

Creativity in Hong Kong's special schools' music classrooms

Wong, Marina Wai-yee

Published in:
Music Education Research

DOI:
[10.1080/14613808.2022.2038112](https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2022.2038112)

Published: 15/03/2022

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Wong, M. W. (2022). Creativity in Hong Kong's special schools' music classrooms. *Music Education Research*, 24(2), 256-271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2022.2038112>

General rights

Copyright and intellectual property rights for the publications made accessible in HKBU Scholars are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners. In addition to the restrictions prescribed by the Copyright Ordinance of Hong Kong, all users and readers must also observe the following terms of use:

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from HKBU Scholars for the purpose of private study or research
- Users cannot further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- To share publications in HKBU Scholars with others, users are welcome to freely distribute the permanent publication URLs

Creativity in Hong Kong's Special Schools' Music Classrooms

Marina Wai-yee Wong

*Department of Education Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong SAR,
China*

Postal address:

Hong Kong Baptist University,
Dept. of Education Studies,
AAB830, Baptist University Road,
Kowloon Tong, Kowloon,
Hong Kong SAR, China.

Email: marina@hkbu.edu.hk

Marina Wong is an associate professor and the Director of the Doctor of Education Program at Hong Kong Baptist University. She obtained a PhD at the University of British Columbia in Canada. She is involved in teacher education courses in the areas of music education. She has obtained various competitive research and development grants for developing integrated-arts curriculum and inclusive music curriculum for mainstream schools and adapted music curriculum for children with intellectual disabilities in special schools.

Disclosure statement

In accordance with Taylor & Francis policy and my ethical obligation as a researcher, I am reporting that I do not have any financial and/or business interests in any company that may be affected by the research reported in the enclosed paper.

Funding information

This study is funded by the General Research Fund of Hong Kong Research Grants Council (Project number: 12603817)

Creativity in Hong Kong's Special Schools' Music Classrooms

To investigate music teachers' perceptions and concerns in fostering music creativity of students with intellectual disabilities, findings are presented from a study of nine music teachers purposely sampled from across all three categories (mild, medium, severe) of Hong Kong's special school for students with intellectual disabilities. Personal profiles identify respondents' displaying three professional knowledge gaps – music expertise, special-education training and prior experience of being taught 'creativity'. Findings also indicate that respondents add to the creativity literature: first by supplementing Hargreaves' (2012) 'process' to include 'music making' and 'body movement': and second, that music creativity may be described as a spectrum that embraces various forms of expressions.

Keywords: music education; intellectual disabilities; creativity; Hong Kong

Hong Kong education reform

Following a global trend for education reform, Hong Kong initiated in 2000, a new curriculum comprising four core subjects: Chinese Language and English Language for achieving Biliteracy and Trilingualism (Evans 2013), Mathematics for training students' numeracy and Liberal Studies for training students thinking skills (EDB 2018). All other subjects, such as Art and Music, were cast as non-core. Objectives and learning targets were set but responsibility for the detailed implementation of these wide-ranging curriculum reforms fell largely on classroom teachers. The music learning target 'Developing creativity and imagination' reflected Western values (CDC 2003, p. 11). However, these values were not familiar to local classroom teachers, leading to subsequent reports of their difficulties in coping with the student-centered approach of curriculum development (Chan 2007).

Hong Kong's educational values: negotiating change

Illustrating the changes introduced by Hong Kong's educational reform (CDC 2001) is the following paean for the past:

‘Although Hong Kong's (pre-2000) education system has long been criticized as lacking in creativity and over-emphasizing rote learning, on the whole it has served Hong Kong well, breeding outstanding business, academic and political leaders who continue to maintain Hong Kong's competitive edge’ (Poon and Wong 2008, p. 33).

This paean for the past ignores that Hong Kong's competitive edge has changed from the manufacturing-base of the 1970's to the financial and knowledge economy of the 2020's (Ho and Iyke 2017; Tao and Wong 2002). Sweeting (2007) notes that since the mid-19th century Hong Kong's education reforms were implemented within a colonial top-down model. For example, in the 19th century there was an attempt at mass conversion - from Buddhism, the Chinese traditional religion, to Christianity - through a proliferation of Christian missionary schools (Sweeting 2007). Although Hong Kong's education system still retains a majority of schools operated by Christian/Catholic churches (Cheng 2004), this mass conversion proved unsuccessful – the religious education in these mission schools now embraces both Christianity and Confucianism (Lam 2019). In a similar vein, when the colonial government promoted English-language education in government schools, the demand for and provision of Chinese-language education continued in private schools (Sweeting 2007). The legacy of this top-down model in Hong Kong is a hybrid of Confucian-Christian influences on education, i.e. Chinese families living with Confucian values at home while their children attend schools run by Christian/Catholic organizations (Cheng 2004). From this hybrid of Confucian-Christian influences on education emerges two of Hong Kong's educational values. The first educational value is that education embodies self-discipline: the second value is that being educated confers a ‘duty of service’. Such

educational values reflect both Confucian and Catholic/Christian views that for generations, have shaped Hong Kong (Sweeting 1990 and 2004).

In Hong Kong, the education reform seeks to align ‘self-discipline’ and ‘duty of service’ to both the economy and the community. How this new alignment impacts the musical creativity in Hong Kong special schools for students with intellectual disabilities, is considered in the following.

Musical creativity in Hong Kong’s special schools for students with intellectual disabilities

Following Hong Kong’s education reforms, the policy of ‘one curriculum framework for all’ is now implemented not only across all mainstream schools but also in special schools for students with (mild, moderate, and severe) intellectual disabilities (EDB 2020). In Hong Kong, there are 41 special schools for students with intellectual disabilities. All special schools are government funded and all offer one or more targeted programs: 10 schools offer programs for students with severe ID, 14 offer programs for students with moderate ID, 7 offer both programs for students with mild or moderate ID and 10 offer programs for students with mild ID (CHSC 2020).

As a non-core subject within the ‘one curriculum framework for all’ the *Music Curriculum Guide* (Primary 1 – Secondary 3) (CDC 2003), identifies four learning targets: ‘Developing creativity and imagination’, ‘Developing music skills and processes’, ‘Cultivating critical responses in music’, and ‘Understanding music in context’ (CDC 2003, p. 11). The target of ‘Developing creativity and imagination’ denotes the expectation that all students will ‘develop music ideas and acquire creating skills, together with performing and listening’ (CDC 2003, p. 12).

