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ABSTRACT

This research was a qualitative study of an education policy process in Hong Kong. The aim of this research was to conduct an analysis of policy by the Education Manpower Bureau (EMB) on teachers’ continuing professional development (CPD) since 2003, with reference to ‘policy practice’. The inquiry sought to develop an understanding of how the production and practices of the CPD policy affected teachers’ perspectives of their roles in professional development at the individual primary school level. It sought to make a substantial and original contribution to the understanding of policy concerning teachers’ CPD practice which is seldom examined from the perspectives of both the policymakers and the practitioners. Although this study focused largely on the micro level of policy implementation, it did explore some of the influences directing the macro level of policy text production. Through different contexts, the original CPD policy intent was interpreted and enacted in different ways by the major stakeholders in the policy process.

The study focused on developing both descriptive and explanatory accounts of teachers’ perceptions of their professional development. The investigation was conducted in three Hong Kong primary schools through questionnaire survey, focus group interviews, documentary and cross-case analysis. The research time frame was from teachers’ CPD policy inception (2003) to the deadline for policy enactment (2007) and the bulk of the data was collected during this period. Some follow-up interviews on implementation occurred later in 2009-2010. The main policy document, “Towards a Learning Profession: The Teacher Competencies Framework and the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers” (hereafter CPD Document 2003) was analyzed across what Vidovich (2002) terms “the policy trajectory”.

iii
At the macro level, policy text production was mainly the work of Education Manpower Bureau and the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications (ACTEQ). Together, they provided the parameters of the CPD policy and continued to develop the policy text from 2000 to 2003. At the micro level, the sites of policy practice were individual schools. The findings revealed significant variance in both the policy-makers’ and classroom teachers’ understanding of policy processes surrounding the development and enactment of CPD in Hong Kong. The majority of the teachers understood and normalized new knowledge in their CPD conception but they deployed new self-governing strategies in CPD policy enactment. The findings highlight the need for re-conceptualization of teachers’ CPD at both macro (EDB/ACTEQ) and micro levels (schools/community). Strong power dynamics and power struggles are characteristics at all levels within the policy trajectory. There was clearly a need to harmonize the variation in policy consultation and production in order to enhance policy implementation.

The study makes a significant contribution with findings from the emergent themes providing new insights for policymakers with regard to teachers’ CPD policy construction. Both the implications for improving teachers’ CPD policies and practices and some topics for future research are discussed in the concluding chapter.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

In the last decade of the 20th century, professional development has been viewed as an ongoing process which contributes and responds to the demands of social change (Anderson, 2001). In Hong Kong, since 2000, the government has taken a proactive approach in reviewing its education system and has started reforms to nurture more creative and innovative citizens for the increasingly globalized economy. To enhance teacher professionalism and develop a professional force which is able to implement the new curriculum, the Education Manpower Bureau (EMB) institutionalized the practice of continuing professional development (CPD) through the enactment of a policy document entitled “Towards a learning profession” in 2003. As the government said in its key Policy Address 2000, ‘the need for continuing professional development (CPD) is a deep-rooted conviction in the teaching profession – to strive in every way for any improvement… so as to fulfill society expectations of a profession’, it seems that “professional development is regarded as a means of empowering teachers by providing them with an ability to update and upgrade knowledge and qualifications in order to bring about the potential for system change” (McKenzie, 2001).

The aim of this study is to explore why the Hong Kong Education Manpower Bureau developed the teachers’ CPD policy document in 2003 and explore the ways in which its design and implementation impacted teachers’ perspectives and their perception of their roles in professional development at individual primary schools. Understanding policy-makers’ and teachers’ perceptions and views of CPD may be helpful to improve and facilitate the construction of CPD policy processes. In terms of enhancing teachers’ professionalism and the process of professionalization, the research provides a broader perspective to inform and assist staff developers in planning and designing more meaningful and sustainable CPD activities at the micro (school) level in future.
This study uses a multi-methods approach, including a quantitative self-developed questionnaire survey, qualitative individual interviews with the chief policy-maker and the schools’ CPD teachers-in-charge, and three focus group interviews with teachers involved in CPD. The study was conducted in three district primary schools in Hong Kong. The questionnaire survey was conducted in April 2007 and data analysis was completed in June 2008. Nine focus group interviews with teachers were conducted in June 2009 after analyzing the survey results and data analysis of the focus group interview data was carried out from July till October 2009. Three individual interviews were carried out in August and September 2010 and data analysis was completed by December 2011. This chapter introduces an overview of the thesis. First, it states the background and context of the problem. Then the research aims and the motivation of the study are followed by a presentation of the main research questions and specific research questions. A brief outline of the thesis is also presented at the end of this chapter.

1.2 Contextual background

In the new era of globalization, professional development of teachers is seen as a continuous facilitative process to keep up with all the changes in the education system. Teachers are considered by most policymakers and school change experts to be the centerpiece of educational change and many reform efforts focus on improving teachers’ knowledge, skills and capacities. Ample researches indicate that innovations have a better chance of succeeding when teachers feel some ownership of the change process (Cousins & Leithwood, 1986; Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, Earl, & Ryan, 1993; Newman & Wehlage, 1995). CPD was no longer an option but an expectation of all professionals since it had taken place in many different countries within contexts of increasing governmental interventions for the purpose of ‘accountability’ and ‘performativity’ over the previous 20 years (Day & Sachs, 2004).
Researchers had argued the need for a new concept of professionalism (Lacey, 1995; Day, 1999; Whitty, 2000) and there was a shift away from focusing on the development of individual teachers to the development of the school as an institution from 1990s to 2000s. In some countries such as England, Taiwan and Sri Lanka, most teachers accepted as reasonable that there should be a balance between system (school and national) CPD needs and individual needs. However, they felt that personal / individual interests now needed more prioritisation with additional opportunities for professional control and self-regulation (Rhodes & Houghton-Hill, 2000; Livingston & Robertson, 2001; Hustler & McNamara et al., 2003).

A similar situation appeared in Hong Kong and the morale of the teaching profession was an area of concern. Ever since the introduction of the School Management Initiative (SMI) from 1991 to 2001, CPD activities had only served the purpose of implementing government policies. Studies showed that teachers participated quite actively in CPD activities in an attempt to fulfill the government’s requirements on CPD policy (Hoyle & John, 1995; Hirst, 1996; Crocker, 2005). It seemed that if the teacher did not undertake enough CPD, they could not be termed ‘professional’. After 2003, all schools in Hong Kong were required to include CPD records as an integral part of a school’s annual report and annual plan, and all teachers, irrespective of their rank and capacity, were required to engage in continuing professional activities of not less than 150 hours in a three-year-cycle. Even now, teachers with different teaching experiences and working in very different school contexts are attending the same continuing professional development programs. To use Ng’s (2003) terms, the provision of professional development activities is ‘policy-led’ and ‘provider-led’, i.e. the curriculum and the mode of delivery are based on the providers’ expertise, experience or interests.
The context of CPD in many Hong Kong schools still in 2001 aligned more with traditional in-service approaches which typically relies on outside experts, centers on helping teachers adopt a particular method, and consists of relatively short-term activities with limited follow-up (Goldenberg & Gallimore, 1991; Richardson & Placier, 2001).

Schools in Hong Kong have traditionally had to adhere to a range of educational policies, Ball (1993) uses the term ‘policy ensemble’ to describe a ‘collection of related policies’. In an attempt to operationalize the government’s vision in CPD, the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications (ACTEQ) produced the policy document entitled “Towards a learning profession: The Teachers Competencies Framework and the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers” in 2003. It is interacted with EMB’s ensemble of CPD policies which had been published in previous years - the Policy Address (2000) and the Principals’ CPD Framework (2002). The CPD Document (2003) aimed at formulating a Teacher Competencies Framework (TCF) and it is like a map, providing teachers with “a guide to the world of teachers’ professional development”. In other words, it is a theoretical reference for teachers to evaluate their own professional development but it never mentions how teachers can be empowered through actively designing and participating in their own CPD, despite the repeated mentioning of the word ‘professionalism’. There was this ‘strange’ phenomenon that although most teachers did not regard the CPD activities to be helpful in their own professional development, they still participated quite actively in these activities because they had to fulfill the government’s requirement on CPD policy (Crocker, 2005).

This study is conducted with the intention of informing future policy construction and, echoing the words of Kenway (1990), “bringing about change not only to educational practice but also to the current ways in which educational policy is produced, processed and received”.
1.3 Role of researcher

From 2004 to 2007, I was one of the teachers’ professional development coordinators in a subsidized primary school in Hong Kong. I worked with my team members to plan and design the school’s professional development plans. With my current practice as a CPD leader, I recognized the importance of identifying teachers’ perceptions and needs in the process of future CPD planning and implementation. Having a strong desire to enhance and encourage more successful CPD activities, I conducted this study to understand more about teachers’ beliefs about the CPD policy document. In practical terms, this study has enabled me to listen to teachers’ real needs and their voice before planning teacher professional development. In other words, the understandings or emerging themes from this now largely historical study, not only gives new insights to policymakers in the construction of CPD policy processes, but also helps CPD coordinators at schools to maximize the effectiveness of promoting CPD in a more strategic and systematic way.

1.4 Research objectives and questions

At the time of commencing this study, only a few policy studies had demonstrated that professional teaching communities play a role in mediating teachers’ responses to policy (Spillane, 1999; Coburn, 2001). So it was critical that policymakers and teachers’ perceptions about teachers’ CPD policy and practice be investigated. The investigation in this research analyses the dynamics of CPD policy processes involved in the production and enactment of EMB’s teacher professional development policy in local primary schools. Contrasting perspectives from the policymakers (former chairman of ACTEQ, school principals and CPD teacher-in-charge) and school teachers are explored and elucidated. In order to capture the complexities and interrelatedness of teacher CPD policy processes, ‘policy trajectory study’, a conceptualization of policy analysis, presented by Ball (1994a) and further developed by Vidovich (2002) was used. The context of outcomes is added to evaluate policy consequences.
To guide the specific research objectives, some questions are considered:

1. Do the policymakers or educators consider the ‘whole teacher’ and his/her needs that determine an individual’s overall professional growth and well-being?

2. Does the apparently top-down bureaucratic policy approach contribute to teachers’ professionalism and professionalization?

3. Is the teachers’ voice being thoroughly considered, or constantly suppressed, by the bureaucratic establishment during the policy making process?

4. Do the schools and teachers support or resist the CPD policy for future professionalism?

The ‘policy trajectory’ approach (Vidovich, 2002) comprises of different contexts: the context of influence (the factors that influence and help shape the policy), the context of text production (how the policy is articulated) and the context of practice (how the policy is enacted and the attending impact). It is hoped that by incorporating the context of outcomes suggested by Ball (1994a), the study will recognize the plurality of contexts and it will help the policymakers for future implications when they deal with issues of power and social justice. In this study, the main focus is placed on the teachers’ perceptions of the policy processes, supplemented by analysis of key policy documents. So, research questions were framed under the above contexts:

1. What were the influences leading to the initiation of teachers’ CPD policy in Hong Kong primary schools?

2. What was the nature of teachers’ CPD policy text and how was it produced?

3. What policy practices were adopted in regard to the implementation of the CPD Policy Document (2003) in individual primary schools?

4. What were the outcomes and implications of teachers’ CPD policy for the case study schools with regard to their future professional development?

The aim is to reveal how CPD policy intent was translated into policy practices in each case study school, and also to help explore the reasons why these local primary schools adopt the CPD Policy Document 2003.
Each general research question is then subdivided into specific research questions highlighting both macro and micro level perspectives in terms of teachers’ understanding of policy:

**The context of influence**

- What are the global influences on the development and initiation of teachers’ CPD policy? (Macro level)
- What are the global and local influences on the development and initiation of teachers’ CPD policy at different case schools? (Micro level)
- Who are the main policy actors initiating teachers’ CPD policy text at each case study school? (Micro level)
- What influences do they bring to teachers’ professional development and how are the influences operating? (Micro level)

**The context of policy text production**

- What is the stated intention or purpose of the Hong Kong Education and Manpower Bureau in producing teachers’ CPD policy document? (Macro level)
- When did the production of the CPD policy text start and why was it announced and published in 2003? (Macro level)
- What processes and personnel are used to construct the policy text at different case study schools and why? (Micro level)
- What are the different perspectives of teachers at different case schools with regard to the main features of teachers’ CPD policy text? (Micro level)
- How does teachers’ CPD policy construction influence policy implementation in different case study schools? (Micro level)
- How well are teachers’ interests represented in the production of the policy text? (Micro level)
The context of practice

- How well is the teachers’ CPD policy practiced in a wide variety of local primary schools? (Micro level)
- How are global influences evident in the CPD policy practices at individual primary school level? (Micro level)
- How do different case study schools implement teachers’ CPD policy and how different are the policy practices between and within localized sites? (Micro level)
- How well is the teachers’ CPD policy received in different case study schools? (Micro level)
- How do teachers change their roles as a result of complying with the CPD policy? (Micro level)

The context of outcomes

- Are the teachers in different case study schools familiar with the CPD policy and do they support or resist the implementation of the policy? (Micro level)
- What was the impact of the policy on the future development and planning of teachers’ CPD programs or activities in local primary schools? (Micro level)

1.5 Significance of the Research

There is a history of research regarding the relationship between teacher learning, teacher collaboration, and school improvement (Little, 1982, 1990, 1993; Rosenholtz, 1989; Johnson, 1990; Hargreaves, 1994; Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996; Louis & Marks, 1999). But only a limited body of research existed, which mostly put emphasis either on the effects of CPD in enhancing teachers’ satisfaction and commitment (Hawley and Vali, 1999; Villegas-Reimers and Reimers, 2000; Crocker, 2005) or on enhancing teachers’ confidence to achieve the basic requirements of the CPD (Wong, 2005). There were currently few studies which reviewed or analyzed teachers’ CPD policy in relation to policy and practice in Hong Kong. Hence this study would extend knowledge on CPD policy.
As a teacher and a researcher, I aim to contribute to the literature in the field of CPD in primary school in the Hong Kong context so that school leaders may take into account the authentic perspectives of teachers’ CPD policy and practice as these perceptions and needs of CPD may affect the effectiveness of professional development planning (Wheeler, 2001; Chan, 2004; Komba & Nkumbi, 2008). It is also anticipated that the analyses from the study will act as a reference point for those local primary schools struggling with the implementation of the CPD policy. By exploring the differences existing between teachers and policymakers’ (which mentioned in Section 1.4) understandings through cross-case study, the study can provide valuable feedback to both the government and schools in assisting further improvement in policy production and implementation.

1.6 Limitations of the research

The major limitation of this study is the substantial time gap between data collection and the final write up. The primary data was first collected in September 2003 after the release of the CPD Document 2003 while other official reports were collected from 2006 to 2009. Quantitative data was collected through the self-developed questionnaire survey in 2007. After data analysis was completed, further research questions were then set up in 2008. Individual and focus group interviews with policymakers and teachers were subsequently conducted to collect secondary qualitative data in 2009. From September 2010 to December 2012, data analysis was completed. However, due to significant career, and personal family health problems, there was a delay in writing up the thesis, including a period of suspension of enrolment from the university. Final write up resumed from February 2015 to June 2016. I have endeavoured to provide a brief postscript in the final chapter to highlight significant development since 2009.
As a result, the findings may not be generalizable to teachers from secondary teachers. Moreover, not all the policymakers from the EMB were interviewed as the interviews were carried out in the busy months from July to October. The stakeholders’ willingness to attend interviews may have affected data collection. In fact, the researcher only had a clear understanding of the culture of the first case study school, so the other two were not as thoroughly understood in exploring and investigating CPD policy construction and implementation.

1.7 Summary

This study helps to contribute to new knowledge of teachers’ CPD policy construction and its interpretation. By identifying gaps between policymakers and classroom teachers’ perspectives in policy construction and interpretation processes, the study demonstrates how knowledge or power relations operate in CPD policy discourses. The relationship between policy formulation decisions and interpretation processes is further examined through document and interview analysis at implementation level. It is hoped that the study contributes to the Hong Kong research literature on teachers’ CPD in terms of policy development and implementation processes in a post-structural framework.

There are ten chapters in this thesis. This chapter presents the contextual background of the study, the role of the researcher, research objectives and questions as well as significance and limitations. Chapter Two outlines literature concerning CPD concepts, global development and some empirical studies of teachers’ CPD related to the Hong Kong context. Chapter Three is a discussion of the theoretical framework of the study. Chapter Four focuses on the research design, methods and data collection and analysis procedures.
Chapter Five presents some themes and issues from teachers’ survey analysis. Chapter Six focuses on teachers’ CPD document analysis while Chapter Seven illustrates interpretations through interview analysis. Chapter Eight consists of a triangulation of all data collection through cross-case analysis. Chapter Nine elucidates and synthesizes the key findings of the study.

It highlights the mode of formation of teachers’ CPD policy, the progress of conducting teachers’ CPD policy and Hong Kong teachers’ CPD experiences in policy implementation. Chapter Ten provides a final discussion of the key findings and explores the implications for future development in CPD policy and practice, as well as noting fruitful areas for future research on teachers’ CPD.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The research reported in this thesis analyzes the perceptions of both the policymakers and classroom teachers in relation to CPD policy processes after 2003, with a particular focus on the development and enactment of CPD Document 2003. The study is embedded within three main bodies of the contemporary literature: conceptual literature, contextual as well as empirical literature. The first section of this chapter presents the definitions of CPD, professionalism as well as its related concepts of professional development. These are the toolboxes to locate the study within the interpretivist paradigm. The second section explores issues concerning the development of CPD in global and local contexts in an attempt to explain why the study is needed to improve the contemporary situation with regard to policy context and practice. The third section explores some literature which aims to fill the gaps of the above section, showing why and how the development of CPD policy and practice affects teachers’ and policymaker’s perspectives. The reviews are designed to lay the foundation to understanding teachers’ acceptance of and beliefs about CPD.

2.2 Conceptual literature

2.2.1 Definitions of CPD and professionalization

The term continuing professional development (CPD) was first coined by Richard Gardner in the mid-1970s. Many professional associations have adopted other definitions of CPD and almost all of them differ from each other. Because of different educational traditions and contexts, teachers’ CPD has no unique definitions (Wan, 2011). Their interpretation of CPD is often implicit within the description of purpose and implementation (Evans, 2002; Kennedy, 2005). Some researchers have equated CPD with the activities or processes undertaken (Whitford, 1994; Miller & Silvernail, 1994 cited in Evans, 2002). So far, understandings of CPD within academic literature has been implicit and they are mainly located within interpretations and descriptions of activities and outcomes.
It was not until 1999 that Day provided a more holistic definition about professional development, stating that:

Professional development consists of all natural learning experiences and those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual, group or school and which contribute through these to the quality of education in the classroom. (p.4)

Similar to Day’s definition, teachers’ CPD can be described as a general process embracing all activities that enhance professional career growth (Rogan & Grayson, 2003). Interestingly, literature after 2000 emphasizes the term continuing professional development (CPD) more. Curtis and Cheng (2001) use the term ‘continuing’ to highlight the professional development as being ongoing, lifelong oriented, an ‘ongoing’ change process. CPD encompasses many different situations but definitions of CPD were scarce (Evans, 2002). Goodall et al. (2005: 26) further elaborate Day’s definition, claiming that:

The concept [of CPD] is often left ill-defined being in many cases conflated with the related concepts of in-service training and on the job learning. Both are more limited than CPD, as CPD can encompass a wide variety of approaches and teaching and learning styles in a variety of settings (inside or outside of the workplace). It is distinguishable from the broader concept of lifelong learning, which can include all sorts of learning.

It is significant to point out that at this time, CPD for teachers and school leaders is undergoing a paradigm shift. Pollard (2002) recognized CPD to be a core element of school effectiveness and the key goal as helping teachers deal with the changes demanded by policy and legislation (Rhodes & Houghton-Hill, 2000). It comes as no surprise that CPD was become a management tool. Livingston and Robertson (2001) noted that, “the professional development of teachers implies a process whereby teachers may be helped to become more professional.” So, CPD must focus on individual needs and aspirations. Pollard (2002) observed that as a means of developing the profession, teachers needed to be helped to ‘accommodate new initiatives and requirements’, but also needed to drive themselves through the process of professionalization.
Vonk (1991) identifies two general trends towards the professionalization of teachers. The first trend tends to establish a body of professional knowledge and expertise which aims at “bringing Teacher Education curricula to academic level”. Another trend relates to the increasing government intervention in the definition of a set of competencies and standards against which the training of teaching is set up and evaluated. Other authors further elaborate professionalization as a social and political project or process by which a given occupation seeks the recognition as a profession, and it is more related to status and public recognition (Calgren, 1999; Sockett, 1993). If organizers of CPD can balance the intended outcomes and teachers can undertake CPD for their own personal reasons and benefits, it will simultaneously contribute to school development and to the status of the profession. To justify the need for the perspective study, other concepts deserve their own discussion in the next section.

2.2.2 Professionalism and professional development

Evans (2008) and Hargreaves (2001) specifically point out that the notion of teacher professionalism is closely related to professional development. Guskey (2002) has argued that “high quality professional development is a central component in nearly every modern proposal for improving education. Helsby’s (1996) categorizes two different notions of teacher professionalism according to teachers’ responses - the notion of ‘being a professional’ and the notion of ‘behaving professionally’. The former touches the issues of status, reward and public recognition while the latter implies such factors as dedication, exceptional standards of behavior and a strong service ethic. His research found that many teachers, with the notion of ‘being a professional’, felt that educational reforms and a perceived loss of status over time had lessened their ‘professional’ autonomy. For those teachers holding the notion of ‘behaving professionally’, they were professional simply because they had entered the teaching profession. To behave like a professional was nearer to their everyday experience and therefore, more within their control.
But “more recent sociological perspectives on professionalism have rejected such normative notions of what it means to be a professional”(Whitty, 2008). Kelchtermans (2004) conceptualizes professional development as “a learning process, resulting from the meaningful interaction between the teacher and their professional context, both in time and space” (p.220). Some researchers also claim that the concepts of professionalism are inherent in professional development policies and practices and professional development implies changes to professionalism (Evans, 2008; Tang & Choi, 2009).

CPD for teachers is a special case of professional development in general, which in turn, is a special case of lifelong learning (Stefani & Elton, 2002). Professional development and adult learning is closely related since teacher change should not be about acquiring a fixed set of skills but in providing a basis for continual growth and problem-solving (Franke et al., 1998). As Guskey (2000a) argued, “Educators at all levels must be continous learners throughout the entire span of their professional careers and professional development is defined as a process that is intentional, ongoing and systematic”. This is the intent of the ACTEQ, to develop life-long learners through self-directed inquiry on policy practices, which was evident from its recommendations from the CPD policy Document 2003. Since teachers are adult learners, their desire to fill the gaps in knowledge can create the motivation for improvement and change. When they are involved in planning their own learning, they are motivated and invested in learning, which is congruent with Knowles’ (1973) assumptions of andragogy or adult learning (Sixel, 2013): (a) the need to know; (b) the learner’s self-concept; (c) the role of learner’s experience; (d) readiness to learn; (e) orientation to learning; (f) motivation (Knowles, 1984).

In fact, adult learning is largely located within the workplace and it has the potential to enable or inhibit learning. So, learning is an ongoing and inevitable process arising from participation in work practices across working lives (Billet, 2001b, cited in Sixel, 2013).
Bean (2004) points out that “For teachers, a workplace or school culture, composed of interrelated elements”, has the potential to develop into a community of learners thus affording meaningful professional development for teachers (Shulman & Shulman, 2004, cited in Sixel, 2013). The following section will address the concept of Communities of Practice and how these communities impact on teachers’ professional development.

### 2.2.3 Communities of practice

Teaching has moved towards being a more collaborative profession, so there is a need to move from the more traditional form of professional development to one that provides opportunity for reflection on practice and hence impacts on teachers’ beliefs (Fetters et al., 2002). The term ‘community of practice’ (COP) comes from theories based on the idea of learning as social participation and according to Schlager and Fusco (2004), teacher professional development is defined as “A process of learning how to put knowledge into practice through engagement in practice within a community of practitioners” (p.4) and COP can play an integral role in teacher professional development. Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and who interact regularly to learn how to do it better as they interact regularly (Wenger, 2007). Research point out the importance of COP by recognizing that teacher communities figure among the most vital factors for promoting educational change within schools (Grossman et al., 2001; Louis, 2006; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Stigler & Hiebert, 2009, cited in Shúilleabháin, 2013).

Participants in the community of practice encompass three major characteristics: ‘mutual engagement’, ‘joint enterprise’ and ‘a repertoire of negotiable resources accumulated over time’ (Wenger, 1998) and Shúilleabháin (2013) introduces two more features, ‘situated realism’ (the unique environments of schools and individual work settings) and ‘shared meaning’ (an outcome of dialogue) to describe a sustainable and meaningful community of practice.
The community of practice framework considers language as one of the many social practices in which participants engage (Bucholtz, 2011, cited in Shúilleabháin, 2013). As teachers communities are situated within the realities of school, ‘dialogue’ within the community is very important when participants develop a sense of understanding and evolution of ideas through dialogue interactions but trust, respect and appreciation for the interpretation of the other is also vital in order for ‘authentic dialogue’ to emerge (Bohm, 1996; Burbules, 1993).

This research will track the moments of transformation of teachers’ perspectives (personal and professional) due to participation in the CPD policy construction process. Within the community of teachers, schools and the government, conflict will exist while a shared meaning is negotiated (Bohm, 1996). It is interesting for this research to go some way in analyzing teachers’ and policymaker’s perceptions on CPD policy document as well as its implementation through dialogue. In the research context, Chapter 7 will focus on the interview analysis in order to understand the participants’ views and voices on policy construction and practices. Through the cross-case analysis in Chapter 8, the process of learning within a community of practitioners will be viewed through a lens of authentic dialogue between both teachers and schools. It is hoped that the degree of success on putting teachers’ CPD knowledge into practice through policy engagement will also be evaluated and insights will be given to policymakers for future CPD planning and reference.

2.2.4 Concept of policy perceptions

Perception is a broad term that includes a systematic process and factors that affect your mind set. Policy perception is a broad concept not only to the teachers but also to the stakeholders, i.e. all those people who have a legitimate interest in the continuing effectiveness and success of an institution (Bush & Heystek, 2003a).
To understand teachers’ perception on CPD policy, Fullan’s (2001) theory indicates three important characteristics for the success of policy reform: need, clarity and practicality of the policy. First, teachers must agree with the importance of the policy and acknowledge that the policy is appropriate for their school (Floch, Zhang, Kurki, & Herrmann 2006, cited in Tuytens & Devos, 2010) and this is the priority for teachers to comprehend the need of the new policy (Tuytens & Devos, 2010). Second, if teachers have to be able to understand the goals and means of the policy, the policy’s clarity is recognized.

In other words, the policy should be clear for teachers so they are able to put it into practice (Fullan, 2001), but information should be structured clearly so the reform nurtures more support (Datnow, 2000) (both cited in Tuytens & Devos, 2010). Kelchtermans (2004) points out that ‘the perception of teachers on new policy is influenced by the structural working conditions in the school’, materials and other resources provided to schools to implement the policy can stimulate practicality.

Research argues more about the dimensions of the stakeholders’ (teachers and policymakers) perceptions in the sensemaking process. Spillane, Reiser and Reimer’s (2002) cognitive implementation framework argues that teachers make sense of and perceive new policies in the implementation process and it is based on their individual understandings and schemata, and within a social and organizational context. Teachers’ individual beliefs about teaching and learning and their desire to maintain a positive self-image affect them in responding to new policies while the structure and culture of the organization can either support or hinder teachers’ positive perception formation, and the policy itself, especially the implicit images and values conveyed by the design choices, also influence teacher perception (Spillane, Reiser & Reimer, 2002, cited in Gottlieb, 2014).
However, the intended policy is often very different from the policy in use (Bowe, Ball & Gold 1992; Halverson, Kelley & Kimball 2004; Smit 2005, cited in Tuytens & Devos, 2010). Whether policy makers are aware of local actors’ concerns or interpretations of the new policy depends on the relationship between social construction and policy design, as proposed by Ingram, Schneider, and deLeon (2007). Conversely, as policy designs convey how policymakers constructed the target population, representations can either challenge or confirm the positive self-image of most teachers, which in turn reinforce or change how policymakers view that population (Gottlieb, 2014, cited Spillane, Reiser & Reimer, 2002).

By posing the above concepts within the CPD framework, the study will be more able to understand both teachers and policymakers’ perceptions on the construction of the policy document. Taking into account the ‘voices’ of teachers on policy implementation, policymakers can get insights to react more positively towards the practicality of the CPD policy.

2.3. Contextual literature

This section explores some of the issues concerning the development of CPD in global and local contexts in an attempt to explain why the study was needed to improve the present situation with regard to policy context and practice.

2.3.1 Changes of conceptualizations of teachers’ CPD

CPD was no longer an option but an expectation of all professionals since it had taken place in many different countries within contexts of increasing governmental interventions for the purpose of ‘accountability’ and ‘performativity’ over the previous 20 years (Day & Sachs, 2004). Research during the 1990s suggests strong links between leadership in the effective management of professional development, and school improvement and effectiveness (Brennan, 1996; Clarke & Newman, 1997).
Little (1993) reports that the focus has been on stimulating and supporting teacher learning and instructional decision making, bolstering teacher community, advancing whole-school reform and satisfying the demands of accountability. However, issues concerning the nature of teacher professionalism are still problematic in different countries. Carlgren (1999) cites the Swedish government’s lack of concern for teacher professionalism; Koetsier and Wubbels (1995) discuss the accusation that teacher training in the Netherlands has failed to prepare its graduates adequately for the realities of their professional role. In Australia, Sachs (1997) criticizes the importing of market principles and the drive for standards which has meant that ‘politicians and bureaucrats are demanding greater conformity of education offerings which are transparent and superficially testable’.

As a result, writers have argued the need for a new concept of teacher professionalism (Day, 1999; Whitty, 2000), arguing that the image of the teacher as an autonomous professional is currently being replaced by the concept of the school as a ‘learning community’ in which the teacher works collectively, as an important member, in an effort to improve the quality of learning. As Hargreaves (1994) contends, “To improve schools, one must be prepared to invest in professional development; to improve teachers, their professional development must be set within the context of institutional development”.

However, there is little evidence of CPD’s impact on policy practice although numerous CPD schemes and programs are constantly being introduced throughout the world. Arguably, it is valuable to understand how the teachers’ CPD concepts affect their needs of struggling for an acceptable policy process and implementation. The following discussions highlight the context and background for conducting a comprehensive research.
2.3.2 Global development of teachers’ CPD and its significance

During the 1960s and 1970s, ‘in-service education’ was organized by mostly state-based education systems or professional associations aiming at keeping teachers up with current changes or helping them to develop professional discipline and pedagogy. New information, knowledge or skills were identified and delivered to the teachers in order to update their acquired knowledge and competencies in classroom teaching. But by the 1980s, there saw a move to the school as the appropriate site for professional development and a greater interest in educational reform by national governments. This is strongly related to political agendas in different countries with a conviction that education should be more economically efficient and effective, and that the way to achieve this was by organizing education according to business and market needs and principles (Grundy & Robison, 2004).

A rapidly growing recognition of the need for CPD flexibility emerged to meet current and evolving needs, due to the changes in the management and control of in-service education, government funding mechanisms and the development of government-sponsored or targeted training (Glover & Law, 1996). Many countries such as England, Scotland, Australia and Singapore, began to develop their own conceptions and CPD policy frameworks. But CPD is presented narrowly as a tangible sign of commitment to professionalism (Patrick, Forde, & McPhee, 2003). If the teacher does not undertake enough CPD, they cannot be termed ‘professional’. CPD often reinforces the notion of the teacher as deliverer of measurable standards. The 1990s witnessed a shift away from the development of individual teachers to the development of the school as an institution. During this decade, the central concept of professional development rested upon not only teachers but also students and the school system. Researchers began to highlight a holistic approach towards CPD definitions (Johnson, 1991; Philip, 1991; Fullan, 1991 and Hargreaves & Fullan, 1991).
Globalization as well as higher accountability demands from communities foster professional development as an integral part of the lifelong learning of teachers. As a result, competency development was central to the CPD policy framework of teachers in the last decade of the 20th century. A DfES study (2000) found that effective CPD occurred where CPD was central to a school’s improvement plan and in those that had a coherent cycle of CPD and performance management. In fact, the rise of a knowledge-based economy accelerates a paradigm shift of teachers from being transmitters of knowledge to facilitators of knowledge, from traditional ‘followership’ to ‘leadership’ roles, dealing with rapid educational change (Frost et al., 2000). If CPD is effective, it has the power to change teachers, students and the whole school system in general. But which CPD policy framework best suits the needs of the local context of the research is still subject to identification.

2.3.3 Background for the development of Teachers’ CPD Policy Document (2003) in Hong Kong

During the decade of the 1990s, reform of the school curriculum was being undertaken as a key instrument of educational change. To cope with demands for school-based curriculum development and accountability, school administrators and teachers were becoming increasingly involved in seeking and taking advantage of opportunities to improve their professional skills and teaching effectiveness (Craft, 1996). Successful implementation of new educational policies, reforms or innovations depend on whether teachers are adequately prepared and equipped by means of initial retraining and whether they realize the importance of improving their practice by means of CPD (Coetzer, 2001; Earley and Bubb, 2004). To enhance teacher professionalism and develop a professional force which is able to implement the new curriculum, the Education Department (now known as the Education Bureau) introduced the School Management Initiative (SMI) Scheme in 1991, which offered a school-based management (SBM) framework for the improvement of the quality of schools, giving support to help teachers grow professionally.
With the handover of sovereignty on 1 July 1997, Hong Kong has progressed into a new era. The government emphasized in the Policy Address 1999 that “our society must become an innovative and knowledge-based society so as to maintain our international status”. Hence, Hong Kong must adopt "life-long learning” and aim at all-round development of our children. According to the Education Commission’s Report No. 7 (1997), Hong Kong society held a general consensus that the basic principles of education should be 'student-focused', 'no-loser', 'life-wide learning', 'promoting quality' and 'society-wide mobilization'. It recognized that teachers were the key to success of any education reforms efforts and every teacher should be a continuous learner in order to advance the quality of the education system and students’ learning.

Also, the Education Commission recommended that all public schools (government or aided schools) should practice SBM by 2000. SBM is a management framework to delegate more responsibilities to schools and provide them with enhanced flexibility and autonomy in managing resources and planning for school development. Through SBM, teachers were expected to be able to pursue 150-hours of CPD over three years’ time. The 150 hours of CPD was to include time spent on structured learning and other professional development activities that contributed to school development. Teachers were expected to attend courses/seminars, engage in professional activities within and among schools, as well as provide service and support to the education community (an essential part of their professional lives). This type of professional development was to be based on ‘the needs of the institution’. Calderhead (1995) pointed out that “competence-based approach” is not sufficient for quality teaching and the qualities of a ‘good teacher’ include both the proficiency of modern pedagogical skills and the mastery of solid subject knowledge. He or she should also be “committing himself or herself wholeheartedly to their (students’) betterment, being positive and patient, working collaboratively with colleagues, and practicing what they believe and preach” (Ng, 2003).
In fact, the government of Hong Kong considers continuing professional development as peripheral rather than of great significance (Ng, 2003). In terms of costs, a total of HK 198 million dollars was spent on continuing professional development in 1996-1997 by the government (ACTEQ, 1998). Only a limited amount, equivalent to $147 to $166 per teacher, was spent in aided primary and secondary schools for school-based staff development. A new trend towards education reform was announced on the Policy Address 2000 that an extra (HK) $2 billion would be invested on education per year in order to enhance teacher professionalism and develop a professional teaching force to help implement the new curriculum.

Believing that the time was ripe for institutionalizing the practice of CPD in 2002, the Principals’ CPD Framework was developed "to equip and develop school principals with the necessary knowledge, skills and attributes to become competent leaders to lead schools into the new millennium" (Cheng, 2000). To present a coherent framework for principals’ professional development, the consultation paper entitled Continuing Professional Development for School Excellence was released in February 2002. This document was generally positively received but some interest groups expressed reservations about certain recommendations. There is no doubt that the current policy was a very positive forward step but perhaps it was not fully realized that teachers’ CPD needs had to be recognized and supported if teachers’ aspirations towards fuller professionalism were to be achieved. In order to operationalize the government’s vision in CPD, feedback was received from wide consultation and similar CPD developments in other regions of the world. The Teachers’ Professional Learning Framework of England in 2003 and the continued education policies specified by the Ministry of Education in China in 2001 provided models and principles for systematic CPD policies. It is against this background that the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications (ACTEQ) produced the policy document entitled “Towards a learning profession: The Teachers Competencies Framework and the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers” in 2003.
2.3.4 Teachers’ CPD in Hong Kong context

Government intervention may be detrimental to the professionalism of teachers. CPD in Hong Kong was mainly centrally provided by the government, or commissioned by the government to tertiary education institutions from 1982 to 1998, the ED (Education Department) “exerts little control and adopts a laissez-faire approach to the school-based CTE (continuing professional development) program” (Ng, 2003). Teachers participated in continuing professional development activities on a voluntary basis to support the implementation of reform initiatives only when it was necessary but “the government has not yet formulated any coherent policy or established any mechanisms to ensure CTE to be provided in a systematic manner.” (Ng, 2003). Ng (2003) urged the provision of a long-term, visionary policy and strategic planning to guide and direct CPD and its advancement.

It was until 2001 that a unit in the government named “Teacher and Principal Training” with a few officers responsible for coordinating continuing professional development was formed. It cooperates with the ACTEQ (formerly established in 1993) with the chairman and members totally appointed by the government on a fixed term basis. The ACTEQ has a membership varied from time to time, ranging from 15 to 18, and all members were normally academics from high local higher education institutions and principals from various school sectors. As as a non-statutory body under the purview of EMB, the ACTEQ plays an advisory role on government policies and measures relating to the professional development of the teaching profession. Apart from conducting researches, it also provides a platform for promoting professional sharing, collaboration and networking with various stakeholders in school management, educational bodies and organisations (COTAP). As the vast majority of schools (nearly 96%) are not ‘owned and operated’ by the government, there was a very particular notion of the ACTEQ to prevent a loosely structured CPD framework which might otherwise be carried out on an ad hoc basis.
The policy document formulated a teacher competencies framework (TCF) which was like a map, providing teachers with “a guide to the world of teachers’ professional development”. In other words, it was a theoretical reference for teachers to evaluate their own professional development. The Teachers’ CPD Policy Document 2003 sought to set out a CPD strategy designed to ensure that the teachers were given opportunities for relevant, focused, effective professional development; and that professional development was placed at the heart of school improvement.

Two important goals for the central are outlined in the document: first, to set out a generic Teachers’ Competencies Framework which enabled individual teachers to make meaningful self-evaluations of their learning needs over a wide spectrum of professional experience; second, to provide a template that schools could use for developing school-based professional development frameworks - one which was appropriate to their own students, background and mission. It also touches the core professional values of the proposed ‘Teacher Competencies Framework (TCF)’. The framework is built around four core domains namely ‘Teaching and Learning’, ‘Student Development’, ‘School Development’ and ‘Professional Relationships and Services’. Each domain is extended by four dimensions, each of which highlights an important aspect of teachers’ work. Each dimension has a number of strands with stage descriptors linking typical competencies with particular stages of teachers’ professional maturity. The adjectives ‘threshold’, ‘competent’ and ‘accomplished’ are used to locate identifiable stages on a continuum of growing professional achievement. Under the ‘threshold’ column, the stage descriptors outline the basic competencies expected of teachers (ACTEQ, 2003). In short, the framework is comprehensive and touches different aspects of teacher professional needs and performance. The ACTEQ also proposed that all teachers, irrespective of their rank and capacity, should engage in continuing professional activities of not less than 150 hours in a three-year cycle with not less than 50 hours on other modes of continuing professional development.
Although the “other modes” in the TCF include a very broad range of activities such as innovative teaching practice within and across schools, mentoring and serving in education-related committees and the remaining hours could be freely apportioned at individual teachers’ own discretion, whether teachers actually had a voice on what should be included in their continuing professional development was open to question. It seems that teachers working in different school contexts, were soon attending the same generic continuing professional development programs with a passive ‘directed’ orientation!

There was to be a three-year “try-out period” for schools and teachers to experiment with the implementation of the TCF and schools and teachers believed that they were responsible for complying with the document. It is doubtful that teachers’ voice was thoroughly considered during the planning process of the policy document because no representative was present on ACTEQ. In terms of methods of CPD, the document does not provide teachers with a meaningful framework for identifying their own needs and the modes of delivering knowledge in CPD activities are seldom mentioned. Furthermore, nearly all programs conducted or commissioned by the government at that time were heavily skill-based or knowledge-based. Since the document never mentioned how teachers could be empowered through actively designing and participating in their own CPD (despite repeated mentions of the word ‘professionalism’), it is crucial to explore teachers’ own perceptions and experiences about their roles and professional development during the implementation of this CPD document.

With the limited Hong Kong literature on this aspect of CPD, the researcher expects that the findings may be of practical value for future policy-makers seeking to improve models of sustainable, teacher-friendly CPD. The evolution of this process of policy development and the understanding of teachers’ and policymakers’ perceptions of remains the central focus of this study.
2.4 Empirical literature

The approach to and content of CPD in Hong Kong at the turn of the century, seemed poorly equipped to meet modern notions of professionalism. This section reviews some then current literature with an aim to show why and how the development of CPD policy and practice affects teachers’ perspectives. The reviews help to lay the foundation as to how we might foster teachers’ acceptance of, and promote positive beliefs about CPD.

2.4.1 Research about teachers’ perceptions of CPD

Between 1997 and 2002, there were a number of international studies relating to teachers’ perceptions of CPD. In framing a model of outcomes, Harland and Kinder (1997) suggest that teachers experience a ‘sea change’ in both attitude and motivation after participation in high quality INSET. Research drew similar conclusion that CPD is seen as an important and useful means for the teachers to update their professional skills and knowledge (ORC International, 2001; OFSTED, 2002). The study of teachers' perceptions of CPD by Hustler and McNamara et al. (2003) also supports this view and makes the following observation:

- Pressure on teachers to respond to new initiatives and take new responsibilities stimulates the need for CPD but is experienced as a factor that can limit opportunities;
- The development activities seen as particularly beneficial are those which are clearly focused, well-structured, linked to the school development plan, presented by expert practitioners, provide the opportunity for teachers to work collaboratively and for active involvement;
- Support for teachers is felt by them to be essential if they are to take up CPD opportunities, for example, additional funding for development activities and supply cover are required.

Authors proved the about perspective by noting the importance of positive impact of professional development on teachers’ ability to decide on and implement valued changes in teaching (Desimone, 2009) or stressing that ‘teachers’ positive sense of their status is closely linked to other aspects of quality education, including continuous professional development, engagement in research, collaboration and exchange with other teachers, and involvement in decision-making’ (Hargreaves & Flutter, 2013). Effective CPD provision usually leads to personal progress because teachers will increase their levels of self-confidence if they have more encouragement to reflect on teaching and learning.
Teachers learn best through professional development that addresses their needs (Meissel et al., 2016). But some researchers carry opposite views. Findings from the Teacher Training Agency (TTA, 1995) study suggests that CPD is still of an ad hoc nature with inconsistencies in terms of expenditure, usage of the days for CPD activities, and often has little or no means of evaluation. MacBeath and Galton, et al.(2004) found that subject-based professional development opportunities for many teachers were being severely curtailed and teachers have to face a high and unequal workload to participate in CPD.

Certainly, in Hong Kong, there is still a need to investigate the problem of CPD policy and practice since 2003 because limited research information is hindering our understanding of the issue. A study by Wong (2005) concluded that although Hong Kong teachers understood the basic government requirements about how much time should be spent on CPD (after 2003), but most of them did not use the "Teacher Competencies Framework" to help plan their CPD. They criticized the policy document as 'too broad and the stage descriptors are too vague for them to locate their stage of professional achievement'. Also, they were generally, simply trying to fulfill the government or the school requirements listed in the policy document rather than viewing it as a useful means to improve the quality of their personal and professional lives. (Wong, 2005).

The success and impact of CPD goes far beyond improving an individual teacher's skill or knowledge. It may relate to the professional socialization by which individuals become members of the teaching profession and then take on progressively more mature roles. It can result in higher status within the profession (Lacey, 1995) and correlate to the concept of empowerment which enhances personal commitment and satisfaction (Evans, 1997). However, policy-makers should consider reviewing both explicit and implicit assumptions about the ways in which new initiatives are implemented in schools and how these may be enhanced by an explicit commitment to sustained, collaborative CPD (Cordingley, Bell, Evans, & Firth , 2005a).
2.4.2 Effects of CPD in enhancing teachers’ satisfaction and commitment

As Villegas-Reimers and Reimers (2000) highlight: successful professional development activities occur within the process of a low-threat, comfortable setting in which there is a degree of "psychological safety". Teacher satisfaction, a key factor in teacher commitment, establishes a cause-effect relationship for CPD. In fact, teachers need to feel that they belong to the system.

