

Learning Diversity in the Chinese Classroom

Contexts and Practice for Students with Special Needs

Edited by Shane N. Phillipson



香港大學出版社

HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

Hong Kong University Press

14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong

© Hong Kong University Press 2007

Hardback ISBN 978-962-209-872-5

Paperback ISBN 978-962-209-873-2

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Secure On-line Ordering

<http://www.hkupress.org>

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Printed and bound by Condor Production Ltd., in Hong Kong, China



Hong Kong University Press is honoured that Xu Bing, whose art explores the complex themes of language across cultures, has written the Press's name in his Square Word Calligraphy. This signals our commitment to cross-cultural thinking and the distinctive nature of our English-language books published in China.

“At first glance, Square Word Calligraphy appears to be nothing more unusual than Chinese characters, but in fact it is a new way of rendering English words in the format of a square so they resemble Chinese characters. Chinese viewers expect to be able to read Square Word Calligraphy but cannot. Western viewers, however are surprised to find they can read it. Delight erupts when meaning is unexpectedly revealed.”

— Britta Erickson, *The Art of Xu Bing*

Contents

Foreword by Wu-Tien WU		ix
Preface		xiii
Section I: The Chinese Classroom		
<hr/>		
Chapter 1	The <i>Regular</i> Chinese Classroom <i>Shane N. PHILLIPSON</i>	3
Chapter 2	Critical Issues in Diversity and Schooling within Asia <i>Suk Ching Stella CHONG</i>	35
Chapter 3	Conceptions and Challenges within the <i>Inclusive</i> Asian Classroom <i>Hoi Yan CHEUNG and Leng Han Martha HUI</i>	65
Chapter 4	Classroom Diversity: Towards a Whole-School Approach <i>Chris FORLIN</i>	95
Section II: Catering for Learning Diversity		
<hr/>		
Chapter 5	Including Children with Motor Disabilities and Health Impairments <i>Shihui CHEN</i>	127
Chapter 6	Specific Language Impairment and Hearing Impairment <i>Chris R. DOWSON</i>	157
Chapter 7	Giftedness within the Confucian-heritage Cultures <i>Shane N. PHILLIPSON and Hoi Yan CHEUNG</i>	205

viii *Contents*

Chapter 8	Students with Visual and Perceptual Difficulties <i>Simon LEUNG and Phoebe YEUNG</i>	249
Chapter 9	Including Students with Intellectual Disabilities <i>Kim Fong POON-MCBRAYER and Philip MCBRAYER</i>	283
Chapter 10	Understanding and Teaching Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders <i>Sivanes PHILLIPSON</i>	307
Chapter 11	Including Students with Learning Disabilities <i>Fuk Chuen HO</i>	359
<hr/> <p>Section III: Whole-School Approaches to Learning Diversity</p> <hr/>		
Chapter 12	Developing Inclusive Schools in Hong Kong <i>Chris R. DOWSON</i>	399
Chapter 13	A Chinese Perspective on Guidance and Counseling for Diverse Learners <i>Betty C. ENG</i>	431
Chapter 14	Classroom Management for Children with Diverse Learning Needs <i>Ming Tak HUE</i>	459
Index		487

1

The *Regular* Chinese Classroom

Shane N. PHILLIPSON

Jade which has not been polished is of no use. (Chinese proverb)

If you work at it you can do it. (Japanese proverb)

The unique nature of the Chinese classroom is discussed in this chapter, including:

- What is meant by a Confucian-heritage culture, and where it is to be found;
- The approach to learning in a Confucian-heritage culture;
- What it means to be a “Chinese” learner;
- The motivation for learning in a Confucian-heritage culture;
- The role of the English language in a Confucian-heritage culture; and
- The role of parents in their children’s learning.

Introduction

Schools are places where students come to learn. Behind this truism, however, lies a great deal of diversity. Each school develops a unique culture as a consequence of its importance in the wider community; and, as pointed out in Marsh (2000), the culture of a school has both an anthropological and aesthetic basis, which contribute to its unique character. For Chinese schools, the anthropological basis of a school’s culture originates from its Confucian heritage, including its specific values, rituals and ceremonies, as well as its geographical location and status within the community. Of course, the school’s location and other factors such as the social-economic status of the students’ families determine the relative influences of other

cultures (see Figure 1.1 on p. 5). In terms of its aesthetic basis, the culture of Chinese schools is also determined by the subjects taught, the skills of the teachers and the support from the school's immediate community.

This chapter begins with a discussion of the influence of Confucian-heritage culture (CHC) on learning and then describes the role of parental expectations in this process. The components of the Chinese classroom are then explored, including the processes that occur within the classroom, the physical environment, and curriculum and pedagogical approaches, such as the use of information communication technologies and the medium of instruction. Next, the CHC approach to the nature and development of knowledge is explained, followed by its approach to learning, including the values placed on education, motivation and learning styles. The goal of this chapter is to describe the Chinese learner within the wider context of the classroom as a basis for understanding the diversity of learning within Chinese classrooms.

The Chinese classroom will generally mirror the school's culture, although there will always be some diversity between classrooms in the same school. Within the classroom, the Chinese learner will both influence and be influenced by the school's culture. Despite school cultures changing over time (Marsh, 2000), there will be some common elements that make the Chinese school and classroom readily identifiable. For this book, the Chinese classroom is construed as having an anthropological basis in the CHC, as well as the aesthetic influences of teachers and involvement in communities that also derive predominantly from the CHC. Accordingly, for students who participate in these schools the generic term "Chinese learners" is used, despite the fact that many of these students come from countries other than China. However, many studies refer to differences between East and West, using participants from the USA and East Asia. As these studies do not refer specifically to the CHC, care must be taken when applying their findings.

Globalization and the Confucian-heritage Culture

Rather than reducing cultural diversity, the increasing globalization of education has produced a growing sense of ethnic identity (Smelser, 1994, cited in Torres, 2002). In the field of special education, the movement toward the full inclusion of children with disabilities in the regular classroom is subject to the pressures of globalization. Significantly, these pressures on education in general contrast with the specific goals of inclusion. At the curriculum level, globalization encourages a competitive and outcomes-based curriculum which values high ability and skills in areas such as mathematics, languages (especially English) and science, as well as higher-order thinking processes, including comprehension, analysis and abstract thought (Naidoo & Jamieson, 2005; Pereira dos Santos, 2001). At the level of

economic resources, inclusive education requires support that may not necessarily have an obvious financial return, thus generating a tension with the forces of globalization that require a return on economic investment (Parmenter, 2001; Pereira dos Santos, 2001).

Because globalization also affects Chinese learners — whether or not they are in countries with a CHC — the next section describes the unique nature of the Chinese classroom and provides a firm foundation for recognizing the learner diversity it contains.

The Approach to Learning in the Confucian-heritage Culture

A central component of the Chinese classroom is its cultural context. In order to understand the basis of the phenomenal success of East Asian students, both studying abroad and in their country of birth, Lee (1996) outlined the view of learning within the CHC, the features of which are shared to a greater or lesser extent by societies in China (including Hong Kong), Taiwan, Singapore, Korea and Japan. The source materials for Lee's analysis were the translated works of *The Great Learning*, one of the four books of Confucianism. Lee identified four important themes in the attitudes toward education and learning in the CHC: (1) educability and perfectionism; (2) learning, effort, will-power and the attainment of perfectionism; (3) learning for self-realization; and (4) the role of personal reflection and enquiry in developing deep approaches to learning.

In broad terms, the CHC is characterized by a high level of enthusiasm for education, in the belief that it is the key to both societal and personal development (Lee, 1996). More specifically, Confucianism maintains that all people are educable, although to different degrees because of individual differences in intelligence and propensities for study. Confucius also identified four groups of people based on the origin of knowledge as well as attitudes towards study — namely those who are born with knowledge, those who study to acquire knowledge, those who study after being beset with difficulties, and those who do not study despite having difficulties (Lee, 1996, p. 28).

Human perfection, or sagehood, in the CHC is closely aligned with the acquisition of knowledge, for which an individual's conscious and considered effort is essential. Furthermore, effort often involves experiencing and overcoming hardship (Lee, 1996, p. 32). Central to the idea of perfectibility is the emphasis on self rather than collective perfection — it is only through the efforts of the individual that knowledge can be gained. Once gained, however, the family shares in the economic and social rewards that come from these individual efforts.

In drawing attention to the “paradox” of the Chinese learner, Watkins and Biggs (1996) described Western misperceptions about learning within the CHC,

including alleged reliance on “low-level, rote based strategies” (p. 49). It is clear, however, that the CHC encourages a deep approach to learning (Lee, 1996), where the memorization of information merely provides a foundation for deeper kinds of thinking such as reflection and enquiry. Also considered important for the development of deep understanding is open-mindedness, and teachers who challenge rather than push students towards learning (Lee, 1996). These ideas are explored in greater depth later in this chapter.

The value of education in the Confucian-heritage culture

Lee (1996) also showed that learning in the CHC was not just concerned with the development of perfection. Learning had a utilitarian purpose, allowing individuals to attain positions of influence beyond those they exercised in their families. Attaining a position in the government or civil service was one way of achieving such influence. Along the way, the individual may also acquire extrinsic rewards such as “... fame, wealth, a beautiful wife, and upward social mobility ...” (p. 37). Biggs (1995a) has argued that in Hong Kong, achievement motivation is both individualistic and collective, reflecting an international as well as CHC influence on the education system. It is individualistic because of the highly competitive nature of society (and education) in Hong Kong; but at the same time, it is collective since the wider family benefits economically and through the gaining of face.

The main purpose of education in ancient China was to secure a position in the Imperial government, which brought with it the promise of wealth and fame. The Chinese people, as well as other East Asians, have long held a strong belief in the utilitarian value of education, prompting one emperor in the Sung Dynasty (AD 960–1279) to proclaim that “in books one finds golden mansions and women as beautiful as jewels.” The CHC has affected many of China’s neighboring countries, especially Korea and Japan. For example, Rohlen (1983, p. 78) noted that the relentless pursuit of educational excellence by Japanese high school students “which is followed by a good job, economic security, respect, and status in a technocratic world” is no different from the earlier Chinese view.

While countries such as China, Taiwan, Singapore, Korea and Japan share the CHC, it would be incorrect to assume that they are influenced equally by this heritage. For example, the influence of the West on education in Hong Kong (Hong et al., 2000) extended over many decades, producing an idiosyncratic system in which assessment is pervasive and intensive, and possibly more conducive to surface than deep learning. Also, at the tertiary level, many examiners are external to Hong Kong, which restricts the types of assessment tasks that can be used (Tang & Biggs, 1996). In addition, the long-running and continuing debate regarding the use of English as the medium of instruction in both primary and secondary schools has

produced perceived inequities and, hence, pressures on the schools and education system unparalleled elsewhere (Li, Leung, & Kember, 2001; S. N. Phillipson, 2005; Tung, Lam, & Tsang, 1997). Some of these issues are examined in greater detail later in this chapter.

The Confucian-heritage culture and models of learning

Li (2000) argued that attempts to understand the psychological effects on Chinese students of changes to school systems cannot be based on research conducted in Western cultures. The unique nature of learning in Chinese societies, epitomized in Chinese classrooms, makes it difficult to interpret meaningfully the findings of studies that were not conducted in the Chinese culture or classrooms. According to Li's commentary, models of learning and achievement in the West focus on the individual, including their cognitive processes, motivations for learning, intelligence and narrow school and social environment. For example, in the USA, adult learners focus on:

- externally existing and discrete bodies of knowledge such as mathematics and biology;
- institutional resources such as libraries;
- mental processes such as logic and critical reasoning;
- learner capabilities such as intelligence; and
- learning activities.

In contrast, Li (2000, p. 181) maintained that Chinese models of adult learning emphasize the attainment of self-perfection through complex interactions between individuals and their wider social environment. Chinese learners are concerned with:

- seeking knowledge and cultivating a passion for lifelong learning;
- fostering diligence, endurance of hardship, persistence and concentration;
- feeling “shame-guilt” for a lack of desire to learn;
- achieving breadth and depth of knowledge, social honors and material benefits; and
- making contributions to society.

In Li's view, when these two different orientations to learning are placed in a social context, learning in the CHC involves a clear relationship between the intellectual, social and moral aspects of individuals in developing their life purposes, goals of learning, attitudes and courses of actions — whereas learning in the West lacks a clear notion of purpose. For him, the Western orientation to learning is more concerned with self and the mental processes that most effectively acquire and distinguish between different types of knowledge; and, furthermore, knowledge and learning are “neutral” in value (p. 182).

Li (2000) concluded that it is naïve to assume that the psychological pressure placed on Chinese students (including those from Hong Kong) because of changes to school systems is the same as for those in other cultures. Taking the argument one step further, the stresses under which Chinese students and their families are placed when they are studying in Western classrooms, or when Western pedagogies or curricula are adopted, may not necessarily be the same as for their Western peers. In societies such as China, Japan and Korea, the process of self-cultivation and self-empowerment is not only an individual pursuit but also the fulfillment of family duties and social obligations, and is more explicitly expressed by students.

The Student from the Confucian-heritage Culture

A number of studies have suggested that Chinese learners are qualitatively different from their Western peers. Based on the results from the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Leung (2002) and Papanastasiou (2002) argued that the success of students from Hong Kong, Singapore, Japan and Korea, in comparison with similar students from Western countries, cannot be explained simply by the importance they assign to the study of mathematics, or by sheer hard work. Leung showed that their high achievement was not associated with a "... corresponding level of positive attitudes towards mathematics" (p. 105); and Papanastasiou also found that students' attitudes towards mathematics did not always predict high achievement, and that the relationships between instructional variables and mathematics achievement were dependent on the cultural context (p. 144). Both Leung and Papanastasiou suggested that an experimental approach to research was required in order to unlock the secrets behind the success of students from these countries. To date, this research is yet to be completed.

Other recent studies have provided strong evidence for differences between East and West in a number of thinking and social tasks. These include numerical tasks involving memory and speed of thinking (Hedden et al., 2002), categorization (Ji, Zhang, & Nisbett, 2004), causal reasoning (Norenzayan & Nisbett, 2000) and modes of communication (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2003), particularly among younger members of the culture (Park, Nisbett, & Hedden, 1999). At a social level, some work has shown that East Asians view behavior as involving complex interactions between the person, the object and other contextual factors — unlike Americans who see it as resulting from a person's disposition (Norenzayan & Nisbett, 2000). In their review of a number of studies, Norenzayan and Nisbett concluded that it is more difficult for Euro-Americans to separate the person from their expressed point of view. For Asian participants, in contrast, the context of the situation dictates whether a given viewpoint is believed to be an accurate reflection of a person's opinion. Norenzayan and Nisbett proposed that these differences reflect a

fundamental difference in cognitive processes, with Asians tending to think holistically rather than analytically.

Holistic cognitive processes include communication styles. In an experimental study involving adults, Sanchez-Burks et al. (2003) showed that people from East Asia (Korea, China, Singapore, Taiwan, and Japan) paid more attention to indirect information compared to those of an Euro-American origin, particularly in formal situations such as work. In another study designed to measure the relative importance of language and culture, people who used languages such as Japanese or Tagalog, compared to English speakers from the USA, paid more attention to tone than verbal content when interpreting words (Ishii, Reyes, & Kitayama, 2003).

Although all the above work originated outside the classroom, there is every reason to expect that these and other differences can also be found inside it. If both Chinese students and their teachers think holistically, then more attention is given to the field within which an object is found. In physics, for example, explanations for the behavior of a projectile lie not just in the attributes of the object, but in the properties of the space in which it is traveling. The consequences of any mismatch between “analytic” explanations by Western teachers that focus only on the properties of the projectile and holistic thinking by Chinese students remain to be studied (see “Points for Discussion and Learning Activities 1”). In general, however, mismatches between teaching and learning styles are recognized as important variables affecting the outcomes of learning. When the teaching and learning styles reflect fundamental differences in thinking processes, the consequences of the mismatch may be more dramatic.

