A qualitative study of in-service teacher evaluation beliefs

Qiaoyan He *[a,b], Martin Valcke [a], Antonia Aelterman [a]

[a]*Department of Educational Studies, Ghent University, Gent, B9000, Belgium*
[b]*School of Educational Science, Sichuan Normal University, Chengdu, 610101, China*

Abstract

Evaluation is traditionally seen as judgment to help teachers assess the educational outcomes. However, evaluation also plays an important role in the development of teaching and learning process as a key driving element. As evaluation is often used as a tool, it offers little opportunity for these attributes (learning environment, behaviour, competence and attitude) to develop. Thirty-one Chinese in-service teachers were interviewed to ascertain their evaluation beliefs In the classroom. The result shows that in-service teachers define their evaluation in terms of who, why, what, how and when to evaluate. Implications of this research suggest in-service teachers should have an integral role in designing a curriculum and systems relevant to the evaluation context if educational researchers are all concerned with their beliefs.

Keywords: beliefs; evaluation; evaluation beliefs; in-service teachers

1. Introduction

As shaping teacher beliefs through childhood to university the amount of time in-service teachers engaged in a range of formal and informal teaching and learning activities increases. Formal teaching, which in China usually commences in the year that a student teacher graduated to a school, is one of the collections that occupies a large proportion of in-service teachers' lives. In-service teachers spend more than six hours per day to contact with pupils in the average primary school. Researchers has recognized that the educational reform has one of the most sustained contacts with in-service teacher educational beliefs and has recognized the importance of understanding the impact of their evaluation beliefs on the classrooms (Pajares, 1992; Fang, 1996; Raths, 2001). Educational research documents our understanding of how teacher beliefs impacts on the educational role, individual academic performance, right and wrong in the classroom (Kennedy, 1997; Korthagen, 2004). Further to this, Wallace & Alkin (2008) argues that the inherent idea of evaluation is value. Hence, evaluation applied by teachers in the classroom is usually done in the context of comparing worthiness, appropriateness, goodness, validity, effect, etc. This article explores primary-school in-service teachers' beliefs of their evaluation with a view to broadening our understanding of the evaluation as a system, from the in-service teachers' perspective.

1.1. The importance of teachers' evaluation beliefs

Sense of beliefs is a need to understanding humans' philosophies which are generally consistent, coherent, and adequate (Ferre, 1988; Simmons, Emory, et al., 1999). Sense of teacher beliefs is the way to examine teachers' philosophies, which are often revealed in the metaphors to be used to describe their roles in the classroom (Tobin, 1993). Sense of teachers' evaluation beliefs is proposed as a necessary

antecedent to successful teaching and learning process for a list of reasons. Firstly, the current national priority for systemic approaches to the reform of curriculum has led to unprecedented interest in research on the efficacy of education (Chinese Ministry of Education, 2001). Secondly, in response to this priority, a focus on self-directed learning, problem-based learning and collaborative learning to curriculum reform resulted in the great concern on the discussion how to evaluate students' academic achievement in the classroom (Zhong, 2005; Zhang, 2008). Thirdly, as the driving force of the whole teaching and learning process, evaluation acts more important role and involves itself into innovation as peer evaluation, authentic evaluation, portfolio evaluation, performance evaluation, summative evaluation (Chinese Ministry of Education, 2002). Fourthly, since childhood, teachers spend thousands of hours to shape their educational beliefs which remain latent during formal training in pedagogy at the university and become a major force in their classroom (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981; Kessels & Korthagen, 1996; Raths, 2001). Fifthly, Chinese curriculum reform is the result of "top-to-down" traditional policies and educational system, which brings a strange phenomenon as in-service teachers accept student-centered training but still uses teacher-centered teaching in the classroom (Wang, 2006). Finally, there is a gap needed to be bridged by researchers between "top" theoretical ideas and the "down" practical beliefs (Kessels & Korthagen, 1996).

With a more aims' curriculum reform, increases in in-service teachers' professional training hours and the change in the evaluation approaches of classroom, "top-to-down" educational innovation are less relevant to teachers individual educational beliefs (Wu, 2009). It is argued that in-service teachers who do not feel a sense of benefits from new approaches during the teacher training, may acquire or seek a sense of satisfactory from their familiar teaching styles that could derive to their learning experience as a child (Borg, 2004; Li, 2006; Griffiths, Gore, and Ladwig, 2006). Therefore for in-service teachers, feelings of alienation and isolated within the great curriculum reform is normal because their voices about their educational beliefs are too weak to be heard by the "top" group (Cao & Lu, 2003; Feng & Li, 2010). The onus is on educational researchers to confirm in-service teachers' evaluation beliefs, then to bridge an effective cannel to foster an active communication between the "top" theoretical ideas and the "down" individual practices (Kessels & Korthagen, 1996; Ye, 1997).

