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Conceptualising Citizenship and Citizenship Education: A Trajectory of Exploring Asian Perspectives

Lee Wing On
The Hong Kong Institute of Education

Conception of Citizenship and Citizenship Education

I would like to thank the Hong Kong Institute of Education for giving me an opportunity to share my academic works in this area over the last 15 years. The bulk of research and publications were done here, while I was serving in the Institute. Thus, I would perceive the accomplishments, if any, to be shared today is not only mine and my colleagues’, but the Institute’s. The works on comparative Asian citizenship are mainly represented in a series of three edited books and two special journal issues, all of which are collaborative works with HKIEd colleagues. All these works represent our deliberate efforts to identify and analyse distinctive characteristics of citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific. In our first volume, Citizenship Education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and Issues (Lee, Grossman, Kennedy & Fairbrother, 2004), we established that there are identifiable perspectives in citizenship education that can be characterised as “Asian-Pacific”. The regional perspectives have significant features that contribute to the academic discourse of citizenship and citizenship education and the international literature. Specifically, Kennedy & Fairbrother (2004) identified seven citizenship education themes in Asian-Pacific societies:

1. Asian countries are characterized by multiple modernities that provide rich and complex contexts for the development of citizenship education.
2. Asian citizenship education is characterised more by conceptions of moral virtues and personal values than by civic and public values.
3. Civil society is constructed differently in the West and in Asian countries but it nevertheless can play an important role.
4. The nation-state plays the same role in Asian and Western countries in relation to citizenship education.
5. There is a tension between citizenship education, school subjects and the academic curriculum.
6. Teachers are key players when it comes to the implementation of citizenship education in school.
7. Student agency in responding to citizenship education needs to be taken into consideration.

Of these, Theme Five became the focus of our investigation in our second volume, *Citizenship Curriculum in Asia and the Pacific* (Grossman, Lee & Kennedy, 2008). Themes Six and Seven are particularly relevant to this current volume. Themes One to Four have been relevant in all volumes of the series.

*Being a good person as the foundation for a good citizen*

In our first volume I argued that there are both similarities and differences between conceptions of citizenship in the East and the West (Lee, 2004). Common features include citizenship rights and responsibilities and the relation between the state and the individuals. The differences are more at the conceptual level and the way citizenship is understood. Concepts of citizenship in the West, ranging from classical approach where citizenship was a privilege to various liberal, social, nation-state and post-national theories, are largely characterized by state-individual concerns and therefore are fundamentally political. Discussion on citizenship in Eastern societies, however, is not bounded by these historical contexts, and the point of departure for discussing citizenship can be quite different. Rather than focusing on state-individual (and political) rights and responsibilities, discussion on citizenship in Eastern societies tends to be relationalistic. A typical citizenship curriculum in Asia-Pacific societies is concerned with how one relates to self, others (such as family and friends), the state and Nature. One often finds significant emphasis on self-cultivation as well as harmonious relationships between the self and the others. In this view one has to be a good person in order to be a good citizen. The
distinction between public and private virtues is often not clear-cut in discussions of citizenship in many Asia and Pacific societies. Referring to the notion of being a good person as a good citizen and applying Turner’s (1986) analysis of the various dimensions of “individual”, namely individualism, individuation and individuality, I have found that there is more emphasis on individuality than on the individual in the Asia-Pacific literature on citizenship discussion.

The Asian “self” as an individual citizen

Indeed, rather than a dichotomy, the Asians see the relationship between the individual and the collectivity as two sides of a coin in terms of citizenship. The two can be mutually reinforcing each other, or related to each other as a continuum, with one end developing toward another. There is a wealth of meaning in relation to the term “self” in the East. Self-cultivation is a term most commonly used that refers to a continuous process of self-enrichment. This self-enrichment is referred to as continuous self-improvement, self-advancement, self-actualisation and self-perfection, very closely linked to Western concepts of growth and actualisation or realization. However, self-cultivation also contains a moral sense and a collective sense within it.

