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Inclusive Education in China

This CEREC working paper is adapted from the summary chapter of the author’s doctoral dissertation (Malinen, in review) that studies inclusive education from teachers’ perspective in mainland China, especially in Beijing Municipality. It should be noted that China is a vast and diverse country. Therefore one must always be careful in generalising the findings from one place to other Chinese regions. The author’s dissertation is connected to an international comparative research project that aims to produce knowledge on the development of inclusive education from a teacher’s point of view in six countries in three different continents. The expected time of doctoral defence is in the end of May 2013.
Inclusive education in global perspective

Inclusive education is included in the education policies of governments around the world and today there is a wide international consensus about inclusion as a desirable goal. This does not mean that there would be single unified global movement towards inclusive education. An illustrative example of the plurality within the inclusion agenda are the numerous competing definitions of inclusive education (Ainscow, Booth & Dyson 2006, p. 27; Kavale & Forness 2000; Allan & Slee 2008, pp. 27–41). The variety within the global inclusive education movement is so great that Dyson (1999) has suggested that we could use the plural form and talk about inclusions. Inclusive education has been used to describe anything from physical integration of students with disabilities in mainstream classrooms to the transformation of classrooms, curricula and pedagogies. Initially inclusive education concentrated on students with disabilities’ access and participation in normative contexts. Today, however, inclusive education is often used as a broader concept that relates many groups of children and youth who are excluded from school and society (UNESCO, 2009).

According to Kozleski, Artiles, Fletcher and Engelbrecht (2009) the basic principle of inclusive education and inclusive schools schools are commitment to belonging, nurturing and educating all students regardless of their differences in ability, culture, gender, language, class and ethnicity. (Kozleski, Artiles, Waitoller, 2011)

Inclusive education movement has involved many different research genres from which Slee (2011, pp. 63–64) provides a few examples. According him the first genre is traditional or neo-special education research that aims at rebranding the special education so that it would align with the inclusive education policies around the world. The second genre is dedicated to providing critique of special education. The third genre of inclusive education research concentrates on analysing inclusion according the different identity groups such as
gender, race, sexuality, and social class. In this genre the research interests may also focus on some specific area of education such as educational leadership and administration, teaching and learning, or different levels and sectors of education. In addition these three genres, there are also scholars who are sceptical particularly about the feasibility the so-called full inclusion (i.e. educating all students, with no exceptions in mainstream settings). In the United States, scholars like Mostert, Kavale and Kauffman (2008) who prefer a more traditional special education, have been involved in intense debate with researchers such as Gallagher, Heshusius, Iano, and Skrtic (2004) who are strong believers of inclusive education.

It is important to bear in mind that educational practices labelled as ‘inclusive education’ have a strong local flavour. Even though the inclusive rhetoric and policies may travel across borders and from language to language the educational practices which are tightly connected to the local culture have proven to be harder to transform (Alur, 2009; Bach, 2009; Mitchell, 2005). There is for example a considerable distinction between the inclusion education of the developing and the developed world. In many affluent Western democracies inclusive education refers to the policy of merging well-resourced segregated special education and general education into a one system. In these countries, inclusive education is commonly seen to tackle the exclusion of students with disabilities and other ‘special needs’. In many developing parts of the world, for example in most Sub-Saharan African countries, this version of inclusion is irrelevant as there is not much special education that could be deconstructed (Artiles & Dyson, 2005; Singh, 2009).

**Inclusive education in China**

In China, the first high-profile experiments of admitting children with disabilities in regular classrooms of mainstream schools began in the 1980s (Deng & Zhu, 2007). The initial
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measures of promoting inclusion were taken in the rural and remote areas of China where, because of limited financial resources and expertise, and difficult transportation conditions, regular classrooms were often the only option for providing some education for children with disabilities (Deng & Pei, 2009; Xiao, 2007). In 1980s, Chinese legislation also started to support more inclusive approach to education (Deng & Manset, 2000; Deng, Poon-Mcbrayer, & Farnsworth, 2001; Liu & Jiang, 2008; McCabe, 2003; Qian, 2003). 1990 the new government policy of accepting children with disabilities in mainstream classes was given the name suibān jiùdú (learning in regular classrooms) (Xu, 2012). Even though the official suibān jiùdú policy has only about thirty years of history, anecdotes from Chinese scholars and practitioners suggest that in individual cases the practice of children with disabilities attending mainstream schools had existed much longer time (Deng & Zhu, 2007; Xu, 2012).

