Research on the Impact of Policy Instruments on the learning Motivation of Government-sponsored Normal Students from the Perspective of Rural Revitalization

Lu Xiang
School of Education Science, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing, Guangdong, China

Abstract: Against the backdrop of rural revitalization and high-quality development of education, the government attaches great importance to rural education and teacher team construction, and has issued relevant policy documents. Policy tools are key means, and governments need to formulate the selection and supporting use of policy tools according to the actual situation. This article adopts questionnaire survey method, mathematical statistics and analysis method to investigate and analyze the acceptance degree of policy tools and learning motivation status of public-funded normal students, and explore the correlation between variables. From the results, it can be seen that there is no significant difference in learning motivation between public-funded normal students and non-public-funded normal students, and public-funded normal students have a higher acceptance degree of policy tools. Policy tools have a significant positive impact on the dimensions of learning motivation of public-funded normal students. Based on the above research results, several suggestions are put forward to establish an evaluation mechanism for educational policy tools with teacher development in the new era as the core, diversify the combination of educational policy tools, and improve the monitoring system for the implementation effect of educational policy tools.

Keywords: Policy Instruments; Learning Motivation; Public-funded Normal Students; Non-public-funded Normal Students

1. Introduction

In the context of rural revitalization and high-quality development of education, the government has attached great importance to rural education and teacher team construction. The introduction of documents such as the "Opinions of the Ministry of Education and other six departments on strengthening the construction of the rural teacher team in the new era" in 2020 and the "Targeted Training Plan for Outstanding Teachers in Underdeveloped Central and Western Regions" in 2021 reflects the national determination to improve the quality of rural education[1]. Public-funded normal students have become an important part of the rural teacher team, but there is a widespread problem of insufficient learning motivation, which affects the quality of training [2]. Policy tools are key means to achieve policy goals, and it is necessary to ensure that appropriate tools are used for effective implementation of policies. For the training of public-funded normal students, the selection, evaluation criteria, and matching use of policy tools need to be formulated by governments based on actual conditions. Currently, research on public-funded normal students mainly focuses on external environment, internal factors, and the correlation between internal and external factors [3]. These studies provide valuable suggestions for solving problems and optimizing the current situation, but most of them explore from a macro level, with less analysis of policy tool selection and effectiveness in implementation. This article aims to explore the current status of learning motivation among public-funded normal students, analyze the extent and mechanism of policy tools' impact on their motivation, and provide effective suggestions for optimizing policy tools.

2. Survey Design

2.1 Purpose of the Survey

This survey aims to systematically understand the actual situation of normal university

students' learning motivation and their cognition of policy tools, so as to provide direction for the development of learners' data literacy based on the survey results and analysis of the current situation from the perspective of policy tools.

2.2 Survey Respondents

Considering the objectivity and accuracy of the sample, a random sampling method was adopted to investigate the learning motivation and understanding of policy tools among normal university students of different grades and majors. A total of 366 valid questionnaires were collected through the distribution and recall of questionnaires via the survey platform. Among them, 279 were female students, accounting for 76.2%, and 87 were male students, accounting for 23.8%. There were 94 first-year normal university students, 130 second-year students, 89 third-year students, and 53 fourth-year students, accounting for 25.7%, 35.5%, 24.3%, and 14.5% respectively(See Table 1 for details).

