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Abstract

This paper provides a review of policy documents on the school guidance and counseling policy in Hong Kong, and presents data from a survey study on guidance personnel's perceptions of the level of implementation of guidance activities and their time allocation in secondary schools. The review indicates that school counseling in Hong Kong has evolved from a remedial approach to a comprehensive guidance and counseling program approach. The survey findings suggest that some guidance activities, including a guidance curriculum, individual planning, responsive services and system support, have been implemented in Hong Kong secondary schools, although not at a high level. Class-teachers, guidance teachers, career teachers, life education co-ordinators and school social workers are performing multiple roles and are actively involved in various domains of guidance activities. Most respondents received some training, although not a great deal, in guidance and counseling. This survey is the first step in assessing the current implementation status of the comprehensive guidance and counseling program in Hong Kong. The discussion of future directions for research and program enhancement is intended to be of interest to education leaders, counselor educators and researchers in Hong Kong and other parts of the Asia Pacific region.
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Introduction

Recently, there has been a lot of discussion about the implementation of the comprehensive guidance and counseling program in Hong Kong schools (e.g. Lau, 2005; Lee, 2005; Yuen, Lau, et al., 2003). In this paper, I wish to provide some background information on the history and current status of school counseling in Hong Kong, review and identify key policy issues by analyzing some key policy documents, present data from a survey study on guidance personnel's perceptions of the level of implementation of guidance activities and on the time allocated to these activities in secondary schools, and discuss the directions for research and program enhancement.

Historical Overview

Long before the terms "guidance" and "counseling" were adopted, the tradition of teachers guiding students for whole personal development had existed in Chinese society (Luk Fong, 2001). However, guidance and counseling programs in Hong Kong schools officially began with the appointment of guidance masters
in secondary schools and the establishment of the Hong Kong Association of Careers Masters in 1959. This Association aims to support careers masters in disseminating information about vocational guidance and careers, bring schools and employers together, and inform students and parents about opportunities in employment (Fung, 1971; Zhang, 1998).

In the 1970s, external support services were introduced, such as the school social work service and the student guidance service, whereby social workers visited secondary schools and student guidance officers from the Education Department visited primary schools. Each social worker visited four schools and each guidance officer was responsible for about 3,000 students. The main focus of these services was providing remedial support for students through individual case work and group guidance activities (Lee, 2005).

In the 1980s, internal support for student development was strengthened. Every secondary school was given five additional teachers to improve student supportive services in the following areas: English remedial teaching, Chinese remedial teaching, remedial teaching in other subjects, educational and careers guidance, personal guidance and extra-curricular activities, and community services. In primary schools, the teacher to class ratio was raised to 1:2 so that teachers would have more time to work with students (Yau, 1998).

Policy

From 1986 to 2003, a number of policy documents were released by the education authorities to guide schools in implementing school guidance and counseling programs. In 1986, the document entitled “Guidance work in secondary schools: A suggested guide for principals and teachers” (GWS) focused on the need for the organization of teamwork and remedial support for students with problems, and teacher preparation for guidance work (Education Department, 1986). During the 1990s, various documents on a “whole school approach” (WSA) emphasized the importance of involving all teachers and staff in schools in develop-
mental guidance programs and of creating a supportive learning environment for all students (Education Commission, 1990; Education Department, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c). From 2000-2003, documents on comprehensive guidance services emphasized the need for systematic planning of developmental, preventive and remedial guidance activities along the lines of “whole person development and learning for life” as advocated in the education reform (Education Commission, 2000; Careers and Guidance Services Section, Education Department, 2001; Education Department, 2001; Education and Manpower Bureau, 2003).