Many of the studies on “self” in the Asian context, particularly in the Confucian tradition, discuss the concepts of “self” in ways very closely linked to the various aspects of citizenship. The most illuminating analysis is given by William Theodore de Bary. In his exposition of the concepts of self in the Confucian tradition, he points out that the term “self” is closely linked to concepts of liberalism:

The **tzu** of the **tzu-yu** in “liberalism” is a term for “self”, frequently used in combination with **chi**, **shen**, or **ssu**. Like **chi** and **shen**, it is often translatable simply as self. In classical Chinese usage **tzu** also has the connotation “from, in, or of itself”, much like our prefix “auto”. This sense of self-originated or self-motivated gains added emphasis when used in combination with **yu**, “from” or “out of” (de Bary, 1983, p. 44).

Thus, according to de Bary, the Chinese equivalent term of liberty means from “within oneself” to “out of oneself,” meaning an expression or realization of the internal originality and motivation. It is almost equivalent to the Western concept of liberty, and the dual emphasis of
from “within” to “out of” oneself vividly links the “liberal” individual to the spheres beyond the individual. In the Confucian tradition, the spheres beyond the self within and the self without refer to the social and national context in respect to humanity, and Nature in respect to the metaphysics. For example, as pointed out by de Bary, “Chu Hsi’s discussion of ‘learning for the sake of one’s self’, i.e. self understanding should be linked to one’s conduct toward others and does not stop with the self” (p. 25). Also, the term “nature” in Chinese, *tzu jan*, contains the prefix of “self,” and refers to what is so natural of the self – not to be made to be or appear so, in accordance with the inherent propensity of one’s own nature (pp. 44-45).

The Relationistic Perspective of the Individual and the Collectivity

De Bary actually wants to argue against the tendency to apply a negative sense to the “self” in the Chinese tradition, e.g. selfishness and self-interest, and point out the many positive meanings of self inherent in the Chinese tradition. Ambrose King (1992, pp. 9-13), a Chinese sociologist, also argues against a negative perception of the “self” in the Chinese tradition. He concedes that self in the Chinese tradition is not a passive individual in the collectivity. He also concedes that the paradigm of collectivism and individualism is not helpful in understanding the position of the individual in the collectivity in the Chinese tradition, as the Chinese society is neither individualistic nor collectivist, but is “relationistic” (my translation). Man is a relational being in the Confucian tradition. Relation governs the interactions between the individual and the collectivity. Thus, in this context of relations, the individual and the collectivity are mutually dependent. Also, in this context of relations, the individual is an active being and plays an active role in the collectivity. To some extent, the individual even defines the collectivity. For example, within the circle where one has close relations with the collectivity, the Chinese behaves in a very collectivistic manner. However, leaving the relational circle, e.g. after emigration, a Chinese can become surprisingly individualistic.

The notion of relation, rather than individualism or collectivism, as the fundamental premise for understanding citizenship can be helpful in explaining many of the political features in the East. While “democracy” has become an ideal political direction for national development and political participation, the concept of democracy is
elusive and means different things to different people. The term democracy does not seem to be particularly meaningful to the Asian people. In a 2001 international forum on democratic citizenship education in the Asia-Pacific region organized by the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), several Asians were invited to present papers on “the current challenges to democratic citizenship” in their countries. Interestingly, these country papers mention about religious education, values education, political education, civic and moral education and NGOs, rather than democratic citizenship education (see Wan Chik, 2001; Li, 2001; Nagata, 2001; Jan, 2001). I expressed my observation to one of the paper authors. She agreed and responded that it was very difficult to directly talk about democratic citizenship education, even though she was asked to write about it.

Looking at the features of democracy in the East, it is obvious that despite the presence of a representative democratic system, many of the Asian countries are characterized by a so-called “one-party dominant democracy.” For example, the Chinese Nationalist Party (Kuomintang) ruled Taiwan since the end of World War II until quite recently; the Liberal Democratic Party of Japan won all the elections save one for half a century; the People’s Action Party of Singapore continues to be the ruling party since its independence. It seems that there is a general wish for continuation in the relationship between ruler and ruled. The relational perspective can help to explain such a phenomenon: both the ruler and the ruled want to maintain their relationship, unless to an extent that such a relationship becomes unacceptable because of elaborate social discontents. And the tendency to maintain the status quo relationship is so high that people tend to support the incumbent. This helps to explain why the dictatorship can be acceptable to the public, as long as the dictator is a benevolent dictator.