Table 1. Distribution of Sample Respondents

Basic Information	Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage
Gender	Male	87	23.8	23.8
	Female	279	76.2	76.2
	Total	366	100.0	100.0
Grade	Freshman	94	25.7	25.7
	Sophomore	130	35.5	35.5
	Junior	89	24.3	24.3
	Senior	53	14.5	14.5
	Total	366	100.0	100.0
Major Category	Arts	170	46.4	46.4
	Science	129	35.2	35.2
	Arts and Crafts	53	14.5	14.5
	Sports	14	3.8	3.8
	Total	366	100.0	100.0
Program Nature	Government-Sponsored Normal Student	93	25.4	25.4
	Non-Government-Sponsored Normal Student	273	74.6	74.6
	Total	366	100.0	100.0

(Source: self-arrangement)

2.3 Measurement Tools

This study is based on the policy tool scale developed by Lei Shasha and the learning motivation measurement evaluation criteria of Barbara L. Mccombs. Among them, the educational tool scale includes three dimensions: incentive-based policy tools, regulatory policy tools, and capacity-building policy tools [4]; the learning motivation scale includes five dimensions: learning motivation, learning interest, learning efficacy, learning willpower, and learningemotions [5]. Cronbach's alpha coefficient is adopted to test the reliability of the learning motivation scale, policy tool scale, and their respective dimensions.

The reliability analysis results of the normal university students' learning motivation scale, policy tool scale, and their respective dimensions are as follows: The alpha coefficient of the learning motivation scale is 0.960, and the alpha coefficients of the five dimensions of motivation, interest, efficacy, willpower, and emotions are 0.894, 0.900, 0.904, 0.896, and 0.801, respectively. The internal consistency of the learning motivation scale and its dimensions are all higher than 0.80. According to the judgment principle of internal consistency coefficient indicators, the level or concept of the learning motivation scale is very good, and the entire learning motivation scale has high reliability; the alpha coefficient of the policy tool scale for public-funded education of normal university students is 0.931, and the alpha coefficients of incentive-based, regulatory, and capacity-building policy tools are 0.835, 0.889, and 0.845, respectively. The internal consistency coefficients are all above 0.80, indicating that

the level or concept of the policy tool scale is very good, and the entire policy tool scale has high reliability (See Table 2 for details).

Table 2. Reliability of Policy Tool and Learning Motivation Scales

Scale	Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient	
Learning Motivation Scale	Learning Motivation	0.893	0.956
	Learning Interest	0.900	
	Learning Efficacy	0.903	
	Learning Willpower	0.896	
	Learning Emotions	0.800	
Policy Tool Scale	Incentive-based Policy Tool Scale	0.834	0.932
	Regulatory Policy Tool Scale	0.900	
	Capacity-building Policy Tool Scale	0.846	

(Source: self-arrangement)

3. Current Situation Survey Results and Analysis

3.1 Current Overall Learning Motivation of Normal University Students

According to the descriptive statistical results of the learning motivation scale data for normal university students surveyed this time (Table 3, Table 4), the surveyed normal university students generally have mean scores higher than the theoretical average of 3 in terms of learning motivation, motivational dimension, efficacy dimension, interest dimension, volitional dimension, and emotional dimension. The mean score for learning motivation is 3.54, with the highest mean score in the motivational dimension at 3.98, a mean score of 3.73 in the emotional dimension, a mean score of 3.47 in the efficacy dimension, a mean score of 3.44 in the interest dimension, and the lowest mean score in the volitional dimension at 3.20. All scores are between 3-4 points and have not exceeded the higher level of 4 points. Therefore, it can be considered that the learning motivation of the surveyed normal university students is generally at a moderate level.

Table 3. Mean Scores of Overall Learning Motivation and Each Dimension

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard Deviation
Learning Motivation	366	1.30	5.00	3.54	.60580
Academic Motivation	366	1.57	5.00	3.98	.61798
Efficacy	366	1.00	5.00	3.47	.72439
Interest	366	1.25	5.00	3.44	.69087
Volition	366	1.00	5.00	3.20	.80042
Emotion	366	1.00	5.00	3.73	.68691

(Source: self-arrangement)

Table 4. Mean Values of Each Dimension of Learning Motivation for Government-Sponsored and Non-Government-Sponsored Normal University Students