Education of children with disabilities in China

The Table 1 shows that in 2010 the total number of official suibān jiùdú students in Chinese regular primary and junior middle schools was 255,662 while, the total enrolment in special education schools or attached special education classes was 169,951 students. These statistics can be interpreted so that the majority (60.1%) of students who are officially recognised as having a disability or other special educational need are already placed in mainstream settings. While this interpretation provides quite positive picture from the advancement of inclusive education in China, adding the statistics reported in Table 2 to the mix, produces a more confusing image. In 2006 national sample survey (CDPF, 2007) China had almost 2.5 million compulsory education age (6–14-year-old) Children with disabilities. It would mean that in the official Chinese statistics, the majority of compulsory education age children with disabilities are recognised as neither suibān jiùdú nor special education school/class student. Potential explanations for this mismatch could be that some children
with disabilities who go to school are registered as regular students and/or some children with disabilities do not go to school at all. In addition, the Chinese numbers of people with disabilities are small in international comparison. In 2011 the World Health Organisation (WHO, 2011, p. 30) estimated that the global prevalence of moderate and severe disabilities would 15.3 % across all ages, and 5.1 % among the 0–14-year-old population. The corresponding Chinese percentages, calculated from the Second China National Sample Survey on Disability (CDPF, 2007) and the China Statistical Yearbook 2007 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2007), are almost three times smaller (6.3 % and 1.8 %).

The difference between the Chinese and WHO estimates in the number of people with disabilities is probably at least partly explained by different assessment criteria. The Chinese government standards for assessing disabilities (CPG, 2006) uses six different disability categories which are (1) visual disability (2) hearing disability (3) language disability (4) intellectual disability (5) physical disability (6) mental disability. These categories are mostly defined by following the medical model of disability. A person has to meet the criteria of at least one of the categories in order to be defined as having a disability. Instead of disability categories, the WHO (2013) Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 uses six different domains of functioning in measuring health and disability. Compared to the Chinese disability criteria, these domains which are (1) Cognition (2) Mobility (3) Self-care (4) Getting along (5) Life activities (6) Participation, cover much wider area of human functioning. Therefore, they are likely to produce higher estimates about the prevalence of disability in a given population.

National strategy of implementing inclusive education

The Chinese government promotes a more inclusive approach to education but it does not aim at deconstructing the existing special education system entirely. The government still plans to maintain the existing special education schools as resource centres that provide
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disabilities with profound special education needs (SEN), and support the regular schools in including the majority of students with SEN. This mainland Chinese approach to inclusive education, that emphasises the roles of both special education and mainstream schools, is often described by slogan 雙軌并行，特殊學校為主導，普通教室為主體 (Special education school as backbone, learning in regular classroom as main body) (CPG, 2011). In China’s National Plan for Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development for years 2010–2020 (CPG, 2010) the government also provides concrete guidelines for implementing its strategy of inclusive education. One concrete goal in this influential document is to ensure that by 2020 every prefecture, prefecture-level city, and county of more than 300,000 residents has at least one special education school.

Financial factors are most likely an important incentive for educating the majority of students with disabilities in regular classrooms. The number of children with disabilities going to school has grown so rapidly that expanding the network of special education schools at the same pace would have been very expensive exercise, while accepting children with disabilities into regular classrooms has been seen as much more cost-effective approach (Liu & Jiang, 2008; McCabe, 2003; Xiao, 2007).

It appears that in the last two decades, the growth in the number of special education school in China has slowed down. The national statistics show a steep growth (from 375 to 1,539) in the number of special education schools during years 1985–2000, but the growth during the next ten-year period (years 2001–2010) was much more relaxed (from 1,531 to 1,706 schools). However, during years 1985–2010 the number of regular primary schools dropped by over half-a-million units and even the number of junior middle schools by over 21,000 units. This means that in recent decades, the relative share of special education
schools has grown significantly, even though they still make up only about half a per cent of compulsory education schools in China.

In Beijing municipality, where this dissertation mostly concentrates the student enrolment in special education schools did not grow much during the 12 years period between 1998 and 2010 and the number of special education school units actually dropped from 30 to 21 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 1999, 2011) Yet, the local strategy of special education emphasises still emphasises both the development of special education schools and inclusive regular schools (Beijing Municipal Commission of Education, 2011).