Although the curriculum defines learning targets, such as here ‘Developing creativity and imagination’, responsibility for their implementation and achievement are

left to the individual classroom music teacher. Underpinning this line of responsibility are two assumptions. For example, 'Developing (musical) creativity and imagination' assumes that there is a consensus view of creativity, and that this view is shared by music scholars.

The following offers an examination of these two assumptions.

Creativity: a contested field

In 1999, Csikszentmihalyi set out his Systems Model of Creativity - consisting of 'three elements, a culture that contains symbolic rules, a person who brings novelty into the domain, and a field of experts who recognize and validate the innovation' (p. 206).

Seeking to express creativity as less of a system, more of an interaction, Cropley (2020) views creativity as 'an aspect of thinking, as a personality constellation, and as an interaction in a specific environment between thinking, personal properties, motivation, and feelings' (p. 315). In contrast, Runco and Jaeger (2012) seek to preserve its essential mystery; the 'standard definition of creativity only pinpoints which criteria must be used (for judging)' (p. 95). Whether as a system, process or mystery, such a range of definitions of creativity reveal that creativity appears to be a contested field.

Concepts of creativity in the East differ from those in the West. For Gardner (1989), Chinese culture prefers creativity to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Morris and Leung (2010) highlight that the East's social culture of the collective norm contrasts with the West's individualistic norm. Han yu (AD 768-824), a neo-Confucian scholar, taught his learners to be diligent in reading masters' work and learn creativity by following the ideas from masters but do not copy their words (Han, 1996). Such differing perceptions of 'creativity' leads Chinese educators to emphasise acquiring skills and knowledge in contrast to their Western colleagues' perception that 'creativity'

can be taught.

Music scholars' definitions of musical creativity are equally varied, and expressed in the following examples as either a process, a product or indeed a flow. Hargreaves (2012) regards the production of a piece of creative music as only a part of the whole creative musical process; a process involving reciprocal-feedback loops comprising the 'listener/ composer/ improviser/ performer'; the socio-cultural 'situations and contexts', and the perception/ imagination/ production of the individual (p. 555). In contrast, for Kladder and Lee (2019) music creativity is 'a novel or new idea resulting in a formalized product' (p. 395). While for Randles and Webster (2013), musical creativity is a flow involving

'the divergent and convergent thought processes, ... that lead to musical products that are both novel and useful, within specific sociocultural contexts, manifested by ... combinations of modes that can include but are not limited to the following: improvisation, composition, performance, analysis, and listening'.

In the West, musical creativity is a process, a product or indeed a flow. Burnard (2012) argues that, embedded in the sociocultural context and personal experience, there are various forms, functions and dimensions of musical creativity. Further, she argues that the experiential dimensions of musical creativity include the rehearsal-time, physical body-responses to music, the interaction-space and the relationships of the person to the music (Burnard 2012). In contrast, musical creativity from a Confucian perspective carries a moral function. For Confucian scholars, music is a tool that can distill a person's spirit, cultivate selfhood, enhance human relationships, engender a harmonious family, and bring harmony and peace to society (Wong 1998).

Where creativity reportedly is a contested field, both in the literature and among music scholars, what is the perception of teachers tasked with teaching creativity in their classrooms?

Creativity – teachers’ perceptions

In contrast, definitions of creativity in classroom settings are notably uniform. Reported teachers’ views suggest creativity to be a common human trait: for Pope (2005) creativity is the ‘capacity to make, do, or become something fresh and valuable concerning others as well as ourselves’ (p. xvi); for Best et al. (2013), it is a ‘personal quality that enables people to use their imagination and external stimuli to produce something new that has value’ (p. 34), and for Steers (2014) ‘most people regularly solve problems of all kinds in their daily lives with some degree of creativity’ (p. 165). Although some teachers’ report creativity as imagination and intelligence filtered through subject-specific experience (Dekelaita-Mullet et al. 2016), broader-based research reports that teachers’ perception of students’ creative characteristics have no relationship with grade level, subject, experience and age (Kettler et al. 2018). For such Western mainstream teachers, creativity is innate.

For Davies and his associates (2014), creativity in classrooms occurs when teachers hold a ‘positive attitude towards creativity and feel confident about their own skills base’ (p. 39). Reported practice, however, identifies one common classroom barrier that of teachers’ feeling professionally exposed: for example, when lacking confidence in their content knowledge (Beghetto 2009); feeling creative students to be more disruptive (Scott 1999), feeling insufficient time for implementing creative work (Steers 2014), or when lacking professional development opportunities (Davies et al. 2014). In a classroom situation, feeling professionally exposed can destroy objectivity, leading some teachers reportedly to perceive their favorite students or those who perform well as creative (Gralewski and Karwowski 2013; Westby and Dawson 1995). Such classroom pressures can further destroy teachers’ objectivity – as Kasirer and Shnitzer-Meirovich (2021) report, even though general and special education teachers

perceive themselves as highly creative and regard creativity as an important educational goal, most of them prefer their students to possess fewer creative characteristics. For such Western general teachers, the common barrier to classroom creativity arises when feeling professionally exposed, defensively their professional objectivity closes down. In contrast, in the East, though Confucianism is a complex belief system (King, 2018), one of the Confucian perspective favours a teacher-directed approach (Tan 2015), where the teacher's function is both affective and instrumental (Ho, Peng, and Chan 2002).

“The teacher, as a master-educator of superior self-cultivation, (he is) stingy in giving praise for good efforts, but harsh in making demands ... a popular saying puts it: “Stern teachers produce outstanding pupils” (Ho, Peng, and Chan 2002, p. 42).

The teacher-directed approach reflects the traditional values about human relationships in Chinese culture. The father-son relationship that involves authority and responsibility is a value that teachers may assume (Pratt, Kelly and Wong, 1998). While students are taught to respect and obey teachers' instructions, teachers would exercise authority as their responsibility. For Confucian educators, developing students' skills is a pre-condition to exploring creatively (Gardner 1989; Tan 2015). Where creativity in the general classroom is perceived as problematic, what is the perception of general music teachers, tasked with teaching creativity in their music classrooms?