Continuity and Changes in the Policy

In reviewing the above policy documents, we have identified two key features of guidance and counseling programs in Hong Kong which are common to all documents: the involvement of teachers in guidance and counseling work, and teamwork. In Hong Kong schools, professional guidance personnel, such as school social workers, primary student guidance officers, and school psychologists, provide specific support services for students with learning, emotional, and behavioral difficulties. In addition, most secondary schools and some primary schools have specifically identified “guidance teachers”, who are full-time teachers given the duties of managing and developing the guidance program and providing guidance and counseling to students in school (Education Department, 1986; Yuen, 2001). Teachers are organized into teams such as guidance committees, careers committees, and life education committees, to be responsible for implementing particular guidance activities in schools. Apart from this, all teachers and administrators are expected to play a role in guidance work. Class-teachers, for example, are involved in the care of individual students, group and class guidance activities, and liaison with parents (Lung, 1999).

On the other hand, from the 1986 GWS document to the WSA guidelines of the 1990s, and through to the “comprehensive guidance service implementation
procedures” (CGS) circular (Education and Manpower Bureau, 2003), we have also identified some major changes in assumptions, goals, and management strategies.

Assumptions, Values, and Beliefs

Firstly, the emphasis has shifted from “person with problem” to “person develops in contexts” (See Table 1). From the perspective of implementing a whole school approach to guidance through a comprehensive guidance and counseling program, development is considered as the process of interaction between persons and the environment. The WSA guidelines, for example, state that “the students’ growth and learning will be enhanced here ... interpersonal encounters are respecting and respectful” (Education Department, 1993, p. 4). It is believed that all students can learn and further develop. This is in contrast to the idea presented in the GWS document (Education Department, 1986), which does not mention growth and learning in its justification of the need for guidance work in school. The GWS document, instead, considers guidance as ways of meeting the concerns of disruptive behavior and lack of motivation in the classroom. This is evident in, for example, its rationale for guidance work: “With the introduction of nine-year universal, free and compulsory education, pupils’ developmental, educational and personal problems become more and more visible; especially among adolescents in secondary schools” (Education Department, 1986, p. 1).
Table 1
Comparison of Guidance Work in the 1980’s and a Whole School Approach to Guidance through a Comprehensive Guidance Program: Assumptions, Values, and Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Problems lie within the individuals</td>
<td>* Development as individuals interact with favorable context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>* Care and help</td>
<td>* Growth and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>* Some students need extra help</td>
<td>* All students can learn and further develop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goals and Outcome Expectations**

There has also been a shift in the focus of effective guidance work from the remedial, problem-oriented goals of the GWS document to the holistic growth goals of the later guidelines (see Table 2). From the perspective of the WSA guidelines, the goals and outcomes include: a school culture for holistic growth; positive teacher-student relationships; and improvements in students’ self-esteem, attitudes toward study, and behavior. For example, the WSA guidelines Part II recognise that “the ultimate goal of provision of guidance service in schools is not merely remedial or correctional but to create an inviting and caring school environment for the development of all students as whole persons” (Education Department, 1995, p. 2). The recent guidelines published by the Careers and Guidance Services Section Education Department (2001) list the following goals for comprehensive guidance and counseling programs in schools:

(i) To create a pleasurable and inviting learning environment in school

(ii) To help students develop a better understanding of themselves; their abilities, strengths, and weaknesses

(iii) To raise students’ awareness of their feelings and develop their skills in handling emotions

(iv) To help students build up self-confidence and enhance self-esteem
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(v) To promote desirable learning and social behavior
(vi) To facilitate students in life planning, goal setting, and career formu-
lating
(vii) To provide initial and frontline intervention in helping students cope
with their problems.” (pp. 9-10)

This contrasts with the GWS document’s emphasis on the need to over-
come students’ problems: “there is also an increasing awareness, both within and
outside the education system, of the need to promote guidance work in school
since most of the pupils’ problems can be overcome, or even prevented, through
prompt assistance and appropriate advice” (Education Department, 1986, p. 1).

