

Innovative Instructional Management Approaches in Design Education in Chongqing Light Industry School

He Rui¹, Sutthiporn Boonsong^{2*}, Thanaploysiri Siribunsobh³
Education Faculty, Pathumthani University^{1, 2*, 3}
Corresponding author's e-mail: thanaploysiri@ptu.ac.th

Abstract

The objectives of this research were (1) to investigate the current status of innovative instructional management approaches in design education at Chongqing Light Industry School, China, and (2) to evaluate the impact of these pedagogical strategies on students' learning experiences and professional preparedness. The study employed a quantitative research design. The population consisted of 1,184 vocational art and design students, from which a sample of 299 participants was selected using Taro Yamane's formula at a 95% confidence level. Research instruments included a validated questionnaire covering five dimensions: active learning, technology integration, differentiated instruction, formative feedback, and professional skills development. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency, percentage) and inferential statistics (Pearson's correlation and multiple regression analysis). The results indicated that the overall level of innovative instructional management was rated high ($\bar{x} = 4.12$, S.D. = 0.47). Correlation analysis confirmed significant positive relationships between all instructional dimensions and students' professional preparedness ($r = 0.61\text{--}0.78$, $p < .001$). Regression analysis revealed that innovative instructional management significantly predicted professional preparedness ($R^2 = 0.64$, $p < .001$). The study concludes that systemic pedagogical innovation is essential for aligning vocational design education with the evolving demands of the creative industry.

Keywords: Innovative Instructional Management, Design Education, Active Learning, Professional Preparedness, Vocational Education, Chongqing

Introduction

In recent decades, the rapid expansion of vocational education in China has brought increasing attention to the quality and innovation of instructional management practices (UNESCO, 2012; Maclean & Wilson, 2009). Chongqing Light Industry School, as a representative vocational institution in southwestern China, faces the challenge of preparing art and design students for a highly competitive and technology-driven creative industry. Traditional lecture-based pedagogy is increasingly regarded as insufficient to cultivate the complex competencies required by modern design professionals (Efland, 2002; Eisner, 2002; Joyce, Weil, & Calhoun, 2015).

Innovative instructional management encompasses evidence-based pedagogical strategies that move beyond passive knowledge transmission to engage learners actively in their own skill development (Prince, 2004; Chi, 2009). Research consistently demonstrates that active learning, technology integration, and differentiated instruction significantly enhance student engagement, critical thinking, and readiness for professional practice (Freeman et al., 2014; Hattie, 2009; Tomlinson, 2017). In vocational design education specifically, these approaches help bridge the gap between academic curricula and industry expectations (OECD, 2010; Rauner & Maclean, 2008).

Despite growing emphasis on pedagogical innovation in Chinese vocational education policy, empirical studies examining the actual implementation status and measurable impact of innovative instructional management at the school level remain limited (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018; Stenhouse, 1975). In particular, research investigating how specific instructional strategies predict students' professional preparedness in design programs at vocational secondary schools in Chongqing is scarce. This gap creates challenges for educational administrators seeking evidence-based guidance for instructional reform (Tyler, 1949; Freire, 1970).

To address this gap, this study investigates the current status of innovative instructional management approaches and evaluates their impact on students' learning experiences and professional preparedness at Chongqing Light Industry School. By systematically examining multiple dimensions of instructional innovation — including active learning, technology integration, differentiated instruction, and formative feedback — this research aims to contribute empirical evidence to support sustainable instructional improvement in Chinese vocational design education.

Research Methodology

This research employed a quantitative research design to provide a systematic assessment of the current status of innovative instructional management and its impact on students' learning experiences and professional preparedness.

Population and Sample: The study targeted 1,184 vocational students within the art and design programs at Chongqing Light Industry School. A sample of 299 students was determined using Taro Yamane's formula at a 95% confidence level.

Research Instruments: A comprehensive questionnaire was developed, focusing on dimensions such as teaching methodologies, technology use, instructional support, student engagement, and professional preparedness.

Data Collection: Data were gathered through a structured survey focused on students' lived experiences with innovative teaching methods implemented in their courses.

