

Vision, Task, and Hope: The Hong Kong Education Reform Movement in the 21st Century

David W. Chan

Department of Educational Psychology

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

The Hong Kong education reform movement is discussed in light of our shared vision, our past failed attempts, the tasks ahead, and our hope in talent development for all learners. It is believed that the issues of the centrality of the learner, equity, excellence, multiple talents, and the learning society bear directly on our reform measures. An evolutionary approach that maximizes success is suggested, ensuring the collaboration among learners, practitioners in schools, parents and other stakeholders, the respect for diversity and choice, the equitable pursuit of excellence, the programming for talent development for all students, and the promotion of educational research that informs practice.

Key words: education reform; talent development; Hong Kong

It has been widely recognized among educators in Hong Kong that our education is in trouble, and has been for many, many years since British

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to David W. Chan, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong. Email: davidchan@cuhk.edu.hk

colonial times. Regardless of the source, educators are pressured to react to emergent problems and issues with one after another quick-fix reform measures that often raise hopes without delivering useful and enduring consequences (Chan, 1998b). Without confronting basic assumptions about education, aims, missions, schooling, learning, and instruction, practitioners in schools are doing as well as can be expected, using methods and materials from schooling in their youth. But our knowledge base has changed, our learner characteristics have changed, and society has changed. We need to shift from a reactive to a proactive mode of operation, reexamine our goals and purposes, and reinvent our education system to meet new challenges in the 21st century.

At this juncture, I am reminded of a sign on the wall of a church in England that reads,

*“A vision without a task is but a dream,
A task without a vision is drudgery,
A vision and a task are the hope of the world.”*

The vision, the task, and the hope for the future of Hong Kong education are precisely the concerns of the current education reform movement. Policy makers, educators, practitioners in schools, and parents in the community must come together to shape a vision of education for our children, and develop tasks and procedures to realize and sustain that vision.

Education for Our Children: Do We Share a Vision?

The challenges confronting Hong Kong education today are as formidable as they have ever been. The expectations we hold for what education can do for our children are probably higher, as our children are going to face ever more difficult personal, career, and social challenges in the context of expanding knowledge and technology. We need high-quality education for our children, as our society increasingly needs creative thinkers and problem solvers. Practically everyone has a stake in schools. Parents would like their children to lead happy and successful lives. Employers and institutes of higher learning would like to have access to people who are competent,

creative, and effective in their work and in their educational pursuits. Political leaders would like to have good and productive citizens who contribute to a healthy economy, a high quality of life, and respect for the values and institutions in a democracy. Thus, failure in our education system will have far-reaching consequences that are not only personal and local but also societal and global.

While recognizing the importance of knowledge and competence, we must not ignore the need to promote physical fitness and prosocial behaviors, and to nurture talent, imagination, critical thinking, and ethical conduct among all our children and youths. The notion that education should play an important role in the all-round or holistic growth and development of students is not novel. The ancient Chinese saying of all-round development of students in the domains of ethics, intellect, physique, social skills and esthetics (*de, zhi, ti, qun, mei*) corresponds precisely with the suggested overall aims of education in the consultation document “Review of Education System: Reform Proposals” by the Education Commission (2000). The Education Commission (2000) further defines the desirable outcomes of such education or all-round development of students. Ideally, our children will become individuals who are capable of life-long learning (corresponding to the Chinese saying of “*Huo dao lao, xue dao lao*”), critical and creative, resilient to stressors and adapting to changes, gregarious and prosocial, and with societal and worldly concerns. The educational priorities will be to enable our students to “enjoy learning, enhancing their effectiveness in communication and developing their creativity and sense of commitment” (p. 5). Specifically, lifelong learning appears to have provided solutions to important concerns that Hong Kong (and any government in the 21st century) has to address, namely, to increase its economic potential, to make its political arrangement more equitable, just and inclusive, and to offer more avenues for self-improvement and personal development to all its citizens (Aspin & Chapman, 2000).

