

Wing-Wah LAW

Globalization, National Identity, and Citizenship Education: China's Search for Modernization and a Modern Chinese Citizenry

Abstract Since the early 20th century, numerous scholars have proposed theories and models describing, interpreting, and suggesting the development paths countries have taken or should take. None of these, however, can fully explain China's efforts, mainly through education and citizenship education, to modernize itself and foster a modern citizenry since the late 19th century. This article traces and examines these efforts through a reflective and critical analysis of such public texts as official policy documents, curriculum standards, and related commentaries, and reveals three major findings. First, China's leaders have advanced different views of and approaches to development and citizenship in response to changing domestic and global contexts. Second, the Chinese state determines China's development course, defines its national identity and citizenry, and selects its nation-building curricula. Third, the Chinese state's growing desire for national rejuvenation in an increasingly competitive, globalized world in the 21st century mandates an important education mission that its citizenship education be politically and ideologically open and accommodative, and help students develop global, national and local identities and function as active, responsible citizens of a multileveled, multicultural world. This article furthers academic understanding of how China's education responds to economic, political, and social demands and shapes students' multiple identities in a global age.

Keywords globalization, national identity, citizenship education, China

Introduction

Since the early 20th century, scholars have proposed numerous theories and

Wing-Wah LAW (✉)
Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China
E-mail: wwlaw@hku.hk

models describing, interpreting, and suggesting the development paths countries have taken or should take, including: modernization theory, the dependency thesis, world-systems theory, globalization discourse, and the developmental state concept. None of these alone, however, fully explains China's century of efforts to create, through education, a modern state and modern citizenry. This article examines China's struggle to balance foreign influences, national identity, and cultural heritage in school curricula and general education since the late 19th century through a historical approach, together with a reflective and critical analysis of public texts, including policy documents, curriculum standards, and related commentaries.¹

China's efforts to balance the economic and socio-political tasks of education in its modern nation-building can be traced to the late Qing dynasty's struggles, under threat of foreign aggression, for modernization and national survival during the mid-19th and early 20th centuries. This dilemma persisted following the establishment of the Republic of China (ROC; 1912–1949), and the People's Republic of China (PRC) under Mao Zedong's leadership (1949–1976) and then that of his successors.

During these periods, the Chinese state sought to revive and modernize the nation, define its national identity and create a modern citizenry. The leaderships in each period, however, had different approaches to foreign influences and cultural heritage, which, in turn, were refracted into and reflected by Chinese education policy and curricula. These approaches included: (a) the late Qing state's supplementary approach, which adopted Western methods for utility and maintained traditional Chinese values as the essence of knowledge; (b) Republican China's synthesis approach, which embraced Western development methods and integrated select Chinese and Western traditions and practices; (c) Mao's rejection approach, which relied on socialism, rather than capitalism and Chinese culture, for nation-building and fostering a modern citizenry; and (d) post-Mao China's pragmatic use of market forces to revive its socialist economy, and of traditional Chinese values to address social transitions caused by globalization.

¹ In addition to extant literatures, China's official documents and curriculum standards were reviewed for this paper to enable it to examine in greater detail China's roles and strategies for national development and citizenship education. These sources provided historical data and helped trace and compare these policy areas over different periods, as they reflected official views and indicated intended policy outcomes; they did not, however, necessarily reflect reality or represent actual outcomes. This paper acknowledges that a gap between intention and reality in terms of national development and citizenship education might exist in China.

This article argues that this progression reveals China's ongoing nation-building project and its search for national identity and a modern citizenry to be largely state-defined and dynamic, due to the interplay between its leadership's political intentions and changing domestic and global contexts. The more China's state wants national rejuvenation in an increasingly competitive, globalized world in the 21st century, the more China needs to open to and interact with the world and, at the same time, to find a balance between contemporary developments and cultural heritage. To foster a modern Chinese citizenry, this mandates an important education mission in that its citizenship education should be politically and ideologically open and accommodative, and help students develop global, national and local identities and function as active, responsible citizens of a multileveled, multicultural world.

The article first reviews major development theories to set a theoretical stage for understanding China's approaches to development and education for nation-building. Next, it discusses China's late Qing dynasty struggle between pursuing development and preserving cultural identity, and how it looked abroad for solutions. Third, it examines the ROC's approach to this same dilemma. Fourth, it discusses the PRC's "red and expert" formula and its Mao and post-Mao approaches. The article then discusses the implications of China's case for understanding globalization, national identity and citizenship curriculum reform.

