that increasing faculty professionalism may be an effective way to raise the quality of instruction at this university. Also, the findings suggest that this agreement between faculty and administrators at Guangdong X University may indicate an open policy window (Kingdon, 2003) for advancing the strategy of increasing faculty professionalism as a way to raise instructional quality. Finally, policy alternatives are suggested in view of Kingdon's (2003) model.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

CHAPTER 1: PROBLEM STATEMENT

In recent years, Chinese higher education has changed dramatically (Cai & Qi, 2011; "China's New Guidelines", 2010; Jiang, 2009; Lai, 2010; Lai & Lo, 2007; Li & Lin, 2008; Min, 2004; Postiglione, 2005, 2009; Wang, 2008). Higher education has transformed from an elite to a mass education system. Management and control of higher education has become more decentralized than in the past. Ambitious reforms have aimed at creating world class universities. Most striking among the many changes is that in a relatively short period of time, China's higher education system has grown to be the largest in the world.

This dissertation is a case study of one Chinese university, and the focus of the study is on instructional quality. Instructional quality is an important issue for any educational system, but perhaps especially for a university within a rapidly changing higher education system such as China's. In this study, faculty and administrators, key stakeholders at the university, were asked if they believed instructional quality needed to be raised at their university. In addition, they were asked if a strategy of faculty professionalism is a viable means of raising the quality of instruction.

The Massification of Chinese Higher Education and Resulting Quality Issues

In recent decades, China's higher education has transformed from an elite to a mass education system (Jiang, 2009, Qiang, 2011). During this period, many institutions expanded too rapidly, and as a result now face issues of low quality ("China's New Guidelines," 2010; Lai, 2010; Lai & Lo, 2007; Min, 2004; Zhou, 2006), including the

need to maintain an adequate number of qualified faculty, upgrade and develop curriculum, and provide sufficient laboratory facilities and library books (Min, 2004).

In particular, quality of instruction has become an area of concern ("China's New Guidelines," 2010; Lan, 2008; Wei, 2005). In a study by Wei (2005), fifty-four percent of students surveyed said they believe more than half of their instructors use "traditional teaching methods, spoon feeding, neglecting teacher-student interaction, and requiring students to learn by rote" (p. 10).   Moreover, sixteen percent of the students believed that fewer than ten percent of their instructors "are effective teachers that students appreciate" (Wei, 2005, p. 10). In addition, scholarly papers, government reports and popular newspapers express dissatisfaction with teaching methods that are traditional and content/exam-oriented (Postiglione, 2002).

From their two years of interviews, Lincoln, et al. (2002) concluded that instructional methods, course content, and course structures need improvement. Some researchers (Cao, 2011; Lincoln et al., 2002) also reported a mismatch between what is taught in the classroom and what is actually happening in the lives of Chinese people on a social and work level.

The Importance of Faculty in Relation to Higher Education Quality

Faculty play an important role in efforts to raise educational quality (Min, 2004; ADB, 2011a, 2011b). The number of faculty in China increased from 603,900 in 1998 to 944,500 in 2004 (Zhou, 2006) and by 2012 had swelled to 1,440,292 according to the Ministry of Education

(http://www.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s7567/201309/156899.html).

Min (2004) explains that during the higher education expansion, large numbers of faculty were hired or promoted, but that some were lacking in credentials and experience. As a result, Min argues that significant faculty development is needed. Because faculty are such important stakeholders in Chinese higher education, Lincoln et al. (2002) suggest that China must attract, support and develop highly qualified faculty if they are to engage in new pedagogies, revise curriculum and increase research.

Faculty Professionalism as a Strategy for Raising Instructional Quality

Although issues with instructional quality appear to exist, there does not seem to be a clear consensus as to how to address these issues. In recent years, the government has tried to improve quality by implementing more stringent assessments of faculty instruction; however, these assessments have been met with criticism, due in part to the deprofessionalizing effect they had on faculty (Huang, 2009; Lai & Lo, 2007; Liu, 2009). In contrast, Lincoln, et al., (2002) suggested increasing the roles and responsibilities of faculty as a strategy to improve quality. Though both strategies are intended to improve quality, they would appear to be in conflict; the former strategy tends to undermine faculty professionalism (Lai & Lo, 2007) whereas the latter increases faculty professionalism.

Hutcheson (2000) argues that the notion of faculty professionalism lies in tension with bureaucratization. Hutcheson's work focuses on three issues related to this tension between professionalism and bureaucracy: academic freedom, economic issues, and faculty participation in governance. In describing faculty professionalism, Hutcheson adds that the "sociological definitions of profession, in the context of the professoriate,

focus on expert (disciplinary) knowledge resulting from advanced education, autonomy from contractual standards of technical work, control of appointments and promotion, ethics, and social prestige" (p. 4-5).

Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007) argue that faculty are critical to the success and effectiveness of institutions of higher education. In addition, they propose five essential elements of faculty work: employment equity, academic freedom and autonomy, flexibility, professional growth, and collegiality. They suggest that the realization of these elements would result in the following desirable outcomes: increased faculty satisfaction and sense of meaningfulness, increased organizational commitment, enhanced recruitment and retention, a broader spectrum of individuals represented on the faculty, and more strategic utilization of intellectual capital.

The current study draws on the works of Gappa, Austin and Trice (2007) and Hutcheson (2000) to conceptualize the notion of professionalism. Professionalism, for the purposes of this paper, includes six domains: (a) academic freedom; (b) balanced workload; (c) salary; (d) reward systems; (e) governance; (f) professional development. This concept of professionalism is illustrated in figure 1.

Figure 1

The Six Domains of Faculty Professionalism

A framework proposed by the author.

Kingdon's (2003) Multiple Streams Model and the Viability of Faculty

Professionalism

While Gappa et al. (2007) and Hutcheson (2000) are drawn on to define the *concept* of professionalism, the question as to the *viability* of this strategy still remains. This paper will apply Kingdon's model to help frame an investigation of the extent to which the strategy of professionalism is indeed *viable* in the Chinese higher education context.

Kingdon's model identifies three process streams in the policy making process: problems, policies, and politics. The *problem stream* involves the identification or recognition of a problem; the *policy stream* describes how policy actors will produce a short list of policy solutions for the perceived problem; the *politics* stream involves the consensus among various political forces in regards to a proposed policy solution to a recognized problem. For policy to be developed or advanced, there needs to be a coupling of these three streams: solutions are joined with problems, and both are connected to political forces or actors. In this model, the consensus among policy actors about problems and solutions will predict the likelihood of policy change.

Research Questions and Implications

Grounded in Kingdon's (2003) model, this paper will investigate the extent of agreement between administrators and faculty at a Chinese university in regards to (a) the need to raise the quality of instruction and (b) increasing faculty professionalism as means to raise instructional quality.

A high level of agreement among faculty and administrators about these questions might have policy implications. For instance, a high level of agreement that a) instructional quality is low and b) that greater faculty professionalism would lead to higher student learning may indicate a greater likelihood of policy change in regards to raising faculty professionalism. On the other hand, if faculty or administrators (or both) did not feel instructional quality should be raised, policy change in regards to faculty professionalism would be unlikely. Likewise, if faculty and administrators disagree about how to raise instructional quality (i.e. by employing the strategy of increasing faculty professionalism), policy change would also be unlikely. Little literature appears to address the extent of agreement between Chinese faculty and administrators about faculty professionalism as a means to raise quality of instruction.

Implications for the study are as follows. If there is agreement among the stakeholders (faculty and administrator) as to the problems and solutions, it would suggest that the time is ripe for policy change. If there is disagreement among stakeholders as to the problems and solutions, it would suggest that the timing for policy changes may be premature, or that perhaps greater consensus building needs to occur before policy changes will be successful.

The research questions for this study are as follows. To what extent do administrators and faculty at a Chinese university agree:

1. about the current level of quality of instruction at their university?

2. that increasing faculty professionalism would raise instructional quality at their university?

It is anticipated that both administrators and faculty will agree that the quality of instruction needs to be raised at their university.   It is also expected that faculty would believe that increasing faculty professionalism would raise instructional quality at their university. However, the question of whether administrators believe increasing faculty professionalism would raise instructional quality is more difficult to anticipate; yet it is one of the questions this study aims to answer.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework: Kindgdon's Multiple Streams Model

Kingdon's (2003) model suggests that at certain times, windows of opportunity for policy change will appear; in other words, there are moments of opportunity for change to happen when the streams of problems, policy solutions and politics are joined. When there is agreement among key stakeholders about a particular problem and a proposed solution, a window of opportunity for policy change is opened. The present study seeks to determine the extent of agreement between faculty and administrators in regards to a) the need for raising instructional quality and b) increasing faculty professionalism as a strategy for raising instructional quality. The greater the extent of agreement between faculty and administrators, the more likely policy change would happen; conversely, the lower the level of agreement, the less likely policy change would happen.

Researchers have applied Kingdon's model in a variety of contexts. Li and Lin (2008) have applied Kingdon's model, in particular its notion of a policy window, to the 1999 policy decision to massify Chinese higher education. In their analysis, certain events or factors preceded the opening of a policy window. One such factor was the economic concern that remained after the 1997 Asian economic crisis, which prompted the government to spend money on higher education as a boost to the economy. Another factor was that education is traditionally highly valued in Chinese culture, and families are willing to save for and invest in education. These important factors ultimately lead

to the 1999 policy solution, which was the radical massification of Chinese higher

education.

Other researchers have used Kingdon's framework in educational contexts as

well; Dejaegher, Chapman, & Mulkeen (2006) utilized Kingdon's model to analyze

policy decisions in regards to secondary education in sub-Saharan Africa. In this case,

researchers examined responses of various stakeholders (teachers, headmasters, and

education officials) in regards to secondary education. Kingdon's model was used to

assess the level of support these stakeholders had regarding policies aimed at increasing

the number of qualified secondary school teachers. One of the suggestions the

researchers gave was that in the context of a "steep hierarchy" (p. 529) such as the

political systems of sub-Saharan Africa, various stakeholders may have legitimate, but

different, concerns.   These different concerns can lead to fragmentation or lack of

agreement about acceptable policy solutions. In addition, the researchers suggested that

policy makers need to build consensus among various stakeholders at every level in order

for policy solutions to be successful.

Kingdon's model has been used in relation to educational policies, including the

decision in China to massify higher education (Li & Lin, 2008). In this study it will also

be applied to the Chinese higher education context, in regards to increasing faculty

professionalism as a possible policy decision.

History and Reform in Chinese Higher Education

For thousands of years, Chinese people have placed a high value on education, as

is reflected in the ancient saying "to establish a nation state, education should come first"

(Min, 2004, p. 55). Chinese higher education began as early as 1100 B.C. and continued until the late 19th century. As western countries gained entry into China following the Opium war, a western university model was introduced. China began to move toward this model in order to promote learning in science and technology. In 1898, as part of a major reform, Capital Metropolitan University, the predecessor of Peking University, was established. It was the first modern national comprehensive university in China, and a milestone in the development of China's higher education system. Yet it was not until Cai Yuanpei became Peking University's president in 1911 that it truly became a modern Chinese university. Cai, drawing on his education in Germany and France, promoted institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and arts and sciences (instead of ancient classics), patterning the university after the western model (Min, 2004).

After the founding of the People's Republic of China, the government nationalized higher education institutions, following the Soviet model. Large numbers of soviet professors and administrators came to China to assist with the structural reform of universities as the country began to develop a centrally planned economy. Adopting the Soviet model meant that Chinese universities became specialized and were operated by various government ministries; for example, Beijing Agricultural University came under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Agriculture (Min, 2004).

In 1958, the government launched the Great Leap Forward, a national movement for economic development. Partly in reaction to the overspecialization, fragmentation of knowledge, and rigidity of the Soviet model, and partly as a result of the Chinese government's overall plan for economic development, the number of higher education

institutions dramatically increased. In a span of three years, 1,000 new universities were established and enrollments jumped from 441,181 to 961, 623. However, three years later, due to low efficiency and quality, and as a result of national economic challenges, the number of institutions decreased from 1,289 to 407. After two years of healthy development from 1963-65, the Cultural Revolution began. It was a period in which enrollment dropped precipitously, from 674,400 in 1965 to 47,800 in 1970, and many universities and colleges were shut down (Min, 2004).

Even this brief overview of the history of Chinese higher education demonstrates that China has experienced a number of reforms in higher education. It is out of this context that we begin to understand the contemporary reforms which began in the 1980's and continue to the present. The change from a centrally planned economy to a market economy, the development of science and technology, and increases in living standards all began to increase the demand on higher education. Education was considered the foundation for economic success, and developing higher education was made a priority. As a result of this development, enrollments at higher education institutions increased from one million in the early 80's to thirteen million in 2001 (Min, 2004).

During this transition to a market economy, the economic sector experienced the most rapid changes. The education system changed as well, but at a slower pace. Higher education institutions now need to be responsive to market forces and human resource needs, adjusting enrollments and programs accordingly. Yet the government still influences and supervises higher education through several means, such as funding educational programs and developing an accreditation and quality control system for

higher education institutions. The government has also restructured hundreds of

universities, restoring to a certain extent the university structure that existed before the

Soviet model. From 1993 to 2001, 708 higher education institutions were reorganized

into 302 institutions, eliminating ministerial control and combining previously

specialized universities into more comprehensive ones (Min, 2004).

In briefly describing some of the historical context of Chinese higher education, it

is worth highlighting some points relevant to this study. China's higher education has

reformed many times in its history, so in a sense, the current reforms are not an anomaly.