In this regard, it is inconceivable that these noble aims will meet with opposition. Indeed, if there are differences of view, the differences might

be more related to how these aims can be translated into practical realities, the priorities of implementation of these aims, and how the achievement of these aims can be validly and reliably assessed. In other words, what is at issue is the question of how we can ensure that our dream of education does not remain a dream, but can be turned into our vision of education.

Nonetheless, we must not be naive about the politics, personalities, and financial issues that often supersede the intended noble pedagogical aims. Such forces might arouse defenses of vested interests, bias the interpretation of aims, and result in conflicts, concessions, and compromises that create hurdles to our tasks and prevent our dream to become our vision.

“Failed” Attempts: Have We Learned to Avoid Doing More of the Same Tasks?

In the seemingly endless discussion about education reform movement in Hong Kong since the 1980s as reactions to the series of reports by the Education Commission, numerous reform measures have been attempted for different components of our complex education system (Education Commission, 1984, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1995, 1996). These changes are intended to meet the educational needs of our children of the time. Indeed, the early attempts were largely concerned with expanding educational opportunities for our children. The more recent attempts however have focused on the quality of education, and included attempts to meet the increasingly diverse abilities and needs of our students, to promote independent thinking and creativity in our students, and to reverse the lowering of student academic performance especially in language arts. However, the implementation of these reform measures has not gone unchallenged, and great resistance has been reported by practitioners in schools (e.g., Morris et al., 1996; Pang, 1998). If these attempts have not been very successful, despite that there are claims to the contrary, we should be able to learn from our failures (e.g., Lo et al., 1997). We should remind ourselves that doing the right things is important, and doing things right is equally important.

For the former, we need to rethink our goals and purposes; for the latter, we need to reexamine our strategies.

One example is the changes in the use of more flexible curriculum materials and tailoring as in target oriented curriculum, and the corresponding criterion-referenced rather than norm-referenced testing and assessment standards and procedures initiated as target and target related assessment in 1990 (Education Commission, 1990; Education Department, 1994; Morris et al., 1996). However, it has been said that inadequate preparation and ineffective use of materials on the part of teachers and inadequate support from the government have negated any potential value that these new measures might have for meeting the diverse abilities and needs of students.

Another example is provided by the changes in school governance started by the Hong Kong Government Education Department in 1991 as the school management initiative that promotes staff appraisal and school-based management (Education Commission, 1996). However, it has been said that schools are reluctant to participate in the scheme, as the extent to which educational policy is decentralized is limited (Ho, 1997; Pang, 1998). True independent governance can perhaps be only achieved by switching to the direct subsidy scheme or even the private school scheme. Further, the new emphasis on the need for schools to demonstrate effectiveness or value-addedness through improved student examination results or improved banding of students might put pressure on schools to expand the use of compensatory learning models that have so far contributed to the drilling for examinations and the lowering of academic standards.

Still, another example is provided by the changes suggested for the teaching profession, as teachers are in one way or another blamed for the increasingly severe behavioral problems of students in school, and the lowering of academic standards (e.g., Lee, 1991). Teachers' roles and responsibilities are redefined to emphasize the nurturing of the whole person development of the students as in the whole school approach to guidance and counseling (Education Commission, 1990). On the other hand, teachers' competence is questioned as in the revised certification requirements and the implemen-

tation of benchmarking examinations for language teachers, and eventually for all teachers (Education Commission, 1995).

If we examine these aborted, half-accomplished or failed attempts, one common characteristic does seem to emerge. These past and current reform initiatives invariably follow the top-down patterns of school organization that have dominated our schools. Policy-makers have yet to realize that the tinkering with single components of our complex education system at different times might generate great resistance from other stakeholders and give only the appearance of school improvement rather than the real and enduring changes that are desperately sought after by educators and school reformers (Kaufman, 1993). Inevitably, visionless tasks are doomed to be perceived as drudgery by teachers, administrators, and practitioners in schools.

The Tasks Ahead: How Should We Interpret Our Reform Principles?

