

# Cultural Mirror Image: A Text Analysis of the Guide to the Social Development of Preschool Children in China and Australia

Jie An, Qinghua Zhang\*, Jiayu Luo, Haoyuan Zheng, Shiping Li, Jiahua Zheng

Guangzhou Huashang College, Guangzhou 511300, Guangdong Province, China

\*Corresponding author: Qinghua Zhang, zhangqinghua@gdhsc.edu.cn

**Copyright:** © 2024 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

## Abstract:

From a cross-cultural perspective and through text analysis, this study compares the Guidelines for Learning and Development for Children aged 3 to 6 (China) with the Early Years Learning Framework for Australia (EYLF), titled Belonging, Being & Becoming. The analysis encompasses educational objectives, implementation principles, teaching methods, practical operations, and the role of educators. It highlights the focal points of each country in these areas and examines their relationship with respective cultural and educational traditions. The study advocates for educational practices prioritizing children's subjectivity, enhancing educators' reflection and evaluation abilities, and fostering an open learning environment.

## Keywords:

Learning and development  
Social field  
Pre-school children  
China  
Australia

**Online publication:** September 12, 2024

## 1. Introduction

Sociality is fundamental to children's physical and mental health and holistic development, influencing their future learning, communication, and adaptability. Early learning standards in various countries encompass learning and development goals in this domain <sup>[1]</sup>. The Early Years Learning Framework for Australia, titled Belonging, Being & Becoming, and China's Guidelines for Learning and Development for Children aged 3 to 6 serve as guiding documents for preschool education in

their respective countries, reflecting distinct educational strategies and practices shaped by different cultural contexts. The Australian framework emphasizes the cultivation of creative thinking and children's autonomy, while China's guidelines focus on fostering collective consciousness and normative behavior <sup>[2,3]</sup>. Preschool education in both countries falls under the category of non-compulsory education. The comparison of these two distinct educational approaches, set against differing national conditions, cultural backgrounds, and levels of

socio-economic development, prompts reflection and discussion on maintaining cultural characteristics while promoting educational equity and efficiency.

## 2. Comparison and analysis of social development goals

The social development goals outlined in China's Guidelines are phased and continuous, adhering to the gradual nature of children's development. Based on children's physical and mental characteristics, specific age-related goals are established to progressively enhance their social abilities and promote their overall social development.

In contrast, Australia's EYLF categorizes age groups from birth to pre-primary education to support comprehensive development throughout early childhood <sup>[4]</sup>. Many Western countries have adopted this system of preschool education programs to ensure continuous and healthy growth under nationally guaranteed education <sup>[5]</sup>. This approach effectively promotes access to scientific parenting and education, particularly in disadvantaged or underdeveloped areas.

### 2.1. Social and psychological development goals

Social psychological development forms the foundation of individual social learning and overall development, encompassing children's self-identity, emotional growth, morality, responsibility, and values.

The construction of self-identity is not only a product of social interaction but also a result of the internalization of cultural tools within the individual mind. China's guidelines emphasize the cultivation of collective consciousness and team spirit, advocating for children's obedience and harmonious interactions within the group. This approach reflects traditional Chinese collectivism, which aims to shape children's social identity through collective activities and social norms. Conversely, the Australian framework places greater emphasis on individual autonomy and self-expression. It encourages children to explore their identities through diverse activities, reflecting the value orientation of individualism in Western culture.

In the emotional dimension, both Chinese and Australian educational frameworks emphasize the

cultivation of children's self-esteem and sense of belonging. Research indicates that fostering a sense of belonging is fundamental to the development of children's self-confidence, emotional expression and regulation, and autonomy <sup>[6-8]</sup>. It also serves as a critical foundation for nurturing children's sense of national and cultural identity and confidence <sup>[9]</sup>. The cultivation of these emotional attributes is closely related to the family, school, and broader socio-cultural environment, with cultural differences reflected in the specific implementation processes.

Social psychology is the result of cultural heritage passed down through history <sup>[10]</sup>. The cultural characteristics and social values of each country further influence the specific educational practices through the setting of these goals.

### 2.2. Social sexual behavior development goals

Both China and Australia regard the development of social behavior in young children as a key objective, but there are significant cultural differences in their specific educational methods and goal setting. China's guidelines emphasize cultivating children's adherence to basic behavioral norms and their enjoyment of participating in group activities. This objective reflects the influence of the social environment on child development, particularly in fostering and shaping children's social adaptability and public morality. This aligns with Confucian culture's emphasis on collective norms and social responsibility. Children's social behavior develops through cooperation and communication with others, which are influenced and supported by social and cultural norms and tools <sup>[11]</sup>.