Typically, Chinese higher education has been characterized by very strong central

control, though there has been a certain amount of ebb and flow between centralized and

decentralized control during various periods in its history. The most recent reforms have

resulted in a rapid expansion of higher education institutions and enrollments, resulting in

issues of educational quality ("China's New Guidelines," 2010; Lai, 2010; Lai & Lo,

2007; Min, 2004; Zhou, 2006;). Finally, after a long period of centralized control, there

appears in recent years to be a general movement toward decentralization in higher

education (Mok, 2005; Yang, Vidovich & Currie, 2007) in which the central government

has granted more control to local governments and higher education institutes than it has

in the past. The next section discusses this trend toward decentralization in more detail.

Decentralization of Chinese Higher Education

As a part of higher education reforms, the government has been decentralizing

power, granting more responsibility and flexibility to higher education institutions

("China's New Guidelines," 2010; Mok, 2005; Yang, Vidovich & Currie, 2007). Some,

however, argue that the government has still not granted enough autonomy to institutions, suggesting that institutional administrators are still heavily influenced by the central government (Cynanowski, 2010). On the other hand, others predict that recent comprehensive reforms will lead to an increase in autonomy. Sun Xiaobing, director of policy and regulation, said that the new policies would grant more autonomy to colleges in regards to teaching and research and that "professors will be given an important position in teaching and academic decisions" ("China's New Guidelines," 2010).

Although there may be debate as to how much decentralization has actually happened and will possibly happen, the current level of institutional autonomy appears to be limited. Due to quality concerns, the government retains a strong evaluative role, which some claim is a form of central governance (Jiang, 2009). In addition, though decentralization has shifted some control from the government to the institution, this control has not always been extended to the level of the individual faculty member within institutions (Yang, Vidovich & Currie, 2007). To a certain extent, individual faculty at some higher ranked and supported universities have more authority and autonomy than in the past, but in some ways face increased accountability and evaluation from the ministry of education (Yang et al., 2007).

Decentralization is relevant to the current study in several ways. If decentralization continues, it would suggest that faculty would need to take on more responsibility and leadership at their universities. Therefore, decentralization may result in an opening window for the strategy or policy of faculty professionalism. In other words, increased decentralization may lead policy makers in Chinese higher education to

consider policies that are consistent with faculty professionalism, such as increasing

academic freedom, governance, and professional development.

Identification of Kingdon's (2003) Multiple Streams in the Context of this Study

Kingdon's (2003) model identifies the streams of problems, solutions, and

politics. In this study, the problem is conceptualized as instructional quality, and the

possible solution as faculty professionalism. The political stream refers to the level of

agreement or consensus between administrators and faculty at Guangdong X University,

in regards to the six domains of professionalism. The following section of this literature

review will be organized by the domains of professionalism: (a) academic freedom; (b)

balanced workload; (c) salary; (d) reward systems; (e) governance; (f) professional

development. For each of these domains, this study will determine the extent to which

administrators and faculty agree that raising each domain will increase instructional

quality.

Professionalism and academic freedom. Academic freedom is defined by the

American Association of University Professors (2001) (as cited in Gappa, Austin &

Trice, 2007) as:

> …the right of all faculty members to freely express their views in research and in
> the publication of results, in the classroom in discussing their subjects, and as
> citizens without institutional censorship, when such views are appropriately and
> responsibly expressed (p. 141).

As it relates to teaching, academic freedom includes "the autonomy to plan their courses,

select the materials they will use, and decide the best methods by which to teach the

materials" (p. 227).

Tenure, the new employment system, and academic freedom.   In the United

States, the connection between academic freedom and tenure was made in the *1940*

Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which called for permanent

tenure after a seven year probationary period. In doing so, the American Association of

University Professors "made a bid to install tenure as the keystone of academic freedom"

whereas at the time half of the HEIs hired faculty on an annual basis (Menand, 1996, p.

87). Traditionally, tenure helped secure faculty jobs, autonomy and academic freedom,

and in exchange made long-term commitments to their institutions (Gappa et al., 2007).

The modern history of tenure in the Chinese higher education context, however,

has been different. It appears that faculty for many years, until perhaps recently, have

experienced virtually guaranteed employment. In fact, Wei (2005) suggested that one

reason for low quality faculty has been the prevalence of the lifelong system of

guaranteed employment (zhongshenzhi), and that there were no mechanisms for

institutions to reward excellence, eliminate incompetence, or create competition.

Yet, there have been significant changes in the recent past regarding tenure and

reward systems in Chinese higher education institutions (Yu, 2009; Lai, 2010). Yu (2009)

interviewed 50 faculty and administrators regarding the recent faculty employment policy

shift in Chinese higher education. The Chinese higher education system used to provide

guaranteed employment to almost all faculty, regardless of performance. However, in the

new employment system, faculty are employed on a contractual basis, which can be

potentially renewable. Faculty are now evaluated on their research, teaching, and service

for decisions regarding merit, promotion, and retention.   According to Yu (2009) it has

increased productivity among faculty, which contributes to institutional productivity. On

the other hand, faculty activities, including publishing, funding generation, and teaching

are defined largely by numbers; quantity is emphasized without close examination of

quality. Similarly, Lai (2010) found that the employment reforms have not only

increased work-related pressure for faculty but have negatively affected the quality of

their research and teaching. One faculty said:

> In the past, I felt that…as a teacher, I should be responsible for my students…but
> now, I must consider…what I would take away if I leave this university one
> day…So I think more about my own needs…the rationale (of the new system) is
> like a knife that cuts out many things (such as relationships, commitment and
> traditional values) (p. 99).

In summary, the employment policies have changed in ways that may affect teaching

negatively. In the new promotional system, faculty face lower job security and feel an

increased pressure to do research.

   Curriculum and academic freedom. Beginning in the 1950's, the Chinese higher

education system followed a state controlled model, where the central government

assumed substantial control over higher education institutions (HEIs), including control

over curriculum. However, universities now have more responsibility for curriculum

than they have in the past.   Faculty have more responsibility for curriculum as well, but

to varying extents (Yang, Vidovich, & Currie, 2005).

   Evaluation of teaching and academic freedom. Chinese universities currently

undertake several activities in an attempt to improve teaching quality, including teaching

evaluation. According to Minister of Education Zhou (2006), teaching and research

offices offer teaching discussions. School leaders in charge of teaching may audit

classes, and teachers audit colleagues' classes. The dean's office collects information such as student exam data and feedback from graduates. The dean's office organizes a committee for teaching inspections, providing standards and procedures for the committee to follow. The committee supervises all types of classes, and does a comprehensive evaluation of teaching at the departmental and individual level. These are examples of ways university administrators have responded to the perceived problems with the quality of teaching.

The Ministry of Education (MoE) has also attempted to improve instruction, but perhaps in ways that have decreased professionalism. One way the MOE has tried to improve instructional quality is by instituting an Evaluation Plan for Undergraduate Teaching Quality in Higher Education Institutions (Lai & Lo, 2007; Zhou, 2006). This involved two major parts: 1) an evaluation of teaching quality and 2) a measure of employment rates of graduates from each specialization. One part of the evaluation of teaching quality was at the university level, and included senior faculty observations of their colleagues. Another part of the evaluation was on the national level, conducted by a team of educational management experts, and covered eight areas: the directing ideology of education, teacher qualification, the use of teaching equipment, the establishment of specializations, reform in teaching and learning, management of teaching and learning, and the learning culture and the effectiveness of teaching and learning. The national team then reported back to the MOE its evaluation conclusions. During the final stage of this plan, the university tried to address the teaching problems suggested in the report.

Feedback on this assessment plan have been mixed. On the positive side,

Minister of Education Zhou (2006, p. 113) reports that institutions have increased funds

for teaching, improved teaching conditions, improved the campus environment,

established institutional level teaching quality control mechanisms, and given greater

attention to educational quality.

On the other hand, faculty have expressed dissatisfaction with this approach to the

evaluation of teaching (Lai & Lo, 2007; Jiang, 2009). For one, it required a large amount

of resources and manpower in the creation of evaluation related documents. Secondly,

the assessment also caused faculty to feel more restricted in terms of their freedom to

teach in the way they thought would be most effective:

> We should not be strictly confined to the quantitative indicators…Teaching is an
> interactive activity, but now the state has normalized it into narrowly defined
> outcomes…(under these measurements), the teacher can only be a passive object.
> However, teaching should instead be a highly flexible activity, one which allows
> the teacher to work as an independent agent. In this way his/her creativity can be
> best utilized to raise the quality of teaching and learning (Lai & Lo, p. 156).

In general, faculty felt that this assessment limited instructor flexibility, individuality, and

autonomy, and that it had a negative effect on quality.

The assessment also required departmental specializations to reach a graduate

employment rate of 60% or above for a specified number of years; otherwise, the

specialization would be eliminated. This focus on employment rates placed significant

pressure on faculty.   One result was the creation of new courses to fit market appeal;

however, these courses were often taught by younger faculty even though they were

outside their area of specialization. In addition, some faculty felt that the MoE controlled

instruction by requiring standardization of exams and teaching schedules. These and

other examples of state supervision led to increased pressure on faculty and decreased

autonomy, amounting to what Lai & Lo (2007) viewed as a trend of deprofessionalization

of faculty. In addition, some (Li, 2010) claim the state performance measures on

teaching waste resources and disturb the teaching process.

In contrast, Liu (2009) downplays the notion that external evaluation puts undue

constraints on autonomy and academic freedom. Liu instead argues that because

universities are public institutions, they should accept the government's role in oversight.

From Liu's standpoint, the government represents the interests of the country and society,

and by performing teaching evaluations, is employing one means of supervising colleges

and universities.

Huang (2009), president of Zhongshan University, also defends the recent

emphasis on evaluation. He argues that government supervision by using evaluations,

accreditation, and examinations are practices used commonly around the world. He also

contends that students have primarily benefitted from the evaluations, and have led to

cleaner campuses and classrooms, teachers who are more conscientious about teaching,

and even improved cafeteria food. Huang says that faculty have been the greatest source

of resistance, because they must meet high standards of teaching, requiring more effort

on their part. Huang also acknowledges that some institutions go beyond the

requirements of the evaluation, taking a formalistic approach, with which the faculty

would understandably disapprove.

Professionalism and a balanced work load. Faculty workloads and working

conditions are deteriorating in some parts of the world, where faculty are being asked to

do more with less time (Tierney, 2003).   In China, workloads are increasing as well. For example, several researchers note an increase in the teacher-student ratio (Lai & Lo, 2007; Lincoln et al., 2002; Xu et al. 2005). In the early 1990s, the teacher- student ratio was 1:7-8 for undergraduate education. In a decade, ratios had changed to those comparable to the U.S. (1:15 for undergraduate education; 1:7-8 for graduate education) (Lincoln, et al., 2002). In addition, Xu et al. (2005) in a survey of 17,900 professors and associate professors found that 48% of respondents felt that their workload was excessive.

Postiglione's (2002) research of top universities in Bejing and Shanghai also indicates significant pressure on faculty to do research. In total, more than 500 faculty from Beijing and Shanghai were interviewed using a survey based on an adaptation of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Higher Education's International Survey of the Academic Profession (Boyer, Altbach, & Whitelaw, 1994). When asked about pressure to conduct research and workload expectations, only Chile and Hong Kong faculty felt under more pressure. In addition, a survey administered by Wei (2005) indicates that 37.9 of faculty believed their workload was too heavy, and 84.9 percent have neither time nor opportunity for training due in part to their heavy workload. It is possible, then, that a heavy faculty workload is having a negative effect on instructional quality.

Professionalism and salary. Salaries for faculty have grown in recent years (Zhou, 2006). This has made teaching, in the words of Minister of Education Zhou, an "enviable" profession (p. 73).   Min (2004) adds that great efforts have been undertaken

to strengthen faculty, who are seen as critical actors in reforming teaching and curriculum. During the 1970's to the 1990's, faculty incomes were lower than other professionals with comparable educational backgrounds. However, in recent years, efforts have been made to increase faculty remuneration. For example, from 1998 to 2001 faculty salaries doubled, from U.S. $1,500 to U.S. $3,000. In addition, the government also spent U.S. $14.3 billion to improve faculty living conditions (Min, 2004). Faculty salaries continued to increase to a level of U.S. $6,318 per year in 2006 (Mohrman, Geng & Wang, 2011).

In spite of recent increases, faculty salaries may still be insufficient to support institutional quality and reforms. Faculty will be increasingly responsible for costs such as providing for their own housing and funding portions of their own retirement (Lincoln et al., 2002). In addition, the cost of living has risen dramatically, to the degree that eight of the world's most expensive cities are in China. In fact, Beijing, home to many of China's top HEI's, has a higher cost of living than Stockholm, Sweden ("Price Shock", 2009). Recent research (Altbach, 2012, as cited in International Herald Tribune, 2012) compares faculty salaries internationally, taking into account both salary level and cost of living. Using this formula, Canada's monthly salary ranked highest in the world ($9,485) while China ranked near the bottom ($259), below even Armenia and Ethiopia.

Postiglione (2002, p. 157) notes that if salaries are not adequate, faculty may be less committed to institutional reforms. He adds that some of the most talented faculty can supplement their salaries by taking on additional teaching opportunities or by consulting. In addition, he reports that there is a migration of faculty from the university

to the marketplace or to other universities that offer higher salaries. Without sufficient faculty salaries, it may be difficult to achieve successful reforms and raise instructional quality.

If salaries are insufficient, faculty may take on second jobs. However, faculty may be motivated to have second jobs for several reasons. In a study of 268 faculty by Lu (2005), 53.4 percent reported having second jobs. The two most reported reasons for taking a second job were 1) "It gives full play to my strengths, enabling me to realize my self-worth" and 2) "my income is too low and I am under great financial pressure." Of those surveyed, eight percent believed that their second job had a large impact on their primary work, 19 percent believed it had a considerable impact, 32 percent believed it had minimal impact, and 30 percent believed it had no impact. These findings suggest that second jobs are impacting their primary jobs to some degree.