Despite the ponderous rhetoric about education reform and the possibly endless lists of noble goals, we need to establish our shared vision to give directions to our tasks, and an effective reform process with well accepted strategies that overcome our recorded history of failed attempts. In this connection, the Education Commission (2000) has outlined five principles of reform. These principles emphasize the centrality of the learner (student-focused), the concern with equity (no-loser), the concern with excellence (quality), the diversity of learning modes to nurture multiple abilities (life-wide learning), and the importance of lifelong learning made possible by collaboration with different sectors of the community (society-wide mobilization). The Education Commission (2000) also targets certain key areas or components for reform. These key components include: Reforming the curricula, improving the assessment mechanisms, removing obstacles to learning in the system, reforming the university admission system, increasing post-secondary learning opportunities, and formulating resource strategy.

In formulating our tasks of reform, again, we must not be naive about the politics, personalities, and financial issues, which might create conflicts and power struggles among different parties or stakeholders, and might bring about actions that militate against well-intended reform measures. While the principles suggested by the Education Commission (2000) appear humanist, humanitarian, and egalitarian in origin, their interpretations have often been tempered with economic, enterprising, and performance-based or outcome-oriented concerns due to the rise of consumerism and the notion of accountability. Thus, it is imperative that we should fully understand our reform principles and their underlying rationales, as diametrically opposed views and interpretations might inadvertently prescribe inconsistent and possibly contradictory reform measures. In this connection, the careful consideration of the reform principles as they are applied to different reform areas is in order.

The learner-centered approach and the act of learning

The “student-focused” principle reminds us that we are teaching learners, not merely teaching subjects or conveying content information. The educational experiences we provide for learners will be more complete, responsive, and useful, if we plan with the big picture in mind — what our children and youths have to know and be able to do in tomorrow’s world. Students not only have to learn traditional academic subject matters, but they also have to learn how academic subjects relate to knowing themselves as human beings. They have to learn how to apply knowledge, to act in moral and ethical ways, to take responsibility for social relationships and their own future, and to learn with their own unique styles and talents. Specifically, a truly student-focused orientation always leads to the consideration of a learner-centered approach in which the learner controls, directs, and regulates his or her own learning. Thus, the learner becomes an autonomous learner. However, the learner is only one component in the act of learning, which should be the primary consideration in any change process. Any

reform measures must address the crucial question of how we can improve the act of learning.

An act of learning takes place when a learner, a teacher, and the material to be learned (curriculum) interact (Renzulli, 1992). When considering the act of learning, we must consider the learner's abilities, achievement level in the specific domain of study, interests in the topic, preferred learning styles, and how extant interests or new interests can be enhanced. To meet the learner's needs, we must consider the teacher's knowledge on the subject, pedagogical techniques, and passion for the subject. The curriculum also has to be considered in terms of its structure, content, and method, and how it appeals to the learner. In the interaction of the three components, teachers can create effective learning environments by balancing structured teaching with less structured but personalized experiences based on student interests and preferred learning styles for classroom activities. In the context of enriched teaching and learning, students' motivation and enjoyment of learning will correspondingly increase when they can participate in deciding what they will learn and how they will pursue their interested topics, and when at least a part of the prescribed curriculum is replaced by self-selected, open-ended real-world problems that allow students to assume roles as first-hand investigators individually or in small groups (Renzulli, 1994). Thus, the "student-focused" principle interpreted in relation to the act of learning in the learning environment bears directly on curriculum reform.

Equity and "you jiao wu lei"

The "no-loser" principle reminds us that no student really chooses failure. All students are motivated to learn. They just may not be motivated to learn what the school wants them to learn. We have not found nor used the proper motivators and incentives for learners who have been punished by the system. Motivational content and responsive incentives must therefore become a part of our reform measures for educational design and development. To find out why students who could be normal achieving become at-risk stu-

dents might eventually help us prevent failure and bring us closer to the educational ideal of “*you jiao wu lei*” or the provision of equitable opportunities to pursue learning for all students.