By comparison, the Australian framework places greater emphasis on individual behavior and its impact on others and the environment, such as "reflecting on one's actions and considering the consequences for others." This aligns with Australia's individualistic culture, which emphasizes self-awareness and independent thinking, fostering children's autonomy and creative thinking. Children's social behavior develops through internalizing the actions and language of others into their own behavior and language, a process that requires active participation and self-regulation <sup>[12]</sup>.

In summary, from the perspective of social psychological, and behavioral development goals,

China's guidelines focus more on the cultivation of knowledge and skills, whereas the Australian framework emphasizes the development of abilities, attitudes, and values. Both instructions adapt and regulate the development of children's social behavior within their respective ecosystems. However, each has its limitations and challenges. There is potential for both to be further refined and optimized by drawing on and integrating each other's strengths and experiences.

### 3. Comparison and analysis of the implementation principles of social development

The principles of implementing social development in preschool education in China and Australia reflect deep cultural and educational philosophical roots. The differences in principles embodied by the guidelines and the framework highlight the fundamental distinctions in educational concepts and methods between the two countries.

- (1) Holistic and multidimensional development: Both frameworks emphasize the holistic development of children but differ in their consideration of multiple dimensions. The holistic principle in the Chinese guidelines is closely linked to China's collectivist culture, emphasizing the interpenetration and integration of different domains and goals, resonating with Confucius's idea of "teaching without discrimination." Alternatively, while the Australian framework also values holistic development, it places greater emphasis on the principle of diversity, acknowledging and reflecting the customs, values, and beliefs of different families, thus demonstrating a multidimensional consideration of cultural and social contexts.
- (2) Respect for the individual and interactivity: While both frameworks emphasize respecting individual differences, their implementation focuses on different aspects. The principle of respecting differences in the Chinese guidelines focuses more on the uniqueness of individual development and aligns with the concept of "teaching according to individual aptitudes," a

modern construction of Confucius's philosophy<sup>[13]</sup>. On the contrary, the Australian framework's principle of respect emphasizes the interaction between teachers and children, as well as the importance of family and community diversity. This reflects the Western educational emphasis on interactivity and community involvement, aligning with the ecological systems theory's emphasis on the interaction between the microsystem and the child.

- (3) Cooperation and family involvement: The principle of cooperation is implemented differently in the two frameworks. The Chinese guidelines foster a spirit of cooperation through group activities and team games, while the Australian framework emphasizes collaboration between educators, families, and communities, viewing parents as the child's first teachers and highlighting the central role of family in education. Children's social development is achieved through interactions and cooperation with others, influenced by various ecological systems. These differences reflect the distinct understandings and expectations of cooperation in the educational contexts of the two countries. The Chinese guidelines focus on cooperation between children and their peers and teachers, aiming to enhance children's social adaptability and collective consciousness. The Australian framework, on the other hand, emphasizes cooperation between children, families, and communities, aiming to better promote children's social participation skills and multicultural awareness.
- (4) Equity and diversity: Both frameworks value the potential of every child, reflecting respect and care for children. However, they differ in how they achieve educational equity. The Chinese guidelines emphasize the quality of learning to achieve equity, which may overlook individual differences and diverse needs. In opposition, the Australian framework directly emphasizes the principle of equity, believing that every child can achieve expected outcomes in some aspect of learning, which may overlook basic abilities

and common standards. Ensuring children's basic rights and equal opportunities while accommodating their diversity and individualized development is a topic worthy of in-depth exploration.

- (5) Reflection and assessment: Both frameworks emphasize the importance of educators' reflection and assessment, highlighting a focus on educational quality and effectiveness. The Chinese guidelines emphasize indirect reflection through the assessment of learning quality, which may overly rely on objective evaluation metrics and standards, potentially neglecting teachers' subjective experiences and creativity. Differently, the Australian framework explicitly introduces the principle of reflection, positioning teachers as facilitators of learning and encouraging continuous, critical self-reflection. However, this approach may overly emphasize teachers' subjective judgment and freedom of choice, potentially overlooking the consistency and standardization of teaching practices.

## 4. Comparison and analysis of social development education suggestions

Educational recommendations refer to guiding opinions provided to educators on the implementation process based on educational objectives. The following is an analysis of the educational recommendations for the social development of young children in China and Australia.

### 4.1. Teaching methods

Both guidelines advocate for child-centered approaches that use play as a fundamental method, context as a foundation, inquiry as a process, and diversity as a characteristic of teaching methods. Children's learning occurs through interactions with the social and cultural environment, and the complex and important interplay between the individual and the environment is reflected in the teaching methods of both the guidelines and the framework.