Peer interaction and support encourages them to feel that they belong to a community of learners in which they are valued members. When the teacher becomes self-actualized, successful CPD will take place. Crocker (2005) points out that there is a kind of continuum or a cyclical interaction between commitment and satisfaction: if teacher are happy and satisfied in their work and in their perceived contributions to their students and the profession in general, they tend to be more committed to remaining in their jobs and improving their skills and abilities to best support their students and their school. Hausman and Goldring (2001) concluded that "forming a community of learners for teachers is a powerful strategy for enhancing teacher commitment". With the common goal of being part of a group of professionals, the support and collegiality promotes greater teacher satisfaction and commitment to their careers.

Crocker's (2005) study argues that satisfaction is very prominent in teachers' thoughts when they talk about CPD and it is related to worthwhileness, collaborative activities and teachers' feeling of being empowered. Professional learning communities foster an “ongoing process in which educators work collaborately in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve” (DeFour et al., 2010). When teachers saw the students becoming more motivated and learning had been improved, they express greater satisfaction in their jobs. At last, they also appreciate the support that comes with working productively with their colleagues.
All the above findings strongly support current literature regarding CPD activities, policy and practice and cultures in schools. Although professional development emerged as a significant contributing factor in teacher satisfaction and commitment, there are some questions to be investigated. Are the CPD programs practical enough to raise teachers’ ‘professional values’? Does the 2003 CPD policy document provide a meaningful framework to help teachers identify their own needs? Is teachers’ voice being systematically and constantly articulated or considered during the policy making process? This study is not an attempt to answer all the above questions definitely, but it hopes to be an effective pointer to the direction that research into the study of CPD policy and practice must take in a wider perspective.

2.4.3 School choice of CPD models

It is also worthwhile to examine a CPD model based on local policy context since school choice of CPD models affects teacher participation in CPD policy implementation and practices. According to Guskey (2002), professional development leaders often attempt to change teachers’ beliefs about certain aspects of teaching or instructional practice. Beckum’s (2010) study further supports for change, autonomy and belief with evidence showing that teachers successfully implemented change when they had ownership of the change and believed they are treated as trusted adults. It is critical to understand how the schools adopt their own professional development model to make CPD policy implementation of professional learning endure. Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1989) shared what they have researched as five effective staff development models:

- Individually guided professional development;
- Development improvement of process;
- Observation/assessment;
- Training;
- Inquiry.
The three case study schools had undergone some changes with regard to their own choice of CPD models due to different school culture, beliefs and resources allocation. School A selected the training model at the beginning, which often takes place in the form of workshops or seminar sessions. It is hoped that training should provide follow-up with assistance, such as peer observation and coaching to transfer more complex teaching skills (Joyce & Showers, 1988) when policy practice was still in an immature stage in preparing teachers to access, and accept the policy document, and implement reforms. Kennedy (2005) argues that the training model supports a skills-based, technocratic view of teaching whereby CPD provides teachers with the opportunity to update their skills in order to be able to demonstrate their competence.

For School B, the individually-guided professional development model was chosen in the early stage of professional development with an aim to equip the teaching staff well enough to fit the change of the curriculum. The principal and CPD teacher-in-charge assumed that teachers can best judge their own strengths and weaknesses when it comes to learning needs. This model also allows teachers to find answers to their own professional issues using their preferred method of learning. The school seemed to characterize teachers as ‘reflective professionals’, acknowledging that ‘teachers have their complex roles and they have to set learning goals and build upon their strengths’ as interpreted by Clark (1990). With regard to School C, the inquiry model was selected with a vision to create a small professional learning community. Having a concept that teachers within small groups were involved in formulating questions and researching their own practice, the school was convinced that professional learning is most often done collaboratively with colleagues who have a sense of trust with one another. This model reflects a simple belief that teachers are capable of formulating valid questions about their own practice and of pursuing objective answers to the questions (Hopkins, 1993; Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995; Dean, 1991; Glover & Law, 1996).
Clearly teachers’ continuing professional development incorporates various complicated and sometimes controversial concepts. It is evident that the above selection practices of school CPD models are not sufficient for teachers’ CPD since teachers are expected ‘to learn, to build, to exchange good practice, to be open to change and new ideas, and to experiment and learn from mistakes (O’Brien & MacBeath, 1999, cited in Wan, 2011).

The above description simply presents a spectrum of CPD models, allowing the creation of a framework through which CPD policies and practice can be analyzed and compared (Kennedy, 2005). Changes of development of CPD models among the case study schools will be discussed in Chapter 8. This study can serve to ask questions relating to the fundamental purpose of ‘why’ and ‘how’ the 2003 CPD policy was developed. The more we understand the CPD capacity for supporting professional autonomy, the more we are likely to know about the effectiveness and the underpinning influence of teachers’ CPD policy practice in Hong Kong.

2.5 Summary

A teacher must consider his or her own values in relation to the act of teaching and must be able to foresee his or her changes of roles in CPD policy enactment. Professional learning is not simply a matter of "reading off" others' expert theories and "reading them in" unproblematically to practice (Hamilton, 1994). Although these reviews pose different opinions on teachers' CPD issues, they share the similarities to suggest the needs for an appropriate theoretical framework. As a more contextualized policy development process is critical for teachers' professionalization, this study seeks to help discover meanings in teachers' continuing professional development. The foregoing discussion on the reviews of literature provided the conceptual framework to examine the CPD policy with regard to its policy formulation, context and influence. A conceptual framework is presented below (see Fig. 2.1) to identify the key concepts from the literature and it serves as a link to connect the theoretical framework on policy trajectory.
Fig. 2.1  Conceptual framework related to CPD policy analysis
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMINGS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the theoretical base that guides the study and the analysis is informed by a conceptualization of policy as a ‘trajectory study’ (Ball, 1994; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Vidovich, 2007) which highlights the interrelatedness between contexts and levels (macro and micro). Walter (2010) notes, “Unless we have a theoretical understanding of the social terrain we are traversing our research is likely to fail” (cited in Ledger, 2013). Within the framework of policy trajectory, the multi-dimensional nature and the complexity of the CPD policy and practices are under investigation through a qualitative approach.

3.2 Dual Paradigms

As Basit (2010) suggests, “Paradigms are models, perspectives or conceptual frameworks for guiding the organization of thoughts, beliefs, views and practices into a logical whole and eventually inform research design.” Since the perspectives of policymakers and teachers on CPD policy were central to the study, a dual paradigm approach that combines interpretivism and critical theory was used to capture how policy actors made meaning of teachers’ CPD policy and explore the power relationships that existed within the policy processes. Ozga (2000) and Cibulka (1994) claim that the dual paradigm structure reflects ‘theoretical eclecticism’ and it was inspired by Peters and Humes (2003) who argue, “greater theoretical sophistication and creativity involves more than one theory alone” (cited in Ledger, 2013). This approach offers a disciplined way in which to inquire into the research questions as it utilizes complementary theories to frame and add depth at different stages of policy analysis (Ledger, 2013). For data collection and early analysis, interpretivism is employed while critical theory is applied for meta-analysis. In the following section, both theories are presented in detail, including their usage to span the policy trajectory.
3.2.1 Interpretivist Theory

Since the view of teachers’ CPD policy is not a linear process, this research is located within the interpretive paradigm which is viewed as subjective, focuses on individual concerns in the context of human experience (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000). It is appropriate to choose interpretivism as the principal research paradigm for two reasons. As the research will take an interpretive methodological stance to reveal issues and meaning of the CPD policy through the 2003 policy document in their natural setting, this approach is useful in highlighting how policies come to be framed in certain ways, reflecting how different contexts shape both the content and language of the policy document. The perspective of interpretivism also provides guiding principles to the techniques of data collection and analysis when ‘scaffold’ acts as the theoretical perspective, “the philosophical stance behind a methodology, a context for the processes involved and the basis for its logic and criteria” (Crotty, 1998).

O’Donoghue (2007) suggests that researchers must “emphasize on social interaction as the basis for knowledge” as meaning is socially constructed. The interpretivist approach allows the exploration of the lived experiences of policy actors (including teachers, teachers of CPD-in-charge, principals) in local primary schools, and this helps revealing how they made meaning of, and interpret CPD policy intent into local practice. The perspectives held by teachers direct interpretation and enactment of policy but can be unpredictable and dynamic (Allen, 2004; Audi, 1999; O’Donoghue 2007; cited in Ledger, 2013). When teachers and policymakers transfer their own values, beliefs and ideologies of CPD on their professionalism, they become ‘transmitters’ of CPD policy, in general terms, of ‘social reform’. This study captures the interactions and perspectives involved at micro level of CPD policy enactment. So, interpretivism was used as an effective tool for analysing policy ‘in situ’ where perspectives were sought about interpretations of CPD policy, policy processes and the social constructs of ‘professionalism’ and ‘professional development’.
3.2.2 Critical Theory

The above section explains the justification of applying interpretivism on data collection and early data analysis and this section examines the role of ‘critical theory’ as a supplementary approach for the meta-analysis of findings. Critical theory, emerging from social sciences in the 1930s, was used to critique society rather than explain how societies functioned (Horkheimer, 1972) and it provides a rigorous approach to research that minimizes subjectivity and bias (Ledger, 2013). In this study, critical theory was chosen as it provides a tool that can “show us our world and ourselves through new and valuable lenses… and can strengthen our ability to think logically, creatively and a good deal of insight” (Tyson, 2006). Through critical theory’s ‘power lenses’, the power structures were explored at different stages of the CPD policy process and within different school contexts. This provides the study an opportunity to gain insight into the dynamic nature of power relations as policy is constructed, interpreted and enacted (Ball, 1994a, cited in Ledger, 2013).

Bottery (2006) stresses the notion that being critical in analysis helps us “deconstruct the many taken-for-granted in the policy processes and policy texts”. So, critical theory and its inherent ‘power lens’ was employed in this study to examine the assumptions and values in policy texts and contexts. In order to analyse the power differentials between macro and micro level policy actors, the CPD Policy Document 2003 and other related reports were reviewed and compared either horizontally (cross-case analysis at micro level) and vertically (between macro and micro levels) for meta-analysis, as described in later chapter. Also, power is contingent on the relationships between individuals within the policy process as suggested by Jacobs (2010). By looking into the micro level perspectives of participants (from three case study schools), the interrelatedness of stakeholders and policy documents along the policy trajectory were investigated, in particular when the study emphasizes the role of ideology and language employed by teachers and policymakers in shaping outcomes (Fairclough, 2003; 2007, cited in Ledger, 2013).
As Weber (1946) coined on ‘value free’ research, personal values and views are different to set aside to address, critical theory was employed to help the researcher critique practice and patterns of inequality that are ‘value laden’. The personal beliefs and perspectives of those involved in the CPD policy processes will be reflected through the selection of case studies, design and employment of interviews as well as data analysis. What is more is that Crotty’s (1998) idea about the construction of meaning exists to support a hegemonic interest, namely the values of the one who developed them, can be understood and acknowledged. It is hoped that the meta-analysis will reflect a bigger picture on CPD policy implications and critical perspectives in relation to power differentials will be taken into account for policy construction.

3.2.3 Employing theories into the policy trajectory framework

Ball (1998) and Vidovich (2007) both agree that the dual paradigm approach facilitated exploration of different levels and contexts of the policy trajectory but O’Donoghue (2007) argue that an eclectic or hybrid approach to research was considered traditionally a weakness rather than strength. In this study, interpretivism and critical theory was combined to provide new understandings and meanings on the construction and enactment of the CPD policy process as each construct has its own strengths, i.e. the former allows the study to emphasize participants’ meanings to social interactions ‘in situ’ (especially in the case study schools), while the latter allows an examination of the role of power inequalities in the policy process between micro and macro levels (Ledger, 2013). As Miller and Fredericks (2000) address, perspectives include “implicit structures that are highly complex and can produce contradictory conclusions if only one research domain was used”, the combined use of critical theory with interpretivism helped highlighting contradictions and inequalities, thus providing a disciplined approach to answer the research questions or address the research aims.
Ledger’s (2013) study supports this view by emphasizing the advantage of the dual paradigm:

An interpretive approach is illuminative for ‘micro case studies’ and critical theory for ‘macro bigger picture’ patterns of power, practice and influence. They together support the wide span of analysis from macro to micro levels of the policy process (policy trajectory). (p.102)

To overcome the weaknesses of each paradigm, the research employed interpretivist theory in data collection and early analysis and critical theory for meta-analysis in a way to add depth and breadth to the study.

3.2.4 Policy Trajectory Approach

Traditionally, policy analysis has centered on either policy generation or policy implementation (Bowe et al., 1992) but both approaches exclude the interrelationship of social structure, power, culture and human agency that influence policy. Bowe et., al., (1992) prefer to identify policy analysis as a ‘cycle’ to allow for a recontextualisation of policy and Ball (1994) identifies policy as an interactive process rather than an end product and thus provides a clearer understanding of how the intent of policy is negotiated at different levels of a hierarchical system. Research points out that policy involves the production of the text, the text itself, ongoing modifications to the text and the processes of implementation into practice (Ball, 1993, 1994; Taylor et al.; 1994). Taylor (1997) also argues that policy analysis needs to take both macro and micro levels into account when discourse theories are drawn to explore policy-making processes within the broad discursive field within which policies are developed and implemented. From the above standpoint, policy is not merely just about production and implementation but involves a trajectory. It was not until 2002 that Vidovich argued more reasonably for a balance of macro and micro agency perspectives by drawing on both critical theory and post-structuralism (Vidovich, 2002; 2007).
This research adopted Vidovich’s policy trajectory as the conceptual framework in order to uncover the complexity of the policy process. This principal feature of Vidovich’s (2002) conceptual framework relevant to the study is conceived in terms of a series of ‘contexts’ outlined by Ball (1994a), namely, contexts of influence, policy text production, practices and outcomes. Based on Ball’s conceptualisation of policy analysis, Vidovich (2002) suggests the use of hybrid model in policy study because ‘selective coupling of different approaches are more productive to draw on the strengths and overcome the weaknesses of individual approaches’ and explicit examination of the links. Also feedback between the different levels and contexts throughout a policy trajectory can help investigate the ‘messiness’ of policy processes (ibid). Employing this framework provides the study a mixed version of textual-contextual process and it resonates the research with a critical analysis of the policy issues (see 3.2.2 & 3.2.3).

Regarding to the research aim (as described in 1.4) of exploring the dynamics of CPD policy processes which involve the adoption, production and enactment of CPD Policy Document 2003 in the three local primary schools, the structure of the study was concerned and reflected on what Ozga (2000) and Ham and Hill (1993) label as an analysis ‘of’ policy rather than analysis ‘for’ policy. Analysis ‘of’ policy is used and utilized in three major stages of policy analysis, namely: ‘contextual’, ‘textual’ and ‘outcomes’ (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010), and researchers conduct it to understand why a particular policy was developed at a particular time and the effects, intended or otherwise, of that policy while appears to be practical and requires analysis for the sake of practice – policy development and implementation (Khorsandi, 2014). It is important to notice that the intended policy outcome of what policy-makers are asking is not always in line with the interpretation and understandings of the policy implementing agents because policy implementers may implicitly or explicitly interpret policy to fit their own agendas, interests, and resources (Ketlohoilwe, 2007).
Yeatman (1990) supports this view and he points out the importance to understand power and knowledge relations within the contexts of policy in the policy cycle as policy making is “an arena of struggle over meaning” or “the politics of discourse”. Ketlhoilwe (2007 citing Scott, 2000) points out that an authoritative policy text would use specific grammatical and syntactical devices to empower the author and disempower the reader. Ozga (2000) stresses a ‘fluid interrelationship’ between intention, interpretation, and enactment of agency at all levels of the policy cycle, and policy must therefore always be understood within its unique context. To elicit the meanings that the policy actors and agents have of the policy process, the framework of three primary policy contexts is adopted to draw understandings from the participants. Different sources of policy texts are interpreted. Also, discourses from the CPD policy-makers as well as policy documents are interpreted as statements of the course of action that policy-makers intend to follow. Within the dual research paradigm, participants’ views on what, why and how the policy is constructed and implemented are also examined within the contexts of the policy cycle.

Aligning the study to ‘a description of policy as a process and product involving negotiation, contestation and struggle along the trajectory’ (Ledger, 2013), data from the macro level (the EMB & ACTEQ agenda) of policy text production was compared and contrasted with the micro level (schools and teachers’ agenda) policy practices to highlight explicitly the interlinkages between different levels and context of policy process in order to provide a ‘complete picture’ (Vidovich,2002). Because the study only focuses on the analysis of two levels (both the macro and micro) of the CPD policy trajectory, the researcher will incorporate Ball’s additional concept of ‘context of outcomes’ in the discussion chapter. It is hoped that by adding this ‘context of outcomes’ as a ‘supplement’, the constraints of lacking the meso level policy analysis (explained later in section 4.4) will be counteracted and the absence of one level analysis will not affect the applicability of the conceptual framework to the study.
3.3 Summary

Education policy does not emerge within a vacuum, “rather it is developed within the context of particular sets of values, pressures and constraints. It is also a response to particular problems, needs and aspirations” (Harman, 1984). This chapter has provided an orientation of policy trajectory analysis deriving from Ball and Vidovich’s framework (see Fig. 3.1). All the arguments and discussions in the above conceptual and theoretical approaches are compatible with the critical grounds of critical theory as well as interpretivism on the analysis ‘of’ policy. Ball proposed (1993, 1994a) a “toolbox” of theoretical approaches for a more satisfactory analysis of policy: “What we need in policy analysis is a toolbox of diverse concepts and theories – an applied sociology rather than a pure one” (Ball, 1994a cited in Allen, 2004). In the coming chapter, the qualitative research design together with a multi-methods approach involved in the data collection and analysis process will be introduced to gain an understanding of the meanings that key players at the different levels in the policy process, bring to it (Allen, 2004).

Figure 3.1 The trajectory for teachers’ CPD policy processes
CHAPTER FOUR: THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter outlined the theoretical framework that underpins this study. This chapter describes the research design, methods and processes used within the theoretical frame. The discussion provides a descriptive analysis of methods, justification of using the techniques, limitations and ways of ensuring data quality for this research. The first section explains why the qualitative approach is appropriate for this research. The second section outlines the multi-methods design. The third and the fourth sections describe the methods of data collection and analysis that were employed. The fifth section examines the ethical issues involved in the research.

4.2 Qualitative approach

Punch (1998) stresses that qualitative research places an emphasis on inductive, constructive processes which aim to build up a ‘thick description’ of the policy cycle. Employing analysis-of-policy in this study is another approach that brings logical premises to the nature of the research as the chosen or qualitative method of collecting data and analysis is able to describe and unravel “the complexities and messiness” of the policy process (Taylor, 1997 cited in Allen, 2004). Qualitative research has the strength of allowing flexibility in how and with whom it can be used (Ledger, 2013) and this is confirmed by Punch (2009) as the qualitative approach provides an interpretation that is compelling for theoretical and significant reasons. Researchers try to maximize the understanding and dynamics of a particular event through the identification of patterns and themes of data. Based on the nature of the research, the qualitative approach seems more suitable, as it focuses on developing descriptive as well as explanatory accounts of teachers’ perceptions of their professional development, because of its emphasis on social phenomena, interaction and communication (Griffiths, 2007 citing Sarantakos 1993 & Wiersma 2000) and the approach is that of a holistic interpretation of the natural setting (Wiersma, 2000, p.12).
Another rationale for using a qualitative approach for this study was to add breadth and depth to the policy analysis as described in 3.2.3. Employing a case study approach, conducting interviews and analyzing policy documents facilitate analysis of individual perspectives and help capture the ‘voices’ of CPD participants and ‘this combination is a recognized strength of qualitative research’ (Travers, 2009 cited in Ledger, 2013). As more than one approach in data collection and analysis was employed, the approach allows group interactions and investigates wider policy influences. There is a continuing interplay between data collection, analysis and theory when the qualitative approach is undertaken. For the teachers’ CPD policy, at the macro level, policy text production is mainly the work of Education Manpower Bureau. The Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications (ACTEQ) only took the role as an advisory body on CPD policy consultation. But together, they provided the parameters of the CPD policy and continued to conduct the policy text from 2000 to 2003. At the micro level of the trajectory, the sites of policy practice were individual schools. Data taken from these two levels will enable the researcher to discover meanings through the policy cycle which reveals the continuous struggles. This is consistent with the analysis of policy, ‘namely the comparison between policy text and policy in the empirical world’ (Curry, 1999). When different policy contexts are examined through the different levels of trajectory, they are interactive with one another.

4.3 Multi-methods design

Policy was defined as an interactive process that is shaped and reconstructed by different ‘contexts’ and the methodological framework for this research drew on Ball’s (1994) policy analysis and Vidovich’s (2002) ‘trajectory study’ by examining the three contexts: context of influence, context of policy text production and context of practice. To choose a suitable research strategy within the qualitative approach, the first and the most important condition is to identify the type of research question being asked (Yin, 2003). The study attempts to develop analytic generalization in teachers’ perceptions on CPD policy and practices.
With regard to the research questions outlined in chapter 1, half of them are being asked in the form of ‘what’ questions for the purpose of being descriptive in both the context of influence and policy text production. In the context of practice, ‘how’ questions are focused on explanatory purpose. In order to capture multiple realities and perspectives from both teachers and policy-maker in different stages of the CPD policy process, a qualitative design is adopted to fit the purpose of the research (see Figure 4.1). Collective case study, as well as a questionnaire survey within the case study, is applied in which qualitative data is used to establish and support quantitative data for exploratory and confirmatory purposes (Tashakorri and Teddlie, 2009). The logic of choosing such a design is that the case study is not either a data collection tactic or merely a design feature alone (Stoecker, 1991) but a comprehensive strategy. It is best for answering the “how” and “why” questions, thus providing the opportunity to ask penetrating questions and to capture the richness of organizational behavior (Gable, 1994).

Figure 4.1 Research Design
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Methods for generating data</th>
<th>Data analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Exploring underlying assumptions on policy initiation and implementation</td>
<td>Information about policy initiation and implementation</td>
<td>All teachers in 3 case study schools</td>
<td>Questionnaire survey of teachers’ general perceptions on CPD</td>
<td>Descriptive analysis with tables and charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents (historical records)</td>
<td>Education and Manpower Bureau, Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications, Public library, Websites</td>
<td>Document analysis involving review of historical records e.g. 2003 CPD policy document, 2008 Interim Report</td>
<td>Discourse analysis on policy text and context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Investigating policy interpretation and implementation</td>
<td>Information about policy interpretation and implementation</td>
<td>Former Chairman from ACTEQ and staff development teacher of in charge</td>
<td>Semi-structured individual interviews with Former Chairman from ACTEQ and CPD development teacher in charge</td>
<td>Miles and Huberman’s model (Inductive analysis) and discourse analysis on interview transcripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject teachers</td>
<td>Focus group interviews with subject teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;Drawing themes and insight in relations and patterns on policy interpretation and implementation</td>
<td>Information about policy interpretation and implementation</td>
<td>All data used in stage 1 and stage 2</td>
<td>Document analysis involving review of school records on teachers’ CPD</td>
<td>Inductive analysis to trace descent and emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison of the interpreted and contextualized data presented in 3 case study schools</td>
<td>Miles and Huberman’s model (Inductive analysis) and cross-case analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this research, multi-methods are applied in different stages for both data collection and analysis (see Table 4.1 above). Quantitative data is collected by a self-developed questionnaire survey and then qualitative data collection and analysis ‘builds on’ the results of the initial quantitative results (Creswell, 2009:211). As Tashakorri and Teddlie (2003) mention, the combined use of quantitative and qualitative approaches provides greater opportunities for exploring, aligning and illuminating the research findings in the study. These approaches help by complementing each other, and it is useful to get a holistic picture of the research area.

Merriam (1998: 27) defined a qualitative case study as an “intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit”. Benbasat, Goldstein, & Mead (1987:370) also identify three strengths of case study research: (1) the researcher can study the problem or phenomenon in a natural setting, learn about the state of the art, and generate theories from practice; (2) the method allows the researcher to understand the nature and complexity of the process taking place; and (3) valuable insights can be gained into new topics emerging. A collective case study was chosen because it was compatible with the approach of analysis-of-policy and it met the criteria suggested by Yin, as cited in Punch (2005: 145):

- The proposed study investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context as a study will be undertaken of strategies adopted by the CPD policy makers and adapted by the teachers in realizing the complexities of policy practices.
- The boundaries between the formation of CPD policy document and the social context in which schools and teachers work for policy implementation are not clearly evident.
- There is a need to use multiple sources to gather evidence.

Miles & Huberman (1994: 29) argue that ‘By looking at a range of similar and contrasting cases, we can understand a single-case finding, grounding it by specifying how and where and, if possible, why, it carries on as it does, and we can also strengthen the precision, the validity, and the stability of the findings’.
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In fact, micro-level case studies must relate to particular research questions that are answerable through studying the sites (Walford, 2001). Instead of studying one case, the researcher conducted three case studies in three different types of Hong Kong primary schools with the notion that they were at different levels of teachers’ CPD policy implementation.

4.4 Data collection

This research aims at investigating how the CPD policy documents and statements published by the EMB at the macro level and the participants (teachers in individual schools) at the micro level interacted with the policy process. So, it is invaluable in researching the dynamics of the CPD policy. Silverman (2000) states, “we cannot simply aggregate data in order to arrive at an overall ‘truth’”. As the researcher has mentioned, this is a qualitative study, so the outcomes are quite unpredictable. In other words, it is dangerous and unconvincing to use one single method in collecting data as it may lead to delusions. Different forms of data collection rely on the use of multiple sources for questionnaire, documentary and interview data which facilitate ‘triangulation’ and thus, in turn increase the ‘trustworthiness’ of the findings (Griffiths, 2007 citing Silverman, 2000; Scaife, 2004).

This section will explain the principles and methods of data collection in terms of sampling, macro, micro data collection as well as the interview process. Unlike other countries, there was no ministerial committee at the meso level to refine policy text production and implementation of CPD policy in Hong Kong. As a result, only two levels of the policy trajectory (macro and micro) were addressed and the adding of the ‘context of outcomes’ in the discussion chapter will help minimize the effect concerned with the applicability of the conceptual framework (as described in 3.2.4). Accordingly, data were collected through questionnaire survey, document analysis, and semi-structured, as well as focus group interviews, of primary school teachers and administrators. Information also framed the analysis of interview and document data.
4.4.1 Sampling

Travers (2009) stress, ‘In qualitative research there is no need to work with a whole research population group or sample because the research is interested in meanings and understandings not statistics’. It is appropriate to explore social or human problems in their natural setting to build a complex and holistic picture (Creswell, 1998). To gain a deep understanding of the phenomena experienced by the key participants, purposive sampling, maximum variation sampling and snowball sampling are the three common options of strategies to acknowledge the complexity of human and social phenomena.

Based on the case study component of the study, ‘purposive sampling’ was chosen to obtain an understanding of how teachers’ CPD policy document is interpreted and its implementation is enacted along the policy trajectory. Patton (1990: 186) recommends specifying a minimum sample size ‘based on expected reasonable coverage of the phenomenon given the purpose of the study’. Collective case studies were conducted in three medium-sized school districts located in a diverse, working class community. The researcher selected these districts for study because they had engaged in a substantial reform effort that included a multi-year professional development component. Instead of four or five, three schools (all in rural areas) formed the research sample and they were selected on the criterion that they were all ‘whole-day primary schools’ and they had already begun to develop a policy and some strategies for enacting the teachers’ CPD policy since 2003. The rationale for selecting three case study schools was to provide rich detail and nuanced understandings of the context and the participant perspectives in each rural school setting implementing teachers’ CPD policy.

In order to ensure a diversity of information gathered for the study, the sample schools comprised the most popular type of primary schools in Hong Kong. Two primary schools are government-subsidized schools and another one is a private school.
Justification of school selection was based on their differences in background and resources in the process of implementing teachers’ CPD policy, and the researcher’s easy accessibility related to his current employment as a visiting teacher. However, not all teachers in the case were invited to participate. Altogether twenty-one participants across three schools were interviewed (18 subject teachers and 3 administrative teachers). Invitations were made through individual phone calls to principals and a letter of consent was sent to them to gain the agreement to participate. To protect anonymity, each case school was offered a pseudonym regardless of its background, status and school ability. To conduct the study in the ‘most practicable’ way so that the sample fitted in with the components of the study, teachers of different age, gender, years of teaching experience and rank were chosen randomly as a means to obtain teachers’ opinions from different perspectives.

In fact, this purposive sampling strategy offered the advantage that all participants were all-career teachers who had taught in diverse school environments and could thus reflect on the situated nature of their professional interactions towards CPD policy and practices. The small number of participants thus enabled this interpretive study to sustain an in-depth focus on their professional beliefs and lived experiences. As all the participants were at different stages in their careers, and had worked in a variety of school systems and in different geographical locations, their background might well help shape their perceptions of the CPD policy and practice.

But, on the other hand, the deliberate sampling scheme may pose a limitation to the study of emotions, as teachers’ responses to the policy document may coincide with implementation levels (e.g., teachers in schools experiencing success with CPD policy implementation are likely to be more positive) and also their opinions from small sample size may affect the applicability and transferability of cases to other situations.
4.4.2 Macro level data collection

Document, questionnaire and interview as well as observation analyses were conducted as the beginning and on-going process in an attempt to develop the structure and meaning in collecting macro and micro level information. At the macro level of the policy trajectory, the main sources of data collection come from documents and policy elite’s interview. The key policy document, ACTEQ (2003) CPD Policy Document: ‘Towards a learning profession’ was first examined. Other relevant historical documents including ‘Towards a Learning Profession: Interim Report on Teachers’ CPD 2006 and 2009’ were selected on the basis of their relevance to the CPD policy processes. These documents were analyzed to present the ‘official’ perspectives from the government within the policy contexts, and policy discourses were discussed and analyzed based on the critical and post-structural approach in the later chapter. Then one macro level participant, the chief policy-maker (former Chairman of ACTEQ) was interviewed as he represented the policy elite in the CPD policy construction process. He was interviewed individually once for more than forty-five minutes and this interview took place in the participant’s working environment and was tape-recorded and transcribed later.

4.4.3 Micro level data collection

On this level, data collection was drawn from different sources of the case study schools. There were three stages of data collection: Questionnaire data was collected in the first stage; Interview Data came in the second stage; Observation and Documentary Data appeared in the final stage.

Stage 1: Questionnaire Data

At this stage, a self-developed questionnaire (hereafter CPD Questionnaire Survey) was designed (modified from Wong, 2005) and sent (during the last three months in 2007) to explore teachers’ perceptions of CPD and the implementation of the policy document proposed by “Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications” (ACTEQ, 2003) with reference to the research questions.
All teachers (about 136) of the three case study schools except the principals were invited to complete the questionnaire and about 65% (88 participants) returned the questionnaire. The data gathered from the predetermined questionnaire allowed the researcher to obtain ideas that had not been given attention and it saved time for the researcher by getting the more updated information which formed the initial background context for the study. Although Robson (1993) complains that the information obtained from questionnaires can be rather superficial, it does provide some clues for the researcher to design future interview questions and, to some extent, helps in answering some specific research questions.

The suggested questionnaire consisted of four parts (see Appendix 1). In order to reveal the informants’ feeling and experience of their own continuing professional development when their memory was still fresh, questions in the first part were designed to collect the informants’ experience of continuing professional development in school years 2004 - 2007. The second part of the questionnaire investigated how teachers perceive their ideal scenario in terms of content, mode and approach of continuing professional development. The third part of the questionnaire revealed teachers’ knowledge of and perceptions about implementation of the CPD policy document. The fourth part was set to collect the personal information of the informants. The questionnaire is anonymous and some questions are open-ended. All teachers with different gender, teaching experience and posts held were asked. All participants answered the same questions within the same period and the researcher adapted the guide of Cohen & Mansion (1989) in designing the questionnaire. Since some of the technical terms might be unfamiliar to some informants, and nearly all respondents in the case schools are Chinese, the questionnaire was translated into Chinese in order to avoid misinterpretation of those terms and to make it user-friendly pilot test was conducted by three to four teachers with similar background knowledge and experience in the policy enactment from a non-case study school to ensure the reliability and validity of the questionnaire.
The questionnaire was administered by posting the instrument, accompanied by a self-addressed, postage envelope, and there was a short deadline for the return. For those who failed to respond there was another telephone survey to gain responses. The use of questionnaire survey is a reliable research method that can easily be administered before or after intervention (Edwards & Talbot, 1994). Its use is able to collect a large amount of quantitative data reflecting general perspectives in an efficient way (Walker, 1985; Bryman, 2001) and enable comparisons to be made across groups in the sample (Oppenheim, 1992) especially in the first stage of data collection in exploring the underlying assumptions on teachers’ CPD policy initiation and implementation.

**Stage 2: Interview Data**

When compared with questionnaire, interview is a more interactive way of data collection as it involves conversation and the free flow of ideas. Punch (2005) emphasizes that interviewing is a one of the main data collection tools in qualitative research and it is a very good way of accessing people’s perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations and constructions of reality.

**Semi-structured Focus Group Interview**

Certain thematic questions (see Appendix 2) are being asked to bring up the issues for discussion and the interviewees are also be able to explain, clarify and elaborate under the framework set by these questions whenever they consider necessary. Semi-structured interview has the merit of allowing a more flexible approach. It allows the interviewee to unfold according to their own frame of mind, or enables the interviewer to probe freely beyond the answers where needed, and enter the dialogue in order to expand on the issues raised. In the second stage, this type of interview is the principal means of data collection for the case study.
According to Morgan (1988:25), a focus group consolidates one specific technique of investigation to collect qualitative data through interaction to produce comprehensive data and insights from various participants in the group and the most benefit is ‘they are economical on time, producing a large amount of data in a short period of time’. As focus group participants can interact with each other rather than the interviewer, this allows for merging the views from the participants by being less dominated by the researcher (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000).

The researcher chose 9 focus groups (each consists of 2 subject teachers of different years of teaching experience) for interviews. To elicit further responses from those subject teachers can obtain a better understanding of their perceptions of CPD policy text production and implementation. Three categories of participants with homogenous grouping were utilized as the research sample (see Table 4.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of teaching experience</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Type of case study school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government-subsidized primary school run by a charity organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the group size was small, with a limit of 6 teachers in one case study school, it allowed the researcher to retain control over the interview. This is consistent with Merton and Kendall’s (1946) explanation:

In the usual depth interview, one can urge informants to reminisce on their experiences. In the focused interview, however, the interviewer can, when expedient, play a more active role: he can introduce more explicit verbal cues to the stimulus pattern or even represent it. In either case this usually activates a concrete report of responses by informants. (cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000)

Also, these focus groups were participants having similar career qualifications, experiences and power (in this case, position of teaching). Attending safe and comfortable interviews helped the researcher to generate qualitative data from their words, expressions and categorizations.
Semi-structured Individual Interview

This approach is adopted to put the interviewees (i.e. teachers and CPD in-charge) at ease with in-depth ‘small talk’ and it is an “attempt to understand the complex behavior of members of society without imposing any prior categorization that may limit the field of inquiry (Fontana & Frey, 1994:366). As Pring (2000) pointed,

Typically the researcher, in seeking answers to certain questions, will structure the interview so that the answers will be relevant to the researcher’s interests. But the interview will normally be only semi-structured because otherwise there would not be the scope for those interviewed to expound the full significance of their actions. …The individual’s consciousness and intentions are the significant factors in explaining why things happen as they do. (cited in Ketlhoilwe, 2007)

In this study, three teachers from the management level such as school curriculum development teacher (PSMCD), teacher in-charge of staff development planning were the target respondents to elicit, expand and clarify their views on CPD policy contexts. What was being said in the interviews could be respected and described as ‘a joint construction of meaning between the researcher and the participant, not just a construction of the participant’ (Gay & Airasian, 2000: 219). Altogether four individual interviews (including Chairman of ACTEQ) were conducted with questions (see Appendix 3 & 4) derived from both the literature and the contexts of policy trajectory, similar to the framework used in the questionnaire.

Interview Process

All the twenty-one participants (18 subject teachers and 3 administrators) attended the interviews from June to October in 2009, nine months after the data analysis of the questionnaire survey. The interviews were held either in mid-term 1 or late-term 2 after the school staff development days, an appropriate time because the teachers had time to reflect upon CPD policy practices and evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies employed. Each interview lasted for no longer than one hour and it took place at each school so as to increase participants’ comfort level.
All interviews and focus group meetings were audio-recorded with the consent of the participants in the case study school. In order to enhance the internal validity of the study, all interviews were transcribed from tape in Chinese, and then translated from Chinese to English during data analysis with the help of a native speaker. Tapes were kept in a locked storage. Finally, transcripts were also be offered to participants for verification and to ensure accuracy. An Interview Guide Approach (Patton, 1990:288) was being utilized where the topics and issues to be covered were specified in advance and the interviewer decides the sequence and precise wording of the questions during the course of the interview.

Also, a suggested protocol of data gathering questions such as introductory, follow-up and probing as required, was developed based on guiding questions to generate opinions and responses that are reflective of teachers’ perspectives. The first contact with each participant was through a letter with an Information Sheet (see Appendix 5), outlining the purpose of the interview and latter, personal or telephone contact was made with each person to set an interview date. Sapsford and Jupp (1996) illustrate the criteria for the standardized interview schedule while Punch (2005) suggests a checklist for managing the interviews. To give the researcher the idea of structuring the interview, as well as some skills with interviewing, the proposed interview guide (see Appendix 6) was piloted to the teachers (in the researcher’s school) who had been involved in the focus group. According to their feedback, amendments were then made and the researcher held a semi-structured interview with two teachers so as to verify the validity of the questions.

Power relations observed in interviews

As most of the participants were policy implementers, data generated from the interviews were based on their perspectives of the CPD policy discourse such as what the policy document demanded, why and how it was initiated or implemented.
As a regular visiting teacher in the case study schools, the researcher did not sense any power or authority imposition during the process of interviewing. Most of the interviewees freely gave information on their experiences and there was no explicit power relations within the focus groups when teachers respected each other’s point of view. Only those individual teachers from the management category were observed exercising any sort of disciplinary power. The PSMCD or CPD-in-charge teachers seemed to be more careful in explaining the school’s own CPD direction, their CPD progress and what they had achieved according to the CPD policy document. Because they had been promoted to higher positions, they were “more guarded in what they say, wrapping this up in well chosen, articulate phrases” (Wan, 2011 citing Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000: 122). Although semi-structured interview was used as the major research instrument, there was an issue of bias in both individual and focus group interviews. When part of the questions involved discussion of school ethos and culture, some participants might be sensitive to provide prescriptive answers, rather than their true perceptions, which may have posed some threat to validity.

Stage 3: Observation and Documentary Data

In this research, observation was used as one of the several tools to add value in understanding the actual policy contexts and the nature of the CPD policy document and practices. At this stage, the individual interview and focus group meetings data were supplemented by the observation data. As the researcher is a teacher of the management category from one of the case study schools, self-observation was carried out on an on-going basis during the first and second school terms, in collecting not only verbal but also non-verbal behavior of the participants in CPD activities. Observation provides a check reference to enable the researcher to verify that schools and teachers are doing what they stated that they were doing after the implementation of the CPD policy. However, the researcher changed his role from a participant in the initial stage to an observer after the research began.
While observation has a reality verifying character, documents form a major source of data at all stages and at all levels of the policy trajectory, as they provide a rich and invaluable source of information (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). To ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data collected, emphasis was placed on the examination of these primary sources of data such as Progress Report on the Education Reform (2006). In addition, each case study school was asked to provide institutional documents such as school self-evaluation and ESR reports from EMB, staff development plans and teachers’ professional development records. Each relevant text was analyzed at different stages of data collection to gain insights for ‘policy practice’, and information gathered was used to for setting questionnaire or probing questions in interviews. It is undeniable that documents corroborate interviews and observations and thus make research findings more trustworthy (Gleson & Peshkin, 1992). Also, the documents obtained here were free and easily accessible and these data helped tracking the changes and development of the CPD policy.

4.4.4 Data triangulation

According to Denzin (1978), the flaws of one method are the strengths of another and the use of documents, questionnaires and interviews as well as observation notes as data collection methods allows for ‘triangulation’. The triangulation (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000: 112) of data allows the researcher to check on inferences drawn from one source of data towards another. It is considered more likely that the qualitative researcher will develop instruments rather than use those developed by others (Punch, 2006: 53). Hopefully, by using a multi-methods approach, the researcher achieved the best of each method while overcome their unique deficiencies. Collective case study of the three target schools provided multiple sources of evidence. To cross-check the consistency and credibility of data and information derived from different sources, researches usually apply more than two methods or techniques in data triangulation (Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).
Methodological triangulation (suggested by Denzin & Lincoln, 2005) as well as voice triangulation were used to enhance the credibility and authenticity [and validity] of findings in order to produce richer critical analysis (Wan, 2011). The former method involved the reviewing of data analysis from questionnaire and comparing information from focus group interviews (teachers’ perception of CPD policy), policy document and report review (documentation), observation data and cross-case analysis (validation) (Wan, 2011 citing Stake; 2006; Denzin, 2006; Creswell, 1998; Yin, 2006) while the latter analyzed the contrasting perspectives from both discourse analysis of the policy maker and the teachers in-charge-of CPD.

4.5 Data analysis

4.5.1 Background for policy document analysis

Qualitative research occurs when data collection, analysis and theory are intimately interwined (Ezzy, 2002 cited in Ledger, 2013). As this research is a policy analysis, the process of data analysis is quite different according to the nature of the data obtained. The Miles and Huberman (1994) framework, and discourse analysis, were adopted in case study design. The former is often used to move the data analysis from an empirical level to a conceptual level and it can help achieve ‘transparency’, as suggested by Punch (1998: 196). The researcher agrees with experts such as Gubrium and Holstein (2000) that discourse analysis “puts words to work”, but gives them their meanings, constructs and perceptions and formulates understandings and ongoing courses of interaction. By using the elements of Vidovich’s (2002) and Ball’s (1994) conceptual framework, this research followed a multi-layered methodological approach as it provides a systematic analysis of data from questionnaires and interviews in the data generation processes to construct meanings of the CPD policy. Another layer of analysis is constituted through a critical discourse analysis of the statements of the ACTEQ (2003) CPD Policy Document: ‘Towards a learning profession’ and related historical documents including the Interim Reports (2006) and (2009), to provide a deeper understanding of policy texts and their construction.
Data generated from interviews with the policy-maker, teachers-in-charge-of CPD, and classroom teachers, provided further understandings of policy contexts and knowledge/power relations in policy construction and interpretation. The main analysis technique used in this research was chosen from Miles and Huberman’s framework or interactive model, by which data reduction, data display and verifications and drawing conclusions were managed to analyze the collected data. As Bogdan and Biklen (1998) suggest, this model is a process “helps to systematically search and arrange one’s data source”. Questionnaire data collected in the first stage was rather quantitative in nature while interview data in the second stage was mainly qualitative and the outcomes were quite unpredictable and divergent. As a result, data were analyzed inductively and interpretation was based solely on what the data told, so that it could reveal the native perspectives of the participants.

The collective case study incorporated three local primary schools and twenty-one teachers. As Vaughan (1992) notes, “the case studies were analysed independently to respect the uniqueness of each case but analysed sequentially for the purpose of cross-case analysis. So, each case study school was examined individually within its distinctive setting in an attempt to gain an understanding of teachers’ perspectives of CPD policy and practice processes. After the interviews were completed, the data was transcribed and individually analyzed to reduce data into codes. The researcher developed a list of codes that related to the research questions. The initial codes helped classifying materials into themes, issues, topics and concepts making reference to the literature reviewed earlier. As the study progressed, the codes were expanded. Descriptive codes as suggested by Punch (1998) were used to summarize segments of the data while inferential codes were also used to group the pattern codes into a lesser number of codes at a higher level of abstraction. Memos were used to write down ideas about the data as they occur.
Data collected from interviews and documents were used to develop data display to assist in organizing, compressing and assembling information (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Punch, 1998). According to Ryan & Bernard (2000), the ‘whole text analysis’ method is appropriate when the data is more linguistic.

4.5.2 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

With regard to documentary and interview sources, critical discourse analysis was applied in data analysis, as it assisted in emphasizing the importance of language and exposing the power relations and ideology of individuals and institutions at both the macro and micro levels that exists in the policy process. The findings from the discourse analysis of documents were used in line with data analysis of the questionnaires to guide and refine interview questions which, would be related back to and inform, the research questions. Observation notes were also used to cross-reference data collected from documents and interviews to verify whether research participants’ interests were actually represented by the policy document and how they were influenced by the CPD policy, upon its practice. Finally, a cross-case analysis, resulting from the data collected was used to compare and contrast the findings from each case study. By applying different approaches to the analysis of data, the researcher was more confident in validating the findings.