How students from a Confucian-heritage culture learn

Research into the learning and pedagogical approaches used by students and teachers within the CHC classroom have identified memorization as a key strategy in the development of understanding (Marton, Dall’Alba, & Kun, 1996). However, as Marton and his colleagues have pointed out, memorization does not equate to rote learning and deep understanding, as opposed to surface learning, is possible through the process of memorization. Using a number of case studies, they showed how repetition can bring about understanding over a period of time:

In the process of repetition, it is not a simple repetition. Because each time I repeat, I would have some new idea of understanding, that is to say I can understand better. (p. 81)

In studying the development of learning from primary through to secondary schooling in Hong Kong using a cross-sectional (rather than longitudinal) approach,

Watkins (1996) showed four clear stages. The first stage took place in the primary school (years 1 to 6), when the intention of learning was accurate reproduction of the content of the lessons and the learning strategy was rote memorization. At the beginning of secondary school, when the workload increased to the point where it became impossible to remember everything, students became selective in what they memorized. At this second stage, they began to exercise a degree of metacognition and the locus shifted from teacher-dependent selection of content to self-selection of what was considered important.

At the third stage, the goal of learning was still the reproduction of learned material, using the combined strategies of understanding and memorization, but the students became even more metacognitive and the locus of control even more learner-centered. Assessment now consists of more flexible questions rather than simply requiring the reproduction of content. The aim of learning in the fourth stage was to both understand and achieve in the examinations, using a combined strategy of understanding and memorization, but Watkins noted that this stage was not reached by any of the students in his study.

To summarize, understanding in the CHC is seen as developmental. Only through effort and seeing the relationships between fewer pieces of a problem will a complete and full understanding of the whole problem finally be possible — in contrast to the West where understanding is often seen as a “process of sudden insight” (Watkins & Biggs, 2001, p. 6). Only when the problem is fully comprehended can the complete problem be memorized. Also, memorization is often viewed as a lower or inferior form of thinking compared with analysis, synthesis (creativity) or evaluation, and consequently proportionally more time is spent in Western schools, including primary schools, on these higher forms of thinking.

Motivations for learning in the Confucian-heritage culture

Student motivation is an important aspect of the CHC classroom. Because a detailed description of the various models of motivation is beyond the scope of this chapter, the reader is directed to “Further Reading” on educational psychology at the end of the chapter. This section is limited to reviewing some of the studies that have highlighted the peculiarities of motivation in the CHC. However, as Biggs and Watkins (1996) have pointed out, the distinction between the various forms of motivation, and the widespread notion that intrinsic motivation is the only “meaningful and worthwhile” (p. 273) way to achieve deep understanding, is not applicable in the CHC. Instead, motivation is better understood as a potent amalgam of many “energizing” forces, making the intrinsic/extrinsic polarity of limited practical value.

Expectancy value theory of motivation: There are several ways of understanding how and why students are motivated to learn, including making learning both important and possible. The relationship between importance and possibility has been referred to as the expectancy value theory of motivation (see Biggs, 1995a; Eggen & Kauchak, 2004). The importance, or value, of a learning task can be increased through an understanding of four different models of motivation, namely *extrinsic*, *social*, *achievement* and *intrinsic motivation* (Biggs, 1995a). As Biggs indicated, explanations of why students are motivated to learn can be based on more than one these models at the same time.

Extrinsic motivation: Briefly, *extrinsic motivation* can be explained by the consequences of behavior. Some consequences — *rewards* — lead to an increase in the likelihood that the same sort of behavior will be seen in the future, while others outcomes — *punishments* — result in a decrease in this likelihood. The value of the learning task is then determined by the associated reward or punishment. It is often difficult for a teacher to predict whether a consequence will reward (increase a desired behavior) or punish (decrease an undesirable behavior) in any one student.

Many studies have shown that, in a variety of ways, Chinese students in Hong Kong are similar to those in the West in their responses to rewards and punishments (Salili, 2001). For example, Hong Kong students consider teachers' use of rewards as more effective in producing good behavior and improving performance than punishment. More specifically, the use of term reports and certificates was rated the most effective strategy for improved performance and behavior, unlike students from the West.

Good grades, positive comments and notes sent to parents were also considered to achieve the desired effect, as was public praise. In addition, giving students roles of responsibility was considered effective for behavior-related tasks, particularly for students with low achievement. Approaches that were considered most successful in reducing poor performance included repositioning the student closest to the teacher, followed by referral to the discipline master or principal.

As regards punishment, Hong Kong students believed that extra work and explicit instructions from teachers on how to make the necessary changes were the most effective strategies; and punishments related to the issuing of demerit points were considered the least effective.

However, the approaches perceived by students as most successful were not those used by teachers. Surveys of teachers' strategies have shown that they most commonly employ punishments, particularly "black marks, demerits, writing lines, standing in class, extra work" (Salili, 2001, p. 90) — but, as Salili pointed out, no definitive work has yet been carried out on the effectiveness of these strategies.

Social motivation: According to Biggs (1995a), social motivation is concerned with the value placed on an activity by someone else. If a task is given a high value by someone admired or considered important, then the task is also assigned high

value and importance. A particular form of social motivation, achievement motivation, relates to the need for “some people ... to perform a task better than someone else” (p. 88). Students who are motivated to achieve success (and gain face) are called “high-need achievers,” while those who are concerned with avoiding failure (and loss of face) are referred to as “low-need achievers.” As Biggs indicated, achievement motivation was originally concerned with the individual, but is particularly important in collective societies such as the CHC, since individuals identify strongly with their extended families, making this type of motivation “a particularly powerful motivating stimulus” (p. 89) when used effectively.

Intrinsic motivation: The value of a task can also be increased through intrinsic motivation, which is concerned with the human need to develop, build competencies and understand how the world works. For Biggs (1995a), an important aspect of intrinsic motivation is curiosity, which occurs when there is an optimal mismatch between what an individual knows and what he/she senses as challenging — and he suggested that it can be encouraged in the classroom by using discrepant events and effective questioning, rather than by just providing facts.

Success motivation: Several factors are significant in influencing the likelihood, or expectation, of students’ success in any given task, such as teachers’ expectations of a successful outcome, and student beliefs about their ability to carry out the task successfully (referred to as “self-efficacy”) and perceptions of the task difficulty. Important in developing self-efficacy are the possible attributions (or causes) of past successes and failures, including effort, ability, task difficulty and luck (Weiner, 1986), and whether or not these attributions are stable, controllable, or internal. Attribution theory allows the prediction of future behavior, including that of students from the CHC, on the basis of these attributions and their dimensions (Biggs, 1995a).

Causes of success and failure: Research conducted in Hong Kong to determine the cultural contexts of the effects of causal attributions has shown that there are some differences in the ways teachers use praise and criticism to convey information to their students. In a series of experiments reported by Salili (2001), students’ estimates of their teachers’ perceptions of their *ability* and *effort* were based on differences in the teachers’ comments as well as whether or not they succeeded or failed in a series of difficult or easy mathematics tasks. The results showed that younger students could not distinguish between *ability* and *effort* and that, for them, praise for success reflected both high *ability* and greater *effort*. Among older Chinese students, apportioning blame for failure to a partner in a learning task was not an indicator of *ability*, in contrast to students from the West. For these Chinese students, the results also showed a positive correlation between *ability* and *effort*, suggesting to Salili a strong cultural influence in which *ability* is less important than *effort* in determining the source of the praise or blame.

These experiments confirmed the conclusions of earlier studies that Chinese students attribute success and failure primarily to *effort* and *learning strategies* rather than *ability*; for them, ability is a modifiable and controllable attribute that is largely determined by *effort* (Salili, 1996). In noting the causal attributions for success and failure, Ho et al. (1999) found that students rated internal factors (*effort, ability, interest, study skills*) as more important than external ones (*teacher's help, course difficulty, English instruction, family's help and luck*) for both success and failure. When looking specifically at success, the rank order of importance of the attributions was *effort, teacher's help, study skills, interest, course difficulty, ability, English instruction, family's help and luck*; and for failure, the rank order was *course difficulty, effort, interest, teacher's help, English instruction, study skills, ability, family's help and luck*.

Goal orientations in the Confucian-heritage culture

Also of relevance to the coverage of this chapter are goal orientation theories whereby students set goals and then manage their behavior toward their attainment (Salili, Chiu, & Lai, 2001). In reviewing this area, Salili, Chiu and Lai identified two themes as important in the context of the CHC, namely learning (or mastery) goal orientations and performance goals. Students who engage in learning orientations typically use deep learning strategies and are able to direct their cognitive and metacognitive skills more effectively. They are also more likely to attribute success (and failure) to effort rather than ability and have a higher sense of self-efficacy and self-esteem.

Students with performance goals, however, are more concerned with ego-enhancement and "... judge their ability in comparison with their classmates" (Salili, Chiu, & Lai, p. 223), using grades and approval from teachers as the basis of their comparisons; and they are also more inclined to use surface approaches to learning. Consequently, they may avoid challenging tasks in order to protect their self-worth as this is judged in relation to the achievements of others.

The same study also investigated the cultural context of goal orientations, self-efficacy, test anxiety, effort and achievement in Chinese senior high school students from Hong Kong, expatriate Chinese students in Canada and European Canadian students. The results indicated that the cultural context played a significant role in both motivation and achievement. The following points paraphrase their main findings and interpretations:

1. Competition was more intense in Hong Kong schools than in Canadian schools.
2. Hong Kong students spent more time studying, but received lower grades than their Canadian counterparts. Although the levels of achievement were much higher in Hong Kong, fewer students were able to attain this standard.

3. In contrast to Canadian schools — where Chinese Canadian students spend more time studying and receive higher grades than European Canadians — examination results in Hong Kong were not linked to effort. Disturbingly, the results suggested that “those who worked harder tended to have poorer examination results’ (p. 233), especially students who were relatively low achievers. Chinese Canadian students are thought to work harder to meet the demands of a filial society as well as to fulfill the immediate expectations of their families who are supporting them financially.
4. Hong Kong Chinese students had higher test anxiety than their Canadian counterparts, the origins of which, according to the authors, lies in the highly competitive nature of the examination system in Hong Kong, a point also made more recently in Yan and Chow (2002).
5. Hong Kong Chinese students scored lower in estimates of self-efficacy than both groups of Canadian students, which possibly reflects a culture that values modesty and humility. Salili, Chiu and Lai also proposed that self-efficacy is linked to achievement in examinations: when students consistently receive low grades over a long period of time, as in Hong Kong, self-perceptions of their competence may also be lower. Once again, Yan and Chow’s (2002) study drew similar conclusions.
6. All students placed a heavier emphasis on performance goals than learning goals, and more so for both groups of Chinese students. In comparing learning goals, European Canadian students were placed highest and Hong Kong students last, and it was suggested that this reflected both an education system that was preoccupied with examinations and the additional pressures arising from the use of English as the medium of instruction.
7. For Chinese students in Hong Kong, learning and performance goals were correlated positively, suggesting that they adopted both strategies in their studies; but for both groups of Canadian students, they were correlated negatively — which indicates a teacher-centered and student-centered focus respectively in these two education systems.
8. For all three groups, family-related goals were rated the highest of the three socially-oriented goals (the other two being teacher- and peer-orientations), and socially-oriented goals were more important for the Chinese students than the European Canadian students.

Salili, Chiu and Lai (2001) concluded that a harsh education system is particularly damaging for students with low ability or special needs and that self-efficacy is “... the single most important predictor of academic achievement.” Consequently, education systems should focus on the development of self-efficacy as well as the motivational beliefs of students, particularly those related to effort for high-ability students and study skills. Also, family-related goals correlated

highly with performance for all students, indicating that family influences remain an essential aspect of student performance in the CHC.

Concluding remarks on motivations for learning in the Confucian-heritage culture

Education in the CHC principally serves a pragmatic purpose. Studies have shown that students from a CHC are motivated by a variety of factors, with intrinsic motivation per se being of little importance. It is not altogether surprising that CHC classrooms generally do not reward students who are motivated by interest alone. Interestingly, students in Hong Kong who are more intrinsically motivated have lower levels of achievement than their extrinsically motivated peers in primary and secondary schools and universities (Hong, 2001; Moneta & Siu, 2002).

As discussed previously, the value of education in the CHC is not determined by the needs of the individual alone, but by the needs of the wider social and cultural group. For example, Kim's (2002) study of Korean parents' views on the benefits of higher education demonstrated that their major concerns for their children included giving them opportunities to experience the "joy of learning", increasing their self-esteem, reducing their socio-economic disadvantage, and providing them with opportunities to form social networks.

The Use of English as the Medium of Instruction

In some classrooms in the CHC, English is used as the medium of instruction (EMI). English-medium schools hope that, in addition to teaching the curriculum, they will improve their students' English language proficiency. However, a range of studies have shown the difficulties facing Chinese students when studying using EMI, and two studies (Li, Leung, & Kember, 2001; Tung, Lam, & Tsang, 1997) have grouped these problems into four broad areas: *reading*, *writing*, *speaking* and *listening*.

Reading: When reading texts and study materials written in English, Chinese students want clarification in Chinese from their teachers; and given a choice between reading full Chinese or English texts, they prefer to read the full Chinese text first and then refer to the English text (Tung, Lam, & Tsang, 1997). When asked about their reading skills after a course of study using EMI, more than half of the Cantonese-speaking university students reported that their reading abilities in English remained unchanged or became worse (Li, Leung, & Kember, 2001).

Writing: Cantonese-speaking tertiary students have claimed that many of their previous courses of study at the secondary level did not require them to write very often, particularly in science and applied sciences. If given the chance, students at

secondary level have reported that they would choose courses that placed less emphasis on writing skills, particularly for subjects using EMI (Li, Leung, & Kember, 2001).

Speaking: In EMI secondary schools, Chinese students have many opportunities to speak in English with their teachers. However, their preference is to use Cantonese wherever possible (Tung, Lam, & Tsang, 1997) for a variety of reasons, including difficulties in finding equivalent English words to express their ideas; that is, they often have problems with the clarification of meaning in English (Lam & Wong, 2000). Lam and Wong (2000) also found that the use of English affected relationships with other students, as peers are often perceived as lacking sympathy for those who have difficulty in expressing themselves in English, thus discouraging them from using the language in class.

Listening: According to Li, Leung and Kember (2001), two-thirds of Cantonese-speaking tertiary students believed that taking classes using English improved their listening skills because of the increased exposure to the language; and of those who considered that their listening skills had deteriorated, some attributed this to the lack of opportunities to listen to English outside class while others specifically mentioned that Cantonese was used in their other classes, implying that the use of the two languages interfered with their overall listening skills. The same research also showed that there was a “psychological influence” (p. 305) that reduced students’ propensity for speaking in English to both peers and their foreign lecturers.

In an interesting qualitative study, Liu (2002) observed and interviewed three Chinese graduate students who studied in prestigious American universities. These students had high scores in the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), as well as good results in examinations and assignments, but they seldom participated in class discussions. Liu found that these students responded only when they were (1) well prepared for the class and (2) familiar with and had confidence in their understanding of the issue to be discussed.

Language plays a fundamental part in the cognitive processing of students. For example, Ho (2001) found that, in Hong Kong, bilingual primary students used a unique mixture of Cantonese and English to support their learning, even though the materials they were studying were solely in English. Also, studies in the Philippines have shown that teaching in the mother tongue can facilitate children’s cognitive development in mathematics (Bernardo, 2002).

The Classroom in the Chinese-heritage Culture

Educators consider that the classroom environment generally reflects the pervading cultural practices. Positive classrooms are normally “culture-neutral”, as few studies

mention cultural differences in their climate (Marsh, 2000). Li (2000) argued that serious problems occur when the teaching methods and content do not meet students' expectations, or when students perceive that their teachers do not understand "... their needs and lacked competence in teaching methods and Chinese culture" (p. 63). This study concluded that it is crucial to appreciate cultural differences if teaching and learning are to be successful.