Table 2
Comparison of Guidance Work in the 1980’s and a Whole School Approach to Guidance
through a Comprehensive Guidance Program: Goals and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>* Support individual students and help them solve their problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Support individual students and help them solve their problems</td>
<td>* Support individual students and help them solve their problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Create a positive culture of holistic growth and learning for the benefit of all students and staff</td>
<td>* Building students’ self-identity/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Clear sense of direction for the school</td>
<td>* Clear sense of direction for the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Improvement in affects, attitudes, and behavior of students</td>
<td>* Improvement in affects, attitudes, and behavior of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Students not only aim for academic success but also personal-social and career development</td>
<td>* Improvement in teacher-student relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Outcome | * Individual needs of some students are met |
| * Improvements in students’ affects, attitudes, or behavior depending on the intervention strategies taken | * Individual needs of some students are met |
| * Improvements in students’ affects, attitudes, or behavior depending on the intervention strategies taken | * Improvements in students’ affects, attitudes, or behavior depending on the intervention strategies taken |
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Management

Here, the emphasis has shifted from reactive individual casework to proactive programs, strategic self-management cycles, and shared common visionary goals for whole school development; although common to all documents is an emphasis on the class-teacher's guidance role, teamwork, and the principal's leadership (see Table 3). For example, the WSA guidelines Part II states: "In schools with a positive and caring atmosphere, all teachers contribute to helping students develop into whole persons. Functional teams are well coordinated to work towards a school mission" (Education Department, 1995, p.4). Furthermore, the WSA guidelines describe the development of a whole school approach as a process involving six stages. In order to implement the whole school approach to guidance, there is a need to promote awareness among teachers, parents, and students of the aims, principles, and needs of the school guidance program. The guidance plan is formulated with input from all parties concerned. First, the programs and activities are designed and then implemented with the collaboration of all teachers, parents, and students. Next, the programs are evaluated to ensure their effectiveness. The guidance program plan is then reviewed and adapted to meet other areas of concern. In addition, the CGS circular emphasizes that guidance counseling programs should work in collaboration with teaching & learning and that the school management teams should provide remedial, preventive, and developmental student guidance activities (Education and Manpower Bureau, 2003). The suggested program planning is similar to the steps involved in developing and managing comprehensive guidance programs in the US (Gysbers, 2005; Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). In contrast, the concepts of awareness raising, evaluation, and review, and the integration with teaching and learning and management are not mentioned in the earlier GWS document (Education Department, 1986).
### Table 3

|---|---|
| **Nature** | * Reactive and problem-oriented  
* Casework and group work with individuals  
* Remedial and supportive | * Proactive and strategic plan/program  
* Involve all staff and students  
* Developmental, preventive and remedial; four components: policy and organization, support service, personal growth education, responsive services |
| **Work Pattern** | * Leadership provided by the guidance team leader and the principal  
* Specialization and division of work among functional teams  
* Single role; e.g. school social worker, guidance teachers, and discipline teachers with specialized duties | * Leadership provided by the principal, the school leadership team, the guidance team leader, and other leaders in the school  
* Teamwork and collaboration among teachers and functional teams  
* Multiple roles; e.g. class-teachers conduct guidance activities and handle students' discipline problems; student guidance personnel as program manager, life skills education curriculum designer, educators in the classroom, consultant to teachers and parents and a counselor to students |

The above document analyses show an obvious shift in emphasis since the 1990s from “person with problem” to “person develops in contexts”, from remedial problem-oriented goals to holistic growth goals as the focus of effective guidance work, and from reactive individual casework to proactive school-wide developmental programs. In sum, the changes identified are in line with the three-level model proposed by Lang (2003). Comparing school counseling and guidance in a number of European countries, Lang (1998) suggested there was a
historical process. Guidance started from reactive work, extended to proactive guidance, and further developed into a comprehensive developmental program. This is also consistent with Hui’s (1994) three-level model of guidance services for Hong Kong schools. The first level was developmental guidance for all students, such as classroom guidance activities, integrated themes throughout the curriculum, extracurricular activities, and whole school guidance programs. The second level was preventive guidance for students at risk; for example, peer tutoring schemes, peer counselor schemes, and social skills training groups. The third level was remedial guidance for students in problem situations, such as case referral, school social work intervention, and classroom management interventions. The remedial, preventive, and developmental work has all contributed to more effective counseling and guidance in Hong Kong schools.