The relation-based social fabrics in the Asian societies have allowed for the persistence of soft authoritarianism (using the term of Huntington). Where there can be soft authoritarianism, there can be soft democracy as well. In my IEA civic education study, some of my informants view democracy in such a relaxed way that “as far as the government is a good government, it is democratic.” The allowance for the persistence of soft democracy has relaxed the definitions of democracy in Asia. Hong Kong, without a democratic structure, creates the concept of consultative democracy. That is, Hong Kong people have accepted the absence of representative democracy when a wide
consultation network is in place which allows the views of people to be “represented” in policy making and implementation. The existence of such a consultation network makes people feel that democracy is in place even though it is not. In many other Asian countries, the concepts of guided democracy and paternalistic democracy feature the leading and educative role of the ruling party in their relationships with the public.

The relation-based social fabrics have also provided an insight into understanding a particular feature of the Asian culture, i.e. harmony. Liang Shuming (Liang, 1930, pp. 53-55), a Chinese cultural theorist, provides a very interesting analogy: facing a dilapidated house, the Westerners would change house, but the Easterners would learn to live in it or ignore the problem. Learning how to live in a condition less favourable is a means of maintaining harmony, which is a very significant goal or philosophy of life. The aim for harmony also explains why people are willing to put up with soft authoritarianism and soft democracy, because to them maintaining harmonious human relationships is more meaningful than reconstructing an ideal house. Liang’s view of Chinese culture also coincides with King’s in that the Chinese maintain an ethics-based society (Liang, 1987, p. 79). The term ethics in Chinese (lunli) actually stems from the concept of relation. The emphasis on ethics or relations as a philosophy of life and social living explains a great deal why moral philosophy has been so elaborate in the Chinese intellectual history, as learning to live together and to live with one another in harmony is an a priori agenda of the culture.

**Individualism or individuality?**

Coming back to the notion of the self, it is quite clear that the way that the self is discussed in the East is very different from the notion of individualism. Turner’s classification of the self may be helpful for our discussion in this context. Turner (1986, pp. 11-12) distinguishes the discussion of self into three aspects, namely, individualism, individuality and individuation. According to Turner, individualism is restricted to the notion of individual rights, mainly concerned with the nature of the external relations that connect individuals to society through a social contract and involving the analysis of the network of rights and duties which is seen to be essential to civil society. Individualism as a concept represents the opposition of the bourgeois to
the feudal system, claiming God-given rights for all individuals despite their class origins. Individuality, by contrast, is a romantic theory of the interior and private nature of personal life. In the English context, it rose as a critique of the hedonistic view of motivation in utilitarian individualism. In the German context, it rose against traditional moralities and in opposition to middle-class hypocrisy. While individualism represents bourgeois’ opposition to feudalism, individuality represents literary elites’ opposition to the perceived threat of mass literacy, standardization and commercialism. Individuation refers to bureaucratic practices and disciplines that individuate citizens for purposes of taxation, social regimentation and political surveillance. The paradox of individuation is that while making people separate, it also makes them more subject to control and regulation.

The three aspects of the self or individual depicted by Turner is again a Western prototype, with particular connotations developed from Western histories. So is the concept of democracy. Without the historical context, the discussion of the meanings of the terms can be meaningless. Looking at the ways that the “self” is discussed in the East as quoted above, it is obvious that the Eastern conception of the “self” does not fit into any of the three notions of individual that Turner has classified. Nevertheless, with such a framework as reference, it is helpful to associate the concept of the “self” discussed in the Asian context as much closer to individuality than individualism or individuation. Such a characterization of the self is helpful in interpreting some of the research findings on citizenship.

I have re-analysed the findings of the Pacific-Basin Values Education study, noting that the three most important reasons cited by the Asian educational leaders are, in rank order, “to provide a foundation for spiritual development,” “to increase the sense of individual responsibility,” “to help young persons develop reflective and autonomous personality.” Obviously, personal qualities rank top as reasons for values education, even higher than collective concerns such as collective values, community development, and social and global concerns (Lee, 1998). Many interesting questions arise with this type of choice among the Asian educational leaders – Why is personal quality ranked higher than collective concerns? Why is spiritual development ranked higher than reflective and autonomous personality? What could the relationship be among spirituality, responsibility, reflectivity and autonomy as some of them may be conflicting values (e.g. spirituality
being non-rational and reflectivity being rational; responsibility and freedom can be a dichotomy but autonomy and freedom is not)?

