

Citizenship Curriculum in Asia and the Pacific

CERC Studies in Comparative Education

For other titles published in this series, go to
www.springer.com/series/5731

CERC Studies in Comparative Education 22

Citizenship Curriculum in Asia and the Pacific

Edited by

**David L. Grossman
Wing On Lee
Kerry J. Kennedy**



**Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong**



Springer

SERIES EDITOR

Mark Mason, *Director, Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong, China*

FOUNDING EDITOR (AND CURRENTLY ASSOCIATE EDITOR)

Mark Bray, *Director, International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)
UNESCO, France*

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Anthony Sweeting, *Comparative Education Research Centre
The University of Hong Kong, China*

INTERNATIONAL EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Robert Arnove, *Indiana University, USA*

Beatrice Avalos, *Santiago, Chile*

Nina Borevskaya, *Institute of Far Eastern Studies, Moscow, Russia*

Michael Crossley, *University of Bristol, United Kingdom*

Gui Qin, *Capital Normal University, China*

Gita Steiner-Khamsi, *Teachers College, Columbia University, USA*

Comparative Education Research Centre

Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China

© Comparative Education Research Centre

First published 2008

ISBN 978-1-4020-8744-8

e-ISBN 978-1-4020-8745-5

Library of Congress Control Number 2008931318

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher.

Contents

List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	vii
List of Abbreviations	ix
Series Editor's Foreword	xi
Introduction	1
<i>David L. GROSSMAN</i>	
Conceptual Overview	
1 Globalised Economies and Liberalised Curriculum: New Challenges for National Citizenship Education	13
<i>Kerry J. KENNEDY</i>	
East Asia	
2 The Development of Citizenship Education Curriculum in Hong Kong after 1997: Tensions between National Identity and Global Citizenship	29
<i>Wing On LEE</i>	
3 Taiwan's New Citizenship Curriculum: Changes and Challenges	43
<i>Shiowlan DOONG</i>	
4 Citizenship Curriculum in China: A Shifting Discourse towards Chinese Democracy, Law Education and Psychological Health	61
<i>Minghua ZHONG and Wing On LEE</i>	
5 Citizenship Education Curriculum in Japan	75
<i>Kazuko OTSU</i>	
South/Southeast Asia	
6 The Anatomy of an Islamic Model: Citizenship Education in Pakistan	97
<i>Iftikhar AHMAD</i>	
7 Citizenship Discourse in the Context of Decentralisation: The Case of Indonesia	111
<i>Mary FEARNLEY-SANDER and Ella YULAELOWATI</i>	

8	The Building of a Nation and Ideas of Nationhood: Citizenship Education in Malaysia <i>Ibrahim Ahmad BAJUNID</i>	127
9	Political Pragmatism and Citizenship Training in Singapore <i>Tai Wei TAN and Lee Chin CHEW</i>	147
Pacific Rim		
10	Democracy at a Crossroads: Political Tensions Concerning Educating for Citizenship in the United States <i>Thomas SCOTT and John J. COGAN</i>	165
11	More Civics, Less Democracy: Competing Discourses for Citizenship Education in Australia <i>Kerry J. KENNEDY</i>	181
12	“Creative and Innovative Citizenry”: Exploring the Past, Present and Future of Citizenship Education in New Zealand <i>Carol MUTCH</i>	197
Reflective Analysis		
13	Tensions and Contentions in Citizenship Curriculum in Asia and the Pacific <i>Wing On LEE</i>	215
	Contributors	233
	References	237
	Index	263

List of Tables

1.1	The Scope of Education Reform in the Asia Pacific Region, 1997-2002	18
1.2	Kliebard's Classification of Rationales for Progressive Approaches to the School Curriculum	20
2.1	China Elements in Various Subjects in Hong Kong	32
2.2	National Identity of People in Hong Kong	36
3.1	Goals and Thematic Strands of Taiwan's New Citizenship Curriculum	51
3.2	Comparison of Teaching Time of the Old and New Citizenship Curriculum	57
5.1	Prescribed Subjects and the Number of School Hours at Junior High School	81
5.2a	Objectives for Knowledge	89
5.2b	Objectives for Skills	89
5.2c	Objectives for Attitudes	89
5.3	Curricular Framework for International Education	91
7.1	The Social Knowledge Organisation of the Indonesian and the Australian Curriculum	118
8.1	Explicit and Implicit Values, Characteristics and Good Habits	141
11.1	Discovering Democracy Curriculum Materials at a Glance	190
11.2	Support Materials for Civics and Citizenship Linked to Strands and Levels of Schooling for Queensland Schools	191
11.3	Framework for a Broader Approach to Civics and Citizenship Education	194

List of Figures

5.1	Structure of the Learning Areas	90
-----	---------------------------------	----

List of Abbreviations

AP	Advanced Placement
APEC	Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
CER	Commission on Education Reform
CICED	Centre for Indonesian Civic Education
CIDE	Comparative and International Development Education
CIRCLE	Centre for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement
CME	Civics and Moral Education
CMI	Chinese-Medium Instruction
CPC	Communist Party of China
DPP	Democratic Progressive Party
EI	Education Index
EMI	English-Medium Instruction
EPA	Economics and Public Affairs
EU	European Union
GPA	Government and Public Affairs
IEA	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement
IMF	International Monetary Fund
JAIE	Japan Association for International Education
KLA	Key Learning Area
KMT	Kuomintang (Nationalist Party)
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology
MOE	Ministry of Education
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress
NAFTA	North Atlantic Free Trade Association
NCSS	National Council for the Social Studies
NEA	National Education Association
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NICT	National Institute for Compilation and Translation
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAP	People's Action Party
PSHE	Personal, Social and Humanities Education
ROC	Republic of China
TIMSS	Third International Mathematics and Science Study
TOC	Target Oriented Curriculum
TTRA	Target and Target Related Assessment
UN	United Nations

UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organization

Series Editor's Foreword

In governments, ministries and departments of education the world over, citizenship education is increasingly viewed by politicians, policy makers and other stakeholders as a panacea, if not the panacea, for the ills that are perceived to plague contemporary society, its young and their youth culture, and which education is expected to ameliorate. The loss of community associated with the disembedded nature of modern existence and the ensuing alienation and disaffection of many young people; the disenchantment of the world that has followed modernity's undermining of established and traditional sources of meaning; the factors associated with what has been called the 'risk' society of late modernity and the increased vulnerability of young people; the fragility of identity in a world of contested authority and the attraction to young people of other forms of identity constituted in terms of consumer choices, for example, rather than in national and patriotic terms – these are among the chief concerns that have led educational policy makers to citizenship education in their search for solutions. Citizenship education is expected to contribute substantially to the development of young people more at home in their communities, societies and nations, who are more patriotically loyal but who also see themselves as global citizens concerned about and committed to the solution of planetary problems of sustainable existence, intercultural conflict, environmental destruction, disease and poverty. Citizenship education is expected to produce young people with a stronger sense of cultural and national identity, but who are also more culturally sensitive, planetarily committed and globally fluent. It has become, to cite the classic expression, all things to all men.

In this book, David Grossman, Wing On Lee and Kerry Kennedy examine the ways in which these multiple and conflicting demands on citizenship education are translated – or not – into the citizenship curricula of a diverse group of societies in Asia and the Pacific. The book follows their successful volume, *Citizenship Education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and Issues*, which was published as Number 14 in this series. Here the editors, who are widely regarded as leaders in the field, have gone beyond broad citizenship education frameworks to examine the realities, tensions and pressures that influence the formation of the citizenship curriculum. They asked their chapter authors from these different societies to consider two fundamental questions in this domain: (1) how is citizenship education featured in the current curriculum reform agenda in terms of both policy contexts and values; and (2) to what extent do the reforms in citizenship education reflect current debates within the society? The editors' comparative analysis of these case studies renders a complex picture of curriculum reform that indicates deep tensions between global and local agendas. On one hand, there is substantial evidence of an increasingly common policy rhetoric in the debates about citizenship education – those planetary commitments and responsibilities, those aspirations to global fluency through 'lifelong learning' for a 'globally competitive' 'knowledge society'. On the other hand, it is evident that this discourse does not necessarily

extend to citizenship curriculum, which in most places continues to be constructed according to distinctive social, political and cultural contexts. Whether the focus is on Islamic values in Pakistan, an emerging discourse about Chinese 'democracy', a nostalgic conservatism in Australia, or a continuing nation-building project in Malaysia – the cases show that distinctive social values and ideologies construct national citizenship curricula in Asian contexts even in this increasingly globalized era.

It is a pleasure to see this book in the CERC Studies in Comparative Education Series – not only for the continuity it represents with its earlier companion volume in the series, but also because its editors are old friends of the Comparative Education Research Centre (CERC) at the University of Hong Kong. One of the editors, Wing On Lee, was in fact CERC's founding Director.

CERC has recently been described, by the Co-Editor of the *Comparative Education Review*, David Post, as "one of the world's most important publishers of research in the field of comparative education". This volume, in its application of comparative education's research methods to the intersection of the fields of citizenship education and curriculum, is another reason why.

Mark MASON

Editor

CERC Studies in Comparative Education Series

Director

Comparative Education Research Centre

The University of Hong Kong

Introduction

David L. GROSSMAN

Like the first book in this series, *Citizenship Education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and Issues* (Lee, Grossman, Kennedy & Fairbrother, 2004), this book originates from a desire upon the part of the editors to encourage dialogue among scholars in the Asia-Pacific region about the nature of citizenship education. The first book focused on conceptions of citizenship education in the region that took into account local and indigenous contexts, traditions, knowledge and values. Its chapters included analysis and reflection on the conceptual debates in citizenship education along with historical and policy studies, studies of key contemporary issues and comparative studies of citizenship education. In the second book, however, it was decided to put the central focus on curriculum issues related to citizenship education, hence the title, *Citizenship Curriculum in Asia and the Pacific*.

The decision to make curriculum the focus was a measured one, based on the editors' observation of some highly visible and common trends in the region, if not internationally. Much of the Asia-Pacific region has witnessed massive curriculum reform over the past five years. Often fuelled by a neo-liberal reform agenda, the purpose of these reforms has been to align the school curriculum with the assumed needs of the "knowledge economy." Reform objectives have focused on the preparation of future citizens who are creative, innovative problem-solvers capable of contributing to future economic growth. "Lifelong learning" has become a mantra of the reforms and the creation of "learning societies" is seen to be one way to develop human capital that can continually generate new ideas and innovations. Beneath these slogans, these so-called "knowledge societies" seem to demand the development of a critical mass of educated citizens to engage in entrepreneurial and innovative activities directly related to economic growth and development.