In addition, the above analyses indicate that the class-teacher’s guidance role, teamwork, and the principal’s leadership have remained consistently important elements of effective practice in Hong Kong schools. In a way, this observation is consistent with the Confucian tradition of teachers’ care, self-in-relation, and authoritarianism. It would be interesting to explore the level of implementation of guidance and counseling activities from the perspective of guidance personnel and their involvement in guidance work in terms of the time they spend on guidance and counseling and the time they allocate to various aspects of guidance and counseling.

**Current Implementation Status in Primary Schools**

For primary schools in Hong Kong, the comprehensive student guidance service includes four components: policy and organization for creating a caring culture; support service for teachers and parents; personal growth education for developing the life skills competencies of all students; and responsive services such as early identification of students at risk, and individual and group counseling (Education Department, 2003; Lee, 2003). Each student guidance teacher is
responsible for about 950 students (i.e. 24 classes in one school). Student guidance personnel must assume the roles of program managers, life skills education curriculum designers, educators in the classroom, consultants to teachers and parents, and student counselors. In 2003-2004, there were about 600 Student Guidance Personnel serving schools. 96% schools had Guidance teams, and 12% of the guidance teams were headed by the school principal or the vice-principal. Personal growth education was implemented in 99% of the schools, with 71% of the sessions related to Personal & Social development, 18% of the sessions to Academic Development, and 15% to Career Development (Lee, 2005).

Survey of Secondary School Guidance Personnel

There have been few empirical research studies on school guidance and counseling in Hong Kong, and particularly so from the perspective of guidance personnel (e.g. Hui, 1997, 1998; Hui & Lo, 1997; Lam, 1995, 1998; Lau, 2003; Yuen, 2001; Yuen, 2002; Yuen, Shek, et al., 2003; Yuen, Chan, et al., 2004). In May 2005, a life skills development project team in Hong Kong conducted a questionnaire survey of 753 guidance personnel from 96 secondary schools. The schools were randomly selected from a list of secondary schools in different areas of Hong Kong provided by the Education and Manpower Bureau. 635 completed questionnaires were collected from 79 schools (Individual response rate = 84.33%; School response rate = 82.29%). The aims were to assess the perceptions of school guidance personnel as to the level of implementation of guidance activities in their schools, and to examine the time allocated to guidance activities in Hong Kong secondary schools by school guidance personnel. The respondents consisted of 359 class teachers, 77 guidance masters, 73 careers masters, 54 life education coordinators, and 72 school social workers (male = 201, female = 421, missing = 13). Their mean teaching experience was about 12.37 years (sd = 8.06) and their mean guidance experience about 8.71 yrs (sd = 6.36).
Method

The respondents were asked to complete a mailed questionnaire that included the Comprehensive Guidance Program Inventory (CGPI) (Yuen, 2005) and a personal data form. The CGPI was especially designed for the study. Respondents were asked to rate the perceived level of implementation of guidance activities in their schools (e.g. My school organizes activities that help students work out their study plans) on a 6 point Likert scale (1= strongly not agree; 6= strongly agree).