Creativity – music teachers' perceptions

In the field of music education, a similar closing down has been reported, in this case of music teachers focusing on skills transfer rather than creativity (Sullivan 2006). In a similar vein, Kokotsaki (2011) comments that student-teachers' conceptions of creativity are too narrow leading them frequently to overlook the importance of improvisation in composing activities. Odena and Welch (2009) found that teachers' perceptions of musical creativity are shaped by their experiences of daily classroom

teaching. Odena (2012) then comments that creativity in the music curriculum is misleadingly treated like a skill to be developed through composition and improvisation. In their quantitative study, Kladder and Lee (2019) report another ‘closing-down’ – although music teachers believe that student autonomy supports creativity, only a few teachers include improvisation in their music lessons. This professional nervousness with creativity in the mainstream music classroom is common to both Western and Occidental pre-service music teachers (Cham, Cheung, and Mak 2006; Crow 2008), a lack of confidence that some researchers suggest leads to both a neglect of students’ creativity and an avoidance of creativity in the music classroom (Langley 2018; Odena and Welch 2007). Where teachers have successfully implemented musical creativity, their chosen pedagogies include the use of group learning activities that integrate body movements, dance, playing music and playfulness in improvisation (Burnard and Dragovic 2015), and computer-assisted music-making (Burnard 2012).

The above-reported research is exclusive to mainstream settings. Where creativity is a challenge to able teachers teaching able students, what is it like when able teachers address the creativity expressed by students with intellectual disabilities?

Creativity in children with intellectual disabilities

Although music is reported as an essential component in the daily living of students with profound special needs, their music teachers - confounded by their students' musical attainment and progress - defensively focus on non-musical rather than musical features (Ockelford, Welch, and Zimmermann 2003). Seeking to resolve this defensive non-musical focus, Burnard et al. (2008) observed that successful inclusive pedagogy depends on a music teacher’s ability to design meaningful and collaborative learning experiences that recognize students’ potential for music engagement. Enhancing this

engagement of students with intellectual disabilities, research has shown the benefits of music technology (Jarvis-Holland et al. 2020), The benefits of improvisational music therapy and creative music therapy has been well researched both in Western countries (Hooper et al. 2008), and in Japan (Takahashi 2013). To this established research knowledge, the following seeks to add the contrastive experiences drawn from the culturally diverse context of Hong Kong.

Unlike the education systems of the West and Japan, which offer their students with intellectual disabilities both music therapy and music education (Salvador and Pasiali 2017), the Hong Kong school system only provides music education. Not only does Hong Kong omit music therapy, but also tasks music education with developing the creativity of Hong Kong students, including students identified with intellectual disabilities. Apart from publications by this author (Wong and Chik 2016; Wong 2015, 2016 & 2020), there is an absence of research into how Hong Kong music teachers respond when tasked with developing the creativity of Hong Kong students identified with intellectual disabilities. The following seeks to address this knowledge gap.

Rationale and Purpose of the study

The public usually perceives students with intellectual disabilities as students with low capabilities (Scior 2011). Regardless, in Hong Kong all music teachers in both mainstream and special schools are required to implement the same curriculum including the common teaching goal 'Developing creativity and imagination'. The purpose of this study is to address a gap in the literature by identifying the perceptions and concerns of music teachers tasked with the teaching goal of 'Developing creativity and imagination' in Hong Kong's special schools. Two research questions address this research purpose:

- (1) What perceptions do Hong Kong special school music teachers have when tasked with the teaching goal of ‘Developing creativity and imagination’?
- (2) What are the concerns of special school music teachers when tasked with the teaching goal of ‘Developing creativity and imagination’?

Methodology

This qualitative study employed face-to-face interviews for soliciting music teachers’ perceptions and concerns about developing creativity in music education for students with intellectual disabilities. The research procedures and sample interview questions were approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the university where the author is working. An informed consent statement was sent with the invitation letters to the music teachers of special schools for students with intellectual disabilities. The consent statement explained the purpose, research procedures, and informed the music teachers that their participation was voluntary and would not bring any personal benefits to them. In addition, their personal information would not be reported and all the collected data would be reported with a pseudonym. The respondents of this study were recruited by purposeful sampling (Patton 2002). All the respondents signed acknowledgment of the informed consent statement as requested by the Research Ethics Committee of the university. The sampling criteria were: (1) The respondents should be in-service music teachers of special schools for students with intellectual disabilities; and (2) The respondents allowed the researcher to conduct face-to-face voice-recorded interviews with them.

The research tool for investigating teachers’ perception was face-to-face interviews conducted in Cantonese, with a semi-structured interview guide by the sole researcher of this study (Foddy 1993). The interview guide, as shown in the Appendix,

sought to address the three research questions and was informed by the literature. Questions 1-4: recognising that music scholars' definitions of musical creativity vary (Hargreaves 2012; Kladder and Lee 2019; Randles and Webster 2013), for investigating the participants' definitions of musical creativity. Questions 5-6: recognising that teachers' experience and perceptions of students' musical creativity vary (Kladder and Lee 2019; Kokotsaki 2011; Odena 2012), for investigating the participants' perceptions of their student's musical creativity. Questions 7-8: recognising that teachers' possibly neglect and avoid creativity in music classroom (Langley 2018; Odena and Welch 2007), for investigating the participants' concerns of developing their students' creativity and imagination. The congruence of the interview guide and the research questions can enhance the reliability and validity of the study (Miles et al. 2014). The interview data were transcribed and checked by the respondents before coding for analysis according to the research questions.

Team coding was done manually by the researcher/author and a research assistant to enhance the findings' reliability and avoid possible bias due to the researcher effects (Miles et al. 2014). In Vivo Coding was used to explore the meanings of the participants' views (Saldana 2015). The themes that emerged include "interpretations/definitions of students' musical creativity," "process of creativity", "access to professional development," and "teachers' perceived students' concerns." The researcher/author selected the verbatim reported here and then translated this verbatim from Chinese to English. A research assistant, who is also proficient in both Chinese and English, confirmed these translations.

Research Findings

Research participants

The personal profiles of these research participants are shown in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Table 1 displays that respondents are drawn from each of the three categories (Mild, Moderate and Severe) of Hong Kong's special schools for students with intellectual disabilities. Respondents' classroom experience ranges from Grace with < 5 years classroom experience; followed by Ada, Ben, Diana and Ivan with >10 years; Cara and Eva with < 15 years while Flora and Helen with < 25 years classroom experience.