In reality, Hong Kong is compromised by large numbers of children who are at risk of academic and social failure when they enter school, and whose risk status is exacerbated by ineffective schooling. Such risk factors include poverty, developmental delays, poor physical and mental health, biological and psychological trauma, family indifference, domestic violence, substance abuse, and family or parental stress and dysfunction. Obtaining successful education outcomes for at-risk students will require restructuring schooling and our education system to take into account risk factors that are amenable to education accommodations, and to promote protective factors that render students less vulnerable to risk factors. Schools have to cater for a diverse set of learners with varying needs in a flexible manner. Non-achieving and underachieving students need to be provided with ample educational opportunities within and outside the mainstream education system, and school dropouts need to be provided with pathways to pursue their learning or to re-enter our mainstream education system.

From a slightly different perspective, we also need to ask ourselves whether we judge our students on the basis of performance restricted only to academic, cognitive or linguistic-logical domains. Consequently, students who do not perform desirably but are talented in other domains might be deprived of opportunities to realize their potential, and might even be regarded as “losers” in the education system. Thus, the “no-loser” principle with the implied concern for equity bears directly on our reforming of the mechanisms of assessment, and highlights the importance of designing programs for reversing underachievement (e.g., Chan, 1999b).

Excellence and “*yin cai shi jiao*”

The “quality” principle helps ensure that all students should achieve an accepted level of basic knowledge and minimum competence (*bao-di*, not *bu-di* as in compensatory education or remedial work), and be allowed to pur-

sue excellence within their capabilities (*ba-jian*). All students have the right to an equal opportunity to receive a quality educational experience, although such an experience should not be interpreted to be the same experience.

Quality in contemporary society has often been interpreted from a managerial perspective, and expressed in economic terms such as efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, and performance. Specifically, accountability represents the assurance of quality through the introduction of a set of performance indicators, which, in the case of quality education, are at best only partial indicators of good learning. It should be noted that how we can achieve quality in the act of learning remains the most important question that needs to be carefully addressed in education reform.

Quality teaching and learning may be inferred to occur when students develop individual and social competence through interacting with the school or learning environments, and when they develop lifelong learning orientations through articulating extended horizons of learning that impact on global issues. Since knowledge is not an absolute entity but is always evolving, quality learning needs to be conceived as a personal meaning process that empowers the students and enables them to undergo an ongoing transformation in their professional development throughout life. This transformational view of learning incorporates the notion of autonomous, self directed and authentic learning that supports lifelong learning. Students are expected to take responsibility for their learning, develop autonomously, take risks, and search for appropriate knowledge to solve problems. Thus, the “quality” principle at the individual level advocates the development of talents and realization of potential for all students through teaching to their strengths, interests, talents, and styles (Chan, in press-b).

Multiple talents

The “life-wide learning” principle should not be interpreted as representing an intention to replace the focus on traditional academic achievement. Rather, it can be interpreted as an emphasis on the development of a broader spectrum of the multiple potentials of young people, including, but not restrict-

ing to, those related to the traditional academic disciplines. The concept of multiple talents is not novel, and dates back to ancient Chinese history (Chan, 1998a). Currently, there are multiple ways to define multiple talents, ranging from 180 distinct abilities in Guilford's structure of intellect model (Guilford, 1983) to 3 different types of analytic, synthetic, and practical giftedness in Sternberg's triarchic model (Sternberg, 1997). A more manageable set of differentiated talent domains more related to the five domains of *de*, *zhi*, *ti*, *qun*, and *mei* (ethics, intellect, physique, social skills, and esthetics) is the seven intelligences proposed by Gardner (1983), which include verbal-linguistic, logical-mathematical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, musical, intrapersonal, and interpersonal domains. The list of intelligences is expanding into the naturalist and spiritual domains.