By Western standards, Asian classrooms generally appear to be very harsh with few resources, large classes and relentless norm-referenced testing (Watkins & Biggs, 2001). Moreover, when Western teachers come to work in Asian countries for the first time they notice that students are more attentive and quiet in class (Kennedy, 2002). Although they seldom respond to their teachers' questions, they are happy to sit and copy notes; and when they do answer questions, they give short replies such as "yes", "no", or "I don't know". Some Western teachers feel that this reflects the students' poor language skills, but this is equally common among university students, who are supposed to have a higher level of English communication skills.

In contrast to the West, silence in the CHC classroom is a sign of respect (Kennedy, 2002), meaning that students are listening attentively to the teachers and not distracting them from their teaching. It is also a face-saving strategy to avoid making unnecessary mistakes and thereby protect their self-esteem.

Curriculum in the Confucian-heritage classroom

After examining the education systems in China, Taiwan and Japan, Stevenson, Lee and Chen (1994) concluded that the curricula of these countries were highly controlled by their governments. They are often criticized as being rigid and standardized, in a schooling system which "predominantly emphasizes the learning of basic knowledge and analytical skills" (Niu & Sternberg, 2003, p. 111). The rationale behind this control and rigidity is that each child should have an equal opportunity to be educated and gain a high-level position in society. Those who work hard can be high achievers, and the early years of schooling should ensure "fair" competition by offering the same opportunities to all. For instance, when Stevenson, Lee and Chen interviewed a Japanese former education official, he expressed pride in this system, saying that:

We need to ensure that they will have the basic skills they need to compete. As long as they have these basic skills, it is up to them where to go or how much effort they want to give in order to succeed in competition. (p. 120)

Examinations are an important aspect of the CHC, their function being to select students for places at senior high schools and universities. Countries within this culture tend to adopt an elitist approach to higher education, with only a small proportion of school-age children being able to enter colleges and universities. Since the examinations are highly competitive, parents prepare their children earnestly for them, often chiding teachers when they feel the schools do not give enough homework. In addition, parents often pay to send their children to after-school tutorial classes, or private “cramming” schools (Yan & Chow, 2002).

The psychological effects of such intensely competitive examinations on students within the CHC are beginning to be understood (Yan & Chow, 2002). For example, many Hong Kong Chinese students suffer from high test anxiety and low self-efficacy; and those who have expended a great deal of effort with little return begin to believe that they are of low ability, thus reinforcing the link between attributions of effort and ability (Hong, 2001).

Pedagogical Approaches in Confucian-heritage Cultures

The classroom environment is also affected by the teaching strategies adopted. As Biggs (1996) pointed out, there are pervasive misconceptions about the pedagogical approaches taken by teachers in the CHC that have continued to persist.

A directive teaching approach, from a young age, is common practice in many Asian countries, and writers such as Brauchli (1994, cited in Podgorecki, 1997) have expressed concern about this style of education in the Chinese schooling system: “The problem with China’s schools is that, instead of teaching students how to think, they still teach what to think” (p. 78).

Gardner’s (1989) experience provided an insight into this Chinese practice. When he and his family visited China, he found that the Chinese who interacted with their one and a half year old son in the hotel lobby were much more directive in attempting to shape the toddler’s responses than were Gardner and his wife. The role of the teacher is not to allow children to learn through trial-and-error and experience, but to direct them in the correct procedures with care and gentleness. Creativity in the Chinese culture, as Gardner found, comes after the mastery of technique and not, as is encouraged in the West, before the acquisition of knowledge.

Teachers in the CHC spend a great deal of time on teaching their students and assessing their homework assignments, and parents and students follow this pattern of learning. As mentioned previously, parents in the CHC place a greater emphasis than in the West on the training of their children, and are more willing to participate in their daily activities (Leung, Lau, & Lam, 1998).

Information and communication technologies in the Confucian-heritage culture

The development of information and communication technology (ICT) is having a profound effect on the scope of education. It is important, therefore, to understand the ways in which ICTs are utilized in CHC classrooms. Several recent studies have suggested that these tools have potential limitations, and that only the more motivated and independent learners are likely to benefit from this teaching mode (Weiner, 2002).

Six primary schools in Hong Kong recently participated in a research project on the benefits of ICTs for their students which revealed that teachers can become a barrier to ICT-based learning. For example, during the half-year investigation, Yuen (2003) observed that teachers who were inclined to the conventional view of education and learning resisted adapting to the new role of online mentor. During the interview sessions, some teachers said that they could not allow their students to discuss issues by themselves, and that they must provide knowledge to support students' learning. Therefore, one of the biggest advantages of ICTs — the opening up of knowledge — challenges the traditional role of the Asian teacher as it emphasizes an interactive guidance and support role rather than a directive one (Smith, Ferguson, & Caris, 2003).

Learning style preferences of students from Confucian-heritage cultures

I hear and I forget; I see and I remember; I do and I understand.

(Chinese proverb)

Oxford and Anderson (1995) highlighted four characteristics of Chinese learners. In their cross-cultural investigation, they found that Chinese learners:

1. Prefer classrooms where rules are emphasized and learning is inductive;
2. Adopt a concrete-sequential cognitive style (i.e. they prefer to follow the teacher to the letter and use strategies such as memorization, lists and repetition);
3. Adopt a reflective learning style (i.e. they prefer a slow, accurate, systematic approach and are less comfortable with guessing or predicting); and
4. Seldom work in groups in class but cooperate readily outside the classroom.

A recent study of the learning style preferences of Asian American secondary school students in US schools showed no differences in *auditory*, *kinesthetic* or *tactile* learning style preferences, irrespective of their ethnic origin, length of residency in the USA, achievement level or gender (Park, 1997). The results suggested that all students used a variety of learning styles, although tactile learning

was the least preferred, and there was a greater preference for *visual* learning among Asian-Americans — particularly those from China, the Philippines, and Korea, irrespective of their length of residency — compared to Anglo-Americans. Furthermore, Chinese, Korean and Anglo-American students showed little preference for *group* learning within the classroom, although low-achieving students of any origin preferred *group* learning more than those who were achieving at the high or middle levels.

In terms of individual learning, the study found that Asian Americans who were born in Asia preferred individual learning more than those born in the USA and Anglo-Americans. Park (1997) concluded that the preference for visual learning is sufficiently important to warrant teaching strategies that are based on, for example, charts, maps and graphic organizers.

Researchers from the West have described the East Asian style of learning as “rote learning.” While criticizing it as a shallow way of learning, they have been puzzled by the exceptional achievement of these students in international competitions and graduate schools around the world. Recently, some studies have recognized that East Asian learners are not simply using rote learning but repetitive learning (Watkins & Biggs, 2001) or deep learning (Biggs, 1995b). The difference between these learning styles is that the former does not require the learner to understand material: rote learners superficially process (or memorize) the material and reproduce it. However, repetitive or deep learning requires a thorough understanding of the material before mastering it. Oxford and Anderson (1995) proposed an interlocking process: students learn and memorize independently during the class, while teachers provide the basic concepts in the materials. This process takes a longer time, as students need to absorb and analyze what they have learned in class and, if necessary, revise the material again and again until they fully understand it. While East Asian students prefer to study individually within the classroom, they collaborate spontaneously outside it, exchanging their ideas and understandings through discussion. Only when they cannot resolve problems through textbooks and discussion with classmates will they seek a teacher’s assistance.

Parents’ Expectations within the Confucian-heritage Culture

Many previous studies and accounts have described Chinese parents as authoritarian, tightly controlling their children’s academic activities. Compared to their Western counterparts, they are seen as focusing more heavily on their children’s academic results, and forcing them to work relentlessly on an excessive number of assignments and worksheets. However, this picture is more stereotypical than factual and it is important to understand the values inherent in the CHC and the behavior expected by parents as a basis for explaining this aspect of the Chinese learner’s experience.

Chinese parents' views on diligence, intelligence and academic achievement

Studies on the ways in which Chinese parents intervene in their children's academic activities, have generally concluded that they are more heavily involved than are European and American parents (Chen, 2001; Chen & Uttal, 1988; Hong & Lee, 2003). This results from their belief that effort is very important for academic achievement and, if possible, they are more willing to invest time and energy in assisting their children in their schoolwork, give more encouragement and feedback and set a higher standard for their children (Hong & Lee, 2003; Huntsinger et al., 1997; Wan et al., 2003).

In a study of 160 Australian school children from three ethnic groups, Dandy and Nettelbeck (2002a) found that Chinese and Vietnamese communities did better in mathematics, spent more time in studying and had higher educational aspirations than those from an Anglo-Celtic background. The researchers claimed that their findings were suggestive of complex socio-cultural relationships that contributed to ethnic differences in achievement.

The same authors carried out a second study in which 239 Australian parents from Chinese, Vietnamese and Anglo-Celtic communities were asked to describe their educational standards for their children (Dandy & Nettelbeck, 2002b). They found that parents from Chinese and Vietnamese backgrounds had higher educational expectations and aspirations for tertiary education for their children, while parents from an Anglo-Celtic background, especially those of lower socio-economic status, preferred their children to attend some form of vocational training. Once again, the authors suggested that there were significant cultural factors acting on the parents from the Chinese and Vietnamese communities that may influence their children's academic achievement.

Parental expectations and attitudes toward science education were examined in a cross-cultural study involving secondary school students (Chen, 2001). This research found that Chinese parents and students from China had a more positive attitude toward the value of science than their US counterparts. The attitudes of Chinese students studying in America showed evidence of cultural influences from both China and the USA. The study also revealed a significantly greater involvement by Chinese parents in their children's homework, and a higher expectation for success and belief in their children's abilities, compared to parents from the USA.

Traditional values in the CHC maintain that diligence is the key that unlocks an individual's potential, as expressed in Chinese proverbs such as *jade which has not been polished is of no use and fierce fire reveals true gold*. Instead of uncovering innate abilities, Chinese teachers focus more on encouraging their students' self-improvement through working hard. Furthermore, it is believed that there is always room for gradual improvement and to excel in life should not be at the expense of someone else. This belief is shared by parents from Japan where it is thought that

effort, rather than ability, is the single most important determinant of academic achievement (Stevenson, Lee, & Chen, 1994).

A recent study has, however, provided evidence for cultural variability between two Chinese classrooms in Hong Kong in parental and child achievement attributions, suggesting that it is unwise to generalize about Chinese classrooms (S. Phillipson, 2006). It was found that in a Chinese primary school in a catchment area of high socio-economic status (SES), students' attributions for their *success* in both mathematics and languages were dependent on both *effort* and *strategy*. In contrast, students from a Chinese primary school in a low SES catchment area were more inclined to attribute *success* and *failure* in these two subjects, as expected, to *effort* alone.

In addition, S. Phillipson (2006) found that students' achievement is dependent on both the SES and the subject itself, with parental attributions of their child's failure to *effort* being a significant predictor of achievement in languages but not mathematics for the high SES parents. For the low SES parents, the best predictors of achievement in languages are parents attributing their child's failure to *effort*, and children attributing their failure to lack of *ability* and their success to *effort*.

In terms of intelligence, Furnham, Rakow and Mak (2002) found that Western parents commonly believed that their children were significantly more intelligent than they actually were. Although, in broad terms, this view is shared by parents in Hong Kong, they did not consider their sons more intelligent than their daughters, reflecting the belief that intelligence or ability is related more to effort than to innate factors. A Chinese proverb explains that there is always a higher mountain ahead on your journey, meaning that ability increases according to the future challenges.

Ability and prayer: An additional piece of the puzzle

As well as diligence, many Chinese parents also believe that prayer is important for academic success, an additional aspect of the achievement "puzzle" which is often neglected by researchers interested in understanding the Chinese learner. In describing the role of religion in the increasingly examination-oriented East Asian culture, Zeng (1996) noted that during the examination period in many East Asian countries, many of the candidates and their families visit temples and shrines, particularly those related to success in examinations — and that the number of prayers made by students and their parents at temples and shrines increased with the growing importance of examinations as "... gateway[s] to socioacademic mobility" (p. 264). Because examinations are seen as unpredictable, anonymous and beyond the control of the individual, success cannot be guaranteed. Accordingly, many students and parents resort to shrines and temples for guidance, confidence and, if required, consolation.

While prayers related to examination success are commonly used, parents (usually the mother) also resort to self-inflicted “torment” (Zeng, 1996, p. 266) such as repeating rituals a hundred times, or bowing three thousand times, or praying for a hundred days (pp. 266–7). Parents in Japan also pay priests to chant on behalf of their sons or daughters, or purchase an *ema*, a small wooden tablet containing prayers asking for scholastic success in general or examination achievement in particular. Variations of the *ema* exist in Taiwan, Korea and China. When the practice began, the focus of the academic-orientated *ema* was the university entrance examination (Zeng, 1996). However, in modern times, it has included high school, middle school and even kindergarten entrance examinations. Although there has been no comparable study since Zeng’s work, there is no reason to suggest that the focus has changed.

According to Zeng (1996), the content of the *emas* reflects the three major features of the modern examination systems in these cultures, namely its highly symbolic and war-like competitive nature, its intense socio-economic ramifications, and its almost superstitious manifestations. Zeng reported that the content of the prayers does not pass responsibility for success to the deity or ancestor, but asks them to increase the confidence of the candidate. Also, the candidates often resolve to work harder, practice self-control and forgo simple pleasures such as watching TV or reading comic books. The prayers are often placed in auspicious positions on the plum tree in the temple grounds, particularly in relation to the *emas* of rivals. Although examination results are still dependent on the diligence and ability of the students, many unpredictable events can occur before, during and after the examination, ruining the efforts of the candidates. Parents may not be able to give their children guidance in academic matters, but they can be involved by praying for their children in temples and shrines, an involvement which does not seem to exist among parents from Western cultures.

Interactions within the Chinese family

It is a common perception in the West that Chinese parents engage in one-way communication with their children. The view that their children listen passively and carry out their parents’ orders comes from an overgeneralization of filial piety. Within CHCs, filial piety (*hsiao*) is the primary duty of all Chinese people. In simple terms, being a filial son means complete obedience to one’s parents during their lifetime and, as the parents grow older, taking the best possible care of them. In terms of academic performance, however, Chinese families tend to engage in two-way communication when discussing their expectations with their children. In this relationship, children constantly communicate and provide feedback on their parents’ expectations, and parents are expected to respond to these comments.

On the other hand, Chinese and Japanese mothers are more critical of their children's achievements, compared to US mothers (Stevenson, Chen, & Lee, 1993; Stevenson, Lee & Chen, 1994). In describing their children, Chinese parents used more descriptors involving aspects of conscientiousness, including carefulness, faithfulness and diligence, and they were more critical than a comparable group of Dutch parents (Zhang et al., 2002). For other descriptors related to intellect, such as intelligence, openness and interest, there was no marked difference. Zhang et al. proposed that the role of these critical comments was to provide practical directions for children about the best way to improve their academic work.

Although many parents actively convey their expectations, their children may not always act according to their wishes. Japanese adolescents treated different expectations with different strategies: when an expectation was perceived as positive, they acted accordingly, but when it was perceived as negative, they either changed themselves or attempted to persuade their parents to change their expectations (Kawamura, 2002).

In another study, S. Phillipson and S. N. Phillipson (2007) used a Vygotskian perspective to examine the relationship between parental expectations of success, parental beliefs about their children's memory and involvement in their child's school with the academic achievement of Chinese students. They found that parents' *expected scores* in mathematics and languages, irrespective of their SES, were very strong predictors of achievement in each of these subjects, but not their assessment of their child's episodic memory. However, the results of a study of one British international school in Hong Kong showed that parents' assessment of their child's episodic memory was a positive predictor for language achievement and that parental involvement in their children's education (at home and school) was a negative predictor of achievement.

Children with Special Needs in the Confucian-heritage Culture

This chapter has established that the classroom in the CHC is different from that in the West. In the CHC classroom, education is valued more for pragmatic reasons, not only for the individual but also for the students' wider family group. The motivations for learning, therefore, are a complex mixture where the distinction between *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* motivation becomes meaningless. Accordingly, *effort* is a highly valued commodity and it is only in the face of persistent low achievement that the child's ability will be questioned.