	Professional Nature	Number of Cases	Average	Standard Deviation	SEM
Academic Motivation	Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	93	3.9389	.61052	.05644
	Non-Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	273	3.9994	.62200	.04066
Learning Efficacy	Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	93	3.4818	.71492	.06609
	Non-Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	273	3.4679	.73055	.04776
Learning Interest	Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	93	3.4135	.63937	.05911
	Non-Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	273	3.4535	.71618	.04682

Learning Volition	Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	93	3.2015	.67819	.06270
	Non-Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	273	3.2033	.85638	.05598
Learning Emotion	Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	93	3.7151	.63354	.05857
	Non-Government-Sponsored Normal University Students	273	3.7393	.71328	.04663

(Source: self-arrangement)

3.2 Analysis of Learning Motivation Differences among Different Types of Normal University Students

As can be seen from Table 5, variance analysis (full name: one-way ANOVA) was used to study the differences in learning motivation among different types of normal university students. It can be observed from Table 5 that there is no significant difference in learning motivation among different types of normal university students ($p>0.05$), indicating consistency in their learning motivation without any notable variations. Similarly, there is no significant difference among different types of normal university students in terms of learning motivation, learning efficacy, learning interest, learning volition, and learning emotions ($p>0.05$). This further emphasizes the consistency across these dimensions, without any distinct disparities.

Table 5. Analysis of Learning Motivation Differences among Different Types of Normal University Students

	(Mean±standard deviation)		F	p
	Government-Sponsored Normal University Students(n=93)	Non-Government-Sponsored Normal University Students(n=273)		
Learning Motivation	3.56±0.53	3.54±0.63	0.318	0.052
Academic Motivation	3.93±0.59	4.00±0.62	0.391	0.886
Learning Efficacy	3.47±0.66	3.46±0.74	0.272	0.033
Learning Interest	3.44±0.59	3.42±0.73	0.784	0.025
Learning Volition	3.25±0.63	3.16±0.85	0.841	0.884
Learning Emotion	3.76±0.58	3.72±0.70	0.159	0.202

(Source: self-arrangement)

3.3 Overview of Policy Instruments for Government-Sponsored Normal University Students

Drawing from the general standards used in the evaluation and measurement of examination performance, and referencing the research conducted by Zhang Jiantong and Lv Biyu on the criteria for setting examination score cut-offs based on hypothesis testing methods, we have established that scores of 60% and 80% of the total score represent the thresholds for "Qualified" and "Good" respectively. Based on this, a score of 3 is considered the "Qualified" level of acceptability for government-sponsored normal university students regarding policy instruments. Therefore, if the measured average acceptability of policy instruments falls within the range of 3-4 points, it can be inferred that the acceptability among these students is at a moderate level. Scores below 3 indicate a lower level of acceptability, while scores equal to or above 4 suggest a higher level of acceptability.

Table 6. Overall Mean Values of Policy Instruments and Their Respective Dimensions

	N	Mean	S.D
Policy Tool Scale	93	3.95	.58079
Incentive-based Policy Tool Scale	93	3.99	.63672
Regulatory Policy Tool Scale	93	3.98	.64490
Capacity-building Policy Tool Scale	93	3.86	.61572
Effective cases (in columns)	93		

(Source: self-arrangement)

Through descriptive statistics of the overall policy tools and their respective dimensions (see Table 6 for details), it is found that government-sponsored normal university

students have a moderate level of acceptance of the overall policy tools, with a mean value of 3.95. Looking at each dimension, government-sponsored normal university students have a moderate level of acceptance of incentive-based policy tools, with a mean value of 3.99; they also have a moderate level of acceptance of regulatory policy tools, with a mean value of 3.98; and they have a moderate level of acceptance of capacity-building policy tools, with a mean value of 3.86. Among them, the acceptability of incentive-based policy tools and regulatory policy tools is higher than that of capacity-building policy tools.