In Hong Kong, teachers elect to teach in either mainstream or special schools. As displayed in Table 1, for teachers electing to teach in special schools, no special pre-training is required. Reflecting Hong Kong's all-graduate teaching profession, Table 1 displays that every respondent has a university degree. However, to be a music teacher it is not mandatory that this degree be in music – only Ben, Cara and Ivan have music degrees. Although a degree is required to teach in a special-school, undertaking in-service special-education training is not – only Diana, Eva, Flora and Eva have undertaken in-service special education training.

In Hong Kong, it was not until the current Education Reform, introduced in 2000, that 'creativity and imagination' became a mandatory part of the music curriculum (CDC 2003, p. 11). It is relevant therefore to highlight if these respondents' formative schooling was immersed in, bridged, or preceded this current education focus on 'creativity and imagination'. Table 1 displays that only one (Grace) is of an age to have been educated entirely within the current Education Reforms initiated in 2000. The majority (Ada, Ben, Diana, Eva and Ivan) are of an age that their education bridged between the former and current Education Reforms. Only Flora and Helen are aged such that their formative education entirely preceded these current Education Reform.

In summary, respondents are drawn from all three categories of Hong Kong's special schools. All respondents have a university degree, but only three have music degrees. Although they have jointly had from < 5 years to < 25 years of teaching students with intellectual difficulties, this pedagogic practice was gained without any specific pre-training. Only four have undertaken in-service special education training. All respondents are tasked with the teaching the learning target 'creativity and imagination' - a learning target that only one has experienced in their own schooling, five have partial schooling in and two have no experience.

Having outlined the respondents' personal profile, Table 2 now addresses the first research question: *What perceptions do Hong Kong special school music teachers have when tasked with the teaching goal of 'Developing creativity and imagination'?*

Teachers' perceptions

The perceptions of music teachers when tasked with the teaching goal of 'Developing creativity and imagination' form two categories. First, how these music teachers define the music creativity of students with intellectual disabilities; and second, their perceptions of how students with intellectual disabilities express their musical creativity.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Definitions of musical creativity for students with intellectual disabilities

The definitions of musical creativity displayed in Table 2, form two sub-categories – creativity that is teacher-led (denoted with a #) and second, creativity that is innate (denoted with an *). For example, Ada and Ben's definitions employ 'follow' and 'learn', while Cara and Diana's definitions employ 'born with' and 'create'. Within these two sub-categories, creativity as 'teacher-led' is held by Ada, Ben, Eva and Flora;

creativity as innate, is held by Cara, Diana, Grace, Helen and Ivan. Respondents'

verbatim responses are as follows:

- (#) Ada: At first, they follow what we do in music making. Later on, they will come up with more ideas for creating.
- (#) Ben: They learn bits and pieces of music; they remix all tiny bits of musical elements in their minds.
- (*) Cara: I believe that they (SID) are born with the ability to create music.
- (*) Diana: They can create music in their ways if given the opportunity.
- (#) Eva: Musical creativity ...(means) let them experience and explore sounds.
- (#) Flora: Musical creativity ... (they) re-arrange or make changes to existing music.
- (*) Grace: The concept of musical creativity for these weak students should be re-defined, i.e., accept their alternate forms of showing musical creativity.
- (*) Helen: Musical creativity for students with severe intellectual disabilities is their unique way of interacting with the music and musical instruments. Musical creativity for students with severe intellectual disabilities cannot be taught but can be stimulated with music.
- (*) Ivan: Musical creativity for students with severe intellectual disabilities is to make music in their ways.

These findings – that respondents define creativity as being teacher-led and second, as being innate - supplement the existing mainstream definitions of creativity (Henriksen and Mishra, 2015; Kupers et al. 2018). For those music teachers who define music creativity as being teacher-led, their views reflect Hong Kong's East-meets-West culture which blends Confucian and Catholic/Christian values that revere 'self-discipline' and 'duty of service' (Sweeting 1990 and 2004). Teacher-led creativity places the teacher as both model and guide, the student as both focused and observant. For those music teachers who define music creativity as innate, reflect those Western scholars who view creativity as a personal quality, one that interacts with thinking in a specific environment (Cropley 2020; Dekelaita-Mullet et al. 2016).

These findings also reflect a differing perspective from the mainstream definitions of music creativity that expect a product (Hargreaves 2012; Kladder and Lee 2019), or something new (Best et al. 2013). None of the respondents report any expectations of a ‘product’ nor ‘something new’ resulting from their students with intellectual disabilities. Instead, the respondents’ reported definitions of music creativity, whether they see creativity as innate or teacher-led, are uniformly of a process that involves making and interacting with music.

A creative process: how students with intellectual disabilities express musical creativity

Respondents’ report that their students with intellectual disabilities express their music creativity in two ways: first, through music performance, including playing music instruments (denoted with a #) and second, through dance and music movements (denoted with an *). Respondents’ verbatim responses are as follows:

(*#) Ada: Students with ID may show their creativity through music performance and dance.

(#) Ben: After accumulating sufficient musical experiences, students with ID express with music instruments, they play music in the way they like, then it’s a way for them to show their musical creativity.

(*) Cara: When my students listen to music, they would create body movements to express the characteristics of music.

(*#) Diana: Listening to music can motivate students with moderate ID to create music. Though students with ASD are weak in communicating with others, but they may react to music and create music in their way with music instruments or body movements.

(#) Eva: Students with ID enjoy the freedom to experience and explore sounds in their ways.

(#) Flora: When they are stimulated to react with the music, they’ll engage themselves in music learning and music-making. My students’ ideas about modifying the sounds are their ways to show music creativity.

(*) Grace: When my students initiate a response to music, no matter whether it’s a body movement or interaction with musical instruments, these are the ways that they show their musical creativity.

(*) Helen: When my students respond to music pieces in their unique ways of body movements creatively, their connection with music and their response are unique.

(#) Ivan: When my students interact with the instruments or play with the computer apps or sound sources, they may imitate some of my patterns and make others on their own.

Unlike mainstream teachers - reported as focusing on their students' creative 'products' (Kladder and Lee 2019), or 'something new that has value' (Best et al. 2013) - these special school music teachers focus is instead on Hargreaves' (2012) 'process', specifically here the process of 'music making' and 'body movement'. This finding highlights that music creativity forms a spectrum embracing various forms of expressions, a spectrum that embraces 'products', 'something new that has value' and 'processes' that include 'music making' and 'body movement'.