As regards the classroom, the curriculum is much more rigid, reflecting the belief that competency must be developed before creativity can be cultivated. Students in the CHC develop a deep understanding through a process of memorization (rather than rote learning); and the pedagogy is appropriately targeted

to developing knowledge and skills, rather than exploration, so the teaching is teacher-directed rather than student-centered.

Parents from the CHC are highly involved in their childrens' education, reflecting the belief that effort is highly controllable and broadly "additive". They also have higher expectations for their children compared with parents from the West.

Against this cultural backdrop, there is a growing awareness in the CHC of the needs of all children, including those with special educational needs. Many tertiary institutions in the Asian region offer teacher education awards with specialized studies on children with special needs. The Hong Kong Institute of Education, for example, offers qualifications in this area in response to government and public pressure. However, many of the technologies and practices for working with these children are imported from the West and, to date, little thought has been given to the possible negative interactions between educational technology and practices and the unique nature of the CHC. As Li (2000) warned, the school system does matter for children's learning, but not necessarily in ways that can be predicted from studies originating from cultures outside the CHC.

Summary

In this chapter, it has been argued that the approach to learning in Confucian-heritage cultures (CHCs) is different from that taken elsewhere. Because students are influenced by and, in turn, influence the society around them, classrooms in the CHC differ in the way that students learn and lessons are conducted. These learner differences include a greater reliance on memorization to achieve deep understanding, motivations for learning, goal orientations and learning style preferences. An examination of the pedagogical approaches taken by teachers from the CHC concluded that there are important differences in the way teachers teach. The role of parents in the education of their children also differs in the CHC compared with parents from the West. Because of these differences, it is appropriate to look more closely at research and best practice regarding the learning of students with special educational needs.

Points for Discussion and Learning Activities

1. How would you explain the following discrepant event?
A round object is dropped into a tank of water. After passing through the surface of the water, the object then returns to its original position at the surface of the water.

Compare the explanations from Chinese students and those from a Euro-American background. What similarities and differences do you find?

2. Beare et al. (1991) described a structure for identifying the four aspects of a school's culture, including tangible expressions and symbolism (values, philosophies, ideologies), conceptual and verbal manifestations (aims and objectives of schools, curriculum, metaphors, organizations stories/structures/heroes), behavioral manifestations (rituals, ceremonies, ways of teaching, ways of learning, rules and regulations, psychological and social supports, parental and community support structures), and visual and material manifestations and symbols (facilities and equipment, artifacts and memorabilia, crests and mottoes, uniforms).

Describe your school's culture according to this structure. Identify those elements that are common to all schools from a Confucian-heritage culture.

3. The 1996 study in Marton, Dall'Alba and Kun involved twenty teacher-educators from China. It developed a model of learning, describing the relationship between memorization and understanding, and made the point that memorization with understanding is one of the differences between Western and Chinese ways of learning. The study also referred to the distinction between deep and surface learning (Biggs, 1996).

What are the key features of the model and what is the difference between the two types of learning? Is the memorization with understanding model of learning constructivist in its approach?

Use the techniques described in the study to determine the way your students learn.

4. How are ICTs being used in your school? Are they used in an interactive way, or a more directive fashion, reflecting the pedagogical style commonly seen in the CHC?

Glossary

Attribution theory is a model of motivation that describes how students explain the reasons (or attributes) for their past successes or failures. For students from a Confucian-heritage culture, the main reasons include *effort*, *interest in the topic*, *mood* and *ability*. Other possible reasons include *task difficulty* and *luck*.

Confucian-heritage culture is a culture that is heavily influenced by the teachings of Confucius (551–479 BC). Although often equated with Chinese culture, the two are not synonymous. Confucianism has influenced a number of different cultures, including Japanese and Korean.

Expectancy value theory is a model of motivation that posits that students learn when they both value the task and expect success.

Extrinsic motivation is a theory of motivation that explains that students learn because of the expectation of a reward. The model is based on B. F. Skinner's theory of "operant conditioning".

Intrinsic motivation is a model of motivation that explains that students learn because of their inherent curiosity, and their need to build competency and make sense of the world.

Social motivation is a model of motivation that explains that students learn because the outcomes of learning, such as high achievement, are valued by people who are important to them.

Success (or achievement) motivation is a model of motivation that describes the need of some students to achieve success in a competitive situation.

References

- Beare, H., Caldwell, B. J., & Millikan, R. H. (1991). *Creating an excellent school*. London: Routledge.
- Bernardo, A. B. I. (2002). Language and mathematical problem solving among bilinguals. *Journal of Psychology, 136*(3), 283–297.
- Biggs, J. B. (1995a). Motivating learning. In J. B. Biggs, & D. A. Watkins (Eds.), *Classroom learning: Educational psychology for the Asian teacher*. Singapore: Prentice Hall.
- Biggs, J. B. (1995b). Assessing for learning: Some dimensions underlying new approaches to educational assessment. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 41*(1), 1–17.
- Biggs, J. B. (1996). Western misperceptions of the Confucian-heritage learning culture. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 45–67). Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Biggs, J. B., & Watkins, D. A. (1996). The Chinese learner in retrospect. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 269–285). Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Chen, C. S., & Uttal, D. H. (1988). Cultural values, parents' beliefs, and children's achievement in the United States and China. *Human Development, 31*(6), 351–358.
- Chen, H. (2001). Parents' attitudes and expectations regarding science education: Comparisons among American, Chinese-American, and Chinese families. *Adolescence, 36*(142), 305–313.
- Dandy, J., & Nettelbeck, T. (2002a). The relationship between IQ, homework, aspirations and academic achievement for Chinese, Vietnamese and Anglo-Celtic Australian school children. *Educational Psychology, 22*(3), 267–275.
- Dandy, J., & Nettelbeck, T. (2002b). A cross-cultural study of parents' academic standards and educational aspirations for their children. *Educational Psychology, 22*(5), 621–627.
- Eggen, P., & Kauchak, D. (2004). *Educational Psychology: Windows on classrooms* (6th ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

- Furnham, A., Rakow, T., & Mak, T. (2002). The determinants of parents' beliefs about the intelligence of their children: A study from Hong Kong. *International Journal of Psychology, 37*(6), 343–352.
- Gardner, H. (1989). Learning, Chinese style. *Psychology Today, 23*(12), 54–56.
- Hedden, T., Park, D. C., Nisbett, R. E., Ji, L. J., Jing, Q., & Jiao, S. (2002). Cultural variation in verbal versus spatial neuropsychological function across life span. *Neuropsychology, 16*(1), 65–73.
- Ho, T. F., Salili, F., Biggs, J. B., & Hau, K. T. (1999). The relationship among causal attributions, learning strategies, and level of achievement: A Hong Kong Chinese study. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 19*, 44–58.
- Ho, W. K. (2001). Models of bilingual memory of primary pupils in Hong Kong (China). *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 61*(10-A), 3859.
- Hong, E., & Lee, K. H. (2003). Parental awareness of their children's homework motivation and preference and its relationship to achievement. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 11*(3), 231–249.
- Hong, Y. Y. (2001). Chinese students' and teachers' inferences of effort and ability. In C. Y. Chiu, & F. Salili (Eds.), *Student motivation: The culture and context of learning* (pp. 105–120). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and learning. *American Psychologist, 55*, 709–720.
- Huntsinger, C. S., Jose, P. E., Liaw, F. R., & Ching, W. D. (1997). Cultural differences in early mathematics learning: A comparison of Euro-American, Chinese-American, and Taiwan-Chinese families. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 21*(2), 371–388.
- Ishii, K., Reyes, J. A., & Kitayama, S. (2003). Spontaneous attention to word content versus emotional tone. *Psychological Science, 14*(1), 39–46.
- Ji, L. J., Zhang, Z., & Nisbett, R. E. (2004). Is it culture or is it language? Examination of language effects in cross-cultural research on categorization. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 87*(1), 57–65.
- Kawamura, T. (2002). The research on the cognition of the university students toward the parents' expectation. *Japanese Journal of Family Psychology, 16*(2), 95–107.
- Kennedy, P. (2002). Learning cultures and learning styles: Myth-understandings about adult (Hong Kong) Chinese learners. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 21*(5), 430–445.
- Kim, D. (2002). What do high school students and their parents expect from higher education? A case study of South Korea. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 24*(2), 183–196.
- Lam, W., & Wong, J. (2000). The effects of strategy training on developing discussion skills in an ESL classroom. *ELT Journal, 54*(3), 245–255.
- Lee, W. O. (1996). The cultural context for Chinese learners: Conceptions of learning in the Confucian heritage. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 25–41). Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.

- Leung, F. K. S. (2002). Behind the high achievement of East Asian students. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 8(1), 87–108.
- Leung, K., Lau, S., & Lam, W. L. (1998). Parenting styles and academic achievement: A cross-cultural study. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, 44(2), 157–172.
- Li, J. (2000). Learning among Chinese children: Does the system matter? Commentary on “The controversy of through-road education.” *Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies*, 1(2), 179–184.
- Li, N., Leung, D. Y. P., & Kember, D. (2001). Medium of instruction in Hong Kong universities: The mis-match between espoused theory and theory use. *Higher Education Policy*, 14, 293–312.
- Liu, J. (2002). Negotiating silence in American classrooms: Three Chinese cases. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 2(1), 37–54.
- Marsh, C. (2000). *Handbook for beginning teachers*. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia Pty Ltd.
- Marton, F., Dall’Alba, G., & Kun, T. L. (1996). Memorizing and understanding: The keys to the paradox? In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 69–83). Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Moneta, G. B., & Siu, C. M. Y. (2002). Trait intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, academic performance, and creativity in Hong Kong college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(5), 664–683.
- Naidoo, R., & Jamieson, I. (2005). Knowledge in the marketplace: The global commodification of teaching and learning in higher education. In P. Ninnes & M. Hellsten (Eds.), *Internationalizing higher education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy* (pp. 37–51). Hong Kong, China: Comparative Education Research Centre/ Springer.
- Niu, W., & Sternberg, R. J. (2003). Societal and school influences on student creativity: The case of China. *Psychology in the Schools*, 40(1), 103–114.
- Norenzayan, A., & Nisbett, R. E. (2000). Culture and causal cognition. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(4), 132–135.
- Oxford, R., & Anderson, N. (1995). A cross-cultural view of learning style. *Language Teaching*, 28, 201–215.
- Papanastasiou, E. (2002). Factors that differentiate mathematics students in Cyprus, Hong Kong, and the USA. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 8(1), 129–146.
- Park, C. C. (1997). Learning style preferences of Asian American (Chinese, Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese) students in secondary schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 30(2), 68–77.
- Park, C. D., Nisbett, R. E., & Hedden, T. (1999). Aging, culture, and cognition. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences & Social Sciences*, 54B(2), 75–84.
- Parmenter, T. R. (2001). Intellectual disabilities: *Quo Vadis?* In G. L. Albrecht, K. D. Seelman, & M. Bury (Eds.), *Handbook of disability studies* (pp. 267–296). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Pereira dos Santos, M. (2001). Special education, inclusion and globalisation: A few considerations inspired in the Brazilian case. *Disability & Society*, 16, 311–325.

- Phillipson, S. (2006). Cultural variability in parent and child achievement attributions: A study from Hong Kong. *Educational Psychology, 26*(5), 625–642.
- Phillipson, S., & Phillipson, S. N. (2007). Academic expectation, belief of ability and involvement by parents as predictors of child achievement: A cross-cultural comparison. *Educational Psychology, 27*(3), 329–348.
- Phillipson, S. N. (2005). The expectations and difficulties faced by Cantonese speaking tertiary students in a teacher education award when using English as the medium of instruction. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 14*(1), 47–95.
- Podgorecki, A. (1997). *Higher faculties: A cross-national study of university culture*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Rohlen, T. (1983). *Japan's high schools*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Salili, F. (1996). Accepting personal responsibility for learning. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 85–105). Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Salili, F. (2001). Teacher-student interactions: Attributional implications and effectiveness of teachers' evaluative feedback. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 77–98). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Center, The University of Hong Kong.
- Salili, F., Chiu, C. Y., & Lai, S. (2001). The influence of culture and context on students' motivational orientation and performance. In C. Y. Chiu, & F. Salili (Eds.), *Student motivation: The culture and context of learning* (pp. 221–247). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Sanchez-Burks, J., Lee, F., Choi, I., Nisbett, R. E., Zhao, S., & Koo, J. (2003). Conversing across cultures: East-West communication styles in work and nonwork contexts. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 85*(2), 363–372.
- Smith, G. G., Ferguson, D., & Caris, M. (2003). The web versus the classroom: Instructor experiences in discussion-based and mathematics-based disciplines. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 29*(1), 29–59.
- Stevenson, H. W., Chen, C. S., & Lee, S. Y. (1993). Mathematics achievement of Chinese, Japanese and American children: Ten years later. *Science, 259*, 53–58.
- Stevenson, H. W., Lee, S. Y., & Chen, C. S. (1994). Education of gifted and talented students in Mainland China, Taiwan, and Japan. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 17*(2), 104–130.
- Tang, C., & Biggs, J. B. (1996). How Hong Kong students cope with assessment. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 159–182). Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Torres, C. A. (2002). Globalization, education, and full citizenship: Solidarity versus markets? *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(2), 363–378.
- Tung, P., Lam, R., & Tsang, W. K. (1997). English as a medium of instruction in post-1997 Hong Kong: What students, teachers, and parents think. *Journal of Pragmatics, 28*(4), 441–459.

- Wan, X. S., Fei, L. C., Zhang, X. Q., Chen, J., Wei, B. G., Wang, K., et al. (2003). Factors having influence on academic achievement of middle school students. *Chinese Mental Health Journal*, 17(1), 45–46.
- Watkins, D. A. (1996). Hong Kong secondary school learners: A developmental perspective. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences* (pp. 107–119). Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Watkins, D. A., & Biggs, J. B. (Eds.) (1996). *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences*. Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Watkins, D. A., & Biggs, J. B. (2001). The paradox of the Chinese learner and beyond. In D. A. Watkins, & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 3–23). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Weiner, B. (1986). *Human motivation*. New York, NY: Rinehart & Winston.
- Weiner, C. (2002). A new alternative: Adolescent students study in cyberspace. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 63(1-A), 155.
- Yan, P. W., & Chow, J. C. S. (2002). On the pedagogy of examinations in Hong Kong. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(2), 139–149.
- Yuen, A. H. K. (2003). Fostering learning communities in classrooms: A case study of Hong Kong schools. *Educational Media International*, 40(1–2), 153–162.
- Zeng, K. (1996). Prayer, luck, and spiritual strength: The desecularization of entrance examination systems in East Asia. *Comparative Education Review*, 40(3), 264–279.
- Zhang, Y., Kohnstamm, G., Slotboom, A. M., Elphick, E., & Cheung, P. C. (2002). Chinese and Dutch parents' perceptions of their children's personality. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 163(2), 165–178.

Further Readings

- Biggs, J. B., & Watkins, D. A. (1995). *Classroom learning: Educational psychology for the Asian teacher*. Singapore: Prentice Hall.
- Chan, J. (2007). Giftedness and China's Confucian heritage. In S. N. Phillipson & M. McCann (Eds.), *Conceptions of giftedness: Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 35–64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eggen, P., & Kauchak, D. (2007). *Educational psychology: Windows on classrooms* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Watkins, D. A., & Biggs, J. B. (Eds.) (1996). *The Chinese learner: Cultural, psychological and contextual influences*. Hong Kong, China and Victoria, Australia: Comparative Education Research Centre and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Watkins, D. A., & Biggs, J. B. (Eds.) (2001). *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives*. Hong Kong, China: Comparative Education Research Centre.

Useful Website

Federation in Community Support (FICS) at <http://www2.ied.edu.hk/fpece/fics/>

Acknowledgements

The comments made by Assoc. Prof. Chris Forlin, The Hong Kong Institute of Education, on an early version of this chapter are gratefully appreciated.

Correspondence regarding this chapter should be sent to Shane N. Phillipson, Department of Educational Psychology, Counselling and Learning Needs, The Hong Kong Institute of Education, 10 Lo Ping Road, Tai Po, New Territories, Hong Kong.