4.5.3 Meta-Analysis—Analysis along the trajectory

As a feedback and support for ‘methodological triangulation’ explained in section 4.4, several methods were used to gather and analyse data in order to increase the credibility of the findings and provide a more substantive view of how teachers’ CPD policy is interpreted and enacted in local school setting. But we cannot simply aggregate data in order to arrive at an overall truth (Silverman, 2000) since each type of analysis informed the articulation of the findings and add methodological rigour (De Coster, 2004 cited in Ledger, 2013). The researcher also employed meta-analysis on the empirical data to reveal patterns in the policy processes.
In fact, when critical analysis runs parallel to the process in which qualitative data make meaning, meta-analysis provides a critical lens throughout each stage of the analysis process (Ledger, 2013). Within the dual paradigm, texts were viewed critically (Fairclough, 2003) from policy and related documents. Data was triangulated through a process of cross case (horizontal) analysis at the micro level (school) of the policy trajectory (presented later in Chapter 8) and (vertical) analysis (Vidovich, 2007) along the policy trajectory from macro to micro levels (but without meso level) (presented later in Chapter 9). It is hoped that both analysis can help revealing the interconnectivity of the levels and contexts along the trajectory and meta-level themes extracted can provide ‘food for thought’ related to future CPD policy implications.

4.6 Ethical issues

The researcher agrees with Prunty’s (1985) argument on educational policy analysis that ‘as a subcategory of policy analysis itself, it must be conducted within a moral and ethical stance’ (Prunty, 1985: p.135). As there were many stakeholders in the research, the researcher had the responsibility to be honest and respect other people during the process of data collection and analysis in order to protect academic integrity. In this case, the research was carried out according to The University of Western Australia guidelines. The research ethics approval of this study was obtained from The Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Western Australia in October 2009. Each participant received a letter stating clearly the research objectives including a description of how the data would be used. All participants were informed of data collection devices and activities.

Permission was requested from all the school principals to survey and interview teachers. An informed consent letter (Appendix 7) was then distributed to all participants, whereby they agreed to participate voluntarily in the study or they could withdraw without reason or prejudice.
After all teachers’ consent had been obtained, a self-developed questionnaire was distributed in a survey packet with envelope for confidential return and those completed questionnaires were collected by the researcher or a person that he knew well, within two weeks. The interview procedure was outlined in the information sheets and notes were made during interview recording. Verbatim transcripts, written interpretations and reports were typed and given to the participants for verification. All responses from participants were protected by anonymity. All data was treated strictly confidentially and stored securely. The stored data will ultimately be discarded according to guidelines provided by the University.

As one of the participating schools (School A) was the school at which the researcher was employed, measures were taken to guard against the potential threats to quality of data. To counter the possible bias or perspective of the researcher on data collection and analysis, Miles and Huberman’s concern for research integrity was addressed by employing a well-structured, theoretical base with specific framework for analysis. Also, the researcher recognized his own involvement and job position as an visiting teacher to School B and C. So, from the research perspective, the researcher was trying to look at the study problem from an outsider perspective. Reflexivity is crucial throughout all phases of the research process, including the formulation of a research question, collection and analysis of data, and drawing conclusions (Bradbury, Sambrook, & Irvine, 2007; Guillemin & Gillam, 2004). The researcher always reminded himself to be ‘self-reflective’ especially when identifying questions and content that he tends to emphasize or shy away from and to become aware of own reactions to interviews, thoughts and also participants’ emotions. It is hoped that by employing the strategies of members checking, triangulation, keeping a self-supervision diary, the researcher can be alert from ‘inconscious editing’ (Berger, 2013) during content analysis and report.
4.7 Summary

This chapter focused on a discussion of the research design and methods of data source and processing. An introduction of the research paradigm and research methodology was followed by a discussion on different data collection sources, sampling and data analysis techniques. A description of the ethical issues completed this chapter. In the next chapters (5 to 8), attention will turn to describing different analysis processes and skills with regard to CPD policy interpretation and construction.
CHAPTER FIVE: POLICY INTERPRETATIONS THROUGH CPD QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 identified the research design and methodologies that were chosen to explore underlying assumptions about CPD policy initiation and implementation. The CPD questionnaire survey was conducted to generate school profile data relating to teachers’ CPD practices as well as data on teachers’ personal views on policy implementation. This chapter reveals the findings with regard to the dynamics of teachers’ perceptions in CPD ‘policy’ and ‘practice’. This section begins with the characteristics of the participants’ profile. Then the findings are presented with the emerging themes.

Characteristics of the respondents’ profile in CPD questionnaire survey

Table 5.1 presented a summary of the background information on the teacher respondents who participated in the CPD questionnaire survey. The ratio of female to male teachers (72% to 28%) was consistent with the general gender ratio for teachers in the local primary school system (Education Manpower Bureau, 2002). In view of the gender imbalance, the researcher ensured inclusion of more male teachers in the focus group interviews in the next stage with the aim of identifying different gender perspectives and beliefs related to the scope of this research. A total of one hundred and thirty-six questionnaires were sent out and eighty-eight were returned. The response rate was 64.7%. However, five were discarded due to incompletion. So as a result, data from eighty-three questionnaires is analyzed in this chapter. Regarding the specific characteristics of the respondents, the majority (59.1%) were teaching in the upper primary section and the rest were evenly distributed in the lower primary levels among the three case study schools. Among the respondents in lower primary, 12 were teaching P.1-3 in school A, 12 in school B and 10 in school C.
Table 5.1 Characteristics of participants in CPD questionnaire survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching level</td>
<td>P.1-3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.4-6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in school</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM/SAM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APSM</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSM</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPSM</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This reflects the fact that the researcher gained access across all levels. Although the sample of teachers consisted of more women than men from school types and gender distributions, all major categories of primary teachers were represented. Notice the sample’s variation in teaching experience ranged from less than 5 years to more than 21 years and there is a fairly even distribution. The largest proportion (24.1%) of respondents had teaching experience within the range of 11-15 years and nearly 80% of the sample had at least 6 years teaching experience.

Having substantial teaching experience was an important factor in influencing the degree of planning and participation in CPD activities as they became more involved with their own professional development component. Also, the outlook of the individual on the broad area of CPD may be expected to differ according to their experience and rank in school.
As Table 5.1 indicated, most of the respondents (65.1%) were CM (certificated master) teachers and their perceptions on CPD policy document and implementation directly represented the voice and interests of those working in the local primary school system. The remainder (35%) of the respondents performed as subject panels (APSM) or administrative teachers (AM/SAM/PSM/SPSM) with certain experience in the field of management. Their feedback on the survey was different, due to their rank or position in favor of school based CPD policy. It helped in constructing a broader picture of teachers’ perceptions of CPD and the policy document in the case study schools. The following sections report the results of the questionnaire survey.

5.2 Analysis of teachers’ understanding of CPD

The questionnaire gave the respondents an opportunity to say privately what they were not able to articulate in the focus group discussion. Moreover, it was made deliberately anonymous to give the respondents the opportunity to feel free, and openly give information in response to the basic understanding on CPD questions. It was also a means to gather what teachers could immediately think or remember of the demands and context of CPD.

5.2.1 Teachers’ experience of CPD in school years 2004 – 2007

This section presented the findings relevant to the first part of the questionnaire. It was trying to reveal the respondents’ feelings and experience of their own CPD while their memory was still fresh and they were keeping pace with their own school-based CPD policy. Table 5.2 indicated that teachers in the three case study schools participated very actively in continuing professional activities in the academic years 2004 to 2007. The majority (66.3%) participated in over 150 hours of CPD activities. With reference to the modes of activities, teachers experienced different combinations including seminars, workshops, co-teaching and sharing ideas with colleagues in lesson preparation and observation.
Figures reflected that they attended more seminars (27.2%) and workshops (27.2%) than mentoring (7.2%) and other structured courses (3.6%). The reason is that most of the workshops and seminars were centrally provided by the EMB or some tertiary education institutions but mentoring was mainly for administrative teachers and structured courses were time-consuming.

Co-teaching and sharing with colleagues were more or less equally participated in, since teacher collaboration was initiated within schools and it allowed more CPD flexibility. The main reasons were the necessity to update subject knowledge (24.8%), to fulfill the government’s mandated requirement (18.8%) and to update one’s professional competence (18.4%). Less, but still a considerable number of respondents participated in other activities because of their own interests or meeting the demands of school development.
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These figures seemed to reflect the general patterns and trends of teachers’ CPD in Hong Kong. When considering whether teachers perceived CPD activities to be effective and useful, 69 respondents were quite positive and 24 of them regarded the activities to be rather useless (Table 5.3). This showed that there was a general acceptance of the CPD policy proposed by the ACTEQ after 2003.

Table 5.3 Respondents’ general comments on CPD activities from 2004-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less useful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wong’s (2005) ‘strange’ phenomenon that ‘teachers appeared to be simply trying to fulfill the government’s or the school’s requirements listed in the policy document, rather than seeing it as a genuinely useful means to improve the quality of their CPD’ seems inconsistent with the above findings. Villegas-Reimers and Reimers (2000) stress that as a general rule, successful professional development activities occur within the process of a low-threat, comfortable setting in which there is a degree of ‘psychological safety’ and teachers’ CPD is likely to be more effective if teachers are supported throughout the learning process.

However, the figures in Chart 5.1 reveal that many problems were confronting teachers in relation to their professional development. The major obstacle was time constraints. 33 respondents felt that CPD activities were too time-consuming. Another 18 of them reflected that heavy workload prevented them from planning or organizing CPD activities.
Clearly, long working hours and lack of relaxation time decreased their enthusiasm for participating in normal CPD activities. Others felt that some of the CPD courses were not useful and due to the school CPD activities, teachers had no spare time to attend other favored professional activities.

Chart 5.1 Obstacles encountered by respondents when participating in CPD activities

5.2.2 Teachers’ understanding of the content of current CPD

Data collected in this section was relevant to the second part of the questionnaire. The following findings present an investigation of how teachers perceived their current continuing professional development in terms of content, mode and approach. Teachers agreed that a wide range of content areas should be incorporated into their continuing professional development. The responses about the content of CPD were positive. Table 5.4 illustrated their views about the usefulness of the CPD content.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of CPD that is useful to personal professional development</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Relationships &amp; Services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Growth &amp; Development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Development</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective modes of CPD</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-teaching</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing ideas with colleagues</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (Structured courses)</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to enhance teachers’ enthusiasm for participating in CPD activities</td>
<td>Study allowances</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study leaves</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of workload</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal development opportunities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most suitable and responsible party for planning of teachers’ CPD</td>
<td>The government (EMB)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher in middle management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher in charge of CPD</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School principal/ Vice principal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 5.4 illustrates, there was a high percentage of respondents (67%) choosing ‘Teaching and Learning’ as useful content and others regarded ‘Student Development’ (18.8%) and ‘Personal Growth and Development’ (19.4%) as equally important to their own personal professional development. In the process of constructing their own knowledge to become more professional, teachers showed more interest in the modes of CPD with their active participation in seminars and workshops (20.8 and 34.5%) as most of these activities were more related to ‘Teaching and Learning’. Being an agent of change, the tasks in their work could be accomplished only with professional standards, norms and conditions. The more they participated in the area of ‘Teaching and Learning’, the better to secure their teaching position.
While the administrative teachers were more concerned about ‘School Development’ (27%), the percentage for ‘Professional Relationships and Services’ was relatively low when compared with other options. The reason was that most of the respondents were frontier teachers, busy with teaching work. With heavy workload and time constraints, they were indifferent to participation in educational policy formulation (described in 5.2.4). Also, they regarded the need for ‘Professional Relationships and Services’ or ‘School Development’ as more for principals or other administrative teachers. As a result, ‘Professional Relationships and Services’ and ‘School Development’ is marginalized as not very useful, especially when principals have more power to establish relationships with other professional organizations for school development.

5.2.3 Teachers’ understanding of the mode of current CPD

The majority of the respondents (34.5%) believed that workshops were more effective in enhancing their professional development than seminars. They considered the provision of information was sometimes necessary but it was ‘theoretical’ and not ‘practical’ enough. The data revealed that other teachers expressed a preference for participating in co-teaching (17.9%) and sharing ideas with colleagues (20.2%), as these CPD activities were more lively, interactive in nature, and provided opportunities for participants to apply knowledge in certain contexts. Only 1.8% of the respondents considered other modes (Structured courses) to be useful primarily because, as we will see, they were not confident about the standard of centrally provided courses. In fact, the above findings were consistent with the key themes of ACTEQ Study 2005, presented in the Interim Report (2006), that ‘teachers were able to engage in the CPD activities they preferred with the discrepancies with less than 5% between “actual” and “ideal” time allocations for all the domains’.
5.2.4 Factors contributing to teachers’ enthusiasm for CPD activities

Analysis of data indicated that most primary teachers (36.9% and 25.6%) felt that study leave and reduction in workload were the effective ways to enhance their enthusiasm for participating in CPD activities. This is consistent with the obstacles they encountered in undertaking CPD activities (Chart 5.1). As one of the respondents commented, “Since teaching workload is so great, it is hard to participate in ‘structured mode’ activities and we can’t spare too much time off work as it affects the pupils as well as our needs”. Teachers believed that their professional development could be enhanced if they were provided with time and space. About 20.8% of the respondents were more concerned about study allowances and 16.7% believed that personal development opportunities such as career promotion and professional competency affected their interests and needs in planning their CPD. It seems that teachers were more eager to participate in CPD planning if they were not, to some extent, inhibited by financial costs for long-term courses and they attached importance to professional autonomy, as they indicated the highest level of acceptance on the recommendation that “teachers can select CPD activities at their own professional discretion” (Interim Report, 2006).

5.2.5 Teachers’ perceptions about the approach to the planning of CPD

In response to the question of ‘who should be most suitable and responsible for planning teachers’ CPD’, a comparatively larger proportion of the respondents (32.5%) selected ‘Teacher’ themselves as the most suitable and responsible party for formulating their own CPD plans. This was also consistent with the findings on Key Themes in the Situation and Progress of Teachers’ CPD (ACTEQ Study 2005) that teachers emphasized “teachers’ autonomy in planning their own CPD activities” as the most important condition. They also attached high importance to the conditions that “school administrators make particular teaching arrangements for them to participate in CPD activities” (Interim Report, 2006).
However, more or less equal numbers of the respondents (22.9% and 20.5%), selected ‘EMB’ and ‘School principal or Vice-principal’ as their ideal CPD planners. Such responses implied that many teachers still seemed to reject a top-down approach. They were still not confident with the provider-led approach of CPD (Ng, 2003) in Hong Kong as the providers (mostly EMB and other tertiary education institutions) offered courses of various curricula and modes of delivery, but only according to their own interests, expertise and experience. Some of them had convergent ideas that this approach, to a certain extent, led to CPD activities which were usually ‘one-size-fits-all’ (Wong, 2005) although the EMB highlighted that there was no intention to impose a ‘one-size-fits-all’ set of ‘guidelines’ or ‘regulations’ on how to handle CPD matters (Interim Report, 2006).

5.3 Analysis of teachers’ perceptions of the CPD Policy Document 2003

Findings presented in this section were relevant to the third part of the questionnaire. It was exploring teachers’ knowledge of and perceptions about the implementation of CPD Policy Document 2003. Questions 1 and 2 sought the respondents’ basic understanding of the policy document, while questions 3 and 4 helped identify their tendency to follow or use the items in the document and whether they used it or not during the planning of their CPD.

5.3.1 Teachers’ awareness of CPD Policy Document 2003

Over half (59%) of the questionnaire respondents (Chart 5.2) in the three case study schools had not read the document although the EMB claimed that ‘a series of briefing and sharing sessions and school visits has been conducted to disseminate the contents of “CPD Document 2003” and to gauge initial responses from relevant stakeholders’ (Interim Report, 2006). On the other hand, by far the largest proportion of respondents (84.3%) agreed that they were aware of the numbers of CPD hours that they should commit to, in the 3-year cycle.
As Table 5.5 showed below, most respondents (69.9%) also accepted that it was their responsibility to achieve enough CPD hours in ‘Structured mode’ and ‘other modes’ within the CPD framework. It seemed that the ACTEQ had succeeded in proposing the pursuit of not less than 150 hours as a ‘soft target’ for teachers to work towards during the three-year ‘try-out period’ after 2003 (ACTEQ, 2003). Clearly while the overwhelming majority had not read the Document, they were aware of the keys items in it.

Table 5.5 Respondents’ perception of CPD Policy Document 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ awareness of CPD</td>
<td>not less than 150 CPD hours in 3-year cycle</td>
<td>Yes: 70</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document items</td>
<td></td>
<td>No: 13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not less than 50 hours each in “Structured mode” and “other modes”</td>
<td>Yes: 58</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No: 25</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use the document as a tool in planning professional development</td>
<td>Yes: 43</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No: 40</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason to follow the Teacher Competencies</td>
<td>Enhance individual professional capacities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pursuit one’s personal growth</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade individual competitiveness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework in planning one’s CPD</td>
<td>Enhance the quality of students’ learning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow EMB’s suggestion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep pace with school-based CPD policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another unexpected finding was that over 50% of the respondents agreed that they would use the document as a tool in planning their CPD but Chart 5.3 illustrated that nearly 60% of them did not follow the ‘Teacher Competencies Framework’ (TCF) to help them plan their continuing professional development from 2004 to 2007.

Chart 5.3 Percentage of respondents following the Teacher Competencies Framework in planning one’s professional development from 2004-2007

One of the explanations was that there was a tendency for the teachers to follow both the school development agenda and the government’s agenda in order to satisfy their career demands for CPD. Despite the fact that CPD was supposed to be the means through which teachers are empowered to meet the challenges and changes in contemporary society (Interim Report, 2006), most of the teachers had no choice but to incorporate the imposed essence of the CPD framework of professional learning into their everyday life.
5.3.2 Reasons teachers followed TCF in the planning of CPD

Even though 48.2% of the respondents agreed to use or follow TCF in planning their professional development in the school year 2004 to 2007, it appears that many were just trying to fulfill the government’s requirement (24.2%) or to keep pace with the school-based CPD policy (20.1%). Some of them (14.6%) felt that the TCF could help enhance their professional capacities, while others (16.9%) thought that it would help them to pursue personal growth. The above findings seems, to some extent, contradictory to the Interim Report’s (2006) conclusion that ‘most teachers did not participate in CPD activities solely for fulfilling the CPD hours “requirement”’. On the whole, the TCF purports to be a map which dictates the route for teachers in the world of continuing professional development (ACTEQ, 2003, p.i). However, teachers criticized it for being ‘too broad and the stage descriptors too vague for them to locate their stage of professional development (Wong, 2005). As a result, most respondents tended to fulfill the ‘requirement’ listed in the policy document, rather than see it as a means to improve the quality of their CPD. It seems doubtful that the teachers were feeling empowered and they were possessing ownership of the policy.

5.4 Themes and issues summarized from teachers’ CPD survey

This section summarizes some of the key themes and issues which were analyzed inductively using descriptive codes (Table 5.6). Several concepts were chosen and modified from Crocker’s study (2005) in order to develop interpretive understandings. Crocker’s work is relevant to this study as it also applies the ‘interpretive’ approach to investigate individual teachers’ perceptions of abstract feelings concerning CPD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Code</th>
<th>Concepts (Adapted and modified from Crocker, 2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Engagement in CPD practices</td>
<td>Worthwhileness is characterized as having the following indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub codes:</td>
<td>- Practical for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Amount of time spent on CPD activities, mode of CPD activities participated from 2004-2007, reasons for participating in CPD activities)</td>
<td>- Beneficial for teachers’ professional learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Practical and beneficial for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Future usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Usefulness and effectiveness of current CPD</td>
<td>Satisfaction is affirmed in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub codes:</td>
<td>- Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Content of CPD that is useful to personal professional development, effective modes of CPD, ways to enhance teachers’ enthusiasm for participating in CPD activities)</td>
<td>- Cooperation and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Freedom in choosing CPD initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seeing increased motivation and success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improvement of professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Awareness and acceptance of the policy document</td>
<td>Empowerment is conveyed with regards to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub codes:</td>
<td>- Freedom in planning CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Teachers’ awareness of CPD Policy Document items, reasons to follow TCF in planning one’s CPD)</td>
<td>- Flexibility in choosing CPD content and modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment is presented itself in reference to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Desire and interest for more CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Self-initiative to enhance professional capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase demand for professional commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worthwhileness, empowerment, commitment and satisfaction are concepts which help us understand teachers’ sense of ownership of having their own CPD. As Crocker (2005) notes, ‘worthwhileness emerged as an issue on which teachers placed significance regarding both satisfaction and commitment’. Also, ‘continuing professional development was a contributing factor to commitment’, ‘satisfaction was repeatedly noted as a resultant effect’ and ‘the teachers’ perceived feelings of empowerment (self-efficacy, autonomy and impact) were significantly related to all these outcomes’ (Crocker, 2005).
Originally, Crocker used these concepts to examine their interrelationship with continuing professional development in professional learning communities especially the effects on teaching and learning. But the researcher found that these concepts were mutually interdependent and they could be used as ‘indicators’ to frame the teachers’ perceptions concerning CPD. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) contended that, “The process and success of teacher development depends very much on the context in which it takes place. The nature of this context can make or break teacher development efforts”. If teachers recognize the value or worthwhileness of professional development initiatives, their attitude will shift positively towards what Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) referred to as “teacher development as ecological change”.

In order to explain the teachers’ responses to the CPD Policy Document and its practice, ‘worthwhileness’ which relates to a particular teaching model was modified to describe engagement in CPD practices while ‘satisfaction’ which relates to teachers’ enjoyment of their job was modified to describe the usefulness and effectiveness of the current CPD. The relationship of teachers’ continuing professional development with their ‘commitment’ to teaching and the concept of ‘empowerment’ control of teachers’ own professional development was also modified to describe their awareness and acceptance of the policy document.

With enhanced understanding from the descriptive codes and its summaries, key themes and issues were analyzed inductively and appropriately. Table 5.7 shows the key themes from the questionnaire findings and which reflect the level of acceptance of CPD policy among local primary teachers. Six common themes emerged from the respondent teachers in the three case study schools. They included: CPD practices which encourage professional learning, school factors which influence willingness to participate in CPD practices, opportunities offered by schools to support CPD, different perceptions about CPD planning, the alignment between CPD practice and policy, and attitudes about CPD ownership.
Table 5.7 Key themes and issues summarized from CPD questionnaire survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Key themes (Descriptors are listed below italics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Engagement in CPD practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common issues among teachers in CPD practices</td>
<td>CPD practices which encourage professional learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers saw themselves as active participants in CPD activities. (Modes of CPD activities participated in 2004-2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— seminars, workshops, co-teaching (about 70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• They believed that different modes of CPD activities such as workshops and seminars were practical and beneficial to their professional learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some considered co-teaching and sharing ideas with colleagues were worthwhile in the practicability in their day to day classroom practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The regular CPD modes gave teachers a consistent style of learning opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers recognized the future usefulness of CPD in updating their subject knowledge and upgrading their professional competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation among teachers in CPD practices</td>
<td>School factors influencing willingness to participate in CPD practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some felt ‘psychologically unsafe’ as they had to fulfill the government’s requirement in CPD especially when the schools used CPD as a ‘survival tool’ to satisfy government and community expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some were less motivated because the context of CPD activities did not cater for their needs and interests but for the sake of school improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decisions to formulate teachers’ own CPD were mainly affected by heavy workload and time constraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Usefulness and effectiveness of current CPD</strong></td>
<td>Opportunities offered by schools to support CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common issues among teachers in the perceptions of CPD</td>
<td>• Wide range of CPD content created opportunities for teachers to pursue their personal professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School-level cooperation and peer collaboration gave teachers support to ‘bounce ideas off each other’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers were more satisfied with the interactive nature of CPD modes which provided them enough opportunities to apply knowledge in teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation among teachers in the perceptions of CPD</td>
<td>Different perceptions about CPD planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers were less enthusiastic to participate in policy formulation due to their heavy workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Others showed interest in CPD initiatives if positive results were observed from their professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A strong desire to choose the planning of CPD by ‘Teacher’ themselves because of limited professional autonomy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Awareness and acceptance of the policy document

Alignment between CPD practice and policy

- The majority of the teachers tended to be aware of the items on the policy document especially the CPD hours, and requirements in TCF; but they seldom read the document.
- In spite of their flexibility in choosing ‘Structured mode’ or ‘other modes’ of CPD activities, teachers felt that there was a lack of freedom in CPD planning due to the time limit proposed by the policy document.
- Teachers accepted their responsibility to implement CPD practices for the sake of their professional development and students’ learning.

Variation among teachers in their understanding of CPD policy document

Attitudes about CPD ownership

- Some teachers revealed their self-initiative for further study, which stemmed from the desire to improve themselves professionally or to expand their knowledge.
- Teachers seldom followed the TCF in planning their own CPD and ‘uncertain’ commitment showed that they possessed doubts about the empowerment and ownership of the CPD policy.

There were some inter-school differences regarding to the participants’ responses in the CPD questionnaire. These variations are displayed below in Table 5.8 but will be discussed later through the interview analysis in Chapter 7.

Table 5.8 Display of views or issues related to the themes derived from CPD questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes derived from CPD questionnaire</th>
<th>Case study school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPD practices which encourage professional learning</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School factors influencing willingness to participate in CPD practices</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities offered by school to support CPD</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different perceptions about CPD planning</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment between CPD practice and policy</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about CPD ownership</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S = views/issues were described similarly; D = Views/issues were described differently**
In all cases, CPD practices were described as a means of encouraging professional learning. The majority of teachers acknowledged that undertaking different modes of CPD practices which were suggested or offered by the school could help promote their professional competencies. It seems that respondents from all three schools viewed the government’s expectation and their school’s decision for improvement to be significant factors influencing their willingness to participate in CPD practices. Regardless of different school policies and culture, respondents from all three schools expressed positive views about school support for CPD opportunities. With regard to the perception of CPD planning, respondents from both Schools A and B described their views differently while those from School C were satisfied with the flexibility offered in CPD planning. In fact, the majority of teachers in all three schools knew that they had the responsibility to learn and understand the policy document but they were tied by the fulfilment impacted by the demanding number of CPD hours required. Respondents from School A and C showed more positive attitudes of support towards owning their CPD but some teachers from School B voiced their unwillingness and dissatisfaction when they were forced to comply with school agendas regarding CPD needs and provision.

After reviewing the general picture of teachers’ perceptions from the CPD questionnaire, there seemed to be a strong view that teachers, rather than the government or the school principals, should become the key planners for their own continuing development. This was consistent with the findings of “HKPERA & EC Research, 2004” [presented in the Interim Report (ACTEQ, 2006, p.10) ] that ‘teachers agreed to the overall direction of the CPD policy, and were receptive to the concept that while “teachers need to undergo continuous learning”, they also tended to view “personal growth and development” and “life enrichment activities” as essential to their own professional development.
5.5 Summary

To conclude, teachers’ views from the questionnaire survey were worth analyzing for any issues concerning the production of the CPD policy text and the implementation of CPD policy. The findings generally showed that teachers in the case study schools were alert to their role as a teacher and learner, but they were somewhat indifferent to participation in CPD policy formulation. There was a strong sense of desire for empowerment and teacher ownership of the CPD policy. However, pressure from both government policy and from society affected their willingness to accept the policy document. Chapter Six will further focus on the policy interpretation through critical discourse analysis of the policy documents.
CHAPTER SIX: POLICY INTERPRETATIONS THROUGH CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

6.1 Introduction

Bell (1999: 108) divides documentary sources into primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are “those which came into existence in the period under research” and secondary sources are “interpretations of events of that period based on primary sources”. Both primary and secondary sources provided important information for phase one of this research. These sources assisted in understanding the construction of the CPD policy in Hong Kong. This research included the process of policy text production, the key document being ACTEQ (2003) CPD Policy Document: ‘Towards a learning profession’. Relevant historical documents including the Interim Reports (2006) and (2009) are important primary sources of existing data, that have been described as items that are original to the problem under study and have direct physical relationship with the events that happened (Cohen, Mansion & Morrison, 2000).

The researcher analyzed the above documents to discover witting (original intention) and unwitting evidence (everything else from the original evidence) (Bell, 1999). It is from this evidence that the basis of examining the policy implementation processes was formed. In an attempt to examine how teachers’ continuing professional development was conceptualized and implemented in the local education system, the 2003 CPD policy document was subjected to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) drawing on Fairclough’s model (1992) as used by Janks (1997) and the Interim Reports on Fairclough’s recent work (2001a) on CDA framework.
6.1.1 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Since the analysis ‘of’ policy is adopted to address the policy problem (see 3.2.4), i.e. to understand why teachers’ CPD policy was developed at a particular time (2003) and the effects on teachers’ professionalization, critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a suitable method to uncover contradictions in policy statements and rhetoric. CDA is not limited to specific structures of text and talk, and is open to various directions and interpretations and it provides both an analytic lens and conceptual approach to critically and analytically examine and interpret discourse data (text and talk) (Khorsandi, 2014). Policy experts claim that CDA acts as a ‘lens’ as it provides a methodological perspective to describe, interpret, and critique the ‘social context’ reflected and embodied in written or spoken texts (Fairclough, 1995; Wood & Kroger, 2000, cited in Khorsandi, 2014). From Ball’s (1993, 1994) point of view, discourses in policy texts allow only certain voices to be heard and expressed. CDA provides a conceptual framework for the study of discourses that view texts (written and spoken) as a form of ‘social practice’ and focuses on the ways social and political domination are visible in written text and spoken talk (Fairclough, 1995, 2010; Wood & Kroger, 2000, cited in Khorsandi, 2014).

To describe, interpret, analyze and critique teachers’ perceptions reflected in policy texts, CDA was used to explore how language works in policy statements, rhetoric, and talks (Fairclough, 1995; Taylor, 2004). Drawing on Fairclough (1992), CDA provided the researcher a critical approach and a lens to examine how values in teachers’ CPD policy were constructed through language.

Data from documents for analysis were focused on three dimensions: the text, discursive and social practice (Figure 6.1).
By introducing Fairclough’s concept, Janks (1997) proposes that all dimensions are “mutually explanatory” (ibid: 27) and each dimension is interdependent in CDA:

- the first dimension represents the discourse fragment, i.e. “the object of analysis (including verbal, visual or verbal and visual texts);
- the second dimension represents “the processes by which the object is produced and received (writing/speaking/designing and reading/listening/viewing) by human subjects (ibid.)” take place;
- the third dimension describes discourse as ‘power behind discourse’ or as social practices, because it is containing “the socio-historical conditions that govern these processes [of production and reception]” (Janks, 1997: 26)

In this research, these three dimensions were analyzed. CDA employed a textually oriented discourse analysis for policy text, which was complementary to Foucault’s discourse analysis, which was concerned mainly with the social and political analysis of discursive practices as systems of rules, rather than with textual analysis of real instances of what was said or written, that was with the analysis of actual texts (Fairclough, 1992).
In analyzing the *CPD Policy Document 2003*, some specific statements concerning the purpose, underpinnings, content, operational considerations and the roles of the stakeholders were explored. For the *Interim Reports*, the main focus was on the major developments reflected from 2003 to 2008 and its recommendations. CDA was used to complement and enrich policy trajectory analysis and this enabled a deeper understanding on the basis of power relations in CPD policy processes.

6.2 Background for policy document analysis

In Hong Kong, the need for continuing professional development (CPD) was a deep-rooted conviction in the teaching profession since the Code for the Education Profession of Hong Kong in 1990 pointed out an important theme for developing teachers’ professionalism—‘to strive in every way for any improvement... so as to fulfill society expectations of a profession’. The development of teacher professionalism in Hong Kong rooted its beginning in 1997. Starting from this year, the ACTEQ (2003) and University Grants Committee (UGC) began to review the existing teacher education. Reports in 1998 emphasized on the development of an all trained and all graduate teaching profession. This echoed the international trend towards marketization, accountability and quality in education with the aim of satisfying stakeholders’ expectations (Yin, 2006), “Teachers should be accorded a high professional status in society commensurate with their professional responsibilities, qualifications and skills, and the contribution which their profession makes to the development of society” (Education International, 2011, Article XI).

In 1994, the government had set up a Council on Professional Conduct for the Education Profession. According to the Code of Practice, all Hong Kong local schools serve a vital public service and they have to set standards for teacher practice. All internally developed policy documents voiced similar expectations, commonly noted in the school’s “Teacher Handbooks”.
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However, the vast majority of Hong Kong schools (about 96%) are independently managed public and private schools, and they are not ‘owned and operated’ by the government (through the Education Bureau, the former EMB) (Quong, 2016). As a result, teachers’ work can be loosely governed and far more autonomous. Under the public and parents’ scrutiny, the professionalism of teachers is constantly judged by teachers’ behaviour. The Education Reform document (2000) advocated that every teacher should be a continuous learner in order to advance the quality of the education system and the quality of students’ learning.

In 2003, the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications (ACTEQ) produced revealed that the CPD document which marked a dramatic shift in the way teachers’ professionalism was to be strongly expected and recognized in the education system. It constructed a common reference framework for establishing direction and creating momentum in continuing professional development. The purpose of CPD Policy Document 2003 was to provide teachers and schools with an essential tool for the advancement of the planning and practice of their professional development (ACTEQ, 2003). The following section presents a critical discourse analysis of policy statements on teachers’ CPD as contained in the *CPD Policy Document 2003* (see Box 6.1).

CDA was intended to reveal intertextuality embedded in statements and language used (how texts define, position and control readers and listeners) (Fairclough, 1992: 70). In other words, it opened up an opportunity for understanding the insights provided in all the chapters that follow.
6.3 Critical discourse analysis of policy statements based on CPD Policy Document 2003

Policy analysis involves text-based interpretations of what the author intended to express. Critical discourse analysis opens up opportunities to explore how policy discourse materially affects teachers CPD and their practice (Ketlhoitwe, 2007). This analysis is limited to various features of the text and the context in which it was created. Below (box 6.1) is a list of policy statements from the CPD Policy Document 2003 analyzed in the subsequent paragraphs and section in this chapter.

Box 6.1 Critical discourse analysis of specific statements from CPD Policy Document 2003

A close investigation of some specific statements of the policy text:

**Purpose**

- A generic TCF (Teacher Competencies Framework) should enable individual teachers to make meaningful self-evaluations of their learning needs over a wide spectrum of professional experience.
- It must enable schools to address the professional development of their entire staff in a manner consistent with established theory and effective practice.
- A properly charted TCF serves to illustrate what teacher competencies should broadly embrace during the different stages of the teachers’ professional growth and development.
- In drafting the generic TCF, the Focus group believed that the framework must be sufficiently robust for teachers, schools, teacher education institutions and other stakeholders to ensure the professional growth of individual teachers throughout their careers, the Government to formulate policies for teachers’ continuing education and the associated allocation of resources.
Underpinnings

- As professionals, teachers should be well-equipped with the subject and pedagogical knowledge, professional skills and supporting attitudes and values.
- Teachers should have a responsibility to be professionally up to date and to strive for continuous personal growth and professional excellence through lifelong learning.
- Schools should be developed as professional learning communities, teachers’ professional development should be regarded as important force in school development.

Content

- A CPD policy is successfully realized only when all teachers are engaged in effective professional development. To be effective, a professional development policy must impact beyond those who are already enjoying the abundance of learning opportunities.
- Time spent on school-organized staff development days should be appropriately registered according to the modes of professional development experienced.
- ACTEQ proposes that all teachers, irrespective of their rank and capacity, should engage in CPD activities of not less than 150 hours in a three-year cycle: in a three-year cycle, not less than 50 CPD hours should be spent on structured learning and not less than 50 CPD hours on other modes of CPD and the remaining CPD hours can be freely apportioned between structured / other modes at individual teachers’ own discretion.
- Teachers should have access to a variety of professional learning experiences through a balanced selection of activities.
- Although it is not feasible to set a ratio for time allotted to professional needs and that allotted to personal development, an appropriate balance must be made between these competing demands. The need for proper dialogue between teachers and school is obvious.

Operational considerations

- Teachers are expected to share the same vision and direction as the school.
- When drafting CPD plans, teachers should work out with their schools with an appropriate balance between school and teacher needs.
- Most importantly, the CPD policy is never meant to place an extra burden on the already very busy work of a teacher.
Roles of the stakeholders

*Teachers*

- Teachers should make a leading contribution to the successful implementation of the CPD framework, for CPD is both a right and an obligation to every practitioner.
- Teachers should be prepared to bear the cost, in whole or in part, of engaging in CPD, as an investment in their own professional development and career advancement.

*School leaders*

- School leaders should create professional development opportunities that address the aspirations and development of teachers at different career stages.
- Principals should support teachers’ CPD by ensuring that both the teachers’ professional needs and the school’s development needs are met.
- Principals should make teachers understand that the CPD of all the staff contributes to the corporate and collective intelligence of the whole school and ultimately to effective student learning.


To aid critical analysis of the above policy text, table 6.1 was constructed to categorize the dimensions listed below. To facilitate a closer analysis of the texts, various linguistic tools were employed “to provide a way of ‘denaturalizing’ and reading it as a discursive practice” (Cormack & Green, 2000: 13, cited in Ketlholwe 2007). It is concerned with the meaning and value producing practices in language rather than the relationship between utterances and their referents (Shapiro, 1989).
Table 6.1 Dimensions of critical discourse analysis on CPD Policy Document 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text – description</strong>&lt;br&gt;(i.e. text analysis)</td>
<td>The focus of textual analysis is the 2003 CPD Policy on teachers’ professionalism. This document contains the guidelines for teachers, schools, teacher education institutions and other stakeholders to ensure the professional growth of individual teachers throughout their careers across the education sector. (see Box 2.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse practice –</strong>&lt;br&gt;process of production and interpretation&lt;br&gt;(processing analysis)</td>
<td>This document is the official and principal guideline produced by the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications (ACTEQ) of the Education Manpower Bureau (now called Education Bureau) on the introduction of teachers’ continuing professional development. It is distributed to every school, district education office, and higher learning institutes to be read. ‘It recommends a system that recognizes and facilitates teachers’ efforts to continuously refresh and upgrade themselves, as is done in most major professions in the community (ACTEQ, 2003). It contains theoretical references for teachers to evaluate their own profession in other professional areas. It not only instructs teachers and schools, it seeks to commit institutions of teacher education to develop an internship system to provide new teachers with a comprehensive environment conductive to their development in professionalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social practice –</strong>&lt;br&gt;situational, institutional and societal (explanation)&lt;br&gt;(i.e. social analysis)</td>
<td>A new education system is crucial to maintain Hong Kong’s international status as an innovative and knowledge-based society after 1997. ‘Our priority should therefore be to nurture a new generation of talents, generalists and specialists alike, who are good learners, articulate, creative, adaptive, have good organizational skills and a sense of commitment’ (Review of Education System Reform Proposal, 2000). Teachers as the key to the success of education reform have an urgent need to change in accord with the pace of the society. In the process of education reform there are many different tasks, but one of the major ones is to enhance teacher professionalism and develop a professional force which is able to implement the new curriculum. In order to achieve the sacred mission, teachers really need great support and measures in different aspects to help them grow professionally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To operationalize the governments’ vision in teachers’ professional development, the CPD document 2003 was published to local teachers and schools. Ng (2003) stresses that “the success of CTE (continuing professional development) depends heavily on the level of commitment from the government” (p.661). There is dire need to focus on teachers’ CPD policies and practices to ensure that long-term vision of sustaining and producing the environment to professionalize teachers. CPD concerns have become a social issue; the teacher education institutions, the school societies, the policymakers and the government are engaged in rhetorical and practical endeavors to sustain the environment. This brief analysis is expanded below.

Modified from Ketloilwe 2007, after Cormack and Green (2000: 12)

6.4 Textual analysis of policy statements based on CPD Policy Document 2003

The following analysis focused on the points concerning policy purposes and underpinnings and the ACTEQ was identified as the main implementing agency. The first point proposed a generic Teacher Competency Framework, providing a template for schools to develop school-based professional development frameworks and a useful tool for evaluation and revision. It reads as follow:

A generic TCF (Teacher Competencies Framework) should enable individual teachers to make meaningful self-evaluations of their learning needs over a wide spectrum of professional experience. (CPD Policy Document 2003: p.6)

It identified concern with the lack of a generic Teacher Competencies Framework to ensure meaningful self-evaluations on teachers’ professional development. It also suggested the beneficiary of the TCF being the individual teachers. However, no evidence was provided about how teachers achieved professionalism through the use of the competency framework. The text left the reader to work out what meaningful self-evaluations on their learning needs were and how they were going to work over a wide spectrum of professional experience. Although the TCF was proposed by the ACTEQ, it did not suggest any particular focus on how individual teachers construct their ‘wide spectrum’ of professional experience.
In terms of ideational meaning, the clause ‘A generic TCF (Teacher Competencies Framework) should enable individual teachers to make meaningful self-evaluations’ was transitive and imperative. It implied that the policy agent was obliged to work for its success. As Fairclough (1992: 76) puts it “The writer-reader relationship here is that of between someone telling what the case is in no certain terms, and someone being told; these are the two subject positions set up in the clause”. From the above statement, the reader was expected to play a reactive role while the EMB or the government had its authority. Thus, asymmetrical power relations occurred in favor of the text author.

The second point states,

It must enable schools to address the professional development of their entire staff in a manner consistent with established theory and effective practice.  
(CPD Policy Document 2003: p.6)

In this statement, the policy text recognized the significance of the TCF, in which, schools adopted it as an important means of addressing their own teachers’ CPD policy. But, the phrase ‘in a manner consistent with established theory and effective practice’ left the reader wondering: ‘Why did the schools have to motivate the entire staff to formulate or evaluate their own CPD?’ Maybe the statement added a further assumption that teachers’ CPD practice was not underpinned by theory or effective practice previously. It also emphasized the relational subjectivity and function of the TCF in teachers’ CPD. The text was structured around a coherent policy. It continued the essence of the first statement which called for an implication that CPD was an established mechanism, necessary to ensure CTE (continuing professional development) in a systematic manner. In terms of interpretation, the reader would be tempted to think that attention and resources were enough, or symmetrically distributed in the implementation of the policy.
The third point states:

A properly charted TCF serves to illustrate what teacher competencies should broadly embrace during the different stages of the teachers’ professional growth and development. (CPD Policy Document 2003: p.6)

The policy recognized the need to have a ‘properly charted TCF (Teacher’s Competency Framework)’ in order to ensure its utility as a reference in deciding the content of school’s CPD plans and activities. It demonstrated a power relation from the policy designer (ACTEQ) to direct implementers (the schools and teachers) to follow. Although the document stated that ‘The CPD framework is formulated with focus on relevance and quality rather than quantity and a wide definition of CPD is adopted’, the text did not clarify what the different stages of the teachers’ professional growth and development are. It still left the reader to work out how and when to achieve the competency. Kogan’s (1995) description of policy as “the authoritative allocation of value statements of prescriptive intent” (p.55) was acknowledged when the clause “should broadly embrace” indicated an official, authoritative emphasis and pointed to the importance attached to content of teacher competency in their professional development.

The fourth point states:

In drafting the generic TCF, the Focus group believed that the framework must be sufficiently robust for teachers, schools, teacher education institutions and other stakeholders to ensure the professional growth of individual teachers throughout their careers, the Government to formulate policies for teachers’ continuing education and the associated allocation of resources. (CPD Policy Document 2003: p.6)

The text implied the exercise of political power of the text author by introducing the generic TCF to ensure the policy implementation of teachers’ CPD. The above text suggested the use of TCF for all stakeholders. It assumed that TCF was an all-encompassing framework that was multi-disciplinary for teachers’ career development. The text was high-sounding on its applicability in playing an advisory role on government policy for teachers’ continuing education and the associated allocation of resources (Ng, 2003).
The clause “must be sufficiently robust for” implied an authoritative imperative in the illustration of choices for teacher competency framework. On one hand, it left the reader with no options but to follow the prescription. The policy stakeholders and implementers were forced to oblige. But on the other hand, the reader or policy agent was worrying to work out how the TCF should be achieved. Another clause “the Focus group believed” left the reader to accept who would be the appropriate agent to illustrate the CPD framework.

Referring to the underpinnings of the policy document, some important meanings were also discovered from the statements. The first point states:

As professionals, teachers should be well-equipped with the subject and pedagogical knowledge, professional skills and supporting attitudes and values.
(CPD Policy Document 2003: p.7)

This text tended to imply that teachers should have the capacity and ability to fulfill the “built-in value assumptions” of the concept of profession as suggested by Hoyle (1980). It assumed that teachers, as professionals, had an obligation to become active life-long learner to the rest of the profession. However, the text did not allow multiple views on the constantly challenged concept of professionalism, i.e. professional knowledge can be based on “scientific principles” and that it can be “applied” in a straightforward way has been deeply contested (Schon, 1983, 1987, cited in Hirst, 1996).