Findings

The findings indicated that the scores of the sixteen items were all higher than 3.5. This showed that all guidance activities, including responsive service, guidance curriculum, individual career & educational planning and system support were perceived to be implemented to some extent, but not to a great extent, in this sample of Hong Kong secondary schools (See Table 4)
Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Guidance Curriculum, Individual Career & Educational Planning, Responsive Service, and System Support (N=613)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance Activities (Domains of Guidance Activities)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. My school arranges counseling professionals to counsel students with more serious problems (e.g. school social workers and psychologists). (RS)</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My school sets up easily accessible referral mechanism and communication channels to enhance teachers’ participation and coordination in guidance work. (RS)</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My school organizes extra-curricular guidance activities in relation to students’ whole person development (e.g. human relationship week, career day). (GC)</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My school organizes activities that help students work out their study plans. (IP)</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My school arranges case conferences to co-ordinate guidance of individual students. (RS)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My school organizes individual study and career plan consultation services for students. (IP)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My school has been evaluating the effectiveness of guidance programs. (SS)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My school organizes teacher development activities which aim at supporting and encouraging teachers to take part in guidance programs for students. (SS)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Classroom guidance activities are run as experiential learning and with the aim of students’ introspection and interaction. (GC)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My school offers group counseling to help students with personal emotional problems. (RS)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My school organizes activities that help students understand their interests in various jobs. (IP)</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My school introduces students to social resources related to counseling (e.g. counseling organizations, youth centres, and activities held by universities). (SS)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom guidance activities are held in class on a regular basis. (GC)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Classroom guidance activities are designed with balanced curricula and fulfillment of students’ needs in personal development, social, academic, and career development. (GC)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My school helps students set up their own achievement record books (including personal interests, extra-curricular activities, achievements and study and career plans etc.). (IP)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My school organizes parental education activities to support and encourage parents to guide their children’s growth. (SS)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cronbach’s Alpha for the whole scale=.87 ;
Domains of guidance activities: GC=Guidance Curriculum; IP= Individual Career & Educational Planning; RS=Responsive Service; SS=System Support
In addition, the respondents reported the estimated time that they spent on
guidance per 5 day week: school social workers (M= 21.78 hours), guidance
masters (M= 9.33 hours), life education co-ordinators (M= 6.36 hours), careers
masters (M= 4.90 hours), and class-teachers (M= 4.37 hours). In terms of time
allocation, the respondents were asked to indicate their percentage distribution in
four domains of guidance activities (i.e. guidance curriculum, individual career &
educational planning, responsive service, and system support) with 100% representing
the total time spent on guidance work. The findings indicated that all
guidance personnel spent more than 10% of their time on each of the four domains
of guidance activities (See Table 5). This indicated that the guidance personnel
were performing multiple roles, and were involved in various domains of guidance
activities. The respondents also reported the estimated time they spent on talking to
students outside the classroom per day: school social workers (M= 249.49 minutes),
guidance masters (M= 48.60 minutes), life education co-ordinators (M= 34.19 minutes),
careers masters (M= 29.93 minutes), and class-teachers (M= 33.05 minutes).
Table 5
Time Spent and Time Allocation in Guidance Work among Guidance Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class-teacher (n=546)</th>
<th>Guidance master (n=70)</th>
<th>Careers master (n=57)</th>
<th>Life education co-ordinator (n=52)</th>
<th>School social worker (n=65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time talking with students</td>
<td>33.05 (31.50)</td>
<td>48.60 (39.12)</td>
<td>29.93 (16.84)</td>
<td>34.19 (27.86)</td>
<td>249.4921 (231.68018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(minutes per day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours in guidance</td>
<td>4.369 (7.91)</td>
<td>9.352 (15.60)</td>
<td>4.900 (4.82)</td>
<td>6.362 (16.37)</td>
<td>21.7769 (12.41692)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work (hours per week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% allocation in guidance</td>
<td>22.59 (21.80)</td>
<td>26.92 (15.60)</td>
<td>31.69 (20.15)</td>
<td>41.02 (25.37)</td>
<td>17.09 (18.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% allocation in individual</td>
<td>17.08 (17.82)</td>
<td>13.10 (10.16)</td>
<td>29.01 (19.73)</td>
<td>11.56 (11.84)</td>
<td>10.35 (12.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment and planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% allocation in responsive</td>
<td>28.62 (23.79)</td>
<td>33.97 (15.60)</td>
<td>16.43 (12.60)</td>
<td>22.05 (20.36)</td>
<td>56.51 (21.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% allocation in system</td>
<td>19.61 (18.82)</td>
<td>21.83 (11.99)</td>
<td>17.87 (12.46)</td>
<td>18.64 (18.90)</td>
<td>13.20 (6.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding teamwork, 90% guidance masters indicated that there was a guidance team responsible for implementation of the counseling program in their schools (Team size, M=7.72, sd=2.80), and the mean annual budget for school guidance activities was HK$20,784 (maximum=HK$140,000, minimum=HK$0). 78% careers masters reported that there was a careers team responsible for careers education and guidance in their schools (Team size, M=5.46, sd=6.82), and the mean annual budget for this was HK$3,571 (maximum=HK$30,000, minimum=HK$0). 85% life education co-ordinators indicated that there was a life education team in their school (Team size, M=9.53, sd=9.01), for which the mean annual budget was HK$12,949 (maximum=HK$75,000, minimum=HK$0). 32% class-teachers reported that they were involved in teaching class guidance and life skills lessons, and the mean number of class guidance lessons taught by the class-teachers was 15.29 per year (sd=23.08).