Scholars seem to disagree about the effects of second jobs on faculty work. Wei (2005) states that second jobs should be encouraged, because it can broaden the thinking of faculty. Postliglione (2002) says that many professors have been drawn into the marketplace and that much time is spent on second and even third jobs. He warns that though commercialization has brought revenue to the university, it can have negative effects on the core mission of the university, as some professors are lost to the marketplace and its higher salaries.

Professionalism and reward systems. Teaching and research are two core functions of a university, but greater emphasis and finances support the latter (Altbach,

Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2010). In some institutions, little incentive is provided in reward systems for faculty to improve their teaching quality.

As part of the recent changes in the Chinese higher education employment system, faculty reward systems have been reformed (Lai, 2010; Morhman, Wang, & Li, 2011). The intent of these changes has been to improve research and teaching; however, the reward systems have tilted heavily toward quantitative measures related to research, such as counting the number of publications or research projects, and there is much less reward for excellent teaching.

Boyer (1990) argued that faculty reward systems are inadequate. Although he was writing primarily about the US context, there may be relevance for Chinese HEIs as well. Research, as measured by publications, is the prevailing measure of scholarship, and teaching is rewarded less. He argues that undergraduate and graduate education is improved by redefining scholarship and how it is rewarded. By defining scholarship along the four parameters of discovery, integration, application and teaching, he expands the meaning of scholarship. Boyer explains that the scholarship of teaching is teaching that is knowledgeable, well informed, carefully planned, pedagogically sound, and inspiring. Huber, Hutchings and Shulman (2005) describe the scholarship of teaching and learning as "building and using knowledge to improve curricula, classroom teaching, and the quality of learning", and that faculty in all disciplines can refer to the pedagogical literature to inform their own classroom teaching. It is essentially "treating teaching and learning as subjects for scholarship" (p. 34). Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning, and creating a system where such scholarship is rewarded are ways to improve

instruction in higher education. In other words, by adequately rewarding teaching, institutions are recognizing that teaching is a professional activity, and that to teach well requires faculty with high levels of expertise.

Professionalism and governance. Shared responsibility among all stakeholders, including faculty and administrators, is necessary for the health of a college or university (Gappa et al., 2007). In US higher education, faculty often have a wide range of responsibilities, including those most directly related to the teaching role, such as curriculum and methods of instruction. In addition, depending on the institution, they may engage in institutional decision making as they serve on committees or in advisory roles. They may make decisions about peer review, hiring of faculty, work load, student admission, and other issues. Many have attributed the excellence of American higher education to shared governance and decision making (Gappa et al, 2007).

Lincoln, Cole, Wang and Yang (2002) anticipate that modernization and decentralization will necessitate that Chinese faculty take on greater roles in governance, including promotion and tenure systems, selection and hiring committees, policy development structures, admissions decisions, financial decisions, and corporate partnerships. Faculty roles are changing in other ways as well; for instance, a larger percentage of faculty will be expected to do research. Whereas curriculum development used to be controlled at the ministry level, now it is increasingly the responsibility of faculty. In addition, the recent national education reforms indicate that faculty will be involved more in academic decisions ("China's New Guidelines," 2010).

Li (2010) surveyed 29 faculty and administrators from nine universities, although they did not state how many were faculty and how many were administrators. When asked about who makes decisions in regards to determining course content and objectives, respondents answered as follows (results in %): department (20.7); faculty (48.3); institution (31); government (0). In addition, according to this study faculty had more decision making power than departments, the institution and the government in regards to hiring new faculty, granting faculty tenure and promotion and setting salary scales. Considering the small sample size, however, the author did not claim that the results were generalizable.

In contrast, Lai (2010) interviewed twenty faculty from a renowned university, four of which also had administrative responsibilities. Based on data from her interviews, the researcher concludes that "the state and university administration still maintain a significant influence over academics' work, which has affected the academic freedom and collegial decision making at the university" (p. 90).

Interviews by Yang, Vidovich and Currie (2007) at two relatively high ranking universities indicate that both the institutions and individuals within them have generally gained more autonomy from the MoE than in the past. They also suggest there have been more gains in institutional autonomy from the MoE than faculty autonomy from the institution. In some cases, autonomy of faculty over curriculum and pedagogy is limited.

Xiong (2011) notes that the "vertical structure" of the university is difficult to change, but that decentralization of power within universities has begun at 985 Project universities (p. 39). Due to the traditionally centralized structure, universities are

struggling with a shift to democratic governance structures and greater involvement of faculty in decision making.

The literature about faculty involvement in decision making and governance remains a bit unclear, and more research is needed in this area. Professional development is the final domain of faculty professionalism that will be explored.

Professionalism and professional development. This section will first develop a rational for professional development. It will also include many possible actions that might be taken to improve faculty development. The examples of possible actions are taken from the U.S. as well as Chinese researchers in order to create a broader number of possible alternatives.

Professional development or professional growth is one of the essential elements of faculty work, and includes "opportunities that enable faculty members to broaden their knowledge, abilities, and skills, to address challenges, concerns, and needs, and to find deeper satisfaction in their work" (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Researchers suggest many ways that faculty development can support all faculty roles, including teaching, research, service, engagement, and leadership duties (Sorcinelli et al., 2006). The importance of faculty development should not be minimized, since it is a "key lever for ensuring institutional quality, responsiveness, creativity, and excellence (Sorcinelli et al., 2006, p. 169). Bland and Schmitz (1998, cited in Gappa et al., 2007) argue that faculty members respond to their institution's investment in them with increased commitment to the institution.

Austin (2002) lists five international trends that implicate the importance of professional development for faculty. First, the increase of marketization would imply a need to make a closer tie between curriculum and the job market. In order to accomplish such a change, faculty should have training in course development and revision. Second, faculty may need development in teaching an increasingly diverse student population. Third, the rise of privatization in higher education creates competition among institutions. If colleges or universities are able to provide excellent teaching, it creates a competitive advantage. Fourth, the trend toward greater institutional autonomy increases faculty responsibilities, such as serving on committees, or in leadership and decision making capacities. Fifth, faculty development may strengthen commitment to the institution in some contexts where faculty time may be divided by entrepreneurial activities outside the college or university. These five trends implicate the need for increased faculty development. Moreover, several of these trends implicate faculty development in regards to improving instruction in particular.

There are many different actions that can be taken to support faculty instructional development. One action that could be taken is to establish a teaching center (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2010). Teaching centers offer a number of opportunities for faculty to develop, including workshops and seminars on various teaching topics. In addition, upon the invitation of the faculty, colleagues or faculty development specialists from the teaching center facilitate a midterm course assessment by meeting with students to discuss the strengths of the course and ways the course could be improved. The facilitator then shares and discusses the findings with the

instructor in an effort to consider what can be done to improve the course. Teaching centers also facilitate faculty learning communities as a way for faculty to collaborate on developing various aspects of teaching. Teaching centers can provide expertise on a wide variety of issues, such as course design, assessment, student feedback instruments, learning outcomes, and educational policy.

Faculty instructional development can be supported in other ways as well. Peer review of teaching is a common method. Faculty members may also engage in team teaching, perhaps matching one junior and one senior faculty, or forming cross-disciplinary teaching teams. In these situations, faculty may learn from colleagues' areas of expertise and experience. For early career faculty, a mentor or team of mentors may encourage faculty growth in teaching and other faculty responsibilities.

Teaching portfolios may also be used to encourage instructional development. In teaching porfolios, the faculty "chronicle their teaching goals, successes, concerns, plans, and strategies for improvement" (Gappa et al., 2007 p. 291). Teaching portfolios are a means to help faculty engage in self-reflection about their teaching, and may help them plan for the future (Gappa et al., 2007).

Faculty development plans should include opportunities outside the institution as well. Faculty involvement and attendance at regional and national conferences on teaching and learning are another way for institutions to support faculty development (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007).

Faculty development plans should be comprehensive. Institutions should consider faculty growth opportunities at every stage in their career (e.g. early career, mid-career,

senior faculty) and for every type of appointment (e.g. tenured, tenure track, contract-renewable) as professional growth opportunities can contribute to the vitality of the individual faculty member and the institution (Gappa et al., 2007).

Identifying key issues in faculty development is important. Faculty developers in the U.S. were surveyed about the key faculty development initiatives that are important to offer and are currently offered (Sorcinelli et al., 2006). The results were, in order of greatest importance: 1) teaching for student-centered learning; 2) new faculty development; 3) integrating technology into traditional teaching and learning settings 4) active, inquiry-based, or problem-based learning; 5) assessment of student learning outcomes; 6) multiculturalism and diversity related to teaching; 7) scholarship of teaching; 8) writing across the curriculum.

During China's recent higher education expansion, faculty development has been an important initiative. To cope with the need for teaching development, a system of teacher training networks was set up in the mid-1980s under the MoE. This network included the Beijing Center, the Wuhan Center, six regional centers, and other teacher training centers established in provinces, cities and autonomous regions (Wei, 2005).

Though measures such as the building the training networks have been taken, some researchers suggest instructional development still needs to be improved. Xu, et al. (2005) recommend that that the structure for instructional development needs to be changed, suggesting that the current system for faculty development is tied to an outdated planning system in which "the government leads, the training network coordinates, and those running the schools implement the training" (p.19). Training concepts have been

tailored to individual needs. Instructors have lacked autonomy since training has been

under control of the government and "has not reflected the actual needs and diversity of

teachers in different kinds of schools" (p. 28).

There are also indications from faculty that instructional development needs

improvement (Xu et al., 2005).   Of 45,100 instructors surveyed, 28.5 percent reported a

"significant improvement"(p. 28) in their professional teaching skills; 62.6 percent

reported a "slight improvement."   However, instructors identified the three main reasons

for this reported improvement as "independent study" (73.6 percent), "research" (47.0

percent), and "having benefited from teaching" (44.9 percent). These reasons ranked

ahead of professional development training, and suggest a gap between instructional

development opportunities and the real needs of instructors.

Xu, et al. (2005) suggest several ways to improve instructional development for

faculty. Their suggestions include: 1) increase the amount of training; 2) make training

more localized and less centralized; 3) make training less general and more

individualized (specific to disciplines); 4) the government should support institutions as

the ones primarily responsible for instructional development; 5) increase support for

advanced studies, such as domestic and international scholarly exchanges; 6) establish

professional development instructional centers in advanced normal universities and

comprehensive universities; 7) provide instructional development over the internet.

Faculty also may develop by obtaining a higher degree. The number of

instructors with doctoral degrees has increased in recent years (Ji, 2006).   From 1998-

2004, instructors who held doctoral degrees increased by 237.44%, but by 2004 the total

number of instructors with doctoral degrees (71,700) was still much smaller than those with masters degrees (223,860) or bachelor degrees (532,710). By 2012, of 1,494,553 full-time higher education faculty, 255,799 (17%) held doctoral degrees, 525,034 (35%) held master's degrees, and 689,987 (46%) held bachelor's degrees according to the Ministry of Education website (http://www.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s7567/201308/156577.html). Though the number of faculty who hold doctoral degrees has increased in recent years, nearly half of all higher education faculty only held bachelor's degrees in 2012.

Although there are many suggestions for how to improve faculty development, there are challenges as well. Xu, et al.(2005) claim that faculty need to have more autonomy from the government, since "for many years schools tailored the style and content of higher education teacher training to the demands of government departments" (p. 28). They also stated that universities are not giving the financial support necessary for advanced studies for faculty. In addition, though they believe that expert faculty members are the best resource for instructional development, their time to train others is limited because of their increased workload.

Kingdon's Policy Windows

Kingdon (2003) compares windows of opportunity for policy change to a space launch which must take place during the brief period when the planets are in proper alignment. As that opportunity passes, the possibility that it may come again remains; however, until that time, the astronauts and engineers must wait until the window opens again. Opportunities for policy change come and go, and timing is important. Changes

in policy streams occur when there are changes in the political stream or when compelling problems appear. Examples of such changes might include changes in administration, changes in the national mood, or turnover among political actors.

Hence, the purpose of this study is to determine whether or not increasing professionalism as a strategy for raising instructional quality is an idea "whose time has come" during a transition to the socialist market economy and amidst major reforms in higher education (Lai & Lo, 2007; Min, 2004; Postiglione, 2005; Wang, 2008). The aforementioned dissatisfaction with instruction ("China's New Guidelines," 2010; Lan, 2008; Postiglione, 2002; Wei, 2005;), the trend toward decentralization (Mok, 2005, Yang, Vidovich and Currie,2007), and the discontent of faculty with deprofessionalism (Lai & Lo, 2007) may be indications that a window may be opening for the policy of faculty professionalism.

Conclusion of Literature Review

This literature review has employed Kingdon's (2003) multiple streams model to frame an investigation of faculty and administrator beliefs in regards to: a) the current level of quality of instruction in Chinese higher education and b) whether professionalism may be a viable strategy to raise instructional quality. This is important because, according to Kingdon's (2003) model, agreement among policy actors (in this case, faculty and administrators) about problems and solutions increase the likelihood that policy changes will occur. It may also indicate that more work needs to be done in order to build consensus among stakeholders. The research questions for this study are to what extent do administrators and faculty at a Chinese university agree:

1. about the current level of quality of instruction at their university?

2. that increasing faculty professionalism would raise instructional quality at their university?

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Overview

This case study used a mixed-methods design. One of the assumptions of researchers who employ a mixed-methods design is that collecting diverse kinds of data will lead to the best understanding of a research problem (Creswell, 2003).

Before contacting participants, the researcher submitted an application to the University of Minnesota Institutional Review Board. The researcher met with participants after the Institutional Review Board approved the study. The researcher collected data for this study between October 6th and November 2nd, 2012 at Guangdong X University in China.

Research Site: Guangdong X University, People's Republic of China

Guangdong X University is a second-tier comprehensive university. Second-tier institutions in well-differentiated HE systems are teaching-oriented institutions that also may engage in local or applied research (ADB, 2011a). The university is funded by the city government, and it is affiliated with both the city and provincial government. It has over 60 undergraduate programs, more than 20 graduate programs, three doctoral programs and over 30 research institutes or research centers. It has more than 1,400 teaching or research staff and over 23,000 students.