Having explored respondents' perceptions when tasked with the teaching goal of 'Developing creativity and imagination', Table 2 is now considered in terms of the second research question: *What are the concerns of special school music teachers when tasked with the teaching goal of 'Developing creativity and imagination'?*

Teachers' concerns about developing the musical creativity of students with ID

In Table 2, respondents' concerns about developing the musical creativity of students with ID form two broad categories – teachers' concerns and their perceptions of their students' concerns.

Teachers' concerns

Respondents' voice two concerns: (1) about accessing adequate Professional Development (denoted with *) and (2) that developing students' musical creativity absorbs classroom Time (denoted with #). These two concerns are voiced in the following respondents' verbatim responses:

(#*) Ada: Lesson time is short, only 40 minutes ... my students may not have ample time to try and experiment with their musical ideas.

(#*) Ben: Time constraint is a concern. There's only one 40-minute lesson per week. Many of my students have multiple disabilities. They need more time and more help to accomplish every small task of creative music-making. I have to spend more time to design small tasks for my students so that they could have sufficient guidance ...

(#) Cara: Time constraints. We only have one lesson (40 mins) per week. All the tasks have to be designed as small tasks. There's not much time for students to develop their ideas at a non-pressured pace.

(*) Diana: Opportunities for professional development are needed. For example, knowing the strategies of music therapy ... (how) to design learning activities to cater to the abilities of students with moderate ID.

(#*) Eva: Designing creative music activities for my students is time-consuming. I have to teach other subjects as well ... My available time for developing the music curriculum is very limited.

(#*) Flora: I prefer to teach according to their pace of learning. I have to set a differentiated task for every one of them to work on their own. The constraint of lesson time available is a concern when I design these differentiated tasks.

(*) Grace: Opportunities for me to learn from other special school music teachers through professional development seminars (and) ... the opportunity to observe music lessons taught by other special school music teachers.

(*) Helen: I worry that my choice of repertoire is not good enough to help my students to develop their musical creativity ... I (want) the opportunity to learn more through professional development workshops (and) to observe the music lessons in other special schools.

(*) Ivan: I want to learn more strategies from other music teachers and develop new strategies for teaching my students.

All respondents voice a common concern about accessing professional development to further support their students' music creativity. For some of these respondents - Ada, Ben, Cara, Eva and Flora - this lack of access to professional development raises related concerns about their time-management - when curriculum designing and when implementing creative music activities. These findings - accessing professional development and time-management - reflect the professional nervousness with teaching

‘creativity’ reported in mainstream schools (Crow 2008; Cham, Cheung, and Mak 2006).

Perceived students’ concerns

The second broad category comprises respondents’ perception of their students’ concerns. Respondents’ perceptions of their students’ concerns form two types: (1) that their students need teachers’ guidance (denoted with *), such as the opportunity to play musical instruments, selection of repertoire and the instructional design; and (2). teaching aids (denoted with #), such as visual aids, adapted musical instruments and computer software Respondents’ verbatim responses are as follows:

(*) A: Students with ID need the opportunity to learn playing musical instruments. They need the basics for music performance that can facilitate them to develop their musical creativity. Some of my students who have training in violin and piano. They are very creative and can improvise whenever they have the opportunity to perform in public.

(#) B: They need help to visualize what they can do. The use of computer software and apps is effective in helping them. With the help of computer apps, they can participate more in playing and creating music.

(*) C: If students with ID have the opportunities to play musical instruments, they can show their musical creativity through music performance. The knowledge and skills of playing instruments are essential for developing musical creativity.

(*) D: If creative music activities for students with moderate ID can be related to the contexts of their daily life, they will be more motivated to participate in creating music. It depends on the teachers’ design of music activities for enhancing students’ musical creativity.

(*) E: They need teacher’s demonstration and guidance before they are stimulated to explore and try to create sounds in their ways. The music learning tasks for students with moderate ID need to be designed with ample sub-tasks to suit their ability and pace of learning. The use of props can stimulate them to engage more readily in creating music movements.

(*) F: They need the opportunities to listen to a wide range of music and the different versions of an individual piece of music. All the music experiences that they get from school and daily life will become the input to their ideas of musical creativity. They’ll internalize the music they had heard of and will be able to apply their ideas in creating music in the future.

(*) G: They need physical help from teachers, for example, stimulate them by holding their hands or feet to touch and play with adapted musical instruments.

(*) H: It takes a long time for students with severe ID to react to music. They respond to individual music pieces in their unique ways creatively. While they are developing their connection with music, I'm developing my patience to wait for them to respond creatively.

(*#) I: My students need adapted instruments, computer apps, or other sound sources; and my demonstration to show them how to create sounds or patterns. When they interact with the instruments or play with the computer apps or sound sources, they may imitate some of my patterns and make others on their own.

The majority of the respondents (except Ben and Ivan) voice a need for guidance about how to support their students' creativity. Five types of guidance are identified: how to creatively use musical instruments (Ada, Cara, Eva, and Ivan); designing smaller tasks to suit student abilities (Eva); providing demonstrations and examples to stimulate students' creative thinking (Eva); designing music learning activities that relate music-making to students' daily life contexts (Diana); providing physical assistance (Grace); and how to develop students' connection with music (Helen). In addition to the above five types of guidance, some respondents also voice their interest in how further to employ supportive teaching aids. Four teaching aids are identified: visual aids (Ben), computer software (Ben), a wide range of music repertoire for listening (Flora) and adapted musical instruments (Grace and Ivan).

Underpinning these findings that, students' creativity needs 'teacher-guidance' and 'supportive teaching aids', reflects a common mindset that, for these respondents, music creativity is essentially teacher-led. This common mindset is rooted in both Confucian and Catholic/Christian values that emphasizes teacher-led learning (Gardner 1989; Morris and Leung 2010; Sweeting 1990 and 2004).

Summarizing the above findings and in answer to the second research question: *'What concerns do special school music teachers voice when developing creativity in music education?'* Respondents voice both their own concerns as teachers and then

their perceptions of their students' concerns. As teachers, they voice two concerns about accessing professional development and their need to improve time-management. Both concerns reflect a professional nervousness with teaching 'creativity' that has been reported both in mainstream schools (Cham, Cheung, and Mak 2006; Crow 2008) and by other special school music teachers in Hong Kong (Wong 2016).