In relation to training, most respondents received some training, although not a high level, in guidance and counseling. However, a number of the respondents indicated that they had not received any training in guidance and counseling, namely, 31.8% class teachers, 5.2% guidance masters, 8.2% careers masters, 11.1% life education co-ordinators, and 4.2% school social workers (See Table 6).

The limitation of the study is that the sample was taken from schools that participated in the study voluntarily, and those guidance personnel who returned the questionnaires might have tended to hold favorable attitudes toward school guidance and counseling in their schools.
Table 6
Training in Guidance and Counseling among Guidance Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training received</th>
<th>Class-teacher (n=346)</th>
<th>Guidance Master (n=73)</th>
<th>Careers Master (n=72)</th>
<th>Life education co-ordinator (n=51)</th>
<th>School social worker (n=67)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about 15 hrs</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 hrs</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-60 hrs</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-120 hrs</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree in Counseling or related discipline</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree in Counseling or related discipline</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concluding Thoughts

In this paper, I have examined the official documents related to school counseling programs in Hong Kong and reported a survey study on the perceptions of secondary school guidance personnel concerning the implementation of school counseling programs in their schools. The review indicates that school counseling in Hong Kong has evolved from a remedial approach to a comprehensive guidance...
and counseling program approach. The survey findings suggest that the guidance personnel perceived that some guidance activities, including guidance curriculum, individual planning, responsive services and system support, had been implemented in their secondary schools, but not at a very high level. Class-teachers, guidance teachers, career teachers, life education co-ordinators and school social workers are actively involved in various domains of guidance activities. Most respondents received some training, although not a great deal, in guidance and counseling. This survey is the first step in assessing the current implementation status of the comprehensive guidance and counseling program in Hong Kong.

*Future Directions for Research*

Some worthwhile areas for future research are: (a) an extensive review of the input and management of human, finance, and political resources in the implementation of school counseling programs (Lee, 2005); (b) case studies on the processes and good practices involved in the implementation of successful school counseling programs (Yuen & Fung, in press); (c) longitudinal studies on the impact of the implementation of the whole school approach, through comprehensive school guidance and counseling programs, on students' connectedness, achievements, and life skills development (Yuen, 2005).