Through broadening the conception of talents beyond the academic focus prevalent in schools, students of all levels of achievement and ability should be helped to identify and develop their specific aptitudes and talents within and outside the classroom. However, we must recognize that talent identification is a long-term process. The process depends on the administration of appropriate assessment instruments and provision of challenging learning activities or experiences in which teachers and others provide feedback that helps students to recognize and understand the nature of their talents, and to commit themselves to the long-term development of these talents. Thus, the "life-wide learning" principle comes full circle to the all-round development of students in the five domains of ethics, intellect, physique, social skills, and esthetics through learning within and beyond the regular classroom.

The learning society

The "society-wide mobilization" principle asserts the importance of contributions from all sectors of the society to the education of our children. It is for the learner's best interests to take responsibility for his or her own learning. However, realistically, the decision of the learner in the choices of what, when, where, and how to learn are inevitably influenced by the diverse in-

terests and needs of different stakeholders. Consequently, concerted collaborative efforts toward reform measures cannot be readily achieved unless learners, practitioners in schools, parents, and other stakeholders have a shared vision of education, advocate lifelong learning, and recognize their changing roles in education.

Lifelong learning or learning throughout life is a major challenge for all governments, policy-makers, and educators. Lifelong learning is now increasingly seen as fundamental to bringing about the achievement of a learning society, which should become the overall aim of all education reform. While a learning society might be conceptualized somewhat differently by different educators at the philosophical level (e.g., Wain, 2000), it is generally believed that a learning society will help promote social inclusiveness and democratic understanding and activity, economic progress and development, personal development and fulfillment, and help realize the aim of lifelong learning for all (Aspin & Chapman, 2000).

To build a learning society, a broad range of advanced level learning experiences and higher order thinking skills should be integrated into curricular areas that impact on global issues. For example, ethical and moral principles, and philosophical analysis enable students to understand and deal effectively with the complex challenges of human existence. Science, medicine, technology, and engineering enable students to solve the problems of hunger, disease, and the destruction of our environment. Physical fitness and personal fulfillment enable students to lead physically and mentally healthy lives. Leadership, social and behavioral sciences, and organizational behaviors enable our students to pursue justice and equality for all people, and celebrate their own talents and those of others. Arts, culture, and entertainment enable students to enhance and celebrate the creative expressions that give joy and meaning to life. Learning may occur within the regular classroom, but may also occur through such processes as mentoring arrangements, work shadowing and training packages (e.g., Chan, 1999a).

Our Hope: How Should We Maximize Our Chance of Success?

Successful reform moves us toward a learning society, and it demands nothing less than a substantial reappraisal of the aims, resources, and provisions of our education system and schooling, and a major reorientation of the direction toward the availability of opportunities for all to secure access to lifelong learning as well as to develop the broadest and richest experiences in the pursuit of excellence and the realization of potential. Given that we are certain that we are doing the right things, we need to ensure that we will do things right. The following strategies might be helpful in maximizing our chance of achieving success in this wave of education reform: (1) collaborating for systemic changes; (2) respecting diversity and choice; (3) allowing an equitable pursuit of excellence; (4) programming for talent development for all; and (5) promoting educational research that informs practice.

Collaborating for systemic and evolutionary changes

Our past failed attempts and the disillusionment with single component tinkering of our complex education system at different times have led to a refocusing of changes on the entire education system or systemic change (Smith & O'Day, 1990). Since a change in one part of the system necessarily requires corresponding changes or adjustments in other parts, reform measures need to be comprehensive and accommodating.

Consequently, policy makers need to relinquish the mindsets that they know best and have all the right answers. They have to recognize that changes do not proceed by a linear progression, but should be conceptualized as an evolving process. Thus, policy makers need to develop a plan that incorporates the best of top-down and bottom-up approaches. They need to initiate a gentle and evolutionary approach to change, with which practitioners and school personnel can live and grow, and by which practitioners do not feel threatened. On the other hand, practitioners in school need to dispel the myths that they are only observers who receive instructions and guidelines

rather than participants or actors who are able to exert their influences in the change process. Policy makers and practitioners need to collaborate during all stages of the change process by assessing and evaluating local capacity and motivation in connection with the desired changes.