1.2. Teachers' beliefs about evaluation

In context of Chinese new curriculum reform devoting to innovation including teaching aim, teaching content, teaching method and evaluation approach, researchers disclosed that Chinese "top-to-down" political and educational system prevent the communication channel between theory and practice (Zhong, 2005; Wang, C.S., 2006; Wang, B.L., 2009). Educational officers and educators guide the curriculum reform that emphasizes student-centered evaluating approaches and teacher training. In-service teachers perceive feelings of distrust, a lack of participation and minimal communication to "top" in the country-wide movement. Undoubtedly, in-service teachers with their educational beliefs are the right group to bring kinds of educational theory and innovation into practice (Gregoire, 2003; Wang, 2006). In order to avoid the missing links between calls for school reform and teachers' implementation of the reform, understanding teachers' inside world (beliefs) is the key factor to lead the curriculum reform to success (Clark and Peterson, 1986; Munby, 1982; Cuban, 1990; Civil, 1993; Battista, 1994; Vacc & Bright, 1999; Fullan, 2001).

Belief is the people's personal philosophy, which consists of a group of consistent, coherent and adequate beliefs (Price, 1969; Rokeach, 1973; Ferre, 1988). Sense of beliefs includes two components: a "core" that depends on the individual's intrinsic properties; and a periphery that depends on the individual's context, including his or her history, environment, and linguistic community (Brown, 1986). Thus, belief is defined as a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further it serves as a guide to thought and behavior (Borg,

2001). That's to say, when we state a belief on something or somebody, a judgment process is following: what to be, why to be, how to be, when to be, whether it is good or not, who is the authoritative and etc.

According to Fullan (2001), any change in beliefs would challenge the core values held by individuals regarding the purposes of world. In the classroom, teachers' beliefs are belonging to their own philosophy to translate their experiential worlds molded from childhood into a unique view of what constitutes good teaching and learning, e.g. what is valid and valuable knowledge to be taught; how to adopt the effective and appropriate strategies and forms to promote his/her professional development and student learning achievement, and when to carry on the instruction or evaluation(Beattie, 1995; Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989; Kagan, 1992; Shulman, 1986).As Korthagen (2004) asserted that beliefs are the right connection to integrate observed environment & behavior and un-observed identity & worldview together. Therefore, we can touch in-service teachers' beliefs via observation, questionnaires, interview and then impact on them via environment, training, policies. Obviously, the discussion of teachers beliefs is a big topic which is related the whole educational process. However, Buehl and Alexander (2001) proposed that domain-specific beliefs should be discussed to clarify the different views about knowledge depending on the academic domain under consideration. On the base of the proposal, as the key driving force of teaching process, evaluation is selected to explore in-service teachers' beliefs in the classroom.

Evaluation is not only a methodological area but also the systematic assessment of the worth or merit of some object (William, 1989; Worthen & James, 1987; Steele, 1991; Alkin, 1990). As a tool, Evaluation is used to help teachers judge whether a curriculum or instructional approach is being implemented as planned, and to assess the extent to which stated goals and objectives are being achieved (Fleischman & Williams, 1996). Guided by "value", the generic goal of evaluations is to provide useful feedback to shape the academic, social, personal and career growth and development of students and teachers (Chinese Ministry of Education, 2002). In fact, all evaluation work involves collecting and sifting through data, making judgments about the validity & reliability of the information and of inferences we derive from it (Fleischman & Williams, 1996). Meanwhile, all of these involve teachers' educational beliefs into each step of evaluation. Authors such as Kagan (1992), Borg (2001) and Hermans et al. (2008) have all referred to what teachers educational beliefs should be in terms of learning and teaching. These are characteristics of teachers' beliefs as they focus on the whole educational process and different subjects. Inherent in much education research and practice is the in-service teachers' implicit assumption and subjective knowledge about students, learning, classrooms, and the subject matter to be taught. However, on examination it is evident that in-service teachers' beliefs are practicing as decoration. For example, much research focuses on the success of curriculum reform where the onus is on the in-service teachers to fit in and if they doesn't or failure to bring the ideas into classroom they should be trained more for it. Rather, we suggest successful and conceptualization curriculum reform that really encourage participation from all in-service teachers, where in-service teachers have the opportunity for developing the teaching skill, efficiency, where they can gain access to kinds of educational resources, all important for positive professional development at the individual and collective level.

As a result, the body of research needs to alter its focus from exploring the innovation of evaluation approaches to the understanding teachers' evaluation beliefs. The innovation of evaluation approaches is an educational policy while understanding teacher' evaluation beliefs is a holistic concept that encompasses the whole educational system and thus reaches communication between up and down. In addition, in-service teachers are unlikely to be involved in the process of developing the professional innovation in context of the curriculum reform. More often, they are the recipients of programs developed for them yet with their limited involvement. However, we see that in-service teachers are the crucial ones to put the innovation of evaluation approaches into practice (Kessels & Korthagen, 1996). Hence, the purpose of this manuscript is to explore in-service teachers' evaluation beliefs about teaching

with the five basic questions: who to evaluate; why to evaluate; what to be evaluated; how to evaluate and when to evaluate.

2. Method

2.1. Design

The present research adopted a qualitative approach consistent with focused pre-service teacher' evaluation beliefs (He, et al., 2011) where through a series of scoping interview with pre-service teacher the specific belief framework for the study emerged. This is also consistent with our previous study on teacher evaluation beliefs (He, et al., 2012).

