

Integration in Hong Kong: where are we now and what do we need to do?

A review of the Hong Kong Government's Pilot Project

Nick Crawford, Vivian Heung, Ellen Yip, Celeste Yuen and Shirley Yim

Department of Special Education, HKIEd.

Abstract

This paper discusses the 2 year Pilot Project on Integration set up by the Hong Kong Government in 1997. It considers the background to the implementation of the Project, the difficulties faced by Government in recruiting schools and the preparation of the participating 9 schools. The paper describes the aims of the Pilot Project in integrating 48 students with disabilities in primary and secondary schools and outlines the methods used by the Research Team to evaluate the Project.

The paper outlines some of the main findings of the evaluation study and considers the central issues and challenges for Hong Kong set against a background of the political changes surrounding the return of Hong Kong to Chinese sovereignty. A number of recommendations for successful integration strategies for Hong Kong are indicated.

“Subject teachers have difficulties in attending to the ‘integrators’ whose learning abilities and academic standards are low.” (subject teacher)

“Not all ‘integrators’ are fully prepared psychologically to study in ordinary primary school and there are adjustment problems.” (resource teacher)

“This Integration Pilot Project is so much better than I had anticipated.” (a parent).

Introduction

The Hong Kong Government, since the 1970s, has been attempting to move towards the integration of disabled children into ordinary schools in order that they should receive an appropriate education alongside their peers. The success of this policy has been limited, and where there has been success it has been largely on the basis of individual effort and advocacy, rather than on the basis of policy and reform.

The pressure for reform has come from a changing philosophy which recognises the principle of inclusive education, expressed clearly in the UNESCO Salamanca Statement (1994) that all children should be enrolled in regular schools, unless there are compelling reasons not to do so. That policy to integrate was again strongly endorsed in Hong Kong by the 1995 White Paper on Rehabilitation: *Equal Opportunities and Full Participation: A Better Tomorrow for All*.

Background to the Government Project

Policy on integration in Hong Kong was initially formally expressed, in a White paper in 1977: *Integrating the Disabled into the Community: A United Effort*. There then followed a policy of expansion of special places. That practice was reversed in 1981 with the Education Department's first *experiment* at integration. At that time a Working Party Report on Secondary Special Classes (Education Department, 1981) brought about the closure of most special classes, and their replacement by an intensive remedial service (IRS), which remained the pattern of provision until 1990.

The integration policy set out by Government in the 70's and 80's had been driven largely by the rhetoric of integration from the United Kingdom, the colonial power, and the terminology in published documents closely followed that contained in the Warnock Report and the 1981 Education (Handicapped Children) Act in the UK. There was, however, an enormous gap between the rhetoric of the Hong Kong Government and the practice in schools. This gap and the problems surrounding implementation were further confounded by the publication of the Education Commission Report No. 4 (ECR4) in 1990, chaired by Rita Fan. This Report recommended more segregation at secondary level, which was in almost complete contradiction with existing Government policy. The primary author strongly criticised that policy and claimed that the policy would eventually fail (Crawford, 1991).

In 1996 the Board of Education's *Sub-Committee Report on Special Education* continued to argue for integration but provided further confused (and confusing) messages. It argued that the Practical Schools proposed by ECR4 gave children "equal chances for proper schooling" (p.153). In June 1997, at the point of departure of the British colonial power, and the return of sovereignty to the PRC, the scene was now set for Hong Kong to rethink its own policy implementation issues, and to consider simultaneously the integration programme in mainland China.

The Pilot Project on Integration set out to develop the potential of a sample of children with disability integrated in ordinary schools; to enhance the schools' understanding of the potential and individual needs of these pupils; to encourage a whole school approach (WSA) and to strengthen home-school cooperation.

Over seventy schools were originally contacted by the ED during the spring and summer of 1997 to take part in the Integration Pilot Project and the ED experienced a number of difficulties in the recruitment of schools. There was opposition from teachers, parents and from school supervisors. There was concern about the additional workload and the challenges which would result, in schools already working with and "overwhelmed" by a number of new initiatives (e.g. SMI, TOC). It was also argued out that an integration process might lower the 'overall academic' standard in schools.