Globalization, National Identity, and Education

Since the rise of the modern nation-state and cross-border exchange activities, many theories and models have been proposed to describe, explain and interpret the development paths countries have taken or can take, and related problems and issues (Law, 2009), in particular the struggles between being open for development and preserving national identity and cultural heritage, and the roles of state and education in such struggles. Guibernau (2007) defined national identity as a collective sense of belonging to a nation and sharing features that distinguish it from other nations (p. 11). Smith (1991, p. 14) defined national identity in terms of "we" and "they," and as marked by the collective belief in an agreed-upon historic homeland; shared myths and histories; a common public culture; shared legal rights and duties; and "a common economy with territorial mobility for members." The article adopts Smith's concept as it accommodates collective ethnic, cultural, and political identities, temporal and spatial continuity

and differentiation, and changes in political, economic, and cultural activities.

In the 1940s and 1950s, modernization theorists divided the world into two sectors—the modern (the developed West) and the traditional (the Third World)—and argued for a unilinear path of modernization in which developing countries transition from agricultural to industrialized societies and adopt Western values and institutions (e.g., democracy and equality before the law; Levy, 1952; Parsons, 1951; Smelser, 1969). Education was seen as facilitating modernization and development, and as reinforcing Western values and practices. Dependency theorists divided the world into developed core countries and less developed peripheral areas, secondary to the core (Jenkins, 1992); these peripheral countries engage in unequal economic exchanges with core countries, leading to under-development rather than development (Frank, 1971). Education can reinforce these unequal relations. Modernization and dependency theories have been criticized as deterministic and as underplaying the developmental impact of nation-states and domestic cultures and values.

World-systems theorists (e.g., Wallerstein, 1974, 1979) viewed the world economy as capitalist and consisting of core, semi-periphery, and periphery areas; nation-states possess different capacities to intervene in that economy, and can change their core/periphery status depending on whether they develop or regress (Wallerstein, 1975). Education is seen as a key to development; institutionalists (e.g., Meyer, Ramirez, & Soysal, 1992) contended that many countries provided compulsory schooling and emphasized secondary and higher education to enhance their human capital, while Arnove (1980, 2009) argued that transnational agencies (e.g., the World Bank) are global forces shaping national educational systems.

In the 1990s, the discourse on globalization began to dominate the development and education literature and called into question the nation-state's role in an increasingly globalized world. The increased pace and intensity of movement in capital, goods, services, people, information and images between and within nations has made global human activities more interconnected and interdependent, and competition between nation-states more keen. Globalists argue for the diminishing significance of nation-states and national governance in an increasingly borderless world, and predict globalization's effects on areas of human activity ranging from the economy to culture (Fukuyama, 1992; Ohmae, 1990, 1995; Urry, 1998). Statists or neo-statists acknowledge increasing global interconnectivity and interdependence, but argue for the continued or increased significance of nation-states and their divergent responses to globalization (Kennedy, 2010; Krasner, 1999). Similarly, developmental state theorists argued

that some East Asian societies (e.g., Japan and South Korea) industrialized rapidly between the 1960s and 1980s because of state direction and market intervention (Amsden, 1989; Castells, 1992; Johnson, 1982).

Many nation-states share similar policy rhetoric, objectives and measures regarding education and curricula in response to globalization (Arnove, 2009; Bottery, 2006; Green, 1999), and use education to equip students with “globalization skills” (e.g., a broad knowledge base, IT skills, language proficiency, and cooperation) to facilitate lifelong learning and survival in a competitive, globalized world (Marginson, 1999). While accommodating these imperatives has made knowledge and learning more standardized and homogenous (Christou, 2010), nation-states differ in policy details, structures and processes (Green, 1999), and in how they blend local traditions and incentives with international developments (Priestley, 2008).

Over time, the question of the role of the nation-state became a specific challenge to traditional notions of citizenship and citizenship education, which are nation-specific and involve state-society relationships. Citizens are individuals who live in a nation-state (Banks, 2008). Citizenship refers to people’s legal status, membership, rights and responsibilities, all of which are commonly prescribed by governmental bodies (Osler, 2010) and which determine the extent to which they can participate in civil, political, social and economic affairs within their common geopolitical borders (Giddens, 1993; Law, 2011). Citizenship education is often used by the state and other stakeholders as an instrument of political socialization to foster among students a sense of collective membership, promote rights and responsibilities, and equip them with relevant political and civic literacy, skills and attitudes with a view to helping them become functioning and responsible citizens in a given polity (Banks, 2004b).