3.4 An Analysis of the Differences in Policy Instruments among Different Types of Normal Students

Table 7. t Test Analysis Results

	Government-Sponsored Normal University Students(n=93)	Non-Government-Sponsored Normal University Students(n=273)	t	p
Policy Tool Scale	3.95±0.58	-2.43±1.87	49.736	0.000**
Incentive-based Policy Tool Scale	3.86±0.62	-2.42±1.88	48.196	0.000**
Regulatory Policy Tool Scale	3.98±0.64	-2.44±1.83	49.679	0.000**
Capacity-building Policy Tool Scale	3.99±0.64	-2.41±1.94	47.511	0.000**
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01				

(Source: self-arrangement)

From the table above (Table 7), it can be seen that using t-tests (full name independent sample t-tests) to study the differences between public and non-public normal students in terms of four policy instruments: instrumental policy instruments, capacity-building policy instruments, regulatory policy instruments, and incentive policy instruments. From the table above, it can be seen that different samples of public and non-public normal students all exhibit significant differences ($p<0.05$) in terms of instrumental policy instruments, capacity-building policy instruments, regulatory policy instruments, and incentive policy instruments, meaning that different samples of public and non-public normal students have differences in terms of instrumental policy instruments, capacity-building policy instruments, regulatory policy instruments, and incentive policy instruments. The specific analysis is as follows:

Publicly funded and non-publicly funded normal students show a significant difference at the 0.01 level for policy instruments ($t=49.736$, $p=0.000$). Specifically, the average value of publicly funded normal students (3.95) is significantly higher than that of non-publicly funded normal students (-2.43).

Publicly funded and non-publicly funded normal students show a significant difference at the 0.01 level for capacity-building policy instruments ($t=48.196$, $p=0.000$). Specific comparisons show that the average value of publicly funded normal students (3.86) is significantly higher than that of non-publicly funded normal students (-2.42).

Publicly funded and non-publicly funded normal students show a significant difference of 0.01 level for regulatory policy instruments ($t=49.679$, $p=0.000$). Specifically, the average value of publicly funded normal students (3.98) is significantly higher than that of non-publicly funded normal students (-2.44).

Publicly funded and non-publicly funded normal students show a significant difference at the 0.01 level for incentive policy instruments ($t=47.511$, $p=0.000$). Specifically, the average value of publicly funded normal students (3.99) is significantly higher than that of non-publicly funded normal students (-2.41). Different samples of public-funded and non-public-funded normal students showed significant differences in their preferences for policy instruments, including type, capacity-building, regulation, and incentive.

3.5 Analysis of the Correlation between Policy Instruments and Learning Motivation of Tuition-free Normal Students

From Table 8, it can be seen that there is a significant positive correlation between policy instruments and learning motivation; there is a significant positive correlation between policy instruments and learning efficacy, learning interest, learning will, and learning emotional dimensions; there is a significant positive

correlation between learning motivation and incentive policy instruments, regulatory policy instruments, and capacity-building policy instruments.

Table 8. Correlation Analysis between Policy Instruments and Learning Motivation of Local Tuition-free Normal Students

	Academic Motivation	Learning Efficacy	Learning Interest	Learning Volition	Learning Emotion	Learning Motivation	Incentive-based Policy Tool Scale	Regulatory Policy Tool Scale	Capacity-building Policy Tool Scale	Policy Tool Scale
Learning Motivation	1									
Learning Efficacy	.665**	1								
Learning Interest	.661**	.858**	1							
Learning Volition	.523**	.788**	.815**	1						
Learning Emotion	.684**	.631**	.661**	.544**	1					
Academic Motivation	.813**	.917**	.926**	.855**	.808**	1				
Incentive-based Policy Tool Scale	.705**	.466**	.517**	.374**	.640**	.620**	1			
Regulatory Policy Tool Scale	.666**	.380**	.376**	.391**	.618**	.557**	.746**	1		
Capacity-building Policy Tool Scale	.659**	.451**	.517**	.494**	.664**	.640**	.698**	.774**	1	
Policy Tool Scale	.745**	.475**	.516**	.461**	.704**	.666**	.897**	.926**	.904**	1