Although the history of the university goes back several decades, the present form of the university is the result of five local universities merging in the year 2000. These universities are Guangzhou Normal University, South China College of Construction, Guangzhou University, and Guangzhou Education College (Guangzhou Junior Teachers

College) (Guangdong X University website, 2012). This university is not one of the top

100 universities in China, and is therefore relevant to the focus of this study. This case

study is of a university which might be considered more typical of Chinese universities

than some of the elite institutions, such as Peking University and Tsinghua University.

Sample

The sample for this case study is consistent with what Patton (2002) describes as a

purposeful sample. He stated that such samples are "selected purposefully to permit

inquiry into and understanding of a phenomenon in depth" (p. 46). Patton cautioned that

the cases do not imply generalization from the sample to a larger population as in

experimental studies.

The sample in this study included 30 faculty and 15 administrators for the

interviews. The sample for the surveys included 27 faculty and 21 administrators. Most

of the faculty and administrators took part in both the interviews and surveys.

Survey participants were asked to self-identify as to whether they were faculty,

department heads, or full-time administrators. If more than one of the roles applied, they

were instructed to check all that apply. If they self-identified as both faculty and

department head or full-time administrator, the data were not included, since the focus on

this study was comparing faculty and administrators. Five individuals self-identified as

both faculty and administrators, and thus their survey data were not included. In

addition, one individual did not identify their role, and that person's responses were also

not included in the study. Hence, in the end the survey sample was 27 faculty and 21

administrators. Of the 21 administrators, 12 were males and nine were females. In

addition four were department heads and 17 were full-time administrators.

The number of administrators in the sample is smaller than the number of faculty

because the number of administrators at the university was relatively small in comparison

to the number of faculty. The researcher asked for help from a dean and faculty member

at Guangdong X University, who subsequently identified participants and arranged for

meetings with them.   No claim is made to generalize the findings of this sample to the

greater population, but this sample was chosen because they are "information rich"

(Patton, 2002, p. 46) in relation to research questions of the study.

Questionnaire

In designing a research questionnaire, Gall et al.'s (2003) instructions include

aligning the questions with the research objectives. Figure 2 (in Appendix) demonstrates

that both questionnaire and interview questions are aligned with the research questions of

the current study.

The questionnaire was translated from English into Chinese by a graduate student

in the department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development at the

University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. The student was a native speaker of Chinese who

was also a former English instructor.

The questionnaire contained 26 questions with a four-point response scale

(strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree). An additional open-ended question

gave participants the opportunity to clarify or comment on any of their answers.

Demographic data were collected, including gender and role of the participant ("teacher",

"department head", "full time administrator" or "other"). If more than one role was

relevant, participants were instructed to check all that apply.

A Guandong X University faculty member and graduate student arranged the time

and place of the interviews. In most cases, the faculty and administrators were first

interviewed by the researcher and then asked to fill out the questionnaire. The remaining

questionnaires were distributed and collected by the graduate student.

Interview

Participants were interviewed using a standardized open-ended approach (Patton,

2002). Typically, the researcher asked the participant to read a copy of the questions

themselves and then answer. The standardized open-ended approach was combined to a

certain extent with an informal conversational interview approach, in which questions

emerged (Patton, 2002). In some cases, the researcher asked additional questions based

upon the respondent's answer (Gall, et al., 2003).   The interviews typically took about

30 minutes. The interviews took place in the participants' offices or in meeting rooms in

campus buildings, depending on what was most convenient for the participant.

The interview process typically proceeded as follows. When meeting

interviewees, the researcher thanked them for their time. The researcher introduced

himself, engaged in small talk with the interviewee, and introduced the topic of research.

Prior to beginning the interview and survey, the researcher asked participants to read a

paragraph that explained: 1) the purpose of the study; 2) the procedures of the study; 3)

that there are no risks or benefits associated with the study; 4) of the anonymity of

responses; 5) the voluntary nature of participating in the study and 6) that participants

could decline answering any of the questions. None of the participants declined the interview. The researcher gave interviewees a copy of the interview protocol in Chinese in order to read the questions (silently) and respond when ready. This was more efficient due to the researcher's limitations in speaking Mandarin. This process seemed to make interviewees feel more comfortable or at ease about the interview. This also helped ensure that participants had clearly understood the questions. One drawback to this process, however, was that interviewees skipped over questions somewhat frequently. After the interview, the researcher asked the participants if she or he would be willing to complete the survey.

Forty-one of the interviews were conducted in Mandarin Chinese and four were conducted in English, depending on the participants' preference. Participants were asked if the researcher could record the interviews, and 44 of 45 agreed. For the case in which the participant declined being reported, the interview was conducted in Chinese and the researcher took notes during the interview without recording. Mandarin interviews were translated by a Chinese graduate student that has no affiliation with Guangdong X University. The translator was a master's student in translation and interpreting at a prestigious university in the north part of China, located more than a thousand miles from Guangdong X University. The researcher transcribed the four interviews that were done in English.

When writing about research that is conducted in a second language, Marshall and Rossman (2006) suggest describing the researcher's level of fluency in the second language. The researcher for this study has a basic conversational level of fluency in

Mandarin Chinese.   In terms of listening, the researcher is often able to comprehend the main idea, but usually does not comprehend all the details within a discussion. To compensate for his Chinese language deficiencies, the researcher worked with native Chinese speakers in the translation and piloting of the instrument. This process is explained in detail in the following paragraphs. In addition, the researcher had a native Chinese speaker, a graduate student in the translation program of a prestigious Chinese university, translate the interviews from Chinese to English.

Piloting instruments

One purpose of piloting research is to improve the instruments (Sampson, 2004). The piloting process for this study was as follows. First, the instruments were translated into Chinese by a graduate student from China. This student is a doctoral student in the department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development at the University of Minnesota, the same department as the researcher. The instruments were then piloted with two Chinese faculty and one Chinese administrator visiting the University of Minnesota. In the first two interviews, faculty were asked to provide feedback about the clarity of the questions. In the third interview, the administrator answered interview questions, completed the survey, and gave feedback about the clarity and accuracy of the questions. The Chinese graduate student and researcher were both present during the interviews, and after each interview made any necessary revisions in order to improve the instruments.   The instruments were then back-translated from Chinese to English by an additional native speaker of Chinese, who is also a graduate student in the researcher's department. These graduate students were chosen because they not only are fluent

Chinese speakers, but are also fairly familiar with the subject and terminology of the study. The researcher then assessed the back-translated English version to ensure that its meaning matched that of the original English version. Because revisions to the instruments were made as a result of the pilot interviews and because the pilot interviewees were not from Guangdong X University, data from the pilot interviews were not included in the final study.

Analysis

     Survey. The quantitative data from the survey were analyzed as follows. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation), were calculated for each survey question, comparing responses of faculty and administrators. T-tests were calculated for each individual survey question as well in order to determine if differences between faculty and administrator means were significant.

     Interview. The data from interviews were organized by cross-case analysis, in which responses to questions given in common to two different groups of people are then grouped together (Patton, 2002).   In this study, two groups of people (faculty and administrators) were asked a common set of questions in the interview protocol. The data were imported and organized in Nvivo software, and the researcher performed content analysis.   Interview questions were organized by the six domains of professionalism, and so the responses to interview questions were organized by these domains as well. Frequencies of responses were counted, and comparisons between faculty and administrator responses were made (Appendix F).

Some quotations that are included in the interpretation may contain minor grammatical errors, because the researcher decided not to correct any of the errors that occurred in interviews done in English. For grammatical errors that occasionally occurred in the translations by the Chinese graduate student, the researcher at times made minor grammatical corrections that did not affect meaning, but improved readability.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the surveys and interviews. The results are organized to answer the two research questions of the study.

Research question 1: To What Extent do Faculty and Administrators at a Chinese University Agree about the Current Level of Instructional Quality at their University?

Survey results. Faculty and administrators at Guangdong X University both believe that the current level of instruction needs to be raised (Table 1).   The mean responses of faculty and administrators to this question about the extent to which instructional quality needs to be raised was the highest among all of the 26 survey questions. Differences in the mean response of faculty and administrators were not statistically significant.

Table 1

Extent that Instructional Quality Needs to be Raised: Means, Standard Deviations, Welch's t-test

	M (SD)		t-test		
Question	Faculty	Administrator	t	df	p
To what extent does instructional quality need to be raised at my university?	3.64 (.56)	3.57 (.51)	-0.47	45.22	0.64

Note. Responses are on a four point scale from 1=To no extent/none; 2=To a small extent; 3=To some extent; 4=To a great extent.
[a]*n*=27; [b]*n*= 20

Research question 2: To what Extent do Administrators and Faculty at a Chinese University Agree that Increasing Faculty Professionalism Would Raise the Instructional Quality at Their University?

The following paragraphs include the results that help answer research question 2. This section is organized by the six domains of professionalism, beginning with the academic freedom domain. For ease of reference, quantitative data are located mostly within this chapter, while the longer qualitative (interview) tables can be found in the appendix. Some of the interview data is also presented in-text below. In these cases, the number of participant responses are followed by percentages. The percentages are always calculated from the total number of participants (15 administrators and 30 faculty).

Domain 1: Academic freedom.

Administrator interviews. In interviews (Table 7, appendix), administrators described the current level of academic freedom at Guangdong X university. Twelve of the fifteen (80%) administrators thought that faculty could currently choose the *pedagogical methods* they prefer, while none thought otherwise.

In regards to choosing *content*, however, the results were more mixed: five (33%) of the administrators believed faculty currently can choose the content of what they teach. Their viewpoint is reflected in the following comment:

> The content mainly depends on teachers. What kind of classes to teach is decided by the school, while what to teach and the choice of textbook is decided by the teacher. The school will not intervene in this process.

In contrast, four (26%) thought faculty currently cannot choose content, explaining that the Ministry of Education (MoE), the university, and the department develop the curriculum and content before it reaches the faculty at Guangdong X University. The following comment is illustrative:

> *While in China, we have stronger administrative management. We feel unsatisfied with that and we think teachers should have more freedom. Since teachers have degrees, professional titles and academic performances, they should be fully trusted that through their innovative hard work their advantages can be fully used…while currently in China, the universities are making too many decisions for teachers. For example, the Department of Education would recommend textbooks which are edited by high-level professors, and universities need to use these recommended textbooks. Therefore, in the selection of textbooks, teachers do not have much freedom. Basically the decision is made by the university or department leaders. For a teacher, he can only teach based on the textbooks with his experience or teaching methods. Therefore, from the standpoint of teachers…currently there are too many restrictions.*

Hence, responses from administrators about the extent to which faculty can *currently* choose course content were mixed.

In regards to whether or not *increasing* faculty choice about content and pedagogy would raise instructional quality, administrators offered few responses. Survey results in regards to this question were more informative than the interview responses.

Faculty interviews. Of the thirty faculty interviewed, eleven (37%) said they could currently choose *pedagogical methods*, while three (10%) said they could not. Twelve (40%) faculty reported that faculty can choose the *content* of what they teach, and six (20%) faculty said they could not choose content. Of those who said they can choose the content of what they teach, the following comments are typical:

I think teachers have much freedom in the content. Teachers can choose the textbooks, the content and the method. Our university is doing very well in this aspect.

Compared with before, teachers in Chinese universities have much more freedom in the content and method of teaching. The university will not intervene too much about a teacher's choice in the content. Personally, I think that the freedom teachers enjoy in teaching is satisfying.

In contrast, of the three faculty who said they could not choose the content of what they teach, the following comments are illustrative:

Take our university as an example. Eighty percent or more is not decided by the university, but by the teaching plan made by the Department of Education. So twenty percent or less is up to the teachers.

I think the university will mostly decide what we teach. There is a very strict control of the teaching content of the syllabus and everything and we need to follow the textbook, and that's really not a very good thing for me.

Hence, in regards to the *current* situation at Guangdong X University more faculty believed they could choose pedagogical methods and content than those who thought otherwise.

However, there is a contrast between what faculty believe about the *current* situation and what faculty say *would raise* instructional quality. Eleven (37%) faculty thought that increasing faculty choice about content and pedagogical methods would raise instructional quality in comparison to only one (3%) who thought it would not.

Survey results on academic freedom. Responses to academic freedom survey questions (Table 2) are generally consistent with the interviews. As with the interviews, faculty and administrators both indicated that increasing faculty choice over content and teaching methods could raise instructional quality. In addition, both groups believed that increasing faculty choice about student assessment and increasing job security for faculty

would raise the quality of instruction.

Faculty and administrator mean responses did not differ significantly on three of the four survey questions related to academic freedom. However, though faculty and administrators both believed that increasing faculty choice about how they assess students would raise instructional quality, faculty means in response to this question were higher than administrators, to a statistically significant extent ($p<.01$).   This result suggest that faculty believed more strongly than administrators that increasing faculty choice about how they assess students would raise instructional quality.

Table 2

Survey Results for the Academic Freedom Domain: Means, Standard Deviations, and Welch's t-test

Question	*M (SD)*		t-test		
	Faculty	Administrator	*t*	*df*	*p*
To what extent would increasing faculty choice about the content of what they teach raise instructional quality?	3.33(.88)	3.19(.68)	-1.37	39.24	0.18
To what extent would increasing faculty choice about how they assess students raise instructional quality?	3.33(.88)	2.9(.54)	-3.56	44.49	0.0009
To what extent would more job security for faculty (e.g. tenure) increase instructional quality?	3.19(1.04)	3.33(.8)	0.16	43.81	0.88
To what extent would increasing faculty choice in regards to the teaching methods they use raise instructional quality?	3.3(.87)	3.14(0.65)	-1.47	39.98	0.15

Note. Responses are on a four point scale from 1=To no extent/none; 2=To a small extent; 3=To some extent; 4=To a great extent.
[a]*n*=27; [b]*n*= 20

Domain 2: Balanced Workload.