Index

- Abbeduto, L., 46, 58
Ability and effort, 13, 212
Abrams, D. M., 47, 58
Academic performance, 24, 51, 76, 136, 145, 209, 406, 461, 467
Acculturation, 35, 44–45, 46, 55, 56, 58, 300, 447
Achenbach, T. M., 310, 352
Adaptive functioning, 291
Ad Hoc Committee on Service Delivery in the Schools, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, 159, 200
Affective needs, 129, 205, 214
Aggression, 207, 225, 310–311, 323, 337
Ainscow, M., 69, 89, 408, 429
Albinism, 252, 253, 274, 276, 277
Alber, S., 192, 201
Alghazo, E. M., 109, 118
Algozzine, B., 96, 121
Aloofness, 321
Alter, G., 440, 454
Alur, M., 79, 89
Alva, S., 42, 60
American Association on Mental Retardation, 293, 301
American Psychiatric Association, 312, 316, 352
Americans with Disabilities Act Restoration Act of 2006, 130, 153
Ames, R., 439, 455
Anastasiow, N. J., 65, 90, 309, 311, 314, 315, 320, 322, 354
Anderson, N., 20, 21, 30
Anderson, R. C., 370, 392, 370, 372, 393
Andreani, O., 232, 233, 244
Aniridia, 252
Apple, M., 49, 58, 43, 45, 59
Approach to Teaching, 188, 399
Arbeiter, S., 109, 119
Arditi, A., 265, 278
Armstrong, F., 72, 73, 89
Arter, C., 256, 257, 260, 268, 279
Ashlock, R., 379, 389
Asian Development Bank, 51, 59
Asia-Pacific Development Center on Disability, 79, 89, 97, 98, 103, 119, 131, 153
Asperger syndrome, 118, 316–317, 324–325, 326
Assessment issues, 96, 413
Assimilation, 35, 36, 44–45, 46, 48, 55, 56, 58
Assistive listening devices, 199
Assistive technologies, 127, 128, 143–144, 145, 147, 150, 258–259, 261, 268, 273, 328, 337
Association for Direct Instruction, 301, 301
Assouline, S. G., 214, 242
Asynchronous development, 215, 221, 241, Attitude
and parent, 22, 139, 141, 174, 264

- and teacher, 84, 86, 129, 139, 140, 146, 174, 263
- Au, K., 175, 203
- Audit Commission, 82, 89
- Austin, S., 169, 200
- Autistic Spectrum Disorders, 308, 311
- Auxter, D., 130, 131, 132, 133, 143, 152, 153
- Avatars, 337, 351, 352, 358
- Background noise, 173, 174, 176
- Backman, O., 258, 279
- Baddeley, A. D., 352, 352
- Badian, N. A., 377, 389
- Baker, J. M., 142, 155
- Bandein-Roche, K., 144, 155
- Banks, J., 43, 48, 49, 52, 59
- Baptiste, H. P., 148, 154
- Barraga, N. C., 261, 266, 267, 268, 270, 271, 279
- Barton, L., 45, 59, 72, 73, 89
- Bateman, B., 359, 389
- Bateson, M. C., 440, 454
- Batodano, M., 44, 60
- Beare, H., 27, 28
- Becker, G. S., 57, 59
- Behavioral tests, 172
- Behavioral therapy, 314–315
- Being with, 326, 327, 333, 344
- Belford, O., 308, 310, 353
- Benet-Martinez, V., 7, 29
- Bennett, K. S., 313, 355
- Berk, L. E., 216, 241
- Berkey, D., 139, 155
- Bernardo, A. B. I., 17, 28
- Berthrong, E., 284, 301
- Berthrong, J., 284, 301
- Best, A. B., 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 264, 267, 279
- Bialystok, E., 46, 59
- Biggs, J. B., xv, xvi, 7, 11, 12, 13, 19, 27, 28, 14, 29, 7, 31, 6, 11, 18, 21, 32, 128, 155, 186, 200, 209, 243
- Biggs, J., 463, 464, 484
- Bilingual education, 46–47
- Billingsley, R., 128, 146, 154
- Blanck, P., 45, 59
- Blind, 99, 117, 137, 141, 149, 221, 249, 250, 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 260, 265, 266, 270, 271, 274, 275, 276–277, 278, 286
- Block, M. E., 137, 154
- Bloom, L., 162, 200
- Boelens, H., 180, 201
- Boler, M., 43, 44, 59
- Booth, T., 69, 89
- Borland, J. H., 205, 241
- Bouchard, E., 190, 202
- Bourdieu, P., 47, 59
- Bowers, P. G., 368, 394
- Boyer, J. B., 148, 154
- Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association, 465, 484
- Bradley, D., 47, 59
- Braille, 117, 257–258, 260, 261–263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269–270, 271–272, 273, 274, 276, 277
- Brailler, 258, 260, 262, 277
- Brandes, D., 465, 466, 484
- Brawley, L. R., 129, 154
- Bray, M., 76, 89, 128, 137, 154
- Brazil, N., 69, 92
- Brennan, M., 436, 449, 456
- Breton, R., 47, 59
- Brink, B., 80, 89
- Brinkhoff, T., 100, 119
- Brookes, K. J., 314, 353
- Brunei, 35, 36–37, 41, 42
- Brunt, J., 232, 241
- Bryant, B. R., 379, 389
- Buddy
 - pairing, 332, 334
 - system, 145, 406, 409, 419, 426
- Bulgren, J. A., 384, 390
- Burch, N., 467, 484
- Burke, C., 367, 390
- Burts, D., 188, 201
- Butler, F., 382, 392
- Caldwell, B. J., 27, 28
- Caldwell, J., 360, 391
- Caldwell, J. S., 366, 373, 374, 375, 376, 393
- Calhoun, S. L., 316, 317, 355
- Callaway, A., 167, 172, 176, 177, 178, 179, 200

- Cambodia, 35, 36–37, 41, 42–43, 44, 51
 Campbell, J. R., 220, 221, 223, 241
 Cangelosi, J. S., 461, 462, 484
 Canter, L., 467, 470, 484
 Canter, M., 467, 470, 484
 Cao, J. M., 286, 301
 Caris, M., 20, 31
 Carlson, J. S., 45, 59
 Carmine, D., 366, 372, 390
 Carron, A. V., 129, 154
 Carter, K., 440, 454
 Cassel, P., 467, 468, 484
 Castles, A., 372, 390
 Cataracts, 252, 253, 254, 277
 Cawley, J. F., 378, 381, 390, 393
 Cazden, C., 182, 200
 Center, Y., 96, 109, 121
 Central Intelligence Agency, 103, 119
 Chaiklin, S., 187, 200
 Chan, A. S. K., 212, 242
 Chan, A. S., 317, 353
 Chan, A., 315, 317, 353
 Chan, C. W. M., 110, 119
 Chan, D. W., 209, 241, 207, 212, 215, 217, 219,
 220, 222, 240, 242, 209, 243, 325, 353
 Chan, D., 366, 391
 Chan, H. K., 81, 82, 83, 90
 Chan, J., 207, 242
 Chan, L. K., 209, 245
 Chan, L., 372, 390
 Chan, W. S., 371, 391
 Chang, C.-C., 312, 314, 315, 353
 Chang, H. J., 217, 240, 242
 Chang, H.-L., 315, 353
 Chang, L., 310, 311, 356
 Chang, R. M. L., 110, 119
 Chang, Y. P., 218, 242
 Chao, C.-C., 312, 314, 315, 353, 311, 312, 315,
 354
 Charlesworth, R., 188, 201
 Chen, C. S., 22, 28, 18, 23, 25, 31, 314, 357
 Chen, C., 210, 213, 228, 245
 Chen, C.-C., 314, 357
 Chen, C.-Y., 315, 353
 Chen, H. C., 371, 392
 Chen, H., 22, 28, 310, 311, 353
 Chen, J., 22, 32, 315, 353
 Chen, S., 139, 155
 Chen, S. H., 128, 139, 140, 142, 145, 154
 Chen, S.-F., 315, 353
 Chen, W.-J., 310, 357
 Chen, X., 310, 311, 353
 Chen, Y.-H., 315, 353
 Chen, Y. Y., 76, 89, 315, 353, 364, 377, 390
 Cheng, C. M., 371, 390
 Cheng, K. M., 322, 353
 Cheng, P. W., 372, 392
 Cheng, R. H. M., 287, 300, 301
 Cheng, Y., 337, 355
 Cheng, Y. C., 42, 59
 Cheuk, D. K. L., 314, 353
 Cheung, J., 315, 317, 353
 Cheung, M., 317, 353
 Cheung, M.-C., 315, 317, 353
 Cheung, P., 292, 301
 Cheung, P. C., 25, 32, 212, 242
 Cheung, P. M. P., 315, 316, 356
 Cheung, R., 315, 317, 353
 Cheung, R. W., 317, 353
 Cheung, Y. T., 371, 390
 Chiang, C.-N., 310, 357
 China, x, xiii, xiv, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 18, 19, 21, 22,
 24, 27, 35, 36–37, 40–41, 42–43, 44, 47, 50,
 51, 53, 66, 71, 75, 97–99, 107, 108, 111–112,
 129, 131, 136, 137–138, 139–140, 142, 145,
 146, 149, 152, 166, 168, 172, 176, 178, 179,
 186, 205, 207–208, 209, 211, 219, 221, 227,
 229, 237, 238, 240, 251, 283, 284–285, 286,
 287–288, 292, 307, 311, 315–316, 318, 364,
 367, 371, 373, 377, 400, 431, 432, 434–436,
 442–445, 446, 447
 Chinese
 context, 144, 145, 146, 152, 316
 culture, 8, 18, 19, 27, 218, 284, 308, 310–311,
 312–313, 316, 320–322, 332, 432, 435,
 474, 481
 family, 24, 432
 philosophy, 459, 475, 480, 483
 Chinese Medical Association-Mental Health
 Division, 316, 353

- Ching, W. D., 22, 29
- Chiu, C. Y., 7, 29, 14, 15, 31
- Chiu, K. S., 465, 485
- Cho, S., 211, 223, 242, 210, 213, 214, 223, 245
- Choi, H. P., 221, 242
- Choi, I., 9, 10, 31
- Choi, K. A., 221, 242
- Chong, S., 44, 53, 54, 55, 59
- Chow, A. P. Y., 222, 224, 225, 226, 242
- Chow, G. C., 36, 41, 43, 44, 59
- Chow, J. C. S., 15, 19, 32
- Chow, P. C. W., 222, 224, 225, 226, 242
- Chua, S. K., 46, 60
- Chui, E., 110, 120, 308, 311, 355
- Chung, E., 175, 203
- Chung, K. K. H., 296, 301
- Chung, L.-C., 314, 357
- Churchill, S., 48, 59
- Ciocca, V., 174, 201
- Clandinin, D. J., 440, 441, 454
- Clark, E., 316, 317, 318, 353
- Clark, F. L., 297, 302
- Classroom
 - behavior, 367, 328, 461, 467, 468, 469, 476, 482
 - challenges, 142, 205, 221, 222, 223, 256, 319
 - management, 56, 226, 325–326, 414, 459, 460–461, 462–463, 467, 468, 469, 470, 473, 475, 476, 477, 479–483
 - strategies, 49, 128, 146, 205, 226, 227, 228, 249, 264, 276, 325, 328, 399
- Closed-circuit television, 258
- Cloud, N., 196, 200
- Cochlea implants, 174
- Cochlea Implant Clinic, 174, 200
- Cognitive
 - disability, 284
 - strategy instruction, 296–297, 302
- Colangelo, N., 214, 217, 242
- Coleman, M. R., 65, 90, 309, 311, 314, 315, 320, 322, 354
- Coles, R., 441, 454
- Colonization, 37, 57, 287, 432, 449
- Color blind, 252
- Coltheart, M., 372, 390
- Columbus Group, 215, 242
- Communication
 - alternative, 147, 149, 194, 195, 197
 - augmentative, 194, 195, 197
- Community acceptance, 95, 71, 72, 80, 88
- Comorbid, 314,
- Comprehension, 4, 158, 162–163, 166, 189–190, 198, 224, 236, 237, 266, 317, 340, 342, 352, 366, 367–368, 373–375, 376, 377, 386, 388, 389, 461
- Comprehension Strategies, 374–375, 376
- Computation, 377–379, 381, 382, 383
- Confucian-heritage Culture (CHC), ix, xiv–xv, 3, 4, 6–7, 8, 9, 10–11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 66, 96, 117, 128, 205, 206, 214, 218, 221, 222, 240, 307, 308, 312, 315, 318, 326, 400, 414, 431, 432, 445, 447, 449, 450, 452, 453
 - and children with special needs, 25, 26
 - and classroom, xiv–xv, 10, 11, 18, 25
 - and goal orientation, 14
 - and models of learning, 8
 - and motivation, 3, 4, 7, 11, 16, 25, 26
 - and Western ideologies, 287
- Confucianism, 6, 27, 207, 284, 310, 432, 433, 435, 436, 439, 445, 449, 475–476, 479, 481, 483
- Confucius, 6, 27, 207, 283, 284–286, 432, 435, 439, 476, 483
- Connell, P., 184, 200
- Connelly, F. M., 440, 441, 454
- Constitution of Singapore, 50, 59
- Constitution of Thailand, 50, 59
- Constitution of the People's Republic of China, 50, 59
- Continuum of service provision, 99
- Contrast sensitivity, 252, 255
- Conwa, T., 368, 394
- Cook, L., 402, 403, 429
- Cooper, E., 210, 213, 228, 243
- Cooperative learning, 77–78, 298–299, 373–374, 425, 465
- Corson, D., 45, 47, 60
- Cortical visual impairment, 255, 276, 277
- Coulter, W., 362, 390

- Counseling
 and CHC, 431, 432, 449
 and Hong Kong, 431, 433, 435, 436–437, 453
 directive, 447, 454
 nondirective, 446–447, 454
- Cowie, H., 465, 484
- Cramer, R., 185, 200
- Cramond, B., 224, 243
- Crawford, N., 88, 89, 128, 137, 154
- Creativity, 11, 19, 25, 71, 181, 191, 206, 207, 209, 211, 212, 214, 228, 233, 237–238, 239, 269, 270, 298, 342, 377
- Crites, S., 440, 454
- Crocker, S., 169, 200
- Cultural capital, 47, 51, 55, 57
- Cultural identity, 35–36, 43, 46–49, 56
- Cultural norms, 210, 218, 313
- Cummins, J., 43, 46, 47, 49, 51, 52, 60, 46, 62
- Curran, S., 314, 353
- Curriculum
 adaptation, xi, 412, 425
 differentiation, 233, 235, 241, 402, 413
- Curriculum Development Council, 178, 200, 261, 279, 308, 353, 438, 454
- Curriculum Development Institute, 374, 377, 383, 390
- D’Rozario, V., 447, 454
- Dall’Alba, G., 10, 30
- Dan, J. W., 284, 302
- Dandy, J., 22, 28
- Darder, A., 44, 50, 51, 52, 60
- Darnell, F., 50, 52, 60
- Davidson, D., 298, 301
- Davis, G. A., 217, 242, 206, 208, 239, 241, 243
- Deaf culture, 176, 178–179
- Deaf methodology, 176
- Decoding, 366, 372, 377, 386
- Deep approaches to learning, 6
- Defiance, 310, 314, 321, 323, 337
- Delisle, J., 217, 243
- Delpit, L., 52, 60
- Democratic schooling, 54–55, 56
- Deng, M., 263, 279, 286, 287, 301
- Denton, P. H., 376, 393
- Department for Education and Children’s Services, 233, 243
- Department for Education and Skills, 97, 119
- Department of Education of the Philippines, 111, 119
- Department of Health, 100, 103, 119
- Deppeler, J. M., 109, 120
- Depth perception, 255, 260
- Desai, S., 42, 60
- Deshler, D. D., 180, 200, 297, 302, 384, 390, 376, 393
- Deshler, J., 180, 201
- Deutsch, F. M., 219, 243
- Developmental delay, 284, 290
- Dewey, J., 439, 454
- Diaz, S., 128, 154
- Difference blind principle, 50, 57
- Ding, G.-A., 315, 353
- Discipline assertive, 470
- Discipline social, 459, 470, 480
- Discrepancy model, 363
- Discrimination, 46, 48, 50, 52–53, 56, 58, 69, 82, 85–86, 97–98, 104, 118, 136, 138, 169, 175, 287, 288, 450, 452, 453
- Disorder
 attention deficit hyperactivity, 102, 118, 307, 308, 311, 312
 conduct, 314
 emotional, x, 139, 478
- Diverse learning needs, xv, 96, 431, 440, 446, 449, 451, 459, 461, 464
- Dodd, B., 159, 200
- Don-il Kim, 86, 88, 90
- Douglas, G., 109, 120
- Down syndrome, 290
- Dowson, C. R., 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 90, 167, 200, 399, 429
- Draguns, J. G., 310, 354
- Dreikurs, R., 467, 468, 470, 484
- Dual route model of reading, 372
- Dutton, G. N., 255, 279
- Dyson, A., 69, 89, 408, 429
- Ebenezer School, 275, 279