In terms of financing, the nature of development has been less clear. In 1998–2009, the total expenditure on special education schools in China increased over five-fold from 840 million to about 4.5 billion Yuan. Nevertheless, the relative share of special education school costs from the entire national budget of the educational sector in China remained unchanged. During the whole 1998–2009 period special education schools were responsible of only about 0.3 per cent of the total national expenditure on education. (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 1999, 2010; 2011; Xiong & Lei, 2012)

National level Chinese statistics about special and inclusive education, like in any other area of education and society are often problematic since the regional differences in the stage of development inside the country are huge. Disparities in access to resources exist not only between the poor and remote areas of Western China and the wealthier regions along the eastern coastline but also between different groups of people within certain locality. For example the children with disabilities of migrant parents who have from the country side to work in the big cities may not be entitled to services such as special education schools, trained special education teachers and resource classrooms in regular schools that are
available for families who are counted as local residents in the country-wide *hùkūn* (household registration) system

**Barriers of inclusive education in China**

Competitive school culture and traditional instructional practices like whole-class teaching and rote learning have been seen as major obstacles of inclusive education in China. In recent years, teachers have been encouraged to adopt more student-centred teaching strategies that could potentially serve better the individual needs of children with disabilities. Since the days for the kējǔ (imperial examination) system that was introduced in the early 7th century the Chinese educational culture has emphasised selection and competition. Teachers’ performance has commonly been evaluated based on what percentage of their students’ test result in the zhōngkǎo (middle school entrance exam) and gāokǎo (college entrance exam). This has understandably reduced teachers’ enthusiasm to have students with difficulties in learning and participation in their classes. (Deng & Manset, 2000; Deng et al., 2001; Deng & Pei, 2009).

Large class sizes have also been seen as an important challenge for inclusive education in China because it is said to prevent teachers from using more individualised curriculum and teaching methods (McCabe, 2003; Xiao, 2007). According to OECD (2012, p. 450), in 2010 the average class size in Chinese primary schools was 37.4 students while the OECD average was 21.2 students. Even though the class sizes in China are large on the average, there is considerable variation between different schools and localities. In major cities, declines in student population as a result of the one-child policy, have forced local governments to introduce smaller classes in order to minimise teacher layoffs (Cheng, 2011) My own observations from officially registered Beijing schools in spring 2012 also suggest that at least in the primary school level, classes of about 30 students are not that rare anymore.
Nevertheless it is important to recognise that in addition to officially registered schools, Beijing has been reported to have over 200 unregistered schools (Zhongguo qingnian bao, 2008). These schools are usually set up for the children of migrant families without local hūkǒu (household registration) who are not eligible for free public education. In these schools it is possible to encounter classes of over 60 students (Wen, 2012, p. 38). However, these unofficial schools which are epitome of educational inequality in urban China are not within the scope of this working paper.

Considering the issue of class sizes, it is also significant to notice that the average student-teacher ratios in officially registered Chinese schools are not particularly high. In 2010 the Chinese primary schools had, on the average 17.7 students per teacher, and lower middle schools, 15.0 students per teacher (Table 1). In Beijing municipality the average student-teacher ratios in 2010 were 13.2 and 10.2 in primary schools and lower middle schools respectively (Table 3). These ratios were actually well below the OECD average which was 15.8 for primary and 13.7 for lower secondary schools (OECD, 2012, p. 451). The contradiction between large class-sizes but relatively low student teacher ratios is explained by the fact that Chinese teachers, at least in urban schools, often teach only a few lessons per day. The trade-off in Chinese school system has been to limit the teachers’ daily teaching responsibility and reserve more time for lesson planning, exam rating and other off-class activities. In the light of these statistics, it appears that in the officially registered Chinese schools, especially in the wealthier regions like Beijing municipality, the lack of teaching staff as such, cannot be considered as the most crucial obstacle for the implementation of inclusive education.

In regard to developing inclusive education, Chinese teachers’ rather limited class-teaching time could be a valuable resource. When the teachers’ work days are not fully
occupied with delivering lessons, they should be able to use time for other activities like tutoring students with difficulties in learning, collaborating with colleagues, consulting other professionals, and participating in professional development programs related to inclusive education.

**Chinese understanding of inclusive education**

One of the most intense academic discussions around inclusive education among Chinese scholars has been dealing with the question of whether inclusive education even exists in mainland China. In China, inclusive education is translated as *quánnà jiàoyù* or *rónghé jiàoyù*, both terms that up until now have been quite seldom used outside academic circles. In everyday communication among teachers and school administrators the term *suíbān jiùdú* (learning in regular classrooms), is the most commonly used for referring to the policy of accepting students with disabilities in mainstream school settings.