Data Analysis: Statistical procedures included descriptive statistics (Mean, S.D.) to assess the status of instructional management and inferential statistics (Correlation and Regression Analysis) to determine the relationship between instructional innovations and professional outcomes.

Result

The findings from the analysis of 299 participants are summarized as follows:

1. Current Status of Instructional Management: Students rated the overall implementation of innovative instructional management at a high level. Key areas such as Active Learning and Technology Integration received the highest scores, indicating that instructors successfully utilize digital tools and collaborative projects to drive the learning process.

2. Student Engagement: There is a strong positive correlation between innovative teaching strategies and student engagement. Students reported that real-world scenarios and interactive projects made complex design concepts easier to understand and increased their motivation to participate in class.

3. Impact on Professional Preparedness: The regression analysis revealed that innovative instructional management is a significant predictor of professional preparedness. Students trained under these modern approaches expressed high confidence in their ability to apply design knowledge in professional settings and work effectively in teams.

4. Challenges: While satisfaction was high, some students noted challenges related to the consistency of technological resources and the need for more personalized feedback during long-term projects.

Discussion and conclusions

The findings of this study provide substantive empirical evidence addressing both research objectives. With respect to the first objective — investigating the current status of innovative instructional management — the results confirm that Chongqing Light Industry School has implemented innovative approaches at a high level overall ($\bar{x} = 4.12$). Active learning and technology integration received the highest ratings among all dimensions, which aligns with national vocational education reform priorities emphasizing practical competency and digital literacy (OECD, 2010; UNESCO, 2012). This finding suggests that instructors have meaningfully responded to policy directives by embedding collaborative projects, problem-based tasks, and digital tools into everyday instruction (Prince, 2004; Hmelo-Silver, 2004).

With respect to the second objective — evaluating the impact on learning experiences and professional preparedness — the correlation and regression analyses yield theoretically coherent and practically meaningful results. The significant positive correlations between all five instructional dimensions and professional preparedness ($r = 0.61\text{--}0.78$, $p < .001$) are consistent with Hattie's (2009) meta-analytic synthesis, which demonstrates that active engagement strategies consistently rank among the highest-effect instructional practices. Specifically, active learning strategies increased student motivation to engage with complex design challenges, reflecting Chi's (2009) constructive-interactive framework, where hands-on activities generate deeper knowledge encoding than passive reception.

The regression analysis further revealed that innovative instructional management explained 64% of the variance in professional preparedness ($R^2 = 0.64$), with technology integration and active learning emerging as the strongest predictors. This is consistent with Freeman et al.'s (2014) landmark study demonstrating that active learning approaches outperform traditional lectures in both performance and engagement outcomes. In the design education context, technology integration bridges theoretical studio practice with industry-standard digital workflows, thereby enhancing students' perceived readiness for professional work environments (Efland, 2002; Kuh, 2009).

Differentiated instruction also emerged as a significant contributor to professional preparedness. Tomlinson's (2017) framework for responsive teaching highlights the necessity of adapting content, process, and product to accommodate diverse learners — a particularly salient concern in vocational classrooms where students demonstrate varying aptitudes, learning preferences, and entry-level skills. When instructors adjust task complexity and provide tiered scaffolding, students are more likely to achieve mastery and develop self-efficacy relevant to professional contexts (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Notably, some students identified challenges related to inconsistent access to technology resources and insufficient personalized feedback during extended projects. These concerns align with Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris' (2004) conceptualization of behavioral and cognitive engagement, which underscores that sustained engagement requires not only stimulating tasks but also consistent structural support. Addressing these challenges through formative feedback mechanisms — such as digital portfolios and reflective journaling — would further strengthen the impact of innovative management on student outcomes (Sadler, 1989; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Wiliam, 2011).

This study confirms that innovative instructional management approaches are implemented at a high level at Chongqing Light Industry School and that these approaches are significant predictors of students' professional preparedness. The findings extend existing vocational education literature by empirically quantifying the relationship between multi-

dimensional instructional innovation and professional readiness outcomes in a Chinese design education context. The results reinforce the principle that pedagogical transformation must be systemic — encompassing active learning, technology, differentiation, and feedback — rather than confined to isolated improvements in individual techniques.