Interviews with the Hong Kong educational leaders seem to provide some clues. According to them, building moral and spiritual values is intrinsically important for the youngsters in their development because, as many of them said, “Their intrinsic values determine the directions of their development.” Also, helping the young develop reflective thinking and autonomous personalities are important for them to make wise decisions in their development. It seems likely that in the Eastern eyes, spirituality is referred to the internal qualities of the self that provides a parameter for the self to make wise decisions, with rational tools such as reflective thinking and autonomous personality. Such an axis is fundamentally important for processing rational thinking and making rational choices. In fact, this is what the study of value should mean. Axiology, i.e. the study of values, starts with an axis, and this axis is the fundamental direction of the self. When the Chinese language talks about self-cultivation (xiushen), self-reflection (zixing), self-discipline (zilu), taking it upon oneself (ziren), getting it by, or for, oneself (zide), self-enjoyment (zigian) etc., all this forms the fundamental axis for one’s thinking and choices. If self means auto, an autonomous person in the Confucian tradition contains all these qualities. To de Bary (1983, p. 65), this is what a neo-Confucian autonomous mind should possess: self-consciousness, critical awareness, creative thought, independent effort and judgment.

While the West focuses on individualism in terms of individual rights and individuation in terms of individual responsibility in its political and citizenship development, the East may have focused upon the development of individuality in its history. This divergence produces fundamental differences in citizenship development. The former is political (in terms of rights) and bureaucratic (in terms of the political system), but the latter is apolitical, focusing on self-enrichment which may or may not lead to political ends. That helps to understand the acceptance of the persistence of soft authoritarianism and soft democracy. To the Eastern citizens, it does not matter who rules and in what way the country is ruled, as far they are in a situation where they can live their lives, they can maintain their relationships, and they can pursue their individuality (in terms of spiritual development), then they will live with whatever the rule is, unless the situation has become intolerable. This explains the long reign of a government in many Asian
countries for a long period of time in their histories.

However, if their individuality is threatened, they would react and to an extreme extent revolt. A commonly known reaction is to express themselves in literature written with indirect or crooked languages. Others would not understand what they write, but their inner circle can. When they were imprisoned because of this type of writing, it was known as literary imprisonment (wenziyu). However, the existence of literary imprisonment has at least two implications. First, the Easterners have a strong urge, especially among the intelligentsia, to maintain their autonomy. The more severe the oppression, the stronger the urge is. Second, the concern is not political rights, but their individuality. Hence, if citizenship in the West is politically oriented, it is apolitically oriented in the East. Westerners are concerned about individual rights and responsibilities in citizenship concerns, but Easterners are concerned about the fulfilment of individuality.

With this background in mind, it has become easy to understand several features of citizenship education in the East. First, rather than talking about politics, citizenship education in the East talks about morality. “Civics” always goes with “morals” in the East; thus civic and moral education is a term more common than civics education or citizenship education in Asian countries. Second, many Asian countries would tend to focus on the development of individuality (as far as the self is concerned) and relations (as far as the society is concerned) in citizenship education.

Language differences in describing citizenship

The conceptual differences between the East and the West were further explored in terms of language. In many Asia-Pacific countries there is no clear-cut distinction between civic and citizenship education and many Asia-Pacific countries equate moral education with civic/citizenship education. Thus it is quite common for Asia-Pacific countries to describe civic/citizenship education as “civic and moral education” or “moral and civic education”. Further the term “civic” can be employed by the government to mean loyal citizens and by the civilians to mean critical citizens or even civil disobedience (Otsu, 2008).
In related work extending beyond the first two volumes in this series, we have explored Asia Pacific citizenship issues in a broader context (Lee & Kennedy, 2006). This additional work advanced our observation that citizenship and citizenship education in Asia-Pacific countries cannot be viewed as static. Within the context of a global community, it is unrealistic to view citizenship and citizenship education as secluded and time-bound. With enhanced international interactions across countries, modern Asia-Pacific societies are actively engaged in dialogue with other parts of the world. This observation was particularly salient in the country cases analysed in Lee & Kennedy (2006) where we further identified the following features of citizenship concepts and citizenship education:

- Citizenship education in the selected Asian countries is influenced by strong states;
- Cultural manoeuvring for national citizenship education was identified; and
- The concept of Asian citizenship is an emergent concept, with some degree of fluidity, unpredictability and eclecticism.