Chinese *suíbān jiùdú* which dates from the 1980s indeed has some characteristics not found in the international inclusive education agenda. *Suíbān jiùdú* has for example strong connections to Confucian educational thinking and the concepts of socialism, and it is directed mainly at children with visual impairments, hearing impairments, and mental retardation and not for all children, as characterised by the international inclusion movement (Deng et al., 2001; Deng & Zhu, 2007). In 2009 over four-fifths (83%) of primary school students who were officially counted as *suíbān jiùdú* students had still been classified under one of the above mentioned three disability categories (Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, 2010).

Due to the national characteristics of the mainland Chinese policies some scholars make a distinction between *suíbān jiùdú* and inclusive education (*quánnà jiàoyù* or *rónghé jiàoyù*), while others use these concepts interchangeably, at least in academic exchanges outside
mainland China (Deng & Zhu, 2007; Li, 2009; Liu & Jiang, 2008). However, in this working paper, all these Chinese concepts are considered to refer to the phenomenon that is named as inclusive education in the international discussion. The justification for doing so is that the Chinese suibān jiùdū policy is not only home-grown initiative. Several scholars emphasise that the development of inclusive education in China has also been strongly influenced by the high-profile international inclusion campaigns, including United Nations (1989) Convention on the Rights of the Child, as well as the UNESCO World Declaration on Education for All (1990), Salamanca Statement (1994), and Dakar Framework for Action (2000) (Deng & Pei, 2009; Liu & Jiang, 2008; Potts, 2000).

Conclusions and recommendations

As described in the working paper the Chinese government seems to be promoting inclusive education in its official policies. The future challenge is to ensure that real changes take place in the in the practical reality of schools, educational system and educational culture. To start with the educational culture and education system in China, inclusive education would benefit from a shift from highly competitive school culture and strictly academic oriented curriculum to education that respects individual ways of learning, sees personal growth of every child as more pressing priority than academic excellence in standardized tests. Changing the entire Chinese educational culture is not an easy task. Chinese have been inclined to exam-oriented and highly competitive rote learning practices at least since early 7th century A.D., when the kējǔ (imperial examination) system that was used to select the administrative officials for the government positions, was introduced. Problems related to compulsory school students’ heavy work-load and over-packed curriculum are already widely recognized and the Chinese government has already plans to tackle the issue (CPG,
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There’s no doubt that teachers are in a key position in the implementation of inclusive education in Chinese schools. Based on the author’s and his colleagues recent findings (Malinen, Savolainen & Xu, 2012; Malinen, Savolainen & Xu, in review) teachers’ opposition towards inclusion could be reduced by increasing their self-efficacy in inclusive teaching (i.e. teachers’ own perception of their competence as inclusive teachers). The research findings also suggest that gaining experiences from successful inclusive teaching is an effective way to increase this sense of efficacy in inclusive teaching (Malinen, et al., 2013). How to then ensure that teachers’ receive these mastery experiences? The answer given here is: with adequate support. Without support it is very likely that teachers’ experiences become discouraging in their nature. Support can come in many forms. It can come in a traditional form of formal training programs organised by universities and other training institutions. It can come in a form of more informal exchange of ideas between experienced expert teachers and junior colleagues or other collaborative problem solving among teachers who struggle with the same issues.

One key finding of the author’s doctoral dissertation (Malinen, in review) is that those teachers, who rate themselves as effective collaborators, perceive inclusive education less threatening. Therefore, increasing collaboration seems to be one essential way for to build inclusive schools. All teachers should already during their initial teachers education start to learn how to work together with colleagues, parents and other professional, and this learning should continue throughout the teaching career. However, teachers’ willingness to collaborate is not enough if she school structures prevent collaboration from taking place. This means that teachers should have places (physical or virtual) and time (within working
hours) to plan, teach and reflect with their colleagues, seek help from outside experts and communicate with families.

Fortunately, the officially registered schools in Beijing Municipality schools that the author has visited already exist many examples of supportive and collaborative practices. Many of these examples came out in the interviews conducted in Beijing schools during the spring 2012 (27 Beijing teachers, personal communication, March 23 – 12 April, 2012). One positive case of collaboration between teachers comes from a primary school where the head teachers (bānzhīrèn)\(^1\) of the same grade level share an office where they meet regularly and discussed about the problems they had encountered in their work.