These trends in curriculum reform are by no means isolated phenomena. Fiala (2006) argues that a global ideology of education has emerged. In brief, this "ideology" presses education systems to pursue:

1. Full development of the individual
2. Development of the nation and the economy
3. Recognition of the importance of the values of equality, democracy and the broad rights of human beings for education (p.30)

It is now common to find these three trends represented in some form in curriculum policy documents across the Asia-Pacific region, if not globally. However, in constructing a formal curriculum the reality is that it is difficult to balance these three ends, and curriculum debates often reflect the differing priorities put on each one of these. For

example, as Fiala (2006) points out, less developed countries have a tendency to put more emphasis on national identity and economic growth. In fact, in many cases the more Utopian goals of full development of individuals, equality, democracy and human rights may in the end have only a loose connection to the formal curriculum.

As this volume will illustrate, these global themes are central to issues surrounding citizenship education debates in the Asia-Pacific region, and gave rise to a number of key questions for us to consider. How has citizenship education fared in the process of the broad curriculum reforms across the region? Where has citizenship education curriculum been located within these new educational contexts? How has citizenship education been modified to meet new ideological purposes? What kinds of citizens are needed for these knowledge societies that are being developed throughout the region?

In this context, we invited prospective authors to submit proposals for chapters that would respond to the following set of questions:

1. How has citizenship education featured in the current curriculum reform agenda in terms of its policy contexts and values?
 - 1.1 At the level of policy;
 - 1.2 At the level of syllabus design;
 - 1.3 At the level of teaching materials and schools and classrooms.
2. To what extent do the reforms to citizenship education reflect the current debates within society?

Upon completion of a draft that addressed these questions in terms of their own societal context, authors were invited to a seminar to share their draft chapters in the interests of serving the agenda for cross-regional dialogue and indeed to enhance their chapters through the cross-fertilisation of ideas.

Before outlining the set of chapters that resulted from this process, I would like to take the opportunity to make some brief comments about the conceptual, geographical and political aspects of this endeavour.

The Curriculum Focus

There is not a lot of agreement about the term curriculum and its usage in the literature. For example, Glatthorn (1999) identifies eight conceptually different types of curriculum: hidden (unintended), excluded (what has been left out intentionally or unintentionally), recommended (advocated by experts), written (as found in official documents), supported (as found in textbooks, software and media), tested (embodied in tests), taught (what teachers actually deliver), and learned (what students learn). As Glatthorn points out, there is a challenge into bringing these wide range versions of what is taught into congruence. In a useful definitional exercise, Kennedy (2005c, p.84) describes four broad dimensions of the curriculum that taken together reflect for him the totality of the curriculum.

1. Curriculum as a prescribed plan for learning;
2. Curriculum as all the learning experiences encountered at school, planned and unplanned;
3. Curriculum as a reflection of the expectations that society has for young people; and
4. Curriculum as a statement of values.

Kennedy's definition assumes that curriculum takes place in a political context and represents a selection from the culture. As individuals and groups in a society will want their say, there will be different and often conflicting interests at work. According to Wood (1998), we argue for competing conceptions of the curriculum on the basis of our view of a just society and a good life, and thus every proposed curriculum formation carries a distinct social outcome, "a notion of what body of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values students should gain in order to live in a particular social order" (p.177). The crucial question, as Kennedy points out, is who selects the knowledge, skills and attitudes that make up the school curriculum. In this context we should not be surprised if there are vociferous debates over the curriculum.

Ross (2002) reminds us that no curriculum is a neutral document; any statement of what is to be learned is permeated with objectives and intentions that in turn embody values, whether implicit or explicit.

The current curriculum reform movements only reinforce the reality that curriculum is far from a fixed entity. Curriculum policies and frameworks will be altered from time to time as their purposes and emphases evolve through societal and political shifts, and in some cases, regime change. In the cases presented in this book, readers will find rather dramatic evidence of the variability of curriculum and its impact on citizenship education engendered by wide-ranging curriculum reforms in a number of societies. What are the educational goals and/or motivation behind reconstructing the curriculum? Ross (2002) argues that there are three distinct approaches to constructing a given curriculum:

1. Content-driven curriculum, a construction of formally delimited zones of subjects or disciplines (knowledge as a distinct body of data);
2. An objectives-driven curriculum, built around specific needs, for competencies of society, of the economy, or of the individual (knowledge as a commodity); or
3. A process-driven curriculum, principally concerned with or guided by processes of learning (knowledge as how to learn).

As Ross concludes, citizenship education does not fall neatly into any one of these three types, and confusingly, can be described as any one of them. Citizenship education variously can be seen as a body of knowledge, or as useful to the individual and socially desirable, or as nurturing a student's value system. The current motivation in the curriculum reform movements seems to focus on the second of these approaches. However, as

Ross points out, in the current assessment environment, there will always be a tendency to migrate towards a content-driven curriculum for testing purposes.

Faced with the ambiguity of the linkage between citizenship education and the curriculum, the editors of this book purposely did not impose on the authors any definition of curriculum. Rather, we challenged them to explore the tensions between these three dimensions of content, objectives and process in the formation of the citizenship education curriculum. We asked them to explore the ongoing debates about both the form and substance of citizenship education, and to give voice to the various stakeholders.