In regard to the last point, we identified some space for negotiation between the state and the individuals among the case studies, but there were different dimensions to the nature of negotiation. For example, in Hong Kong students and teachers played an active role in defining citizenship; in China, it was the emergence of such notions as “regulated individualism”; in Japan it was the development of “self-awareness” among Japanese people living in international societies; and finally in Korea it centred on the debate over state or individual-oriented social studies.

While there are common features identifiable in Asia Pacific citizenship and citizenship education, there is also a dynamism that is reflected not only in conceptual debates about what constitutes citizenship in Asian contexts, but also about how to teach citizenship. In our first volume, Liu (2004, pp. 113-116) pointed out the prevalence of those debates in Taiwan where there are tensions between individual and society; freedom and order; diversity and uniformity; identification and criticism; Americanisation and localisation; rights and
responsibilities; deliberation and civic virtues; universal citizenship and differentiated citizenship; as well as fixed citizenship and flexible citizenship. This is typical of curriculum debates across the region.

Conceptions of Citizenship Curriculum

Curriculum: broad and diverse definitions

If the “what” of citizenship is contentious, despite the several significant common and unique conceptual features that we identified in our first volume, then the “what to teach”, i.e. citizenship curriculum, is equally contentious. Thus, we examined the tensions surrounding citizenship education curriculum in our second volume (Grossman, Lee & Kennedy, 2008). From the outset, the definitions and purposes of “curriculum” are broad and diverse. Curriculum can be understood as syllabus, content outline, textbooks and sometimes even teaching materials. As an organization of study, however, curriculum should not be seen as restricted to teaching contents. It can also be viewed as a process, and in this way refers broadly to school activities as a series of learning experiences that involve academic, athletic, emotional and social experiences, as well as interpersonal relationship in the school context (Oliva, 1992; Marsh, 1997; Posner, 1998).

As regards to curriculum purposes, it is contentious whether the curriculum should be state-oriented or individual-oriented, and whether the citizenship curriculum should remain unchanged in the midst of rapid social change or should move towards the forefront of change, etc. (Lee, 2008). Viewing curriculum in terms of learning orientations, it is arguable whether the curriculum as a design for learning should be cognitive-process oriented; self-actualisation oriented; technologically oriented; academic-rationalist oriented; social reconstructionist oriented; or a combination of these various orientations. Curriculum orientations are a source of struggle between national-societal goals and individual-personal development goals. Putting it nicely, MacDonald (1977) suggested that the curriculum plays a mediation role between the individual and the societal order and the political order, through a process of internalisation developed from school experience.
Civic and moral education as a twin relationship

When we analysed citizenship curriculum in Asia and the Pacific, the general picture developed in our previous work about citizenship education in the region was confirmed. We found a common emphasis on culture, a common understanding that civic and moral education is a twin relationship, a common expectation of the development of social responsibility to be supported by healthy and positive personal values and a common concern about linking the cultural context to the modern challenges that these societies are facing. However we also found substantial tensions and contentions in the citizenship curriculum in respect to its relationship to tradition and culture, politics and ideologies, and societal goals and individual goals. Underneath an emphasis on culture were tensions and contentions about what kind of culture should be upheld and whether the younger generation should be socialised into the traditional culture or develop competencies in critical acculturation.

Tensions and contentions in citizenship curriculum

The country cases in our second volume invariably revealed tensions and contentions in discourse and ideology in relation to what kind of citizenship curriculum should be adopted for the younger generation relevant for today’s globalised environment. All these cases touch upon the changing social and political circumstances of their societies, the reaction and integration to the outside world and as a part of the globalised community. There are ongoing tensions between whether the traditional expectations towards good citizenship should be upheld or be adapted to globalised circumstances. There are ideological tensions between the state and the public and between various social groups in the public. There are ideological contentions on many issues. For example, there is the relationship between state and religion, localisation versus globalisation, the historical past and the present society and whether citizenship education should be state-oriented, societal-oriented, or individual-oriented.

The study of citizenship curriculum in terms of a society’s social and political contexts thus reveals multiple tensions and contentions. There are tensions in terms of whether the curriculum should mainly focused the kind of knowledge to be selected for transmission in a particular social and political context or whether it should reflect, and in
what way if it should, the changing political orientations of the society. This makes the curriculum always subject to change. As the country cases showed in our second volume, curriculum policy decisions are always contentious when they governs who decides what to be taught and how it is to be taught. Curriculum development in general is often very contentious in most societies, but it is even more contentious when it is linked to citizenship issues (Lee, 2008).