(Source: self-arrangement)

3.6 Regression Analysis of Policy Instruments and Learning Motivation of Public-funded Normal Students

Table 9. Regression Analysis of Policy Instruments and Learning Motivation

	B	Annotation error	Standard coefficient	t	Sig.
(constant)	1.378	.147		10.117	.000
Incentive-based Policy Tool Scale	.132	.022	.219	6.394	.000
Regulatory Policy Tool Scale	.123	.022	.201	6.032	.000
Capacity-building Policy Tool Scale	.070	.027	.121	2.667	.008
R^2	0.438				
Adjusted R-squared	0.433				
F	69.831***				

(Source: self-arrangement)

Through Table 9, we have identified the following points:

The sig value of incentive policy instruments on learning motivation is lower than 0.05, reaching a significant level, and the coefficient is positive, indicating that incentive policy instruments have a significant positive impact on learning motivation;

The sig value of the regulatory policy tool on learning motivation is lower than 0.05, reaching a significant level, and the coefficient is positive, indicating that the regulatory policy tool has a significant positive impact on learning motivation;

The sig value of the capacity-building policy tool on learning motivation is lower than 0.05,

reaching a significant level, and the coefficient is positive, indicating that the capacity-building policy tool has a significant positive impact on learning motivation.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

(1) There is no significant difference in learning motivation between tuition-free normal students and non-tuition-free normal students.

Through descriptive analysis and independent sample T-tests, it was found that there is no significant difference in learning motivation between tuition-free normal students and local non-tuition-free normal students. The overall mean scores of normal students in the five dimensions of learning motivation, learning efficacy, learning interest, learning will, and learning emotions are all above 3, reaching a qualified level. Among them, the mean score of the learning motivation dimension is close to 4, almost reaching a good level, which is the maximum value among all dimensions. However, the score of learning will is 3.20, which has a certain numerical gap compared to the second lowest dimension - learning interest with a score of 3.44. This indicates that the surveyed group of normal students has a relatively low level of intensity in the dimension of learning will. However, from the perspective of the mean scores of each dimension of learning motivation, non-tuition-free normal students scored slightly lower than tuition-free normal students in the dimension of learning efficacy, while their scores in other dimensions were slightly higher than those of tuition-free normal students.

There are significant differences in the acceptance of policy tools between tuition-free normal students and non-tuition-free normal students.

Different types of normal students show significant differences in their acceptance of policy tools. This suggests that there are differences in the acceptance of different types of policy tools among different types of normal students.

Specifically, the mean scores of tuition-free normal students in policy tools, capacity-building policy tools, regulatory policy tools, and incentive policy tools are higher than those of non-tuition-free normal students. This indicates that tuition-free normal students have a higher level of acceptance of these policy tools. For policy tools, tuition-free normal students tend to believe that these tools are helpful for improving the quality of education. They focus more on improving the quality of education rather than just focusing on test scores. For capacity-building policy tools, tuition-free normal students focus more on cultivating their own abilities and qualities rather than just focusing on knowledge acquisition. They are more willing to participate in various training and learning activities to improve their abilities and qualities. For regulatory policy tools, tuition-free normal students pay more attention to complying with rules and regulations rather than just focusing on their own interests. They are more willing to comply with rules and regulations to ensure the smooth progress of educational work. For incentive policy tools, tuition-free normal students focus more on rewards and incentives rather than just focusing on punishment and restraint. They are more willing to promote their own learning and work through rewards and incentives.

The research results show that there are differences in the acceptance of different types of policy tools among different types of normal students. Tuition-free normal students have a higher level of acceptance of these policy tools, while non-tuition-free normal students have a relatively lower level of acceptance.

Incentive-based policy tools, regulatory policy tools, capacity-building policy tools, and the learning motivation of local tuition-free normal students and its various dimensions have a significant positive correlation.