The Geographical Scope

As the reader can determine from a perusal of the table of contents, the societies covered are drawn from four geographical regions including South Asia (Pakistan), Southeast Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore), East Asia (Hong Kong, Taiwan, China, Japan), and three “Pacific Rim” countries (United States, Australia, New Zealand). These 11 “societies” (technically we cannot use the term countries because of the inclusion of Hong Kong and Taiwan) are found in this volume as the result of a long search on the part of the editors for appropriate authors in the region. This search was not always successful, and we failed in efforts to obtain chapters from several places, e.g., Thailand, South Korea and two Pacific Island nations.

To capture this geographically diverse set of societies, we have opted to use the term “Asia and the Pacific” in our title. There is a great deal of terminological confusion over terms such as Asia-Pacific, Pacific Rim, etc., and a great deal of debate over their meaning and usage (see for example, Dirlik, 1998). It is not our purpose here to engage in this debate. To be sure, the studies in this book cover a wide geographic range. Yet, despite the spatial diversity, there are some underlying connections among these places, notably economic. With the exception of Pakistan, these societies are all member “economies” of APEC, but in fact this was not a conscious criterion for the selection of the cases. In reality, our notion of “Asia and the Pacific” is a construction, based largely on our own location in Hong Kong. Like most geographical designations, it is not real, natural or essential. It is socially constructed and can be politically contested. At the same time, it is a highly relevant construction if it is viewed from the perspective of Hong Kong as the geographical centre, notably because it is derived from the agenda of our work and existing networks in our Centre for Citizenship Education (see the Centre website for further information: <http://www.ied.edu.hk/cce/>).

The Political Scope

Perhaps more significant than the geographical diversity is the range of political systems found in these case studies. In no sense can we characterise all of these societies as “democratic.” They range from highly authoritarian states to highly developed democracies, and variations between these two poles. The poles are comparatively easy

to identify and label, but states that combine democratic and non-democratic elements, or so-called hybrid regimes, are more difficult to categorise. In the literature they are variously categorised as semi-democracies, illiberal democracies, semi-authoritarian regimes, or authoritarian democracies, but the underlying point is that a considerable number of political regimes are neither purely authoritarian nor purely democratic. Munck and Snyder (2004) suggest a four-point scale along a continuum that includes authoritarianism, semi-authoritarianism, semi-democracy and democracy, built along Dahl's notion of the twin dimensions of participation and contestation. However, they also indicate it is very difficult to define the critical and perhaps multiple thresholds that separate authoritarian from democratic regimes even on these two dimensions. They further argue the need for more nuanced measures that distinguish between authoritarian and democratic participation and contestation. They find that a focus on electoral politics neglects extra-electoral factors. They suggest four extra-electoral dimensions that should be considered in understanding the variety of non-democratic regimes: Who rules (e.g., a party, the military, or a person), how do rulers rule (e.g., networks, ethnic ties, mass-based party), why do rulers rule (e.g., religion, ideology, greed), and how much do rulers rule (e.g., the degree of state control)?

It is certainly beyond the scope of this study to resolve the highly complex and contentious task of labelling political regimes. Authors were asked to take into account the political context of the citizenship education curriculum, and this necessarily involved the use of their own labels. While we leave aside the question of whether predominantly Western liberal and highly legalistic notions of democracy can serve as templates for political regimes worldwide, we must point out that in several of the chapters we are examining citizenship education in the context of non-democratic or at best quasi-democratic regimes. In other words, in this book we allow for the possibility of non-democratic citizenship education as well as its democratic counterpart. This is by no means an endorsement of non-democratic regimes or their practices. In this regard the reader should know that there was considerable discussion of the decision to include the cases of the two most authoritarian regimes on the political continuum, China and Pakistan, in a book devoted to citizenship education curriculum. To the editors the alternative, i.e., to narrow the scope of the book by excluding the most extreme cases while including some societies whose political regimes have different blends and mixes of authoritarian and democratic elements (e.g., Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong), seemed untenable. In the end, the interests of casting a wide net of inquiry covering a range of regimes across the authoritarian-democratic spectrum seemed more appropriate, and served the larger agenda of increasing dialogue across traditional boundaries.

Synopses of the Chapters

In the opening chapter Kennedy introduces some underlying issues that provide a broad context for the more specific curriculum discourses found in the succeeding chapters. He provides us with an impressive list of policies and legislation that demonstrate the pervasiveness of the curriculum reform agenda across the Asia-Pacific region. He examines

how key elements of both the macro context of the “new” global economy and the micro level of the school curriculum are likely to continue to affect citizenship education. Next he considers competing influences on national citizenship education and whether these, rather than more liberalizing tendencies of economic and curriculum reform, will shape citizenship education in the future. Kennedy worries that if social and political values rather than economic values drive curriculum, pedagogy and assessment for citizenship education in the future, the result will be a citizenry ill-equipped to make judgements about the role of the nation states in complex and uncertain global contexts. Kennedy argues that citizenship education needs to encompass both the nation state and global realities, and must rest on the development of these multiple perspectives. Kennedy concludes that it remains an open question whether nation states are capable of reconstructing citizenship education along these lines.