The second point states:

Teachers should have a responsibility to be professionally up to date and to strive for continuous personal growth and professional excellence through lifelong learning.
(CPD Policy Document 2003: p.7)

Although this text recognized the need for professionalization of teachers, it assumed that readers should be well aware of the concept that “the professional development of teachers implies a process whereby teachers may be helped to become more professional” (Livingston & Robertson, 2001, cited in Ketlhoilwe, 2007).
Here attitudinal change and teachers’ implementation of the policy were highlighted as preferred outcomes for professionalization but the reader was left to distinguish professionalization from professionalism (Carlgen, 1999; Sockett, 1993). The policy designer assumed that the use of words ‘strive for’ could stimulate teachers’ attitudinal change, i.e. update their profession would resulted in continuous personal growth and professional excellence. In order words, teachers seemed more likely to cultivate a positive behavioral process in policy implementation.

The third point states:

Schools should be developed as professional learning communities, teachers’ professional development should be regarded as an important force in school development. (CPD Policy Document 2003: p.7)

Legitimizing the development of schools as important professional learning communities, this statement forced the policy implementers (schools) to acknowledge the directive nature of the policy text.

Moreover the text recognized and suggested the link between the teachers’ professional development and school development. It did not specify when and how the schools developed their professional learning communities. So, the reader was left to figure out whether the setting up of learning communities could truly add value to school development. Pinpointing the schools as an ‘important force’ to develop teachers’ professional development, this text also neglected the effects of government intervention on teacher autonomy and professionalism. This was consistent with Bell’s (1999) argument that “there is gradually increasing government intervention in the structure, content and delivery of an educative process at a time when teacher autonomy and the status of teaching as a profession has been eroded” (p.9).
6.4.1 Transitivity analysis of specific statements

In order to read the document in a more comprehensive perspective, the CPD content and its operational considerations were analyzed by transitivity process. Transitivity analysis is a deconstructive exercise that documents the forms and contexts wherein different points of view are constructed and values embedded (Tsirougianni & Sammut, 2013). It is important to understand how meaning is represented in a clause especially in the course of social interaction and with an aim to work through policy texts, transitivity analysis ‘will seek to interpret, rather than simply describe the linguistic structure of texts’ (Simpson, 1993). Employing such an analytical method in this study made it possible to analyse discursively how narratives are ‘made to look’, that is, the particular point of view an author adopts as an ‘angle of telling’ a story (Simpson, 1993, cited in Tsirougianni & Sammut, 2013). In this study, the researcher chose the clauses from CPD Policy Document 2003 as as the main unit of analysis. By evaluating the statements in terms of the types of values the policy writer expresses, it is more easy to understand whether these policy statements represent the subject’s ability to take the perspective of the other (Simpson, 1993). Also, in examining what type of subject is ‘speaking’ and how the policy text is represented in each utterance or statement, it is convenient to uncover the values that each position expresses (in particular, the policy actors and the recipients).

Janks (1997) argues that transitivity analysis looks for “patterns that emerge across these linguistic functions which confirm or contradict one another” (p. 335) and it can also assist in establishing power relations within discourse. Transitivity specifies the different types of processes that are recognized in the language and the structures by which they are expressed (Ketlhoilewe, 2007). Some of the statements from the document were analyzed with the processes summarized from Janks (1997):

- Material processes, that is types of doing by actors to achieve a goal;
- Mental processes, that is use of senses, e.g. thinking, feeling, perceiving, etc;
- Relational processes, that is types of being, e.g. ‘is’, ‘has’, etc.; and
- Behavioral processes, that is types of behaving, e.g. drawing, dreaming, smiling, etc. (ibid).
According to transitivity analysis, there were three elements to be reviewed. Regarding the CPD content, some specified statements reflected the mental processes in the activity. The material processes were recognized in the statements while an assumed actor remained linguistically silenced in the text. Table 6.2 indicated the processes during transitivity analysis. The policy recipients or actors were specified in some cases. The ACTEQ (EMB) and schools were the assumed key players constructed with material processes. They seemed to possess more power. Schools and teachers were constructed with both material and mental processes. They were able to effect change, exercising their power relations within the policy discourse. In other words, the ACTEQ and the EMB were expecting the teachers to ‘update their professional competency’ and ‘change their attitudes towards professionalism’.

Table 6.2 Process of Transitivity Analysis in the CPD content and operational consideration clauses from CPD Policy Document 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy points</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Assumed actor (Who)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPD content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Realized Impact</td>
<td>Material Behavioral</td>
<td>Teachers ACTEQ (EMB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Propose Engage Spend</td>
<td>Material Material Material</td>
<td>ACTEQ (EMB) Teachers Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Registered</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Teachers /Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Have access to Variety Balanced selection</td>
<td>Relational Material Mental</td>
<td>Teachers ACTEQ (EMB) Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Set Made</td>
<td>Material Material</td>
<td>ACTEQ (EMB) Teachers /Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Considerations</td>
<td>Expected Vision and direction</td>
<td>Behavioral Mental</td>
<td>Teachers Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Realized Impact</td>
<td>Material Behavioral</td>
<td>Teachers ACTEQ (EMB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Work out</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Teachers /Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Place Burden</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>ACTEQ (EMB) ACTEQ (EMB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified from Janks (1997:337)
But the statement “Teachers should have access to a variety of professional learning experiences through a balanced selection of activities” left the reader to wonder how the selection of activities were balanced. As the source of agency (from where power relations operate) was obscured, the reader would allocate its responsibility to either himself or herself or a particular agent that offered professional choices (Ketlhoilwe, 2007). Thus, the role of the ACTEQ was established and the EMB was legitimized to carry out their duties in the implementation of teachers’ continuing professional development.

The material construction of the ACTEQ in Table 6.2 indicated policy-power relations within the CPD policy discourse. The 2003 policy document was written as an official commitment to the introduction and implementation of teachers’ CPD. Through text, the ACTEQ (EMB) committed its material resources to the proposition. It was politically obliged to ensure policies in action. Teachers and schools were constructed with material processes because they were under government control, having social responsibility to implement government policies. Schools got government resources when they performed their duties to implement CPD policy. Teachers were constructed with mental and behavioral processes. They were motivated to refresh and upgrade themselves and ultimately changed their behavior towards professionalization as well as professionalism. In this way, the major stakeholders were put in a positive response for effective policy construction and implementation.

6.4.2 Modality analysis of specific statements

In this research, modality analysis was applied to analyze the statements concerning the roles of the stakeholders. Fairclough (1992) puts a view on analyzing text:

The objective is to determine patterns in the text in the degree of affinity expressed with propositions through modality. A major concern is to assess the relative import of modality features for (a) social relations in the discourse and (b) controlling representations of reality. (p. 236)
The policymaker used ‘should’ followed by ‘must’ as the most common modal verb in the statements:

- Teachers *should* make a leading contribution to the successful implementation of the CPD framework, for CPD is both a right and an obligation to every practitioner.
- Teachers *should* be prepared to bear the cost, in whole or in part, of engaging in CPD, as an investment in their own professional development and career advancement.
- School leaders *should* create professional development opportunities that address the aspirations and development of teachers at different career stages.
- Principals *should* support teachers’ CPD by ensuring that both the teachers’ professional needs and the school’s development needs are met.
- Principals *should* make teachers understand that the CPD of all the staff contributes to the corporate and collective intelligence of the whole school and ultimately to effective student learning.

(CPD Policy Document, ACTEQ 2003: 16-18)

It was an important aspect of reading policy texts by modality as it helped exposing social relations and the reality represented in discourse (Ketlhoilwe, 2007). Fairclough (1992) also observes,

> Modality is a major dimension of discourse and more central and pervasive than it has traditionally been taken to be. One measure of its social importance is the extent to which the modality of propositions is contested and open to struggle and transformation. (p.160)

Here modal verbs were used by the policy designer to imply a high degree of commitment and determination. Ketlhoilwe (2007) notes that ‘Should and must expressed close affinity to the proposition and reflected power relations, such modal verbs sounded instructive and obligatory in an imperative mood to invite compliance from the recipients’. However, they limited the readers’ creative talents of deciding what is right or appropriate and “implies some form of power imbalance” (Fairclough, 1992, cited in Ketlhoilwe, 2007). Teachers had limited freedom or power to make decisions regarding any form of educational change because of the strong intentions of the statements.
In reality (the stakeholders) usually had their pre-conceived ideas. What the policy makers intended to advise could be contradictory to the policy text recipients’ conceptions since they had their own contextual meaning when reading the policy statements. As a result, assumptions from the statements may result in power struggle between the policy makers and implementers.

6.5 Interpretation of CPD policy production processes and reception

The Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications (ACTEQ) produced the text in 2003, based on public concerns and the Review of Education System Reform Proposal of 2000, which came about as a result of the Policy Address in 1999. The Education Commission’s Report No. 7 in 1997 reads ‘Hong Kong society has a general consensus that the basic principles of education should be 'student-focused’, 'no-loser’, 'life-wide learning’, 'promoting quality' and 'society-wide mobilization’. In the process of education reform, the major task is to enhance teacher professionalism and develop a professional force which is able to implement the new curriculum. In order to achieve the sacred mission, teachers really need great support and measures in different aspects to help them grow professionally.

The first formal systematic arrangements for the professional development of school-based educators were developed in 2002 for principals. For newly appointed principals, The Principals’ CPD Framework provides a professional development programme for the first two years of service. This framework produced a stepping stone on the production of the policy text because teachers’ CPD needs have to be researched, recognized and supported if teachers’ aspirations towards fuller professionalism are to be realized (ACTEQ, 2003).

Historically, Hong Kong has practiced an established tradition of "sharing” out the delivery of professional development to the various, relevant higher education institutions (Dowson, et al, 2003).
However, the policy text constructs teachers’ CPD policy discourse within the framework of Education Commission (2000) seemed to focus on a key element of ‘empowering frontline educators and enhancing the professionalism of principals and teachers’. The reform documentation clearly acknowledges a desire to improve teaching learning standards and accountability across all stages of education.

Changes and improvements in academic structure, curriculum, and instruction and assessment mechanisms at the various levels. The concerns of teacher education included:

…provide learning experiences and opportunities to "develop-broad based knowledge and vision, as well as enhancement of individual students problem-solving power and adaptability" or to "review the functions, contents, focuses and modes of teaching and to strike a balance between the [content] breadth and depth" (EC, 2000: 111-113)

From the above text, the government was eager to issue directives which promoted problem-solving, life-long learning and teaching review in teachers’ professional development. In February 2002, the Focus Group on Teacher Competencies and In-service Professional Development (the Focus Group) was established and tasked with developing a generic teacher competencies framework (TCF) for the reference of both teachers and schools. The policy text expected teacher educators with the responsibility to train both "generalists and specialists" who would have high standards of academic knowledge and language skills. All beginning teachers were encouraged to enter a school system in a time of rapid reform.

But the problem becomes professionally challenging when the "imposition" of standards-based accountability locks teachers into a mode of operating in schools, no matter what efforts are made to reform or shape it (Apple, 2001a). Also, the text was produced for an imposing series of readers, i.e. teachers, school principals and teacher education institutions in spite of their own interpretation of CPD. The government seemed to neglect variables including cultural and historical practices for these readers’ interpretations.
As Fairclough (1992) cautions, different institutions have their complex distribution of variables:

… own patterns of consumption and its own routines for reproducing and transforming texts…Producers within sophisticated organizations such as government departments produce texts in ways which anticipate their distribution, transformation and consumption and have multiple audiences built into them. They may anticipate not only ‘addressees’ (those directly addressed), but also ‘hearers’ (those not addressed directly, but assume to be part of audience) and ‘over hearers’ (those who do not constitute part of the ‘official’ audience but are known to be de facto consumers… (p.79-80)

As stated earlier before in Chapter 2, the policy text relates to some components of the historical documents, such as the Review of Education System Reform Proposal of 2000 and the recommendations of the Education Commission in 2000. It is like a map, providing teachers with “a guide to the world of teachers’ professional development” but the map does not dictate the routes that the traveller has to undertake (ACTEQ, 2003: 9). The government used the Principals’ CPD Framework of 2002 as a blueprint to create a new CPD framework of teacher competency.

Before 2003, teachers’ continuing professional development was implemented in a loosely structured manner and carried out on an ad hoc basis (Ng, 2003). In order to facilitate the dialogue between teachers and schools, generic TCF and its dimensions and domains were introduced to enhance understanding of the CPD concepts and what Fairclough (1992) calls “semantic engineering” which involves articulating around the word and concepts (p. 132). As a result, a strategic CPD planning model through a policy directive helps to compel all teachers and schools to initiate their own CPD. However, diverse policy text elements such as defining CPD principles, incorporating core professional values into CPD planning, advising teachers to apply TCF in policy practice implementation might cause interpretation problems for the discourse subjects. It was because the policy text encompassed a wide range of expectations from its recipients (policy readers and implementers) (Ketlhoilwe, 2007).
6.6 Social practice analysis on teachers’ CPD policy

Since the early to mid-1990s, Hong Kong, like many societies throughout the Asia-Pacific Region and beyond has been engaged in continual educational reform. According to Dowson, *et al* (2003), the success of any reform is dependent not on its rhetoric or its shape but how it is “negotiated” and implemented within a particular system or policy framework. There are differing views concerning the extent of freedom or power that teachers have to make decisions regarding any form of educational change (Vonk, 1991).

Teachers’ CPD continues to become a more complex problem especially when “it is vital for maintaining the morale and enthusiasm of professionally trained teachers”; and it also acts as a process of “revitalization or reflection”, otherwise “teachers may stagnate or even become demoralized” (Ng, 2003). The current policy discourse constitutes the ideology of attitudinal change in which Carlgren (1999) & Sockett (1993) suggested in professionalism (see Chapter 2).

As Janks (1997) puts it:

> Ideology is at its most powerful when it is invisible, when discourses have been naturalized and become part of our everyday common sense. This is what results in writers using a discourse of paternalism unconsciously because it is available. By being there, it and the other available discourses constitute our identities and our constructions of the world. In a time of change, new discourses become available offering us new subject positions from which to speak and read the world. The conditions of text production and reception are gradually transformed. (p.341, *ibid*)

The 2003 CPD policy text could be regarded as historical transformation in policy discourse in the early 2000s. In changing teachers’ and schools’ attitudes towards educational reform, a systematic and coherent CPD policy could be said to be a ‘discourse hegemony’, not only in Hong Kong, but regionally and internationally (Ketlhoilwe, 2007). The role of teachers’ CPD was highly recognized and legitimized in the policy document. Thus, systematic CPD policies have been established to advance teachers’ professionalism in Hong Kong in the new millennium, a phenomenon similar in Scotland, England, Southeast Asia and China (ACTEQ, 2003).
Policy researchers argue that “language is not only an instrument of communication or even of knowledge, but also an instrument of power. One seeks not only to be understood but to be believed, obeyed, respected, distinguished” (Olssen, Codd & O’Neill, 2004 citing Bourdieu, 1997). Since modal verbs of ‘should’ and ‘must’ (discussed in section 6.2.3) were used in the text, it implied that the policy maker was expecting the recipients to comply and collaborate.

6.7 Social analysis of the Interim Reports (Extract One to Four)

Fairclough (2001a) suggests that CDA is ‘a resource which can be used in combination with others for researching change in contemporary social life’ (p.229). It is necessary to investigate other new textual formations before providing insight into the ‘voices’ and experiences of those involved in the policy process (Ketlohoilwe, 2007). As Edwards and Nicoll (2001) remind us, policy texts use rhetoric and metaphor to persuade and influence the reader, another interdiscursive analysis on identifying genres and discourses was drawn to analyze how the key concepts of social interaction were networked in the text.

In critical discourse literature, researchers also propose that ‘interdiscursive analysis may be a fruitful line of enquiry regarding policy networks’ (Volosˇinov, 1986; Evans, 2001). The objective of interdiscursive analysis is to characterize the communicative processes of discourse, including identifying where an element from one discourse is used as an element in another (Haigh, 2011). This borrowing or transfer is called ‘interdiscursivity’ and can give rise to establishment of a ‘super discourse’, which works ‘behind the text’, framing the actual words of a set of communications in terms of the meaning system of either the speaker or the interpreter (Foucault, 1996).
In this research, selected extracts of Interim Reports were analyzed on the domains of genres and discourses as they were related closely to policy texts, rather than on styles. The extracts from policy texts were taken from documents associated with *CPD Policy Document 2003* and they were as follows:

  
  (A follow-up report on the developments and progress made since the introduction of the teachers’ CPD framework in “CPD Document 2003”)

- **Towards a Learning Profession: Third Report on Teachers’ CPD (ACTEQ, 2009)**
  
  (the original document)

The above documents were printed and available electronically on Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualification’s website. Texts from associated policy documents could be referred as a genre chain which promoted a reasonably strong social justice agenda in teachers’ CPD development (Ng, 2003). Particular extracts were selected from sections of each of the documents and they were also highlighted by the use of headings or blockings within the document. The extracts summarized the ‘flavor’ of teachers’ recent CPD development.


This document was directed to the public with a hybrid genre. With elements of policy, political, even promotional, material inside, this glossy publication uses eye catching colour and headings. The use of similar colour on the cover is designed to relate *CPD Document 2003* which symbolically identified the document as part of the genre chain (Weir, 2003).
Extract One – Interim Recommendations: ‘Teacher Participation as a Benchmark for Effective CPD’

This extract was selected from the first section of the Interim Recommendations and it took up nearly a whole page. (Appendix 8)

Interdiscursive analysis:

Professional participation is a major theme of the extract:

The responsibility for professional learning falls on teachers themselves. In the face of the curriculum reform and changes in the wider community, teachers are expected to plan their CPD strategically so that their professional learning can help prepare them for the challenges… (Interim Report, 2006, ACTEQ : p.33)

As a result of the need to meet the reform challenges, the document argues for active teachers’ participation in planning CPD:

…While teachers recognize increasingly that CPD is an indispensable part of their professional lives, they need supportive arrangements and encouragement so that they can take an active part in contributing to nurturing a CPD culture in school. (Interim Report, 2006, ACTEQ: p.34)

Teachers will also change – from being gate keepers of information to becoming life-long learners of professional development. Also, a discourse of institutional surveillance runs through the extract:

…The construction of a cross-school network and community of coordinators of CPD should be greatly encouraged and supported to consolidate individual schools’ efforts in implementing teachers’ CPD policy. The frequent exchange of views and information among CPD coordinators can help narrow the “gaps” between schools in handling CPD matters. (Interim Report, 2006, ACTEQ: p.34)

Fairclough (2001a) points out that governments are increasingly using what are ‘essentially promotional genres’ to bring about change. He explained that communication has become increasingly important in contemporary life, and often for governments this means ‘communicating with’, or ‘to’, the public in a one-sided way – ‘even when the process is ostensibly public ‘consultation’. Through promotional genres, public perceptions are ‘managed’ and new discourses are articulated and become institutionalized (Fairclough, 2001a: 254).
Evidence in this extract signified this assumption. From the above discourse, the role of CPD coordinators was to strengthen the knowledge base between teachers and school communities. When individual schools encouraged more on daily professional exchanges and sharing, a platform for supporting or raising the capacity of both schools and individuals in CPD policy practices was provided.

Extract Two – Interim Recommendations: ‘Professional Discretion’

Linguistic analysis:

**CPD awareness and facilitation** was another theme of this extract:

This was an aspect of the promotional character of the document – the government’s facilitation to the teachers’ awareness is presented. The document was a good example of what Edwards and Nicoll (2001) refer to as a ‘persuasive text’. Professional discretion was presented as a series of declarative statements (Appendix 9):

…In the course of institutionalizing teachers’ CPD practices and building a CPD culture in schools, ACTEQ has been adopting a “soft-landing” approach from the outset… so that CPD can be affirmed as a shared goal among professional teachers.

…This “soft-landing” approach aims to facilitate the realization of the spirit of the teachers’ CPD framework: trust in and reliance on the professionals, and hence teachers’ professional autonomy and school-based decisions in CPD-related matters. The ultimate objective is to advance teachers’ professionalism for school development and hence to improve student learning.

…The target of 150 CPD hours in three years acts as a constructive “pressure” for the entire teaching force. (Interim Report, 2006, ACTEQ: p.36)

The extract was structured to motivate teachers to realize the ‘spirit’ of the CPD framework and they needed to accept the central theme of professional judgement. These statements made assumptions about the possibility of CPD culture in schools with certainty of discursive practices and space that might enable teachers to exercise professional autonomy in planning CPD.
However, it did not consider structural factors in schools. The report stated that ‘there are few problems for the majority of teachers to engage in 150 CPD hours in a three-year period’. But after teachers’ exposure to a wide range of CPD activities, it was difficult to assume that they would logically follow the CPD framework if they were not changing their attitudes and sensitivity to the environment. Also, this extract was intended to leave the reader to accept the possible conditions that may constrain the professional discretion. It also mentioned that ‘…EMB should issue “guidelines” on handling CPD matters for all schools to follow. ACTEQ’s view was that teachers and schools knew best what was most suitable for their professional development, and hence should enjoy discretion.’ It appears to be based on a linear assumption about teachers’ environmental behavior, and simplistic assumptions of agency (Archer, 1996a).

The use of *should* (expressing obligation) and *have to* (expressing necessity) in its recommendations represented a sense of urgency:

(a) The soft target of not less than 150 hours in three years **should be maintained** because this soft indicator is important in order to put CPD on the agenda;
(b) The “soft-landing” approach through which CPD is implemented **should be maintained** as a matter of spirit;
(c) School-based professional autonomy is to be relied on so that teachers and schools can plan and undergo CPD specific to the person and appropriate to the school at a particular time. In planning effective professional development at the school level, the school management and staff have to show full commitment and make concerted efforts to build a climate of trust and open frank communication channels for discussion and exchanges;

The government seemed to have insufficient confidence in teachers’ professional autonomy in CPD planning. It was a long way to witness schools’ progress in developing their systems of recognition of CPD activities. The text indicated that teachers should develop their own sense of responsibility in learning the demands of CPD framework.
Given the assertion that there was an urgent need to advance teachers’ professionalism for school development and to improve students’ learning, issuing top-down guidelines belonged to the government’s responsibility to encourage the discourse of flexibility in policy implementation.

**Towards a Learning Profession: Third Report on Teachers’ CPD (ACTEQ, 2009)**

This document was directed to all Hong Kong teachers and schools as the trial period (from 2003-2006) was ended and a new cycle of CPD was started in 2007. Although the ACTEQ claimed that ‘it is an opportune time to share the progress on teachers’ CPD made in Hong Kong and made recommendations for the coming years’, it clearly exemplified the policy genre. Teachers’ CPD framework related to CPD Document 2003 and its implementation was emphasized in this text.

Here the findings of the ACTEQ 2007 Study persuaded teachers to accept recommendations for sustaining the advances made in teachers’ CPD. The organization of the report linked the document with the original CPD Document 2003 and the rest of the genre chain. This document was more dialogic than CPD Document 2003. In the concluding remarks, questions were apparently directed to the shift of CPD focus from “quantity” to “quality” and “relevance”. The ACTEQ posted two questions to arouse the concern of the entire teaching profession:

a. How effective is our CPD in improving student learning?

b. How might teachers’ CPD be made more effective?

However, although these questions appeared to represent the voice of teachers, they were part of a strategy often used in policy documents to persuade the readers to take up the ideas (discourses) being advanced. More ridiculously, perhaps, this document only provided a review of the CPD principles and research findings from the past few years. Clearly, its major concern was to convince the readers through the policy discourses.
Extract three – The Importance of Teachers’ Professional Development

This selected extract was the introductory message from the ACTEQ to the schools, teachers and the wider community (Appendix 10). Remaining political and informational in its genre, the text was intended to ‘sell’ the importance, urgency and continuity of the need for teachers’ CPD (Ketlohoilewe, 2007). The document wrote definitely the society need and expectations for a high-quality teaching force. The government’s vision for teachers’ CPD reforms was undeniable.

Interdiscursive analysis:

**High degree of professionalism** was highlighted as a theme of the extract on meeting the changes and challenges in the future:

In addition to changes in students’ learning needs and growth, teachers have to adapt the fast advances in knowledge and technologies, different systems and policies, and rapid developments in the wider socio-economic environment. Teachers also have to respond to the expectations of parents and society at large.

Expectations of parents and society were placed centrally and this reflected neo-liberal views of teachers’ CPD as central in educational reform.

Life-long learning for the teaching profession was promoted in the text to signify its importance to contemporary society and economic development:

Schools have to help students develop the capacity for life-long learning and the abilities needed for meeting the changes and challenges in society. Through engaging in continuing professional learning and reflection, teachers can strengthen their capacity for advancing school development and student learning.

(Third Report, 2009, ACTEQ : p.1)

Since the document stressed the importance of strong partnerships with schools, teachers and students, social discourses were also evident. The discourse of partnership actually indicated more democratic relationships. However, Fairclough (2001a) points out that there is a tension between the loosening of central control by governments and their attempts to manage control via the use of partnership discourse and ‘media spin’. Here teachers acted as a major force to promote and implement life-long learning on student and school development. In other words, the policy document was being used to advocate one-way ‘partnerships’ to serve government purposes in education reforms (Ketlohoilewe, 2007).
Extract four – The Current Situation and Progress

This extract offered some promoting discourses in the statements which illustrated the success of a ‘controlled CPD’ for an effective policy implementation. The following statements showed clearly the government’s reference to all Hong Kong teachers – an inclusive vision for everyone in the teaching profession:

(a) For teachers’ participation, the research data and feedback collected have provided fairly strong evidence that most teachers have no difficulty in meeting the “soft” target of CPD hours.
(b) Also teachers had adopted a broader conception of CPD and undertook a variety of CPD activities to enrich their learning experiences.
(c) In general, teachers who had undertaken a larger number of CPD hours had a greater sense of job satisfaction and autonomy. This is an encouraging sign, suggesting a “virtuous circle”: the more CPD involvement, the greater the job satisfaction and autonomy at work.
(d) Over 90% of teachers considered that through teachers’ CPD, all the most important objectives in the “Teaching and Learning” and “Student Development” domains were achieved to some extent.
(e) Teachers generally feel that CPD has strengthened their professional capacity. (Appendix 11) (Third Report, 2009, ACTEQ: p.17-18)

It used a variety of evidence aimed at convincing the readers that some contributing factors and conditions were important to sustain teachers’ involvement in CPD. Bullet points are often used in official policy documents; they may be seen as ‘reader friendly’, but they also tend to be more ‘reader directive’ than discursive texts (Fairclough, 2001a).

The following bullet points summarize those attractive contributing factors and conditions:

• trust and supports from the school management, especially the principals;
• an open and collaborative atmosphere in schools;
• respect for and sensitivity to teachers’ diversity;
• schools’ support for appropriate arrangements in terms of teachers’ workload, facilities and time;
• the provision of opportunities for observations, collaboration, innovation and feedback.
From the above analysis of brief extracts, CDA was applied to explore how language works in policy texts especially when there were hybrid genres and competing discourses. It was obvious that the social discourse of teachers’ autonomy became a ‘silence’. By analyzing and explaining the linguistic issues, it was possible to more easily find implications for how policy texts were read, implemented, and how they might be used by policy makers (EDB and ACTEQ) and the major stakeholders (schools and teachers).

6.8 Summary

Using Fairclough’s (1992) three-dimensional framework, the 2003 CPD policy text was analyzed with regard to the processes of text production, distribution and consumption. Although the core focus of this research (see section 6.2) was confined to those statements specific to teachers’ professionalism, the analysis has demonstrated how language was clearly important in struggles over teachers’ CPD policy. This critical discourse analysis of the policy statements revealed that policy statements could be directive, imperative, authoritative and obligatory leaving the reader with limited chances for innovative actions (Ketlhoilwe, 2007). The government presented the policy document with power and it left the agents with limited options but to accept the policy processes. It was clear that the statements of the policy text informed the readers to be accountable or responsible for the implementation of the policy.

Since deconstruction of text (textual analysis) identified “systems of material and discursive articulation in which meaning and the processes of signification are affected by power” (Olssen, Codd & O’Neill, 2004: 53, cited in Ketlhoilwe, 2007), CDA was applied to ‘denaturalize’ text “thereby showing how representations within texts mask the sources of their status and authority” (Olssen, Codd and O’Neill, 2004: 69). In order to draw attention to the voices of teachers’ autonomy in the policy implementation process, the social discourse of their interviews will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN: POLICY INTERPRETATIONS THROUGH INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

7.1 Introduction

This chapter analyzed the data obtained from three main sources: focus group meetings with teachers, individual interviews with a key policy maker (former Chairman of ACTEQ), and teachers in-charge-of CPD in the case study schools. This allowed the researcher to gather specific information from specific participants selected from different positions along the policy trajectory (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). As a large volume of information emerged, the interview data was then divided into three major areas as indicated in Figure 7.1.

Figure 7.1 Framework of Interview Data Collection, Processing and Analysis
Data collection was completed from the above-mentioned sources to compare the data obtained from both primary (CPD Document 2003 & Interim Reports) and secondary (institutional) documentary analyses. The analysis consists of three sections. The first section presents a brief description of interview data sources and the basic information about the specific participants. The second section lists the descriptive and selective codes reduced from the interview data. The third section presents themes and insights of the participants on CPD policy trajectory as well as their responses to the research questions.

7.2 Description of interview data

The sample population of the study consisted of twenty-one teachers (18 teachers for focus group interviews and 3 teachers in-charge-of CPD) and one policy maker (former chairman of ACTEQ). All the participants were involved in the policy trajectory of teachers’ CPD in various ways. They were, therefore, the stakeholders in the professional development of teachers. The teachers who participated in the research were also beneficiaries of the CPD policy and programs to a certain extent, whilst the teachers in-charge-of CPD were policy implementers, and the policy maker from ACTEQ produced the policy on teachers’ CPD.

Presentation of the outcome of interview data analysis preceded an overview of the three major data sources. The sources of interview data were used to draw out results and follow the sequence of the three research questions (see Appendix 12). Beginning with a description of demographic characteristics, Table 7.2.1 presents a summary of background information on the teachers who participated in focus group and individual interviews. The ratio of female to male teachers (66.67% to 33.33%) was quite consistent with the general gender ratio for teachers in the Hong Kong primary school system. Because of gender imbalance, the researcher ensured inclusion of at least two male teachers in the focus group meeting in each case study school. The aim of the selection of a sufficient number of male teachers for the study was to identify different gender perceptions and beliefs related to the scope of this research.
Table 7.2.1 Characteristics of the Participant Teachers in Focus Group Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group (Years)</td>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>&lt;01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01 – 05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06 – 10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>27.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and Professional Qualifications</td>
<td>Diploma in Teaching</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Certificate &amp;Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*PGDE, M.Ed</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Specialization</td>
<td>Lower Primary</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Primary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in school</td>
<td>Class / Subject teachers</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject panels</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Schools</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government-subsidized school (with 30 classes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school (with 24 classes) run by a local charity organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>private school (with 18 classes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PGDE= Postgraduate Diploma in Education (a one year postgraduate course for existing bachelor's degree holders leading to become a qualified teacher)

The sample consisted of a mixture of teachers with long and short service periods in different types of schools. It was expected that participants would express their perceptions on CPD policy text production, implementation and practices from their experience gained throughout their teaching career history. Thus, the researcher gathered information from both less and very experienced teachers.
The professional qualifications varied from Teacher Certificate to Master’s Degree level. It was expected that this sample of teachers holding different qualifications would express their views on CPD from different angles and perspectives. The researcher sought on teachers’ CPD across all areas of teaching specialization. The majority (66.67%) of teachers were teaching in the upper primary which comprises Primary Four to Six. The rest were evenly distributed among the lower primary levels.

To ensure a diversity of information gathered for the study, three types of schools were represented in this sample and they were the most common types in Hong Kong. It was expected that school culture would affect teachers’ perceptions of CPD policy. Table 7.2.2 provides background information on the teachers in-charge-of CPD included in individual interviews.

Table 7.2.2 Characteristics of the Participant (Teachers in-charge-of CPD) in Individual Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group (Years)</td>
<td>&lt;35</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 – 40</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 – 45</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a teacher</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a teacher in-charge-of CPD</td>
<td>05 – 07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08 – 10</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and Professional Qualification</td>
<td>Diploma in Teaching</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Certificate &amp;Degree</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGDE, M.Ed</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the participants were chosen from different ranks (50% were subject or class teachers and 50% were panel teachers), their professional competency in teaching and diverse experiences in school affairs would be likely to influence their views on CPD. All three teachers in-charge-of CPD were women who had 16 or more years of teaching experience within the range of 16-20 years or more and two of the three were aged in their early 40s. Two of the three had more than 7 years of experience in-charge-of CPD. The outlook of these three participants on the broad area of teacher continuing professional development might be expected to differ from the teachers in focus groups because of their experience in teaching and school administration. It was expected that they would vary little in their perceptions and beliefs on the matters of CPD policy trajectory because of similar professional qualifications.

An individual interview was conducted with the key policy maker (former chairman of the ACTEQ) and his background information is indicated in Table 7.2.3. He had had extensive experience as a teacher educator and a Professor in tertiary education. Furthermore, being a CPD policy maker over ten years, he had a broad understanding of teacher professional needs and his direct involvement in the construction of the CPD policy document enabled the researcher to check inferences drawn from different data sources. It was expected that his commentary and views on the origins and the underpinnings of the drafting of the original policy document would provide valuable insights in answering the research questions.
### Table 7.2.3 Characteristics of the Policy Maker (Former Chairman of the ACTEQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>60-66 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a Teacher Educator</td>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a Professor</td>
<td>14 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a CPD policy maker</td>
<td>Over 10 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Education (Management &amp; Planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD (Planning &amp; Policy Analysis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.3 Descriptive codes reduced from interview data

This section presents the codes derived from the interview data. All the responses from the teachers, teachers-in-charge-of CPD and the policy maker were obtained from focus group meetings and interviews. Additional information was gathered through the review of memos and the researcher’s field notes. Some participants gave identical answers and answers to some questions were expressed in an informal way. This made it difficult to code effectively. For example, when asked for comments on the opportunities for individual CPD planning at school, participants described the areas of the CPD document or the learning hours. Sometimes, the respondents gave similar answers to other specific questions. As a result, answers or feedback was simply categorized relative to major research questions and analyzed under different themes.

In order to structure the codes in a more systematic and meaningful way, the researcher used the policy trajectory as a framework to present categories from the constructed meanings of the respondents within the context of the research (Sarantakos, 2005). Different codes were assigned to reflect the respondents’ perceptions and perspectives on the specific research questions.
By reading to identify and code recurrent patterns in the content of the text, it was possible to identify similarities and differences in what was being said, identifying linguistic repertoires or “clusters of terms, descriptions and figures of speech” as the “building blocks used to make constructions or versions of cognitive processes, actions, policies and other phenomena” (Sarantakos, 2005, p.310).

Table 7.3.1. to Table 7.3.3. show the descriptive and selective codes developed from individual and focus group interview cases and they were related to the elements of policy trajectory.

Table 7.3.1 Codes used to develop themes in the context of policy text influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy Text Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Origins and Objectives of CPD policy | • CPD is developed and initiated as a government policy to promote continuous teacher training in local schools.  
• It is not an outcome of national and external influence but a long term education policy to increase professional quality in teaching.  
• With no specific format for developing teachers’ CPD policy, it is expected to have an observed outcome not through CPD quantity but to establish a CPD culture through implementing the policy framework as an established CPD platform.  
• The time is ripe to initiate an aggressive teachers’ CPD policy because teachers are the final target of change with regard to educational policy.  
• A task force with different stakeholders worked to issue the policy document.  
• The issue of teachers’ CPD policy has a final objective to foster regular school interpretation of its own basis of developing a reasonable and acceptable CPD.  
• Schools have their responsibility to issue a more comprehensive CPD policy not only for enhancing teacher competency levels but also for future school improvement. |

Sub codes:  
(long-term policy, observed outcome, established CPD platform, professional quality, school interpretation)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Knowledge of CPD</th>
<th>Participants’ interpretation (focus groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub codes:</td>
<td>• ‘CPD’ is a means to become a ‘professional teacher’, a system used to achieve ‘self-improvement’ in teaching career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(skills development, self-improvement, quality assurance, school-informed)</td>
<td>• Teachers are eager to develop skills in specialized subjects or other aspects of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘CPD’ is a vague term to the teachers as most of them only know the requirement of the CPD hours through school-informed announcements or meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is little knowledge of the CPD policy document as schools only promotes the fulfillment of CPD hours as a quality assurance in teaching and professional ability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. Opportunities for CPD participation & planning | The access to CPD activities are either school-enforced or accredited to individual teachers. |
| Sub codes:                                          | • Courses such as workshops, seminars or schools’ collaborations are assigned as a means for “informed professionalism” with a focus on developing the skills of teachers in the areas of literacy, numeracy and student development. |
| (school enforcement, subject-specialism, personal interest fragmental to teaching, flexible participation) | • Teachers choice of CPD activities are mostly on school improvement or subject development. Some courses are not related to personal interests or even tangential to teaching pedagogy but theory-oriented. |
|                                                   | • Schools have some guidelines for teachers to formulate their own CPD plans. They are offered certain freedom or flexibility in choosing CPD activities. However, expanding workload and insufficient time minimize teachers’ own motivation towards CPD participation. |

| 4. School perspectives on CPD policy | • Adopting the compulsory enactment of the CPD policy ensures a school to have adequate bargaining power to survive competition in local market. |
| Sub codes:                           | • Most schools offer opportunities for reassurance, and support their own CPD in order to promote improved values of practice in one’s teaching career. |
| (executive necessity compulsory enactment, coherence to school vision) | • A clear CPD vision provides an important focus of commitment among staff. However, it seems that personal learning goals often have to give ways to school improvement priorities, and CPD is clearly viewed as an explicit part of a larger whole-school direction. |
| 5. School development incentive | • There is a positive attitude of schools in Hong Kong to fulfill the CPD requirement of in order to equip teachers with a high professional ability in teaching.  
• CPD leaders and other senior management staff work with a strong incentive to motivate teachers’ participation in internal and external CPD activities.  
• Due to survival needs, most schools started CPD planning before the publishing of the CPD document.  
• CPD policy does foster professionalism and promote more all-roundedness in teachers’ learning. As a result, schools do promote more professional sharing and collaboration.  
• Most teachers believe the collective benefits of CPD to be more important – including addressing immediate school needs, working with colleagues and improving students’ learning as distinct from identifying or meeting their long term career goals. |
|---|---|
| Sub codes:  
(self-motivating, survival needs, professional team spirit) |  |

| 6. Organizational and leadership support | • Schools leaders believe that certain CPD practices represent value for money and they are more eager to find ways to support teachers in CPD participation.  
• Schools encourage teachers to follow the guidelines set on their own and this mediates the gap between teachers’ own professional interests and school priority needs.  
• Some schools incorporate different levels of teachers into the PD (professional development) committee and this allows greater flexibility in teachers’ representation with regard to their voice in CPD planning.  
• When more teachers are promoted to the management ladder, the increase representation in CPD committee will help minimizing the effect of accreditation in future CPD planning. |
|---|---|
| Sub codes:  
(clear management support, increasing representation) |  |
Table 7.3.2  Codes used to develop themes in the context of policy text production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy maker’s interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Intention of issuing CPD policy | • The CPD policy document enhances the motivation of schools to implement CPD as a school improvement policy.  
• The policy document is used as a framework to help individual schools bridge their disparities in initiating CPD policy.  
• Teachers will take initiative and follow the policy because of the ‘soft requirement’ in counting their CPD.  
• It’s a trend of ‘change’ in educational reform on the belief that continuing professional participation in CPD activities will lead to ‘un-monitoring professionalism’.  
• The CPD policy document is an important issue for school improvement and will be adopted because representatives and principals have participated in the production of its policy text.  
• The EMB has an intention to produce the policy document as a ‘platform’ to consolidate the concepts of CPD in local schools. It is something necessary but not additional. Teachers can be persuaded to regard the CPD document as an ‘effective tool’ to plan for their professional development.  
• Only a sample of teachers were taken to represent the teachers’ population in CPD policy production. This was done in an effort to guarantee teachers’ understanding of the policy document. |
### 2. Processes of policy production

**Sub codes:**
- CPD policy awareness, questionable attitude, school-based production, limited understanding, teachers’ reflection, teachers’ willingness, loosely encouragement, regular CPD framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ interpretation (focus groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Teachers tend to have a greater CPD policy awareness when the schools incorporate the planning of teachers’ CPD in their “school improvement” or “year plan”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The majority of participants have some suspicions and doubts about the real goals of CPD policy because their participation in CPD is largely directed to those activities beneficial to school or subject development rather than career development. However, schools do allow teachers some flexibility for choosing their own CPD interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The school-based CPD policy was mostly subject-oriented and it was a progress after the disclosure of the CPD policy document as most schools then adopted a more systematic approach in CPD policy implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teachers still have limited understanding of the Teachers Competence Framework as they have little chance to read the details of the policy document. The limit of 150 CPD hours in a 3-year cycle is insufficient according to teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is a popular view amongst teachers that they can convey their needs of CPD directly to schools. However, they oppose schools making the policy compulsory because their interests have been very poorly represented in the policy production processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some teachers advocate an ideology of professional maturity in planning their own CPD but it is very dependent on their willingness to learn and the ability to obtain satisfaction from CPD participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The use of a teacher development profile, a self-evaluation form and teacher comments on school-based CPD policy has initiated a growing support of professionalism within local schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The majority of participants agreed that the CPD document was a useful tool for providing guidelines for professional development. At the regional level, teachers considered the Education Bureau should take responsibility for providing resources to enrich teachers’ knowledge as well as their professional competency because the EDB CPD policy is a top-down driven process. At school level, teachers believed that their learning should be broadened within a regular CPD framework. They also believed that the policy actors at both school and regional level should create a balance between school improvement and personal interests and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participants’ interpretation (CPD in-charge)

- Most schools follow the CPD policy document and adjust their particular interests and concerns issues which are changing every year. They aim at using it as this framework to plan for their own needs. As a result, professional teamwork is sometimes neglected.
- Some schools set up a teachers’ PD committee to follow the guidelines of the TCF. It is not difficult to meet the requirements of the CPD hours but teachers are often troubled about how to calculate correctly and the quality of CPD activities is never guaranteed.
- Unfortunately, often only the leader responsible for CPD studies the document carefully before producing the school-based CPD policy. Some schools have created a short and easy-to-read document or do encourage teachers to read the hard copy of the TCF guidelines but it depends very much on teachers’ willingness to read the lengthy document.
- Most CPD leaders did perceive the school-based CPD policy as a means to raise teachers’ teaching and learning ability. Some believed that if teachers followed the school policy, they would have no problems in satisfying the professional development requirements.
- Teachers were considered by CPD leaders to have enough opportunities to express their views and interests in future school-based CPD policy production. Although they had a discussion in mid-term review or through appraisal, they were required to attend the arranged courses before they were fully informed about their content and mode of delivery.
- It seemed that most of the teachers understood their school’s intentions of initiating CPD policy because they received lots of information from circulated documents. However, many found it hard to achieve their goals in professional learning due to excess workload and lack of study time.
- Most CPD leaders thought that the school-based CPD policy offered a clear process to deliver teachers’ professional needs. Records of attendance courses and questionnaires were effective ways to collect teachers’ opinions. A complete evaluation system helped assess the progress of teachers’ CPD.
Table 7.3.3 Codes used to develop themes in the context of policy practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Practice</th>
<th>Policy maker’s interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CPD policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub codes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(top-down policy, reform leads to change, an abstract issue, step-by-step CPD framework, success in landing approach, embedded concept)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The EMB/ ACTEQ sent some copies of the CPD document in 2003 to all local schools. Some seminars introducing this top-down policy were held by the district education officers to encourage teachers to familiarize themselves with the policy document.
- All government school heads followed the TCF in planning their own CPD and such a phenomena flourished in other subsidized schools with the aim of increasing or at least retaining enrolments.
- The ACTEQ wanted all local schools to implement the CPD policy within their own school improvement plans. It was promoted as a reform to encourage professionalism. Once teachers accepted it as a routine task, the real outcome of the policy would become clearer over time.
- The staff development day or professional development day was used as a starting point to promote teachers’ CPD after 2003. At this particular historical time, there was no compromise on the process for implementing the CPD policy. Instead this abstract issue was largely limited to a discussion about quality and quantity.
- As the quality of the profession was of ultimate importance, the EMB/ ACTEQ set up a step-by-step CPD framework to ‘comfort’ teachers. Presenting their belief that the government truly understood what teachers needed for the sake of professionalism.
- To some extent, the government succeeded in launching a ‘soft-landing’ approach to CPD policy to all local schools within the first few years. Some survey research was cited with convincing indicators stressing the success of implementing the teachers’ CPD policy.
- The policy maker believed that teachers should have an embedded concept that they were the products of a changing society and that their professional consciousness required them to accept CPD as an ongoing but natural process of educational reform towards professionalization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Modes of CPD implementation</th>
<th>Participants’ interpretation (focus groups)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub codes:</td>
<td>• Most teachers argued for the incorporation of different modes of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(quantity</td>
<td>CPD activities in staff development days in order to maximize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or target-oriented,</td>
<td>the time spent on effective CPD. However, some schools only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systematic</td>
<td>focused on reaching the quantity of the CPD hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but slow participation)</td>
<td>• Some schools had no regular CPD timetable from 2004 to 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or even had any direction what CPD activities and hours should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There was a great diversity in the progress of CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation. Schools that divided the courses into various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>choices for teachers to decide and select seemed to have higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPD flexibility. While some others would just follow the TCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guidelines, were waiting for a systematic but rather slow change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in CPD participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional exchange or visits outside Hong Kong, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inter-school co-teaching and sharing seen were by the focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups to more beneficial in be more increasing teachers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge and expertise in teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Perceptions on CPD practices</td>
<td>• Teachers felt that they had too much of a passive role only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub codes:</td>
<td>listening but little opportunity to participate in CPD planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(passive practices,</td>
<td>since most of the courses were presented by principals,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of quality assurance,</td>
<td>vice-principals or PSMCD (curriculum development teacher) to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject-oriented,</td>
<td>the target participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gains on professional growth)</td>
<td>• Most teachers considered that the nature of CPD programs were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more important than the venue where they were held. The lack of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality assurance in CPD activities as well as limited choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tended to make them frustrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers felt that some CPD content and modes were rather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>useless and that only those longer duration courses related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subject teaching were more effective and reliable in increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their CPD knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some said that it was necessary to force the less experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers to take some courses but that a certain degree of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freedom should be given to them to avoid stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most teachers agreed that the CPD hours and activities broadened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their horizons on teaching and stimulated their thinking, causing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>them to have positive attitudes towards CPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CPD practice environment</td>
<td>Participants’ interpretation (focus groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sub codes: (comfortable environment, valuable changes, positive encouragement) | • Schools usually offered a non-threatening environment in which to allow teachers to develop their own CPD. However, teachers were always puzzled about choosing suitable CPD programs. Compulsory nomination of programs was considered unfair and only hindered the progress of CPD participation.  
• Nearly all participants were keen to have valuable changes in their professional growth. If the teachers were more aggressive to add value for promotion, they might achieve more professional learning instead of following the CPD policy.  
• Teachers expressed their perception that most schools did a good job in speeding up the CPD progress. Positive encouragement would help teachers feel enthusiastic to achieve the required CPD hours. Everyone should know and understand about the CPD policy and knowledge-of-practice is important for future professional development. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Support of CPD practices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sub codes: (reluctant to support, accept without pressure) | • Although teachers were quite familiar with the school-based CPD policy, most of them accepted it but were not enthusiastic about it because schools forced teachers to attend courses for their own improvement.  
• It seemed agreed by the focus groups that those schools which did not include on CPD policy in their school year plan actually put less pressure on teachers and as a result the teachers were more inclined to adopt the CPD culture. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Insights for future CPD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sub codes: (open consultation, resources or capital release, long-term policy support) | • Many teachers believed it was meaningless to have compulsory CPD hours since every teacher was trying their best to achieve their professional competency.  
• CPD policy and its implementation should strike a balance between compulsion and open consultation with the top teaching population.  
• CPD has a good influence on individual professional growth, making teachers reflect on their ability and attitudes about becoming a real education ‘professional’.  
• The government should release more capital and resources to motivate teachers and schools in planning their future CPD. CPD policy makers should consider a longer-term policy and reducing teachers’ workload to create more free time for CPD. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Engaging in CPD practices</th>
<th>Participants’ interpretation (CPD in-charge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sub codes: (practically assigned task, positive mindset) | • Teachers now had opportunities to engage in CPD practices every year. They needed to finish the assigned task such as sharing teaching experiences with colleagues, attending courses or workshops to meet the subject or group aims regardless of whether they enjoyed it or not. Some should focus their professional learning on more practical issues.  
• If teachers had a positive mindset, they would find that different types of CPD activities were effective in promoting professional change regardless of how much time they had previously engaged in the activities or how useful the studies were. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Effective control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sub codes: (regular setting, well-adapted strategy, professional exchange, concrete but varied) | • Most schools set a regular three-year plan in developing their own CPD. Adjustment or amendment could be made to satisfy their school priorities or yearly issues of concern.  
• A well-adapted strategy had been adopted to suit the changing trend of CPD activities such as organizing joint school staff development days or having trips for professional learning outside Hong Kong.  
• Teachers preferred sharing sessions most valuable for professional exchange in curriculum affairs, student development or teaching pedagogy.  
• Although there was no big difference between schools regarding CPD practices, more concrete but varied forms of CPD participation helped the speed and direction of the progress of CPD. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Policy acceptance or resistance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sub codes: (accept and coordinate, resist with support) | • Most CPD leaders had experienced significant changes after participating in the planning of teachers’ CPD activities. They were more able to take into account individual interests before integrating school improvement needs into future CPD planning.  
• Some of them learned to accept and coordinate more with other colleagues in discussing the CPD issues, thus producing a more supportive atmosphere in school-based CPD culture.  
• It seemed that most teachers were well-aware of the school-based CPD policy but some resisted because they were under stress. |
All CPD leaders admitted the fact that effective school-based CPD policy pushed teachers to raise their self-efficacy in terms of teaching and learning.