2.2. Participants

Twenty-nine collaborative teachers from three school districts in the south (Guangdong, developed province), south-west (Sichuan, less developed province) and North-west (Qinghai, developing province) of China who taught in 1st through 6th grade participated in this study. The researcher had previously identified these districts as districts in which a collaboration ship among SCNU (South China Normal University), SICNU (Sichuan Normal University) and QHNU (Qinghai Normal University) was established and the teachers had been collaborating for at least 5 years. The names of potential participants in each of the districts were obtained through contact with the Normal University professors, the primary principles and the in-service teacher personnel. The research personally invited these potential participants to complete the survey as a means of informing stakeholders about the current state of evaluation approaches within their respective districts and China at large. Because the population of collaborating teachers was small, the entire accessible sample was used.

Teachers who recruited were employed in eleven public elementary schools of three districts. The south, southwest and northwest districts were located within one country and were considered high, middle and low income, as determined by the Development Research Center of the State Council ("The strategic thinking and policy measures to promote coordinated regional development", 2005). In addition, the three districts reported quite different educational resource and condition: average class sizes ranging as 50, 70 and 60; faculty-to-student ratios ranging as 1: 19, 1: 27 and 1: 22 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2007. China Statistical Yearbook-2007: China Statistics Press); and the amounts spent per pupil ranging as 2115 (CNY), 1218 (CNY) and 1662 (CNY) (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2005). Further, all schools accepted the educational innovation training to improve the evaluation approaches. Both schools teachers perceive feelings of minimal change in the classroom. More often, they complained the new evaluation approaches are far from their teaching practice while it cost their too much extra time and energy to get very limited result. Finally, each of the three districts included in the study employed a minimum of three collaborative primary schools with nine in-service teachers, as determined by school principals and in-service teachers.

2.3. Materials

A semi-structured interview schedule emerged from the work of He et al.(2011) and a series of scoping interviews with 56 pre-service teachers through 1st to 4th Grade from SCNU, SICNU and QHNU. This pilot study indicated that pre-service teachers' beliefs about evaluation can derive from student-centered and teacher centered. Meanwhile, the past learning experiences impacted on the pre-service teachers tending to apply their beliefs on evaluation in the classroom, which supports present research. This pilot study also indicated the clarity, content and validity of the face validity of the schedule for both per and in-service teachers. As Smith (1995) pointed that a funneling technique questions should be arranged from more general in nature

at beginning to gradually more specific. Present research would use a conversational technique (Burgess T & Burgess R, 1998) and list some more general questions as "Who evaluation of students? Why?" to probe the in-service teachers' evaluation beliefs during the whole teaching and learning process. This style was utilized to create a friendly and relax communication environment between interviewer and in-service teachers and then to create its active effect on the process and subsequent outcome of interviewing in-service teachers.

2.4. Procedure

As mentioned previously, the in-service teachers were chosen as they are in different economic areas of China. In addition, the researcher is engaged in an international research program with three Normal Universities that includes these primary schools. On base of the research indication from pre-service teachers' evaluation beliefs, researcher wanted a range of perspectives from in-service teachers. Informed consents were obtained from 11 primary principals. The principals approached their in-service teachers to ascertain their willingness to participate in the research. The researcher personally sent an information letter about the nature and application of this research. Furthermore, this letter also described the researcher's expectations of the participant teachers and the participant teachers' privacy to be ensured. This was obtained by informing them that each interview would take approximately 20 minutes and would be audiotaped and later transcribed by the researcher. Considering in-service teachers' routine teaching work, each in-service teacher thus identified was contacted by telephone and was scheduled for an interview. In addition, most of interviews were conducted and divided into two / three / four parts to match to in-service teachers' feasible time and place within their schools. After the interview, the research appreciated all of in-service teachers' participation and prepared a nice present for each one.

3. Analysis and results

Following the guidance of the book "Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions" (Greswell, 1998), the researcher stepped into the process analyzing qualitative data and transcribed interview to verbatim. First of all, transcripts were read and noted biases or reactions by researcher. Meanwhile, the researcher kept a list on which memos and notes were recorded as the formed part of the audit trail. Conducted by Miles & Huberman' s thematic content analysis (1994), each of the five questions (See appendix) were analyzed one by one to confirm what the in-service teachers' evaluation beliefs are in the classroom. For that the researcher hoped to explore the teachers' un-observed inside world (evaluation beliefs), the analysis about gender, age, class-size, major or socio-demographic characteristics wasn't made for the present research. However, codes were developed and identified through the locating words used as well as the reference expressed frequently by the participants. And then the codes were grouped into common or recurring themes. After analysis, the researcher compared all transcripts and made sure all common and divergent themes were isolated. And then all of these themes were considered on base of the exploratory research being conducted (Berg, 2001).

During the data analysis, the researcher with colleagues from SCNU, SICNU, QHNU and Gent University capitalized on the method of investigator triangulation (Tindall, 1994), thereby reflecting the multiple perspectives available in understanding the data. As such, the themes that emerged from the analysis will be presented incorporating qualifying statements from participants as following: who to evaluate, why to evaluate, what to evaluate, how to evaluate, and when to evaluate.

3.1. Who to evaluate

Confirming stakeholder is the key to understand that evaluation means to them, that is, stakeholders are all of those individuals who have a vested interest in the program

(Wallace & Alkin, 2008). Program evaluation means different things to different stakeholders (Douglah, 1998). During the process of evaluation in the classroom, the nature of evaluation is to involve the identification, clarification, and application of defensible criteria to determine an evaluation object's value (worth or merit), quality, effectiveness, or significance in relation to those criteria (Worthen, James, 1987). These responses can be likened to the concentric circle of an ecological framework, with an emphasis on the micro system that in-service teachers who are the adults in the classroom have their beliefs to evaluate students with their teaching experiences and develop the multiple influences on students learning achievement. It was noted that all of teachers were likely to focus on their beliefs on two dimensions, student-centered or teacher-centered. In general both focuses were related parents.