In another primary school, teachers described the activities of their so called teaching-study groups (jiàoyánzǔ). Teaching-study groups that are commonly found in Chinese schools are typically subject-based groups that meet regularly to engage in improvement and study of teaching (OECD, 2011, p. 88). One core activity of these groups is to draft detailed lesson plans that all members of the group are expected to follow during the upcoming classes. In addition to lesson planning teachers in this particular school also observed their group member’s lessons, and based on the observation, provided feedback for how to improve teaching.

Besides working together with colleagues, communicating with families is another important form of collaboration and helps teaches to prevent and solve problems. According to the interviews that were conducted in four different Beijing schools (27 Beijing teachers, 

\(^1\) In Chinese schools each class usually has a head teacher bānzhīrèn. In addition to teaching her subject (most commonly Chinese language and literature or mathematics), bānzhīrèn works as a director of a class who has the main responsibility of managing the class and communicating with families.
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personal communication, March 23 – 12 April, 2012) teachers may communicate with parents quite frequently through phone calls, text messages and face-to-face meetings. In one of the schools teachers also used a digital tool called Home-school interaction platform (Jiāxiào hùdòng píntái) to stay in contact with the families. Through this platform school can inform families about school events or teachers and parents can exchange quick messages about individual student affairs.

As described, Chinese teachers, at least in some schools in Beijing municipality are already involved in a range of collaborative practices that have a potential to be effective tools of professional development. In certain aspects, however, they may have a negative effect when it comes to implementing inclusive education. Collaborative practices in Chinese schools also serve the function of controlling that every teacher follows the centralized national curriculum. If this is interpreted in the way that every class and every student should be taught exactly the same way, it discourages teachers to adapt their instruction according to students’ individual educational needs. If Chinese schools can overcome this challenge, teaching-study groups and other co-operative ways of working have a strong potential of becoming units of collaborative problem solving and collegial support for teachers who struggle to teach students in inclusive classrooms.

Yet another factor that could contribute to the development of inclusive education in Chinese schools is the fact that teachers often teach only a few lessons per day. Therefore, compared to many other countries including Finland, they spend much less time for teaching in classroom during their workday. If used effectively, this generous amount of non-teaching time provides a valuable resource for developing and improving both school- and classroom-level inclusive practices.
Table 1: Basic statistics on primary, junior secondary and special education schools in China (Adapted from Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, 2011; National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>257 410</td>
<td>-574 899</td>
<td>5 617 000</td>
<td>+240 000</td>
<td>180 538</td>
<td>99 407 000</td>
<td>-34 295 000</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular lower middle schools</td>
<td>54 823</td>
<td>-21 080</td>
<td>3 523 000</td>
<td>+1 363 000</td>
<td>75 124</td>
<td>52 759 000</td>
<td>+13 111 000</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education schools</td>
<td>1 706</td>
<td>+1331</td>
<td>39 650</td>
<td>+33 000</td>
<td></td>
<td>166 012</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Refers to Children with visual, hearing, intellectual or other disabilities who study in regular classrooms in regular schools

\(^2\)Refers to the average number of students instructed by a full-time teacher

NB! No reliable data from year 1985 about student enrolment in special education schools available
### Table 2: Basic statistics of people with disabilities in China, in year 2006 (Adapted from CPG, 2007; CDPF, 2006; CDPF, 2007; National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Million</th>
<th>Share from</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with disability</td>
<td>in total</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>total population in China</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>total population of people with</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>disabilities</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0–14 years</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>total population in relevant</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15–59 years</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>age-group</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60+ years</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in different disability categories</td>
<td>visual disabilities</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>total population of people with</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hearing disabilities</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>disabilities</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speech disabilities</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>physical disabilities</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intellectual</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psychological</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multiple disabilities</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>university</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>total population of people with</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>upper middle school</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>disabilities</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower middle school</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>primary school</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiteracy among over 15-year-old</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>over 15-year-old people with</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
<th>Full-time teachers</th>
<th>Total student enrolment</th>
<th>Suibān jiūdú students&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Student-teacher ratio&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>60 038</td>
<td>653 255</td>
<td>3260</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior middle schools</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>30 255</td>
<td>309 912</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education schools</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Refers to Children with visual, hearing, intellectual, or other disabilities who study in regular classrooms in regular schools

<sup>2</sup>Refers to the average number of students instructed by a full-time teacher
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