The next four chapters are case studies from East Asia: Hong Kong, Taiwan, China and Japan. Focusing on *Hong Kong*, in Chapter 2 Lee discusses how the dynamic sociopolitical and economic changes in Hong Kong since 1997 have had impact on citizenship education in schools. In particular, he points to the interplay of globalisation and localisation in citizenship curriculum development. On the one hand, he highlights how a growing concern about national identity in the aftermath of the return to Chinese sovereignty has penetrated curriculum documents and generated several governmental and semi-governmental initiatives. On the other hand, he notes the emphasis that government curriculum reform documents have put on meeting the challenges of globalisation and the development of a knowledge economy through global citizenship education. Lee finds that the tensions between the competitive globalisation and localisation agendas are complicated by the process of Hong Kong’s repoliticisation after its return to China. Ultimately how citizenship curriculum will develop in the future in Hong Kong will depend on how these tensions are resolved.

In Chapter 3 Doong shows how the new decentralised school-based curricula system in *Taiwan* has redefined the field of citizenship education at the elementary and junior high school levels, and has dramatically changed the citizenship curriculum’s scope and sequence, as well as school and classroom practice. This has generated a number of heated debates, including controversies over citizenship education as a separate versus integrated subject and the emphasis on national versus nativist awareness. The debates clearly demonstrate the political nature of the reforms where the citizenship curriculum has been used as a battlefield by contending political parties. According to Doong, Taiwan’s citizenship curriculum has now reached a crossroads in which it is too early to tell whether the new reform policies will survive the challenges.

In Chapter 4 Zhong and Lee report that civic education is still in its infancy in mainland *China*, though voices advocating it are growing. In the context of its existing one-party state, the Chinese leadership acknowledges that there is still a long way to go in building a political democracy (while emphasising that by democracy they mean “socialist democracy with Chinese characteristics”). Still, rapid changes in the social and economic fabric of Chinese society have led to dramatic changes in the government’s definition of the essential qualities of citizenship. Zhong and Lee track the changes in

emphasis in the citizenship curriculum discourse since the adoption of the “open door” policy in 1978, and discuss the recent development of three themes in citizenship curriculum, namely nationalistic education, democratic education and psychological health education. They note that there has been a remarkable shift in the government’s framework for citizenship education that now includes an emphasis on the rule of law and legal education. Although in many ways this shift remains at the level of rhetoric, the authors feel that the widening discourses on civic and moral education in China are at least indicative of a nascent trend towards democratisation, linked to China’s rapid modernisation and the development of a market economy.

In Chapter 5 Otsu introduces the historical and educational background of educational reforms in *Japan* and the impact of these reforms on citizenship education. She decries Japanese students’ lack of knowledge of the very meaning of citizenship, and the confusing use of different terms for “citizen.” She shows how government revisions in the Courses of Study have resulted in the first opportunity for schools to create individual classes through the introduction of a new subject, integrated study. After examining Japan’s current curriculum policies in citizenship education, Otsu discusses the controversies over how to foster citizenship education, especially in the new subject of integrated study. Otsu argues that a democratic and peaceful nation in a global era requires an education that is much broader than the curriculum prescribed by the government. She concludes by presenting an alternative approach to citizenship curriculum built around international education themes and objectives.

The next section of the book shifts the focus to South and Southeast Asia: Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. In Chapter 6 Ahmad introduces the reader to the factors that underlie Islamic ideology as the *raison d’être* of *Pakistan* and the central organizing principle of the citizenship curriculum. He argues that the contemporary national policy debate on citizenship education curriculum epitomises the tempestuous character of the nation’s policy itself. He examines the existing national curriculum policy of citizenship education and shows how that policy is implemented through the social studies textbooks. Through content analysis Ahmad identifies a set of values that textbooks seek to transmit for creating a Muslim citizen, and concludes with a discussion of the tensions between theology and citizenship education over the definition of a good citizen. He concludes that the Islamic model of citizenship education has neither taken into consideration the needs of a developing society nor presented Islamic civilisation as a progressive alternative. He urges curriculum policy-makers in Pakistan to recognise that citizenship education is not theology.

In Chapter 7 Fearnley-Sander and Yulaelawati explain that after the end of Soeharto’s 32-year rule in 1998, the *Indonesian* government launched democratizing policies in electoral politics, governance and education. They examine how the contemporary citizenship curriculum has been designed to accommodate these dramatic political changes, as well as the underlying state philosophy of *Pancasila*. They describe the Indonesian government’s introduction of radically democratising policies in the areas of governance and education that stress political decentralisation. In education Indonesia’s policies have mandated participative school-based management and a new

curriculum framework based on competency attainment for all school subjects, including citizenship. Through textual analysis and interviews with key curriculum policy-makers, the authors then examine the degree of integration between the new citizenship curricula and other reforms of schooling that are consistent with an expanding democratic agenda in Indonesia. They are hopeful that what has been put in place will help restructure civic identity and opportunity in directions supportive of democratisation.