At the commencement of the Pilot Project there were 48 pupils integrated in 7 primary and 2 secondary schools, distributed across all years from P.1 to S.2. They included pupils with, mild grade mental handicap, sensory impairments (auditory or visual), physical handicap, and autistic disorder (normal IQ range). No child with a severe intellectual disability was included in the project.

The evaluation team's task was to determine the effectiveness of the pilot project, to make recommendations for successful integration strategies and on the mode of operation for integrating pupils with special needs in regular schools.

Preparing the schools for the Project

Support to the 9 project schools was provided by a number of means: two psychologists working half-time; advisory support from the Inspectorate; and, as a major part of the support to the 9 project schools, the University of Hong Kong set up an Action Research Team (ART). Printed guidelines (*Practice Manual*) were provided by the ED for schools, plus a clear *Operation Guide*. Further, each school in the project received a non-recurrent grant of \$50,000 and received annual grants, for each disabled pupil, of \$1,000.

Each school recruited a Resource Teacher (RT), additional to the establishment. Typically, each principal chose a teacher from the existing staff as the RT and recruited a replacement. The RTs and teachers were given workshops, courses and discussion sessions with staff from the ED

and by tertiary institutions between June and September 1997. Each school set up an Individualized Educational Planning Committee (IEPC) to plan, review and monitor the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) formulated for each pupil in the project.

Integration and Inclusion

A review of the international literature shows that the database addressing emergent issues in the full inclusion of students with disabilities has grown rapidly (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Sailor, Gee & Karasoff, 1993). The major studies reported in the literature represent a broad diversity of questions, methods, and participants (Giangreco & Putnam, 1991). It may be first helpful to make a distinction between the terms “inclusion” and “integration” as the term “integration” was adopted in the current Hong Kong pilot project.

We take the view that “integration” means the placement of children with special needs into the mainstream, with varying levels of engagement. “Inclusion” refers to that process where the schools and the education system welcome children of all abilities and disabilities, where differences are celebrated and where the system, not the child, is responsible for the accommodation. It is well known that children with physical handicaps or with hearing or visual impairments are more readily integrated into ordinary schools than those with learning difficulties. The reason is easy to see. Those with physical or sensory impairments require access to the curriculum; access for such children means providing aids, resources, technology and perhaps architectural changes. The curriculum may remain unchanged. Those with learning difficulties require the system to change the curriculum and its delivery.

The Research Procedures used in the evaluation

In May 1998 and January 1999 two major surveys were conducted in the project schools using 2 specially developed key instruments: the *Parent Questionnaire* and the *School Questionnaire*. A Likert scale was added to the instrumentation to allow for some pre and post project measures of differences. Students, teachers and parents were interviewed. The *Parent Questionnaire* was sent to parents of all “integrators” and a sample of parents of “non-integrators. Documentation and comments produced by the schools and within classrooms throughout the project (school report, IEPC report, and teachers’ comments) were examined to observe the academic progress of integrated pupils.

Sample small-group interviews were conducted with teachers in the 9 pilot schools. Individual in-depth interviews were conducted with the principals and the resource teachers (RTs). All parents of integrators were invited to share their experiences and progress concerning their children, and a sample of parents of non-disabled children was also interviewed. As there were some drop-out cases, those parents were approached and telephone interviews were conducted. Interviews with the co-principal investigators of the ART, were conducted in early August 1998 and mid-March 1999. The sample surveyed contained 380 school personnel and 886 parents in the first survey and 325 and 915, respectively, in the second survey. Among those school personnel, 56 and 47 were found to be support personnel (in the first and the second survey respectively).

The general findings of the evaluation study

Progress of the students

Data on the students were analysed according to the categories included in the Pilot Project (mild mental handicap; autism; mild mental handicap with suspected autistic features; sensory impairment, auditory and visual; and physical handicap) in order to determine whether the nature of impairment was a mediating factor. There was no evidence to show that students' overall academic results showed a direct relationship between the degree and/ or type of impairment. Generally, the integrated students' progress in both academic and social behaviours were satisfactory. Clearly, individual factors are significant (and complex) and it is difficult to be certain what those influencing factors are. Any explanation of differences in students' progress with this sample and in these settings would be contentious; integrated students even in the same class achieved different results. Individual effort, achievement, motivation and support appear to explain individual's results, alongside the expectations and skills of teachers. Many students in the project showed good progress.