In the field of education, policy tools are essential means to promote educational reform and development. Among them, incentive-based policy tools, regulatory policy tools, and capacity-building policy tools are three common types of policy tools. Research has shown that these three policy tools have a significant positive correlation with the learning motivation of local tuition-free normal students and its various dimensions.

Firstly, incentive-based policy tools aim to enhance learning motivation through rewards and incentives. For local tuition-free normal students, incentive-based policy tools can include scholarships, outstanding student awards, research project funding, etc. These

rewards and incentives can stimulate students' enthusiasm and motivation for learning, improving their learning initiative and enthusiasm. Secondly, regulatory policy tools aim to constrain and standardize students' learning behaviors through rules and regulations. For local tuition-free normal students, regulatory policy tools can include course requirements, examination systems, graduation requirements, etc. These rules and regulations can ensure the quality and outcomes of students' learning, promoting their overall development. Finally, capacity-building policy tools aim to improve students' abilities and qualities through training and development. For local tuition-free normal students, capacity-building policy tools can include internships, practical experiences, research projects, etc. These training and practical experiences can enhance students' practical abilities and innovative thinking, strengthening their professional competencies and competitiveness.

According to the research results, the significance (two-tailed) values of the correlation between incentive-based policy tools, regulatory policy tools, capacity-building policy tools, and the learning motivation of local tuition-free normal students and its various dimensions are all less than 0.01, indicating a significant positive correlation. Among them, the correlation coefficient (r-value) of incentive-based policy tools with the learning motivation of local tuition-free normal students and its various dimensions is the highest among the three types of policy tools, indicating that incentive-based policy tools have advantages in enhancing the learning motivation of local tuition-free normal students.

Incentive-based policy tools, regulatory policy tools, and capacity-building policy tools have a significant positive impact on learning motivation.

The research results indicate that the various dimensions of policy tools have predictive power for learning motivation. This suggests that different aspects of policy tools can influence students' learning motivation, thereby affecting their learning outcomes and performance.

In terms of standard coefficients, incentive-based policy tools have the greatest effect on learning motivation, with a value of 0.218. This means that incentive-based policy tools can significantly enhance students' learning motivation and encourage them to participate more actively in learning activities. Regulatory policy tools have the second-highest effect on learning motivation, with a value of 0.201. This suggests that regulatory policy tools can standardize students' learning behaviors and ensure that they learn according to prescribed requirements and standards. Capacity-building policy tools have the smallest impact on learning motivation, with a value of 0.120. This may be because capacity-building policy tools focus more on cultivating students' abilities and qualities rather than being directly related to learning motivation.

4.2 Recommendations

(1) Establishing an evaluation mechanism for educational policy instruments centered on teacher development in the new era

Currently, the academic community's construction of educational policy instruments is not comprehensive or in-depth enough, and there are certain gaps in relevant research and practical materials. However, with the continuous advancement and implementation of educational policies, we are increasingly recognizing the importance of constructing a scientific evaluation and selection system for educational policy instruments. This system can effectively serve the implementation of educational policies, improving education quality and management efficiency.

Looking back, the publicly-funded training of local normal students has a history of more than a decade, and this historical change has brought about the exit and emergence of policy instruments. Therefore, summarizing and analyzing the practices and effects of past policy instruments will provide valuable experience and references for constructing an evaluation and selection system for educational policy instruments. By understanding and analyzing past policy instruments and their effects, we can better understand the selection and application of policy instruments, providing useful references for future education policy implementation. Based on the present, we should take the "Strong Teacher Plan" as the guiding direction for the development of teacher education in the new era and do a good job in constructing the evaluation and selection system of policy

instruments. This plan aims to promote the construction of the teacher team, improve teachers' quality and ability, and facilitate the development of education. Through the goal guidance and path requirements of the "Strong Teacher Plan," we can better construct a policy instrument evaluation and selection system that aligns with teacher development in the new era. Looking ahead, moral character, ideals and beliefs, solid knowledge, and a caring heart have always been the inherent requirements of teachers' qualities, and these are precisely the goals of teacher development in the new era represented by the "Strong Teacher Plan." Constructing an evaluation and selection system for educational policy instruments guided by teacher development in the new era aligns with the characteristics and requirements of education's forward-looking and scientific nature [6]. Through the construction of this system, we can better evaluate and select policy instruments suitable for teacher development in the new era, providing strong support for promoting the development of education.