Administrators interviews. Of the fifteen administrators who were interviewed, only two (13%) thought that decreasing faculty work load would increase teaching quality (Table 8, appendix). Five of the fifteen (33%) administrators thought otherwise. These five administrators argued that faculty attitudes were more important than workload issues, that the faculty teaching loads were not high, and that decreasing workload would not result in faculty spending more time on teaching.

Faculty interviews. In contrast to the administrators, ten of the thirty (33%) faculty interviewed believed that decreasing workload would raise teaching quality. Only two (7%) faculty thought otherwise. Faculty thought that the main benefits of decreasing workload would be more time for preparing courses and developing professionally in regards to teaching.

Survey results on Balanced Workload. Survey responses (Table 3) suggest more agreement between faculty and administrators about the effects of a more balanced workload than did the interview responses. Mean responses from these two groups about the balanced workload survey item were nearly identical, and suggest that both faculty and administrators believe decreasing workload would raise instructional quality

Table 3

Results for the Balance Workload Survey Question: Means, Standard Deviations, and Welch's t-test

	M (SD)		t-test		
Question	Faculty	Administrator	*t*	*df*	*p*
To what extent would decreasing the faculty work load increase instructional quality?	3.04(0.64)	3.02(0.64)	-0.06	43.07	0.95

Note. Responses are on a four point scale from 1=To no extent/none; 2=To a small extent; 3=To some extent; 4=To a great extent.
[a]*n=27;* [b]*n= 20*

Domain 3: Salary.

Administrators. Six of the fifteen (40%) administrators interviewed believed that increasing faculty salaries would raise instructional quality in the long term (Table 9, appendix). These administrators reasoned that raising salaries would help attract and retain excellent instructors and reduce the number of second jobs faculty would take. Conversely, three of the fifteen (20%) administrators did not believe that increasing faculty salaries would raise instructional quality.

Faculty. Ten of the thirty faculty (33%) interviewed believed that increasing faculty salaries could positively affect the quality of teaching, while five (16%) disagreed. In addition, eight faculty (27%) believed that increasing faculty salaries would result in faculty taking on fewer second jobs, and one (3%) did not.

Faculty opinions about the *effect* of second jobs on teaching were mixed.   Six faculty (20%) believed that second jobs had a negative effect on teaching, while three

faculty (10%) did not. In addition, eight faculty (27%) believed second jobs can have

both positive and negative effects on teaching. The following quote illustrates this view:

> *Some part-time jobs can even help improve the quality of teaching… Some part-time jobs can include students into the projects, and students can better understand the practical operation. But some part-time jobs are only to make money. They will distract teachers' energy and thus influence class teaching.*

Hence, the most common response from faculty was that second jobs could influence

teaching both positively and negatively.

  Survey results on Salary domain. Like the interviews, survey results (Table 4)

suggest that faculty and administrators agree that increasing salaries could potentially

benefit teaching. Both groups believed that increasing salaries would result in the

decrease of faculty second jobs outside the university.   Furthermore, both groups thought

that second jobs outside the university decreased the quality of instruction.   In addition,

both groups believed raising salaries would keep excellent instructors from leaving

higher education.

Table 4

Survey Results for the Salary Domain: Means, Standard Deviations, and Welch's t-test

Question	M (SD)		t-test		
	Faculty	Administrator	t	df	p
To what extent would increasing overall salary keep faculty from taking on second jobs outside the institution?	3.26(0.82)	3.33(0.73)	0.33	44.99	0.33
To what extent does faculty taking second jobs outside the university decrease instructional quality?	3.03(0.64)	3.19(0.51)	0.94	46.74	0.35
To what extent would increasing faculty salary levels keep excellent instructors from leaving higher education?	3.61(0.5)	3.52(0.6)	-0.52	38.3	0.61

Note. Responses are on a four point scale from 1=To no extent/none; 2=To a small extent; 3=To some extent; 4=To a great extent.
[a]n=27; [b]n= 20; [c]n=26

Domain 4: Reward system.

Administrator interviews. In interviews, ten administrators (67%) said that a greater emphasis on teaching in the promotional system would raise the quality of teaching, and none disagreed (Table 10, appendix). The following quotation illustrates this perspective:

> *I think the proportion of teaching in the promotional system needs to be increased. And we hope this can happen. Then it will force teachers to focus on teaching skills and methods. It is also good for the management of students in class. We have some teachers who are just talking themselves, ignoring whether*

students are listening or not. The purpose of so-called 'imparting knowledge and educating people' is not attained.

Four administrators (27%) added that teaching currently does not count nearly as much as research in the promotional system, and none thought otherwise. The following quote illustrates the view of these four faculty:

This is also a big problem for many university teachers. Promotion largely depends on the research the faculty has conducted. For the part of teaching, it is mainly calculated by the number of lectures he gives, and the quality of teaching is seldom involved.

While administrators believed that teaching should be emphasized more in the promotional system, they also acknowledged that there were challenges in doing so.

Four administrators (27%) believed that one of the main reasons instruction is not weighted more heavily in the promotional system is because teaching is more difficult to measure than research. They said research is measured by the number of articles published, projects completed, and the amount of funding obtained. The following administrator comment illustrates this perspective:

Currently research goes before teaching. If a teacher can get a national [research] project, we can have an index to evaluate his performance in the project. But for teaching, there is no unified criteria to judge whether a teacher in doing well in teaching. .. Research is different in that the outcome can be measured by the paper he published. This is the main problem and a headache for our universities.

Seven faculty (23%) also believed that measuring teaching quality is a challenge, so administrators were not alone in regards to this opinion.

Faculty interviews. Eleven of the faculty (37%) believed that emphasizing teaching more in the promotional system would raise instructional quality. The following

quotation illustrates the viewpoint of this group of faculty:

> *That's a big, big problem. If you want to be promoted, you need to write enough papers; you need to publish enough papers, but anyway, papers are the most important things and your instructional quality doesn't rate so high in their assessment of your overall performance. I guess if in your promotion system … if you emphasize teaching more you will definitely help improve instructional quality.*

In contrast, three faculty members (10%) did not believe emphasizing teaching more in the promotional systems would raise instructional quality.

   Survey results on the Reward System domain. As in the interview responses, survey results (Table 5) indicate that both faculty and administrators believe that emphasizing teaching more in the reward system may raise instructional quality at Guangdong X University. Administrator mean responses about emphasizing teaching more to raise instructional quality were stronger than those of faculty (p<.01). In addition, both groups believed that decreasing pressure on faculty to do research would raise instructional quality.

Table 5

Survey Results for the Rewards System Domain: Means, Standard Deviations, and Welch's t-test

Question	M (SD)		t-test		
	Faculty	Administrator	t	df	p
To what extent would changing promotional systems to emphasize teaching more raise instructional quality?	3.25(075)	3.76 (0.54)	2.78	46.93	0.008
To what extent would decreasing pressure on faculty to do research increase instructional quality?	3.36 (.78)	3.33 (.67)	-0.12	46.28	0.91

Note. Responses are on a four point scale from 1=To no extent/none; 2=To a small extent; 3=To some extent; 4=To a great extent.
[a]n=27; [b]n= 20

Domain 5: Governance.

Administrators. Of the fifteen administrators who were interviewed, eight (53%) believed faculty at Guangdong X University are not *currently* involved in policy decisions that affect teaching (Table 11, appendix). One of these administrators explained that: "Few teachers are involved. Although there are also representatives of teachers, teachers with no administrative titles normally have no chances." Such a response was typical of this group, suggesting that most of the policy decisions that affect teaching were not made by faculty. In contrast, five administrators (33%) said that

currently faculty are involved in policy decisions that affect teaching. They said that

there is a Teaching Committee that includes individuals who are both administrators and

faculty.   The following comment describes this committee:

> *We have a Teaching Director Committee and Teaching Supervision Committee, which are both made up of professors and teachers. The members are usually vice deans for teaching of each faculty. Our university has over 20 schools, and these vice deans form the Teaching Director Committee which makes important decisions in teaching.*

In addition, the following quote illustrates the way that some administrators feel that

faculty are consulted with regarding decisions:

> *The rights of policy making are mainly in the hands of administrative departments. But before the policy making, we must listen to the professors' advice and make some modification. The Office of Teaching Affairs make a draft, and widely listen to professors' advices.*

Hence, there is disagreement among administrators in regards to how much faculty are

involved in decision making. It seems that the disagreement has to do with how

representative faculty involvement is, and perhaps also the degree to which their

involvement actually makes a difference in decision making.

In addition, three administrators (20%) believed *increasing* faculty involvement in

decisions that affect instruction would raise instructional quality, while no administrators

thought otherwise.

Faculty interviews. While twelve of the faculty (40%) believed that faculty are

not *currently* involved in policy decisions related to teaching, three (10%) thought

otherwise. The following comment is representative of the group of faculty who thought

they were not currently involved:

Common teachers are seldom involved in policy making currently. Some documents are issued without the previous discussion of teachers and they arouse the dissatisfaction of teachers. In this aspect, there is still a lot to improve.

Faculty, then, believe that they are not currently involved in policy decisions that would affect teaching.

Thirteen of the faculty (43%) believed that *increasing* faculty involvement in such policy decisions would raise instructional quality and only one (3%) disagreed. A faculty member from this group explained the benefits of increasing faculty involvement in decisions about teaching:

I think it will surely help improve teaching. Because we are teachers, we have direct contact with the students, and we have more real feeling towards teaching. I think this is very necessary...

This comment is typical of this group and is consistent with the survey results that follow.

Survey results. Results from the survey (Table 6) were similar to interview results in regards to the governance domain. Survey response means indicate both faculty and administrators believe that several actions would raise instructional quality. These include increasing faculty involvement (e.g. on university committees) in university decision making, increasing faculty decision making regarding curriculum, increasing faculty involvement in university educational policy decisions, and to a lesser extent increasing faculty involvement in decisions to hire faculty. However, faculty felt more strongly than administrators ($p<.05$) that increasing faculty involvement (e.g. on university committees) in university decision making and increasing faculty involvement in university educational policy decisions would raise instructional quality.

Table 6

Survey Results for the Governance Domain: Means, Standard Deviations, and Welch's t-test

Question	M (SD)		t-test		
	Faculty	Administrator	t	df	p
To what extent would increasing faculty decision making regarding curriculum raise instructional quality?	3.04(0.92)	3.14(0.65)	-0.03	44.78	0.98
To what extent would increasing faculty involvement (e.g. on university committees) in university decision making increase instructional quality?	3.36(0.5)	2.9(0.72)	-2.3	37.26	0.03
To what extent would increasing faculty involvement in decisions to hire faculty would raise instructional quality?	2.7(0.72)	2.76(0.77)	0.27	41.82	0.79
To what extent would increasing faculty involvement in university educational policy decisions increase instructional quality?	3.43(2.9)	2.9(0.79)	-2.47	40.53	0.018

Note. Responses are on a four point scale from 1=To no extent/none; 2=To a small extent; 3=To some extent; 4=To a great extent.
[a]n=27; [b]n= 20;[c]n=26; [d]n=19

Domain 6: Professional Development.

Administrators. Of the fifteen administrators interviewed, six (40%) said that

increasing professional development would result in raising the quality of instruction, and

none said otherwise (Table 12, appendix). Administrators believed the kinds of

professional development most likely to raise instructional quality are obtaining a higher

degree, attending a training course or workshop, and participating in an international

exchange/visiting scholarship. While obtaining a higher degree was seen as the kind of

professional development most likely to raise instructional quality by administrators (five

or 30% of the administrators said this), only two faculty (7%) believed this. This

indicates that while administrators and faculty seemed to agree that faculty development

could raise instruction quality, they nonetheless did not always agree about what kind of

faculty development was most effective.

Faculty. Of the thirty faculty interviewed, thirteen (43%) thought that

professional development would raise the quality of instruction, and none thought

otherwise. In addition, five faculty members (16%) thought that the most effective

method of professional development was training classes or workshops. The following

statement is typical of their responses: "Teaching training classes and meetings are

directly related to the improvement of teaching, and they can greatly help improve

teaching."

Survey results. Survey results (Table 13, appendix) are similar to the interview

results in that both faculty and administrators believed that increasing professional

development would raise instructional quality. Both faculty and administrators indicated

that certain actions would be particularly effective in raising the quality of instruction. These actions include: increasing support for instructional development opportunities (e.g. workshops or conferences to develop instruction), increasing opportunities for mentoring among faculty about instruction, and increasing support for international scholarly faculty exchanges. In addition, administrators thought that supporting faculty research about teaching and supporting faculty teaching based on principles from her or his research about instruction would also be particularly effective actions.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

This chapter includes discussion of the study findings, implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

Findings

Finding 1: Both faculty and administrators believe that instructional quality needs to be raised at Guangdong X University. This finding is consistent with Wei's (2005) large scale survey which indicated that Chinese university students were not satisfied with instructional quality. This finding is also consistent with the claims of numerous authors (Postiglione, 2002; Lincoln, et al. 2002; Wei, 2005; Zhou, 2006) that many Chinese HE stakeholders (i.e. the MoE, university administrators, scholars, students, the media) believe that educational quality at Chinese higher education institutions needs to be improved.

Finding 2: Both faculty and administrators believe that increasing faculty professionalism may raise instructional quality at Guangdong X University. The preponderance of the interview and survey data suggest that there is no significant difference between what faculty and administrators at Guangdong X University believe about increasing faculty professionalism as a way to raise instructional quality. Both groups believe that increasing faculty professionalism is a viable strategy for raising instructional quality at their university. In particular, faculty and administrators thought the following dimensions of faculty professionalism could raise instructional quality: academic freedom, reward systems, salary, governance, and professional development.

Implications

Policy alternatives in view of Kingdon's (2003) multiple streams model.