- Eberly College of Arts and Science of West Virginia University, 293, 302
- Echolalia, 159, 325
- Eden, G. F., 370, 393
- Education and Manpower Bureau, 76, 77, 78, 90, 106, 107, 111, 112, 114, 119, 284, 292, 299, 300, 302, 308, 310, 319, 354, 363, 364, 377, 390
- Education Commission, 67, 90, 299, 302, 308, 354, 438, 454, 437, 455
- Education Convergence, 465, 484
- Education Department, 87, 90, 112, 119, 178, 201, 208, 243, 291, 302, 308, 354, 407, 429, 436, 455
- Education for all, 45, 54, 69, 72–74, 80, 81–82, 84, 95, 96, 99, 102, 104, 107–108, 118, 138, 307–308, 399
- Educational Statistics Yearbook of China, 111, 112, 119
- Educational support, 76, 87, 293, 311
- Edwards, J., 298, 301
- Eggen, P., 12, 28
- Ehly, S., 465, 485
- Ehren, B. J., 384, 390
- Electronic braille display devices, 258
- Ellis, E. S., 297, 302
- Ellis, E., 180, 200
- Elphick, E., 25, 32
- Empathy, 190, 465, 466, 475, 476, 479
- Encyclopædia Britannica, 284, 302
- Eng, B., 433, 435, 438, 442, 445, 455
- English as medium of instruction (EMI), 16–17
- Enrichment, 46, 185, 209, 212, 223, 228, 230, 233–235, 238, 239, 241
- Epstein, I., 286, 302
- Epston, D., 441, 456
- Equality, 35, 36, 43–44, 49–50, 55, 56, 69, 71–72, 95, 98, 108, 285, 299
- Erni, J. N., 46, 60, 261, 266, 267, 268, 270, 271, 279
- Errors
 - phonological, 165, 367
 - semantic, 367
 - visual, 367
- Essed, P., 52, 53, 60
- Evaluation, 11, 209, 218, 222, 225, 229, 230, 235–237, 240, 335, 360, 362, 377, 404, 417, 463, 474, 481
- Executive functions, 324, 336, 340
- Extension, 183, 209, 228, 232, 233, 235, 238, 299
- Exum, H. A., 447, 455
- Fa, 475, 479–480, 483
- Falitz, C., 297, 302
- Family background, 461
- Fan, C. F., 213, 243
- Farnsworth, E., 263, 279, 286, 287, 301
- Farrell, J., 43, 49, 60
- Farver, J. A. M., 310, 311, 356
- Fawcett, A., 372, 390
- Federation in Community Support, 115, 116, 117, 119
- Fei, L. C., 22, 32
- Feigin, N., 109, 121
- Ferguson, D., 20, 31
- Ferrucci, L., 144, 155
- Fleischner, J. E., 378, 390
- Flem, A., 68, 69, 73, 90
- Fletcher, J., 362, 390
- Fletcher, J. M., 368, 390, 385, 392
- Fletcher, P., 159, 201, 159, 202
- Flexer, C., 173, 201
- Flora, S., 185, 201
- Foil, C., 192, 201
- Foorman, B. R., 368, 390
- Ford, A., 69, 92
- Foreman, P., 362, 390
- Forlin, C., 69, 90, 95, 96, 102, 108, 109, 110, 119, 96, 97, 98, 101, 109, 120, 137, 154
- Fragile X syndrome, 290
- Francis, D. J., 368, 390
- Frazita, R. R., 378, 393
- Freedman, M., 435, 455
- Freid, A. N., 264, 279
- Freire, P., 43, 60
- Fried, L. P., 144, 155
- Friend, M., 402, 403, 429
- Frith, U., 316, 318, 321, 354
- Fry, C. P., 465, 484
- Fry, D. P., 465, 484

- Frye, M., 44, 60
 Fu, Q-J., 174, 202
 Fuchs, D., 377, 390, 362, 378, 385, 391
 Fuchs, L., 377, 390, 378, 391, 378, 393, 362, 386, 394
 Functioning, High, 315–317, 324–325, 336
 Functioning, Low, 317, 321, 324, 336
 Furman, L., 312, 313, 324, 354
 Furnham, A., 23, 29

 Gaad, E. E. N., 109, 118
 Gallagher, J. J., 65, 90, 309, 311, 314, 315, 320, 322, 354
 Gallagher-Landi, M., 383, 391
 Gansle, K. A., 339, 355
 Gao, J., 317, 356
 Gardner, H., 19, 29, 206, 208, 214, 215, 243
 Garguilo, R. M., 98, 12, 360, 391
 Garside, C., 137, 148, 154
 Garvin, C., 368, 394
 Gavin, W., 159, 201
 Gelvoria, M. T., 160, 201
 Gelzheiser, L. M., 263, 279
 Gender, 20, 44, 53–55, 57, 58, 104, 105, 108, 224, 287, 337, 461
 Generalization and maintenance, 297
 Genuineness, 466, 475
 Giftedness, xv, 76, 205–206, 207–208, 209, 210, 211–212, 213, 214, 215–216, 217, 218, 220, 221, 223, 227, 230, 239, 240, 241, 325, 446, 448
 Gillborn, D., 461, 484
 Ginnis, P., 465, 466, 484
 Gipps, C., 465, 484
 Giroux, H., 43, 44, 45, 49, 52, 60
 Glare, 252, 260, 277
 Glaucoma, 252, 253–254, 274, 276, 277
 Globalization, 4, 6, 36, 65, 68, 72–73, 89, 285, 300, 449
 Good Heart Ambassador Scheme, 406, 409
 Goodlad, J., 129, 154
 Goodstein, H. A., 381, 391
 Gordon, T., 467, 473, 474, 484
 Gould, D., 129, 155
 Gould, J., 317, 324, 356

 Government involvement/role, 423
 Graham, J., 172, 201
 Graves, D., 190, 201
 Greenhalgh, P., 465, 466, 484
 Grey, L., 467, 468, 484
 Grigorenko, E., 385, 393
 Groenveld, M., 255, 279
 Grundwald, B., 467, 470, 484
 Gudmundsdottir, S., 68, 69, 73, 90
 Guidance and counseling, xv, 217, 420, 426, 431–433, 434–436, 437–438, 439–440, 441–442, 445, 446, 447, 448
 Guindalini, C., 314, 353
 Guo, C., 309, 310, 355
 Guo, Y., 311, 354
 Guralnik, J. M., 144, 155

 Hall, D., 439, 455
 Hall, J., 158, 201
 Hallahan, D. P., 309, 354, 360, 391
 Hallak, J., 41, 61
 Halliday, M. A. K., 183, 201
 Hallinger, P., 54, 61
 Han, S., 221, 242
 Haring, K., 287, 302, 308, 311, 354
 Harris, P. R., 56, 61
 Harris, S. L., 344, 354
 Harrison, E., 161, 202
 Hart, C., 188, 201
 Hartley, S., 109, 119
 Harvey, D. H. P., 109, 120
 Hattie, J., 109, 120
 Hau, K. T., 14, 29, 209, 243
 Hay, D. A., 313, 355
 He, M. F., 435, 440, 441, 455
 Hearing aids, 166, 168, 169, 171, 172–174, 176, 177, 182, 199, 200
 Hearing loss,
 conductive, 167, 168, 170, 199
 detecting, 171
 sensorineural,
 Hedden, T., 9, 29, 9, 30
 Hegarty, S., 69, 90
 Held, D., 72, 90
 Heller, M., 188, 201

- Helplessness, 109, 264, 468, 471, 472
 Heron, L., 292, 302
 Heung, V., 88, 89
 Heung, W. K., 399, 429
 Hewitt, S., 339, 354
 Hierarchy of educational inclusion, 101
 High myopia, 252, 274
 Ho, C. S. H., 365, 366, 371, 391
 Ho, F. C., 81, 82, 83, 90, 367, 372, 374, 391, 399, 429
 Ho, P. P.-K., 316, 356
 Ho, T. F., 14, 29, 209, 243
 Ho, W., 175, 203
 Ho, W. K., 17, 29
 Hobcraft, J., 42, 61
 Hock, M. F., 384, 390
 Holubec, E. J., 298, 302
 Hong Kong Attainment Tests, 212, 363
 Hong Kong Department of Justice, 288, 302
 Hong Kong Government, 85, 90, 250, 279
 Hong Kong Government Information Centre, 435, 455
 Hong Kong Primary Education Research Association & Special Education Society of Hong Kong, 292, 302
 Hong, E., 22, 29
 Hong, Y. Y., 7, 16, 19, 29, 209, 243
 Hooks, B., 44, 61
 Hopkins, D., 408, 429
 Houvouras, S. K., 47, 61
 Howe, K. R., 81, 90
 Hoyt, L., 190, 201
 Hsieh, J. C., 230, 243
 Hu, X., 288, 303
 Huang, B., 315, 353
 Huang, C.-I., 315, 353
 Huang, H.-L., 311, 312, 315, 354
 Huddy, L., 47, 61
 Hue, M. T., 474, 475, 484, 463, 474, 475, 476, 479, 485
 Huettig, C., 130, 131, 132, 133, 143, 152, 153
 Hughes, C., 381, 393
 Hui, E. K. P., 436, 438, 455
 Hui, K. F., 399, 429
 Hui, L. H., 88, 89, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 90
 Hui, S. K. F., 206, 218, 246
 Hui, S. L.-H., 316, 356
 Human capital, 41–42, 57
 Humaneness, 475, 476, 477
 Humphries, T., 176, 202
 Hunt, D. E., 440, 455
 Hunt, N., 176, 201
 Huntley, M., 161, 202
 Huntsinger, C. S., 22, 29
 Hutchinson, N. L., 378, 391
 Hwang, D. J., 210, 243
 Hwang, K.-K., 308, 310, 353
 Hwang, M.Y., 452, 456
 Hwang, Y.-S., 315, 353
 Hyvarinen, L., 255, 279
 Identity, 4, 35–36, 43, 44, 45–49, 50, 55, 56, 58, 129, 193, 233, 412, 433, 434, 436, 437, 440, 444–445, 452, 463
 Illumination, 252, 258
 Impression management, 479–780
 Inappropriate behaviors, 470, 474
 Inde, K., 258, 279
 India Together, 79, 90
 Individual difference, 6, 50, 68, 128, 147, 148, 153, 223, 286, 413, 461, 464, 477, 478
 Individual Education Plans (IEPs), 81, 141, 143, 332, 335, 338, 410, 411, 419, 421, 424, 429
 Indonesia, 35–37, 41, 42–43, 45, 97, 100, 103, 107
 Infantino, J., 332, 354
 Involvement
 parental, 25, 166–167, 178, 195, 404–405, 411, 416, 421, 423, 426
 student, 423, 426, 454
 Integration, ix–x, 55, 65, 66–67, 70–72, 75, 77–78, 79, 83–85, 86–87, 89, 101, 106–107, 132, 137, 138, 140, 149, 188–189, 190, 197, 275, 292, 295, 299, 300, 308, 316, 399, 407–408, 422
 Intellectual Disabilities, xi, 101, 109, 137, 139, 283–284, 286, 288, 289, 290–292, 293, 294, 295–296, 297–298, 299–300
 Interpersonal interactions, 268, 464
 Intervention, 73, 77, 102, 108, 113, 133, 147, 153, 166, 290, 294, 314–315, 318, 328, 332, 335,

- 336, 337, 339, 352, 362–363, 365, 368, 372,
385–386, 404, 419, 421, 446–447, 454
- Ip, B., 363, 391
- Ip, F., 77, 92
- IQ, 206, 209, 211, 213, 214, 216, 226, 290–291,
292, 293, 314, 315, 318, 360–362
- Isaacson, S., 191, 201
- Ishii, K., 10, 29
- Iwanaga, R., 317, 354
- James, S., 162, 202
- Jamieson, I., 4, 30
- Jan, J. E., 255, 279
- Jenkins, H. J., 109, 120
- Jennett, H. K., 344, 354
- Jennings, J. H., 360, 391, 366, 373, 374, 375, 376,
393
- Ji, L. J., 9, 29
- Jiao, S., 9, 29
- Jin, M., 128, 139, 140, 142, 145, 154
- Jin, S., 284, 302
- Jing, Q., 9, 29
- Jitendra, A. K., 383, 384, 394
- Johns, F. A., 471, 485
- Johnson, D. W., 298, 302
- Johnson, R. T., 298, 302
- Jongsma, E., 367, 391
- Jose, P. E., 22, 29
- Jose, R. T., 253, 279
- Joy of learning, 115, 120
- Juang, Y.-Y., 315, 353
- Kaewboonchoo, O., 168, 201
- Kam, H. W., 46, 61
- Kame'enui, E. J., 366, 372, 390
- Kang, Y. S., 287, 302, 308, 311, 354
- Kanner, L., 316, 354
- Kaplan, P. S., 216, 243
- Kasper, J. D., 144, 155
- Kauchak, D., 12, 28
- Kauffman, J. M., 309, 354
- Kaufman, A. S., 360, 391
- Kaufman, N. L., 360, 391
- Kawamura, T., 25, 29
- Kawasaki, C., 317, 354
- Kay, J., 378, 391
- Kelly, L., 139, 155
- Kelly, L. C. C., 311, 356
- Kember, D., 8, 16, 17, 30
- Kennedy, P., 18, 29
- Kerr, B., 218, 243
- Khouw, E., 174, 201
- Kim, D., 16, 29
- Kim, H.-C., 218, 243
- Kim, H.-W., 218, 243
- Kim, J. T., 139, 154
- Kim, J., 239, 243
- Kim, K., 239, 243
- Kim, M., 221, 242
- Kim, S. Y., 447, 455
- Kincheloe, J. L., 43, 61
- Kirk, B., 452, 456
- Kirk, S. A., 65, 90, 309, 311, 314, 315, 320, 322,
354, 359, 391
- Kitayama, S., 10, 29
- Klapp, O. E., 47, 61
- Klee, T., 159, 201
- Knapp, M., 158, 201
- Knight, J., 314, 353, 384, 390
- Knight, P., 176, 201
- Knoblauch, B., 131, 154
- Koh, S. K., 221, 242
- Kohlberg, L., 231, 243
- Kohnstamm, G., 25, 32
- Koo, J., 9, 10, 31
- Koo, R., 76, 89
- Korea National Statistical Office, 100, 103, 111,
120
- Korean Society of Persons with Disabilities and
RI Korea, 97, 120
- Kozulin, A., 46, 63
- Kraus, L. E., 149, 154
- Kumin, L., 324, 356
- Kun, T. L., 10, 30
- Kung, P., 175, 203
- Kuo, C. C., 218, 242
- Kuo, P.-H., 310, 354
- Kuppusamy, B., 53, 61
- Kurita, H., 309, 310, 355
- Ku-Yu, H. S. Y., 222, 224, 225, 226, 242