The respondents' perceptions of their students' concerns when tasked with learning musical creativity, form two clusters. The first, clusters around that their students need for teachers' guidance - such as the opportunity to play musical instruments, selection of repertoire and the instructional design. A second cluster forms around the respondents' perception that their students seek adapted 'teaching aids' - such as main-stream visual aids, musical instruments and computer software all adapted to the learners' specific intellectual disabilities.

Discussion

Respondents ($n=9$) display personal profiles that, when tasked with teaching music creativity, highlight professional knowledge gaps. All respondents have a university degree, but only three have music degrees. Their teaching experience of students with intellectual difficulties is substantial - ranging from < 5 years to < 25 years – but this pedagogic practice was gained without any specific pre-training: only four have undertaken in-service special education training. All respondents are tasked with the teaching the learning target 'creativity and imagination' - a learning target that only one has experienced in their own schooling, five have partial schooling in and two have no experience.

How these three professional knowledge gaps – music expertise, special-education training and prior experience of being taught 'creativity' – impact on respondents' perceptions is considered in their responses to the first research question: *What*

perceptions do Hong Kong special school music teachers have when tasked with the teaching goal of 'Developing creativity and imagination'?

Respondents' perceptions define creativity as being either teacher-led ($n=4$) or, as being innate ($n=5$). Teacher-led creativity reflects Hong Kong's blending of Confucian and Catholic/Christian values that place the teacher as both model and guide, the student as both focused and observant. This 'East-meets-West' perception offers a supplement to the Western view that creativity equates to self-expression: in contrast, for these respondents' teacher-led creativity equates to mentoring (Cheng 2004; Lam 2019; Sweeting 2007). For those music teachers who define music creativity as innate, their perception is closer to those Western scholars who view creativity as a personal quality, one that interacts with thinking in a specific environment (Cropley 2020; Dekelaita-Mullet et al. 2016). Notably, all respondents, whether they perceive creativity as teacher-led or innate, uniformly report their students' music creativity as a process in which students' make and interact with music. Unlike the mainstream teachers who reported as focusing on their students' creative 'products' (Kladder and Lee 2019), or 'something new that has value' (Best et al. 2013), these special school music teachers' perceptions supplement Hargreaves' (2012) 'process' by adding the process of 'music making' and 'body movement'.

Adding to our understanding of 'creativity', the above finding, that Hargreaves' (2012) 'process' may include the process of 'music making' and 'body movement', highlights that the view of 'creativity' as a contested field may rather be described as a spectrum that embraces 'products', 'something new that has value' and 'process'. The latter to include 'music making' and 'body movement'.

In answer to the second research question: *What concerns do special school music teachers voice when developing creativity in music education?* Respondents'

voice both their own concerns as teachers and then their perceptions of their students' concerns. As teachers expressed their two concerns about accessing professional development and their need to improve time-management, their expressions reflect a professional nervousness with teaching 'creativity' that has been reported in mainstream schools (Cham, Cheung, and Mak 2006; Crow 2008).

The respondents' perceptions of their students' concerns when tasked with learning musical creativity form two clusters. The first, a perception that students' musical creativity needs teachers' guidance, such as exploring musical instruments, selecting a musical repertoire and benefiting from tailored instructional design. A second cluster forms around the respondents' perception that their students seek adapted 'teaching aids', such as the visual aids, musical instruments and computer software all adapted to the learners' specific intellectual disabilities. Taken together the respondents' professional nervousness when tasked with teaching 'creativity' and their perception that students need guidance and adapted teaching aids, these findings highlight the dilemma facing professional, experienced teachers who lack both pre- and in-service special education training, being tasked with teaching that which they themselves have not been taught.

Conclusion

Addressing a gap in the literature, findings presented here explore both the perceptions and concerns of classroom music teachers of students with intellectual difficulties being tasked with the music learning target 'Developing creativity and imagination'. Personal profiles identify respondents' displaying three professional knowledge gaps – music expertise, special-education training and prior experience of being taught 'creativity'. This knowledge gap impacts on respondents' perceptions, eliciting a professional

nervousness. Despite being tasked with teaching music creativity that they themselves have not been taught, these respondents' perceptions add to the creativity literature. Their contribution is two-fold: first they supplement Hargreaves' (2012) 'process' to include 'music making' and 'body movement': and second, that music creativity may be described as a spectrum that embraces various forms of expressions.

Limitations of this study

The findings of this study are limited to the data collected and the voices of these special school music teachers. The voices of parents and their children with intellectual difficulties are not investigated as being out with the scope of this study.

Implications for future research

Identifying the special school music teachers' perceptions and practices of developing musical creativity within Hong Kong's special schools' music classroom, helps to set directions for future research. Current understandings of musical creativity are rooted both in 'mainstream' thinking and mainstream pedagogies. First, research that expands and thereby corrects that myopic view, is required. This new research direction would explore and make public musical creativity rooted in 'disability thinking'. When 'disability thinking' is understood as a contributor to 'mainstream thinking', then the proclaimed aim of Hong Kong's education reforms - 'one curriculum for all' - can be realized. Second, based on the findings of this study, the multiplicity of creativity may be further informed by research in the areas of performance creativity, digital creativity and listening-with creativity in music education for students with special educational needs. Third, although not all children with intellectual disabilities are able to express themselves verbally and fluently, the voices of parents of, and children with intellectual disabilities about their views on musical creativity should also be heard.