Kingdon's three streams of *problems*, *policies*, and *politics* can be identified in the study as follows. The first finding of this study is that faculty and administrators at Guangdong X University agreed about the *problem* of needing to raise instructional quality. The second finding of this study is a viable *policy* solution: both faculty and administrators at Guangdong X University largely agreed that increasing faculty professionalism (in regards to the domains of academic freedom, reward systems, salary, governance, and professional development) could address the *problem* of instructional quality.

The agreement of faculty and administrators in regards to the *problem* and *policy* may indicate the strengthening of the *politics* stream in Kingdon's model. Faculty and administrators are not the only stakeholders involved in decisions regarding teaching quality at Guangdong University. The government, for example, is also an important stakeholder, though it is not the focus of this study. Nonetheless, the role of faculty and administrators within the university is of critical importance. The agreement of these two stakeholders may imply the possible opening of a policy "window", an opportunity for the policy of increasing faculty professionalism to be advanced.

One policy option would be to increase the six domains of faculty professionalism (i.e. academic freedom, balanced workload, reward system, salary, governance, and professional development) at Guangdong X University as a way to

increase instructional quality. Specific implications for each domain will be explained in more detail in the following paragraphs.

    Academic Freedom. Faculty and administrators both believed that increasing academic freedom could raise instructional quality, a finding that has some support from the literature.   Lai and Lo (2007) reported that some policies and evaluations aimed at improving teaching quality restricted what faculty did in the classroom. On the other hand, some (Liu, 2009; Huang, 2009) supported governmental evaluations of teaching and downplayed restrictions on academic freedom. Results from the current study are more consistent with Lai and Lo (2007), suggesting that increasing academic freedom may be a better way of raising instructional quality in comparison to some methods of instructor evaluation that restrict academic freedom.

    Academic freedom issues also include assessment of student learning. While faculty and administrators in this study both believed that increasing faculty choice in regards to assessment would raise instructional quality, faculty believed this more strongly than did administrators.   Similarly, faculty in Lai and Lo's (2007) case study criticized the current use of standardized exams, believing that such exams limit instructor flexibility and individuality in teaching. Because of the nature of their work, faculty may be more aware than administrators of the importance and influence of assessment in regards to course design, learning goals, and day to day pedagogical practices.   Therefore, administrators might consider ways to involve faculty more in the choice and development of assessments.

On the other hand, there may be risks in giving faculty more responsibility with developing assessments. Such risks may include decreased quality and consistency in developing assessments.   This is a legitimate concern that administrators may have, especially if faculty have little experience or knowledge in regards to assessment. To minimize this risk, administrators might provide additional professional development opportunities (e.g. workshops, mentoring, conferences, etc.) for faculty to develop their knowledge, skills, and abilities in regards to assessment and course design. In addition, administrators might more systematically include faculty in assessment decisions on the university, college, and department levels.

Balanced workload. In regards to the balanced workload domain, survey responses and interview responses did not fully triangulate; faculty believed that a more balanced workload would raise instructional quality, but administrator responses were mixed in this regard. From the faculty perspective, study findings were generally consistent with Wei's (2005) survey, in which 48% of faculty reported that workload was too heavy.

If faculty workload is indeed too heavy, it may have a negative effect on teaching quality as faculty may not have sufficient time to prepare for class, interact with students outside of class, give the necessary amount of feedback to students, and develop teaching skills.   On the other hand, the argument by some administrators that decreasing workload would not necessarily result in faculty spending more time on teaching seems plausible as well. In the case of Guangdong X University, it may be that a more balanced workload is a necessary, but not sufficient, policy alternative. More research is needed about ways

that faculty workload could be more balanced, but in ways that strengthen faculty commitment to the university.

Rewards system. Faculty and administrators agreed that emphasizing teaching more in the promotional system may raise instructional quality. This finding is consistent with Wei (2005) who recommended that promotion not only include research achievements, but teaching as well.

In a well-differentiated HE system, second-tier universities should be teaching-oriented institutions that also engage in local or applied research (ADB, 2011a). However, the faculty and administrators in this study believed that Guangdong X University, a second-tier university, emphasizes research over teaching in its rewards systems. This finding suggests a mismatch between reward systems and the primary mission of the university.

However, actual change in this area of emphasizing teaching more in reward systems may have as much to do with measurement methods as policy. Both faculty and administrators stated in interviews that measurement and evaluation of teaching is difficult, and some believed that research is emphasized more in the promotional system because it is easier and more objective to measure than teaching. These comments are consistent with those of several researchers (Jiang, 2009; Lai and Lo, 2007; Li, 2010). Therefore, even if there is support for the *policy* of increasing teaching in the rewards system, substantial discussion may be necessary among multiple stakeholders (MoE, university administrators, faculty) in regards to the *methods* of measuring teaching effectiveness.

To effectively measure teaching effectiveness, it may be helpful to consider using established faculty evaluation models such as Arreola's (1995). This model has several beneficial characteristics. It involves faculty as well as administrators in the process of developing a faculty evaluation system that meets the needs of the university unit or system. It includes the relative weighting of faculty functions (teaching, scholarly research, faculty service, community service) in ways that are clear and transparent. Moreover, within the faculty teaching role, specific areas (e.g. instructional delivery skills, instructional design skills, content expertise, course management) can be identified and weighted. Finally, in this model, faculty are not merely evaluated; opportunities for development are also provided.

The use of such a model can encourage institutions to acknowledge and make transparent the importance of teaching in the faculty promotional system. Such models also assume that teaching is a professional activity that requires various skills that may need to be developed.

Salary. Both faculty and administrators believed that raising faculty salaries would keep excellent instructors from leaving higher education. This data is consistent with Postiglioni's (2002) concern that low salaries may contribute to a migration of faculty from the university to the marketplace or to other universities that offer higher salaries.

Raising faculty salaries is not likely on its own to raise instructional quality, but may be a valuable component of the larger strategy of faculty professionalism. Raising faculty salaries may help build a strong teaching cohort over the long term by attracting

and retaining excellent faculty and potentially strengthening institutional commitment. In addition, raising salaries on a merit basis, to reward excellent teaching in particular, may be a way for Guangdong X University to raise instructional quality.

Extrinsic rewards can have considerable impact on institutional quality. However, if raising faculty salaries is not an option, other incentives could also be considered. Examples may include job security, housing supplements, or additional pay for teaching extra courses. HEIs can also be creative in providing intrinsic rewards such as recognition for faculty accomplishments (ADB, 2011b).

Governance. Both faculty and administrators believe faculty members are *currently* only minimally involved in decision making at Guangdong X University. In general, these findings contrast with those of Li (2010), who found that faculty already have a fairly substantial role in decision making. On the other hand, data from the current study are consistent with Lai (2010) who found that the government and university administrators still significantly influence the work and decision making of faculty at a Chinese university.

This study also found that both faculty and administrators believe that *increasing* faculty involvement in decision making would raise instructional quality, though faculty believed this more strongly than did administrators. The question of who makes policy decisions in regards to the teaching mission of the university is clearly an important one. Given their regular contact with students in the teaching and learning context and their role in curriculum development and instructional delivery, faculty are in a key position to influence the teaching mission of Guangdong X University. Therefore, increasing faculty

involvement in decisions that affect teaching and learning would seem to be a strategic

opportunity. On the other hand, a possible consequence to such a policy change might be

the increased time and effort required of those involved in the decision making process.

In addition, some faculty may prefer not to be more involved in university decisions.

Such factors should be considered if policy decisions are made to involve faculty more in

decision making processes.

Professional development. Both faculty and administrators indicated that

professional development is a viable strategy for raising the quality of instruction. These

findings are consistent with Min's (2004) argument that faculty development and

educational quality are closely connected.

Faculty and administrators believed that actions such as increasing opportunities

to attend workshops and conferences, increasing mentoring opportunities, and increasing

resources for instructional development over the internet would raise the quality of

instruction. This finding is consistent with the recommendations of several researchers

(Gappa et al, 2005; Xu, et al, 2005; Sorcinelli, et al, 2006).

Xu et al (2005) recommend that the way professional development is

implemented needs to be less centralized and more individualized.   In lieu of this,

administrators at Guangdong X University may want to consider how they can increase

support for faculty development at the university level, perhaps by increasing support in

ways that faculty believe are effective, such as mentoring programs and professional

development workshops.   Such actions would not preclude the use of regional or

national resources, but could potentially complement them in ways that are appropriate to

the Guangdong X University context. Utilizing regional and national resources while

building resource capacity at the university level may also maximize efficiency.

Guangdong X University may also want to explore alternatives to some of their

current strategies for professional development. For example, currently a group of retired

faculty (*dudao*) plays a prominent role in both the professional development and

assessment of faculty. An alternative would be to separate the dual roles that the *dudao*

currently play in both development and evaluation. Clearly separating these roles may

embolden faculty to try new and innovative teaching practices while getting formative

feedback. Then at a later time, summative teaching evaluations could be conducted,

perhaps by a different individual. In addition, while the retired faculty may have the

wisdom of experience to offer younger faculty, it is also possible that only having retired

faculty in these positions may introduce a conservative bias.

Additional policy alternatives.

Increase the capacity of instructional staff to a greater extent. A common

challenge throughout Asia is for HEIs to efficiently meet national goals. Internal

efficiency refers to the ability of HEIs to increase quantity and quality without using

higher levels of funding.   For HEIs to merely increase *quantity* (i.e. access and

enrollments) is not sufficient. They also need their students to engage in high *quality*

learning experiences that will enable them to acquire the knowledge, skills and abilities

they need for productive employment and citizenship (Asian Development Bank, 2011b).

One way to achieve greater internal efficiency is by increasing the capacity of

instructional staff (Asian Development Bank, 2011a; 2011b). Though China has invested

in the capacity of instructional staff during recent years (Zhou, 2006), it might still consider the policy option of continuing to increase such investments. The strategy presented in this paper, of increasing faculty professionalism, describes specific alternatives for increasing the capacity of instructional staff, in ways that may raise instructional quality.

Focus and differentiate institutional missions within the Chinese HE system. Another way to increase internal efficiency is to differentiate institutional missions. Countries act strategically when they conceive of HEIs as part of an overall system that is designed to meet various national needs. In addition, if an HEI is clear about its mission, it is more readily able to achieve the mission by strategically focusing resources toward that end (ADB, 2011a, 2011b).

Some of the findings of this study suggest the mission of Guangdong X University may need more clarity. First, though it is the type of university that should be teaching-focused, faculty and administrators strongly believed that instruction needs to be raised at their university. Second, there is also some evidence that the current reward systems do not emphasize teaching as much as research. In addition, both groups believed that changing faculty reward systems to emphasize teaching would raise instructional quality.

It is important for a university such as Guangdong X University to have a clear sense of its mission within the entire Chinese higher educational system. A well-differentiated higher education system typically includes top-tier or flagship/research oriented universities, second-tier or teaching oriented universities, and third-tier

institutions such as vocational and technical schools. Two actions can work against a well-differentiated higher education system. First, mission creep can occur. An example of this is when a second-tier institution loses its focus and attempts to become a first tier institution. Such instances undermine the effectiveness of the overall national higher education system as well as weaken the effectiveness of the second tier institution. The second action is when governments overfund top-tier research universities at the expense of teaching institutions. In order for higher education systems to be successfully differentiated, institutions must avoid mission creep, and governments need to adequately support teaching institutions (ADB, 2011b).

There may be challenges associated with these two actions. For example, top-tier institutions are not likely to believe they are underfunded. In addition, determining to what degree an institution, or type of institution, is overfunded or underfunded can be a difficult task. Nevertheless, if high quality teaching and learning is a government priority, the government needs to provide sufficient support for teaching institutions.

In the case of Guangdong X University, it may be that one or both of the following possibilities is occurring. One possibility is that Guangdong X University is experiencing mission creep by aspiring to become a research university. If this is the case, the university may find more success and internal efficiency if it focuses its mission more clearly on teaching. A second possibility is that the University envisions itself as a teaching university, but its faculty are rewarded and incentivized according to their research production. If this is the case, administrators at Guangdong X University could attempt to better align faculty rewards and incentive systems with the teaching mission.

In order for faculty to be fully engaged in their work, they need to be clear about institutional goals, and be able to trust that incentive and reward systems match those goals (ADB, 2011b).

If Guangdong X University focused more on its teaching mission, it might face challenges. For example, one consequence of focusing on teaching might be a drop in university rankings, which often favor research. Competition regarding university rankings is intense, as is illustrated by a recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Education which suggests international university ranking is a new Olympic sport (Hazelkorn, 2013). Yet some researchers believe that it may not be realistic or necessary for some institutions to engage in traditional research for the purpose of climbing the international ranks (ADB, 2011b). Moreover, if institutions such as Guangdong X University focus more on the teaching mission, it might increase internal efficiency and enable such universities to successfully fill an important role in a more differentiated higher education system.

Limitations and Future Research.

This case study involved participants from a single university who were non-randomly selected by university administrators. Therefore, the findings are not generalizable. More research is needed to determine if faculty professionalism would raise instructional quality at Chinese universities that vary according to dimensions such as region, size, purpose, and prestige.

In addition, the concept of academic freedom discussed in this paper was defined in part by the American Association of University Professors' statement on academic

freedom. A limitation of this study is that the concept of academic freedom in the U.S. higher education context may be understood differently by those in a different context, such as Guangdong X University.