It is particularly important to note that there were very few cases of integrated students at the bottom of a class. In other words, some regular students (who do not have to claim the 'right' to be integrated) are actually falling below the integrated students' standards. This is true even where those students are mildly mentally handicapped. Of course, this raises the question of procedures for admission and the purposes of screening and assessment of students in order to provide separate placement. It also raises the observation that it is not only academic performance that predetermines exclusion in the present system.

The majority of parents of both integrators and non-integrators were satisfied with their children's academic (76.4% and 70.1% respectively) and social progress (78.9% and 82.8% respectively). This suggests that there are no immediate negative effects as perceived by parents of integrating disabled, or lower achieving, students with regular students.

A total of 37 integrated children were interviewed. Most expressed that they enjoyed school life and they perceived themselves as getting along well with peers with or without disabilities. In the classroom, most were engaged in interaction though they were more often responding to approaches from classmates rather than initiating those interactions. Students who were repeaters or those who were already in the school before the Pilot Project were relatively better in their social interaction with schoolmates. Faced with difficulties in school work, disabled students claimed that they fell back on their family members for support.

The remarks of parents who were interviewed were very encouraging. Many reported that their child was happier, enjoyed going to school and cared about school work. They also observed improvement in their child's temper and friendship networks.

Pilot schools' understanding of integration

About half of the respondents from the pilot schools felt unsure whether their schools had explained their policy on support of integration at the commencement of the pilot. The answers collected from the open-ended question on the strategies which had been adopted in their schools to respond to this Pilot Project generated many "don't know" comments. In the second survey, there were fewer "don't know" responses, suggesting that their understanding of integration had grown over time. School personnel also had a good understanding of other colleagues' roles. Again, not only had the positive responses increased from 39.0% to 50.0% in the second survey, but also there were fewer respondents feeling undecided.

Similarly, more respondents in the second survey (34.3%) compared with the first survey (24.8%) claimed that their school had clearly explained the policy on supporting integration. This still remains a surprisingly small percentage of the professional staff in a set of project schools.

Attitudes of teachers to integration

Many studies have shown that direct contact with disability is associated with more positive integration attitudes. Interest in the measurement of attitude, particularly in the US, has been based upon the belief that the implementation of integration depends upon teachers, principals and others having positive attitudes. Research by Jamieson (1984) in the US has not shown that any particular variable is a strong predictor of teacher attitudes. Jamieson did suggest that the further away from the classroom educator was, the more positive the attitude to integration, though this has not been shown to be the case for UK studies. In this study, however, there was evidence that those teachers who did not have direct teaching contact with integrating students had slightly more positive views towards integration than those working closely with these students *by the end of the project*.

Views of Principals and Resource Teachers

Whether the class teacher should take responsibility for *all* children was an important question presented since it is pivotal to the issue of whole school approaches. Two of the RTs were undecided about this, *even at the end of the Pilot Project*.

The statement: *the needs of integrators can best be served through special separate classes*, generated important responses. Teachers with little or no contact with integrated students in the project schools became less convinced that the needs of integrators could be best be served by separate special classes. The difference in responses from the first to the second survey was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). At the start of the Pilot Project six out of nine RTs were undecided as to whether the needs of integrators could be best served through segregated special classrooms. At the end, however, three were still undecided and one RT actually agreed that *segregation was the best option*. The responses of RTs was surprising, bearing in mind their extra training and that the RTs' role is specifically to support integrators in mainstream settings and to support teachers to do so.

Only three principals and two RTs thought that integration required significant changes to the school curriculum. Of principals, 4 disagreed that significant changes to the curriculum were necessary and 2 were undecided. However, if we take the view that learning difficulty is a mismatch between the curriculum on offer in the school, and the interests, abilities and experience of the individual child, then successful integration, must require changes to the curriculum, and these changes must be significant. If the curriculum is "sacred" then it follows that integration can

only occur if students achieve specified entry requirements. Seven out of the 9 RTs saw parents of integrating students as a useful resource (2 were undecided) but surprisingly 1 principal out of the 9 principals saw these parents as not helpful and 3 were undecided on the matter. It seems likely that parents (who obviously know their children well, their history and any difficulties which they may have) should be viewed as helpful, or shaped to be so.