(**Note: 1.** GD-*Guangdong province*, QH-*Qinghai province*, SC-*Sichuan province;***2.*** F-*Female*, M-*Male*; **3.** C-*Chinese*, M-*Mathematics*; **4.** 5-*Grade 5, 6-Grade6;* **5.**TC- *Teacher centered*, SC-*Student centered)*

Teachers should be the main evaluators to evaluate students. Because teachers are adults and they contact more than others to know students learning performance. The evaluation from parents and students tends to subjective evaluation. It is not good for students understanding their learning situation inclusively. (QH-M-E-6, TC)

Students should be the evaluators. They have personal independent judgment and management to carry on their learning. However, teachers and parents should give them some guidance. (SC-F-M-1, SC)

When the in-service teachers thought about the stakeholder of evaluation, most of them addressed the influence of educational system.

Teachers should give students' evaluation on base of educational system. Because test is very important way to evaluate students' achievement, all of evaluation from teachers, parents or students should match to the social mainstream and the ethical line. (GD-F-C-3, TC)

For me, I would like to respect students and help them to evaluate themselves. But I couldn't obey the educational system-the test system. If students evaluate themselves, that's to mean, I couldn't finish my teaching assignments. (GD-M-M-5, SC)

On the whole, in-service teachers with teacher centered were more likely to focus on teachers' authority, class-size and teachers' professional skills.

Yes, I admit teacher couldn't evaluate students comprehensively. But, if all of evaluation should be given by students, how did teachers do to build their authority in the classroom. It is clear that teacher couldn't manage classroom without teacher authority. (SC-F-C-4, TC)

A classroom is a mini society. Students are too young to evaluate others for that they couldn't judge one thing or one person comprehensively. Accordingly, teachers have accepted special educational training and they know the right approaches to evaluate students.(QH-M-C-4, TC)

Corresponding to above, in-service teachers with student centered emphasis more on students' independence, self-awareness and social identity.

Students are growing day by day. They are forming their world view and self-awareness. All of the evaluation from their peers can help him/her to reflect him/herself. These evaluations are much more objective and veritably. (SC-F-M-1, SC)

Students have the views about their learning lives. They are independent. Teachers are far away their real learning life. Only they need is more time to be more skillful to evaluate themselves. (GD-M-C-2, SC)

Comparing student centered and teacher centered teachers' view with the advantages and disadvantages of evaluation stakeholders in the classroom, it is clear that they have the same point to promote teacher/student/parents to participate into the comprehensive evaluation but differ from emphasis point and analysis angle.

Teachers have more knowledge, learning experiences, teaching skills than students, they can realize students' problem more deeply and then give students' evaluation more correctly. However, students always learn and play together, they know the peers learning problem more than teachers. But they tend to evaluate peers from outward appearances instead of the substance. (GD-F-C-6, TC)

Teachers' evaluation always pinpoint on knowledge but block students' creativity and learning interest. Students are changing during their formative years. Maybe teachers and parents couldn't confirm their progress but their peers do. By the way, learning to self-evaluation is good for students to develop self-education in the future. (QH-F-C-4, SC)

3.2. Why to evaluate

The next theme to emerge concerned the issue of "why to evaluate". It exemplifies the iterative nature of the in-service teachers' understanding of the evaluation's aim and function. In-service teachers' responses suggested that they were aware of the aims in a number of dimensions ranging from students' learning attitude and lifelong development to teachers' responsibility and professional development. They felt good evaluation could provide students with a pleasant, warm and active learning environment.

The aim of evaluation is to promote both teachers and students progress. Because students are growing up. They need teachers' guidance to form their right world view. Meanwhile, teachers can make progress on teaching approaches. (SC-F-C-2, SC)

The aim of evaluation is related to students' lifelong learning. The first thing for a teacher to evaluate students is to provide a pleasant learning environment. The academic achievement is the second point to consider for teachers. Thus, teachers should learn enough educational ideas to understand students' needs and thoughts. (GD-M-M-6, TC)

However, the in-service teachers with different educational beliefs indicated their different sense of evaluation's on "why to evaluate". When TC teachers elaborated on personal beliefs about the aim of evaluation, they tend to encourage students and raise their learning interesting.

The aim of evaluation is to promote students' progress for that each students has his/her good traits. As teachers, we should activate their learning instead of constraining their hunger for learning. (SC-F-C-4, TC)

The aim of evaluation is to reflect the result of teaching and learning. First of all, attitude is the most important factor. In the classroom, whether students involve themselves into discussion, communication, practice and consideration or not, all of these are related to the learning attitude. (QH-F-M-6, TC)

By contrast, we can find teachers with student-centered who comments on the aim of evaluation from the perspective of good behavior and points out the importance of learning to be.