Most teachers were familiar with the practice of CPD whenever a new policy was implemented in their schools but management support was often not adequate enough to cater for their individual differences. It is hoped that the government or the policy makers will, in future, give teachers more autonomy in planning their CPD. To make professionalization more effective, more resources should be provided at local school level to reduce the effects of too much standardization in CPD policy.

The above coding clearly helped clarify the responses from the various policy players and actors. They provided useful background explanations about policy acceptance and resistance and this provided a deeper insight into emerging but related issues, which had not been foreseen by the researcher (Lalitha, 2005). Providing a relaxed atmosphere is important for the acquisition of trustworthy data (Cohen, Mansion & Morrison, 2000, cited in Lalitha, 2005). All participants were quite willing to have informal discussions with the researcher, although some were more articulate than others and tended to speak on behalf of the group. Based on the participants’ perceptions of what seemed more appropriate and relevant in the context of policy discussion, the researcher was able to successfully modify the nature of questions and create a relaxed and effective interviewing atmosphere.
7.4 Themes and issues emerging from interview data

As interviews were coded, themes and insights which emerged from the data were placed into categories. For example, if the respondents questioned the necessity of drafting the Teacher Competencies Framework, or commented on the compulsory enactment of school CPD policy, they were placed under a coded ‘teachers’ CPD conceptualization’ category. This study adopted Bogdan and Biklen’s (1992) basic method of organizing words and phrases from interviews under coding themes and categories. These methods allowed the researcher to sort interview data, so that the words bearing on a given topic could be separated from other words for discussion (Lalitha, 2005). This section presents six themes explored from the interview data on teachers’ perceptions concerning the development of CPD: ‘conceptualization of teachers’ CPD in policy’, ‘knowledge and reactions to CPD policy’, ‘access to, and participation in CPD’, ‘ownership of CPD’, ‘effectiveness of CPD activities in policy pratice’ and ‘reflective practice in CPD policy implementation’. All these themes are explained as separate entities but they are interconnected with the concepts and contexts discussed in the literature review. It is understood that these themes played a role in teachers’ decisions to accept or reject the CPD policy within this policy trajectory study.

7.4.1 Conceptualization of teachers’ CPD in policy

In discussing the conceptualization of teachers’ CPD policy, the view of the policy-maker was particularly important in reflecting the expectations of the EMB (especially the ACTEQ) on policy text influence. The CPD Policy Document 2003 advocated infusion of the generic TCF (Teacher Competencies Framework) across the formal professional development system as an appropriate approach. The chairman of the ACTEQ advised all schools and teachers that “ACTEQ has been careful in deliberating the conditions and support with which the recommendations can be most effectively implemented, whilst causing the minimum disturbance to the practices of teachers.” (ACTEQ, 2006)
This view was further supported by his interview. He summarized the authority’s conceptualization and approach to CPD policy:

In the process of implementing CPD, most of the time is spent on discussing its feasibility. We think that what is crucial is not the quantity but to establish a culture. We allow the schools to interpret the policy and set up their own basis but some principals may standardize the requirements while some others may implement the policy flexibly. Disparities mean that some schools may ask teachers to do so, some may just wait and some others may even make a false report. The most ideal case is that it becomes their habits. Therefore, a platform was offered at that time for the change of norm, making everyone accept it not surprisingly, think that it is something necessary for professionals. After we disclosed the document, we didn’t have any monitoring, that is superintending and policing. It is hoped that it will become some routine task when it comes down to the staff at a lower level. However, we have to observe for a few years more for the real outcome of the policy. (Former Chairman of the ACTEQ, 2 June, 2009)

It was clear that the policy maker conceptualized teachers’ CPD policy in relation to an expected outcome of a long-term development policy in order to increase teachers’ professional quality since teachers were the final target of change with regard to educational policy. It also emerged that the government wanted to use this policy framework as a convincing tool to establish CPD culture at that particular historical point of time. With the final objective to foster regular school interpretation of a reasonable and acceptable teachers’ CPD, the policy document was designed to reduce the discrepancies between local schools and teachers in continuous professional training and development.

However to a certain extent, the responses from other interviews (focus groups) about the concepts were different. Some respondents felt that they needed to follow the compulsory enactment of school CPD policy...because we need more bargaining power to survive in local market. Whether the policy is necessary for everyone, and whether the policy is useful for everyone are questionable (RST 2 and 3 from School A). Another respondent argued that...it is required by the government. The school hopes that the teachers can have higher qualification, so it follows the instruction (RST 4 from School A).
It emerged that schools had offered opportunities to support CPD due to their needs to create high value teaching career. *It seems to be a trend. It is like an executive necessity for teachers to take more and more courses for further education. If the school wants you to be responsible for certain area, you will be assigned to have trainings for that particular area* (RST 5 and 6 from School B).

The respondents shared their conceptualizations of what they think CPD entails. Some saw it as a school mandate for staff commitment. But often their personal learning goals went beyond school priorities. One of the respondents indicated his concern, *Actually, teachers’ professional development is required to be in harmony with school development. It is clearly designed to be top down* (RST 1 from School C). It seemed that most of the respondents admitted the fact that they were under pressure to accept a concept that was consistent with the school’s broader CPD policy and priorities.

From the perspective of school, CPD was the means by which the school was used as a ‘survival tool’ for satisfying government and community expectations:

It is thought that if the professional abilities of teachers are high, the school is strong in developments on the whole. That’s why teachers must have professional developments for sure. …The government leads and the schools work it out. Even if the government didn’t lead, our school had already emphasized on teachers’ professional developments before 2003. Decline in teachers’ teaching ability results in decline in students’ standard, leading to the minimization of the number of classes. Therefore, our school have done it in order to survive. (RST 2 CPD leader from School B).

Also another respondent pointed out the importance of having a more all-round CPD policy as *… it is a general atmosphere. If we want to change our curriculum, there should be professional development. Teachers should equip themselves well to fit the change of curriculum.* (RST 3 CPD leader from School C).
With regard to the concept of improved professionalism:

But before the publishing of CPD Policy Document 2003, we may just focus on one or two items such as teaching and learning or students’ development. We may have neglected the professional teamwork. As the change of curriculum, teachers have more chances to share their experiences. This is what I mean professional teamwork. (RST 1 CPD leader from School A).

A recent trend illustrated that the school was a ‘learning community’ where all were committed to fostering a positive climate for continuous learning amongst its community. The CPD leaders attributed positive attitudes towards a strong incentive to motivate teachers’ participation in professional teamwork. It emerged that now with the concept of a holistic CPD policy, the school was able to motivate and develop its community. In fact, most CPD leaders from schools spoke for the advantage of organizational and leadership support in teachers’ CPD policy:

Teachers can apply for some courses according their own preferences, interests and abilities. There are a lots available online e-services and teachers have great flexibilities in choosing the courses. As long as the time is allowed and the principal arranges for it, teachers can go out for developments (RST 3 CPD leader from School C).

They clearly stated that the school was allowing a greater flexibility for teachers to express their particular needs in CPD planning. Two of them stated:

Although we have a teachers’ professional development committee. The committee members have changed many times. At the beginning, there were representatives from different aspects, such as students’ development, IT development and staff responsible for managing staff. Recently in this year, there have been some changes. We focus on the panel head of different subjects. Panel heads should promote more professional teamwork in their subjects and the culture of lesson observation (RST 1 CPD leader from School A).

Teachers from different subjects can discuss and we should report. Teachers can then realize what different subjects need and what development they need. Teachers can foresee how they should go the next year. (RST 2 CPD leader from School B).

What is reflected in this theme is relevant to the literature on both CPD definitions (see 2.2.1) and the changes of teachers’ conceptualizations (see 2.3.1). No matter how differently the school and the teachers interpret their concepts of CPD, it is agreed that a more comprehensive CPD policy brings about desirable changes to school and professional development.
7.4.2 Teacher knowledge and reactions to CPD policy

A central emerging theme was teacher’s knowledge and their reactions to CPD policy. If teachers have a clear knowledge about what CPD policy is, and if they have a positive attitude towards the policy, professional development is more likely to be effective in improving their knowledge and skills. Garet et al (2001) noted out that teachers’ belief of sustained, ‘long-term’ professional development has a greater effect on changing practice than shorter professional development. This echoed Day’s (1999) definition of CPD which focuses upon teacher’s learning within a broader change purpose:

It is the process by which, alone and with others, teachers review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching; and by which they acquire and develop critically the knowledge, skills and emotional intelligence essential to good professional thinking, planning and practice with children, young people and colleagues throughout each phase of their teaching lives. (Day 1999b)

When the teachers talked about their knowledge of CPD, one admitted that “it is a system in the career of teaching which aids at self-improvement of the teachers”(RST 3 from School B). Others got the concept that teachers need to pursue further education to improve their teacher skills in order to become a professional. I think we should, via continuous education, absorb more knowledge related to teaching or beneficial to teaching in different aspects (RST 1 from School B). Some indicated that they were eager to develop their specialized skills in teaching and learning. In view of teaching, teachers may learn some more updated teaching methodologies. Very often, the amount of time our teachers spent on professional development is more than the stated one because many of our teachers are eager to make progress (RST 1 & 2 from School C). It can let teachers to have development for their teaching and personal belief. (RST 3 & 4 from School C).

This theme also supports the ideas reviewed in 2.2.2 and 2.3.2 as it acknowledges the effects of professionalism and recognizes the significance of global development of teachers’ CPD, especially when teachers were found motivated to learn and grow as professionals from their involvement in their self-directed professional learning.
### 7.4.3 Teachers’ access to, and participation in CPD

The interview data on access and participation showed that opportunities to participate in CPD and teachers’ participation in CPD were closely related. Teachers took advantage of the opportunities presented to them as one of the respondents said, *I will accept any mode provided that I can learn from it. I will welcome and enjoy any mode of delivery which is beneficial to me* (RST 2 from School A). *Sometimes I need to attend the talks on holidays. If the workshops or talks are not held during school days, we have to attend them at weekend* (RST 5 from School A).

However, these opportunities were mostly limited to in-school and out-of-school workshops. It seemed that most teachers had limited opportunities to attend varied and relevant forms of CPD, especially in the early stages around 2003. Some respondents echoed this fact. *I don’t like talks which concentrated on either one aspect or listening to talks from some experts. I prefer a talk that incorporated both elements of theories and sharing* (RST 3 from School A). *And sometimes the subject is not suitable for us as some courses target certain class of audience and some may not be related to the field that we are interested in. If all the colleagues need to join, not all will feel interested* (RST 1 from School B).

There was improvement after 2003 with more opportunities provided to teachers as they progressed through the career stages and took on more responsibility in the school. Teachers tended to choose CPD activities in favour of school improvement and subject development. *In the past, teachers might focus on attending courses, such as a master qualification. Now, it is more balanced and more practical. It can be scientific research or leading subject activities* (RST 3 from School C). *As for my own preference, I will put a higher priority of work and school over my preference if time is limited. The workshops or courses I joined are related to my own subject. I can apply what I’ve learnt in those workshops or courses in my teaching* (RST 4 from School C). Teachers were prompted to follow the guidelines of the CPD policy document for one or two reasons: either for individual interest and/or because they enforced to do so.
There were variations in the criteria for choosing CPD activities. Some reflected that their decision was based on personal development and interest: When I choose the courses, I will consider my weaknesses and see whether the workshops and courses provided target at my weakness or arouse my interest’ (RST 2 from School A). What I would consider are also my interest and whether it is useful. Whether the course can improve my knowledge about the subject comes next. By taking this course, I hope to promote my qualification to master (RST 3 & 4 from School A).

Some preferred courses with strong practical application in the classroom and school environment. I will look at the usefulness of the courses and preference. I want to learn something that I can apply to my daily practice (RST 4 from School C). I put my own preference as the first priority. Then, I will choose more courses related students’ emotional problems and discipline problems (RST 5 from School C).

Others tended to be less motivated because they were required to participate. In general, the quality of CPD activities is not very good. It depends much on the speaker. To come across with some high-quality courses is difficult or I should say it may be a bit fragmental (RST 4 from School B). And sometimes the subject is not suitable for some of the participants. Some courses target certain class of audience and some may not be related to the field that the participants find interesting (RST 5 from School B). It is the school that assigns you to take certain courses. Most of these courses we take are assigned by the school (RST 2 from School B). Quite an interesting picture emerged where some teachers felt that school authorities offered them some flexibility in CPD decisions but enforced them in some aspects. We are free to a certain extent to plan for our further education. Of course, there are some workshops that are compulsory under the school’s policy. I think I can make my own choice to suit the CPD requirements. But we have no choice on those assigned by the school (RST 5 & 6 from School B).
From the school leaders’ perspective, most teachers were given enough opportunities to access CPD, not only in planning, but also in their choice of activities. *In 2003, we made a document for our colleagues so that they should know about it. Teachers can apply for some courses according their own preferences, interests and abilities.*

‘There are a lots available online e-services and teachers have great flexibilities in choosing the courses. For the school based workshops, we hope the person in charge makes a questionnaire to evaluate responses. We will read the data to see how our colleagues feel and whether it is useful* (RST 2 CPD leader from School B). Teachers were offered different evaluation channels to express their opinions and to assess CPD such as appraisal related to CPD development, hard copy policy document circulation or mid-term reviews. *In fact, our school prepares some questionnaires for teachers at the end of a school year and they may be asked whether the workshops held by school suit the needs of their school work. Most of them are positive about the workshops held by our school* (RST 3 CPD leader from School C).

The above theme of teachers’ knowledge and understanding of CPD showed factors that affected teachers’ access to and their participation in CPD. It further confirmed the background to the development of the teachers’ CPD policy document as reviewed in the contextual literature (see 2.3.3). The more opportunities given by the school authority to encourage teachers access and to participate in CPD, the higher the demands have been put by the government on the shoulders of teachers as professionals. Although very few schools were actually reluctant to make CPD policy compulsory, they still faced problems of satisfying teachers’ CPD participation due to excess workload and lack of study time.
7.4.4 Teachers’ perceptions of ownership of CPD

According to various authors, effective CPD should firstly be aware of and address the specific needs of teachers (Bredeson, 2003; Muijs, Day, Harris & Lindsay, 2004). Connolly and James (1998) also stated that “Teacher ownership of CPD is a feature of highly effective schools, as are creative CPD opportunities.” In many cases, the schools confirmed that effective teachers should take ownership and give a high priority to professional development.

The data from the case study schools revealed that the majority of teachers were aware of their ownership since most schools had incorporated the CPD policy in their yearly development plan. When the school asked us to have professional development, it should have mentioned the policy. Yet, we have not read the policy in detail (RST 1 from School A). In fact, teachers’ CPD needs to match the direction of the school development. When the school wants you to be responsible for a certain area, you will be assigned to have trainings for that particular area (RST 4 from School A).

But some teachers experienced the tension between personal interests, needs, and the demands of local and school initiatives for the time spent on professional development. In a certain extent, we are free to choose the activities but there is a restriction that all teachers need to complete 150 hours of activities within 3 years. To me, I oppose making this policy of 150 hours compulsory. As an automatic and a professional teacher, we should not be forced in this way (RST 2 from School A).

There often appeared to be strong pressure to comply with school agendas with regard to CPD needs and provision. Some voiced their unwillingness and dissatisfaction during the policy implementation process: ‘Sometimes, I did not want to register the workshop, but I was asked to go. If it was more flexible for me to choose, I would choose those I’m interested in’. ‘Those designated ones might not suit our interest, but they are just to meet the requirements of the quantity’ (RST 3 & 4 from School B).
However, in some schools teachers tended to be more autonomous and they had a greater sense of ownership and were able to choose or prioritize CPD activities. In this way, they worked as a team because *All the teachers do not mind whether it is a ‘hard’ or a ‘soft’ pointer and they know the principle of it is not to affect the school teaching. Or if the school thinks that the course is beneficial to you, it will allow you to go* (RST 2 from School C).

Clearly some of the teachers were to support CPD ownership because they had more sophisticated understandings of the processes of school-based CPD development and structures. One respondent confirmed this point: *I think my colleagues have development on their own. Yet, it is very systematic that the school has divided the courses or workshops into several aspects for you to have developments. The school has some guidelines for our reference but the flexibility is high* (RST 5 from School C).

It is evident that the CPD leaders generally exercised some oversight over teachers’ CPD ‘ownership’ since a regular three-year development plan was established to supervise the school’s progress of CPD. As one of the leaders said, ‘*We have set some requirements for individual colleagues. For example, there must be someone to attend the courses. They must fulfill the requirements, no matter whether they like it or not*’ (RST 2 CPD leader from School B). Thus many types of CPD were developed and accepted as ‘reasonable’ by teachers provided that the government’s direction was tempered with a degree of flexibility.
7.4.5 Effectiveness of CPD activities in policy practice

Edmonds and Lee (2002) noted that “a supportive school ethos and an expectation that all teachers engage in CPD have been found to be important factors in securing change as a result of CPD.” CPD activities have been found to transfer more easily into changed behaviors and teaching practices if there is a good fit with individuals' professional and personal values and if professional development approaches already exist in the organization (Knight, 2002). Evaluation at its best will provide not just an overview of whether CPD itself has been successful, but will also have strong positive learning benefits to teachers in the school (Knight, 2002). There was already a strong assumption so teachers from most schools did not need to be persuaded of the importance of professional learning for supporting students’ learning.

However, many teachers did not place much value on CPD activities because schools still over-emphasized the key target of CPD hours. One of the respondents questioned this point, ‘Who set the limit of 150 hours? Why is 150 hours considered to be enough? Or why is 150 hours considered to be inadequate? That is how 150 hours is drawn up. Have I had enough professional development after I have finished the 150 hours activities? (RST 1 from School A).

Others commented that their school had set no specific direction for implementing CPD activities, other than quantity, from 2004 to 2007. ‘It seems to have no direction to implement different modes of CPD activities. Yet, the school just emphasizes the quantity. To reach the number of hours for the development is a clear target.’ ‘The number of hours is the only thing that we need to pay attention to’ (RST 3 & 4 from School A). This is further supported by another respondent, saying that ‘My school has not put much emphasis on this policy. We need to submit the number of hours finished. I don’t feel that the school is highlighting this policy’ (RST 1 from School B).
The benefits of CPD also varied by school and teacher characteristics. Many teachers were reluctant to participate in planning their CPD, mainly because school-assigned modes were prevalent in most cases:

For those major subjects, I guess school may probably assign teachers to join the workshops or courses according to the need for school development, but taking these workshops or courses is not based on staff’s preference. For those minor subjects, the situation may be a little better (RST 2 from School C).

Likewise, teachers were frustrated with the limited modes of CPD activities: Sharing sessions, workshops, talks with guest speakers and teacher’ development days are the common modes. The choice of topics is very limited (RST 5 from School A). Inconvenient times for attending added pressure to some of the respondents: Some may be held on school days but it is a trend to hold courses on Saturday. We understand that we should satisfy the requirement but it is hard to adjust our lives (RST 1 from School A).

In the smaller case study schools, it seemed that CPD hours and activities were helpful in progressing teachers’ professional growth: I prefer workshops or school visits about how the schools operate. It makes no difference whether the activities are held inside or outside schools (RST 3 from School B). They argued that CPD activities were sometimes effective in increasing their professional knowledge, especially if the activities could operate over a longer duration: You will not receive much except for those long courses. Our horizons are broaden during long courses, as we can appreciate how the others think and in this way stimulate us to think and improve our attitude towards some issues (RST 2 from School B). For those longer courses which may involve more than 10 to 20 or 30 to 40 hours, the learning outcome will be better (RST 3 from School C).

It seems that CPD was not only effective in fostering individual teacher’s professional growth but it could also have a positive impact in promoting the spirit of teamwork and sharing.
Another respondent claimed: *Compelling teachers to take certain courses is sometimes necessary. Due to the heavy workload shared by most of the teachers, very few colleagues are willing to attend these courses if they are free to choose for themselves* (RST 1 from School C).

While teachers had different perceptions on the effectiveness of CPD, leaders in-charge of CPD highlighted that they were trying their best to incorporate CPD into the life of the school, both in policy and development: *According to EDB, there should be a three-year school development plan. In fact, we have set the plans for every three years. But as the society and trend keep changing, we adjust and amend each year. School based curriculum, collaborative learning and self-learning are the common themes. When the relevant issues change, the strategies used will also be adjusted* (RST 2 CPD leader from School B).

Another respondent placed value on the strategy that the school adopted in providing varied forms of CPD participation: *In the past, we seldom used the teachers’ professional development day. Now, there is more variety. Subject-based workshops, collaborative sharing sessions, trips to other schools and curriculum seminars are planned during three professional development days and colleagues find them really useful, more practical and concrete* (RST 3CPD leader from School C).

It is obvious that CPD leaders who discussed CPD effectiveness, always related the purposes of CPD to ‘identified school needs’ but the CPD described by teachers often lacked a coherent focus. Also teachers mostly argued that CPD was usually tied to professional development plans or collective decisions rather than personal development choices.
7.4.6 Teachers’ reflective practice on CPD policy implementation

Different researchers have argued that The purpose of CPD programmes should be to both enable and support teachers, wherever they teach or whatever their professional background is and to provide the best possible instruction so that they become excellent by gaining competence, confidence, commitment and a sense of the joy of teaching (Anderson, 2001; Day, 1999; Day & Sachs, 2004).

Lessing & De Witt (2007) also suggested that:

CPD is necessary to empower teachers by giving them the necessary confidence, knowledge and skills. If teachers can value the CPD activities positively in terms of personal development, confidence and teaching support, they will indicate a willingness to change their teaching habits and methods. Thus, the change would contribute to the development of whole school growth.

In this research, teachers often stressed the importance of their input into deciding CPD opportunities. The majority of them wanted to drive their own CPD context: Mainly the principal and senior staff determined the CPD context. Although some other colleagues are asked to help, they are the ones who plan and we are the ones to follow (RST 1 & 2 from School C). After the PSMCD, it comes to the subject panels and then teachers. We can only choose the courses recommended by them and attend other courses that we are interested in. There is no specific group or team responsible for professional developments in our school (RST 4 & 5 from School B).

When asked about who is the most appropriate in planning CPD, one teacher said: Of course myself because learning is a personal need and I think we will always have some sort of say in enhancing our professional development (RST 6 from School B). The teachers often claimed that having themselves involved in the decision-making around CPD will increase their motivation and this would make CPD more enjoyable: Teachers are the users so that they are more familiar with that policy. From my standpoint, teacher professional development should be organized by teachers. If teachers come away with what they really needed for their classroom, they will feel more enjoyable to further their professional planning (RST 2 from School A).
When teachers were asked to identify the atmosphere of the policy practice environment, they usually spoke in terms of their own reflection on school-based encouragement. Some stated that We have a professional development committee. Our school campus caring team will talk with us about our progress in professional development regularly. Actually, teachers’ professional development needs to be in harmony with school development. It is clearer when it is top down (RST 1 from School C).

The policy directive was confirmed to be ‘acceptable’ by a few respondents. One declared I think our colleagues are quite familiar with this because they have to fill in the number of hours and what aspects the courses, workshops or talks they attended in the table by themselves every year. We are not under pressure as it is just a guideline (RST 2 from School C). On the contrary, others were doubtful about the value of the policy document: It is sure that no one is really pleased to accept this policy. It remains to investigate whether they accept the policy with discontent or just accept it without any comments (RST 2 from School B).

On the whole, the CPD activities were valued as tools to upgrade teachers’ knowledge, address specific needs and inspire them in their teaching practice. The majority of teachers acknowledged the importance of CPD and felt that the sacrifices they had made were worth it: Professional change is good in nature. What we called ‘change’ is to share our experiences with others. I believe that the school and every teaching staff all benefit from the change but it depends on how the changes are carried out (RST 5 from School A). Nevertheless, many teachers were still unsure about how to count the CPD hours in their ‘self-evaluation’ practice: After the disclosure of the document, we had to take record in more details, such as the types of the courses. I think that they understand the general ideas such as how to distinguish the types of courses. Yet, not every teacher pays attention to the details of the guideline (RST 1 & 2 from School C).
Most teachers hoped that the government, or the policy makers, would give greater consideration to teachers’ autonomy in CPD planning. The EDB, as the policy planner, has to set up the whole framework and consider the feasibility and the workload of teachers before introducing the policies one by one (RST 6 from School A). To look for future long-term policy support, it will be necessary for the government to release more capital and resources:

Perhaps, EDB can hold some longer-term courses specifically targeted at teachers’ professional development. It can even be specifically targeted at a particular subject and a particular item. Also, the money spent to employ substitute teachers should not be that tight. Teachers can be more relaxed to go out for a workshop for a whole day or a week or whatever so (RST 5 & 6 from School C).

Criticising both the quality and over-emphasis on quantity of the existing CPD practices, many respondents demanded a more flexible type of CPD provision especially in achieving professional competency:

It should not use set the number of CPD hours to restrict the teachers. Rather, it should implement some framework or set some instructions to clearly guide the schools to work out some long term CPD policies. What is so called continuous development for teachers is not limited to subjects (RST 5 & 6 from School B).

Even one of the CPD leaders questioned the effectiveness of the criteria mentioned in the policy document:

Now it is required to fulfill the 150 hours of development within three years for all teachers. I’m just wondering if it is possible to cater for individual differences. Teachers who entered the career with different number of years, should have different requirements instead of standardization. For those more experienced teachers, they can fulfill less CPD hours because of their experience. But for those newly entered or less experienced teachers, they can have more trainings and professional development? (RST 1 CPD leader from School A).

It seems clear that a better balance should be struck in order to create a compromise between government and school directives on the one hand and teachers, personal and professional needs on the other, with regard to the interpretation of CPD policy.
7.5 Summary

This chapter has revealed the interviewees’ perceptions of what they thought the CPD policy implied. It emerged that although teachers were receptive to change, some were puzzled about how to integrate CPD as it applied to their career professionalization. It also became clear that the government was willing to enforce CPD as a ‘necessary’ innovation into the teacher professionalism process. Although the EMB and the ACTEQ were concerned to ensure clear guidelines so that the policy would filter from the macro to the micro levels, many teachers were still perplexed and left with varied interpretations of policy statements and approaches.

Those schools and teachers who provided positive responses to this CPD policy initiative were largely driven by their sense of responsibility and professional obligation. Through interviews it was apparent that although schools developed their own initiatives to introduce the CPD policy into their own development plan, there was both direct and indirect top down direction from government, via policy documentation, to ensure successful implementation of CPD practices.

Progressive action was taken on the Government's side to develop a policy that legitimized CPD into the teaching profession. It also became apparent that the interview respondents were essentially pro-policy, although some expressed disappointment with regard to the ‘vagueness’ of the policy (Ketlhoilwe, 2007). The effectiveness of CPD activities and the passive sense of CPD ownership let the teachers ‘off the hook’ when their ‘voices’ and experiences of CPD planning were ignored or neglected at the expense of school interests. The next chapter will focus on validating the findings with primary documentary (cross-case) analyses.
CHAPTER EIGHT: POLICY CONSTRUCTION AND IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

8.1 Introduction

In order to validate the findings from the questionnaire and triangulate the themes analyzed from the interview data, case studies are appropriate where the objective is to study contemporary events, and where it is not necessary to control behavioral events or variables (Yin, 1984). Yin further suggests multiple-case designs are desirable when the intent of the research is description, theory building, or theory testing. In this research, there were three main purposes of launching cross-case analysis: to draw patterns from similarities and differences in the study cases, to aid in interpretation of results from statistical analysis of the survey data (data analysis from questionnaire on Chapter 5) and to serve as a further test of validity / reliability through comparison of interpretation of interview data (on Chapter 7) with case study findings (triangulation).

This chapter presents findings in three sections. The first section presents an overview of the case study schools from policy construction to policy implementation. Information in each school is summarized individually to outline a clear picture of the processes and practices in CPD context. The second section presents the results or patterns of an analysis across cases of various aspects related to the process of CPD implementation. The last section lists overall findings about CPD policy trajectory, with responses to the research questions.
8.2 An overview of the case study schools from policy construction to policy implementation

Three local subsidized schools were selected to provide data from CPD policy construction to policy implementation. In order to extract common themes, the data presented in this section was not synthesized across all these schools. Using the information to plot the characteristics of individual schools at different stages of the CPD journey, some patterns about the findings were identified to validate the survey and the interview data.

Information for each school was summarized to provide a fine-grained picture of the processes and practices involved in a yearly based school development context. The first one (School A) illustrated key features of fairly strong strategic teachers’ CPD planning in school development, which operated for more than five years, commencing in 2003. The second (School B) explained the steps being taken towards a more systematic approach to CPD planning. The third (School C) explored how the approach to CPD in a small school might be different from that of mainstream schools because of limited resources in the school context. To present the data collected in these case study schools, a framework was designed around four components influencing the development of CPD derived from the research explored in Chapter 6 and 7. Data were summarized around four areas:

- The school processes to develop and evaluate CPD strategy
- The opportunity for teachers to participate in CPD planning
- The opportunity for teachers to learn in CPD programs or activities
- The measures taken to assess teachers’ professional change
8.2.1 School A, a pilot school with strategic CPD planning

This is a large government subsidized school in a rural area, with 30 classes. It was formed in 1990 by a merchant with two half-day schools in the same venue. In 1998, the school succeeded in obtaining a new site from the government and it became a whole-day primary school. The school performance levels, as measured in government tests, increased significantly over the last ten years, showing that the school succeeded in developing a very evident culture of mutual respect amongst and between teachers, students and parents. Upon the release of CPD Policy Document 2003, the school authority and the principal accepted the invitation of the Education Bureau (EDB) and it became one of the pilot schools with strategic CPD planning in 2004. As a result, there was a strong school leadership committed to creating and sustaining a climate of continuing teachers’ professional development.

The school’s processes for developing and evaluating CPD strategy

Little (1994) argues that because teachers’ CPD is often viewed as a means of implementing reform or policy changes, this can serve to mask questions relating to the fundamental purpose of such activity. She therefore suggests that one test of teachers’ CPD is ‘its capacity to equip teachers individually and collectively to act as shapers, promoters, and well-informed critics of reforms’. With the above concept in mind, School A undertook changes and adopted different CPD models in the process of developing and evaluating its own CPD strategy. From 2004 to 2007, the purpose of CPD was conceived mainly as fulfilling the function of preparing teachers to access, and accept the policy document, and implement reforms. The first three-year CPD plan was designed to align with the training, and deficit models in order to support a ‘transmission’ view of CPD which necessitated the increasing capacity for professional autonomy (Kennedy, 2005). To pilot CPD planning with EDB, a CPD committee was formed by the vice-principal with the Primary School Curriculum Leader (PSMCD) and the members of the school development function group.
Following the Teachers’ Competencies Framework published in the policy document, the committee considered that it had responsibility for teachers’ CPD, and that everyone is a learner, and every learning opportunity is important to motivate teachers for their own professional development. To develop an effective CPD structure and to promote a self-evaluating school culture was the aim of the three-year CPD plan. Before the drafting of the year plan, the committee liaised with different departments, explaining the identified target items: a regular time-table for implementing CPD practices, modes of CPD activities and the criteria for fulfilling CPD hours. Each member of the CPD committee was linked to a particular group of panels and senior teachers of different departments to ensure that there were checks and balances in the system and that every member of staff was getting the support they needed.

The principal worked closely with the local higher education institutions. This partnership played a key role of consultancy in teachers’ CPD because individual members knew the school well and they also brought in external expertise and perspectives. When there were new learning opportunities for teachers, the school applied a whole-school approach to help the staff gain access to new CPD knowledge. The PSMCD worked with these education institutions on projects linked to school priorities such as conducting the staff development days, school-based workshops or seminars, giving opinions on strategies, on subject teaching, and function group development.

To obtain a full review of teachers’ learning and practices, the Friday after-school sharing sessions acted as a tool to assess the effectiveness of CPD programs and activities. Teachers worked with their colleagues to conduct workshops or seminars after lesson observations or coaching. In fact, the school considered that the staff could learn to collaborate well and, through this platform, teachers were given space and time to innovate and take risks in their CPD.
Also, with strategic planning for school-based CPD, the school applied a more systematic performance management (PM) system in the second three-year (2007-2010) CPD plan. Evaluation of teacher learning outcomes was carried out through departmental lesson observations, co-teaching and appraisal meetings. PM was used like benchmarks from the TCF and was always targeted on teachers’ teaching to reinforce student learning and linked to support through the setting of targets. The CPD committee kept in touch with subject-panels and function group leaders to make sure they were giving learning support to teachers in need. The committee required the panels and function group leaders to conduct three meetings each year: one to plan, one mid-year to review, and one at the end to assess. Information from questionnaires and teachers’ interviews provided evidence for CPD leaders to reconsider the target setting and accountability frameworks and CPD development processes.

This system enabled participants in the policy processes to identify, regulate and re-establish their wants and needs in their future personalized CPD.

The opportunity for teachers to participate in CPD planning

School A provided the staff easy access to the CPD policy document through the school intranet (electronic CPD), with hard copies kept in the CPD committee and the school library. All new teachers were required to read the document before signing the contracts of service and all in-service teachers could contribute their ideas to the yearly review of the CPD plan at the end of the school term.

According to the responses of the teacher-in-charge of CPD (PSMCD), various methods and procedures had been used or followed for collecting data on teachers’ professional needs.
The CPD committee announced the details of the yearly CPD plan at the first staff meeting and teachers could express their opinions to the senior teachers within one week. Informal discussions with colleagues, PSMCD and vice-principal were allowed in level meetings throughout the year. After departmental lesson observations, co-teaching and appraisal meetings, the committee received written information from the subject panels, leaders of the function group as well as the principal. At the end of the school year, teachers were requested to give written information about their professional needs into the columns available in the ‘Study Record’. Questionnaires were also sent from the PSMCD or the vice-principal for gathering insights.

If a member of the staff was concerned about his professional needs or wants, he or she could direct opinions to the ‘angels’(the more-experienced teachers paired up by the school as their mentors or coaches in teaching and learning). However, there were some differences between the CPD leader and the teachers’ responses. Even though several methods had been used to fulfill the tasks, not all teachers expressed their professional needs in the same manner. The reasons were as follows:

1. There was a change of the CPD committee membership to include more panel heads and less classroom teachers. *Since panel heads should promote more professional teamwork in their subjects and the culture of lesson observation, their representation is more important to reinforce teachers in teaching and learning* (RST 1 CPD leader from School A). Teachers with no subject-oriented or function group base thus lacked opportunities to express their views.

2. CPD was still a ‘vague’ term in the minds of the teachers because only the new teachers had to read the policy document. One of the respondents stated, *The school has announced that it was not a strictly compulsory policy and then it was not strictly enforced. Also the school told us the policy during some routine meetings. All we need to do is to finish 150 CPD hours within three years’* (RST 5 from School A). Some teachers were not clear about the TCF and they had no avenue to voice their needs or some were too shy to tell their ‘angels’.
3. When making comparison between CPD strategy and implementation practices, the school emphasized that the CPD activities conducted were well targeted on the teachers’ professional needs.

Another respondent expressed a similar point of view:

_The PSMCD emphasized that the school’s CPD needs to match the direction of the school’s development. We have categorized teachers’ needs as “outside” and “inside” needs. We have done our best to be aware of individual professional change_ (RST 6 from School A). Teachers thus wondered whether their ideas would actually be considered or not during the school year.

4. Teachers had mixed feelings about what the policy said because they were extremely busy. They clearly knew that there were different items and aspects in the TCF but they were not very familiar with the details. To complete the questionnaires or provide written opinions in the Study Record was an added burden to some of them. Frequent lesson observations, busy co-teaching schedules and even current meetings increased their daily workload. It emerged that the more complicated the performance system required to collect data about teachers’ professional needs, the less the willingness of participants to express freely their opinions in their own CPD planning.

_The opportunity for teachers to learn in CPD programs or activities_

Because School A had a clear CPD goal, it experienced a linear process in its CPD strategy, in a way that a series of systematic and progressive programs and activities were planned and initiated to help teachers meet the criteria of the TCF in the successive school years. The staff development plan set challenging CPD targets for teachers and they were supported in their efforts to achieve their own goals in different stages.

For the first three years after the pilot scheme (2004-2007), the school consciously used the staff development days as a CPD opportunity for extracting inside or outside resources to deploy its policy. Staff picnics, inter-department competitions or even buffets after teaching reviews were organized to encourage team spirit and increase the morale of the staff in teaching.
CPD was structured as a means to introduce or enhance teachers’ knowledge and skills in teaching because one-third of the staff were newly graduated teachers. With an ultimate aim to provide quality development, some off-site CPD training activities were offered to update teachers’ competencies:

- Workshops in enriching language proficiency in teaching.
- Seminars about the ways of conducting effective cooperative learning.
- Debates about enhancing team spirits in teaching.

It seemed that the school first adopted the training model of CPD which supports a skills-based, technocratic view of teaching whereby CPD provides teachers with the opportunity to update their skills in order to be able to demonstrate their competence (Kennedy, 2005). Although the CPD committee agreed with Kennedy’s (2005) point that “the training model of CPD is compatible with, although not always related to, a standards-based view of teacher development where teachers strive to demonstrate particular skills specified in a nationally agreed standard”, the feedback from the teachers showed that the courses attended were questionable in quality assurance terms.

Lesson observations by subject panels and the core members of the teaching and learning assessment team were structured to monitor individual competence performance. Regular meetings of function groups (once every two weeks) also helped review teachers’ progress in other aspects of teaching and learning. But such an approach was not a useful scaffold for professional development since teachers were not clear about the school’s expectations in individual competency and they were passive to reflect their values in teaching.
In the year 2007 after the second three-year CPD plan was launched, the committee changed the CPD strategy to create more learning opportunities. The ‘transformative model’ of CPD was seen to be adopted on the notion of ‘CPD as a means of supporting educational change’ as suggested by Hoban (2002). An integration of the coaching and mentoring as well as the ‘community of practice’ model was issued to increase the partnership between the school and the teachers. For example, each new graduated teacher was assigned to pair up with an ‘angel’ (see p.157) who sat nearby and he or she was guaranteed as a ‘supporter’ in teaching skills coaching or to provide ‘counselling and professional friendship’ in mentoring (Rhodes & Beneicke, 2002). Lesson preparation and peer sharing sessions were also arranged to enhance professional learning where relationships were established by dialogues sharing with colleagues. The CPD committee was eager to apply the concept of apprenticeship, where the experienced teacher initiates the novice teacher in the profession. As Kennedy (2005) explains Smyth’s (1991) argument for a model of ‘clinical supervision’:

*This initiation, while including support for the novice in gaining and using appropriate skills and knowledge, also conveys messages to the new teacher about the social and cultural norms within the institution. It allows for the two teachers involved to discuss possibilities, beliefs and hopes in a less hierarchically threatening manner.*

To create a more post-structural approach to school-based CPD, the school improved its policy practices by adding the concept of ‘learning community’ to establish a more effective self-learning and evaluating culture. On Fridays after school, special sharing sessions in teaching strategies were organized to help teachers share ideas, reflect their opinions upon current classroom practices and even collect feedback from colleagues in the assessment of teaching competency. Themes and concepts of ‘learning community’ were also discussed regularly in seminars or workshops to internalize individuals’ understanding of the model of community of practice.
This echoed Wenger’s (1998) definition of social theory of learning which recognizes that ‘learning within a community of practice happens as a result of that community and interactions, and not merely as a result of planning learning episodes such as courses’. Wenger (1998) also argues that ‘negotiating a joint enterprise gives rise to relations of mutual accountability among those involved’. Inter-school observations and the planning of overseas studying and exchange trips allowed the members of the community (teachers in school context) to exert a certain level of control over the CPD agenda. It seems that the school has gradually achieved a more explicit awareness of issues of power to teachers when CPD agendas were being addressed through the process of a balance of ‘enquiry’ and ‘practice’ (cited in Kennedy, 2005 defined by Hoban, 2002).

*The measures taken to assess teachers’ professional change*

Huberman and Miles (1984) observed that “Any change that holds great promise for increasing individuals’ competence or enhancing an organization’s effectiveness is likely to be slow and require extra work.”