Respecting diversity and choice

With a shared vision, and in the spirit of collaboration, different views and opinions on policies and their implementation from different parties or stakeholders should be the norm rather than the exception. Since the individual has the responsibility for his or her own learning, it is in the learner's best interest to have diversity and choice. Very often, when new procedures are introduced and old procedures abolished, resistance is generated based on the inertia and conflicting interests of different parties or stakeholders. It can be anticipated that resistance will be reduced if adequate and reasonable options or choices are made available. New procedures must create alternatives rather than remove options. These creative options might include different goals defined by different performance indicators, different pathways for achieving such goals, different timeframes, and pacing to accommodate or address local and individual needs.

Allowing an equitable pursuit of excellence

Parallel to the notion of diversity and choice is the notion of equity. Equity is the belief that every child should be provided with equal access and opportunity to learning. However, equal access and opportunity does not mean the same access and opportunity. Specifically, equity should not be interpreted to imply identity of provision or identity of treatment for all students, and should be interpreted as providing experiences available that are uniquely appropriate for each child. Whatever the talent or interest, and whatever the skill or ability, every child will have every opportunity to develop that uniqueness to its fullest extent. Offering a child talented in music and a child talented in science the same experience is not equity. Equity is offering them equal opportunities to pursue their individual goals toward excellence.

Thus, the current discussion on maintaining a standard for knowledge acquisition for all students while allowing them to develop their potential according to their individual abilities, interests and talents (*bao-di* and *ba-jian*) should be viewed in this context of a balance of equity and excellence. Similarly, the issues and charges of elitism, segregation, student banding, ability grouping, and preferred language of instruction should also be viewed and resolved in this context.

Programming for talent development

The similarities between some of the suggested reform measures for our education system or schooling and principles or recommended practices for the education of gifted and talented students are remarkable and compelling. Some of the key ideas, which include the introduction of higher order thinking skills or a thinking curriculum, creativity or creative productivity, product development, independent projects, product and portfolio assessment, flexible instructional grouping, curriculum compacting, and teaching to students' strengths and interests, have been suggested for educating high ability students for decades (e.g., Reis, 1995). Thus, talent development may serve as a model for education reform (Chan, in press-a).

Talent development focuses on the optimal development of each student, and it is believed that each student should be provided with opportunities, resources, and encouragement to aspire to the highest level possible. The goal of talent development is to find ways to develop the talents and special aptitudes of as many students as possible, while recognizing the special needs of highly talented or highly able students for learning experiences at a level and pace appropriate to their abilities. Thus, it is believed, for example, that all students should benefit from higher level thinking, and relevant and real-world experiences.

Exemplary approaches to programming for talent development provide a foundation on which we can build effective practices in schools (e.g., Feldhusen, 1995; Renzulli, 1994; Treffinger, 1997). For example, how best to infuse the teaching of critical and creative thinking into our content in-

struction or key learning areas should become a primary consideration in our programming, and a first step in building a thinking curriculum in Hong Kong.

Promoting research that informs practice

Education reform will bring about changes that follow an evolving process rather than a linear progression. It is a multifaceted and complex task that is frequently unpredictable, as there are no known solutions. Stacy (1990) aptly articulates the nature of the task ahead of us, who share a vision of education for our children,

“Route and destination must be discovered through the journey itself if you wish to travel to new lands...the key to success lies in the creative activity of making new maps” (p. 3).

Nonetheless, as in the metaphor of going on a discovery tour, we need to take risk in choosing judiciously different routes or reform measures, and creatively make new maps as we go along. Our risk-taking behavior highlights our dire need of building a knowledge base to inform us how we are doing. Our best strategy perhaps is to conduct program evaluation studies, action research studies, longitudinal studies, and programmatic research to provide findings as feedback to guide our future educational practices. Through the mutual nourishing of research and practice, we may eventually come to achieve a new hope for the education of our children.