The aim of evaluation is to help students to understand their learning level and get good behavior as well as more development. If each student can realize their learning competencies and responsibilities, all of them can enjoy their learning at school, and then enjoy their lives in the society. (QH-M-M-5, SC)

3.3. What to be evaluated

The theme of "what to be evaluated" reflects in-service teachers' understanding of the evaluation content that are held by them as the valuable and meaningful aspects to evaluate students. The in-service teachers clearly articulate three aspects to assert their value. The most aspects mentioned were knowledge, attitude and competences. When the researcher asked which aspect was the first to be concerned by them to evaluate students, all of in-service teacher gave the same answer to choose "attitude". This illustrates that teachers believes in the important influence of attitude on students' learning and lives.

Personally, I attach weight to students' learning attitude and habits that act important roles to influence students' learning interesting and development in the future. (SC-M-C-5, TC)

I can bear the bad learning scores and weak competences except the bad learning attitude. For me, the most important thing to evaluate students is not how much

knowledge they have mastered but what kind of learning habit and attitude they have been cultivated. (GD-M-M-6-SC)

Asked the relationship among knowledge, competence and attitude, in-service teachers still keep the same views and place attitude on the first during the evaluation process on students' learning. But there is a deferent order on knowledge and competences between teacher-centered and student-centered. Teacher-centered list competences and knowledge as the second and the third.

In context of standards of evaluation, individual learning and avenue academic level in the class, we evaluate students by the order as attitude, competences and knowledge. Because good attitude brings one's success. Competences are the foundation of knowledge. (QH-F-M-5, TC)

Student-centered are the quite the opposite. They put knowledge on the second while the competence is the third.

Knowledge can be evaluated by the daily homework and tests. Attitude can be evaluated by the communication with students and parents. Competences should be evaluated by the activities and management in the classroom. In person, I prefer to evaluate students with the order of attitude, knowledge and then competences. (QH-F-C-1, SC)

3.4. How to evaluate

Under the theme of "how to evaluate" there appeared to be an emphasis on the approaches. The emphasis on the approaches application described how in-service teachers adopted various approaches to evaluate students in the classroom and achieve the educational aims. Furthermore, "how to evaluate" in the classroom reflects in-service teachers' understanding of what approaches and strategies used or changed. All of the in-service teachers refer to evaluate students by formal and informal ways. Formal evaluation associated with approaches can be further divided into "formal compulsory" and "formal non-compulsory" evaluation. Formal compulsory evaluation we can defined as knowledge-based one with clear & explicit criteria via paper work or test to evaluate students' academic achievement.

I often evaluate students through their daily homework or schoolwork. If time is enough, I prefer to giving the feedback to the individual student about their learning result. (GD-M-M-6, SC)

I always give students' evaluation on knowledge through paper test and routine homework. I think it is a shortcut for parents, students and school to know students learning achievement at some phrase. (QH-M-M-3, TC)

Formal non-compulsory evaluation we can defined as knowledge-based one via class questioning spontaneously to evaluate students' learning achievement, behavior and attitude in the classroom.

Questioning is good for the open students to perform their talent and encourage timid students to build confidence. So in the class, I would like to give students kinds of feedback via questioning timely. (SC-F-C-4, TC)

Normally, I tend to evaluate students through questioning in the classroom. Such of the timely evaluation can promote students' learning activities and give them a good learning model. (GD-F-S-1, SC)

However, on formal non-compulsory evaluation, besides of questioning, it was noted that most teachers emphasize on evaluation from parents' participation.

I often send parents the students' evaluation at school by internet or cell phone about their children's learning situation and then get the students' feedback from parents at home. Communication between school and parents is very important to promote students make progress. (SC-M-C-5, TC)

I make a portfolio for each student and help them to collect all of daily good or bad performance into this portfolio. Each month, I send a paper summarize of the portfolio to parents to change the evaluation on their child at school and home. It is good to involve parents, students and teachers into evaluation and get a objective feedback. (GD-F-S-1, SC)

The informal evaluation were described as daily businesses with implicit criteria and related more to learning attitude and competences. Therefore, all of in-service teachers always adopted the approaches such as peer evaluation, performance evaluation and oral evaluation during the informal learning activities. However, whereas the formal evaluation are largely confined to the classroom environment and knowledge category, the informal evaluation seem to provide a link between the classroom environment and the outside school/society environment as well as among the knowledge, attitudes and competences, typified by students taking part in the extracurricular activities such as class meetings and other instructive activities.

Every week, the students in my classroom evaluate themselves by individuals, peers, groups and a class on progress of their learning results and approaches. All of these feedbacks would be taken and tided by students into their own portfolios respectively. On the base of their evaluation, I can communicate with parents to promote students make more progress. (SC-F-C-4, SC)

I would like to evaluate students' learning attitudes and competences through numerical integration. A student can get the credits when the peers, group and class give a good feedback on his/her learning activities. Accumulate credits can change into teacher's praise letter and learning prize. (GD-F-M-4, TC)

There are no strong clear messages about the deference between SC and TC in-service teachers on the evaluation approaches. But we can still divided in-service teachers into two SC and TC from subject, frequency and degree of using different evaluation approaches. For examples, TC teachers tends to be the major evaluating subjects with the support of peer and individual evaluation while SC teachers rely mainly on students' own efforts as making teacher assistance subsidiary to evaluate.