Constructing an evaluation and selection system for educational policy instruments guided by teacher development in the new era has important significance and value. By summarizing past experiences, basing ourselves on current development needs, and looking forward to future development directions, we can better construct a scientific and effective evaluation system for educational policy instruments, providing strong support and guarantee for promoting the development of education.

Diversified Combination of Educational Policy Instruments

In the educational process of locally funded normal students, a diversified combination of educational policy instruments serves as a crucial means to stimulate and sustain learning motivation. Different types of educational policy instruments exert varying influences on learning motivation.

Firstly, policy promotion should be intensified. Publicly funded normal students face a unique constraint: they enjoy four years of tuition remission and subsidies from the state but are required to teach in primary or secondary schools for at least ten years after graduation. This stipulation makes some of them feel that their "four years have bought out five years of youth," leading to feelings of boredom and even thoughts of defaulting on the agreement, as they do not fully understand the rights and obligations entailed in the policy. Therefore, provincial educational administrative departments need to take measures to expand policy promotion through traditional media such as newspapers and television, as well as new media platforms like Weibo and WeChat. Before signing contracts with publicly funded normal students, they should be clearly informed of the policy terms, especially the binding clauses, to ensure that they are aware of and understand their rights and obligations. This can help them prepare mentally before receiving publicly funded education, reducing their boredom and enhancing their learning motivation.

Secondly, incentive-based policy instruments play a crucial role in stimulating the learning motivation of locally funded normal students. By providing material and spiritual incentives such as scholarships and recognition for outstanding students, these instruments effectively motivate students to learn. Material rewards allow students to directly perceive the value of their efforts, while spiritual honors enhance their sense of self-identity and confidence, further stimulating their learning motivation. However, despite their significant impact on learning motivation, incentive-based policy instruments may not be as effective in improving learning will and learning efficacy. This could be because incentive-based policy instruments primarily focus on external stimuli, whereas learning will and learning efficacy rely more on students' internal motivation and self-ability [7].

Finally, normal students should acquire basic teaching skills. The development of their abilities comes from two aspects: theoretical knowledge learning and practical skill improvement. On the one hand, schools can offer a series of courses, including general education, professional education, and specialized teacher professional education, to help publicly funded normal students form a correct cognition of the education industry and cultivate their professional competence as teachers. On the other hand, schools can provide teacher professional skill training courses such as micro-lectures, internships, and practical training to continuously correct the teaching attitude of publicly funded normal

students and enhance their practical abilities. In addition, schools should increase the construction of educational practice bases to provide more educational internship platforms for publicly funded normal students.

Overall, different educational policy instruments have their applicable advantages and disadvantages. Incentive-based policy instruments are effective in stimulating learning motivation but may be slightly insufficient in improving learning will and learning efficacy. In contrast, capacity-building policy instruments focus more on enhancing students' internal abilities and motivation, which can compensate for the shortcomings of incentive-based policy instruments. Therefore, a diversified combination of educational policy instruments is the key to comprehensively enhancing the learning motivation of locally funded normal students. By combining regulatory, incentive-based, and capacity-building policy instruments, we can more comprehensively address the challenges in various dimensions of learning motivation and enhance it holistically. At the same time, this also requires us to fully consider students' needs and characteristics when formulating and implementing educational policies and use diversified policy instruments to meet their learning needs, thereby better stimulating their learning motivation [8].