It is obvious that professional development must be seen as a process, not an event in order to be successful (Loucks-Horsley et al., 1987, 1989). Our school believes that ‘all CPD participants were not regarded as merely feeding ducks but were practice and experienced-oriented learners responsible for their own learning (RST 3 of School A). This matched with one of Corcoran’s five factors affecting effective teacher professional development: “Teachers recognized as professionals and adult learners and teachers having active roles, choosing goals and activities for themselves” Corcoran (1995). To make sure every teacher was receiving the learning support they needed, the CPD team made use of staff expertise to offer in-school development practices as well as assessing individual professional change.
Measures were taken to help teachers evaluate their own professional change:

- Through joint observation and peer teaching, teachers are supported by their mentors or coaches and they can obtain feedback to improve their teaching skills.

- The Teaching Assessment Committee offers regular lesson observations and sharing in order to supervise the quality of teaching and learning. This enables teachers and convince them that the tasks in their work can be accomplished and evaluated with professional standards, norms and conditions.

- Evaluation and feedback from lesson preparation and learning circle (teacher study group) encourages dialogues, openness and mutual feeling of ownership (Huberman, 1995) which improves the mindset of the individual teacher.

- Regular subject meetings provide teachers opportunities to reflect after practice in the classroom. By working in teams to design and present teaching pedagogy, teachers can gain recognition of their efforts and they will become active participants in their professional development.

- Departmental or function group reviews is another way for teachers to assess their professional growth. Through self-assessment and reflection on their pre-determined targets not only in teaching but also in daily practices, teachers can identify the changes in practice needed to promote learning and take the responsibility for developing their own professional planning.

- Annual appraisal meetings (half-yearly) conducted by principal and senior teachers of the CPD team collected teachers’ opinions on their professional change. Grades and comments were given on personal goals, achieving improvement of teaching practices, relationships with colleagues in the working environment, and attitudes towards self-actualization in teaching and learning.
It appears that the school always valued the opportunity for teachers to exchange and expand on their valuable experiences with their professional colleagues, so it understood and respected the nature of teachers as adult learners. On the whole, the school adopted the observation / assessment model of teacher professional development developed by Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1989) with the assumptions that “teachers learn most effectively when they have a need to know or a problem to solve and that those at the work-site will have the best understanding of what is required to improve their performance.” Peer observations, coaching and teamwork in teaching practices created collaborative learning experiences, made teachers feel supported and ensured that participants built connections between their beliefs and experiences. As Clouder (2000) and Frey and Alman (2003) emphasizes:

> These group practices help schools build a learning community in which teachers can have continuity in their learning goals and receive support to improve their instruction from a learning network.

### 8.2.2 School B, a school with a more systematic approach towards CPD planning

School B is a medium government subsidized school in a rural area, with 24 classes. It was formed in 1989 by a religious organization merging two half-day schools in the same location. School B succeeded in acquiring a new site from the government and it was changed to a whole-day primary school in 2000. Ever since the start of the School Based Management Policy in 1995, the school had played an active role in the local community with a network of partner schools with the aim of becoming a ‘shared vision and practice of learning community’. The school also witnessed a shift away from the development of individual teachers to the development of the school as an institution (Lalitha, 2005) because during the 1990s, teachers, students and the school came to be regarded as a whole system in relation to the professional development of teachers. Although it was not an EDB pilot school in CPD policy implementation, school B seemed to have a good concept and goal towards developing a more systematic approach towards school-based CPD planning.
The school’s processes for developing and evaluating CPD strategy

Surrounded by housing estates in the rural area, School B seemed to have realized that professional development could not be separated from school development and that professional development and school improvement go hand in hand (Fullan, 1991). It was demonstrated that School B, relatively early on, recognized that the ultimate goal of CPD was to change the culture of learning for both teachers and students, in order to promote universal engagement in the goal of school improvement.

It had realized that CPD is reflected as a vision of excellence and is an essential component of the school improvement process (Killion, 1995). Prior to the release of the CPD Policy Document 2003, the teacher-in-charge of School B’s CPD had declared that the purpose of CPD was to ‘create a general atmosphere that will help equip the teaching staff well enough to fit the change of the curriculum’.

At the same time, CPD was the responsibility of the PSMCD and there was no ‘proper menu’ of CPD processes. All that existed was an annual CPD plan to record CPD hours for individual teachers and teachers were not under any pressure to meet the guidelines of a CPD policy document. For the first three years after 2004, it was an individually-guided professional development model (as defined by Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, 1989) and teachers simply set their own learning agenda in CPD. The main features of this model were:

- The majority of teachers identify their own needs and interests to learn;
- They develop their own plans with outcomes indicated;
- They proceed and participate in various learning activities;
- They summarize and evaluate their own experiences.
According to Clark (1990), this model is characterized by teachers being reflective professionals and this allows flexibility in professional development and the opportunities they offer for choice and individualization. He also suggests that because teachers have directed their own development, the learning should result in lasting change in practice. However, School B appeared to have gradually recognized that it was difficult to monitor the great variety of professional development activities going on inside or outside school, as evidenced below. Fullan (1993) notes that CPD programs can be very time-consuming and costly and may lack social interaction, and their outcomes can be unpredictable due to the variable quality, which depends on the ability and commitment of the participants.

In order to develop a more balanced and practical teachers’ CPD, a professional development committee (PDC) was formed in 2007 by the vice-principal with the PSMCD and the school campus caring team. Using the Policy Document 2003 as a guideline, the committee began to develop an effective three-year CPD plan. Before drafting each year plan, the committee designed a time-table for calculating the amount of time for CPD planning each year. Members of the PDC discussed and evaluated progress regularly. Each subject or function group was asked to make decisions according to their own needs. With reference to the school development and improvement plan from 2008 onwards, the PDC divided the courses and workshops into different aspects and an item of ‘teacher professional development’ was set in every school committee’s agenda in order to identify teachers’ CPD needs.

A central element in the teachers’ CPD model was the cooperation with School B’s supervising and sponsoring body, a district religious organization. A Common Education Day was conducted every year to link up schools with the same religious background to create a more all-rounded professional development plan. Staff development days, school-based workshops and scientific research were provided to ensure professional collaboration and sharing.
When teachers were encouraged and conscientiously involved in the process of understanding what was required to improve their performance, the school seemed to make good progress in its development of its CPD processes (RST 1 CPD leader from School B). Like the practices in School A, School B invited professionals situated in close proximity to form a ‘School Circle’ to share experiences, to solve problems, exchange resources or even update on innovative teaching and learning strategy which strengthened the networking effect for school improvement (Turbill, 1993). As the school-based CPD planning was becoming more mature, the school applied a more systematic planning in the second three-year (2007-2010) CPD plan. Departmental lesson observations, co-teaching and subject meetings were held monthly.

The PDC committee kept in touch with subject-panels and the school campus caring team to give support to teachers in need. Every Wednesday afternoon there was a one-hour school development meeting and each had a clear CPD focus on ‘hot and specific’ issues in teacher learning. Mid-term and annual review from questionnaires and teachers’ interviews provided evidence for CPD leaders to set targets for next year’s CPD development processes. When participants generally have a strong interest in the problems and issues addressed, they are more committed to finding workable solutions and their work has direct relevance to their professional responsibilities (Lalitha, 2005).

It seemed that School B had adopted Turbill’s (1993) cluster school idea in order to maximize the physical and human resources in enhancing professional development and it appeared to be a preliminary success in ongoing CPD planning.
The opportunity for teachers to participate in CPD planning

Since School B was not an EDB pilot school, it gradually changed its CPD strategy. For the first three years after 2003, the school applied a ‘loose’ but certainly ‘top-down’ approach to create opportunities for teachers in CPD planning participation. There was a belief that ‘professional development needed to be in harmony with school improvement’ as explained by the PSMCD. With no committee to organize and supervise CPD programs or activities, teachers were on their own to look at their roles and positions before planning their CPD. However, some courses such as seminars and workshops were chosen by the PSMCD to develop individual teachers’ competency or improve the learning standards of students. Sometimes the teaching staff could apply to attend courses according to their own preferences but the whole CPD planning was directly linked with the school improvement plan and departmental improvement plan.

It was also based on a range of school requirement such as:

- Subject or departmental priorities according to the direction of the school authority;
- Performance management with reference to teachers’ appraisals;
- The needs of the school, function groups and departments through mid-term or annual self-evaluation;
- EDB priorities in school-based CPD.

Also, the staff development days were largely perceived as a top-down delivery model of CPD, where information on methods was imposed on teachers for them to implement. Such lecture-style teaching has proved unpopular with teachers, who tend to prefer more active and practical styles of learning (Edmonds & Lee, 2002). It is noted that Dadds (1997) describes how such top-down delivery can reinforce the idea of the teacher as a technician, uncritically implementing externally imposed policies.
Similarly, School B began to realize that an awareness of less formal and traditional forms of CPD was slowly growing, with calls for teachers to become more creative in their approaches to their own professional development, and move away from more traditional transmission-based methods (Muijs et al, 2004).

In the year 2006, the Professional Development Committee was formed in an attempt to increase the teachers’ CPD representation and raise the morale of the whole school community. The vice-principal and a team with the PSMCD took over the planning of future CPD and a more democratic approach was adopted to acknowledge the importance of CPD ownership. There was also a change, incorporating representatives from different aspects of the school development and panel heads of the subject departments. The PDC made a list of teachers’ development records and called meetings with teachers in groups to discuss the effectiveness of their learning.

Detailed CPD surveys were undertaken to evaluate the targets, program priorities, self-fulfillment, satisfaction and the effects of teaching on students’ learning outcomes. It seemed that the school had gradually realized the advantages of an individually-guided model of professional development that allows teachers to set learning goals and build upon their strengths. However, when educators design their own learning, a lot of “reinventing the wheel” takes place (Guskey & Sparks, 1991). So the PDC gradually changed the central emphasis on CPD to one of improvement in standards and the quality of teaching and learning, within a collaborative school culture.
The opportunity for teachers to learn in CPD programs or activities

By creating a culture that extends the capacity for self-improvement, the practice of individuals and teams was encouraged and the Observation / Assessment model was used as a tool for self-analysis and reflection in CPD participation and planning. From 2007 to 2009, School B refocused its CPD on co-planning and curriculum development. All teachers in the school were given responsibilities for subject leadership and staff work with one or two colleagues in coaching and mentoring partnerships (School B’s annual plan, 2010). Peer observations in different subjects became popular and the opportunity to discuss and experiment with new ideas, and receive feedback was seen as useful (Gersten et al, 1995). As a result, teachers increased their participation in CPD especially in daily teaching practice.

As Gersten et al (1995) notes when teachers are being observed and a post-observation conference analyses their performance, reflections on one’s performance and practice strengthens teachers’ values and attitudes and encourage them to take responsibility for their own professional growth.

In 2010, after the second three-year CPD plan was launched, the committee followed the policy document which encouraged collaboration. A Common Education Day was conducted to facilitate professional exchange and sharing within the School Circle. Thus a ‘Development / Improvement Process Model’ of CPD could be said to have been echoing the views of Brighouse (1995) and Morgan (1997) that ‘given appropriate opportunities, teachers can effectively bring their unique perspectives to the tasks of improving the teaching-learning process, with focus on students and their school development.’
As Barlett (1998) notes, ‘effective learning is facilitated in a school where shared talk and joint preparation are part of working in a collegiate manner.’ As with School A, special sharing sessions in teaching strategies or dealing with students’ problems (on Wednesdays after school) were organized in School B to help teachers: share ideas; collect their opinions upon current classroom practices; and even reach compromise to find solutions to teaching and learning problems. The school has extensive contact with the district education office and specialists are often brought into the school to support learning in areas such as special education needs (SEN) (PSMCD minute of School B, 2011).

To establish a more systematic planning of teachers’ CPD, School B seemed to be successfully making use of the strong link between performance management and its CPD priorities. All staff identified their own CPD and performance management targets and then negotiated at an annual meeting followed by regular reviews. Professional development and personal development targets were aligned with school improvement. It seemed that there was a strong awareness of, and commitment to empower not only the school but also the teachers to improve their understanding of CPD practice and planning.

*The measures taken to assess teachers’ professional change*

According to Connolly and James (1998), ‘Teacher ownership of CPD is a feature of highly effective schools, as are creative CPD opportunities.’ An emphasis on understanding and agreeing on the purpose of CPD before any activities take place may enhance the CPD experience, and improve both individual and school-level outcomes (Harland & Kinder, 1997; Muijs *et al*, 2004). School B clearly took the above concept into consideration when the PDC discussed its measures to assess staff’s professional change. At the beginning of the school year, the principal announced the ongoing process of the school’s CPD at the staff meeting.
The PDC then listed the targets for the new school year in order to help teachers understand that staff learning was an outcome of CPD and it was evaluated currently as an integral part of school self-evaluation and performance management.

At School B, several measures were used to help teachers evaluate their own professional change:

- A professional learning portfolio was assigned to each teacher. As part of an annual cycle of both school, and self-evaluation, teachers could identify appropriate CPD needs and analyze their progress.
- Meetings with the school campus caring team also enhanced effective adult learning. Small function groups from this team collected feedback from most teachers and reflected on the needs and individual CPD planning progress with the PDC.
- Subject or departmental meetings also provided teachers with channels to discuss and reflected their professional changes in teaching and learning pedagogies.
- As Kennedy (2005) emphasizes, ‘many teachers are likely to be more comfortable discussing their practice with peers than with senior management, where issues surrounding performance management may hinder honest and open discussion.’ At School B, mentors or coaches from different subjects held regular meetings in order to encourage peer support and collaboration after lesson observations. Teachers could freely express their attitudes towards new CPD targets. The mentors could guide teachers whenever they had their own perceptions about CPD planning.
- External experts also acted as catalysts and agents for change. All teachers from schools in the ‘School Circle’ attended a forum so that they could exchange their experiences in teaching and learning. Teachers from School B had an opportunity to share and talk about CPD with other schools’ participants.
- Annual appraisal meetings were conducted by the principal who was well-informed around teachers’ opinions about CPD policy practices by the PDC. Teachers and the school talked routinely about what they were doing and behaved as a ‘learning school’. Levels of trust were high and there were ample opportunities to collaborate thus enabling both the teachers and the school to assess CPD change.

Smith (2002) suggests that evaluation should play an integral role in CPD and will become part of a cycle: while it provides feedback on the success of the process, it can also help to determine further CPD needs. School B was well aware of its characteristics in CPD planning and implementation with a maximum use of the CPD policy document.
8.2.3 School C, a small school with a different approach to its CPD journey

School C is a small private school in a rural area, with 18 classes. It was formed in 1985 by a local trading organization as a half-day school in a small venue. In 2003, it became a whole-day primary school. As will be shown below, in order to maximize the use of limited resources, the explicit focus, ultimately chosen, was a whole-school CPD approach which was designed to create a link between performance management and pupil attainment. The leadership team developed a clear vision to establish a professional learning community. As a result, the school had travelled a CPD journey which started with a fragmented approach, and then moved towards a concentrated CPD policy. Moving away from a traditional model of CPD which was based on attending courses, the school leadership had been keen to promote an action research model of CPD (somewhat similar to the Inquiry Approach), with catering for individual differences as the main CPD focus.

The school’s processes for developing and evaluating CPD strategy

Before the disclosure of the CPD policy document, School C had developed a CPD strategy which was similar to Johnson’s (1995) definition of CPD planning:

*Professional development is a way for people to change and move towards their own carefully articulated goals to improve their schools, their relationships with each other and the teaching process for students. It has as its purpose, the improvement of the educational enterprise, particularly the quality of teaching and in the final analysis better outcomes for students.*

As the CPD agenda (2009) in School C stressed, “Not only individual enhancement, but also a whole-school development approach can be seen in its CPD strategy. It is confident to initiate an ‘open positive learning culture’ where staff are encouraged to share ideas and strategies in the classroom”. The response of the teacher-in-charge of CPD supported the above argument:

*Our principal and the leaders in our school emphasize that they have sufficient knowledge on it since they have followed tightly the trend of CPD development. So, there is not a specific group or team responsible for professional developments in our school’* (RST 1 CPD leader from School C).
From 2004 to 2007, the purpose of CPD at School C was conceived mainly as fulfilling the function of preparing teachers to access and accept the policy document and implement reforms. The first three-year CPD plan included the designing of a CPD policy triangle (Fig. 8.1) as a viewing tool to see the progress on CPD. It seemed that School C had followed the guidelines of the CPD Policy Document 2003 in this early stage, although there was no CPD team to take responsibility for CPD planning. One of the respondents recalls:

*Actually, we had developments and we counted the number of hours we had attended the courses or talks before the 2003 document. The document stated the requirement of 150 hours in three years and we’ve made it more systematic. We did it before 2003 but not in such a systematic or clear way. There is a focus on development every year (RST 2 from School C).*

Figure 8.1 CPD policy triangle

After 2007, the second three-year school plan changed to become a more strategic approach using the CPD framework promoted by the policy document. There were some changes in human resources. The principal selected the vice-principal to be in charge of staff CPD. As a result, the vice-principal attended an out-of-school CPD training course. From then onwards, the school adopted annual planning of CPD. Once the general goals had been established, subject groups would adjust their plans accordingly. The subject groups set the individual teacher targets for improvement and development.
For example, one of the focuses in 2012 was ‘self-learning’. So, subject groups had to think about how they could raise teachers’ abilities to develop students’ self-learning abilities. However, it appears that just applying the old CPD model of teacher development courses cannot guarantee both teachers’ improvement as well as students’ learning outcomes. According to the respondent’s feedback:

*Teachers have no say in the broad annual goal setting but the issues change every year and the details of implementation may be adjusted a bit according to the issues. Our school has told teachers that there are three broad areas where we want them to have professional development this year and they have then expressed their preferences. We then ask teachers to select their choices. If we have appropriate courses, we will arrange for those teachers to attend first* (RST 1 CPD leader from School C).

This is because the impact of professional development goes far beyond an individual teacher’s skill or knowledge. As Jasman (2001) argues:

*Effective continuing professional development has power, power to change teachers, students and the whole school system in general. If the component is effective, high in power, it has a positive effects on teachers, students and ultimately the school and the whole society as well.’* Adopting the traditional training model can only provide teachers with new information, but the “sitting and listening” model does not help them transfer the information they receive to their classroom practice.

Recognizing this, School C began to strengthen the whole-school connection in its CPD planning. *Two developing teams are organized to make subject and group connections more explicit. The Teaching Affairs Team and the Learning Affairs Team are responsible for creating a balance in the CPD program goals - to enhance individual teachers’ competency and to empower teachers to respond to students learning and social change* (School C’s annual plan 2008).
As Lacey (1995) has observed, if teachers are professionally socialized, they will become members of the teaching profession and then take on progressively more mature roles, usually of higher status within the profession. As a result of these experiences and developments in understanding, the school moved to re-align its CPD processes. *It decided to align CPD planning with individual teacher CPD plans and the introduction of a new CPD model* (CPD document from School C). It chose to use the CPD review and its links to the TCF (Teachers’ Competency Framework) as an opportunity to develop and embed the alignment of CPD with clearly identified and targeted student learning outcomes. In place of the old CPD teacher training model, Sparks and Hirsh (1997) suggest the need to create a culture of support for teacher inquiry through study groups, support networks, research projects and other professional development activities that focus on the school setting.

The Principal and the Vice-principal were strongly supportive of ‘action research’ models and so they added the use of collaborative teams to the new three-year (2008-2011) CPD plan. Project-based learning is now widely conducted in CPD planning with the aim of encouraging “Teachers as Researchers”, a concept found extensively in the work of Hitchcock and Hughes (1995). If teachers can identify an area of instructional interest, collect data and make changes in their instruction based on the interpretation of those data, they can be trained as researchers, learners or ‘reflective practitioners’ as suggested by Fullan (1991). *School C now makes use of ‘Learning Forums’ to evaluate the progress towards the top of the CPD pyramid. Groups of teachers undertake research into different aspects of teaching and learning related to their own practice contexts. They are currently monitored and supervised by the performance management team* (Evaluation from School C’s CPD annual plan 2010). Although there is some way to go before all teachers ‘buy in’ to the leadership’s vision, most of them were reasonably satisfied with the CPD approach as a way to enhance their professionalism.
In fact, School C created a different CPD approach and it was on its way to bringing about change in the learning–teaching process in relation to the transformation roles of the students and teachers.

*The opportunity for teachers in School C to participate in CPD planning*

An awareness of less formal and traditional forms of CPD is slowly growing in the world, with calls for teachers to become more creative in their approaches to their own professional development, and move away from more traditional transmission-based methods (Muijs *et al.*, 2004).

This is reflected in the developments at School C. As two of the respondents said:

*Our school let us choose the courses that we are interested in. I haven’t tried it before. But actually, we can talk to our principal directly about it.* (RST 4 from School C) ‘*We do have developments with other schools of the same educational organization. We have a development day with them every year. It is held by the educational organization*’ (RST 3 from School C).

While School C was consciously trying to build capacity across teachers to lead on CPD planning opportunities, it was still somewhat top-down in process. Under the control of the leadership, the school only required those who were responsible for CPD to read the relevant CPD Policy Document 2003. The Principal and Vice-principal established some CPD policies and a document was then created for all colleagues to know about it. Teachers only knew that there were different goals and issues but they were not very familiar with the details. CPD planning may be weakened by this top-down approach:

*Requirements are set for individual colleagues. For the development of subject knowledge, each teacher must fulfill 15 hours of CPD activities, no matter whether they like it or not* (RST 6 from School C).
So, although CPD now had a high profile in School C, many teachers were still sceptical about the structure of CPD planning. The curriculum development committee and the subject panels were still the main source of teachers’ ideas. Normally, the Principal and the Vice-Principal made the decisions. Teachers could only choose the courses they wanted to attend or the recommended courses. They wondered about their real representation in the Teaching Affairs Team and the Learning Affairs Team. Some respondents reacted:

*It is the subject panels who talk with the school. For example, we had a new syllabus ‘English dramas’ last year and we had cross-subjects such as ‘English’, ‘General Studies’ and ‘Dancing’. We had to acquire more knowledge concerning these areas but we didn’t have any chance to design the syllabus. It is done mainly by our representatives (RST 2 and 5 from School C).*

It appeared that the school saw the advantage of applying a ‘loose CPD policy’ to reduce the pressure on the teachers when following the Teachers Competency Framework. But whether the CPD approach was ‘just for individual professionalism’ or mainly to ‘improve students outcomes’ was still a question to be considered. As Cordingley *et al* (2005a) emphasize, a greater awareness of the positive impact of CPD can increase teachers’ enthusiasm for involvement in the CPD process, so the communication of ‘impact’ is of crucial importance to the ‘take-up’ of CPD opportunities.

*The opportunity for teachers in School C to benefit from teaching and subject knowledge acquisition from CPD programs or activities*

Teachers’ perceptions of what activities constitute CPD is frequently limited to attendance at courses, conferences and whole-school INSET days, often to meet national requirements. Professional learning, or “on the job” learning is regularly seen by teachers as separate from CPD, and something that is just done as part of the job (Edmonds & Lee, 2002; Hustler *et al*, 2003; Robinson & Sebba, 2004).
There is a reasonable provision of learning opportunities enshrined in the school-based CPD policy of School C. However, most of the programs are conducted to enhance specialism in teaching and subject knowledge acquisition (School C’s CPD annual plan 2010). Since there was no formal mechanism for allocating CPD resources across the school, teachers were aware that they could ask about CPD opportunities at any time. Within normal CPD time, teachers worked with their subject colleagues in lesson preparation and planning. But unlike Schools A and B, there were no frequent or fixed periods for peer observation and joint planning sessions. All teachers were free to form pairs since there was no formal system of coaching and mentoring.

Moving away from the external delivered CPD, the school was also able to search for support from its authority, the trading organization. Teachers also worked with guest speakers and other school colleagues in cross-school rather than departmental teams on some research projects during Teachers’ Professional Federation Day. CPD took many forms and attention was much given to support students’ learning such as cross-curriculum projects, project learning after school, groups of thinking strategies etc. With an aim to train up teachers to be independent adult learners, School C cited the four principles suggested by Brookfield (2002) in its CPD planning document when designing CPD programs for the professional development:

- Consider the experience of the participants
- Consider the limitations of the participants
- Incorporate the challenging content into professional practice
- Provide wide choices to get involved in activities for professional growth and create learning environments
According to Cordingley et al (2005a), active experimentation, as opposed to just reflection and discussion, will also yield greater rewards. Also providing on-site events with small groups, are ways of extending moral support through sharing of tasks, and also ensuring efficient use of time. For the past three years (from 2008-2011), School C has made use of Brookfield’s (2002) principles to create room for enhancing teachers’ professional development. An example of conducting a research project on the use of electronic school bags showed the school’s intention. The PSMCD and 3 IT subject teachers formed a core committee before conducting the research. At the first stage, the PSMCD was responsible for information gathering and members of the committee design teaching procedures and teaching kit for the use of electronic school bags. There were regular meetings for finding solutions and sharing of problems.

At the second stage, 4 subject teachers were invited to use the planning and the products. These teachers discussed and analyzed instructional discourse, student work, and debated how the lesson should be programmed. At the third stage, these teachers began to design 2 lesson plans with the use of the teaching kit provided by the core committee. At the fourth stage, they began to produce their own plans together with the production of the teaching kit.

This action research helped teachers to overcome the dilemma caused by subject matter or invent their own solutions to the problem. As a result, teachers acted as researchers and this inquiry approach promotes understanding and appreciation for the work of others. Although limitations fell on technical support, time span and material screening, it echoed Lalitha (2005)’s observation that ‘a problem-based learning approach, self-motivation within the activity process, active participation of teachers through practice are emphasized as characteristics of effective professional practices in teacher development’.
Ball and Cohen (1999) and Rodgers (2002) emphasize through their professional development work with teachers that reflection on a teacher’s own classroom experience is the most productive starting place for teachers’ continuing professional development. School C was developing an ongoing teacher learning culture with a thorough understanding of social change:

Teacher development leads to student development leading to school development which leads to system development which is cyclical, leading again to teacher development. (Lalitha, 2005)

Embarking on a continuous review of CPD, School C was able to use the TCF of the policy document to formulate a more progressive CPD and it saw the next step to move from much closer links between teachers’ CPD and the data from student outcomes to a more efficient and effective professional autonomy.

The measures taken by School C to assess teachers’ professional change

Realizing CPD as a coherent part of a school’s longer-term vision also relates to performance management processes. Our school views CPD assessment as important not only for helping teachers achieve their personal learning goals, but also to help them become more aware of professional standards and to understand more clearly how their personal learning goals relate to school improvement priorities (RST 1 CPD leader from School C).

Data from the respondents’ interviews proved that several measures were taken to assess teachers’ change in their CPD:

- At the beginning of a year, there is a ‘teacher professional development profile’ for teachers to write down what aspects they want to develop.
- There is a part ‘teachers’ guidance’ in teachers’ CPD planning. Some experienced teachers will guide new teachers or some other practiced teachers to evaluate their change such as improving teaching competence and develop excellence.
- For the school based workshops, the person in charge prepares a questionnaire to collect the data. They have to report to the administrative staff, thus providing a platform for the performance management to assess individual CPD needs.
All the staff must do an online questionnaire required by EDB every year. There are several questions about teachers’ professional development and the report presents data on how the school colleagues feel and whether the CPD programs and activities are helpful in contributing to individual development.

Discussions with other teachers during Teachers’ Professional Federation Day are also used as part of professional development and helps teachers to view development as a continuous process.

Monthly working reports from the Teaching Affairs Team and the Learning Affairs Team offer information to the Vice-Principal and the subject departments to evaluate the progress of all teachers in classroom teaching and learning.

From the reflections of the teachers in Learning Forums, it was clear that research activities boosted their confidence and helped them to acquire knowledge, attitudes and skills. Meetings with subject panels and sharing their feedback enhance teachers’ critical thinking and self-direction, and guide them towards teaching excellence.

Random and invited lesson observations between teachers offered another opportunity to share personal expectations and improve teaching and learning in the classroom. Instead of a formal coaching and mentoring system, teachers organized themselves into working groups, intending to meet on a regular basis to share their teaching experiences. This created an open atmosphere to evaluate self-esteem, personal participation, self-confidence and improved performance in their work.

Since School C is small when compared with School A and B, the non-regular performance reviews enabled senior leaders to identify, record and update the learning needs of individual teachers.

The arrangement of half-yearly appraisal also made it easier for the CPD leadership to develop an awareness of the detailed needs of teachers and to shape CPD provision and inform performance management targets.

It appeared that School C had applied a ‘multiple function’ CPD approach in different stages and it was committed to fostering a positive climate for continuous learning among its community. CPD was the means by which the school was able to motivate and develop its community. It did so at a variety of levels – individual, team, whole school and through wider networks with an emphasis on collaborative learning. It conformed closely to the Teachers’ Competency Framework published in the 2003 CPD policy document.
The school believed that a coherent and progressive opportunity to develop professionally and personally both improved standards and raised morale through personal and professional fulfillment. This echoed the concept found in the DfES philosophy which emphasized *effective teachers should take ownership and give a high priority to professional development*. On the whole, School C was sensitive to tracking progress in empowering teachers to accept social change but it was still on its way to develop a well-balanced school-based CPD policy.

**8.3 Patterns of an analysis across three case study schools related to the process of CPD implementation**

Connolly and James (1998) identify professional development as playing a “key role in helping the school to make progress on the school improvement journey.” Although the three case studies suggested similar patterns to the process of CPD implementation, they had different strengths and weaknesses. In the analysis below, the researcher combined the findings emerging from the four areas which had already been mentioned in the first section and discussed some major themes that cut-across the findings. Young (2001) found that all CPD models generally strengthened teachers’ knowledge, skills and dispositions and they had varied effects on other aspects of school capacity. Before the schools were compared in terms of the quality and effectiveness of their CPD, several questions had to be answered:

- Do they offer a well-established coherent conceptual system for understanding the nature of an effective CPD?
- Does the CPD journey appear to be process rather than product-oriented?
- Do the schools and teachers acknowledge the criteria for professional development?
- Do the schools’ CPD approaches offer the potential for generalizability?
- Have they all moved in the same direction of greater self-determination of (own) CPD and collaboration?
Based on the above questions, three overarching themes can be compared and summarized concerning their success in CPD:

- The Role of CPD Leadership
- Teachers’ Autonomy in CPD planning
- Incentive for CPD self-determination.

### 8.3.1 The Role of CPD Leadership

Potter and Powell (1992) stress the importance of leadership as one of the strong factors contributing to, or impacting the school improvement process. A critical examination of the role of leadership in this research showed that all three cases had distinct multidimensional leadership characteristics and school improvement was facilitated by different forms of leadership. School A reflected EDB’s central influence in inspiring and motivating both teachers and the principal, as well as the school community, for CPD improvement. As a pilot school for implementing the government’s CPD policy, most of the stakeholders appreciated the school’s active role in developing a coherent conceptual system for understanding the nature of effective CPD.

Because the principal had always collaborated with local higher education institutions, the influence of external expertise and perspectives was instrumental in teachers’ CPD design. The principal’s vision and influence was instrumental in shaping the school’s CPD progress. For example, the teachers and parents commended the principal as a source of inspiration for school improvement, and his love for his profession, creating the image of the school as a progressive institution. Also, the teacher educators (those supervisors from EDB) clearly influenced the role of leadership in School A. Regular meetings with the PSMCD, function group leaders and subject panels, all promoted strategically planned school-based CPD and a more systematic performance management (PM) system in School A.
Likewise, in School B, the principal and vice-principal showed their long-term vision aimed at creating a strong professional learning community. The teachers also endorsed the fact that progressive CPD planning with a whole-school approach had helped them to get used to the process of CPD implementation. The formation of the PDC (Professional Development Committee), the cooperation with School B’s supervising and sponsoring body, the district religious organization, and the participation in ‘School Circle’, all strengthened the networking effect for school improvement. It was evident that the leaders in these parties played a pivotal role in motivating teachers to work as a team for school improvement. It was their leadership, despite so many social and institutional obstacles which inspired teachers to make a difference for school improvement.

In School C, however, the insight of leadership did not appear to be as strong as it was in Schools A and B although it was not completely absent. The principal only appointed the vice-principal as the teacher-in-charge of CPD. The school started teachers’ professional development with a fragmented approach, and then moved towards a concentrated CPD policy. Since the adoption of the policy document after 2008, the principal took the advice of the vice-principal to initiate research-based CPD in different school subjects. All the teachers were busy in developing an ongoing teacher learning culture in the process of accepting social change. In order to create a more concentrated CPD policy, the school set up the Teaching Affairs Team and the Learning Affairs Team after 2010. The CPD program goals were insufficiently holistic and relied too heavily on the leadership role of these teams to try and create a balance.

It is noteworthy that the three schools gained a great deal of experiences in their CPD journey. Even though they lacked explicit policies in 2003, they were still individually developing their own CPD policies, and based on their successes and failures, they were quite actively engaged in teachers’ CPD planning.
Due to strong team leadership, Schools A and B were better at understanding the nature of effective CPD, and had a more thorough, well-established conceptual system than School C. Because of more resources from the government, and better connections with the local community, Schools A and B had broader perspectives and developed a more strategic and updated CPD policy planning approach. School C did not sufficiently understand that leadership emanating from one source (the belief of the school head) might not withstand the pressures coming from different sources (subject teachers, department panels, students, parents). It seems that a broader and more integrated approach to CPD development might have led to greater school improvement in School C.

8.3.2 Teachers’ Autonomy in CPD planning

Eraut (1994) points out that the teacher is no longer the autonomous, self-directed individual, but rather someone who interacts at the boundaries of expertise, knowledge specialism and state control. Bruner (1990) also argues that there is a critical link between the individual and a cultural community he or she lives in:

(Values) are communal and consequential in terms of our relations to a cultural community. They fulfill functions for us in that community. The values underlying a way of life... are only lightly open to ‘radical reflection’. They become incorporated into one’s self identity and at the same time, they locate one in a culture.

Almost all teachers valued the opportunities they were given for ongoing professional development in and outside the schools. In School A, teachers thought that onsite CPD programs introduced them to many useful innovations including inviting parents to observe teaching and learning processes in their children’s classrooms, and bringing teachers of other schools together for their professional development sessions. In School B, teachers considered weekly sharing sessions helped them understand the significance of developing a vision and working together for school improvement.
Likewise, teachers in both Schools (A and B) said that their access to CPD policy document resources contributed to their learning. In addition, those leading CPD and most teachers in these schools also valued the teamwork approach of working together as colleagues and mentors.

In School A, teachers said that the School’s Professional Development Committee’s care and input in classrooms and during professional development sessions, was based on teachers needs rather than on what the committee wanted, and thus, their contributions were highly relevant and useful for teachers. However, by contrast, in School C, most of the programs were conducted to enhance specialization in teaching and subject knowledge acquisition. It was clear that these schools differed with regard to organizing formal school-based professional development courses. Both the government-subsidized schools (A and B) continued conducting monthly school-based professional development programs. In school C, no formal professional development sessions were conducted and teachers were free to form pairs. Most teachers reflected that ‘a loose CPD approach’ only ‘slowed down’ their ongoing professional development because they had relied too much on the self-directed and action-research approach.

It was clear from the data that all three case study schools and teachers recognized the need for professional development – for institutional, personal survival purposes, as well as ‘school improvement’. They must fulfill the mandatory requirement of CPD hours according to the Teachers Competency Framework! Nevertheless, whether they agreed with the 2003 Government CPD policy document or not, they seemed to recognize and accept an emerging trend for more strategic approaches to CPD which emphasized the entitlement of teachers, and the control of their own professional development within an agreed framework. (Egan & Simmonds, 2002).
In all cases, CPD was viewed as a means of career development and it was described as a good opportunity for pedagogical or problem-solving skills training. Participants expressed their views in terms of strengthening team spirit in the school in almost similar ways. But the lack of teachers’ autonomy in CPD planning was more evident in School C than in Schools A and B. As one teacher in School C reflected:

*Teachers need to know that CPD will be sustained and continuous. They must feel that they have ownership over their own career developments, whilst at the same time acknowledging the need as well for a whole school focus.* (RST 4 from School C).

With no CPD team to take responsibility for CPD planning in School C, it was still a somewhat top-down CPD implementation process. Teachers wondered about their real representation in the Teaching Affairs Team and the Learning Affairs Team since only the Principal and the Vice-Principal made decisions. Another teacher in School C noted that in CPD planning, ‘teachers were made autonomous in improving students’ learning outcomes but they were left alone in voice’. A different dimension was observable in both Schools A and B. For instance, because School A had a long and well-established system of CPD planning, it was easy to know the ‘needs and wants’ from the bottom teachers when the school navigated them to a more advanced CPD approach. Being a pilot school for implementing government CPD policy, the impact on early career teachers had obviously increased teachers’ motivation and a sense of empowerment.

The teachers who had benefited from the initiative felt that they were entitled to CPD and that they had opportunities to learn from other professionals. Some teachers were enthused with a sense of ownership of the school. Many considered themselves as equal partners in promoting school improvement and their collective professional interests in CPD planning. The PSMCD confirmed, *“The majority of our teachers are well informed about the details of what is to be covered in CPD policy and planning”*. 184
Like School A, School B was also found to be enjoying almost total participation in teachers’ CPD planning, although it had no ‘proper menu’ of CPD processes before 2003. Evidence showed that after 2004, the school changed its CPD model from a top-down one to a more democratic approach which acknowledged the importance of CPD ownership. When representatives from different sectors of the school and panel heads of the subject departments were incorporated into the Professional Development Committee, the commitment and motivation of the teachers to accept responsibility for their school and to provide ongoing support to CPD, increased markedly. Some of the subject teachers said that they had clear ideas about ‘What CPD policy is aimed at and how it is to be organized?’ The principal was confident that ‘our colleagues understand the process by which the CPD programs will be delivered and that they need to be collaborative and sustainable. They can judge whether the CPD implementation meets the needs of their professional development.’

The above analysis concluded that to minimize any tensions that may exist between system needs and priorities (the school development plan) and those of individuals (the individual development plans), all three school leaders have to ensure that CPD should offer an acceptable framework with enough autonomy in policy planning and implementation.

8.3.3 Incentive for CPD self-determination

McKenzie and Turbill (1999) endorsed Brophy and Good’s (1974) idea that “a better understanding of teachers’ belief systems or conceptual base, will significantly contribute to enhancing educational effectiveness”. So, it is important to remember that CPD development can’t be forced – it’s the teacher who develops (active) and not the teacher who is developed (passive) (Earley, 2003). Whether the schools could grant enough autonomy for the teachers to choose and decide their CPD depended on conditions of work, personal interests, aptitudes and abilities.
Dadds (1997) argued that from centralized prescription to informed professional judgement, we need to move away from a training or transmission CPD model of teacher growth (technicist) to one which is predicated upon the growth of personal understanding, judgement and agency. Having been advised that teachers’ professional growth and learning is crucial to school improvement, all the case study schools sought to create an entitlement model of CPD or life-long learning. There was an obvious variation of CPD practice between schools towards self-determined professional learning communities because they had an independent culture of collaboration and collegiality. Schools A and B seemed to be what Rosenholz (1989) described as ‘moving’ schools which were more ‘learning enriched’, while School C seemed to be a ‘stuck’ school which was, to some extent, ‘learning impoverished’. The two types of school were illustrated in table 8.1.

Table 8.1 Types of schools (adopted from Rosenholz, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Learning impoverished’</th>
<th>‘Learning enriched’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• teacher isolation/privatism</td>
<td>• collaboration and sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lack of positive feedback</td>
<td>• continuous teacher talk about practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• uncertainty</td>
<td>• a common focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• avoidance of risk-taking</td>
<td>• a sense of efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a sense of powerlessness</td>
<td>• a belief in life-long learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• looking out as well as in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the study, it was possible to find a range of evidence to support the view that both of the government-subsidized schools (A and B) were more likely to develop an effective CPD approach which offered greater potential for generalizability. Other small schools might well benefit from examining the CPD policy planning and implementation processes adopted by these two schools.
Based on the three case studies, some insights in developing a more self-determined CPD are summarized below:

- Schools A and B approached the processes of decision making and policy formulation for CPD in a very systematic way.
- They always seemed to make use of good leadership to initiate and sustain the process of school improvement towards becoming ‘learning enriched communities.’
- They perceived that ‘one-shot’ events for teacher development didn’t work. As a result, both schools valued CPD and mentoring as an integral part of their school improvement agenda and pursued a program of annual CPD evaluation and planning.
- Because of an effective performance management system and a whole-school approach to CPD planning, they were able to create better opportunities to hear teachers’ voices, and to utilize their potential for school improvement.
- Both schools supported all-levels’ CPD participation in order to enhance a real partnership within and outside the school.
- With a close connection with EDB as well as their local school communities, they were more readily able to provide moral support and material resources to assist CPD policy and practice, thus enabling more effective feedback and improved CPD self-determination.
- With active and visionary Professional Development Committees, the more effectively mobilized their school communities to invest time and effort in productive CPD collaboration and outcomes.

By contrast, School C was more limited in its policies and progress towards effective CPD self-determination:

- It appeared to lack strong leadership and management of its CPD committee. As a result, it failed to promote the same degree of understanding and commitment on the part of the individuals and the school towards professional and personal growth.
- The CPD coordinator was, thus, less able to balance the development needs of the individual and the school, and promote a positive and participative attitude to CPD from all levels.
- As a result, teachers appeared to be much more passive in planning their own CPD.
- The principal and the CPD in-charge were very confident they could equip teachers to achieve better professional standards in relation to school improvement priorities but there was a lack of compromise between the leadership and departments to unleash the energies of teachers.
- Although teachers asked about CPD opportunities numerous times, the lack of a formal mechanism for allocating CPD resources across the school hindered the direction for individuals to possess the sense of CPD ownership.
Since there was no formal system of coaching and mentoring, teachers were puzzled in the process of self-determined CPD, especially when they were not clear about the policy schedule, or they wondered about the school’s incentive to empower them in developing their long-term CPD.

Reynolds and Jo (2003) argued that we need to rid ourselves of the notion that the way to improve the CPD system is through school-to-school transfer of good practice. He argues, it is much more sensible for schools not to be dependent on others helping them out but by learning from their own best practice. School C created its unique CPD policy processes with its different culture - teachers or leaders were within a range of ‘researchers’ abilities, strengths and interests. But its CPD processes provided only limited autonomy or flexibility for individuals to voice their needs. As a result, School C seemed to be dealing with too much ‘one size fits all’ CPD. Despite this, all three schools moved in the same direction of greater self-determination of own CPD and collaboration.

Schools A and B performed better than School C since their teachers valued that different types of CPD practices which not only raised the quality of the teaching but also improved their professional competency. The majority of the teachers shared a positive collaborative culture while the leaders of CPD found that they had greater self-determination in CPD planning and implementation.

However, School C showed a greater potential to develop its CPD capacity despite it being more isolated than both government-subsidized schools (A and B). To conclude, teachers and leaders of Schools A and B seemed to have the capacity to drive their own professional learning at all levels whilst School C did not.
8.4 Summary

Gable (1994) noted that multiple case study is suitable to apply in post-structural research when it has the objective of explaining the relationships between key variables, or themes studied. In this chapter, the researcher employed the technique of cross case analysis to identify the major similarities and differences in participants’ perceptions regarding the CPD policy trajectory in order to obtain rich information.

With an in-depth analysis of the data gathered from the three case study schools, more context-specific insights from policy construction to policy implementation were gained. As different schools performed at different rates of progress in the policy trajectory, there existed some gaps between teachers’ interpretations concerning the intentions of the CPD policy and the current CPD implementation. However, CPD was still generally recognized as important to teacher professionalism and professionalization. Despite the fact that these schools operated in significantly different socio-cultural contexts, the same three major themes cut-across the findings of these schools, namely, role of CPD leadership, teachers’ autonomy in CPD planning and incentive for CPD self-determination. First, ‘effective leadership’ emanating from various school stakeholders sustains the process of future CPD planning and seems essential to initiating whole school improvement. Second, reasonable and sufficient teachers’ autonomy in CPD planning appears to be an integral part of the future school CPD agenda. Third, rather than having ‘one size fits all’ CPD, the notion of ‘learning-enriched’ schools must be enhanced to facilitate CPD self-determination among teachers and schools.

Because schools and teachers still faced obstacles and challenges in CPD policy process and practices, their success was affected by various factors such as government policies, finance, school and public demands. The next chapter will present the overall findings on CPD policy trajectory.
CHAPTER NINE: OVERALL FINDINGS ON CPD POLICY TRAJECTORY

9.1 Introduction

The last chapter presented the cross-case analysis of three schools regarding the similarities and differences within CPD policy production to implementation context. Green (2008) notes that the setting of each case study possesses an importance beyond being merely a descriptive backdrop to the policy, and Ledger (2013) considers it to be an integral part of the policy process. This chapter presents the findings which are grouped in terms of the three contexts of the ‘policy trajectory’ framework; namely contexts of influence, policy text production and practices. The findings are illustrated and enriched by using quotes from CPD documents and participants views. Themes are related to the three research questions.