Another limitation is that while faculty and administrators at one university were interviewed, the government response to the strategy of faculty professionalism is still unknown. In addition, some administrators and faculty at Guangdong X University suggested that while increasing certain aspects of faculty professionalism may be effective in raising instructional quality, such decisions could only be made at the governmental level. In "steep hierarchies", various stakeholders may have different, though legitimate, concerns (Dejaegher, Chapman, and Mulkeen, 2006). While this study focused on the opinions of faculty and administrators, clearly the government is also an important stakeholder in a "steep hierarchy" such as the Chinese higher education system. A limitation of this study, then, is that a major stream in Kingdon's framework was not addressed. More research is needed in order to understand to what extent the government would envision faculty professionalism as a viable strategy for increasing instructional quality. Considering the recent movement toward decentralization in China's higher education system (Mok, 2005; Yang et al, 2007; "China's New Guidelines," 2010; Xiong, 2011), the window of opportunity for policy change in regards to increasing faculty professionalism may perhaps be more open than it has been in the past.

References

Altbach, P. G. (2007). Peripheries and Centres: Research Universities in Developing

Countries. *Higher Education Management & Policy*, 19(2), 111-134.

Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L., Rumbley, L.E (2009). *Tracking an academic revolution: A

report prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education.*

Altbach, P. G. (2010*). Trends in global higher education : Tracking an academic

revolution.* Boston : Sense Publishers

Asian Development Bank (2011a). *Higher Education Across Asia: An Overview of

Issues and Strategies*.   Manila: Asian Development Bank.

Asian Development Bank (2011b). *Improving instructional quality: Focus on faculty

development*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.

Austin, A.E. (2002). Academic staff in times of transformation: Roles, challenges, and

professional development needs. In D. Chapman & A. Austin (Eds.), *Higher

education in the developing world: Changing contexts and institutional

responses.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton:

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Cao, Y. (2011). *Skill development in higher education: perspectives from recent college

graduates and their instructors in China.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from

Proquest.

Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and State Council. (1993, February 13th). *Outline for reform and educational development.* Beijing, China: Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and State Council (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

China's new guidelines seek to recharge outmoded and ill-equipped colleges. (2010). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 56(36), A23.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cyranoski, D. (2010). China debates university reform. *Nature,* 464(7287), 336-7.

DeJaegher, J. G., Chapman, D.W., & Mulkeen, A. (2006). Increasing the supply of secondary teachers in sub-Saharan Africa: A stakeholder assessment of policy options in six countries. *Journal of educational policy*, 21(5), 515-533.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E. and Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R. & Gall, J.P. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston: Pearson.

Guangdong X University website (2012).

Hazelcorn, Ellen (2013). Global university rankings: The new Olympic sport? *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 3, 2013.

Huang, D. (2009). Teaching evaluation is very necessary at institutions of higher education. *Chinese Education & Society* 42(2), 56-57.

Huber, M.T., Hutchings, P. &Shulman, L.S. (2005). The scholarship of teaching and

learning today. In K. O'Meara and R. Rice (Eds.) *Faculty priorities*

reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship. San Francisco: Jossey-

Bass.

Hutcheson, P.A. (2000). *A professional professoriate: Unionization, bureaucratization,*

and the AAUP. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

The International Herald Tribune (2012). Professors' salaries are graded on the global

curve. Retrieved from

http://rendezvous.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/02/professors-salaries-are-graded-

on-the-global-curve/?_r=0

Jiang, K. (2009). A critical analysis of accountability in higher education: Its relevance

to evaluation of higher education. *Chinese Education & Society*, 42 (2), 39-51.

Kingdon, J.W. (2003). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd ed.). New York:

Longman.

Lai, M. (2010). Challenges faced by Chinese academics in the Chinese heartland.

Journal of Further and Higher education, 34 (2), 271-290.

Lai, M. (2010). Challenges to the work life of academics: Experiences of a renowned

university in the Chinese mainland. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 64(1), 89-111.

Lai, M. & Lo, L. (2007). The changing work lives of academics: The experience of a

regional university in the Chinese mainland. *Higher Education Policy, 20*, 145-

167.

Li, W. (2010). Higher education governance and university autonomy in China. *Globalization, Societies, and Education*, 8(4), 477-495.

Li, J. & Lin, J. (2008). China's move to mass higher education. In D. Baker & A.Wiseman (Eds.), *The worldwide transformation of higher education*. Bingley: Emerald

Lincoln, Y. S., Cole, B.R., Wang, X., Yang, X. (2002). Context for higher education reform in China: An analysis of faculty issues. In D. Chapman & A. Austin (Eds.), *Higher education in the developing world: Changing contexts and institutional responses.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

Liu, N. & Wang, Q.(2011). Building world class universities in China: A dream come true? *Chinese Education and Society*, 44 (5), 3-7.

Liu, Z. (2009). Three cognitive issues related to evaluation of institutions of higher education. *Chinese Education and Society.* 42 (2), 58–62.

Lu, H. (2005). Survey of teachers in higher education institutions with second jobs. *Chinese Education and Society.* 38 (6), 46-52.

Menand, L. (1996). *The Future of Academic Freedom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miles, M., and Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Min, W. (2004). Chinese Higher Education. In P. U. Altbach, T (Ed.), *Asian Universities* (pp. 53-84). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mok, K. (2005). Globalization and educational restructuring: University merging and changing governance in China. *Higher Education*, 50, 57-88.

Mohrman, K., Geng, Y. & Wang, Y. (2011). Faculty life in China. *The NEA Almanac for Higher Education.*

Mohrman, K., Wang, Y, & Li, X. (2011). Quality assurance in undergraduate education: transformation of higher education policy in China. In T. Huang, & A. Wiseman, (Eds.) *The impact and transformation of education policy in China: International perspectives on education and society* (345-375). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Paying the professoriate : A global comparison of compensation and contracts (2012). In Altbach P. G. (Ed.), . New York: New York : Routledge.

Postiglione, G.A. (1998). Maintaining global engagement in the face of national integration in Hong Kong. *Comparative Education Review, 42*(1), 30.

Postiglione, G.A. (2002). Chinese higher education for the twenty-first century. In D. Chapman & A. Austin (Eds.) *Higher education in the developing world: changing contexts and institutional responses*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Postiglione, G.A. (2005). Higher education in China: Perils and promises for a new century. *Harvard China Review,* 5(2), 138-143.

Postiglione, G. A. (2009). Editor's introduction. *Chinese Education and Society,* 40(6), 3–5.

Price Shock (2009). *Business China.* 35(6), 10

Qiang, J. (2011). China's move to mass higher education in a comparative

Perspective, 41(6), 751–768

Sampson, H. (2004). Navigating the waves: the usefulness of a pilot in qualitative

research. *Qualitative Research*, 4(3), 383-402.

Scorcinelli, M., Austin, A., Eddy, P.L., & Beach, A.L. (2006). *Creating the future of*

faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present. Bolton:

Anker.

Wang, B., & Chen, Q. (2007). The Administrative Mode and Academic Corruption at

China's State-Run Universities. *Chinese Education & Society,* 40(6), 37-46.

Yang, R., Vidovich, L., & Currie, J. (2007). Dancing in a cage: Changing autonomy in

Chinese higher education. *Higher Education*, 54(4), 575-592.

Wei, J. (2005). Creating a Quality Higher Education Teacher Base and Measures for

Undertaking Reforms. *Chinese Education & Society, 38*(6), 7-16.

Xiong, Q., Zhang, D. & Liu, H.(2011) Governance reform at China's "985

project" universities. *Chinese Education and Society,* 44(5), 31–40.

Xu, J., Yang, J., & Yu, Y. (2005). The Future Reform and Development of Higher

Education Teacher Training in China. *Chinese Education & Society, 38*(6), 17-38.

Xu, L. (2008). *The conceptualization of academic duties by university teachers in the*

Chinese mainland: Case studies on two research universities. (Doctoral

Dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest.

Yu, X. (2007). "Faculty Employment Policy Shift in Chinese Higher Education." *Journal of Education*, 188(3), 51-62.

Zhou, J. (2006). <u>Higher Education in China</u>. Singapore: Thompson.

APPENDIX A:
Survey Instrument (English)

Survey on Instructional Quality in China

You are being invited to be in a research study of instructional quality in China. You were selected for this study because you are a Chinese faculty or administrator. This survey will take about 15 minutes. The records of this study will be kept anonymous. Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University of Minnesota. If you decide to participate, you do not have to answer any question and can stop the interview at any time. There are no risks or benefits associated with this study. The researcher conducting this study is Jeff Lindgren, Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development, University of Minnesota. Thank you for filling out the survey.

Directions: the following questions relate to the current situation *at your university*. Please show your response to the questions by checking (√) the boxes below.

	To a great extent	To some extent	To a small extent	To no extent/none
1. To what extent would increasing the support for instructional development opportunities (e.g. workshops or conferences to develop instruction) for faculty raise instructional quality?				
2. To what extent would changing promotional systems to emphasize teaching more raise instructional quality?				
3. To what extent would increasing faculty choice about the content of what they teach raise instructional quality?				
4. To what extent would increasing faculty choice about how they assess students raise instructional quality?				
5.To what extent would increasing faculty resources for instructional development over the internet raise instructional quality?				

6. To what extent would increasing faculty decision making regarding curriculum raise instructional quality?				
7. To what extent would increasing support for faculty getting a higher degree (PhD) raise instructional quality?				
8. To what extent would creating a university-wide center for instructional development increase instructional quality?				
9. To what extent would increasing overall salary keep faculty from taking on second jobs outside the institution?				
10. To what extent does faculty taking second jobs outside the university decrease instructional quality?				
11. To what extent would more job security for faculty (e.g. tenure) increase instructional quality?				
12. To what extent would increasing opportunities for mentoring among faculty about instruction raise instructional quality?				
13. To what extent would increasing support for faculty international scholarly exchanges raise instructional quality?				
14. To what extent would decreasing the faculty work load increase instructional quality?				
15. To what extent would increasing faculty involvement (e.g. on university committees) in university decision making increase instructional quality?				
16. To what extent would increasing faculty involvement in decisions to hire faculty would raise instructional quality?				
17. To what extent would increasing faculty salary levels keep excellent instructors from leaving higher education?				
18. To what extent would increasing faculty choice in regards to the teaching methods they use raise instructional quality?				
19. To what extent does supporting faculty to do research about teaching would increase instruction quality?				

20. To what extent does supporting faculty to teach based on teaching principles from their research about instruction increase their instruction quality?				
21. To what extent would increasing support for faculty to attend national and regional conferences on teaching and learning raise instructional quality?				
22. To what extent would decreasing pressure on faculty to do research increase instructional quality?				
23. To what extent does instructional quality need to be raised at my university?				
24. To what extent would increasing support for faculty to learn about instructional technology (i.e. using multimedia) raise instructional quality?				
25. To what extent would increasing support for faculty to develop interactive strategies raise instructional quality?				
26. To what extent would increasing faculty involvement in university educational policy decisions increase instructional quality?				

27. Would you like to clarify or comment on any of your answers? If so, please write below or on the back page.

Demographic information:
Male _____ Female _____
Position (check all that apply)
                        Faculty/instructor _____
                        Dean or department head _____
                        Full time administrator _____
                        Other: _____

Please return this survey to Jeff Lindgren (lindgren.jeff@gmail.com).

Appendix B:
Survey Instrument (Chinese version)

Survey on Instructional Quality in China

调查问卷用):我们邀请您作为一位中国教师（或管理者）参加一项中国教学质量的调查研究。这项调查大约占用您

15分钟时间。研究记录将被匿名处理。您可以自由决定是否参与本研究。您关于是否选择参与本研究的决定，不会影响您与明尼苏达大学现在或将来的关系。如果您决定参与，您可以拒绝回答问卷中任何一个（让您觉得不舒服的）问题，您也可以随时停止填写问卷中途退出。这项研究不会给您带来风险或收益。本研究的执行人员是明尼苏达大学组织领导、政策与发展系杰夫•林德格润（Jeff Lindgren）。感谢您填写这份问卷。

说明：请结合您学校的情况回答以下问题。请在相应的空格里打勾(√)来表明您的答案。

	很大程度	某些程度	很小程度	没有影响
1. 为教师提供更多的职业发展机会（如教学技能培训班或者教学会议）可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
2. 增加教学在职称评审中的比重可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
3. 在教学内容方面，让教师有更多的决定权可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
4. 在考核学生方面，让教师有更多的决定权可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
5.在网络上为教师提供更多的教学资源可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
6. 提高教师对教学大纲的决定权可以在多大程度上提高教学质				

量？				
7. 加大力度支持教职工拿到更高学位（比如博士学位）可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
8. 成立一个全校范围的教学发展中心可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
9. 提高对教师的薪酬水平可以在多大程度上使他们更少可能从事校外兼职？				
10. 教师从事校外兼职的现象在多大程度上会降低他们的教学质量？				
11. 为教师提供更多的工作保障（比如实行教授终身制）可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
12. 增加教师之间关于教学的经验交流可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
13. 加大力度支持教师出国交流可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
14. 减轻教师的工作量可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
15. 提高教师在学校决策方面的参与程度（比如在学校的委员会上）可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
16. 提高教师在聘用新教师方面的参与程度可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
17. 提高教师的薪酬水平可以在多大程度上使优秀教师更少可能离开高校？				
18. 在教学方法方面，让教师有更多的决定权可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
19. 加大力度支持教师进行教学研究可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
20. 加大力度支持教师按照教学研究中发现的教学原理进行教学				

可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
21. 加大力度支持教师参加国家或者地区关于教学的会议可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
22. 减轻教师的科研压力可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
23. 我的大学需要在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
24. 加大力度支持教师学习教学技术（比如多媒体教学）可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
25. 加大力度支持教师使用互动式的教学方法可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				
26. 在学校的教育政策决策方面，提高教师的参与程度可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？				

26.
对于您的答案，您需要进一步说明和评论吗？如果有，请在下面填写或者写在背面。

个人信息**:**
男_____ 女_____
职位(请选择所有适合您的选项):
　　　教师____
　　　系主任____
　　　 全职行政人员 ____
　　　　其他_____
请把此调查问卷交给杰夫•林德格润（Jeff Lindgren) *(lindgren.jeff@gmail.com).*

Appendix C:
Interview Protocol (English Version)

Interview on Instructional Quality in China

Interview Protocol

You are being invited to be in a research study of instructional quality in China. You were selected for this study because you are a Chinese faculty or administrator. This interview will take about 40 minutes. The records of this study will be kept anonymous. Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University of Minnesota. If you decide to participate, you do not have to answer any question and can stop the interview at any time. There are no risks or benefits associated with this study. The researcher conducting this study is Jeff Lindgren, Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development, University of Minnesota. His contact information is 651-357-2429 or lindgren.jeff@gmail.com. Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed.