In Chapter 8 Bajunid describes the continuing debates in the political arena over citizenship and nationhood in *Malaysia* since its founding in 1957. He traces the impact of initiatives in the wider society on citizenship education over the last 50 years. Bajunid highlights the continuing challenges of developing citizenship education in Malaysia in order to foster a sense of multi-racial, multi-religious and multi-lingual nationhood in an enlightened citizenry where all peoples are equal before the law. He examines current citizenship education initiatives and their potential to achieve these lofty goals. In response to these challenges Malaysia has adopted a national philosophy based on the principle of “unity in diversity.” To foster collective values, education policy has adopted a standardised approach to the process of education with a common curriculum and co-curriculum for all; a common medium of instruction from secondary level onwards; common textbooks and other educational resources; common public examinations; common teacher education; common school rituals and ceremonies; and even common school uniforms. Since the challenges of creating a civil and knowledge society with a participative and enlightened citizenry remain complex and continuing, Bajunid argues that there is no space for complacency or neglect of citizenship education and human rights.

In Chapter 9 Tan and Chew review values teaching in *Singapore* through its rather brief history and highlight the curriculum shifts made to meet changing cultural and political circumstances. The authors argue that in Singapore historically values teaching has been geared solely towards national expediency without reverence for moral understanding and truth. In this regard, values teaching is more appropriately labelled “statecraft.” Further, when “statecraft” is substituted for citizenship education the result may be trained but uneducated citizens. In this context the authors analyse the Civics and Moral Education programme currently in use and find it lacking. According to the authors, like previous curricula this programme is just another example of a government policy of training Singaporeans not to be educated citizens, but rather to be people who fit their concept of nationhood narrowly conceived in terms of economic survival and progress.

The final section of case studies deals with what we have called the Pacific Rim countries: the United States, Australia and New Zealand. In Chapter 10 Scott and Cogan first briefly summarise the history of civic education in the *United States*, and the current controversy between liberals and neo-conservatives over what constitutes the most appropriate citizenship curriculum for the 21st century. They see the United States as a much divided nation over such fundamental issues as what it means to be a “citizen” and a “patriot.” They argue that tensions in citizenship curriculum policies and practices are mirror images of tensions in the divided society at large, and as such are not easily resolved. Their analysis is illustrated through a discussion of the development of guide-

lines in the areas of civics and government at the secondary school level. The authors discuss how citizenship education reforms reflect the current initiatives under the *No Child Left Behind* federal legislation that has instituted a high-stakes testing programme across all subjects, including civics. Scott and Cogan then discuss how the ideological debates, emphasis on testing, teacher preparation and traditional constraints in schools inhibit the development of a coherent curriculum framework for civic education. They conclude by offering suggestions for a practical approach to an “advanced” citizenship education framework for the 21st century.

In Chapter 11 Kennedy discusses how the “renaissance” of civic and citizenship education in *Australia* has failed to keep up with changes in the social, political and economic landscape. The consequence, according to Kennedy, is that civic education in the school curriculum reflects a conservative vision of how schools should prepare citizens. In the aftermath of dramatic global events that have had great impact on Australia, Kennedy describes a divergence between the curriculum discourse on civics and the community discourse on civic issues and discusses why it is that Australia’s civic education seems incapable of dealing with community concerns and issues. To bridge this gap, the author argues that teachers need a broader conceptualisation of civics and citizenship education. In conclusion he offers a dynamic (as opposed to static) curriculum framework that expands the key domains of civics and citizenship so that education can engage with current issues and priorities and remain relevant for both students and society.

In Chapter 12 Mutch examines the relationship between educational policy and education for citizenship in *New Zealand* through three lenses: the past, the present and the future. Mutch describes how in the 1980s and 1990s, as a result of ideological tensions between the “new right” economically-driven agenda and the country’s liberal progressive educational traditions, no real consensus has emerged about how citizenship education should be implemented. As a result citizenship education is not a compulsory curriculum area though it is embedded in several key curriculum areas, such as social studies and health education. The author includes a case study showing how citizenship education in its current form is interpreted by schools and implemented in classrooms. She notes that while currently there is no specific provision for citizenship content, there are indications that discussions about the formal inclusion of citizenship in the curriculum are becoming stronger. The author concludes that the debate over explicit versus embedded citizenship education is still open.

In the concluding and capstone chapter of the book, Lee further builds on themes in citizenship education discourse he introduced in the first book in this series. With input from the preceding chapters, he applies these themes to the domain of curriculum. Using examples from several case studies in this volume, Lee explores what he calls the “tensions and contentions” in the orientation of the curriculum and its responsiveness (or lack thereof) to rapid social change. He describes a number of fault lines that are commonly contested domains, e.g., cultural heritage, civic and moral education, language, religion and ideology. He finds that there are always tensions and contentions when curriculum policy decides what is to be taught and how it is to be taught, and these

contentions are even stronger when curriculum policy is linked to citizenship education. Though these cases are drawn from the Asia-Pacific region, they are not unique to the region. In fact, the author argues that while citizenship concepts can be quite different between Asia and the West, the “tensions and contentions” faced in constructing citizenship curriculum in these case studies have significant commonalities. Though situated in very different sociopolitical contexts, each society must deal with ideological and cultural fault lines as well as global and local pressures in the construction of citizenship education.

Lee’s analysis offers further evidence that much of the debate about citizenship curriculum in the Asia-Pacific region seems to be increasingly part of or perhaps a variation of the global discourse about citizenship education. Evidence from this volume and elsewhere clearly suggest that national approaches to school curricula are increasingly forged within wider regional, cross-regional and global contexts (see for example, Benavot & Braslavsky, 2006). At the very least we can say that despite the diversity among citizenship curricula in these Asia-Pacific societies, there is strong evidence of an increasingly common policy rhetoric found in the debates over citizenship education. In this context it is the editors’ hope that this impressive collection of chapters from a diverse set of societies can inform and enrich understanding of the complex relationship between citizenship education and the curriculum both regionally and globally.