Conception of pedagogies: Starting with the “Chinese learner”

Pedagogical issues specifically related to the Chinese learners have attracted increased attention since the publication of the seminal work, *The Chinese Learner: Cultural, Psychological and Contextual Influences* (Biggs and Watkins, 1996). Biggs and Watkins highlighted two aspects of the so-called “paradox of the Chinese learner”: (1) Chinese learners are often taught in conditions not conducive to good learning according to Western standards, such as large classes, expository methods, relentless norm-referenced assessment and harsh classroom climate, yet they out-perform Western students, at least in science and mathematics and have deeper, meaning-oriented, approaches to learning; (2) Chinese learners are generally perceived as passive rote learners, yet they show high levels of understanding. Five years later, the paradox of the Chinese learner was extended to the Chinese teachers in a follow-up volume entitled *Teaching the Chinese Learners: Psychological and Pedagogical Perspectives* (Watkins & Biggs, 2001). Here the authors found that the tightly orchestrated teacher-centred teaching allowed students to be active, even in large classes. Moreover, Western teaching innovations such as constructivist teaching methods and problem-based learning were found to work well with Chinese learners if carefully implemented by the Chinese teachers concerned (Watkins and Biggs, 2001). This led to the conclusion that Western assumptions about poor teaching in a Chinese context with large classes, strict, expository teaching and passive learners can be challenged. The two volumes of Biggs and Watkins established that there were features specific to the Chinese learners that need to be addressed in pedagogical studies.
**Construction and deconstruction of the Chinese learners**

Following up on these observations, my colleague and I published a special journal issue, entitled *Construction and Deconstruction of the Chinese Learner: Implications for Learning Theories* (Lee & Mok, 2008). Analyzing the articles contributed for this study, we found diverse approaches in the study of pedagogies for the Chinese learners. Some authors adopted the notion of paradoxes of the Chinese learners in further understanding the East-West divide in teaching and learning, such as the different approaches to mathematics teaching and learning (Wang & Lin, 2008; Callingham, 2008). Others extended the investigation of the Chinese learners beyond the cognitive aspects to uncover the emotive and social aspects of learning. For example, Mok et al. (2008) described the social reasons underlying the help-seeking behaviour of the Chinese learners that might make outsiders mistakenly regard the Chinese learners as passive learners, while Harbon (2008) depicted how the deepening of teacher/student relationship enhances learning (Harbon, 2008). Yet others moved further to demystify the concepts of the Chinese learners, arguing that the Chinese learners, even though they may be different from learners of other cultures, still needed to resolve problems common to all learners (Mak, 2008). Moreover, Chinese pedagogies were not easily stereotyped. Rather they emerged in response to changing educational contexts and to changing demands on teaching and learning (Chan, 2008). In sum, the articles argued that studying pedagogies for Chinese learners made a special contribution to a more general understanding of teaching and learning theories. In particular, it was possible to look in different ways at self-concept theories, intracultural perspectives on learning and how specific Chinese contexts influences teaching. Moreover, one of the authors (Chan, 2008) argues that there might not be such thing as “Chinese learners”. Teaching strategy considerations among her sample teachers required adaptation and integration of various learning strategies. Even within a Chinese cultural context teachers need to adopt a transformational approach in teacher development and/or teaching strategy development that integrates a cultural orientation with the changing educational demands and expectation that a society like Hong Kong undergoes.
Conceptions of Asian Citizenship Pedagogies

Our third volume on Asian citizenship has just been completed, being on its way of publication, namely *Citizenship Pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific* (co-edited by Kennedy, Lee and Grossman, forthcoming). The picture that emerges of citizenship pedagogies promoted by the government and adopted by the teachers is complex. There is some evidence of a two-way flow between the intentions of curriculum planners and teachers’ actual classroom implementation. Yet neither can assume the response of the other and therefore learning outcomes cannot also be guaranteed. Nevertheless, there are some patterns that emerge from the chapters in this volume and these are highlighted below.