- Kwak, K., 214, 243
 Kwok, C., 81, 82, 83, 90
 Kwon, H., 71, 90
 Kwon, H. S., 287, 303
- Labeling, 89, 198, 218, 311, 365, 450, 453
 LaFamme, M., 69, 91
 Lahey, M., 162, 200
 Lai, S., 14, 15, 31
 Lam, C. C. C., 372, 392
 Lam, L. L., 315, 316, 356
 Lam, R., 8, 16, 17, 31
 Lam, W., 17, 29
 Lam, W. L., 19, 30
 Lancioni, G., 180, 201
 Lang, O., 432, 455
 Language experience approach, 181, 184–185, 198
 Lao Tze, 477, 483
 Laos, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42–43, 51, 97, 100, 103
 Lau, A., 308, 310, 354
 Lau, C. W.-L., 316, 356
 Lau, E. Y., 447, 455
 Lau, K. L., 209, 243
 Lau, K. O., 128, 139, 140, 142, 145, 154
 Lau, S., xv, xvi, 19, 30
 Law, S. Y., 399, 429
 Layton, L., 216, 245
 Leader, P., 255, 279
 Learning
 difficulties, xv, 76, 113, 132, 183, 186, 187, 314, 318, 324–325, 359, 363, 366, 377–378, 389, 428, 429, 448, 481
 styles, 4, 10, 20–21, 26, 128, 152, 235, 338, 378
 Lee, F., 9, 10, 31
 Lee, J., 224, 243
 Lee, J. Y., 239, 243
 Lee, K., 382, 392
 Lee, K. H., 22, 29
 Lee, S. H., 366, 391
 Lee, S. Y., 18, 23, 25, 31, 224, 243, 210, 213, 228, 245
 Lee, W. O., xiii, xvi, 6, 7, 29, 41, 61, 332, 355, 439, 455, 435, 456
 Lee, W.-C., 316, 356
 Legalism, 459, 475–476, 479, 481, 483
 Legislation, 53, 95, 96–98, 109, 287, 311
 Lemke, C., 148, 154
 Lenz, B., 180, 200, 180, 201
 Lenz, B. K., 297, 302, 384, 390
 Leong, C. K., 371, 372, 392
 Lepoutre, D., 166, 202
 Lerner, J. W., 360, 391, 366, 373, 374, 375, 376, 393
 Leung, D. Y. P., 8, 16, 17, 30
 Leung, F. K. S., 9, 30
 Leung, J. L.-S., 316, 356
 Leung, J.-P., 312, 355
 Leung, K., 19, 30
 Leung, K. W., 212, 242
 Leung, S. A., 434, 436, 437, 449, 455
 Leung, T. T., 436, 456
 Leung, W. W. M., 212, 242, 315, 317, 353
 Levin, J. R., 45, 59
 Levy, F., 313, 355
 Lewis, R., 460, 467, 468, 469, 470, 474, 480, 485
 Li, C., 208, 211, 227, 245
 Li, H., 316, 355, 371, 392
 Li, H. L., 46, 61
 Li, J., 8, 9, 18, 26, 30
 Li, L., 41, 43, 61
 Li, N., 8, 16, 17, 30
 Li, S., 168, 201
 Li, S. Y. H., 314, 353
 Li Si, 483, 479
 Li, W., 370, 392
 Lian, J. M.-G., 307, 355
 Lian, M.-G. J., 106, 120, 195, 201, 251, 263, 267, 279, 260, 264, 251, 267, 280, 295, 303
 Liang, B. Y., 287, 303
 Liaw, F. R., 22, 29
 Life experience, 461
 Lim, C. Y., 40, 41, 43, 61
 Lim, L., 314, 320, 355
 Lin, C. C. H., 310, 354
 Lin, L. H., 238, 245
 Lindamood, P., 368, 394
 Lindsay, G., 66, 67, 69, 91
 Lip reading, 169, 170–171, 175, 177, 198

- Lipman, M., 215, 232, 244
 Lipsky, D. K., 68, 91
 Lisenco, Y., 273, 279
 Little, E., 332, 354
 Liu, H., 317, 356
 Liu, J., 17, 30, 36, 61
 Liu, M., 310, 311, 353
 Liu, X., 309, 310, 355
 Lo, E., 77, 92, 110, 120, 308, 311, 355
 Lo, E. M. K., 77, 92
 Loreman, T., 109, 120
 Louie, V., 42, 61
 Love and Care Scheme, 406, 409, 416, 419, 426
 Lovett, D., 287, 302, 308, 311, 354
 Lu, P., 221, 230, 244
 Lui, L., 238, 244
 Lui, P., 238, 244
 Luk, F. Y. Y., 399, 429
 Luk-Fong, P. Y. Y., 77, 91
 Luk-Fong, Y. Y. P., 436, 449, 456
 Luo, X., 174, 202
 Low vision, 249, 250, 252, 257–259, 261–262, 264, 265, 270, 273, 274, 276, 277, 278
 training in, 261–262, 276
 Lynch, 74, 81, 82, 91
 Lyon, G. R., 365, 385, 392
- M/SET 99 Sessions, 149, 155
 Ma, J. L. C., 311, 356
 Macebo, S., 128, 146, 154
 MacNaughton, R. H., 471, 485
 Macular degeneration, 254, 276, 278
 Madewell, B. J., 296, 303
 Mainstreaming, 71–72, 81, 102, 139, 264
 Majebe, M. C., 318, 355
 Mak, T., 23, 29
 Malaysia, 35, 36, 38–39, 41, 42–43, 44, 51, 53, 97, 100, 103, 107, 111, 340
 Mansoor, S., 43, 61
 Mapping
 semantic, 192, 198
 story, 188, 190–191, 198, 373
 Marabinus, N. G., 471, 485
 Marrs, R., 180, 201
 Marsh, C., 3, 4, 18, 30
 Marshall, D., 175, 202
 Marshall, K., 176, 201
 Martin, M., 172, 201
 Marton, F., 10, 30
 Marzola, E. S., 378, 390
 Mason, H. L., 251, 256, 257, 279
 Mastropieri, M. A., 180, 181, 202, 263, 280
 Mathur, S. R., 325, 332, 355
 Matsumura, N., 210, 213, 223, 244
 Mayes, S. D., 316, 317, 355
 McCabe, H., 75, 91, 98, 120
 McCall, S., 256, 257, 262, 264, 279
 McCann, M., 206, 244
 McComas, J., 69, 91
 McGee, B., 166, 202
 McGrath, P., 337, 355
 McInerney, D., 128, 154
 McLeod, J., 441, 442, 456
 McLinden, M., 256, 257, 279
 McQuillan, J., 47, 61
 Means, B., 148, 155
 Mehan, H., 128, 154
 Mehr, E. B., 264, 279
 Mehta, P., 368, 390
 Meltzer, L. J., 385, 392
 Memorization, 7, 10–11, 20, 25, 26, 27, 224, 225, 285, 340, 438, 447
 Mental handicap, 76, 87, 284
 Mental retardation, 75, 131, 141, 256, 284, 288–289, 293, 301, 318, 359–360, 462
 Meraj, S., 43, 61
 Mercer, A. R., 366, 392
 Mercer, C. D., 179, 202, 366, 392, 462, 485
 Mesibov, G. B., 344, 354
 Meyers, J., 263, 279
 Michailakis, D., 97, 120
 Milam, C., 381, 392
 Mill, J., 314, 353
 Miller, D., 188, 202
 Miller, J., 218, 244, 381, 390, 381, 392
 Miller, S. P., 179, 202, 382, 392
 Millikan, R. H., 27, 28
 Millward, A., 408, 429
 Ministry of Education (MOE-Singapore), 51, 57,

- Ministry of Education Malaysia, 111, 120
 Ministry of Education Singapore, 111, 120
 Miranda, K., 230, 244
 Mitchell, D., 66, 69, 70, 71, 79, 80, 81, 88, 91
 Mittler, P., 87, 91
 Miyashita, K., 168, 201
 Mnemonic devices, 296
 Moats, L. C., 365, 366, 392
 Mock, D., 362, 385, 391
 Mock, D. R., 360, 391
 Mode of control, 468–469
 Mode of influence, 468, 469
 Mode of management, 468, 469
 Moen, T., 68, 69, 73, 90
 Moll, C., 128, 154
 Moneta, G. B., 16, 30
 Montagnino, A., 274, 279
 Montgomery, D., 218, 244
 Moon, J. H., 218, 244
 Moore, D., 337, 355
 Moral development, 205, 216, 230, 233
 Morality, 41, 230, 231, 284, 476, 479, 483
 Moran, R. T., 56, 61
 Moran, S. V., 56, 61
 Morgan, P. L., 362, 385, 391
 Morioka, I., 168, 201
 Morris, J. E., 261, 279
 Morris, M. W., 7, 29
 Morris, P., 439, 456
 Morse, M. T., 255, 279
 Motivation,
 extrinsic, 12, 25, 28
 intrinsic, 11–13, 16, 28, 136, 464
 social, 12, 13, 28, 186
 success, 13
 Muc, P. M., 80, 92, 287, 303
 Multiple intelligences, 206, 208, 214, 226, 235–
 237, 240
 Munandar, U., 210, 213, 214, 223, 245
 Munro, D. J., 43, 61
 Myanmar, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42–43, 44, 45, 97, 103,
 107
 Nagy, W. E., 370, 392
 Naidoo, R., 4, 30
 Narita, S., 287, 303
 Narratives, 325, 438, 440–441, 454
 National Council of Teachers of Mathematics,
 377, 383, 392
 National Institute of Drug Abuse, U.S., 315, 355
 National Joint Committee on LD, 360, 392
 National People’s Congress, 98, 99, 120, 364, 392
 National Reading Panel, 368, 373, 392
 Nettelbeck, T., 22, 28
 New immigrant children, 444
 Nguyen, T. M., 80, 92
 Nicholson, T., 369, 392
 Nicolson, R. I., 372, 390
 Nieto, S., 49, 53, 62
 Ning, C., 221, 244
 Nisbett, R. E., 9, 29, 9, 30, 9, 10, 31
 Niu, W., 18, 30
 Nixon, J., 461, 484
 Noddings, N., 232, 244
 Noell, G. H., 339, 355
 Noll, J. W., 46, 62
 Norenzayan, A., 9, 30
 Nozaki, Y., 52, 62
 Nucci, L., 232, 244
 Nunes, T., 372, 390
 Nuzum, M., 378, 390
 Nye, B., 147, 155
 Nystagmus, 253, 255
 O’Brien, T., 326, 327, 355
 Ockelford, A., 274, 280
 Oddness, 321
 OECD, 42, 62
 Ogle, D. M., 376, 392
 Okawa, M., 309, 310, 355
 Olsen, K., 148, 155
 Olson, R., 385, 392
 Onslow, M., 161, 202
 Onukso, E., 172, 202
 Optic atrophy, 252, 253
 Orientation
 and mobility, 256, 260, 261, 276, 278
 group, 467, 468, 469, 470, 480
 student, 467, 468, 469, 473, 480
 teacher, 467, 469, 470, 480

- Overexcitabilities, 215, 217, 240, 241
 Owen, R. L., 378, 393
 Owens, R. E., 158, 162, 193, 202
 Oxford, R., 20, 21, 30
- Packman, A., 161, 202
 Padden, C., 176, 202
 Pagnin, A., 232, 233, 244
 Pakir, A., 43, 62
 Pang, Y., 98, 120, 364, 393
 Papanastasiou, E., 9, 30
 Parental expectations, 4, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28
 Parental
 involvement, 404, 405, 411
 Park, C. C., 20, 21, 30
 Park, C. D., 9, 30
 Park, D. C., 9, 29
 Parker, R., 314, 324, 357
 Parmar, R. S., 378, 393
 Parmenter, T. R., 6, 30
 Parmer, R., 381, 390
 Passive, 24, 53, 183, 321–322, 448, 471
 Pearson, V., 77, 92, 110, 120, 308, 311, 355
 Pedagogical approaches, 4, 10, 19, 26
 Peer, L., 373, 393
 Peer
 relationships, 462, 464
 tutoring, 295, 296, 303
 Penninx, B. W. J. H., 144, 155
 Pepper, F., 467, 470, 484
 Pereira dos Santos, M., 4, 6, 30, 72, 91
 Perfect Gentlemen, 476
 Perfectionism, 6, 218, 221, 222, 224, 241
 Perfetti, C. A., 317, 356, 370, 371, 393
 Peters, S. J., 81, 91
 Peterson, M., 104, 120
 Phenylketonuria (PKU), 290
 Phillion, J., 440, 441, 455
 Philippines, 17, 21, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42–43, 51, 97,
 100, 103, 107, 111
 Phillipson, S., 23, 25, 31
 Phillipson, S. N., 8, 25, 31, 72, 91, 206, 209, 244
 Physical disabilities, 70, 85, 106, 111, 127, 130–
 131, 132, 133, 136, 139, 140, 142, 143–145,
 146, 148, 149–150, 151, 152, 153, 256
- Piao, Y. X., 286, 303, 286, 303
 Piao, Y., 98, 120, 98, 121, 178, 202, 285, 303
 Piirto, J., 233, 234, 244
 Pinar, W. F., 52, 62
 Pivik, J., 69, 91
 Podgorecki, A., 19, 31
 Pok, T., 42, 51, 62
 Poon-McBrayer, K. F., 84, 86, 91, 106, 121, 260,
 264, 251, 263, 267, 279, 280, 286, 287, 301,
 295, 303, 307, 320, 355
 Positive interdependence, 298
 Positive reinforcement, 183, 185–186, 196, 199,
 332, 333–334, 342, 419, 420
 Postiglione, G. A., 435, 456
 Potts, P., 76, 91
 Powell, N. J., 337, 355
 Power relations, 35, 36, 43, 45, 51–52, 56, 479,
 483
 Pressley, M., 372, 393
 Problem
 representation, 378–379, 383, 384
 solving, 141, 179, 214, 227, 233, 235, 238,
 268, 296, 339, 344, 374, 377–379, 381,
 383–384, 386, 389, 461
 Pun, S. H., 311, 356
 Pyfer, J., 130, 131, 132, 133, 143, 152, 153
- Qian, M., 479, 485
 Qingxia, D., 47, 63
 Quah, M. M., 314, 320, 355
 Quinn, M. M., 325, 332, 355
- Racism, 47, 52–54, 58, 226, 450
 Radical
 phonetic, 370–372
 semantic, 370–372
 Rakow, T., 23, 29
 Ramesh, M., 42, 43, 62
 Rashotte, C., 368, 394
 Rasmussen, M., 147, 155
 Rawal, N., 68, 69, 72, 91
 Recorded books, 266, 270
 Reis, S. M., 206, 244
 Reiter, S., 109, 121
 Relativity, 478