*Counseling Program Enhancement*

With regard to the enhancement of counseling programs in schools, counselor educators and researchers have emphasized the importance of more systemic counseling training for teachers and guidance personnel (Leung, 2003; Leung & Chan, 1998), their professional supervision (Chan, Shek, Lau, & Yuen, 2005), and continuous professional development (Lam & Yuen, 2004). Scholars and guidance practitioners have also advocated a more collaborative commitment to the implementation of the life skills curriculum and comprehensive guidance programs in schools (Yuen, Hui, et al., 2004; See appendix). The priorities of program objectives would be: to provide students with opportunities and support for their academic,
career, personal-social, and spiritual development; to conduct class guidance activities for all classes at their corresponding developmental levels; to facilitate educational and career planning for each student; to ensure responsive services are available for students in need; and to create a support system for students, parents, and teachers. The government departments, tertiary institutions, non-government agencies and schools could further collaborate to enhance the support system of the comprehensive guidance and counseling program including an assessment and evaluation program, a parent education program, a teacher development and consultation service, a student mentorship scheme, and cross-curricular and co-curricular activities that facilitate student self-development and services to the community.
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Appendix

Position Statement on the Life Skills Curriculum and the Comprehensive Guidance Programme in Schools

_Pledge_
We, members of the project team, commit ourselves in collaboration to promote life skills development among students and a whole school approach to comprehensive developmental guidance in schools.

_Rationale_
1. Individuals, groups, families, schools, organizations and community agents all have a role to play in the whole person development of students.
2. Schools should provide all students with education conducive to their healthy development. The guidance programme in schools is aimed at enhancing the academic, career, personal-social and spiritual development of all students.
3. Implementing a whole school approach to comprehensive developmental guidance involves a planned process of curriculum design and staff development in schools.

_Mission_
The Project Team invites parents, teachers, principals, education administrators, university teachers, researchers, guidance personnel, social workers, counsellors, psychologists, guidance teachers, discipline teachers, career teachers, teacher educators, guidance educators, health educators, educational and professional bodies, government departments and non-government organizations to join together to:
1. Provide students with opportunities and support for their academic, career, personal-social and spiritual development.
2. Conduct classroom guidance activities for all classes at their corresponding developmental levels.
3. Facilitate educational and career planning for each student.
4. Ensure responsive services are available to students in need, such as individual counselling, group guidance, peer mediation programmes.
5. Create a support system for students, parents and teachers such as peer tutoring scheme, teacher development and consultation service, parent education programme, cross-curricular and extra-curricular activities that facilitate student self-development and services to the community.

May 2004

The Life Skills Development Project Team

In May 2004, 97 participants of the Symposium & Forum on Life Skills Development and Comprehensive Guidance Programme signed their names in support of the position statement.
在學校推行生活技能課程及全方位輔導計劃的立場宣言

承諾
本計劃小組成員承諾共同協作，推廣學生的生活技能發展及在校推行全校性的全方位發展性輔導計劃。

理念
1. 社區組織、機構、團體、學校、家庭及個人在學生的全人發展方面擔當著重要的角色。
2. 學校應該為所有學生提供有助於他們健康成長的教育。因此，校內的輔導活動旨在加強所有學生在學業、事業、個人與群性和心靈方面的發展。
3. 推行全校參與的全方位發展性輔導計劃是一個有計劃地加強校內課程設計和員工發展的過程。

使命
我們邀請家長、教師、校長、教育行政人員、大學教師、研究員、輔導人員、社工、顧問人員、心理學家、輔導教師、訓育教師、升學及就業輔導教師、教師教育工作者、輔導教育工作者、健康教育工作者、教育及專業團體、各政府部門和非政府機構參與，共同：
1. 為所有學生在學術、事業、個人與群性和心靈的發展提供機會和支援。
2. 推行配合各班級學生的發展程度的課堂輔導活動。
3. 協助每個學生計劃學業和事業上的發展。
4. 確保有需要的學生能獲得輔助服務，例如個別輔導、小組輔導及協調朋輩關係計劃等。
5. 為教師、家長和學生建構支援系統，例如朋輩指導計劃、教師發展及諮詢服務、家長教育、職訓活動和課外活動，以促進學生自我發展和服務社會。
二零零四年五月
生活技能發展計劃小組
在二零零四年五月，共有九十七位參加由本計劃小組舉辦的生活技能發展及
全方位輔導計劃專題研討會及論壇的人士承諾並簽署支持此立場宣言。
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