Mostly, I will invite individual student into my office to evaluate his/her learning performance including other classmates' learning performance. It is a good way to know student's real idea about the learning attitudes and relationship among classmates. (QH-F-C-4, TC)

I open an internet website where students, parents and teachers can access to publish their feedback about learning and teaching. Meanwhile, they can also get the timely feedback from others to reflect their learning approaches. However, each student has their own account as face-book. (GD-F-C-5, SC)

3.5. When to evaluate

The last theme to emerge was that of "when to evaluate". However, the in-service teachers don't talk of "when to evaluate" as time locations on and of themselves, but refer to the period when formal evaluation can occur. Their meaning, therefore, is more functional than pure time in nature. Formal evaluation associated with deliberate time can be also further divided into "formal compulsory" and "formal non-compulsory" evaluation that all students are required to be evaluate by teachers (e.g. the former is the evaluation associated with formal curriculum results; the latter is the evaluation associated with daily learning activities). Formal compulsory evaluations were described as the school-based and state-based tests required to report and communicate to parents and society. Both of student-centered and teacher-centered in-service teachers agreed to evaluate students including the beginning, middle and end of the term. But the teachers with teacher-centered would like more than the student-centered ones to promote students to evaluate themselves during the formal compulsory evaluation.

Evaluation should be integrated into the whole teaching process. Teachers should observe students behavior and take a note for each student. At the end of term, teachers should show all of the documents to students and invite them to discuss whether the record of their learning process is suitable or not. And then we can say that as a teacher, I just give the students a feasible evaluation. (GD-M-M-5, TC)

I would like to evaluate students at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of the term. Because evaluation at the beginning can help students to build the learning confidence; in the middle the evaluation can pinpoint on students' learning problem to encourage them working hard; at the end of the term, teacher give students an

evaluation related the performance of the whole term, which can notice parents their children' learning results while promote them to get good preparation for coming term. (QH-F-C-3, SC)

The "formal non-compulsory" evaluation we have defined as school-based or state based learning activities, which both teachers and students can exercise their choice as to whether they evaluate these or not in the classroom. Comparing the teachers' response on the formal non-compulsory, in-service teachers with student-centered paid more interesting than the teacher-centered ones on students' participant.

In person, I think evaluation should be taken at any time. In general, it should be in time. When the problem was happening after class, the first thing for teacher to do is to involve students into the problem to reflect and summary their behavior. But in the classroom, it is better for teacher to put the problem aside and then to help students to solve it after class. (SC-F-C-2, SC)

I think it is very important to evaluate students in the classroom. It is helpful for them to recognize the right behavior and learn right knowledge and learning skill. Academic achievement is the most important business for Chinese students. (QH-M-M-4, TC)

4. Discussion

The above results suggest that the in-service teachers who participated in this research were applying their beliefs to evaluate students in the classroom, and putting different theories (student centered and teacher centered) into their evaluating practices. They described their evaluation beliefs in terms of stakeholder (who), aim (why), content (what), approaches (how) and time (when). The stakeholders who are central to teachers' evaluation beliefs are teachers, individuals, peers and parents. Different stakeholders are on behalf of different theoretical standpoints. The aim for evaluation, provided by the educational policies generally, mediate the relational aspect of the national education goals and then enhance the relationships with the significant stakeholders and their sense of evaluating contents in the classroom.

In terms of how in-service teachers put their evaluation beliefs into action they emphasized contents, approaches and time in the classroom. All of in-service teachers see evaluation in a concrete way, as a process where their evaluation beliefs can be carried on and worked on both teachers and students through activities/ interactions mediated within the school system. These were evaluating activities that had a common purpose, were for students' lifelong development and teachers' professional development and emphasized time management and responsibility. However, impacted by different educational theories, SC and TC in-service teachers show their observed action of evaluation beliefs on different ways.

Kagan (1992) demonstrated that teacher belief lies at the very heart of teaching and appears to arise out of the exigencies inherent in classroom teaching. However, in-service teachers' conceptualizations of their evaluation beliefs were mostly concrete and related to their teaching practices. The current study indicates that in-service teachers choose their personal evaluating approaches based on their evaluation beliefs more saliently. Through talking about advantages and disadvantages of their evaluation strategies in and out classroom, all of in-service teachers have their powerful identities to apply and persist on the evaluation beliefs chosen by themselves.

5. Sense of evaluation beliefs in in-service teachers

Classroom provide in-service teachers with opportunities to put their evaluation beliefs into practice and explore the better strategies to integrate their teaching and learning experiences, to develop their professional career, to feel success as a teacher in the society and importantly, the classroom provides in-service teachers with a stage to instruct the right knowledge, beliefs and responsibilities to young generations. In this respect these in-service teachers' beliefs on evaluation are so important that all of

researchers should come much closer to understanding them and   involve them into the great discussion of curriculum reform.

Consistent with our research on teachers' evaluation beliefs, in-service teachers' responses closely aligned with He et al. (2011) PSTEB model. The in-service teachers talked about the stakeholders of evaluation in the classroom as well as the aspects of the evaluation aims, contents, approaches and time management were very important. Based on the choice stakeholders and contents, the orientation of aims, the frequency and strategies of evaluation approaches, in-service teacher are divided into student-centered and teacher centered naturally. In sum, the five components of the theory proposed by He et al. (2011) applied to the in-service teachers' beliefs on evaluation.