- Ren, 475, 476–477
 Ren cai, 207
 Renzulli, J. S., 206, 244
 Report of Education Statistics, 109, 112, 121
 Reschly, D., 362, 390
 Resource
 schools, 112, 113
 teacher, 78, 106, 261–262, 265–266, 271, 275,
 402–404, 405, 406, 409, 410, 411, 415,
 416, 417, 419, 420, 421, 424, 426, 427–
 428, 429
 Retinal detachment, 253, 274
 Retinitis pigmentosa, 252, 253, 278
 Revenge, 468, 471, 472
 Reyes, J. A., 10, 29
 Reyhner, J., 47, 62
 Reynell, J., 161, 202
 Reynolds, W. M., 52, 62
 Rhyu, S., 221, 242
 Richek, M. A., 366, 373, 374, 375, 376, 393
 Richey, D., 98, 120, 364, 393
 Riddoch, J. V., 298, 303
 Rimm, S. B., 206, 208, 239, 241, 243
 Rivera, D. P., 379, 389
 Robinson, N. M., 218, 244
 Roeder, E. W., 111, 121
 Rogers, B., 460, 463, 485
 Rogers, C. R., 446, 447, 456, 465, 466, 485
 Rohlen, T., 7, 31
 Roid, G. H., 360, 393
 Role of principal & teachers, 19, 20, 256, 420,
 446, 475, 478
 Rolffhus, E. L., 360, 394
 Romano, J. L., 447, 454
 Romanowski, M. H., 219, 220, 244
 Rose, E., 368, 394
 Rote learning, 10, 21, 25, 339, 438
 Rudduck, J., 461, 465, 484
 Rudowicz, E., 207, 244, 246
 Russell, J. A., 319, 356
 Rutherford, R. B. J., 325, 332, 355
 Rutherford, S., 40, 41, 62
 Ryan, B. P., 160, 201
 Ryan, S., 80, 92, 287, 303
 Sachs, J., 184, 202
 Saladin, K. S., 250, 280
 Salend, S. J., 383, 393, 462, 485
 Salili, F., 14, 29, 12, 13, 14, 15, 31, 209, 243
 Salvia, J., 381, 393
 Sanchez-Burks, J., 9, 10, 31
 Sandhu, D. S., 452, 456
 Santrock, J. W., 216, 244
 Schaller, J., 314, 324, 357
 Schechter, S. R., 46, 62
 Schoenbrodt, L., 324, 356
 Schofield, J. W., 50, 62
 School policy, 83, 222, 225, 334, 408, 416, 417–
 418
 Schulte, A., 385, 392
 Schumaker, J., 180, 201
 Schumaker, J. B., 297, 302, 384, 390, 376, 393
 Schwartz, D., 310, 311, 356
 Scott, C. M., 369, 393
 Scott, I., 439, 456
 Scruggs, T. E., 180, 181, 202, 263, 280
 Sears, D. O., 47, 61
 Seating arrangement, 151, 328, 330, 419, 463
 Seeking
 attention, 310, 323–333, 468, 471–472
 power, 468, 471–472
 Selfconcept, 145
 Selikowitz, M., 313, 356
 Severe language and/or hearing disabilities, 160,
 168, 184, 195, 201
 Sharp, P., 186, 202
 Sharpe, M. E., 72, 91
 Shatschneider, C., 368, 390
 Shaughnessy, M. F., 214, 221, 244
 Shaywitz, B. A., 385, 392
 Shaywitz, S. E., 385, 392
 Shek, D. T. L., 209, 245, 315, 316, 356
 Shen, W. W., 312, 314, 315, 353
 Sheng, V., 70, 91
 Sherrill, C., 131, 132, 137, 143, 155
 Shi, J., 208, 211, 212, 227, 229, 245
 Shu, H., 370, 372, 393
 Siegel, L. S., 385, 393
 Silbert, J., 366, 372, 390
 Silliman, E., 162, 202

- Singapore, xiii, xiv, 6, 7, 9–10, 35, 36, 39, 41, 43, 44, 50, 51, 57, 97, 103, 111, 285, 307, 318, 340, 400, 431, 435, 436, 447
- Silverman, L. K., 214, 216, 245
- Simonsick, E. M., 144, 155
- Sin, K. F., 81, 82, 83, 90, 399, 429
- Siok, W. T., 370, 393
- Siu, C. M. Y., 16, 30
- Sjöholm, F. 62
- Skills,
 - generic, 267
 - transferable, 275
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., 46, 62
- Slattery, P., 52, 62
- Slee, R., 69, 91
- Sloan, J. M., 324, 356
- Slotboom, A. M., 25, 32
- Smith, G. G., 20, 31
- Social
 - aspect, 135, 260, 463, 464
 - behaviors, 233, 314, 465, 476, 483
 - discipline, 459, 467, 469, 470, 480, 483
 - interaction, 118, 220, 261, 294, 317, 360, 403, 406, 426, 427, 428
- Song, S. R., 210, 243
- Song, Y. M., 210, 243
- Soong, W.-T., 310, 354, 310, 357
- Sorenson, B., 131, 154
- Southworth, G., 408, 429
- Special
 - education, 67–68, 70, 72, 74, 76–82, 86–92
 - schools, x–xi, 67, 71, 73, 75, 80, 82, 84–85, 86–87, 89, 95, 99, 101, 111–115, 136, 138, 139–140, 211, 221, 227, 259, 260, 261, 271, 275, 286, 291, 292, 295, 296, 299, 300, 364, 405, 423, 446
- Specific language impairment, 157–159, 160–162, 179, 182, 183, 185, 187, 188, 193, 198, 199
- Spinks, J. A., 317, 356, 370, 393
- SSTA Research Report, 144, 155
- St. George's University of London, 289, 303
- Stanovich, K. E., 189, 202, 362, 393
- State Council, 98, 121, 364, 393
- Statistics Bureau 2006 Schools for the blind, the deaf and the otherwise handicapped, 111, 121
- Statistics Singapore, 103, 121
- Stereotypic mannerisms, 256
- Sternberg, R. J., 18, 30, 206, 218, 245, 206, 218, 246
- Sternberg, R., 385, 393
- Stevenson, H. W., 18, 23, 25, 31, 210, 213, 228, 245
- Stokes, S. F., 159, 201, 159, 202
- Stone, C., 184, 200
- Stone, J., 256, 257, 279
- Stone, K. M., 206, 210, 245
- Strogatz, S. H., 47, 58
- Student
 - centered learning, 464
 - support team, 115, 364
- Style
 - grasshopper, 378
 - inchworm, 378
- Subaverage intellectual ability, 291
- Sue, D. W., 452, 456
- Summerfield, A., 175, 202
- Sun, L. K., 479, 485
- Support strategies, 283, 293, 294
- Suvannus, S., 287, 303
- Swain, M., 46, 51, 60
- Swanson, H. L., 378, 394
- Swanwick, R., 176, 201
- Sweeting, A., 438, 456
- Swisher, 128, 154
- Tac, L. V., 80, 92, 287, 303
- Tachimori, H., 309, 310, 355
- Tahir, A., 43, 61
- Taiwan, x–xii, xiii, 5, 6, 7, 10, 18, 24, 40, 70, 136, 142, 205, 209–210, 213, 217, 220, 221, 223, 228, 230, 237, 238, 239, 240, 263, 284, 287, 307, 310, 311, 315, 316, 318, 431, 435, 436, 447
- Tai, Y. C., 370, 393
- Takaki, R., 452, 456
- Takeda, S., 168, 201
- Takeuchi, D., 308, 310, 354
- Talmor, R., 109, 121
- Tam, Y. H., 296, 301
- Tan, C. B., 45, 62

- Tan, L. H., 317, 356, 370, 371, 393
 Tang, C., 7, 31
 Tang, F. L. Y., 315, 316, 356
 Tannenbaum, A. J., 230, 233, 240, 245
 Tao, 477–478, 483
 Taoism, 38–40, 459, 475, 477, 481, 483
 Tatum, B., 53, 54, 62
 Taubman, P. M., 52, 62
 Taylor, C., 43, 46, 47, 50, 63
 Taylor, R. L., 365, 393
 Teacher
 attitudes, 84, 86, 129, 139, 140, 146, 174, 263
 education, 26, 129, 152, 413, 414, 415, 423, 425, 427–428
 effectiveness training, 459, 467, 469, 473, 480
 orientation, 467, 469, 470, 480
 support and perceptions, 13, 78, 186, 226
 Teaching
 approaches, xiv, 19, 113, 150, 402, 411
 cooperative and co-teaching, x, 113, 150, 399, 400, 401, 402–404, 410, 418, 419, 420, 422, 425, 427, 428, 429
 parallel, 150, 402
 skills and teacher education, 26, 129, 152, 413, 414, 415, 423, 425, 427–428
 Thailand, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42–43, 50, 66, 71, 74, 75, 80–81, 88, 97, 100, 103, 107, 111, 287
 The Open University of Hong Kong, 149, 155
 Thousand, J. S., 70, 80, 88, 92, 143, 144, 155, 287, 303
 Three plus one step, 340–341
 Thurlow, M. L., 96, 121
 Thuy, N. T. M., 287, 303
 Tian cai, 207
 Tilstone, C., 216, 245
 Timmons, V., 68, 91
 Tomlinson, J., 36, 63
 Tong, C. L., 81, 82, 83, 90
 Tong, N., 292, 303
 Topping, K., 465, 485
 Torgesen, J., 368, 394
 Torgensen, J. K., 385, 392
 Torres, C. A., 4, 31
 Torres, R. D., 44, 60
 Toscano, R. M., 166, 202
 Townend, J., 372, 394
 Trabasso, T., 190, 202
 Triad of impairments, 317–318, 321
 Tsai, D. M., 238, 245
 Tsang, A., 175, 203
 Tsang, S. K. M., 315, 316, 356
 Tsang, S. M., 366, 391
 Tsang, W. K., 8, 16, 17, 31
 Tse, Ka-on Andy, 209, 244
 Tse, L., 47, 61
 Tse, S. K., 370, 371, 394
 Tsou, K.-S., 312, 314, 315, 353
 Tsuchido, R., 317, 354
 Tsui, M., 308, 356
 Tsung, L., 47, 63
 Tu, C.-C., 311, 312, 315, 354
 Tuen, J. T-h., 97, 121
 Tung, P., 8, 16, 17, 31
 Tunnel vision, 253, 265
 Tympanometry, 172
 U.S. Department of Education, 360, 364, 394
 U.S. Dept. of Education, 307, 356
 Uditsky, B., 68, 69, 92
 Underachievement, 225, 226, 385
 UNESCO, 45, 56, 63, 66, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 79, 82, 83, 92, 99, 104, 107, 108, 110, 121
 UNESCO Bangkok, 108, 121
 UNESCO-UIS/OECD, 42, 63
 U.S. Department of Labor, 130, 155
 Uttal, D. H., 22, 28
 Vaughn, S., 362, 390, 362, 386, 394
 Verna, M. A., 230, 244
 Vietnam, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 51, 63, 64, 97, 99, 100, 103, 107
 Villa, R. A., 70, 80, 88, 92, 143, 144, 155, 287, 303
 Visual
 acuity, 250, 253, 255, 262, 277, 278
 cues, 175, 260, 268, 332, 337, 339, 344
 errors, 367
 field, 250, 253, 255, 277, 278
 impairment, 75, 76, 87, 102, 106, 111, 139, 145, 148–149, 151, 249, 250, 251, 252,

- 253, 255–256, 257–258, 259–260, 261,
263–266, 267–269, 270, 271, 273, 274,
275, 276, 277, 318, 364, 462
motor coordination, 274
Voice synthesizers, 268
Voltz, D. L., 69, 92
Vygotzky, L. S., 46, 63, 186, 202
- Wagner, P., 463, 485
Wagner, R., 368, 394
Wan, X. S., 22, 32
Wang, D. B., 308, 356
Wang, H. B., 286, 303
Wang, K., 22, 32
Wang, L., 310, 311, 353
Wang, M. C., 326, 356
Wang, M., 288, 303
Wang, W.-T., 315, 353
Wang, X.-M., 315, 353
Wang, Y., 168, 201
Ward, J., 96, 109, 121
Waston, S., 145, 155
Watkins, C., 460, 463, 485
Watkins, D. A., xv, xvi, 11, 28, 6, 11, 18, 21, 32,
128, 155, 186, 200
Watkins, D., 463, 464, 484
Waugh, R. F., 298, 303
Waxer, P. H., 447, 456
Wei, B. G., 22, 32
Wei, W., 175, 203
Wei, Z. T., 479, 485
Weill, C., 287, 303
Weill, D., 80, 92
Weinberg, R. S., 129, 155
Weiner, B., 13, 32
Weiner, C., 20, 32
Weiss, L. G., 360, 394
Wellman, D., 53, 63
West, M., 408, 429
Westwood, P., 74, 92, 110, 119, 108, 121, 263,
280
White, M., 441, 456
Whole
person, 431, 437–438, 440, 446, 454, 465,
476, 481
school, ix–x, xv, 68, 77–78, 86, 88, 95, 102,
104–107, 118, 225, 316, 363–364, 386,
399, 400, 401, 405, 407, 409, 411, 412,
415, 422, 423–424, 429, 431, 437–438,
439, 440, 446, 454
school approach, ix–x, xv, 68, 77–78, 86, 88,
95, 102, 106–107, 118, 316, 363–364, 386,
399, 400, 407, 409, 411, 422, 423–424,
429, 431, 437–439, 446, 454
schooling, 95, 104
Whole school approach,
language, natural, 183, 193
language, structured, 184, 185, 187, 197
Whole Schooling Consortium, 104, 121
Widmeyer, W. N., 129, 154
Williams, K. T., 360, 394
Williams, P. E., 360, 394
Wilson, K. M., 378, 394
Wing, L., 316, 317, 318, 321, 324, 356
Wolf, M., 368, 394
Wong, A., 52, 53, 63, 159, 201
Wong, C.-C., 312, 314, 315, 353
Wong, D., 77, 92, 110, 120, 308, 311, 355
Wong, D. K. P., 321, 356
Wong, D. S. W., 465, 485
Wong, G., 108, 121
Wong, J., 17, 29
Wong, R., 175, 203
Wong, R. Y. L., 46, 61
Wong, V., 314, 353, 316, 356
Wong, W. L., 371, 391
Wong, Y., 175, 203
Wood, F. B., 385, 392
Woolfolk, A., 232, 245
Word identification in word family, 371
World Bank, 50, 63, 81, 82, 92
World Development Indicators, 41, 43, 44, 63
World Health Organization, 250, 280
Wright, L., 206, 241
Wu, D. Y. H., 308, 356
Wu, R., 220, 221, 223, 241
Wu, W. T., 210, 213, 214, 223, 228, 238, 245
Xiang, Y., 288, 303
Xiong, J., 317, 356

- Xu, B., 75, 92
 Xu, J., 288, 303
 Xu, S., 47, 63
 Xu, X., 314, 353
 Xu, Y., 310, 311, 356

 Yan, P. W., 15, 19, 32
 Yan, W., 381, 390
 Yang, C. K., 433, 456
 Yang, H.-J., 310, 354, 310, 357
 Yang, H. L., 286, 303
 Yang, K. N., 314, 324, 357
 Yang, K. S., 437, 456
 Yang, P.-C., 311, 312, 315, 354, 314, 357
 Yap, F., 36, 63
 Yau, H., 175, 203
 Ye, L. Y., 286, 303
 Yeh, C., 452, 456
 Yeo, D., 378, 391
 Yeun Y. M., 399, 429
 Yeung, P., 258, 280
 Yik, M. S. M., 319, 356
 Yin, P. X., 383, 384, 394
 Yip, N. S. Y., 81, 82, 83, 90, 399, 429
 Yiu, Y. W., 258, 280
 Yong cai, 207
 Yoon, C.-H., 218, 243
 Yoon, Y.-H., 218, 243
 Yoshinaga-itano, 128, 155
 Young, C. L., 362, 385, 391
 Ysseldyke, J. E., 96, 121
 Yu, G.-H., 315, 353
 Yu, L., 168, 203, 286, 303
 Yuan, X., 98, 121
 Yue, X.-D., 207, 245, 207, 246
 Yuen, A. H. K., 20, 32
 Yuen, D.-W. D., 238, 246
 Yuen, M., 110, 119, 108, 121, 263, 280
 Yung, K. K., 287, 291, 292, 303

 Ze, J., 309, 310, 355
 Zeng, K., 23, 24, 32
 Zha, Z., 208, 211, 212, 227, 229, 245
 Zhang, D., 286, 303
 Zhang, H., 370, 392
 Zhang, J., 128, 139, 140, 142, 145, 154, 139, 155
 Zhang, L. F., 206, 218, 246
 Zhang, R., 218, 246
 Zhang, S., 168, 203
 Zhang, X. Q., 22, 32
 Zhang, Y., 25, 32
 Zhang, Z., 9, 29
 Zhao, C., 168, 203
 Zhao, S., 9, 10, 31
 Zhao, X., 315, 353
 Zhonghua min guo te shu jiao yu xue hui., 213,
 228, 230, 238, 246
 Zhou, Z., 316, 317, 318, 353
 Zigmund, N., 142, 155

 王淑葵, 220, 246
 李皓金瑜, 219, 246
 唐璽惠, 239, 246
 張蓓莉, 239, 246
 陳維鄂, 220, 222, 246
 馮漢柱教育基金, 228, 246
 楊熾均, 237, 246
 廖永, 239, 246
 劉鳳鸞, 237, 246
 錢志亮, 155