Conceptual Overview

1

Globalised Economies and Liberalised Curriculum: New Challenges for National Citizenship Education

Kerry J. KENNEDY

Introduction

The focus of this book is on citizenship education in the school curriculum of societies in the Asia-Pacific region. As important as this emphasis may be, it is not a common one in the discourses that have attempted to construct and understand the region. During the last decade of the twentieth century, the Asia-Pacific region—or at least parts of it—became a major focus of attention largely because of the spectacular rates of economic growth that were achieved by societies such as Singapore, Hong Kong, Korea and Taiwan. The so-called ‘Asian miracle’ was brought to an abrupt end in 1997 with the Asian financial crisis. Yet the crisis did not mean the end of economic growth in the region, although it did signal a pause. As will be suggested later, the crisis itself led many societies in the region to focus on micro economic issues, such as education and human capital development, to provide a better foundation for the macro policy settings designed to strengthen their growing market economies. After 1997, change became the dominant *motif* of education policy since traditional, elitist education systems could no longer meet new human capital requirements.

The link between education and the economy is not new (Easton & Klees, 1992) but, in the 1990s, it took on a new form. The ‘new’ global economy required ideas, innovation, creativity and critical thinking to ensure economic competitiveness (Ritchie, 2003; Romer, 1994). Thus, schools had to become the engine rooms that would produce these outcomes. This objective required large scale change at all levels of education systems, but in particular it required significant curriculum change. These broad changes at both the macro level of the economy and the micro level of the school curriculum are still under way and there is little indication that they will become less important as the new century moves towards the end of its first decade. Such changes will continue to provide the macro and micro contexts in which citizenship education for the future will be constructed.

These changes are generally in the direction of liberalisation—a freer economy at the macro level and a freer curriculum at the micro level to meet new economic priorities.

It might be expected that citizenship education, as a key component of the school curriculum, would be influenced by such changes. Yet citizenship education has traditionally been rooted in the conservative values and priorities of nation states. A key issue for consideration, therefore, is to consider the challenges to national citizenship education presented by the liberalizing discourses of economic and curriculum reform.

The argument in this chapter will be that the macro and micro contexts referred to above create a particular discourse about learning, individuals and the desired outcomes of schooling. A key issue to understand is the nature of this discourse—its theoretical underpinnings and its practical implications since there is little doubt that national citizenship education, as a component of the school curriculum, has the potential to be influenced by it. Given the centrality of this issue, it seems important to have a good understanding of the kind of changes at different levels that have the potential to affect citizenship education.

The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to explore two related topics that will help provide a foundation for understanding the issues raised above:

- The micro and macro contexts influencing citizenship education in the future will be examined to identify the key elements likely to affect citizenship education in the future; and
- The strength of the liberalizing tendencies of economic and curriculum reform will be assessed by considering other possible influences on national citizenship education in the future.

The following sections in this chapter will examine:

- the discourse related to macro level economic change to highlight its relationship with learning and therefore with schools;
- the way in which this broader macro context has influenced education with a focus on curriculum reform agendas, in a number of countries in the region;
- competing influences on national citizenship education and whether these, rather than the liberalisation that characterises economic and curriculum reform, will continue to shape citizenship education in the future.

New Economic Thinking: The Need for ‘Learning How’ rather than ‘Learning What’

The 1980s saw the emergence of a new theory of economic growth that focused on the internal workings of the economic system rather than on external factors influencing the system. This new emphasis, that came to be called the “new growth theory,”¹ was not so much on “exogenous technological change to explain why income per capita has increased. ... (rather) it tries instead to uncover the private and public sector choices that cause the rate of growth of the residual to vary across countries” (Romer, 1994, p.3).

This did not mean that technological change was unimportant as a factor influencing and explaining economic growth. It did mean, however, that the focus of new growth theory was on the mechanisms by which such changes were generated. The ideas that created the new technologies, rather than the technologies themselves, came to be seen as key economic drivers. Without ideas, there is no technology!

The important issue to understand about this new emphasis is that mechanisms for change and, therefore, growth were seen to reside within the economic system. This focus gave education and training a new role in relation to economic growth. Within new growth theory, ‘learning’ was seen as an important ‘externality’ influencing not just personal growth and development or even just social growth and development, as in traditional education theories. Rather, learning was seen to be at the heart of economic growth and consequently economic competitiveness. Ritchie (2003) explained it this way:

...a key driver of innovation and technological progress is the supply of and demand for a large and competent pool of intellectual capital—the knowledge and skills found in the local labor pool. This is not to say that physical capital, investment, and macroeconomic stability are no longer necessary for economic growth. Rather, they are no longer sufficient. Whether they positively impact long-term technological upgrading (as opposed to only aggregate growth) depends largely on the creation of new knowledge and skills in the local economy. (p.3)

Ritchie’s reference here to new forms of human capital development based on knowledge creation rather than plant and investment is a reflection of the economic essentials of new growth theory. Patrinos (1994) described this as an “ideas based model” of economic growth:

Ideas based models [as opposed to capital based models] give emphasis to a factor that opens up new investment opportunities, alternatively known as innovation, invention or technological change ... Ideas drive both growth in income and capital accumulation. The discovery of ideas is treated as being endogenous rather than exogenous in the new theories. ... ideas are not the same as physical or human capital ... they come about as intentional attempts to make discoveries. (p.3)

According to this view, ideas, creativity and innovation are the drivers of economic growth and these require problem solving and critical thinking skills. The result is that new ways of doing things can be developed, new approaches to old problems can be adopted, and entirely new products can be developed to create new markets and demand. These processes and outcomes are seen to be essential for modern economies competing in the global market place where competitive advantage leads to success. As Ritchie (2003) pointed out, it is intellectual capital rather than physical plant that is more likely to give this important advantage, thus, the term “knowledge-based economy”, an economy driven by ideas rather than by investment in physical plant and infrastructure alone.