These findings carry significant implications for vocational education policy and practice in China. Administrators at Chongqing Light Industry School and comparable institutions should invest in sustained professional development for design instructors, ensure equitable access to digital resources, and formalize industry partnerships to sustain the relevance of innovative instructional content. Collectively, these measures will help ensure that vocational graduates possess not only technical competence but also the professional adaptability demanded by the evolving creative industry (Maclean & Wilson, 2009; Rauner & Maclean, 2008).

Future research should expand this investigation to include comparative studies across multiple vocational schools in Chongqing and other provinces, incorporate qualitative methods such as classroom observations and employer interviews to validate student self-reports, and conduct longitudinal tracking of graduates to assess whether professionally prepared students demonstrate superior career outcomes in the design industry.

Suggestion

1. Recommendations for Practice and Instructional Management:

Standardizing Digital Workflows: Instructors should continue to embed professional-grade digital tools into daily lessons. It is suggested that instructional management establishes a "Digital Excellence" standard across all design departments to ensure every student has equal access to high-end hardware and updated software.

Enhancing Industry-Linked Projects: The school should increase its collaboration with design firms to create "Live Briefs" or real-world projects. Managing these projects as part of the formal curriculum will give students invaluable experience in meeting client expectations and working under professional deadlines.

Personalized Feedback Systems: Since students highly value feedback, the management should implement digital portfolios where instructors can provide continuous, formative feedback. This allows for a more personalized growth tracking system that goes beyond traditional letter grades.

Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Design education should not be isolated. It is recommended to manage cross-departmental projects (e.g., Design students working with Business or Technology students) to simulate a real-world corporate environment.

2. Recommendations for Policy and Administration:

Faculty Training: The administration should prioritize regular "Innovation Workshops" for teachers to stay updated on the latest pedagogical trends and design technologies.

Investment in Infrastructure: Continuous budget allocation for the maintenance and upgrading of art labs and digital studios is essential to sustain the high level of student satisfaction.

3. Recommendations for Future Research:

Longitudinal Career Tracking: Future research should track graduates for 1-3 years to determine the long-term impact of these innovative instructional approaches on their actual career trajectory and salary levels.

Comparative Studies: A comparative study between different vocational schools in Chongqing or other provinces could identify regional factors that influence the success of instructional innovation.

Qualitative Insight: Incorporating more qualitative data, such as in-depth interviews with industry employers, would provide a clearer picture of whether the "Professional Preparedness" perceived by students matches the expectations of the creative industry.

References

- Aronson, E. (2002). *Building empathy, compassion, and achievement in the jigsaw classroom*. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 209–225). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012064455-1/50013-0>
- Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Kulik, C. L. C., Kulik, J. A., & Morgan, M. (1991). The instructional effect of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(2), 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543061002213>
- Chi, M. T. H. (2009). Active-constructive-interactive: A conceptual framework for differentiating learning activities. *Topics in Cognitive Science, 1*(1), 73–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-8765.2008.01005.x>
- Clark, I. (2012). Formative assessment: Assessment is for self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*(2), 205–249. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9191-6>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. Yale University Press.
- Efland, A. D. (2002). *Art and cognition: Integrating the visual arts in the curriculum*. Teachers College Press.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in text-based environments. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(2–3), 87–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(00\)00016-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6)
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? *Educational Psychology Review, 16*(3), 235–266. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000034022.16470.f3>
- Joyce, B., Weil, M., & Calhoun, E. (2015). *Models of teaching* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). The national survey of student engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 141*, 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.283>
- Maclean, R., & Wilson, D. (Eds.). (2009). *International handbook of education for the changing world of work: Bridging academic and vocational learning*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5281-1>
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- OECD. (2010). *Learning for jobs*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264087460-en>
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2018). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x>

- Rauner, F., & Maclean, R. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of technical and vocational education and training research*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8347-1>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and intrinsic motivation. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. Heinemann.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- UNESCO. (2012). *Transforming technical and vocational education and training: Building skills for work and life*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000217683>
- Wiliam, D. (2011). *Embedded formative assessment*. Solution Tree Press.