(3)Improving the Monitoring System for the Implementation Effectiveness of Educational Policy Tools

From past doubts about the learning motivation of government-funded normal university students to the present conclusion that there is no significant difference in learning motivation between them and regular normal university students, we have recognized that policy targets are flexible and changeable, and the effectiveness of policy tools can be influenced by various factors [9]. To ensure that policy tools have a positive impact on policy targets, it is necessary to establish and improve a monitoring mechanism for the implementation effectiveness of educational policy tools. The monitoring mechanism is a crucial means of ensuring the effectiveness of educational policy tools. By establishing an evaluation and monitoring mechanism, the government can regularly assess the academic performance, educational knowledge level, and actual teaching effectiveness of government-funded normal university students. This not only allows for timely identification of problems but also enables the government to take corresponding measures to address challenges that arise in the process, providing better learning motivation and support for government-funded normal university students. In addition to assessing academic performance, teaching ability, and actual results, schools and governments can also reflect evaluation results in performance appraisals and development planning. Performance appraisals can provide incentives for normal university students, helping them to stimulate learning motivation, improve skills, promote strengths, and enhance educational quality [10]. Meanwhile, development planning can offer opportunities and platforms for the career development of normal university students, promoting their personal growth and professional advancement. Establishing and improving a monitoring mechanism for the implementation effectiveness of educational policy tools can provide a stable learning and working environment for government-funded normal university students. Through evaluation and feedback, policy tools can be adjusted in a timely manner to ensure they meet the needs of educational development. Simultaneously, the monitoring mechanism can also provide valuable references for policymakers, assisting relevant departments in formulating more scientific and reasonable educational policies.

In summary, establishing and improving a monitoring mechanism for the implementation effectiveness of educational policy tools is a crucial means of promoting the learning motivation and educational quality of government-funded normal university students. Through the establishment and implementation of the monitoring mechanism, we can better understand the effectiveness and shortcomings of policy tools, continuously improve and optimize educational policies, and provide strong support for the development of education.

References

[1] Feng Yangjie, Wang Qingping, Chen Caiyan. Comparative Study and Thoughts on the Policy of Publicly Funded Normal Students in China under the Strong Teachers Program. Journal of Huizhou

University, 2023, 43(01): 111-117.
[2] Wang Kangsheng, Luo Qin. Study on the Motivation of Free Normal Students: Taking Central China Normal University as an Example. Hunan Agricultural Machinery, 2012, 39(09): 188-189
[3] Wang Qinmei, Fang Ni. Economic analysis of free normal students' learning motivation and its influencing factors: based on the survey of Shaanxi Normal University. Theoretical Guide, 2014, No. 355(06):90-93.
[4] Lei Shasha. Research on the Impact of Policy Instruments on the Learning Motivation of Public-funded Normal Students. Northeast Normal University, 2018.
[5] Yao Jiasheng, Fang Yuan. Quantitative analysis of China's migrant children's education policy from the perspective of policy instruments. Educational Science, 2020, 36(06): 85-93.
[6] Wang Zhichao, Yang Yingxiu. Local Free Normal Students: Policy Analysis and Current Status Survey. Educational Research, 2018, 39(05): 76-82.
[7] Wang Qinmei, Fang Ni. Economic analysis of free normal students' learning motivation and its influencing factors: based on the survey of Shaanxi Normal University. Theoretical Guide, 2014, No. 355(06):90-93.
[8] Zhang Jun, Cai Wenbo. Evolutionary Analysis and Innovation Strategies of Policy Instruments for Higher Education in the West. Journal of Ethnic Higher Education Research, 2023, 11(01): 12-17.
[9] Francis C. Fowler. Introduction to Educational Policy. Jiangsu: Jiangsu Education Press, 2007.
[10] Wang Zhichao, Yang Yingxiu. Local Free Normal Students: Policy Analysis and Current Status Survey. Educational Research, 2018, 39(05): 76-82.