The Chinese guidelines place significant emphasis on specific teaching content and clear learning objectives,

integrating daily activities with situational simulations. This approach ensures that young children develop along predetermined paths, highlighting systematic, standardized, and goal-oriented instructional guidance, which aligns with the traditional Chinese educational emphasis on structure and discipline. \, the Australian framework is more open and flexible, encouraging self-exploration through play and practical activities, and emphasizing practice and reflection. By creating a rich and diverse learning environment, activities, and resources, it provides personalized, contextualized, and process-oriented learning support, focusing on fostering children's creativity, exploratory spirit, and independent thinking skills.

### 4.2. Practice operation

The educational recommendations in the Chinese guidelines integrate Confucius's principles of "teaching according to individual aptitudes" and "moral education first," emphasizing the guidance of young children in forming correct self-awareness and social behavior habits through daily life practices. For instance, teaching habits such as washing hands before meals and lining up closely link learning with daily life, emphasizing the cultivation of behavioral habits. This practical approach is advantageous as it is easily accepted and practiced by young children, but it may sometimes overly emphasize norms and structure, potentially neglecting children's creativity and exploratory nature.

The practical approach of the Australian framework highlights the individualism and multicultural characteristics of Australian education. It encourages young children to explore and understand themselves through practice. Providing open-ended materials and activities, such as mud and wooden blocks, fosters free creation and values children's creativity and imagination. This method emphasizes the process rather than the outcome, promoting children's autonomy, initiative, and deep thinking and reflection. However, its limitations may include the abstract nature of its concepts and the high professional demands placed on educators <sup>[14]</sup>.

### 4.3. Educator role

The Chinese guidelines position educators as knowledge transmitters and role models, closely aligning with the

traditional teacher-student relationship in Confucian culture. Confucius's concept of the dignity of the teacher emphasizes the authority and exemplary role of teachers in the educational process. By designing specific daily life scenarios, teachers leverage children's tendency to observe and imitate, subtly fostering their social development. In the play, educators act as scenario creators, observers, and guides, ensuring the achievement of educational objectives and providing clear behavioral guidance for children.

Compared to the Australian framework, the role of educators tends to be that of collaborators, guides, and supporters, reflecting the cooperative learning philosophy of Western education <sup>[15]</sup>. This philosophy emphasizes interaction and cooperation between teachers and students, valuing children's active participation and autonomous learning. In this educational model, educators encourage children to ask questions, explore, and reflect, engaging with them in the learning process and emphasizing the development of individual creativity and thinking skills.

## **5. Thinking and enlightenment**

### **5.1. Pay attention to children's subjectivity, stimulate creativity and critical thinking**

The emphasis on children's subjectivity in the Australian framework is a core element of modern educational philosophy. Respecting each child's uniqueness and individual needs, within a harmonious, relaxed, and democratic educational environment, children are encouraged to question existing knowledge structures, seek new solutions, explore various possibilities, and actively and independently engage in learning activities. This approach allows them to creatively construct their social worlds as both children and future adults <sup>[16]</sup>.

### **5.2. Pay attention to the reflection and evaluation of educators, and promote professional growth**

In the process of children's social development, early childhood educators hold a central position. They must focus not only on the development of children's knowledge and skills but also on their emotional and

attitudinal growth. Not only on individual and collective development but also on local and global development. Also not only on the present and future but on the past and present. Educators should actively engage in the children's learning process, exploring together and guiding them in developing critical thinking and creativity. Thus, teachers are not merely knowledge transmitters but also guides who need to possess reflective and continuous learning abilities. By creating a supportive learning environment, offering guidance, and collaborating with families and communities, educators provide opportunities for comprehensive development. The role of educators is crucial in building children's confidence, enhancing their social skills, and laying a solid foundation for future learning and life.

### **5.3. Pay attention to the creation of an open learning environment**

One of the core principles of the Australian framework is the emphasis on the importance of an open and diverse learning environment. Children are encouraged to explore and create freely, which not only promotes autonomous learning but also stimulates their curiosity and creativity. To construct such a learning environment, we should start with the richness and diversity of resources. In this process, the latest artificial intelligence (AI) technologies play an indispensable role. Utilizing AI-assisted teaching tools, such as intelligent educational software and adaptive learning systems, can personalize the learning pace for each child and enhance learning efficiency through gamified learning methods. This comprehensive approach, integrating various resources and technologies, provides children with a holistic and in-depth learning experience.

In addition to physical resources, an open learning environment requires the support and guidance of educators. Educators can design flexible and varied activities, encouraging children to participate in the design and modification of their learning environment. Involving children in decisions such as adjusting classroom layouts and selecting learning materials not only enhances their sense of belonging to the learning environment but also improves their decision-making skills and sense of responsibility.