References

- Aspin, D. N., & Chapman, J. D. (2000). Lifelong learning: Concepts and conceptions. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 19*, 2-19.
- Chan, D. W. (1998a). Development of gifted education in Hong Kong. *Gifted Education International, 13*, 150-158.
- Chan, D. W. (1998b). Education reform and special education in Hong Kong: Reflections and concerns. In D. W. Chan (Ed.), *Helping students with learning difficulties* (pp. 3-15). Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Chan, D. W. (1999a). Mentoring students for talent development: Its role in life-long learning. *Educational Research Journal, 14*, 1-12.

- Chan, D. W. (1999b). Reversing underachievement: Can we tap unfulfilled talents in Hong Kong? *Educational Research Journal*, 14, 177-190.
- Chan, D. W. (in press-a). "Education for the gifted" and "talent development": What gifted education can offer education reform in Hong Kong? *Education Journal*.
- Chan, D. W. (in press-b). The TALENT approach: An integrated model for promoting quality education in Hong Kong. *Education Journal*.
- Education Commission (1984). *Education Commission Report No. 1*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government.
- Education Commission (1986). *Education Commission Report No. 2*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government.
- Education Commission (1998). *Education Commission Report No. 3*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government.
- Education Commission (1990). *Education Commission Report No. 4*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government.
- Education Commission (1992). *Education Commission Report No. 5*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government.
- Education Commission (1995). *Education Commission Report No. 6*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government.
- Education Commission (1996). *Education Commission Report No. 7*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government.
- Education Commission (2000). *Review of Education System: Reform Proposals (Consultation Document)*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government.
- Education Department (1994). *General introduction to TOC*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government.
- Feldhusen, J. F. (1995). *Talent identification and development in education*. Sarasota, FL: Center for Creative learning.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Guilford, J. P. (1983). Transformational abilities or functions. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 17, 75-83.
- Ho, S. C. (1997). School-based management as school reform: Taking stock. *Education Journal*, 25(1), 149-161.
- Kaufman, R. (1993). Beyond tinkering: Educational restructuring that will work. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 2, 154-165.

- Lee, W. O. (1991). Student behavioural problems revisited: the need for curriculum re-orientation and values education. In N. Crawford & E. K. P. Hui (Eds.), *The curriculum and behaviour problems in schools: A response to Education Commission Report No. 4* (pp. 7-16). Hong Kong: Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong.
- Lo, L. N. K., Tsang, W. K., Chung, C. M., Chung, Y. P., Sze, M. M., Ho, S. C., & Ho, M. K. (1997). *A survey of the effectiveness of Hong Kong secondary school system. Final report of Earmarked Grant Research Project*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, the Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Morris, P., Adamson, R., Au, M. L., Chan, K. K., Chan, W. Y., Ko, P. Y., Lai, A. W., Lo, M. L., Morris, E., Ng, F. P., Ng, Y. Y., Wong, W. M., & Wong, P. K. (1996). *Target oriented curriculum evaluation project: Interim report*. Hong Kong: In-service Teacher Education Program, Faculty of Education, the University of Hong Kong.
- Pang, N. S. (1998). Should quality school education be a kaizen (improvement) or an innovation? *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 7, 2-12.
- Reis, S. M. (1995). What gifted education can offer the reform movement : Talent development. In J. L. Genshaft, M. Bireley, & C. L. Hollinger (Eds.), *Serving gifted and talented students : A resource for school personnel* (pp. 371-387). Austin, TX : Pro-Ed.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1992). A general theory for the development of creative productivity through the pursuit of ideal acts of learning. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 36, 170-181.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1994). *Schools for talent development: A practical plan for total school improvement*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Smith, M. S., & O'Day, J. (1990). Systemic school reform. In S. H. Fuhrman & B. Malen (Eds.), *The politics of curriculum and testing* (pp. 233-267). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Stacy, R. D. (1990). *Managing the unknowable*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). A triarchic view of giftedness: theory and practice. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 43-53). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Treffinger, D. J. (1997). *Levels of Service (LoS) and programming for talent development in education*. Sarasota, FL: Center for Creative Learning.
- Wain, K. (2000). The learning society: Postmodern politics. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 19, 36-53.