6. Implications

By focusing on stakeholders (who to evaluate), these in-service teachers had their own views to locate themselves in the classrooms and classrooms are important to be a stage for teachers to show their educational beliefs. The theme of aim (why to evaluate) has implications for types of teachers' theoretical background as in-service teachers could promote students to match to various social needs in the future. For example, SC teachers aimed more on the development of competences and interesting for long-life learning while TC teachers pinpointed more on the preparation of knowledge and skills for future. The themes of content (what to evaluate), approaches (how to evaluate) and time management (when to evaluate) implicated that all in-service teachers could evaluate students on same contents with various approaches during different periods. But the difference of ST and TC in-service teachers' evaluation beliefs could be distinguished on the same content by the frequency, application intensity of evaluating approaches. For example, all of in-service teacher regarded knowledge, attitude and competence as evaluating contents and attitude was the most important one to evaluate students. But ST in-service teachers preferred to putting competence as the second important one instead of knowledge chosen by TC in-service teachers.

At present, a further implication of this study is to confirm in-service teachers' evaluation beliefs through the coming quantitative research, and then to contribute in the area of designing educational curricula and programs. Typically the quantitative research will provide the scientific data to support the programs that focus at the communication between national educational policies and in-service practical teaching in the classroom. Within a holistic framework the communication is as important as the individual and relational levels in determining harmony. Collective harmony derives from the recognition as active citizens. It has been suggested that in-service teachers are the real group to put all of educational ideas into practice. Meanwhile, they permeate their personal educational beliefs, which begin since they were childhood in the classroom. Thus, educators should understand and respect in-service teachers' personal evaluation beliefs, and then guide them to access the valued resources, take participation into the curricula decision-making process, demonstrate their teaching competence and fulfill their self-efficacy. The findings of the present study support Kagan (1992) in suggesting that teacher belief appears to arise out of the exigencies inherent in classroom teaching and to be instrumental in determining the quality of interaction one finds among the teachers in a given school. Teachers' accommodation to the curriculum reform is the key to success of reform. Therefore universities in South, South-Western and North western of China have been fostering connections to communication through in-service teachers, pre-service teachers and professors with family targeted programs like Pre-service teacher evaluation beliefs, which aims to develop a framework and resources around un-observed beliefs and observed environment promotion through quantitative and qualitative researches promoting communication between "top" and "down". Currently this has been developing and implementing in a number of educational systems in China but only at the primary level. It provides a framework for understanding and delivering the importance of understanding in-service teachers' evaluation beliefs in curriculum reform.

From childhood, in-service teacher have grown their education beliefs including evaluation beliefs in the classroom and they are locate themselves as teachers from their learning and growing experience in the classroom. A significant implication is that there is very little opportunity for in-service teachers to have a voice about curriculum reform in terms of their own education beliefs. Much of the research argues that the curriculum reform, in its entirety, has a substantial impact on the psychological and educational attainment of in-service teachers, yet they are hardly involved in its development (Kessels & Korthagen, 1996; Enyedy, Goldberg & Welsh, 2005). By giving in-service teachers a voice researcher walked into the primary schools to discuss the main themes from curriculum reform and then confirm their real beliefs about evaluation. In terms of the voices from in-service teachers, the ideal curriculum reform could be enacted by teachers' active participation and communication. The current study indicates that the confirmation of in-service teachers' evaluation beliefs may be a useful backdrop to build a harmonize channel for Chinese curriculum reform and development as well as for future research and practice.

Overall, the findings suggest that in-service teachers should articulate their beliefs of evaluation during the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Most importantly in-service teachers focus on stakeholders and the aim of evaluation in the classroom. This most probably reflects the theoretical background in-service teachers' form within their learning and growing experience. All of in-service teachers focus at this stage of the curriculum reform to release from stubborn educational test system. This paper encourages educators to transform, by walking to schools and listening to in-service teachers inside worldviews, and to provide opportunities for self-determination, influence, self-efficacy, competence and participation within the curriculum reform. For the most part these attributes are seen only in terms of the individual or small range. Our challenge is to foster these on a large scale. For in-service teachers, the classroom is the holy place for their beliefs, respect and value.

References

1. Alkin, M.C. (1990). *Debates on evaluation*. Newbury Park, Sage Publications.
2. Beattle, M. (1995). New prospects for teacher education: narrative ways of knowing teaching and teacher learning, *Educational Research*, 37(1) 53-70.
3. Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
4. Borg, M. (2001). Key concepts in ELT: Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal*, 55/2,186-188.
5. Borg, M. (2004). The apprenticeship of observation. *ELT Journal*, 58(3). 274-276.
6. Brown, C. (1986). What is a belief state? *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 10, 357-78.
7. *Buehl, M. M. & Alexander, P. A. (2001). Beliefs about academic knowledge. Educational Psychology Review*, 13, 385-418.
8. Burgess-L. T. & Burgess L. R. (1998). Conversational interviews and multiple-case research in psychology. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 50(2), 63-70.
9. Cao, T. S. & Lu, N. G. (2003). Resistance and collaboration: teacher change in the situation of curriculum reform. *Journal of curriculum, teaching material and method*, 01, 75-79.
10. Chinese Ministry of Education (2001). *The notice about trying the essentials of curriculum reform out in China*.
    http://www.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_711/201001/xxgk_78380.html
11. Chinese Ministry of Education (2002). *The notice about promoting innovation of evaluation and testing system actively in primary school and middle school*.
    http://www.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_441/201001/xxgk_78509.html
12. Civil, M. (1993). Prospective elementary teachers' thinking about teaching mathematics. *Journal of Mathematical Behaviour*, 12,79-69.
13. Clark, C. M. & Peterson, P. L. (1986). *Teachers' thought processes*. In: Wittrock, M.C.(Ed)Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Macmillan, 255-96.
14. Douglah, M. (1998). *Developing a concept of extension program evaluation*. University of Wisconsin, Cooperative Extension. Available: *http://learningstore.uwex.edu/pdf/G3658-7.PDF*