References

- Beghetto, R. A. 2009. "In Search of the Unexpected: Finding Creativity in the Micromoments of the Classroom." *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 3: 2-5. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014831>.
- Best, B., and W. Thomas. 2013. "A Framework for Creativity in Schools." In *Creating and Critical Thinking*, edited by S. Padget, 32-51. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Burnard, P. 2012. *Musical Creativities in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burnard, P., and Dragovic, T. 2015. "Collaborative creativity in instrumental group music learning as a site for enhancing pupil wellbeing." *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 45 (3): 371-392. DOI: 10.1080/0305764X.2014.934204.
- Burnard, P., S. Dillon, G. Rusinek, and E. Saether. 2008. "Inclusive pedagogies in music education: a comparative study of music teachers' perspectives from four countries." *International Journal of Music Education*, 26 (2): 109-126. DOI: 10.1177/0255761407088489
- Cham, E., J. Cheung, and C. Mak. 2006. *Report on the Study of Creative Music-Making in Primary Schools - 2005/06*. Hong Kong: Education Publishing House.
- Chan, D. W. 2007. "Creative teaching in Hong Kong schools: Constraints and Challenges." *Educational Research Journal*, 22 (1): 1-22.
https://www.hkier.cuhk.edu.hk/journal/document/ERJ/erj_v22n1_1-12.pdf
- Cheng, R. H. M. 2004. "Moral education in Hong Kong: Confucian-parental, Christian-religious and liberal-civic influences." *Journal of Moral Education*, 33 (4): 533-551. DOI:10.1080/0305724042000315626

- Committee on Home-School Co-operation [CHSC]. 2020. Hong Kong Special Schools Profile 2020. https://www.chsc.hk/spsp/school_category.php
- Cropley, A. 2020. "Definitions of creativity." In *Encyclopedia of Creativity*, 3rd ed., edited by S. Pritzker and M. Runco, 315-322. New York: Academic Press.
- Crow, B. 2008. "Changing Conceptions of Educational Creativity: A Study of Student Teachers' Experience of Musical Creativity." *Music Education Research*, 10: 373-388.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. 1999. "Implications of a Systems Perspective for the Study of Creativity." In *Handbook of Creativity*, edited by R. J. Sternberg, 313-388. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curriculum Development Council [CDC]. (2003). *Music Curriculum Guide (Primary 1-Secondary 3)*. Hong Kong: CDC.
https://www.edb.gov.hk/attachment/en/curriculum-development/kla/arts-edu/curriculum-docs/music_complete_guide_eng.pdf
- Curriculum Development Council [CDC]. 2001. *Learning to Learn – The Way Forward in Curriculum Development – Consultation Document*. Hong Kong: CDC.
<https://www.edb.gov.hk/en/curriculum-development/cs-curriculum-doc-report/wf-in-cur/index.html>
- Davies, D., D. Jindal-Snape, R. Digby, A. Howe, C. Collier, and P. Hay. 2014. "The Roles and Development Needs of Teachers to Promote Creativity: A Systematic Review of Literature." *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 41: 34-41.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.03.003>

- Dekelaita-Mullet, D. R., A. Willerson, K. Lamb, and T. Kettler. 2016. "Examining Teacher Perceptions of Creativity: A Systematic Review of the Literature." *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 21: 9-30. DOI: 10.1016/j.tsc.2016.05.001
- Education Bureau [EDB]. 2018. "Ongoing Renewal of the School Curriculum – The School Curriculum Framework." <https://www.edb.gov.hk/en/curriculum-development/renewal/framework.html>
- Education Bureau [EDB]. 2020. "Special Educational Needs – Introduction." <https://www.edb.gov.hk/en/curriculum-development/curriculum-area/special-educational-needs/index.html>
- Evans, S. 2013. "The Long March to Biliteracy and Trilingualism: Language Policy in Hong Kong Education since the Handover." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33: 302-324. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000019>.
- Foddy, W. 1993. *Constructing Questions for Interviews and Questionnaires: Theory and Practice in Social Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, H. 1989. *To Open Minds: Chinese Clues to the Dilemma of Contemporary Education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gralewski, J., and M. Karwowski. 2013. "Polite Girls and Creative Boys? Students' Gender Moderates Accuracy of Teachers' Ratings of Creativity." *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 47: 290-304. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.36>.
- Han, Y. 1996. *Selected Works of Han Yu*. Beijing: China Today. ISBN 7507208311. (In Chinese).

- Hargreaves, D. J. 2012. "Musical Imagination: Perception and Production, Beauty and Creativity." *Psychology of Music*, 40 (5): 539-557.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735612444893>
- Henriksen, D. and P. Mishra. 2015. "We Teach Who We Are: Creativity in the Lives and Practices of Accomplished Teachers." *Teachers College Record*, 11 (7): 1-46.
- Ho, D. Y. F., S. Q. Peng, and S. F. F. Chan. 2002. "Authority and learning in Confucian-heritage education." In *Multiple Competencies and Self-Regulated Learning: Implications for Multicultural Education*, edited by C.-y. Chiu, F. Salili and Y.-y. Hong, 29-48. Green, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Ho, S. Y., and B. N. Iyke. 2017. "Determinants of stock market development: a review of the literature." *Studies in Economics and Finance*, 34: 143-164.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/SEF-05-2016-0111>
- Hooper, J., T. Wigram, D. Carson, and B. Lindsay. 2008a. "A Review of the Music and Intellectual Disability Literature (1943–2006) Part One—Descriptive and Philosophical Writing." *Music Therapy Perspectives*, 26 (2): 66-79.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/mtp/26.2.66>
- Hooper, J., T. Wigram, D. Carson, and B. Lindsay. 2008b. "A Review of the Music and Intellectual Disability Literature (1943–2006) Part Two—Experimental Writing" *Music Therapy Perspectives*, 26 (2): 80-96. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mtp/26.2.80>
- Jarvis-Holland, Q., C. Cortez, and F. Botello. 2020. "Expanding access to music technology – Rapid prototyping accessible instrument solutions for musicians with intellectual disabilities." *Proceedings of the International conference on New Interfaces for Musical Expression*, 2020. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2011.09143.pdf>.

- Kasirer, A., and S. Shnitzer-Meirovich. 2021. "The perception of creativity and abilities among general education and special education teachers." *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100820>.
- Kettler, T., K. N. Lamb, A. Willerson, and D. R. Mullet. 2018. "Teachers' Perceptions of Creativity in the Classroom." *Creativity Research Journal*, 30 (2): 164-171. DOI: 10.1080/10400419.2018.1446503.
- King, A. Y. C. 2018. "The Transformation of Confucianism in the Post-Confucian Era: The Emergence of Rationalistic Traditionalism in Hong Kong." In *China's Great Transformation -- Selected Essays on Confucianism, Modernisation, and Democracy*, A. Y. C. King, 217-234. Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press.
- Kladder, J. and W. Lee. 2019. "Music Teachers Perceptions of Creativity: A Preliminary Investigation." *Creativity Research Journal*, 31: 395-407. DOI: 10.1080/10400419.2019.1651189.
- Kokotsaki, D. 2011. "Student Teachers' Conceptions of Creativity in the Secondary Music Classroom." *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 6: 100-113. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2011.04.001>.
- Kupers, E., A. Lehmann-Wermser, G. McPherson, and P. Geert. 2018. "Children's Creativity: A Theoretical Framework and Systematic Review." *Review of Educational Research*, 89 (1): 93-124.
- Lam, I. P. 2019. "Interreligious education involving Christianity and Confucianism in Hong Kong." In *Global Perspectives on Catholic Religious Education in Schools*, edited by M. T. Buchanan and A.-M. Gellel. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6127-2_47.