This term is now part of international discourse and its roots lay in new growth theory as outlined above.

Ritchie's (2003) contribution to a better understanding of the relationship between new growth theory and education policy was to mark the Asian financial crisis in late 1997 as a turning point. He has argued that, prior to that date, the governments of Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand, for example, had relied excessively on foreign capital and a low-level skills base for economic growth in an increasingly technologically sophisticated world. There was some commitment to human capital development in education policy prior to 1997 yet "in virtually every country the crisis elevated the issue to prominence as part of a strategic imperative to transition from manufacturing-based economies to 'knowledge-based' economies" (Ritchie, 2003, p.4). Thus after 1997, education and the economy in many Asian countries became inextricably linked—education became part of micro-economic reform designed to support new imperatives in the macro economy. One of the best examples of this agenda for micro-economic reform is the school curriculum and some examples of this will be provided in the next section.

Links between human capital formation and economic growth are not new. It is important to understand, therefore, the difference between this new ideas based version of human capital development that now fuels the development of knowledge-based economies and more traditional approaches. Both economists and educators have recognised at least since the 1960s the importance of human capital to economic development. One economist has put it this way:

... many economists have pointed out that education and training create assets in the form of knowledge and skills which increase the productive capacity of manpower [*sic*] in just the same way as an investment in new machinery raises the productive capacity of the stock of physical capital. (Woodhall, 1987, p.1)

A good deal of work has been done by economists to show how investment in different kinds of education (primary, secondary, tertiary) has different rates of return (Psacharopoulos, 1993). Thus investment in primary education on the part of governments has very high rates of return both for society and for individuals. Yet investment in university education has lower social rates of return than primary education but higher private rates of return for individuals. This helps to explain why governments are relatively happy to invest in the universalisation of primary education but charge higher fees for university education. As individuals such as doctors, lawyers and engineers benefit considerably from university education, it seems reasonable for governments to assume that university students should make a personal contribution to its costs. This approach to understanding human capital development, and even the methodology used to reach conclusions about the contribution of human capital to economic growth, is not uncontested (Bennell, 1998; McMahon, 1998; Toh & Wong, 1999). Yet there is a common understanding that education influences economic growth indirectly through the creation of skilled labour.

It follows from this traditional approach to human capital development that the actual substance of education, and in particular the substance of the school curriculum, is

of little interest to human capital theorists. They are more likely to be interested in the aggregate level of education in a society, the length of schooling undertaken, the physical stock of education facilities or the gender distribution of educational opportunities. All of these are important, but they are static variables that provide no insight into students' educational experiences while they are at different stages of schooling. Hanushek and Luque (2002) attempted to address this problem by using the results of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) as a quality measure of educational provision. Yet the TIMSS results focus on learning outcomes—they do not tell anything about learning inputs. Traditional approaches to producing human capital have been curriculum neutral. An educated workforce in such a context is one that has benefited more from the amount of time spent in education than exposure to a particular kind of education.

It is at this point that traditional approaches to human capital development differ most markedly from ideas based approaches referred to earlier. These traditional approaches looked to human capital variables that were external to the economic system. Ideas based approaches, on the other hand, “focus ... on the acquisition of knowledge that can lead to individuals becoming innovative and creative—knowledge producers rather than knowledge consumers” (Kennedy, 2005a, p.9). Knowledge and learning characterise these new approaches but it is not just any knowledge and it is certainly not traditional academic forms of knowledge.

The knowledge being referred to in new growth theory is scientific knowledge that is publicly available and capable of being applied to the creation of new ideas. Thus science is privileged in an ideas-based or knowledge-based economy because it is seen as the source of innovation. New scientific ideas can be applied in different contexts to enhance productivity and ideas successful in one context can be transferred to others. Productive learning that takes place in one company can quickly be adopted in another. There is no end to these creative processes—they can continue unabated, unlike the kind of static variables associated with traditional approaches to human capital development. What is more, these knowledge-based processes are internal to the economic system. They operate within companies, organisations and governments, thus giving rise to the concept of the ‘learning organisation’ and, as will be shown later, even to the concept of the ‘learning nation’. Learning is at the heart of the ideas based economy.

Learning is not a new concept for school educators, but a focus on learning as distinct from schooling has not always characterised school experiences either within the Asia-Pacific region or beyond it. Yet learning has become part of the discourse of current educational policy and ‘lifelong learning’ is now almost a mantra emanating from international agencies such as UNESCO and OECD, as well as governments and Ministries of Education. The extent to which this renewed focus on learning, a focus that is primarily economic in nature, is now reflected in regional curriculum reforms efforts will be addressed in the following section.