When asked whether the needs of integrating students can best be served through special separate classes, one in three of teachers disagreed. This was a statistically significant increase from the first survey ($p < 0.05$), when one in four held that view. Most teachers agreed that integration fosters understanding and acceptance of difference. By the time of the second survey, 77.2% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed. This was again a statistically significant increase from the first survey ($p < 0.05$). More than one-third of teachers agreed or strongly that integration is beneficial also to regular students. These were clear movements in support of integration.

Teachers with and without contact with integrated children

The study identified those teachers who taught those children who were integrated (i.e. had contact) and those who had little or no contact, in order to identify possible changes in attitudes and the implications of actual experience with children being integrated in the project. Of teachers with no contact with integrated students as many as 50.0% felt that segregation was a better option for disabled children compared with 38.3% of teachers with contact. In the second survey there was some evidence of a clear shift in both groups of teachers towards a more positive view of integration.

Asking teachers who were teaching integrated students whether, if they were the parent of a disabled child, they would wish their child to be integrated or not is perhaps one of the most revealing questions regarding attitudes to integration. About 1 in 5 of all teachers at the end of the Pilot Project (whether with or without contact) said that they would **not** like their own child to be integrated. Interestingly, of the teachers working with integrators, more became undecided as the Pilot Project went on (2 out of 7 to 2 out of 5). Those without contact remained constant (at about 1 in three).

Greater exposure to integrators (and perhaps to the commissioned training offered by two tertiary institutes) similarly appeared to explain the finding that those with contact (31.6%) stated that integration was **not doing special education in the regular class**. This compared with 17.9%

of those teachers without contact and with less preparation in this Pilot Project. The point is particularly important for planning purposes since integration for the Education Department is presumably not attempting to move special education (as a body of specialized practices) into the ordinary classrooms but ultimately about *moving towards the development of inclusive schools*. It must therefore be about systemic change. The maintenance of special education within mainstream runs counter to the idea of WSA and inclusive practice, which weakens and reduces the capacity of schools to reform their practice and become *more effective for all students*.

View of Parents

A very positive outcome from the study is the overwhelming support to the integration of disabled pupils by the majority of parents. There was in the second survey a general increase in the positive responses from parents who supported the integration of pupils with learning disabilities into the school, from both the parents of integrators and the parents of the non-integrators.

As to the views on integration expressed by the parents of the non-integrators, the responses, though also very positive, were more varied than the parents of integrators. A group of parents in a primary school expressed that they were supportive of this Pilot Project. They thought, interestingly, that it was equally possible for some regular students to be rejected by others for various reasons and that there had always been special needs children mixed in the regular classroom without being identified by other parents. One parent of a drop-out student from the project commented,

“If curriculum could be adapted to my son’s condition, that would be of help. My son did not learn much of the curriculum, but he had to take the same examination paper as other children. I think it was impossible for my son to take a general examination or curriculum because he had not yet reached the standard. Moreover, even for regular students, their examination results may not be very ideal..... Now in the special school, my son is not learning positive things. He seems to be staying where he was, or even a little back... ... This might be good for him, however, with a slower pace and less pressure in doing homework”.

Skills were needed by teachers

Although findings suggested that most teachers agreed that adaptations were desirable, they often regarded them as not feasible in regular classrooms. In school practice, adaptations were not frequently made. As teachers are playing an important role in implementing and facilitating any innovation at the classroom level, their support for inclusion or innovation in which they are participating, is critical for its successful implementation (Soodak, Podell & Lehman, 1998).

Quite a number of teachers in both surveys were unsure about their confidence in mastering co-operative teaching techniques, co-operative learning techniques, and meeting individual needs. Drawing from the integration experience in the US, Lipsky and Gartner (1997, p.157) stress that it is important for teachers to be skilled in using the above instructional strategies, especially using cooperative learning approaches. The collected self-evaluation responses suggest that teachers may not oppose using these instructional strategies, however, they are unsure exactly how to use them in their teaching effectively. This is further illustrated by their undecided responses of (a) meeting the needs of individual students (38.8% and 44.1%) and, (b) using “IEP” (53.7% and 52.3%) in the two surveys. As meeting an individual’s needs is a major issue for managing successful integration, it must be an area for further attention if effective teaching and learning is going to be enhanced.