15. Enyedy N., Goldberg J. & Welsh K. M. (2005). Complex dilemmas of identity and practice. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 90, 68-93.
16. Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, 38, 47-65.
17. Feng, Y. H. & Li, J. (2010). The reflection and enlightenment about problems of New Curriculum Reform on the base of ecological theory. *Journal of New Curriculum Research*. 01, 16-18.
18. Ferre, R. (1988). *Philosophy of technology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
19. Fleischman, H. L. & Williams, L. (1996). *An introduction to program evaluation for classroom teachers.* Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.
20. Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press. p.45, 44.
21. Gregoire, M. (2003). Is it a challenge or a threat? A dual-process model of teachers' cognition and appraisal processes during conceptual change. *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(2), 147-179.
22. Greswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions.* London: Sage Publications.
23. Griffiths, T., Gore, J., & Ladwig, J. (2006). *Teachers' fundamental beliefs, commitment to reform and the quality of pedagogy*. In: Paper prepared for presentation at Australian association for research in education annual conference, Adelaide, November 26-30, 2006.
24. Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S. M., & Shulman, L. (1989). *Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching*. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.). Knowledge base for the beginning teacher. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 23-36.
25. Hermans, R., Tondeur J., Braak, V. J. & Valcke, M. (2008). The impact of primary school teachers' educational beliefs on the classroom use of computers. *Computers & Education*, 51, 1499-1509.
26. Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27 (1), 65-90.
27. Kennedy, M. M. (1997). *Defining an ideal teacher education program*[mimeo]. Washington, DC: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.
28. Kessels, J. P. A. M. & Korthagen, F. A. J. (1996). The relationship between theory and practice: back to the classics. *Educational Researcher, 25*(3), pp.17-22.
29. Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 77-97.
30. Li, X. P. (2006). A Dialectical Thinking on the Chinese Education Reform. *Journal of Peking University Education Review*, 01, 08-17.
31. Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. 2ndedu. Thousand Oaks, CA and London: Sage Publications.
32. Munby, H. (1982). The place of teachers' beliefs in research on teacher thinking and decision making ,and an alternative methodology, *Instructional Science*, 11, 201-25.
33. National Bureau of Statistics of China (2005). *China Educational Finance Statistical Yearbook*. Beijing: China Statistics Press. 7-19.
34. National Bureau of Statistics of China (2007). *China Statistical Yearbook*. Beijing: China Statistics Press.
35. Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.(ERIC Journal No. EJ453784)
36. Price, H. H. (1969). *Belief: The Gifford Lectures Delivered at the University of Aberdeen in 1960*. Gifford lectures, 1959-60. London: Allen & Unwin.
37. Raths. J. (2001). Teachers' beliefs and teaching beliefs. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 3, 1-10.
38. Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York, United States: Free Press.
39. Shulman, L. S. (1986).Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15, 4-14.
40. Simmons, P. E., Emory, A., Carter, T., Coker, T., Finnegan, B., Crockett, D., et al. (1999). Beginning teachers: Beliefs and classroom actions. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36*, 930–954.
41. Smith, J. A. (1995). *Semi-structured interviewing and qualitative analysis*. In Rethinking methods in psychology, eds. J. Smith, R. Harre, and L. van Langenhove. London: Sage Publications.

42. Steele, S. M. (1991). *Introduction to evaluation*. Class notes, Department of Continuing and Vocational Education: UW-Madison.
43. Tobin, K. (1993). *Constructivist perspectives on teacher learning*. In Tobin, K. (Ed.), *The practice of constructivism in science education*. Washington, D.C.: AAAS Press. Chapter 13, 213-226.
44. Ye, L. (1997). Inspire the vitality in the classroom. *Educational Research*, 9, 6-7.
45. Wallace, T. L. & Alkin, M. C. (2008). Studies in Educational Evaluation. *Journal of Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 34, 192-193.
46. Wang, B. L. (2009). The three hot theoretical topics about Chinese curriculum reform in thirty years. *Journal of Chinese Education,* 02, 06-09.
47. Wang, C. S. (2006). The Dispute about the "Direction" of the Curriculum Reform. *Journal of educational studies*, 02, 03-08.
48. William, M. K. Trochim (1989). An introduction to concept mapping for planning and evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 12, 1-16.
49. Worthen, B. R. & James, R. S. (1987). *Educational evaluation: alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. New York: Longman.
50. Wu, Y. J. (2009). Reflections on the New Curriculum Reform in China: Achievements, Limitations and prospects. *Journal of curriculum, teaching material and method*. 07, 17-24, 36.
51. Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education washed out by school experiences? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32, 7–11.
52. Zhang, R. W. (2008). Basic Structure, Cognitive Framework and Revising Strategy of New Curriculum Reform. *Journal of Fujian Normal University(Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 06, 132-138, 155.