- Langley, D. W. 2018. "Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Creativity in Middle and High School Choral Ensembles." *Music Education Research*, 20: 446-462. DOI: 10.1080/14613808.2018.1433150.
- Morris, M. W. and K. Leung. 2010. "Creativity East and West: Perspectives and Parallels." *Management and Organization Review*, 6 (3): 313-327. DOI: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2010.00193.x.
- Ockelford, A., G. Welch, and S. Zimmermann. 2003. "Music education for pupils with severe or profound and multiple difficulties – current provision and future need." *British Journal of Special Education*, 29 (4): 178-182.
- Odena, O. 2012. "Perspectives on musical creativity: where next?" In *Musical Creativity: Insights from Music Education Research*, edited by O. Odena, 201-213. Ashgate, Burlington, VT, USA. ISBN 9781409406228.
- Odena, O., and G. Welch. 2007. "The influence of teachers' backgrounds on their perceptions of musical creativity: A qualitative study with secondary school music teachers." *Research Studies in Music Education*, 28: 71-81.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1321103X070280010206>.
- Odena, O. and G. Welch. 2009. "A generative model of teachers' thinking on musical creativity." *Psychology of Music*, 37 (4): 416-442.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735608100374>
- Patton, M. Q. 2002. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Poon, A. and Y.-C. Wong. 2008. "Education Reform in Hong Kong: The "Through-Road" Model and its Societal Consequences." *International Review of Education*, 54 (1): 33-55. DOI:10.1007/s 11159-007-9073-9.

- Pope, R. (2005). *Creativity: Theory, History, Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Pratt, D. D., M. Kelly, and W. Wong. 1998. "The Social Construction of Chinese Models of Teaching." *Conference Proceedings of the Adult Education Research Conference*. <https://newprairiepress.org/aerc/1998/papers/42>.
- Randles C., and P. R. Webster. 2013. "Creativity in Music Teaching and Learning." In *Encyclopedia of Creativity, Invention, Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, edited by E. G. Carayannis. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3858-8_470.
- Runco, M. A., and G. J. Jaeger. 2012. The Standard Definition of Creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24 (1): 92-96. DOI: 10.1080/10400419.2012.650092.
- Saldana, J. 2015 *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Salvador, K., and V. Pasiali. 2017. "Intersections between music education and music therapy: Education reform, arts education, exceptionality, and policy at the local level." *Arts Education Policy Review*, 118 (2): 93-103. DOI: 10.1080/10632913.2015.1060553.
- Scior, K. 2011. "Public Awareness, Attitudes and Beliefs Regarding Intellectual Disability: A Systematic Review." *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 32: 2164-2182. DOI: 10.1016/j.ridd.2011.07.005.
- Scott, C. L. 1999. "Teachers' Biases Toward Creative Children." *Creativity Research Journal*, 12: 321-328. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1204_10.

- Shifrer, D. 2013. "Stigma of a Label: Educational Expectations for High School Students Labeled with Learning Disabilities." *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 54 (4): 462-480. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146513503346>.
- Steers, J. 2014. "Creativity in schools: delusions, realities and challenges." In *Handbook of Research on Creativity*, edited by K. Thomas, and J. Chan, 162-174. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2009.01600.x>.
- Sullivan, T. 2006. "Creativity in the Curriculum." *Canadian Music Educator*, 47 (4): 23-27.
- Sweeting, A. 1990. *Education in Hong Kong pre-1841 to 1941: Fact and Opinion*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Sweeting, A. 2004. *Education in Hong Kong, 1941 to 2001: Visions and Revisions*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Sweeting, A. 2007. "Education in Hong Kong: Histories, mysteries and myths." *History of Education*, 36 (1): 89-108.
- Takahashi, J. 2013. "Multiple Intelligence Theory Can Help Promote Inclusive Education for Children with Intellectual Disabilities and Developmental Disorders: Historical Reviews of Intelligence Theory, Measurement Methods, and Suggestions for Inclusive Education." *Creative Education*, 4: 605-610. DOI: 10.4236/ce.2013.49086.
- Tan, C. 2015. "Teacher-directed and learner-engaged: exploring a Confucian conception of education." *Ethics and Education*, 10 (3): 302-312. DOI: 10.1080/17449642.2015.1101229.

- Tao, Z., and R. Y. C. Wong. 2002. "Hong Kong: From an industrialized city to a center of manufacturing-related services 1." *Urban Studies*, 39: 2345-2358. DOI: 10.1080/0042098022000033917.
- Westby, E., and V. Dawson. 1995. "Creativity: asset or burden in the classroom?" *Creativity Research Journal*, 8 (1): 1-10.
<https://www.gwern.net/docs/psychology/1995-westby.pdf>.
- Wong, M. 1998. "A comparison between the philosophies of Confucius and Plato as applied to music education." *Journal of Aesthetics Education*, 32 (3): 109-112.
- Wong, M. W. 2015. "Adapting the music curriculum for senior secondary students with intellectual disabilities in Hong Kong: content, pedagogy and mindsets." *Music Education Research*, 17 (1): 71-87.
- Wong, M. W. 2016. "Understanding the Professional Development Needs of Hong Kong Special School Music Teachers." *International Journal of Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning*, 8 (2): 1-19.
- Wong, M. W. 2020. "Fostering musical creativity of students with intellectual disabilities: Strategies, gamification and re-framing creativity." *Music Education Research*, 23 (1): 1-13. DOI: 10.1080/14613808.2020.1862777.
- Wong, M. W., and M. P. Chik. 2016. "Teaching students with special educational needs in inclusive music classrooms: Experiences of Music Teachers in Hong Kong Primary Schools." *Music Education Research*, 18 (2): 195-207.