The overall survey findings have indicated that teachers have more confidence in mastering different strategies and skills than their actual practice would suggest. This may imply that changing practice requires more than knowledge and confidence. Nevertheless, in the second survey, more daily interactions and exchanges among teachers were reported. Specific teaching strategies which teachers felt had been successful included: staff training; coordination/communication between teachers & parents; more promotion about the Integration Pilot Project; peer tutoring; co-operative teaching; and after-school support.

Specific comments by teachers were:

“All members of the school should participate in the Integration Pilot Project.”
(resource teacher)

“Integrators should be treated and taken care of in the same way as regular students.” (subject teacher)

“Classmates should be supportive of each other; students of higher grades can provide individual assistance to integrators.” (subject teacher)

“Teachers should be psychologically and professionally equipped to effectively

manage the integrators.” (subject teacher)

“The principal’s support in time-tabling for teachers concerned; professional training for the Resource Teacher; understanding of inclusive education by all school personnel...” (resource teacher)

“Individual differences of students are too great and students would be benefited by more tutoring sessions.” (resource teacher)

“More transparency is needed; thorough discussion should be conducted in administrative meeting; roles of teachers and resource teachers should be defined.” (subject teacher)

Suggestions which all teachers made in the open ended questionnaires were numerous and varied. Below is a list of a few selected comments (not in any order): increase resources and manpower; provide teacher training; provide professional support; pull out lessons for integrators; cancel the Pilot Project and send them back to special schools; and reduce class size.

Resource Teachers

As far as the skill levels of the nine resource teachers¹ are concerned, in the second survey, all of them felt comfortable in managing behaviour difficulties in their classroom. Among the nine resource teachers, seven of them were confident in mastering each of the following skills: arranging groups of students in different ways; using peer tutoring and “IEP”. Moreover, eight of them indicated either confidence or strong confidence in assessing all pupils appropriately. These strategies are important for adapting to individual differences and altering aspects of curricula to match individual needs.

However, the nine resource teachers showed decreasing confidence in: meeting the needs of individual students (from 6 down to 4); using co-operative teaching (from 8 down to 5); co-ordinating their teaching with the class teacher (from 9 down to 6); detailing the progress of all students in their classrooms (from 6 down to 4). As these instructional strategies are important for effective teaching and learning in an inclusive setting (Moeller & Ishii-Jordan, 1996), the lack of confidence in applying skills signals a difficulty which needs to be addressed in staff development and training. Five out of nine resource teachers claimed to tailor the curriculum only monthly, or rarely.

¹ Note that only three of the nine RTs had received previous special education training in 1998/99.

Most resource teachers described themselves as playing a supportive role to the class teachers. *“I’m playing a supportive role in assisting subject teachers in managing class assignments and discipline during the Chinese, English and Mathematics lessons”*, said one resource teacher. She continued: *“Owing to our different views on teaching style, content tailoring and delivery, conflicts and misunderstandings were inevitable. I think we Chinese have difficulties in practicing co-teaching”*.

In order to maintain teaching coherence, a resource teacher claimed, *“I am mainly playing a supportive role to the class teacher. I seldom express my view on teaching because all of them are very skillful”*. He also added, *“we are all very busy, so it is difficult to sit down and plan the curriculum together.”* In another situation, two resource teachers from the same school highlighted the challenge of working collaboratively and meaningfully with colleagues. In summary, changing the role from a class teacher to a resource teacher can be a source of stress as reported by some resource teachers.

Curriculum issues

Tomlinson (1982) has argued that in most countries it was the adoption of a universally applied standard curriculum, in which children of a given age were all expected to learn the same subjects to the same level of achievement, that stimulated the development of segregated schooling.

A review of school based integration in the twenty-one Western countries which make up the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) found that practices such as the imposition of a rigid curriculum and the removal of some students into classes which provided a different curriculum were unhelpful to integration. It was concluded that within-class differentiation of the curriculum was *“the only approach seen to sustain any significant degree of integration”* (OECD, 1995, page 58).