*Attempts to align with global pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific*

Contributions of our latest volume show the wealth and diverse array of citizenship pedagogies in Asia-Pacific societies. The pedagogies reported in this volume reflect state-of-the-art awareness of international discourse on citizenship education by both government and teachers of citizenship pedagogies in this region. Citizenship educators, governments, curriculum planners and teachers alike are concerned with developing citizenship education that responds to “global trends” and meets “global challenges.” It is not uncommon that for official curriculum documents to adopt the terminology that can be found almost elsewhere in the international documents to show that the citizenship pedagogies advocated and/or adopted are aligned with international practices. In general, drawing on the international discourse on citizenship education, their official curriculum documents would tend to emphasise democratic values, and advocate that citizenship teaching should be conducted in a rationalistic way, characterised by dialogue and critical thinking.

*Attempts to maintain cultural distinctiveness in pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific*

However, far from blindly adopting internationally-derived pedagogical approaches, the case studies in this third volume of our series reveal that governments, educational agencies, and teachers choose pedagogies that
best fit a combination of contextual factors and learning situations. In the complex interaction among stakeholders it is not always clear who influences whom. For example, when the official curriculum emphasises nation-oriented pedagogies, individual teachers may choose to adopt person-oriented pedagogies, and vice versa.

Thus, as our country cases reveal, pedagogical development in Asia-Pacific is dynamic. Attempts are made not only to juxtapose the various pedagogies advocated by the government and/or adopted by the teachers but also to merge various types of pedagogies, such as the advocacy of blended learning in the Philippines (Almonte-Acosta, forthcoming), integrated learning in Thailand (Lawthong, forthcoming), and action learning in Hong Kong (by some educators). Moreover, there are authentic and indigenous pedagogical approaches developed in the region, such as introduction of life-event approach in Hong Kong (Chai-Yip, Galloway & Lee, forthcoming), or aesthetic moral education, life-practices and learning-to-care approaches in Mainland China (Zhao & Fairbrother, forthcoming).

Moreover, we find that students can be independent actors in the pedagogical process as well. According to the chapters on Taiwan, United States and Indonesia, in contrast to national curriculum goals and recommended pedagogies, students may prefer conservative citizenship values or adopt a depoliticised perspective towards citizenship. For those teachers who choose more conservative pedagogical approaches, there can thus be a student “market” that supports them to do so. Additionally, examination pressures may well influence students in adopting conservative citizenship values also that the system itself may directly influence student choices.

Hybridisation of citizenship pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific

Asia-Pacific societies adopt and adapt, in a hybridised manner, a variety and conglomeration of citizenship pedagogies, there are always in-betweens in the way that citizenship pedagogies are developed that would cater for the various concerns, purposes and features of various types of pedagogies. In Figure 1, I try to visually represent this concept of hybridised pedagogies. In the figure I have identified three types of prevalent pedagogical approaches, namely nation-oriented, person-oriented and global-oriented pedagogies. In between and across the three types of pedagogies, there are efforts at integration to
accommodate and incorporate the often competing concerns and expectations of the different approaches and their underlying values. This reveals a tendency toward the hybridisation of citizenship pedagogical approaches in Asia-Pacific societies in the varied patterns that governments and curriculum planners adopt in a juxtaposed or integrated manner.

Nation-oriented pedagogies tend to be nationalistic, ideological, inculcating, expository, content-based, examination-based, and conservative. Yet even when there is government agenda for citizenship education agenda there are governments and teachers who advocate person-oriented pedagogies. Those advocating person-oriented pedagogies address the need for attending to the development of citizenship values and attributes from within the person. Thus, they would tend to emphasise the significance of experiential learning, such as action learning, and argue that citizenship education has to be reflective, affective, appreciative (e.g. from aesthetic perspectives), and relevant to daily life.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, our latest volume on citizenship pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific shows a variation of approaches, despite a strong state orientation, in citizenship education that would require transformation of teaching approaches to fit changing needs of the students in changing political and social circumstances in modern Asia and the Pacific. As a result hybridised pedagogical approaches emerge in their own ways, combining contextual and global considerations. Moreover, it shows the force of bottom-up approaches available in the Asia-Pacific countries that balance top-down emphases in one way or another (where official curriculum emphasises democracy, teachers and students may choose to be conservative, or vice versa). In this way, there exists negotiation space, and in some case resistance, between the planned and implemented curriculum; and citizenship education implementers function as instructional gatekeeper in the process of delivery (Sim, forthcoming). In Asian Pacific societies, it is pedagogies that both create and occupy this space irrespective of the political or social system.
Figure 1: Hybridised Citizenship Pedagogies in Asia-Pacific Countries
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