## 6. Conclusion

Through a cross-cultural perspective, this study thoroughly analyzes the similarities and differences between the Chinese and Australian guidelines for the social development of preschool children and explores the profound influence of cultural traditions on the choice of educational goals and methods. The findings reveal the differences between the two countries' education systems in terms of philosophy and practice while emphasizing the central role of cultural factors in educational practice. These findings not only enrich the theory of intercultural education, but also provide new perspectives for educational practitioners to promote educational exchange and cooperation in different cultural contexts.

Despite the differences in goal-setting and

implementation principles between the two educational systems, they are both committed to regulating and promoting the development of children's social behaviors in their respective cultural ecosystems. Future research should focus on exploring how to integrate the strengths of the two education systems through innovations in curriculum design and pedagogical methods in order to meet educational needs in the context of globalization. Additionally, research could specifically explore how to utilize the latest technologies, such as artificial intelligence, to create more open and diverse learning environments for children, taking into account the professional development and continuous learning needs of educators in the process.

### Funding

- (1) 2020 General University Research Project of Guangdong Provincial Department of Education (Project No. 2020WQNCX120)
- (2) Research results of the 2017 Quality Engineering Higher Education Teaching Reform Project (Project No. HS2017CXQX6)

### Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- [1] Zheng R, Guo L, 2020, Comparison and Enlightenment of Foreign Learning Evaluation Tools in Social Field. *Early Childhood Education*, 2020(36): 50–54.
- [2] Sumsion J, Wong S, 2011, Belonging, Being and Becoming: The Early Years Learning Framework for Australia (EYLF). *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 12(1): 71–85.
- [3] Li J, Feng X, 2013, Interpretation of the Guide to Learning and Development in Children Aged 3–6 Years Old. People's Education Press, 2013:10.
- [4] Zhang X, 2013, Preschool Education Should be Strictly Forbidden to “Exceed, Irrigation, Engraving”——“Guide To Learning And Development Of Children Aged 3~6 Years Old.” *Research on Preschool Education*, 2013(12): 3.
- [5] Member C, Wang X, 2014, Nature, Content, and Characteristics of a Framework for Early Childhood Learning in Australia. *Research on Preschool Education*, 2014(05): 48–56.
- [6] Peter J, Astrid-Würtz R, 2019, Professional Development and Its Impact on Children in Early Childhood Education and Care: A Meta-Analysis Based on European Studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 63(6): 935–950.
- [7] Bulkeley J, Fabian H, 2006, Well-Being and Belonging During Early Educational Transitions. *International Journal of Transitions in Childhood*, 2006(2): 18–31.

- [8] Anette E, Liselotte EK, 2021, Doing Belonging in Early Childhood Settings in Sweden. *Early Child Development and Care*, 192(14): 2234–2245.
- [9] Osterman KF, 2023, Teacher Practice and Students' Sense of Belonging, *Second International Research Handbook on Values Education and Student Wellbeing*. Springer International Publishing, 2023: 971–993.
- [10] Zhou J, 2016, The Origin, Foundation, Connotation and Ethical Significance of Patriotic Values. *Ethics Research*, 2016(05): 1–7.
- [11] Cong X, Zhang X, 2004, Retrieve the Psychological Loss of Self—Psychology Research Topic of Historical Exploration and Contemporary Enlightenment. *Nanjing Normal University Daily (Social Science edition)*, 2004(05): 85–89.
- [12] Ma Y, Ye H, 2004, Contemporary Development of Recent Development Zone Ideas in Vygotsky. *Psychological Development and Education*, 20(2): 5.
- [13] Li Y, 2019, The Modern Construction of Confucius' Thought of "Teaching Students According to Their Aptitude." *Journal of Hunan University of Science and Technology (Social Science edition)*, 22(06): 155–161.
- [14] White AD, Flear M, 2019, Early Childhood Educators Perceptions of the Australian Early Years Learning Framework (EYLF): Engaged Professional Learners. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 44(2): 124–138.
- [15] Leggett N, Ford M, 2013, A Fine Balance: Understanding the Roles Educators and Children Play as Intentional Teachers and Intentional Learners Within the Early Years Learning Framework. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 38(4): 42–50.
- [16] Yuan J, Gao Z, 2018, Building the Spiritual Home for Children's Subject-Sex Development: The Exploration and Practice of Children's Philosophy. *Journal of Shaanxi Preschool Normal University*, 34(10): 5–10.

***Publisher's note***

*Art & Technology Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.*