The level of development of WSA in schools

The issue of a *Whole School Approach* has been a policy focus for schools for almost 10 years in Hong Kong, particularly in managing students with learning difficulties. The importance of developing a whole school policy to manage the change to inclusive practice is well illustrated by Gross (1995).

On the question of whether staff were encouraged to engage in cooperative teaching there was a positive shift: 47.3% at the commencement of the Pilot Project and 57.8% at the end agreed. One of the key findings of most research on successful integration is that there is a real partnership between parents and teachers. One in three staff felt that parents were supportive of the programme. Disappointingly, 50.3% did not know. Staff did not feel that they were more supported during the Pilot Project (only about 28.9% felt they were supported in the development of a more inclusive curriculum), and 20.8% felt they were not supported. Throughout the project 50.3% of staff, perhaps disturbingly, remained *undecided* on this item.

Parental involvement

Parental involvement in curriculum matters has not traditionally been strong in Hong Kong, and, indeed, the school has been left very much to the professionals with parents playing a peripheral role, with only minimal involvement even in the general management of the school. The substantial number of undecided responses requires us to ask whether parents have a role in the development of curriculum, particularly for children with disabilities, and what that role should be. The recognition of parental support in implementing inclusive education is of great importance and there is a strong need to maintain close links between the school and parents. On the question as to whether parents are supportive of the integration policy there was a strong shift towards recognising their support during the Pilot Project, even though 29.7% of the teachers disagreed that parents were supportive.

The level of Home School cooperation

Similar to the results of the first survey, 86.5% of the parents of integrators and 78.1% of the parents of non-integrators felt that they had good support from their children's school. Parents of integrators were pleased that school officials were available when they needed them. They felt encouraged to go to the school when their children had difficulties. Regarding the question about the support by other parents, in both groups, about 50% felt supported. This result is consistent with that in the first survey. Over 80% of parents from both groups were satisfied with the frequencies and outcomes of the school contact. Among the contacts, interestingly, both groups of parents rated the form teacher as the most effective person with whom to communicate.

In conclusion

A number of recommendations, for system, school and class levels were made to the Government, which are not detailed in the present paper. However, three recommendations will be referred to. One recommendation is particularly important in relation to the role of special schools in the process of integration. It was felt that Special schools should be supported to develop their expertise as resource centres to serve the children in them and to liaise with ordinary primary and secondary schools to explore ways of supporting and assisting in the inclusion of children with special needs. It was recognised that there will be a continuing need for special schools and that in the foreseeable future there will be an important dual role for them. These selected ‘resource’ special schools should also be able to join in support teams which will provide advisory support to teachers and students.

Another recommendation was that banding should be reviewed by the Department of Education. It is not consistent with equal access to a common curriculum and experience in schools. This is a principle which underpins equal opportunities and inclusive practice.. In the Review Of The 9 Year Compulsory Education System, chaired by K C Pang, published by the Board of Education as recently as 1997 it included a confirmation that the Secondary School Places Allocation (SSPA) and the banding system “is functioning smoothly and there is no ground for a replacement”. The Evaluation Team do not agree with either point and argue that it runs counter to the ethos of moving towards an inclusive system. Schools should accept children from within their geographical net, subject to suitable resources and facilities being made available, and the ED should avoid schools that have a good reputation for accommodating special needs children *being a focus for placement*, thus maintaining a balance of disabled students across schools.

Thirdly, it was felt strongly that all initial teacher preparation and in-service training programmes should contain a substantial element of *inclusive education* and the skills central to the changes discussed in this paper as well as special needs materials. There should be a much more rigorous review of teacher education programme content to meet this requirement.

It was clear from the study that despite the excellent preparation of documentation by the ED, that the schools were not sufficiently well prepared and teachers were uncertain of their *roles*.

Hong Kong spends a smaller percentage of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on education than many other countries, including some Asian countries, despite assertions that education is a priority. This argues that funding is not the issue. What is required is the will to reform, and to challenge vested interests, the ability to offer leadership to the schools and support to the teachers, and the need to develop and maintain consistent educational policies driven by ideology and not by expediency.