1. At your institution, what do faculty do if they want to improve their teaching?

       What resources are available for faculty who want to improve their teaching?

       If your institution had a 50% increase in its budget for the purpose of raising instructional quality, how would you recommend they do it?

2. What kinds of professional development would be most useful for improving instruction?

       To what extent do you think increasing professional development opportunities (e.g. instructional development workshops, attending conferences about teaching, obtain a higher degree) for faculty would raise the quality of instruction?

3. To what extent is what faculty teach up to them, and to what extent is it up to the university?

       To what extent are the teaching methods that faculty use up to them, and to what extent is it up to the university?

       Would increasing faculty choice about content and pedagogical methods raise instructional quality or would that not make a difference?

4. Could you tell me about how evaluation of teaching is done at your university?
       What is the effect of the evaluation of teaching on instruction?

5. To what extent are faculty currently involved in policy decisions that affect instruction? (example: faculty involvement on committees)

> Would increasing the amount of involvement faculty have in these decisions raise the quality of instruction or not?

6. These questions are about financial support for faculty. Some may feel that building a strong teaching faculty requires more financial support (for example, in increased salary and benefits), while others may think that increased financial support would not improve teaching. What do you think—would providing more financial support for faculty increase instructional quality in the long run or not?

> To what extent would increasing overall salary (footnote—add later) make excellent teachers not want to or not to leave the university?

> To what extent would increasing overall salary make teachers not want to or need to take second jobs?

> Are second jobs a problem in relation to raising instructional quality?

7. To what extent would emphasizing teaching more in the faculty promotion system raise instructional quality?

8. To what extent would decreasing the faculty work load raise instructional quality?

9. I have a list of possible actions here (hand these out to participants on paper). At your institution, which action would be the most effective? Which one would be least effective in raising instructional quality?

> Increasing the amount of and support for instructional development opportunities for faculty.

> Increasing faculty choice about the content and methods of what they teach.

> Increasing faculty involvement (e.g. on university committees) in policy decisions that affect teaching.

> Provide more overall salary for faculty

> Decrease workload.

> Reward teaching more in the promotional system

10. Do you think the university would support the changes we have talked about? Which ones do you think they would support? Which ones do you think they would not support?

11. You have answered all the questions I've prepared. Are there any other ways you think the quality of instruction at your university could be raised?

Appendix D:
Interview Protocol (Chinese Version)

Interview on Instructional Quality in China

Interview Protocol

(访谈用):我们邀请您作为一位中国教师（或管理者）参加一项关于中国教学质量的调查研究。这一访谈大约占用您40分钟时间。研究记录将被匿名处理。您可以自由决定是否参与本研究。您关于是否选择参与本研究的决定，不会影响您与明尼苏达大学现在或将来的关系。如果您决定参与，您可以拒绝回答任何一个（让您感觉不舒服的）问题，您也可以随时中止访谈。这项研究不会给您带来风险或收益。本研究的执行人员是明尼苏达大学组织领导、政策与发展系杰夫•林德格润（Jeff Lindgren）。感谢您接受访谈。

1. 在您的1大学，如果教师想要提高他们的教学能力，他们怎么做？

　　　　对于想要提高教学能力的教师，有哪些资源可以供他们利用呢？
　　　　如果您的大学准备在提高教学质量方面增加50%的预算，您建议他们应该怎么用这笔钱？
　　　　　　你觉得学校会支持这样做吗？

2. 增加教师的职业发展机会(
比如教学技能培训班、教学会议或者进修更高学位)可以在多大程度上提高教学质量？什么样的职业发展机会最有效？

3.
　　　　关于教学内容，在多大程度上取决于教师，同时在多大程度上取决于学校？关于教学方法，在多大程度上取决于教师，同时在多大程度上取决于学校？

　　　　在教学内容和教学方法方面，给教师更多的决定权会不会提高教学质量？

4. 您能告诉我在您的大学教学质量评估是如何进行的吗？
　　　　教学评估对教学有什么影响？

5.
目前教师在多大程度上参与了关于教学的政策决策（比如参与学校的委员会）？
提高教师在这些决策中的参与程度会不会提高教学质量呢？

6.
以下问题是关于对教师的薪酬水平的。有些人认为建立一个强大的教师队伍需要提高教师的薪酬水平，但是另外有些人可能认为提高薪酬水平并不能提高教学质量。您是怎么认为的？从长远看来，提高教师的薪酬水平可不可以帮助提高教学质量呢？

　　　　提高教师的薪酬水平可以在多大程度上使优秀教师更少可能跳槽？

還有其他可以使優秀教師更少可能跳槽的方面嗎？

提高教師的薪酬水平可以在多大程度上使教師更少可能從事兼職？

教師從事兼職會影響教學質量的提高嗎？

7. 增加教學在職稱評審中的比重在多大程度上可以提高教學質量？

8. 減少教師工作量可以在多大程度上提高教學質量？

9.

這是幾個可能的措施（遞給受訪者寫有以下內容的紙）。在你的大學，在提高教學質量方面，以下哪個措施最顯著？哪個最不顯著？

> 為教師提供更多的學習機會來提高教學質量
> 在教學內容和方法方面讓教師有更多的選擇
> 在教學政策決策方面提高教師的參與程度（比如在學校的委員會上）
> 提高教師的薪酬水平
> 減少工作量
> 增加教學在職稱評審中的比重

10.

關於學校會支持我們剛剛討論過的措施您認為學校哪些會支持？學校哪些不會支持？

11.

您已經回答了我所準備的所有題目。您認為還有什麼其他方式可以提高您的大學的教學質量嗎？

Appendix E: Notification of IRB Approval

The IRB: Human Subjects Committee determined that the referenced study is exempt from review under federal guidelines 45 CFR Part 46.101(b) category #2 SURVEYS/INTERVIEWS; STANDARDIZED EDUCATIONAL TESTS; OBSERVATION OF PUBLIC BEHAVIOR.

Study Number: 1202E10844

Principal Investigator: Jeff Lindgren

Title(s):
Can Increasing Faculty Professionalism Raise Instructional Quality in Chinese Higher Education?

This e-mail confirmation is your official University of Minnesota RSPP notification of exemption from full committee review. You will not receive a hard copy or letter.

This secure electronic notification between password protected authentications has been deemed by the University of Minnesota to constitute a legal signature.

The study number above is assigned to your research. That number and the title of your study must be used in all communication with the IRB office.

Research that involves observation can be approved under this category without obtaining consent.

SURVEY OR INTERVIEW RESEARCH APPROVED AS EXEMPT UNDER THIS CATEGORY IS LIMITED TO ADULT SUBJECTS.

This exemption is valid for five years from the date of this correspondence and will be filed inactive at that time. You will receive a notification prior to inactivation. If this research will extend beyond five years, you must submit a new application to the IRB before the study?s expiration date.

Upon receipt of this email, you may begin your research. If you have questions, please call the IRB office at (612) 626-5654.

Appendix F: Figure and Tables

Figure 2

Alignment Between Research Questions and Survey and Interview Questions

Potential problem	The current level of quality of instruction may need to be raised (survey question 23)
Potential solution	Increase academic freedom (Survey questions 3, 4, 11,18) (Interview question 3,4)
Potential solution	Balance workload (Survey question 14) (Interview question 8)
Potential solution	Increase salary (Survey questions 9,10, 17) (Interview question 9)
Potential solution	Reward teaching more (Survey question 2, 22) (Interview question 7)
Potential solution	Increase faculty participation in governance (Survey questions 6, 15, 16, 26) (Interview question 5)
Potential solution	Increase professional growth opportunities (Survey questions 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25) (Interview question 2)

Table 7

Interview Results for the Academic Freedom Domain

Question/theme	Administrators[a] (N= 15)		Faculty[b] (N= 30)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do faculty currently choose the content of what they teach?	4	5	12	6
Do faculty currently choose their teaching methods?	12	0	11	3
Would increasing faculty choice in what they teach raise the quality of instruction?	3	0	11	1
Stated reasons offered for why increasing faculty choice in what they teach would raise the quality of instruction.			• make teaching more innovative and interactive (1) • help instructors teach to the actual needs of the students.(1) • improve current exam-oriented system(1) • help instructors learn to make sound course content decisions (1)	

[a]*n*=15; [b]*n*= 30

Table 8

Interview Results for Balanced Workload Domain

Question/theme	Administrators[a] (N= 15)		Faculty[b] (N= 30)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Would decreasing faculty workload raise instructional quality?	2	5	10	2
Stated reason offered for why decreasing faculty workload would not raise instructional quality.	• Faculty attitudes are more important than workload (2) • Decreasing workload would not result in faculty spending more time on teaching (2) • Faculty workloads are not too high (2)			
Reasons why decreasing faculty workload would raise instructional quality			• Faculty could prepare classes better with more time (4) • Faculty could use the extra time on developing their teaching/ build knowledge/professionally develop (3)	

[a]*n*=15; [b]*n*= 30

Table 9

Interview Results for Salary Domain

Question/theme	Administrators[a] (N= 15)		Faculty[b] (N= 30)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Would increasing faculty salaries raise instructional quality?	6	3	10	5
Stated reasons offered for why increasing faculty salaries would raise instructional quality.	• Attracting and retaining excellent instructors (3) • Second jobs will be fewer (2) • Build strong teaching cohort in the long term (1) • Cost of living has risen (1)		• It can help faculty focus on teaching (4) • Build strong teaching cohort in the long term (1). • Attract excellent instructors (1)	
Stated reasons for why increasing faculty salaries would not raise instructional quality	• High salary won't keep faculty from taking second jobs (2) • High salary can't guarantee high quality of teaching (1)		• Increasing salary and teaching are not related (2) • Being willing to improve one's teaching is more important (1)	
Would increasing faculty salaries result in faculty taking on fewer second jobs?	• Yes (3) • No (1)		• Yes (8) • No (1)	
Effect of second jobs on teaching	• Negative (3) • Positive (2)		• it depends on situation (8) • Negative (6) • Positive (3)	

[a]*n*=15; [b]*n*= 30

Table 10

Interview Results for Reward System Domain

Question/theme	Administrators[a] (N= 15)		Faculty[b] (N= 30)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Would emphasizing teaching more in the promotional system raise instructional quality?	10	0	11	3

[a]*n*=15; [b]*n*= 30

Table 11

Interview Results for the Governance Domain

Question/theme	Administrators[a] (N= 15)		Faculty[b] (N= 30)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Are faculty currently involved in policy decisions that affect instruction?	5	8	3	12
Would increasing faculty involvement in decisions that affect instruction raise instructional quality?	3	0	13	1

[a]*n*=15; [b]*n*= 30

Table 12

Interview Results for the Professional Development Domain

Question/theme	Administrators[a] (N= 15)		Faculty[b] (N= 30)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Would increasing professional development for faculty raise instructional quality?	6	0	13	0
Kinds of professional development that would be most useful for improving instruction.	• Obtain higher degree (5) • Training course or workshop (4) • International exchange/visiting scholar (3) • Seminar about teaching (1) • Research about teaching (1) • Younger faculty getting help from experienced faculty (1)		• Training course or workshop (5) • Obtain higher degree (2) • Visiting scholar (1) • Classroom observation (1) • View public classes online (1)	

Table 13

Survey Results for the Professional Development Domain: Means, Standard Deviations, and Welch's t-test

Question	M (SD)		t-test		
	Faculty[a]	Administrator[b]	t	df	p
To what extent would increasing the support for instructional development opportunities (e.g. workshops or conferences to develop instruction) for faculty raise instructional quality?	3.5(0.58)	3.52(0.51)	0.15	45.62	0.87
To what extent would increasing faculty resources for instructional development over the internet raise instructional quality?	3.39(0.63)	3.43(0.6)	0.2	44.35	0.84
To what extent would increasing support for faculty getting a higher degree (PhD) raise instructional quality?	3.18(1.06)	3.29(0.72)	0.42	46.62	0.67
To what extent would creating a university-wide center for instructional development increase instructional quality?	3.04(0.72)	3.24(0.62)	0.87	45.86	0.39
To what extent would increasing opportunities for mentoring among faculty about instruction raise instructional quality?	3.5(0.64)	3.67(0.48)	1.04	46.99	0.3

To what extent would increasing support for faculty international scholarly exchanges raise instructional quality?	3.57(0.5)	3.52(0.51)	-0.32	42.87	0.75
To what extent does supporting faculty to do research about teaching would increase instruction quality?	3.36(0.56)	3.57(0.51)	1.401	45.23	0.168
To what extent does supporting faculty to teach based on teaching principles from their research about instruction increase their instruction quality?	3.33(0.62)[c]	3.57(0.51)	1.46	45.86	0.15
To what extent would increasing support for faculty to attend national and regional conferences on teaching and learning raise instructional quality?	3.22(0.57)	3.1(0.44)	-0.83	46.96	0.41
To what extent would increasing support for faculty to learn about instructional technology (i.e. using multimedia) raise instructional quality?	3.07(0.54)	3.09(0.54)	0.153	43.26	0.8791
To what extent would increasing support for faculty to develop interactive strategies raise instructional quality?	3.39(0.63)	3.57(0.51)	1.1	46.71	0.2771

Note. Responses are on a four point scale from 1=To no extent/none; 2=To a small extent; 3=To some extent; 4=To a great extent.
[a]n=27; [b]n= 20;[c]n=26