In relation to the policy trajectory, findings from the analysis of both the macro and micro level data is presented in three sections. Each of the three policy contexts is used as a heading to organize the presentation. The first section provides insights into the formation of teachers’ CPD policy in Hong Kong, addressing research question 1 (What were the influences leading to the initiation of teachers’ CPD policy in Hong Kong primary schools?). The second section focuses on CPD policy production processes, addressing research question 2 (What was the nature of teachers’ CPD policy text and how was it produced?). The third section explains the context of policy practices, addressing research question 3 (What policy practices were adopted in regard to the implementation of the CPD Policy Document (2003) in individual primary schools?).

9.2 Context of influence

In this study, some key influences were explored and they had great impact on the initiation of teachers’ CPD policy in local primary education sectors. The themes are summarized as follows: shaping of stable CPD policy; a common tool for professionalism, and unequal power relationship in CPD policy formation. They are explained in separate entities below but they highlight the significance in the formation of teachers’ CPD policy in local primary schools.
9.2.1 Shaping of stable CPD policy

Teachers’ continuing professional development (CPD) was highlighted in the new education policy in Hong Kong largely because schools and teachers had to face complex and dynamic changes and challenges (Herrity & Morales, 2004). Since its “return” to China in 1997, Hong Kong like most south-east Asian cities, and indeed the world, was facing the problem of nurturing a highly competitive new generation of talents. As noted in Chapter 2, global trends have influenced local developments, and both civil society and the government felt that there was a need to provide systematic CPD policies to advance teachers’ professionalism. The first influential theme identified by this study was the shaping of stable CPD policy.

Although participants from the case study schools were far from agree that the initiation of a CPD system was essential for their professional needs, they generally accepted that a stable CPD policy that was ‘locally recognized’ might elevate their teacher competency and this would be valuable for their own future career development. Prior to the initiation of the ACTEQ’s (2003) teacher CPD policy, there had been some limited whole school CPD policy processes when most of the principals and CPD in-charge ‘did their own thing’ in professional development planning and decision making. However, with the initiation and adoption of CPD Policy Document 2003, structural changes were brought to facilitate school-based CPD policy. Following the ‘road map’ provided by the TCF, all case study schools outlined the three-year School CPD Plan regardless of their individual progress. This was a milestone for CPD policy design and implementation. Teachers had more opportunities to know about the schedule, the CPD model that the school applied, the activities and resources allocated for professional development. The administrative team considered the announcement of the School CPD Plan as significant in facilitating CPD policy transfer: A stable policy with more transparency and accessibility had a direct impact on teachers’ confidence to accept a more holistic CPD approach for the sake of school improvement (RST 1 and 3, CPD leaders from School A and C).
Also, participants commented on the strengths and weaknesses of the CPD initiative but many still saw the whole school CPD approach as a ‘big picture’ to a positive strategy for policy text production. *We were active participants to know the demands of the school CPD policy authorization process and we have never worked so hard or reflected so much on what we have learned in the school meetings* (RST 5 & 6 from School B). Some understood the professional shift that was taking place with their colleagues: *During the authorization process, there was lots of preparation works and we were eager to be involved. It is a time of steep learning, pedagogical reflection and psychological transformation before it became our policy for professionalism* (RST 2 and 3 from School A).

### 9.2.2 A common tool for professionalism

The next influential theme that impacted the initiation of teachers’ CPD related to policy discourses. Since the 1990s, changes in the policy themes were increasingly articulated in different policy documents. In 1990, the Code for the Education Profession of Hong Kong was promulgated to replace the establishment of a Hong Kong Teaching Service, as had been suggested by the Education Commission Report No. 1 (October 1984). The Preparatory Committee from the Education Department recommended:

> ‘the fostering of a sense of professionalism by encouraging teachers, principals, school management and sponsors to co-operate, through the co-ordination of the Education Department, in the writing of a code of practice for the teaching profession. This code would prescribe ethical standards of conduct for teachers in the execution of their professional duties and all registered and permitted teachers would be expected to subscribe to it.’ (The Code, (Note 4), 1990).

Every practicing teacher at that time was given a copy of the Code to read about their rights and the commitment of their profession. Concurrent with the formulation of the Code, the Committee proposed the establishment of a “General Teaching Council”, a professional body to implement the Code and maintain professional discipline.
Later in 1994, the Council on Professional Conduct in Education was established to pave the way for setting up a statutory professional governing body:

…to advise the government on measures to promote professional conduct in education; to draft operational criteria defining the conduct expected of an educator, and through consultation to gain widespread acceptance of these criteria among all sectors of the education community; and in the light of the above criteria, to advise the Director of Education in cases of dispute or alleged professional misconduct involving educators. (The Code, 1990, p.2)

Between 1994 and 1999, there was no centralized system to govern teachers’ CPD activities but all schools in Hong Kong were advised to allocate 3 school days per annum for school-based staff development purposes. With an aim to construct a system of life-long learning and all-round development in 2000, the Education Commission (EC) recommended reforming the education system. Professional development is one of the major initiatives in the context of keeping pace with a ‘worldwide’ trend towards a knowledge-based economy in the 21st Century.

Discourses in documents tended to be conflated with global issues:

High accountability and benchmarking are national and international trends that affected the pathways for lifelong learning and they are not as smooth as they should be. To make up for these weaknesses, we need to uproot outdated ideology and develop a new education system that is student-focused. The workplace requires more than ever before good communicative skills, adaptability, abilities for cooperation, self-learning, exploration and independent thinking as well as creativity. High demands are now placed on the individual’s personal qualities; even the training for a specific vocation should go beyond the teaching of skills and aim to enhance the inner qualities of a person. (The Education Reform, 2000: 3.14 & 6.17)

Taking into account the importance of life-long learning, the CPD policy emerged from a need to equip citizens with the competence to increase social and economic competitiveness:

Hong Kong’s future development will depend on whether we are able to harness new technologies, develop new industries, new business strategies and new operating modes, and whether we have people who are nimble and creative. (The Education Reform, 2000: 3.8)

Local influences was also highlighted in macro level discourses:

The Education Department (ED) is now actively carrying out the reform of “school-based management” for schools to have greater autonomy in administration and teaching coupled with a greater degree of transparency and accountability. The ED will also reinforce its role as a partner of schools in enhancing the quality of education. (The Education Reform, 2000: 6.3.2)
Echoed with the formation of the CPD policy context was government’s accountability as cited in the document:

The basic premise of the education reform is not only to create room for students, but also for schools and teachers alike, so that the latter can develop school-based curriculum and design teaching methods according to their professional judgement and the practical needs of students. While respecting the professionalism and autonomy of educators, the Government has the responsibility to ensure the transparency and accountability of schools, and has to put in place an effective quality assurance mechanism. (The Education Reform, 2000: 6.3.3)

In 2002, the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications (ACTEQ) was set up to keep the policy on the right track. Evidence was found in the CPD policy document 2003:

The Principals’ CPD Framework, the Focus Group on Teacher Competencies and In-service Professional Development (the Focus Group) was established to develop a generic teacher competencies framework (TCF) for the reference of both teachers and schools. At the same time, the Task Force was set up under ACTEQ to study how teachers’ CPD might suitably be promoted.

In preparing its recommendations, the Task Force also researched the CPD policies and practices of other parts of the world such as Scotland, England and China. (ACTEQ CPD Policy Document, 2003)

It was found that CPD is a condition of service for every teacher and it is regarded as an essential opportunity for staff promotion. The government’s process of ‘institutionalizing’ teachers’ CPD policy and all the existing structures, such as the generic TCF and the descriptors which outline the basic competencies expected of teachers, to lay the groundwork for local schools to acquire and develop a common tool for professionalism.

### 9.2.3 Unequal power relationship in CPD policy formation process

The power of particular individuals played a significant role in the early policy formation process because they held powerful positions. The theme below shows the unequal power relationship between different stakeholders in the process of CPD policy formation. As a policy elite, the former chairman of the ACTEQ (Professor Ching Kai-ming) argued that the need for the drafting of the policy document was a kind of ‘paradigm shift’ for developing teachers’ professionalism, as reflected in the following reflective statements:
If teachers did not change, no change could be made. That was the start of the policy borrowing. The main duties of ACTEQ at first was a bit more on qualifications but little on education. Like the other countries that have already developed as a blueprint, the CPD framework offered a platform for the change of norm, making everyone accept it not surprisingly, think that it is something additional, or even think that it is something necessary for professionals. Now, there are no secret worries temporarily that teachers are pushed to change due to the environment of the ecology. (PM, Aug, 2010)

A common view expressed by the other participants in CPD Policy Document 2003 also highlighted the importance of system change:

While the need for a new emphasis on teachers’ continuing professional development is widely acknowledged, it is less obvious how this can be realized in a meaningful, well-planned and coherent manner. Numbering more than 50000, Hong Kong teachers require a common reference framework for establishing direction and creating momentum in continuing professional development. (ACTEQ CPD Policy Document, 2003)

Before the release of the CPD document in November 2003, the ACTEQ attributed positive feedback to broad consultation and collaboration, suggesting the work of formulating CPD framework reflected broader views of the education community:

Since the Task Force first set about conducting a survey of teachers’ CPD, to which around 1100 teachers responded, time is concerned as being ripe for reform. The reference period was the 2001 to 2002 school year and findings revealed a properly charted TCF provides a template for developing school-based professional development framework for the whole education community. (ACTEQ CPD Policy Document, 2003)

However, document review brings into question the validity of the ACTEQ claims that there was a broad-reaching collaborative process between different interest groups in formulating the CPD policy text:

During the informal consultation sessions, the principals and staff of 10 local schools had stressed as ‘enthusiastically participated’ in the interactive process of the development of the generic teacher competencies framework. A total of seven professional teaching organizations provided feedback, assisting the Task Force with positive comments and thoughtful opinions on the generic TCF and how teachers’ CPD might move forward. (ACTEQ CPD Policy Document, 2003)
The discourses of consultation seemed to form part of the ‘policy legitimization’ strategy of the ACTEQ. Criticism of formulating the CPD policy text relates to the lack of time for enough consultation because within just two months (between mid-April and mid-May 2003), the Task Force conducted a series of informal consultations to gauge practitioners’ views about teachers’ CPD and the recently developed generic TCF. Micro level participants claimed that the ACTEQ neglected their role of representation in the processes of consultation and collaboration:

*There was a very concerted attempt to take the feedback of a small proportion in the mode of formulating the CPD framework and only 2.2% of the teaching profession (1100 out of 50000 teachers) as a whole was kept informed and consulted about the present situation of CPD participation.* (PDOs from school A and B)

Also, the ACTEQ and Education & Manpower Bureau (EDB) appointed different interest groups to positions on the committee producing the TCF, as well as the draft of the CPD document:

The efficacy of the CPD policy hinges on the wisdom and experience accumulated over time by all relevant parties. (Interim Report, 2006)

The ACTEQ argued that the membership composition of the policy formulating committee demonstrated that it was an open and representative forum. Its membership composition was mandated in CPD document 2002 and onwards as:

- A Chairperson from the university
- One representative from University Grant Committee
- Four representatives from secondary schools
- Three representatives from primary schools
- Two representatives from voluntary organizations
- One representative from tertiary education sector
- One representatives from private consultant agency
- Two representatives from Education & Manpower Bureau

(summarized from ACTEQ CPD Policy Document, 2003)
As observed from the above documentary data, this study found that from the beginning of the policy trajectory, the ACTEQ included what appeared to be a reasonable number of representatives from the government and non-government education sectors after the release of the CPD Policy Document 2003. However, this did not necessarily reflect equal power relationships in the CPD policy text formation process. There is strong evidence that a small number of key policy actors (ACTEQ members) exercised power in early CPD policy processes due to their important role and status. It was not until 2013 that the ACTEQ was dissolved and the Committee on Professional Development of Teachers and Principals (COTAP) was subsequently established. Although the re-structuring has further relegated weak support rendered to TCF by various stakeholders, the unequal power relationship still exists although the impact on CPD policy making is not obvious or influential in CPD policy formation process.

9.3 Context of policy text production

While the above section presents the influences between document discourses and the power of key individuals in the mode of policy text formation, this section examines different levels of views of the policy production processes surrounding the CPD framework. Although policy texts are articulated in the interest of the general public, they are the outcome of struggle and compromise, and the control of policy representation is rather difficult, because they are to be read in relation to other policies when competing interests and contexts are taken into consideration during the process of policy text production (Ketlhoilwe, 2007).

Policy context can be changed by decisions made by the central authority, which operates as a constraint on action at a local level, and an authoritative policy text uses specific grammatical and syntactical devices that empower the author and disempower the reader (Scott, 2000). This study adopts Ozga’s (2000) definition of policy text as “any vehicle or medium for carrying and transmitting a policy message” for framing the context of policy text production.
It was informed by the analyses of core CPD policy texts in Chapter 6 and interviews in Chapter 7, revealing how policy players made meaning of such texts. In recognition of reality, the conditions of school culture, teachers’ experience and perspectives, attitudes towards professionalism and decisions taken to adopt new CPD policy approach at the local level cause great impacts at all levels of CPD policy text production. Surrounding the production of the CPD policy text, four themes were explored within what Harman (1984) describes as the major activities associated with the ‘context of policy formulation and authorization stage’:

i) exploration of various alternatives

( Newly transformed CPD policy framework );

ii) formal authorization of particular strategies through legislation, issue regulation or publication of a directive.

( Professional support for policy production )

iii) formulation of prepared courses of action

( Changes to CPD policy documentation )

iv) efforts to achieve consensus or compromise

( Engagement in policy consultation )

A balanced CPD policy text would give the teacher possibilities to be innovative and interpret it from his / her own perspective. So it is of crucial importance just how the policy agents interpret the context. The above themes corresponded with the analyses brought by the theoretical lenses as already outlined in Chapter 2 since CPD policy texts were consistently viewed as being socially constructed, consisting of ‘what’, ‘how’, ‘when’ and ‘where’ is taught or learned (Cambridge, 2011) at local primary school level. Each theme is explained below and some with identified sub-themes. As they are interconnected, policy message is interpreted, produced and enacted where conflicts, misinterpretations and negotiations take place (Ledger, 2013).
9.3.1 Newly transformed CPD policy framework

Blandford (2000) declared *CPD focuses on fostering individual competence to enhance practice and facilitate dynamic changes in education*. There is no doubt that CPD is vital to all stakeholders in the process of education. It seems from this study that part of the drive towards a newly accepted CPD policy was based on the transition from a more ‘Laissez-faire CPD policy’ in the 1980s and the 1990s to a more ‘systematic CPD planning’ from 2000 and onwards. There had been strong demands for a comprehensive system of CPD since 1982 (Education Commission 1992, 1997; ACTEQ 1998). Teachers’ CPD had been generally regarded as equally as important as initial teacher education (Lai & Lo, 2007; Tang & Choi, 2009) as a result of the emerging schooling market. However, this had largely taken the form of in-service training (INSET) courses or one-off seminars and workshops, run and government-imposed professional training and graduate qualifications as prerequisites for entering the teaching profession (Ng, 2003). During this period, CPD participation was voluntary and it was peripheral to teachers’ interests and concerns (Little, 1987; Ng, 2003). No requirements were imposed on teachers to engage in CPD until 1992. By 1997, Education Commission Report 7 was asserting the crucial role of the school in CPD.

It was not until 2000, however, that the government finally put stronger pressure on the shoulders of teachers, as professionals, when the curriculum reform ‘Learning to Learn’ was released (Education Commission, 2000; Curriculum Development Council, 2001). The crucial turning point in CPD policy emerged in 2003 when ACTEQ launched *Towards a Learning Profession: The Teacher Competencies Framework and the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers* (ACTEQ, 2003). A new systematic CPD framework, Teacher Competence Framework (TCF), proposed a map of generic teacher competencies not only for teachers but also those facilitators of teachers’ learning and development. It stated, *...the basic premise of the framework is the personal growth and development of teachers* (ACTEQ, 2003:24).
Discourses highlighted in the 2003 Hong Kong CPD policy text and other documentary sources reflected a new focus on a structural conceptualization of teacher professionalism. The ACTEQ first presented the TCF as a competency-based and structural framework for those teachers and facilitators. The focus on developing teachers’ knowledge and skills was emphasized in different domains: 1. Teaching and Learning; 2. Student Development; 3. School Development; and 4. Professional Relationships and Services. Its underlying argument echoes Fullan’s (1991:123) concept of CPD as ‘the cornerstone for meaning, improvement and reform, because ‘professional development and school development are inextricably linked.’ This idea was integral to the CPD text: CPD refers to all kinds of learning opportunities that help teachers strengthen their professional practices. It acknowledged that the different kinds of professional learning and sharing activities taking place within and across schools should also be recognized and counted towards CPD. Furthermore the CPD framework was formulated with a focus on relevance and quality rather than on quantity (Interim Report, 2006: 5).

It seems that the CPD policy text was offering schools and teachers greater flexibility and autonomy to design and formulate school-based CPD plans because the Education Bureau clearly stated that required hours to be spent on CPD activities were flexible and to be determined at the schools’ discretion. However, different school cultures created differences in teachers’ perspectives about an effective CPD framework. The CPD Policy Document 2003 has been subjected to criticism for linking teacher professionalism to too much ‘educational jargon’ such as ‘quality education’, ‘lifelong learning’, ‘school development’, ‘effectiveness and improvement’. The majority of teachers who were interviewed in this study in 2010 all acknowledged O’Brien and MacBeaths’ (1999) idea that ‘CPD is increasingly regarded as an important means of contributing to the creation of more effective schools and as integral to learning organizations’.
They were ready to accept what the ACTEQ (2003) had promoted as the core value of CPD: “every teacher should be a continuous learner in order to advance the quality of our education system and the quality of student learning.” But they questioned their ability to achieve the sophisticated and complicated goals of the TCF when they had simultaneously to cope with the new curriculum reforms and also deal with the government’s CPD policy.

**9.3.1.1 School compliance with non-negotiable TCF directives**

The macro level CPD policy text directives are presented in the Teacher Competence Framework (TCF) document (ACTEQ, 2003) with specific parameters described in the four different domains and this demand certain amount of accountability from school to form their own policy texts at micro level but they are non-negotiable. The document outlines the limit of 150 CPD hours for a three-year schedule of professional development planning. Each school had to set up structural processes and systematic steps for implementing TCF as a compulsory part of the teacher CPD authorization process. The philosophical underpinnings offered in both CPD Policy Document 2003 and TCF, all call for ‘an alignment of school beliefs and values with CPD as a means of facilitating school improvement’. In fact, all three case study schools were required to plan and work within the parameters suggested by the ACTEQ and EMB. It seems that the majority of the participants at local primary schools needed to grasp the authorities’ interpretations of CPD concepts and they had little freedom to express their needs for a more flexible and acceptable teacher competency framework.

**9.3.2 Professional support for policy production**

The research literature suggests that peer support, school support and government support are essential to effective CPD (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Guskey, 2002; Goodall et al., 2005; Timperley, 2008). The government plays an important role through its initiation of CPD policy text production.
In the early policy trajectory, the EMB declared the CPD’s importance in these terms:

In the realm of continuing professional development, ACTEQ recommends a system that recognizes and facilitates teachers’ efforts to continuously refresh and upgrade themselves, as is done in most major professions.

Such policy text suggests that EMB expected teachers to undertake CPD enactment in 2003 because the ACTEQ repeatedly stated that it has responsibility to provide a common reference framework for establishing direction and creating momentum in continuing professional development (ACTEQ, 2003:2). Also at the macro level (evident in both document and interview data), the government continued to emphasize its ‘supporting’ role in the enactment of the Teachers’ Competence Framework (ACTEQ, 2003:6). The former Chairman of ACTEQ himself noted:

I think probably the ACTEQ has been careful in deliberating the conditions and support with which the recommendations can be most effectively implemented, whilst causing the minimum disturbance to the practice of teachers. The documents will embrace such conditions and support systems.

Support is further outlined in the CPD Policy Document 2003 by stressing the government’s role in:

- Taking the initiative in promoting professional sharing and a CPD culture among teachers and providing leadership and support by giving direction and creating the momentum necessary to promote teachers’ CPD;

- Continuing to invest in teacher development, sponsoring policy-initiated training, commissioning new teacher training programmes in order to meet prevailing needs and, where necessary, providing relief for teachers in full-time training;

- Reviewing the existing deployment of funds and its effectiveness in order to ensure that scarce resources are used in the most effective and equitable manner in the promotion of CPD among all teachers. (ACTEQ, 2003:18)
The government highlighted its role in CPD policy text production and its documents clearly stated that it would respond to teachers’ needs and demands. However, the evidence strongly suggests that it neglected teachers’ autonomy in the process of formulating and implementing the CPD Policy Document 2003. According to Lai (2005), professional development has been increasingly controlled by the bureaucracy and the strategies for professional development are strongly characterized by systematic requirements for teachers’ qualification standards and specialist subject knowledge. Research findings will further support this perspective in the forthcoming “process of consultation” section.

9.3.2.1 Supportive role of CPD teachers-in-charge

In all case study schools, CPD teachers-in-charge played a significant role in supporting teachers with interpreting and applying central and local policy texts especially in producing CPD texts. All CPD teachers-in-charge were found to be familiar with the core CPD policy texts and they were able to guide teachers towards a common understanding of the varying interpretations of CPD policy texts.

Since all the CPD teachers-in-charge were the ‘pilots’ to study the policy documents and they were sent to EMB to take the courses for CPD agenda planning, schools were given CPD policy knowledge and support. As a result, teachers were quite dependent on them and the majority agreed that they were being taught to make meaning of teachers’ CPD policy. As all the CPD teachers-in-charge were focussed on the underpinning of the policy document, the progress of CPD policy text production was similar in the three case study schools as the details and principles embedded in central policy texts had to be transplanted into school-based CPD policy texts. This actually provided some room for discussion and variation in interpretation.
### 9.3.3 Changes to CPD policy documentation

All support documents in the early stage of policy text production expressed the underlying theme of flexibility in order to complement the philosophy of a ‘loosely-controlled’ CPD policy framework. Although the government apparently intended to encourage lifelong and developmental concepts of teacher education, it appears that limited research was undertaken to ensure the production of a widely accepted CPD document. According to Chan et al. (2005), different schools have a different pace of implementing school-based CPD policy, and CPD activities have been ‘stimulated and supported’ at different schools which are allowed to have flexibility in CPD development with different backgrounds (Chan & Lee, 2008:97).

The ACTEQ certainly claimed that the first CPD support documentation was deliberately flexible. The ‘school-based’ nature of good CPD seemed to be synchronized with the policy-makers’ emphasis that the needs of teachers in CPD vary ‘from person to person, and from school to school’ (ACTEQ, 2003:6). When the CPD Document 2003 was released, ACTEQ declared that the construction of the generic TCF presented ‘a traveller’s guide to the world of teachers’ professional development’. The Task Force and the Focus Group also arranged and presented consultations to provide positive comments and thoughtful opinions on the generic TCF and how teachers’ CPD might be moved forward:

The “map” does not dictate the routes that the traveller has to undertake. It lays out the landscape of professional growth and provides both individual teachers and their schools with a sense of ‘where they are’ in the journey to fuller professional maturity. Schools are encouraged and expected to make their own modifications and build a set of references that identify the way ahead and lead to school improvement through professional development (ACTEQ, 2003:9).

But the pervasive discourses implicit in Guidelines for Principals’ CPD Framework (2002) underscored these core purpose of CPD:

To enhance the professionalism and competence, school principals need to lead their schools towards excellence in students’ learning (CPD For School Excellence, 2002:3).

This document also contained the more specific enactment information of how the government had equipped school heads to update their values, knowledge, skills and attributes.
To pursue CPD within the interrelated leadership domains, ‘teacher professional growth and development’ was listed as the core area of leadership which principals were required to promote to enable continuing professional and career development for both teachers and themselves. The Guidelines for Principals’ CPD Framework declared that all principals needed to foster the sharing of up-to-date professional knowledge and informed practice aimed at accommodating change as well as the diverse needs of students within a general commitment to student and school improvement. In fact, the Principals’ CPD Framework represented a significant shift in the teachers’ CPD policy process. In the light of the feedback from the education sector, the Sub-committee on Principals’ Professional Development under the Board of Education recommended that the proposals in the “Consultation Document” be universally adopted. The recommendation was also subsequently endorsed by the Board of Education itself and the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications.

The CPD arrangements covered all serving principals, newly appointed principals and aspiring principals. To take forward the entire CPD programme and framework, the Education Department also set up a Steering Committee on Principals' Professional Development to advice on matters relating to the principals’ certification and professional development. While ACTEQ stressed that the CPD Document 2003 did not constitute a syllabus or timetable for teachers’ CPD, the Principals’ CPD Framework nonetheless provided an indication of ‘pioneer’ content for further teacher professionalism.

A speech from the press conference by the Director of Education, Mr. Matthew Cheung Kin-Chung illustrated the tightening guidelines:

Indeed the framework is by the principals, of the principals and for the principals. The framework, which aimed at enhancing the professionalism of principals and providing quality assurance, marks a significant milestone in upgrading the professional skills and confidence of Hong Kong’s school heads (June 28, 2002).
Once again, while early support documents from both the government and the policy elite continued to stress the highly consultative and collaborative processes, stating that they were a response to more specific CPD guideline information being derived from in-depth discussion and extensive consultation processes, the policy strings were tightening!

Among the three case study schools, CPD policy texts were cross-referenced with CPD Policy Document 2003 and each school-based policy texts and practices were guided by the TCF, with strategic plans outlining intended steps for implementation. Different discourses embedded in the school CPD documents reflect the different settings and interpretations by the schools. For example, teachers filter the associated terminology related to professionalism and professionalization and CPD concepts through their own interpretative framework. Also, the schools adopted the CPD vernacular and it was extensively used in CPD policy transmission. At the individual school level, the embracing of professional collaboration by teachers enhanced their confidence to take ownership of CPD policy texts. As one of the participants declared, *the policy texts provided our schools with targets and processes but they needed to be strategically planned* (Respondent 3 and 5). It seems that each school responded to the local setting, in a similar way, and all were attempting to adapt CPD policy to local circumstances.

### 9.3.4 Engagement in policy consultation

Dadds (1997) reminds us that teachers’ voices and needs should be heard and their experiences should be shared and reflected, because the core value of CPD is its moral purpose – ‘the nurturing of inner wisdom and critical judgement about what can be provided for each child and in each situation’. The former Chairman of ACTEQ states that when the current discussions started, ACTEQ had been working with the support and participation, in various ways, of over 200 professionals who shared inspirational thoughts during informal consultation sessions (ACTEQ, 2003: i).
In this study, especially in the process of consultation, teachers’ engagement in the process of formulating CPD planning seems relatively sparse. Although the discourses of ‘consultation’ seemed to form part of the ‘policy legitimization’ strategy of the ACTEQ and Education Bureau, government documents are very vague about what constitutes a well-represented consultation (Walker & Cheong, 1996).

ACTEQ documents stressed the essence of ‘active consultation’ between schools and teachers:

One central theme of “CPD Document 2003” is that a well-conceived school-based policy should be formulated with teachers’ participation and that agreement should be reached between the school and teachers regarding the corresponding action plans. This is an interactive process, which provides a valuable opportunity for teachers to engage in professional dialogue. Teachers’ participation in discussing the various proposals on what is to be recognized and counted towards CPD, in a climate of trust, is essential to fostering teachers’ professional autonomy and enhancing teachers’ professionalism (Interim Report, 2005:7). (This researcher’s bolding)

The government’s primary concern was to deliver policy dissemination to the teachers. In order to convince the stakeholders in the policy processes, ACTEQ also presented positive findings on two emergent themes: teachers’ level of acceptance of the CPD policy recommended in “CPD Document 2003” and how the CPD framework was being implemented in the Interim Report. It emphasized the breadth and depth of the formal consultation processes and the absence of major criticisms:

On the whole, teachers agreed to the overall direction of the CPD policy, and were receptive to the concept that “teachers need to undergo continuous learning”. Regarding the conditions considered conducive to the successful implementation of a school-based teachers’ CPD policy, the overwhelming majority of respondents agreed to all the seven conditions … and teachers’ understanding of the spirit underlying the CPD policy” all received a rating of over 90%. (HKPERA & EC Research on ACTEQ Study 2005: 11)

The ACTEQ Study 2007 reported that teachers’ perceptions of the CPD Document 2003 were positive. However, Wan (2011) suggests that since ‘interviews were conducted mainly with teachers who received awards from the government, their views were likely to be more positive and their CPD aspirations were higher than teachers in general’.
Certainly in this study, there have been many criticisms concerning the enactment of teachers’ CPD policy. In the three case study schools, there was no consensus about the extent of teacher involvement in policy consultation. Here are some examples of what they thought about this domain:

**School A**

*CPD is still a ‘vague’ term in their minds because only the new teachers had to read the policy document and the school authority relied on a more complicated performance system to collect data about teachers’ professional needs, so the colleagues are less willing to express freely their opinions in striving for a valuable participation in their own CPD planning* (RST 5 and 6 from School A).

**School B**

In our school, teachers are encouraged and conscientiously involved in the process of understanding what is required to improve their performance since the whole CPD planning was directly linked with the school improvement plan and department improvement plan. The development of the Professional Development Committee after 2006 increased the teachers’ CPD representation in policy planning process. There is a strong awareness of, and commitment to empower not only the school but also the teachers to improve their understanding of CPD practice and planning (RST 3 and 4 from School B).

**School C**

While some teachers in School A were indifferent about participation and teachers in School B seem somewhat enthused, the process of CPD policy consultation seemed to be downplayed in School C:

*Many teachers are still sceptical about the structure of CPD planning. The curriculum development committee and the subject panels are still the main source of teachers’ ideas. Normally, the Principal and the Vice-Principal make the decisions. Although an ‘open positive learning culture’ was encouraged, the purpose of CPD at School C was conceived mainly as fulfilling the function of preparing teachers to access and accept the policy document and implement reforms (RST 5 from School C). Participation in formulating CPD policy does not take place at the individual level. Teachers only participate minimally in school administration and the teacher’s role is to teach. We must fulfill the CPD requirements no matter whether we like it or not’ (RST 6 from School C).

The above findings reflect that there was not a high level of consensus amongst the teachers concerning CPD policy consultation processes, partly because of different school interpretations about the policy document. Most participants stated that they had not been adequately consulted and many felt that the EDB or the ACTEQ had ‘manipulated’ the policy agenda through their selection of school or education representatives.
On the contrary, ACTEQ’s view was it had consulted adequately and that the policy document had been widely acknowledged. It argued that the majority of teachers were being asked to provide feedback if they still had doubts or questions. Its undoubted power over the direction of the policy agenda was manifested in two ways: through its selection of the high-profile educational experts to take part in the Focus Group, and by its controlled response to teachers’ feedback. Some participants felt that ACTEQ was dismissive of their negative feedback:

_We expected that ACTEQ would listen to us but our concerns were never answered and I feel that the Council was insincere, especially in consultative forums, because only the school head or the person in charge of CPD actually bring people to be the audience, and they generally follow their own agenda_ (RST 4 and 5 from School A and C).

Both the schools and the government seemed to have a strong element of guidance and control of the policy processes as executive decisions made public consultation seem sufficient. As a result, the validity of the consultation process was highly questionable.

### 9.4 Context of policy practice

This section provided insights into the ‘voices’ of the respondents in the context of policy implementation. It examines the policy issues in relation to the practices or effects of CPD policy enactment. It emerged from the interviews that most respondents were aware of the existence of CPD Policy Document (2003) although the introduction of the policy was not organized in formal forums. They indicated that they learnt about the policy from limited sources such as the official EDB circular or school CPD agenda. For instance one respondent declared: _It doesn’t matter, it was something certainly talked about in school and it appeared in the newspapers_ (RST 4 from School A). Some of the respondents considered that they had not been directly informed or consulted about the introduction of the new teachers’ CPD policy.
Publicity given to the CPD policy document was limited. One respondent said *I remember my colleagues were consulted from other areas but we had no idea about how they had learnt about the policy and the Teacher Competency Framework* (RST 1 and 2 from School C). Numerous respondents were frustrated in their reaction to its implementation. They asserted that the officers from ACTEQ and EMB seldom visited, seeking evidence concerning the enactment of CPD policy.

In summary, a variety of interpretations of CPD policy practices were in circulation among different schools. Insufficient time, limited learning and teaching resources, large class sizes, heavy workload, a lack of external support (e.g. from local education authorities), and the attitudes of some colleagues confronted teachers from the case study schools in CPD policy practices. However, some respondents mentioned adequate support from the EDB and the ACTEQ, support from the School Professional Development Council and teachers in-charge-of CPD and School Heads. As a result, there were diverse understandings amongst the participants on issues ranging from their interpretation of what CPD policy meant, to how they should respond to the policy framework. The nature of what happened in this regard reflect in the words of Ball (1994a), what eventuated was a “translation of the crude, abstract simplicities of policy texts into interactive and sustainable practices of some sort” through “productive thought, invention and adaptation” (Ledger, 2013). The context of practices can be associated with some themes related to change and support from schools and teachers themselves. The themes are expanded below.

**9.4.1 Changes of school direction on CPD policy enactment**

From 2004 to 2007, schools in Hong Kong began to follow the guidelines in developing their CPD plans. In this study, the interviews indicated that when schools first learnt about the new CPD policy in 2003, teachers had mixed feelings, some did not know what this entailed.
The teachers in School A were comfortable because CPD had already been integrated into their school development plan, so they did not have problems with it. Teachers felt confident because it dealt with things that they already knew, and there was nothing to worry them as they were able to relate it to their own personal growth. Favorable local interpretations of the CPD environment appears to have led to a sense of familiarity with the new CPD policy and a notion that CPD was a ‘planning document’ that operated on a ‘whole school’ approach.

School A, a government-subsidized school, was not obliged to fully enact the CPD policy. However, under strong leadership and clear expectations, the ‘soft-landing’ approach was adopted and accepted within a few years after the release of the policy document. The evidence suggests that teachers exercised their reflexive powers in engaging with the policy. Some teachers argued that the majority were relatively supportive of the school CPD policy context because the working documents were more teacher-friendly. However, others still had the feeling of being neglected, especially if they were not familiar with the TCF or lacked the opportunity to discuss or express their professional needs.

School B was quite active in its response to CPD policy implementation. The autonomy of being an independent school was a strong theme. Teachers claimed that changes had been made, thus alleviating the pressure of a top-down CPD model. The formation of the Professional Development Committee after 2006 greatly increased the representation of teachers in CPD planning. Because of greater diversity, a policy network was created between the EMB and School B so it was more accountable to ACTEQ through the policy enactment, and its approach was guided by the policy document. When the policy document was first released, no particular policy was developed in School B for enacting CPD, and only the PSMCD and subject departments chose to engage with the Teachers’ Competency Framework individually. This high level of departmental autonomy led to considerable diversity of enactment within the school.
The management team identified professional support from the ‘School Circle’ as a key factor which ‘helped foster a positive response’ to enacting CPD policy. However, some teachers felt policy implementation was superficial when all heads of the subject departments or the PSMCD pushed the idea of CPD as ‘school improvement’. It seemed that the ‘spirit’ of fair participation in professional planning and organization was neglected:

We can only choose those courses recommended by the departments and attend other courses that we are prepared to upgrade our professional skills. We want to decide our own CPD context but in our school, personal need is some sort of unfamiliar say in enhancing our professional development (RST 4 & 5 from School B).

This situation in School B shows that the teachers lacked the power to influence school level policy decisions, and only the school management team exercised a high level of professional judgement in CPD planning as it had greater flexibility to direct CPD in the policy agenda. Since teachers could only provide feedback on school decisions, they consequently did not have the opportunity for ‘authentic’ involvement in the policy implementation process. By contrast, with a clear vision to establish a professional learning community, School C tended to directly connect its CPD policy approach to the goal of improving student outcomes. Although its CPD approach was guided by CPD 2003 policy, as a private school, School C was able to maximize the use of its own autonomy to create, and initiate, an ‘open positive learning culture’ for its CPD planning.

Teachers in School C observed that in the early days, soon after the CPD Document 2003 was released, the school administration decided to prepare teachers to access and accept the policy document and implement reforms. The school’s policy was sharpened after 2007, when the vice-principal was appointed to ‘take charge’ of staff CPD, and subject groups began to address the issue of raising teachers’ abilities as well as students’ learning outcomes. A whole school CPD enactment approach was developed through subject and group development teams which was based around the underpinnings of training teachers as researchers, learners or ‘reflective practitioners’ (Fullan, 1991).
Teachers also noted that the school had a strong focus on building teachers’ competency, and empowering teachers to respond to students learning and social change. But some still had reservations when they observed that CPD planning was weakened by this top-down approach:

*Individual teachers are unfamiliar with CPD planning since they might not have felt the need to look deeply into the policy document. The school focused more on reaching the target of fulfilling individual teachers’ TCF as far as the CPD framework is concerned: much attention has been focusing on the development of subject and group through the contribution from action-research (RST 2 and 5 from School C).*

Another prevailing phenomenon was that the school authority had ‘underestimated what’s demanded from the interests of individuals’ (RST 4 of School C) for CPD policy enactment. Many teachers were suspicious about claims of ‘real participation’ in CPD planning since the curriculum development committee and the subject panels were still the main source of teachers’ ideas.

### 9.4.2 A commitment to professional change

The enactment of new CPD policy at local primary schools provided a more strategic approach to encourage professional change. From the questionnaire data presented in Chapter 5, 84.3% of all respondents agreed that they were aware of the CPD hours that they should commit to in the 3-year cycle and 69.9% also accepted that it was their responsibility to achieve enough CPD hours in ‘structured mode’ and ‘other modes’ within the CPD framework. The overwhelming majority (59%) was only aware of the items in the CPD policy document but they had not read it. Unexpectedly, over 50% of the respondents agreed that they would use the document as a tool in planning their CPD but nearly 60% of them did not follow the ‘Teacher Competencies Framework’ (TCF) to help plan their continuing professional development from 2004 to 2007. It was apparent that teachers from the three case study schools were in favor of accepting a new CPD model. However, many were still unable to understand the policy document, or felt helpless in terms of finding suitable advice from the school authority about future CPD planning. There is a clear discrepancy between teachers’ awareness of relevant CPD policy documents, and school practice.
The demand for higher teachers’ qualifications obviously affects teachers’ choices of CPD activities. Most teachers tended to choose CPD activities that could bring about immediate improvements in teaching and learning. Teachers agreed that attending CPD activities could help them expose themselves to more updated subject. Pedagogical change can be effective and significant in bringing about positive change to their professional lives.

The questionnaire data presented in Chapter 5 revealed that the teachers in all three schools viewed workshops (34.5%) as the most useful mode of CPD activity, although some argued that those offsite activities were less practicable. Seminars (35%) and sharing ideas with colleagues (34%) were considered the most useful CPD content for personal professional development. Similar findings appeared in teachers’ participation. Teachers of School A and B had more favorable attitudes to their participation in CPD workshops and seminars while teachers in School C regarded co-teaching (30%) as another useful CPD activity, since most ‘Circle Schools’ had institutionalized it as part of daily duties.

But heavy workloads and time factors hindered teachers’ participation in CPD. Some teachers claimed that they were not resistant to change but clearly, teachers’ commitment to professional change is greater when they have strong support and leadership at the school level. On the whole, changes in teacher practice took place once the schools adopted CPD policy for teacher development and school improvement. Teachers began to engage more actively and collaboratively in the policy process than before and they also developed an awareness of promoting ‘action’ as an important outcome of continuous learning and teaching. As a result, CPD was considered to be a ‘point of reference’ for both personal and professional growth.
9.4.3 A CPD culture for professional responsibility

The qualitative findings in the focus group and individual interviews with teachers is consistent with the quantitative finding of the questionnaire survey. The majority of teachers had mixed feelings when they first learnt about the CPD policy. Some had their own understandings of what it is and what it entails but others had some reservations especially when they did not fully understand about how the Teachers’ Competency Framework (TCF) was counted for their professional development. However, after a few years of CPD policy implementation in different schools, teachers began to show their interests in nurturing a CPD culture for professional responsibility. The establishment of the ACTEQ was an effective advisory body to give advice to all schools in Hong Kong so that they could become accountable for their planning of CPD. The CPD Policy Document 2003 presented as a ‘route’ and ‘framework’ and it allowed flexibility and empowerment for schools and teachers to develop their own CPD.

Data suggests that teachers across all case study schools gradually came to exercise their reflexive power in engaging with ACTEQ’s policy as they felt that CPD “is good because it gives them lifelong learning skills and helps them to develop positive attitudes towards a strong sense of internal professional responsibility and accountability to themselves and other stakeholders” (former Chairman of ACTEQ). The CPD document represents an unprecedented level of Hong Kong government involvement in the long-term development of teachers’ professionalism at least since the implementation of SBM (School Based Management) in the year 2003. Teacher professional identity is raised when the accountability to the public is increased. This is consistent with researchers’ argument:

Professional identity is linked to power, and is affected by experiences both within and outside of schools as well as beliefs and values (Seddon, 1997a; Sachs, 2001; Whitty, 2002).

The overwhelming majority of teachers reported a CPD culture of professional change but they expressed considerable concern about the impact of CPD policy implementation.
They were still confused with the evolving nature of the policy text which seemed to create too great an expectation for enactment. School A and B had to adhere more to EMB policy in their enactment of the CPD, whereas private School C could cater to market the demand for particular CPD styles. It seems that all schools created considerable diversity of CPD enactment within the schools. For example, teachers in School A and B claimed that they enjoyed a great deal of trust from the school management in their professional responsibility, while teachers in School C reported pressure when the school authority expected them to perform well, not only in student outcomes but also in teachers’ professional identity. It would seem that tensions need to be negotiated between government and the schools in order to foster a healthy CPD culture.

9.4.4 School support to foster professional autonomy and professionalism

CPD is regarded as an on-going process for enhancing professionalism and personal growth. Teachers at all case study schools strongly argued for more time for school CPD activities and more freedom for professional autonomy. Nearly two-thirds of teachers in this study claimed that they were suffering from ‘policy-overload’ and they regarded time and heavy workload as inhibiting factors in developing their professionalism. School A and B teachers explained that different types of administrative and clerical work “killed” much of the time and space to plan and engage in CPD. School C teachers also regarded ‘extra’ work such as writing research reports as an obstacle to their participation in CPD.

According to the teachers, the level of school support and arrangement for CPD and its nature, depended heavily on the principal’s understanding. Approximately half of the teachers in this study suggested that those who are eager to learn and upgrade their professional competency should be rewarded with government or school subsidies in long-term CPD courses. Teachers expressed frustration when school development needs ‘override’ personal CPD needs.
School support only emerged when there was a balance between school or institutional needs and personal needs. Teachers’ motivation to seek more professional autonomy in CPD participation and planning is affected by the choice of CPD provider. Some argued that the EMB is ‘too directive’ about providing autonomy in the policy document whereas the schools are ‘passive’ in taking care of teachers’ self-interested CPD. Teachers of School A felt that the quality of CPD activities was too varied and not regular, while School C teachers requested the contents of CPD programs should be updated and more practical.

On the whole, teachers’ participation in CPD activities in all study schools seems to suggest insufficient support from ACTEQ or EMB. The lack of clear CPD policy explanation disempowers teachers from having a clear understanding of the CPD policy. However, school support is, to some extent, enough in encouraging and motivating teachers to engage in CPD activities. Professional autonomy is limited when there is not enough representation in school-based CPD planning.

9.4.5 Interaction of CPD policy with local setting

At the very beginning, the government wanted to use the policy document as a convincing tool to establish a CPD culture so that it could reduce the discrepancies between local schools and teachers in continuous professional training and development (former Chairman of ACTEQ).

In this study, the policy document seems, to some extent, to have successfully encouraged the schools to foster a high-value teaching culture. For example, from School A to School C, the CPD leaders spoke of the benefits of supporting teachers’ CPD policy, and all schools provided teachers with opportunities to meet the CPD requirements. Hence, the trend of developing a ‘learning community’ was firmly embedded after the implementation of CPD policy.
Teachers at the three schools developed their roles and identities in their respective communities. Those young and inexperienced teachers learned from the mentors the skills for pedagogical and developmental change in local settings, whilst the more experienced teachers learned the preparedness to engage with policy planning and implementation. Thus, the centralized CPD policy promoted a collaborative approach at the case study schools, with its continual reference to developing a ‘community of learners’ in its policy documents (Ledger, 2013). By using a ‘loosely-controlled’ policy document, the EMB and the ACTEQ had sought to offer schools greater flexibility to plan for teachers’ CPD. However, not all teachers read the details of the policy document, so CPD remained unclear in the minds of the respondents. Some of them were only advised of the number of required CPD hours and they were often under pressure to choose only CPD activities that supported school improvement and subject development. Data indicated that the majority of teachers initially viewed CPD as similar to the Teacher Competencies Framework (TCF) but tensions arose when many realized that contrary to ACTEQ’s intent, their personal interests and needs were not being fully considered in CPD choices made available by their schools.