This study shows that moving to a position where all schools are inclusive is a complex process. It is one in which we need to ensure that the services and provisions are appropriate for students as Hong Kong moves towards this ultimate goal. Principals must have a good working knowledge on the rationale of, and strategies for, integration so that the school can be led and supported with ideas in terms of curriculum, assessment, collaboration, and teacher/student learning, as suggested by Fullan (1991). Barnett & Monda-Amaya (1998) cautioned that *without a clear definition and understanding of inclusion, schools might possibly implement basic additive changes without approaching a more inclusive profile.*

Finally, it must be acknowledged that there were a number of statistically significant positive changes recorded and also other positive changes, which although not statistically significant, do seem to indicate promising responses from teachers and parents to the process of integration. This is all the more remarkable when one considers that the actual gap between questionnaire data collections in the first and the second surveys was only eight months, two months of which were holidays. This suggests positive outcomes for a carefully prepared and supported integration programme in Hong Kong.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The team would sincerely like to thank the students, parents and teachers of the pilot schools, for their kind forbearance and support. We appreciated that staff in particular were under pressure and that during any new project work is often stressful, particularly with two research teams adding to the burden of implementing changes. We are particularly grateful to staff, parents and students for giving up some time to talk with us about the Pilot Project. We would also like to thank particularly the resource teachers and the principals for their courtesy and ready friendliness in our visits and in the necessary collection of data. Colleagues in all the schools were very helpful and we are most grateful for their cooperation. The team is also grateful for the help of the Education Department. Three members left the research team during the programme, Chan Kwok Kuen, John Lewis and Sicily Ho.

REFERENCES

- Barnett, C., & Monda-Amaya, L. E. (1998). Principals' knowledge of and attitudes towards inclusion. Remedial and Special Education, 19, 181-192.
- Board of Education. (1996). Report of the Sub-Committee on Special Education. HK: Government Printer.
- Board of Education. (1997). Report on Review of 9-Year Compulsory Education. HK: Government Printer.
- Crawford, Nick (1991) Majority Attitudes and Minority Needs in Nick Crawford and Eodaoín Hui (Eds) The Curriculum and Behavioural Problems in School Faculty of Education Occasional Papers, 11, Hong Kong University: Hong Kong
- Education Department. (1981). Working Party Report on Secondary Special Classes. HK: Education Department.
- Education Commission. (1990). Education Commission Report No. 4. HK: Government Printer.
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (1994). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. Exceptional Children, 60, 294-309.
- Fullan, M. (1991). The New Meaning of Educational Change (2nd Ed.). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Giangreco, M. F., & Putnam, J. W. (1991). Supporting the education of students with severe disabilities in regular education environment. In L. H. Meyer, C. A. Peck, & L. Brown (Eds), Critical Issues in the Lives of People with Severe Disabilities. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Gross, J. (1995). Special Education Needs in the Primary School: A Practical Guide. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hong Kong Government. (1977). Integrating the Disabled into the Community: An United Effort. HK: Government Printer.
- Hong Kong Government. (1995). White Paper on Rehabilitation: Equal Opportunities and Full Participation: A Better Tomorrow for All. HK: Rehabilitation Division, Health & Welfare Branch, Government Secretariat.
- Jamieson, J. D. (1984). Attitudes of educators towards the handicapped. In R. L. Jones. (Ed.), Attitudes and Attitude Change in Special Education. ERIC: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Lipsky, D., & Gartner, A. (1997). Inclusion and School Reform. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Moeller, A., & Ishii-Jordan, S. (1996). Teacher efficacy: A model for teacher development and inclusion. Journal of Behavioral Education, 6, 293-310.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1995). Integrating Students with Special Needs into Mainstream Schools. Paris: OECD.

- Sailor, W., Gee, K., & Karasoff, P. (1993). Full inclusion and school restructuring. In M. Snell (Ed.), Instruction of Students with Severe Disabilities. NY: Macmillan.
- Soodak, L. C., Podell, D. M., & Lehman, L. R. (1998). Teacher, student, and school attributes as predictors of teachers' responses to inclusion. Journal of Special Education, 31, 480-497.
- Tomlinson, S. (1982). A Sociology of Special Education. London: Routledge and Degan Paul.
- UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Salamanca: UNESCO.