Some years after the enactment of the policy document, teachers in some schools tended to be more autonomous and they had a greater sense of CPD ownership but the majority were still not satisfied with compulsory nomination of CPD planning. When the government generated its CPD policy framework, teachers had limited involvement in the CPD policy-making process and their professional needs were not well taken into account. From the government’s perspective, it believed that teachers showed limited interest in, and desire for, educational policy participation, because they have long been accustomed to hierarchical power relationships and, for example, the meanings of SBM was still not yet well-understood (Ng, 2003). As a result, there emerged significant discrepancies in expectation between teachers, schools and government in promoting teachers’ professionalism.
Among the case study schools, CPD leaders were mostly in charge of the school year development plan, and only the subject or department panels had real opportunities to reflect their teachers’ ideas. The majority of teachers were rarely active participants in the decision-making concerning school development. Yet the principals or the ACTEQ stressed that “every CPD policy aims to raise teachers’ CPD levels” but to a certain extent, a recognized paradigm shift occurred when teachers were more engaged in the involvement in policy development. Wong (2005) stated that “Teachers’ voices should be thoroughly considered during the planning process of formulating an effective CPD policy.” The findings in this study suggest that the above goal of having teachers’ role as an active participator in CPD policy or management have not yet been realized and remain, at the very least, significantly underdeveloped.

Another important finding was that the provision of CPD activities often created a gap between teachers, schools and the government in promoting future professional development. In most case study schools, CPD activities were heavily school policy-oriented, as teachers usually made choices to meet official requirements or school demands. In other words, teachers’ CPD needs were not generally based on their professional growth but rather CPD activities were valued as tools to upgrade their academic knowledge and skills or address students specific needs. Some teachers argued that their motivation to participate in CPD activities was considerably lowered when onsite CPD programs were similarly related to school’s performance management system. The CPD leaders needed to report their performance and it was counted in the school’s appraisal system, rather than being used for professional development purposes. This further affected teachers’ incentives to improve as life-long professionals.
9.5 Summary

The relative role and power of the government changed throughout the policy process. In effect, the powerful ACTEQ and EMB forced schools to adopt CPD. And gradually a more positive attitude to CPD in schools become apparent. Ironically, the ACTEQ and the EMB empowered schools and teachers to have flexibility in CPD planning. Although some professional autonomy appeared to be emerging in all case study schools, many teachers still lacked awareness of their rights and responsibilities in policy formulation. This may be partly related to teachers’ indifference to political concerns about policies (Lau, 1997; Sweeting, 2008; Morris & Adamson, 2010).

Power emerged as the central theme in CPD policy consultation and production processes and it was also related to controlling attitudes of school managers and administration. The ACTEQ and the EMB appeared to ignore teachers’ negative feelings about consultation and collaboration processes. Teachers are often ‘marginalized’ in the policy making process and sufficient consultation is often absent (Wong, 2005). This certainly appeared to be the case when CPD policy was ‘being imposed’ by the EMB and decisions on implementation were made by the ‘policy experts’ from the ACTEQ and school administrators further up in the policy trajectory.

Tensions increased within the context of practices when the ACTEQ presented the CPD policy discourses as a guideline for increased teacher autonomy and professionalism. Also in the implementation process of CPD Policy Document 2003, most teachers lacked expertise in understanding policy discourses. Teachers at the first two case study schools (A and B) which were subsidized by the government, expressed a stronger sense of professional identity and accountability while those in School C argued that they were completely ‘policy-overloaded’ even when they were given the opportunities to become ‘researchers’.
The provision of professional development plays a crucial role in all phases of policy processes, especially in policy enactment. Promisingly, a CPD learning culture was emerging within all case study schools and it promotes and reinforces teachers as learners and researchers. Professional development delivery was a clear and consistent ‘message’ provided by the CPD policy document.

Teachers need to be supported and given chances to engage in sustained processes of reflection, collaboration and inquiry (Day, 1999; Eraut, 2001; Tickle, 2001). Teachers in Hong Kong still confront obstacles to fulfill professional CPD participation, with increases in workload, and inadequate resources such as time, funding, and professional support. We might well ask the question ‘How do we ensure teachers treasure the values of CPD to themselves as professionals and life-long learners?’

This answer given by ACTEQ seems sound: When teachers and CPD policy has reached a consensus, teachers’ CPD should be an essential part of a teacher’s professional life (ACTEQ, 2006:1). The findings from this study, suggest that a significant gap still exists between the intentions of ACTEQ’s CPD policy for and the current stage of CPD implementation. The next chapter will conclude with insights and implications for practitioners and policymakers. The context of outcomes will act as a ‘supplement’ to answer the last research question, to connect the summary of findings and correspond to the policy contexts in the policy trajectory. Then, a brief review of recent CPD development of teachers’ CPD policy, future research possibilities and limitations of the study will also be discussed.
CHAPTER TEN: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CPD POLICY DEVELOPMENT

10.1 Introduction

This chapter first concludes the thesis with a summary and discussion that interweave the findings of the study based on research questions. After cross-case (horizontal) analysis at the micro level (see Chapter 8), the context of outcomes provides a vertical analysis (from macro to micro levels) to reveal the ‘bigger picture’ on the impact of CPD policy on power inequalities and social justice which are the focal point of critical theory, as outlined in Chapter 6. Then, the chapter ends with some recommendations for policy and practice. Finally, a post-script will highlight the significant changes to teachers’ CPD policy from 2009 to 2013 with some concluding words.

10.2 Summary of the key findings in relation to different policy contexts

This section recalls the the research questions as they guided data collection and meta-analysis along the policy trajectory from the global world of CPD conceptualizations to the local world of teachers’ policy perceptions. Some propositions are summarized from the meta-analysis and they highlight the key themes which emerged in regard to the production, adoption and enactment of teachers’ CPD policy processes in local primary schools. With regard to Ball (1994) and Vidovich (2002) contexts in the policy process framework (see Fig.3.1), the major findings revealed variance in teachers’ understanding of CPD policy and practice, and propositions have been organized in relation to different research questions.

Context of influence

Research Question One: What were the influences leading to the initiation of teachers’ CPD policy in Hong Kong primary schools?

- Global trends of providing a systematic CPD policy for teacher professionalism have impacts on all contexts and levels along the policy trajectory and help facilitate the shaping of a more stable CPD policy from global to local school levels.
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Strong policy discourses support the government to ‘institutionalize’ teachers’ CPD policy in local schools in order to create a common tool for professionalism.

There was an unequal power relationship in the CPD policy text formation process:
   a. The Teachers’ Competency Framework (TCF) had been imposed ‘top-down’ by both EMB and ACTEQ at different times to legitimize CPD policy in the local education community.
   b. There was considerable consensus among teachers and policy actors that the CPD Policy Document 2003 was a kind of ‘paradigm shift’ in developing teachers’ professionalism.
   c. Teachers were critical of the powerful influence of key policy actors in EMB and ACTEQ who largely denied their strong role in the policy process.

**Context of policy text production**

| Research Question Two: What was the nature of teachers’ CPD policy text and how was it produced? |

- Power struggles between the EMB / ACTEQ with individual schools and teachers created a newly transformed CPD policy framework. Teachers largely accepted the core CPD value that the ACTEQ promoted, but they lacked confidence in achieving the goals of the TCF since they were not informed of the benefits in CPD policy production process.
- The Teacher Competence Framework (TCF) presented non-negotiable directives to schools and the majority of teachers needed to grapple with the interpretations of CPD concepts with little freedom to voice their needs for a more acceptable teacher competency framework.
- The government exerted centralised control over the policy discourses. It was largely key policy actors in EMB and only those teachers supported the ACTEQ position, who were selected to provide feedback on the policy texts.
- The CPD teachers-in-charge played a significant and dependent role in coordinating policy text production at the school level. They held key positions transmitting and moderating the interpretations and conceptualizations of CPD policy messages to local policy actors.
The CPD policy authorization process mandated change in policy documentation and practice at school level. To align with CPD Policy Document 2003, the Guidelines for Principals’ CPD Framework (2002) was a powerful tool for disseminating CPD core values and beliefs, and it was used together with the proposed TCF to inculcate the concepts of professionalism into all facets of policy production. Tensions emerged from teachers when there was inadequate support documentation to help them understand the ‘expert’ language in the complex policy texts.

 Teachers perceived insufficient consultation and collaboration in the production of CPD Policy Document 2003. There was no consensus about the extent of teacher involvement in policy consultation across the case study schools.

**Context of policy practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question Three: What policy practices were adopted in regard to the implementation of the CPD Policy Document (2003) in individual primary schools?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Teachers were aware of CPD policy but they showed little interest in responding to the policy framework due to the narrow publicity given to the CPD policy document.
- Heavy workloads, lack of sufficient government support and great variations in the provision of CPD activities added pressure upon teachers in the process of policy enactment.
- Favorable interpretations of CPD environment led to a change of school direction on CPD policy enactment.
- Teachers argued that they were highly accountable to CPD policy implementation but different levels of school autonomy disempowered them from participating in “real” CPD planning.
- Teachers’ commitment to professional change became greater when schools offered enough leadership and support in the policy implementation process.
• With more understanding on CPD policy document and the requirement of TCF, teachers were able to develop and exercise reflexive power in policy practice and engagement. Considering a CPD culture for professional responsibility was a value-laden exercise, teachers at the school level developed their roles and identities in their communities of practice.
• Teachers expressed frustration with CPD policy implementation since school development needs usually ‘over-rode’ their personal CPD needs. A competitive school CPD culture appeared when school and market forces affected teachers’ professional independence.
• A continuing and significant gap existed between teachers and the government over the current CPD implementation and the ‘real’ intentions of the CPD policy.

**Context of outcomes**

Research Question Four: What were the outcomes and implications of teachers’ CPD policy for the case study schools with regard to their future professional development?

The above contexts showed that teachers’ CPD policy process is complex, evolving and dynamic and it was shaped by an interaction of diverse global and local influences, policy text production and practices. But policy processes and outcomes are complex, messy and contested as power differentials offer broader issues to investigate the impact of policies on inequalities and social justice (Ball, 1994a, 2006; Ozga, 2000; Vidovich & Porter 1999, Vidovich 2007). Here, the researcher adds another context of analysis in the policy process framework (refer to Fig. 3.1) to reveal ‘bigger picture’ patterns of power flow through the policy trajectory so that “sight was not lost of the fact that, in reality, the various ‘contexts’ are multi-faceted, multi-dimensional and inherently interrelated” (Ledger, 2013). To answer the last research question, two themes emerged to highlight issues of power and social inequalities and they are presented as follows: ‘Power inequalities affect policy familiarity’ and ‘Perception change following the adoption of CPD policy’.
Power inequalities affect policy familiarity

Similar to the unqual power relationship which emerged in the policy formation process (see 9.2.3), the CPD policy processes were affected by different power plays which featured in the micro school environment. Tensions, negotiations, and power struggles were played out by the ‘power of individual teacher’ especially in the creation and enactment of policy. Due to small school setting in each case study school, the ‘power of group’ (subject teachers of the same interest groups or CPD teacher-in-charge and principal) played out as collaboration, friendship and cultural group. If the group joined forces, they had the capacity to become an influential majority voice, bringing with its associated power differentials (Ledger, 2013). Group dynamics and micro-politics involving personal and professional interrelationships definitely affected the policy process.

In order to promote CPD ideology within the arena of the policy trajectory, the CPD policy documents were powerful tools and texts which influenced schools and teachers to change perceptions and practice by aligning to CPD demands. On one hand, the CPD Policy Document (2003) wielded power over schools and it presented the policy governance of the EMB and ACTEQ on teacher professional development. On the other hand, the TCF advocated a ‘bottom-up’ approach to policy development as it offered flexibility for schools to plan their own CPD framework and schedule. Teachers seemed to be familiar with the rationale of CPD policy but they reached no consensus to either totally accept or resist the ‘top-down’ policy approach in future CPD development.

Perception change following the adoption of CPD policy

It is not surprising that all the case study schools had identified perception change and change agents as significant features in the CPD policy process. At the macro level, policy-makers from the ACTEQ and EMB were influential in managing change while the teachers-in-charge of CPD and the principals were powerful change agents at the micro level.
The adoption of new CPD policy attempted to change and re-conceptualize teachers’ perceptions of the social constructs of ‘professionalism’ and ‘professional development’. For local policy enactment, teachers were amongst the least powerful policy actors, especially when the schools monitor CPD policies and practices through stringent processes of accountability.

Power differentials from this finding implied that there are still ‘inherent’ differences between the government and school teachers regarding their perspectives on CPD policy implementation and implications when decisions were made by the ‘policy experts’ further up the policy trajectory and CPD policy became something ‘imposed on micro-participants’.

10.3 Implications for CPD policy and practice

This thesis found that there were definite, contrasting perspectives between the policymakers (former chairman of ACTEQ, school principals) and school teachers on the dynamics of EMB’s teacher CPD policy regarding policy and practice in local primary schools, despite claims of collaborative relationships within the policy network. Each of the analytical findings chapters explored the complexities of changing dynamics within and between the case study schools and the ACTEQ/EMB. They were characterized by power differentials, caused mainly by conceptual, structural and cultural factors. Based on the findings of this study, the following suggestions are offered:

10.3.1 For the Education Manpower Bureau and the ACTEQ

To ensure equality of representation of all interest groups in CPD policy construction, the EMB/ACTEQ should consider a careful restructuring of the committee for producing TCF. Instead of using its power through the policy text to effect an implementation, more primary and secondary teachers should be nominated to voice their interests in CPD policy construction and consultation processes.
Also, to prevent policy processes being dominated by key ‘insider’ groups (i.e. CPD policy experts or powerful key policymakers), the roles of different policy actors should be clearly delineated within the collaborative policy network. This can facilitate better trust and rapport relationship between policy actors and interest groups in creating an acceptable, understandable CPD policy text. The EMB could produce materials to address regional CPD issues, while ACTEQ could collect and circulate examples of district CPD plans annually. In such a situation, it is good practice for wide consultation to take place with all stakeholders in order that the materials may be of the highest quality and relevance.

Appointing a responsible person for CPD supervision in each school district is highly desirable to conduct consultation meetings or valuable sharing of CPD achievements and challenges. There should be specific Leadership and Management training for school heads and CPD teachers-in-charge, especially on the nature and purpose of CPD. The EMB/ ACTEQ could offer them capacity building to support teachers needs. By equipping the district CPD officers with relevant skills to train the school management teams currently, schools would have a clearer structure for identifying priorities and CPD. Both the EMB and the ACTEQ could establish cluster networks or e-platforms among schools in the same district to let teachers know and share more about the emerging trends in professional development service provision.

In order to eliminate some of the contradictions reflected in CPD policy documents, and confusion caused by practitioners’ misunderstanding of policy texts and discourses, ACTEQ should ensure that language in the policy text is clear and concise, with enough policy support documentation, produced in sufficient quantities, and distributed throughout the district. Open forums to elaborate specific enactment information needs to be shared with all teachers and integrated into the work of the schools with their own priorities, taking account of individual CPD interests.
10.3.2 For the school principals and CPD teachers-in-charge

CPD programmes should be designed to be appropriate to the needs, the context, the circumstances and available resources. School principals or CPD teachers-in-charge should bear in mind that ‘real CPD’ is achieved by a needs-based programme of activities which allows all teachers to improve their knowledge, skills and attitudes in order that they become more effective classroom practitioners and contribute positively to community development. A process of needs analysis or review from teachers at all levels is needed every year, to provide them with ownership of professional development. Kelchtermans (2004) explains that professional development should not be conceived only in terms of technical issues. Schools should recognize that professionalism is based on an internal and moral dimension on the part of the teachers. Students learning is also dependent on the teachers’ health and well-being. Hence, the continual encroachment of the working week into teachers’ domestic time should be addressed to counteract the current often negative impacts on long-term CPD policy.

As discussed, there is a strong need for a structured professional growth plan not just providing CPD for school development, and then compromised by teachers and administrators. In this way, teachers’ personal professional growth plans may provide an opening to build up collaboration and enhance collegiality (Wan, 2011 citing Fenwich, 2004). CPD leaders should be sensitive to teachers’ responses to the development of teacher competencies and their preferences for school-based CPD activities. They should address teachers’ concerns and difficulties about CPD participation. With balanced CPD opportunities, teachers’ personal needs might be better provided with flexible timetabling, release of heavy workload, coordination in CPD planning and adequate financial support. Moreover, principals and CPD teachers-in-charge should always make a point of identifying and empowering their colleagues as ‘expert teachers’. The synergy between ‘school learning community’ implementing CPD policies, the Education District Office and school cluster could be strengthened through improved inter-school connection.
Existing ‘School Circles’ could be given a higher profile by including PSMCDs, subject panels and department heads in their membership with the district officers. This could empower CPD development committees to make better decisions to ensure sound policy practices. With such meetings, the membership of these more representative committees could then consult extensively before committing to policy enactment and implementation. Schools should pay greater attention to a more systematic consultative process. Teachers perceive real authenticity when the schools increase the transparency of this CPD consultation process. Then, with clearer information about the updated policy developments, and opportunities for genuine reflection, there would be greatly improved possibilities of worthwhile CPD for those charged with enacting policy changes.

10.3.3 For the teachers

In this study, teachers reported features that make the policy practices more effective, such as their desire to accept CPD as a kind of professionalization and willingness to change. Some expressed disappointment about the implementation of CPD policy because of their convictions and the obvious discrepancies between their perceptions and those of the policymaker who prepared the policy document. Teachers need to understand that continuous professional development can be placed into two categories of meaning: Professionalism needs ‘updating’ and ‘upgrading’, not only in career status but also in professional competency. As every professional teacher participates in CPD during their career as a teacher, ‘updating’ is a continuous process which focuses on subject knowledge, pedagogy and self-improvement. Also, teachers need to participate in additional study outside their regular work in the process of ‘upgrading’. If teachers come to see themselves as not simply being pressured to be involved in the CPD reform agenda by the policy agents, but also as actively choosing to be involved, their willingness to cooperate with policy directives will be more positive.
On the pathway to believing in an ongoing process and progress of CPD policy, teachers must feel that they own their professional development. Confidence of the teachers in the whole process is required to support the school’s overall CPD agenda and the government’s intentions in CPD policy and implementation. Teachers should have an open mind and take the opportunities to gain an understanding of the underlying rationale of ‘real’ CPD within the Hong Kong context. They must come to acknowledge their responsibility for engaging actively in their own future CPD planning in consultation with others throughout their careers.

10.4 Implications for future research

Future research should consider the following points:

1. First, it is necessary to conduct detailed research that captures the CPD experiences through observing the interaction between the policymakers and teachers and among teachers themselves.

2. Moreover, it is important to explore other policymakers’ views of what is considered effective CPD and their vision for current CPD in Hong Kong to measure future trends and directions.

3. It could be valuable to replicate this study by exploring Hong Kong secondary teachers’ perceptions of CPD policy enactment and implementation.

4. Further research is needed into the question of how and how far, teachers’ interpretations of CPD policy and practices affect their morale and teaching performance.

5. Similarly valuable, would be a longitudinal study, comparing the findings of this current study in an attempt to further understand whether teachers’ satisfaction and confidence about CPD policy and practices improves as change occurs over time.

This initial provider-led Hong Kong CPD policy forced schools to implement CPD activities as features of a top-down delivery approach and, it rarely recognized teachers’ voices in policy production and construction. However, some significant changes have occurred after 2009.
Postscript

With the completion of the second cycle of the “try-out period” of TCF in 2009, school-based CPD experiences came to more closely resemble teachers’ self-directed professional development. ACTEQ recommended that schools should encourage teachers to exploit the potential of different learning modes including self-directed learning. As a result, more flexibility was offered to teachers for planning their CPD in their own time and at their own pace. By 2012, most of the schools had their own CPD committees and efforts were stepped up to build cross-schools networks among the staff responsible for CPD coordination. Sharing among schools also opened up valuable sources of reference for other schools in CPD overall planning. It seems that the culture of teachers’ CPD was gradually becoming rooted in schools and in the profession.

Finally, in 2013, ACTEQ was reconstituted as The Committee on Professional Development of Teachers and Principals (COTAP), with clearer specialization into:

1. A Sub-committee on Initial Teacher Education (SCITE);
2. A Sub-committee on Teachers’ Professional Development (SCTPD);

and (3) A Sub-committee on School Leadership (SCSL).

A more systematic and long-term CPD model of “Initial, Professional, Leadership” was issued to modify CPD into a more school-based TPD framework. COTAP promulgated Staff Development in three highlighted areas: 1. Initial Teacher Education (ITE), 2. Teachers’ Professional Development (TPD), 3. School Leadership (SL). It seems that the government was eager to apply a more holistic approach with a broader contemporary view of CPD. TPD is now embraced in more diverse forms, including all formal and informal activities that are pertaining to teacher learning and professional growth (Fullan, 1995).
Teachers are now more aware of the clear TPD framework, policies and guidelines. Schools are now able to identify their own areas of development based on their diversification. So, schools and teachers can plan ahead for what to develop and how to develop by soliciting both internal and external program providers. It is hoped and expected that the new CPD perspectives will create a base to help the shift to more collaborative forms of CPD. Measures taken by the government should help CPD become, “a joint mission, flexible enough to ensure that it is fit for purpose rather than a ‘one size fits all’ package of imposed change” (Cordingley et al., 2003, p.3).

10.5 Conclusion

This study claims only to provide insights into policy outcomes, creating new points for understanding different perspectives of teachers’ CPD policy construction and interpretation in the Hong Kong context. Many similarities and differences were found between policy processes, contexts and actors in local primary schools. Clearly, the agenda for CPD policy production and implementation is shaped by complex and interconnecting settings in relation to different dimensions of policy discourses along all levels of the policy trajectory. The findings highlight the complexities of power influences and social inequalities in making meaning of the CPD policy reform. Successful CPD policy enactment and implementation requires the support of all policy actors; and the most effective way to gain support is to have clear, understandable and transparent policy processes.

As a concluding remark, professional development would appear to need a more consistent and democratic policy articulation. It is hoped that this study proves useful to practitioners and policymakers seeking to improve teachers’ CPD policy design and enactment in the future.
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Appendix 1 Questionnaire on Teachers’ Continuing Professional Development  
(adopted and modified from Wong, 2005)

* All data will be used solely for academic purposes and is strictly confidential.  
Please put a tick in the checkbox wherever appropriate.

Part 1 According to your own experience of continuing professional development (CPD), please answer the following questions:

1. In school year 2004-2007, how much time did you spend on participating in CPD activities?  
(Including different modes of activities.) 
≤ 60 hours □ 61-90 hours □ 91-150 hours □ >150 hours □

2. In school year 2004-2007, did you participate in CPD activities in the following modes?  
(You can tick more than one option.) 
Seminars □ Workshops □ Mentoring □ Collaborative teaching □ 
Sharing ideas with colleagues (e.g. lesson preparation and observation) □ 
Others (Please specify. ______________________________________) □

3. The reasons for you to participate in CPD activities in school year 2004-2007 are:  
(You can tick more than one option.) 
Being assigned with new duties □ Updating subject knowledge □ 
Interested in those CPD activities □ Requested by principal or subject panel □ 
Fulfilling the requirement of the government (EMB) □ 
Upgrading professional competence in teaching and learning □ 
Others (Please specify. _________________________________) □

4. How would you comment on the CPD activities that you have participated in school year 2004-2007?  
Very useful □ □ □ □ Useless

5. What are the obstacles you encountered when participating in CPD activities in school year 2004-2007?  
_____________________________________________________________  
_____________________________________________________________  
_____________________________________________________________  
_____________________________________________________________
Part 2 According to your understanding of continuing professional development (CPD), please answer the following questions:

1. With reference to the content of CPD, which of the following options are **useful** to your personal professional development? (You can tick more than one option.)
   Teaching and Learning □  Student Development □
   Professional Relationships and Services □  School Development □
   Personal Growth and Development □
   Others (Please specify. ___________________________ ) □

2. With reference to the mode of CPD, which of the following options do you think are **effective** in enhancing your personal professional development? (You can tick more than one option.)
   Seminars □  Workshops □  Mentoring □  Collaborative teaching □
   Sharing ideas with colleagues (e.g. lesson preparation and observation) □
   Others (Please specify. ___________________________ ) □

3. Which of the following reasons can **enhance** your enthusiasm for participating in CPD activities? (You can tick more than one option.)
   Study allowances □  Study leaves □
   Reduction of workload □  Personal development opportunities □
   Others (Please specify. ___________________________ ) □

4. Who should be the most suitable and responsible party for the planning of CPD of teachers?
   The government (EMB) □  Teacher □
   Teacher in middle management □  The teacher in charge of CPD □
   School principal / Vice-principal □

Part 3 According to your understanding of the CPD policy document proposed by the Advisory Committee of Teacher Education and Qualification (ACTEQ) in 2003, please answer the following questions:

1. Have you read the CPD policy document proposed by ACTEQ in 2003?
   Yes □  No □
2. Were you aware of the following items about the CPD policy document proposed by ACTEQ in 2003?
   a. Teachers should participate in not less than 150 hours of CPD activities in a three-year cycle.
      Yes □   No □
   b. Teachers should participate in not less than 50 hours each in “structured mode” and “other modes” of CPD activities.
      Yes □   No □
   c. Teachers can decide to use or not to use the document as a tool in their personal professional development.
      Yes □   No □

3. Did you follow the “Teacher Competencies Framework” in the document to plan your professional development in school year 2004-2007?
   Yes □   No □
   (If “yes”, please answer question 4.)

4. The reason you followed the “Teacher Competencies Framework” in the document to plan your professional development in school year 2004-2007 was:
   (You can tick more than one option.)
   This framework could enhance my individual professional capabilities effectively
   This framework could help me to pursue my personal growth
   This framework could help me to upgrade my individual competitiveness
   This framework could enhance the quality of students’ learning in the long run
   Following the suggestion of government (EMB)
   Keeping pace with school-based CPD policy
   Other (Please specify. ______________________________________)

Part 4 Personal particulars:

Gender:       Male □   Female  □
Teaching level:  P.1-P.3 □  P.4-P.6 □
Teaching experience:  <5 years □  6-10 years □  11-15 years □
                   16-20 years □  >21 years □

Post:  CM □  AM / SAM □  APSM □  PSM □  SPSM □
Appendix 2  Focus Group Interview Questions –Micro-level  
(Case Study School Teachers)

Part 1

Educational and Professional Qualifications, Age, Gender, Years of Teaching Experience, 
Type of school

Part 2

Initial Questions

1. Can you tell me your understanding of the term “continuing professional development” 
(CPD)?

2. On average, how much time do you spend on CPD each year?

3. When should CPD activities be held? (e.g. long school holidays, weekends, weekdays…)
   Why?

4. Why did you participate in CPD activities?

5. What was included in terms of the content of these CPD activities? What were the criteria 
you used when choosing them? Why?

6. Did you participate in different modes of CPD activities? If yes, which modes of 
CPD activities do you think can most effectively enhance your personal 
professional development? Why?

(Context of Policy Influence)

1. How much do you know about the CPD policy document proposed by ACTEQ in 2003?

2. When and where did you read the ‘CPD Document 2003’?

3. What caused your school to develop and initiate teachers’ CPD policy?

4. Did your school adopt the CPD policy soon after the release of CPD policy document 
in 2003? If not, when was it adopted?

5. Who are the main policy actors initiating teachers’ CPD policy at your school?

6. Do they offer you flexibility or freedom to formulate your own CPD plans? 
   If so, comment on the influences that are operating.
(Context of Policy Production)

7. What processes and personnel are used to construct CPD policy at your school?

8. What are your perceptions and feelings about teachers’ CPD policy?

9. What is your view of how school-based CPD policy should be implemented?

10. After reading the policy document, did you better understand the Teachers Competencies Framework?

11. Do you think that teachers’ interests are well represented in the production of the school-based CPD policy text?

12. How do you convey your professional needs to your school?

13. Which of the following parties (EMB, subject panel, principal, teacher) do you think is best suited to plan your personal professional development? Why?

14. To what extent do you think that the ‘CPD Document 2003’ was a useful tool for providing guidelines and a framework for enhancing teachers’ professional development?

(Context of Policy Practices)

15. How does your school implement teachers’ CPD policy?

   (e.g. To incorporate different modes on staff development day or apply other modes?)

16. Did your school set a regular time-table to implement CPD policy from 2004 to 2007?

17. Do you think there is a big difference between your school and others regarding CPD practices? Can you give examples of schools with excellent CPD programs?

   What do they do?

18. Are you given enough opportunities to participate in CPD planning with the policy actors in your school?

19. Where do you prefer to have your CPD development programs/activities?

   Inside or outside the school? Why?

20. What are your views or feelings about the CPD content and modes of CPD after participating in different CPD activities from 2004 to 2007?
21. Do you view the CPD hours and activities as worthwhile in increasing your professional growth? Why?

22. Do you feel that your school has a comfortable environment to allow everybody to develop their own CPD?

23. Have you experienced any significant or valuable professional changes after participating in certain CPD activities?

24. Can you comment on the CPD policy of the school that you’re working in?

25. Are the teachers in your school well aware of the school-based CPD policy?

(Context of Policy Outcomes)

26. To what extent do the colleagues in your school accept or support the implementation of the CPD policy?

27. What was the impact of the CPD policy on the future development and planning of teachers’ CPD programs?

28. If you had a chance to give feedback to the policy makers, what advice would you give in order to enhance professional autonomy in CPD?
Appendix 3  Individual Interview Questions -Macro-level  
(Chairman of ACTEQ)

Part 1

Educational and Professional Qualifications, Age, Gender, Years of Professional Experience

Part 2

Initial Questions

1. Can you tell me what work you were doing in teachers’ continuing professional development since 2003?

2. What can you tell me about teachers’ CPD policy? Again what do you think of it?

3. Why do you think the teachers’ CPD policy needed to be implemented?

(Context of Policy Influence)

1. What caused the Hong Kong Education Manpower Bureau (EMB) to develop and initiate the teachers’ CPD policy? (Think of both local, regional and international context. Was it an outcome of national and external influence?)

2. Did the Hong Kong Education Manpower Bureau follow any kind of specific format for developing the teachers’ CPD policy?

3. Did the Hong Kong Education Manpower Bureau follow any kind of learning theories, principals or approaches in developing the teachers’ CPD policy?

4. How was the teachers’ CPD policy initiated?

5. Who were the players? E.g. Was it government policy making body (ies), stakeholders, or pressure groups including professional organizations? (Name the players and how they particpated?)

6. How was the teachers’ CPD policy going to be implemented?
(Context of Policy Production)

7. When did the EMB/ the ACTEQ start to produce the CPD policy text?

8. Why was it announced and published in 2003?

9. What were the intentions of the EMB/ the ACTEQ in producing the CPD policy document?

10. How were the intentions to be achieved?

11. How did the EMB/ the ACTEQ intend to implement this policy in schools?

12. How well were teachers’ interests and voices represented in the production of the policy text?

13. How did teachers perceive the policy? Did they understand the items on the policy document?

14. In their understanding(s), how was the policy to be implemented?

   (To reflect on their understandings, their feelings, their competence, the acceptance or resistance of the CPD policy?)

15. Why did the EMB/ the ACTEQ choose to incorporate Teachers Competencies Framework (TCF) on the policy document?

16. What changes were you (policy makers) expecting from teachers and learners as a result of the policy production?
17. How does the EMB/ the ACTEQ ensure teachers read the policy document and follow the TCF in planning their own CPD?

18. Do you feel that different modes of CPD activities are effective in creating professional change in teachers?

19. To what extent was the teachers’ CPD policy adopted and practised in local primary schools from 2004 to 2007?

20. Do you think that the ‘CPD 2003 Document’ succeeded in promoting the teachers’ CPD framework as a guide or model for teachers’ future professional development?

21. To what extent were the ACTEQ Study 2005 and the Interim Report 2006 important indicators showing the success of the ‘soft-landing’ approach through which teachers’ CPD policy is implemented?

22. How significant is the CPD policy and its implementation in:
   a. nurturing a CPD culture that arouse teachers’ professional responsibility in judging on their own CPD?
   b. fostering teachers’ professional autonomy and enhancing teachers’ professionalism?
Appendix 4  Individual Interview Questions –Micro-level

(Teacher in-charge-of CPD)

Part 1

Educational and Professional Qualifications, Age, Gender, Years of Teaching Experience, Type of school

Part 2

Initial Questions

1. Can you tell me your understanding of the term “continuing professional development” (CPD)?

2. How much do you know about the teachers’ CPD policy?

3. Why do you think the teachers’ CPD policy needed to be implemented?

(Context of Policy Influence)

1. Did you study the CPD policy document proposed by ACTEQ in 2003 before you were in-charge-of the school teachers’ CPD planning?

2. How much did you know about the ‘CPD Document 2003’?

3. What caused your school to develop and initiate teachers’ CPD policy?

4. Did your school adopt the CPD policy soon after the release of CPD policy document in 2003? If not, when was it adopted?

5. Are you the main actor in planning and initiating the teacher’s CPD policy in your school?

   If no, who are working with you?

6. Does your school offer you and your colleagues flexibility or freedom to initiate the teachers’ CPD plans? If so, comment on the influences that are operating.
(Context of Policy Production)

7. What were the intentions of your school to follow the CPD policy document?

8. What processes and personnel are used to construct CPD policy at your school?

9. Did your school follow the guidelines (especially the Teachers Competencies Framework TCF) of the CPD document in producing the school-based CPD policy?

10. Have you and your colleagues study the CPD policy document well before producing the school-based CPD policy?

11. What are your perceptions and feelings about school-based CPD policy?

12. How well were teachers’ interests and voices represented in the production of the school-based CPD policy?

13. How do teachers perceive the school-based CPD policy?

14. Do the teachers understand the school’s intentions in initiating CPD policy?

15. Does the school-based CPD policy convey teachers’ professional needs for their own continuing professional development?

16. Does your school have an assessment or evaluation system to review the progress of teachers’ CPD?

(Context of Policy Practices)

17. How does your school ensure teachers to follow the school-based CPD policy in planning their own CPD?

18. Do you feel that different modes of CPD activities are effective in creating professional change in teachers?

19. Did your school set a regular time-table to implement CPD policy from 2004 to 2007?

20. How does your school implement teachers’ CPD policy?

(e.g. To incorporate different modes on staff development day or apply other modes?)

21. Do you think there is a big difference between your school and others regarding CPD practices? Can you give examples of excellent CPD programs in your school with?
22. Are the teachers given enough opportunities to participate in their own CPD planning in your school?

23. What are your views or feelings about the CPD content and modes of CPD after participating in different CPD activities from 2004 to 2007?

24. Have you experienced any significant or valuable professional changes after participating in the planning of teachers’ CPD activities?

25. Can you comment on the school-based CPD policy that you’re working in?

26. Are the teachers in your school well aware of the school-based CPD policy?

(Context of Policy Outcomes)

27. To what extent do the colleagues in your school accept or support the implementation of the CPD policy?

28. What was the impact of the school-based CPD policy on the future professional development of teachers in your school?

29. If you had a chance to give feedback to the policy makers, what advice would you give in order to enhance professional autonomy in CPD?
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All study participants will be provided with a copy of the Information Sheet and Consent Form for their personal records. As the majority of concerns raised by the Human Research Ethics Committee are raised in connection with the Information Sheet and Consent Form, it is strongly recommended that you consult the Guidelines for Preparation of Information Sheet and Consent Form, available on the Human Ethics Office web page at http://www.research.uwa.edu.au/humanethics.
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Mok Siu Fai, Peter
Flat G, 12/F, Tower 7,
Yoho Town,
8 Yuen Lung Street,
Yuen Long, N.T.
Appendix 6

Interview Guide

**General questions**

1. What were the influences leading to the initiation of the teachers’ CPD policy in Hong Kong primary schools?
2. What was the nature of the teachers’ CPD policy text and how was it produced?
3. What were the practices of policy regarding the implementation of the teachers’ CPD policy document in individual primary schools?

**Guiding questions**

1. What caused the Hong Kong Education Manpower Bureau to develop and initiate the CPD policy in 2003?
2. What was the stated intention or purpose of the Hong Kong Education and Manpower Bureau in producing the teachers’ CPD policy document?
3. When did the production of the CPD policy text start and why was it announced and published in 2003?
4. What influences does the CPD policy bring to teachers’ professional development and how are the influences operating at different schools?
5. What are the perspectives of teachers towards the CPD policy and its implementation?
6. How well are teachers’ interests represented in the production of the CPD policy?
7. Are the teachers in different case study schools familiar with the CPD policy and do they support or resist the implementation of the policy?
8. What was the impact of the policy on the future development and planning of teachers’ CPD programs or activities in local primary schools?
Dear Sir/ Madam

RESEARCH PROJECT TITLE: Teachers’ Continuing Professional Development in Hong Kong Primary Schools: Contrasting Perspectives from the Policy-makers and Classroom teachers.

You are invited to participate in a Doctoral degree research study named above. The research is led by Emeritus Professor Don Smart of the Graduate school of Education of the University of Western Australia, assisted by the study research student Mok Siu Fai, Peter.

The research aims to find out why the Hong Kong Education Manpower Bureau developed the teachers’ continuing professional development (CPD) policy document at 2003 and how influential the design and implementation of CPD policy were in affecting teachers’ perspectives and their perception on their roles in professional development at individual primary schools. It is believed that data generated by you and other participants will contribute to the suggestions to the policy makers in further consideration of new teachers’ CPD policies and help teachers to review and forsee their future professional development, thus extending knowledge on policy and practice studies.

Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide not to take part or skip some of the questions, or to withdraw any unprocessed data you have supplied, you are free to do so without prejudice. You are also free to withdraw at any time.

If you agree to participate in this study, Mr. Peter Mok (Mok Siu Fai) will conduct one interview with you, of no more than one hour duration at your place of work. The interview will include questions about your perceptions on the teachers’ CPD policy document and its implementation, your experiences of participating in CPD activities and your reflections on your own professional development. With your permission, the interviews will be tape-recorded and you will be invited to review a transcript of the interview to ensure that your comments accurately reflect your opinions.
Your contribution will be entirely confidential and in any sort of report we make public, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. Pseudonyms will be used throughout the report. All study records will be kept private and they will be kept in a locked file; only the researcher will have access to the records. Once this research has been completed, a copy of the findings will be sent to you. It is possible that the results will only be published for academic purposes. The data will be kept securely for a minimum of five years from the date of publication before being destroyed.

All study participants will be provided with a copy of the Information Sheet and Consent Form for their personal records. Please sign the attached form to indicate your willingness to take part in this research.

The Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Western Australia requires that all participants are informed that, if they have any complaint regarding the manner in which a research project is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or alternatively to the Secretary, Human Research Ethics Committee, Registrar’s Office, University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling highway, Crawley, WA 6009 (telephone number 64883703). Should you require any further information, or have any concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Mok Siu Fai, Peter at evacat@netvigator.com or on 90287378. Should you have any concerns about the conduct of the project, you may contact Emeritus Prof. Don Smart at donsmart@bigpond.net.au or (618) 9386 8665.

Yours sincerely

Don Smart
(Research Supervisor)
Appendix 8

Extract One – Interim Recommendations:

‘Teacher Participation as a Benchmark for Effective CPD’


Teacher Participation as a Benchmark for Effective CPD

5.10 Teachers’ needs vis-à-vis school needs. The responsibility for professional learning falls on teachers themselves. In the face of the curriculum reform and changes in the wider community, teachers are expected to plan their CPD strategically so that their professional learning can help prepare them for the challenges. Teachers draw up professional development needs based on systematic self-evaluation. When formulating CPD plans, teachers should integrate their needs with school development needs, and there should be effective two-way communication between them and the school management.

5.11 Teachers’ participation in planning CPD. There is a growing trend for teacher participation in drawing up staff development plans. While teachers recognise increasingly that CPD is an indispensable part of their professional lives, they need supportive arrangements and encouragement so that they can take an active part in contributing to nurturing a CPD culture in school. Schools should provide teachers with sufficient opportunities to share with colleagues their learning reflections, and how they have applied the knowledge and skills acquired from CPD activities in daily teaching. They may invite CPD teams of other schools for sharing of successful experience in implementing school-based CPD policies.

5.12 Sharing and networking. As teachers seek and construct knowledge, their knowledge base expands. As they share their knowledge among colleagues, both within and across schools, their shared professional knowledge base expands as well. The construction of a cross-school network and community of coordinators of CPD should be greatly encouraged and supported to consolidate individual schools’ efforts in implementing teachers’ CPD policy. The frequent exchange of views and information among CPD coordinators can help narrow the “gaps” between schools in handling CPD matters.
Appendix 9    Extract Two – Interim Recommendations: ‘Professional Discretion’


5.2 Professional discretion is by design central to effective CPD. CPD by definition is a professional endeavour, which entails professional judgement and professional discretion. By design, professional discretion is a central theme underlying the teachers’ CPD framework released in November 2003. Schools and teachers are expected to exercise autonomy and professional decision for CPD. This is why, in the course of institutionalising teachers’ CPD practices and building a CPD culture in schools, ACTEQ has been adopting a “soft-landing” approach from the outset, i.e. not to impose any rigid requirements or a set of regulations on teachers, but to achieve a basic common understanding so that CPD can be affirmed as a shared goal among professional teachers. The underpinning rationale of this approach is the flexible interpretation of the quantity and intensity of CPD and the discretionary choice of the mode of CPD. This “soft-landing” approach aims to facilitate the realisation of the spirit of the teachers’ CPD framework: trust in and reliance on the professionals, and hence teachers’ professional autonomy and school-based decisions in CPD-related matters. The ultimate objective is to advance teachers’ professionalism for school development and hence to improve student learning.

5.4 The soft target of not less than 150 hours in three years creates a constructive pressure. Based on the information gathered so far, there are few problems for the majority of teachers to engage in 150 CPD hours in a three-year period. The CPD hours normally include attendance at the three staff development days and scheduled school-based sharing of teaching experience, participation in school-based projects, EMB-organised seminars, workshops and training courses of different duration, enrolling in formal programmes for upgrading qualifications and personal capabilities, and engaging in education-related services recognised by schools. As no sanctions are imposed, the target of 150 CPD hours in three years acts as a constructive “pressure” for the entire teaching force.
Appendix 10  Extract three – The Importance of Teachers’ Professional Development

Towards a Learning Profession: Third Report on Teachers’ CPD (ACTEQ, 2009)

1.1 The core business of schools is to educate students, and this involves fostering their whole person development and caring for learner diversity. Schools have to help students develop the capacity for life-long learning and the abilities needed for meeting the changes and challenges in society. Through engaging in continuing professional learning and reflection, teachers can strengthen their capacity for advancing school development and student learning.

1.2 It is no easy task to educate students in Hong Kong, a knowledge-based society characterized by change. In addition to changes in students’ learning needs and growth, teachers have to adapt the fast advances in knowledge and technologies, different systems and policies, and rapid developments in the wider socio-economic environment. Teachers also have to respond to the expectations of parents and society at large.
Third Report on Teachers’ CPD (ACTEQ, 2009)

3.3 More than half of the principals and about a quarter of the teachers even indicated that teachers’ participation in CPD had increased significantly over the past two years. For teachers’ participation, the research data and feedback collected have provided fairly strong evidence that most teachers have no difficulty in meeting the “soft” target of CPD hours.

3.5 The findings with respect to teachers from primary, secondary and special schools were similar. This findings indicated that teachers had adopted a broader conception of CPD and undertook a variety of CPD activities to enrich their learning experiences.

3.2.7 As shown in the research data, over 90% of teachers considered that through teachers’ CPD, all the most important objectives in the “Teaching and Learning” and “Student Development” domains were achieved to some extent. Teachers generally feel that CPD has strengthened their professional capacity.

3.3.0 The survey also attempted to explore the link of teachers’ CPD with job satisfaction and teacher autonomy. In general, teachers who had undertaken a larger number of CPD hours had a greater sense of job satisfaction and autonomy. This is an encouraging sign, suggesting a “virtuous circle”: the more CPD involvement, the greater the job satisfaction and autonomy at work.
## Appendix 12  
### Sources of Interview Data by research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> What were the influences leading to the initiation of teachers’ CPD policy in Hong Kong primary schools?</td>
<td>- Individual interview with the former chairman of the ACTEQ – (initial questions) 2,3 and (specific questions) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus group interviews with teachers – (initial questions) 1,4,5,6 and (specific questions) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual interviews with teachers-in-charge of CPD – (initial questions) 1, 2, 3 and (specific questions) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> What was the nature of teachers’ CPD policy text and how was it produced?</td>
<td>- Individual interview with the former chairman of the ACTEQ – (specific questions) 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus group interviews with teachers – (specific questions) 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual interviews with teachers-in-charge of CPD –(specific questions) 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> What were the policy practices regarding the implementation of the teachers’ CPD policy document in individual primary schools?</td>
<td>- Individual interview with the former chairman of the ACTEQ – (specific questions) 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus group interviews with teachers – (specific questions) 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individual interviews with teachers-in-charge of CPD –(specific questions) 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>