The power of globalization to transcend borders, however, has made human activities in economic, political, social and cultural domains increasingly interconnected and interdependent both within and between nation-states (Giddens, 2002). This has created a situation in which nation-states are no longer the exclusive source of legitimacy or the sole site of allegiance, and provided individuals with more opportunities to choose and determine the extent of their affiliation and identification with groups or communities at local, national and/or global levels. Despite this, in reality, citizenship, as Kennedy (2010) argued, is still “embedded in the nation-states” (p. 224).

The discourse on citizenship education has made two main types of response to globalization. The first is to question the role of the state and state borders, and

to argue for a shift in focus from nation-state to individual, local, regional, or global identity (Arnett, 2002; Oommen, 1997; Soysal, 1994). For example, global education models focus mainly on the cultivation of global citizenship and identity by promoting universal values (e.g., human rights), global concerns, and transnational solidarity in the world (Pashby, 2008). The second type of theoretical response is the emergence of inclusive models of education for multiple citizenships. These include both multicultural models (e.g., Banks, 2004a) and multileveled or multidimensional models (e.g., Kubow, Grossman, & Ninomiya, 2000) that embrace personal-social, local, national and global domains. In addition to identifying with their nation-state, people are urged “to live together in increasingly diverse local communities and an interdependent world” and foster multiple (local, national, and global) citizenships (Osler & Starkey, 2003, p. 243). They are also encouraged to develop multiple identities by, for example, sharing normative values and beliefs and developing a sense of identification with and attachment to local, national and global/or communities (Banks, 2004a). These levels or domains of citizenship or identities are interrelated and even intertwined, and individuals’ identities are flexible and can shift between global, national, and local levels (Osler, 2010).

In practical terms, inclusive frameworks for citizenship education have received increasing international attention. No nation-state entirely replaces its national curricula with global education; indeed, many have increased their control over national education and curricula “to play a fundamental part in defining the national community and supplying a sense of continuity and purposes to the very existence of the nation-state” (Guibernau, 2007, p. 31). While encouraging students to develop global outlook, curricula, particularly citizenship education curricula in states such as the United States (Scott & Cogan, 2008) and England (Andrews & Mycock, 2007) stress the importance of learning about national and local institutions, cultures and traditions, and how they relate to other countries. Some nation-states use education to preserve and perpetuate traditional cultures and values; Japan revamped its moral education to stress the importance of inheriting Japanese culture and traditions and cultivating a national identity and consciousness (Otsu, 2008), while South Korea used curriculum reform to revitalize its Confucian traditions and values (So, Kim, & Lee, 2012).

These theories of development and education and studies on citizenship and citizenship education are useful to the understanding of globalization, national identity and citizenship education in China. They are not specific enough, however, to explain three particular aspects of China’s case: the struggle between economic development and cultural preservation; the roles of China’s state in

these struggles; and the strategies used by different Chinese national leaders to find new directions for China's modernization and education.

Traditional Chinese Education in Imperial China before 1911

Before being severely challenged during the late Qing dynasty, education and curriculum in Imperial China were mainly state-led and Confucian-oriented, and focused on cultivating an obedient citizenry rather than development. Imperial Chinese education was integrated with state governance and Confucianism to foster social harmony and support for the Emperor. This undermined education's development function and was severely challenged as China was confronted by foreign powers in the 19th century.

Dominance of Confucian Education

Confucius (551BCE–478BCE) was a pioneer of Chinese private education and a major contributor to the collection, revision, and publication of important classical writings, including the Five Classics (*I-Ching*, *Poetry*, *Rites*, *Book of History*, and *Spring and Autumn Annals*; You, 1993); Confucian education based on these classics was dominant in China for over two millennia. According to many scholars (e.g., Liang, 2006; Qian, 2004; Russell, 1922), Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism inform core Chinese cultural values and norms shaping China's national identity and Chinese people's thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors.

Due to the integration of Confucianism and state politics, socio-political tasks overshadowed development in traditional Chinese education since the Western Han dynasty (202BCE–9BCE). To facilitate governance and foster harmony and stability, Emperor Han Wu (156BCE–87BCE) officially adopted Confucianism as state doctrine and banned other schools of thought, promoted Confucian education, established the imperial college (*taixue*), and designated the Five Classics as mandatory textbooks. This integration was further strengthened in 606CE, when the Sui dynasty tied the study of Confucian writings to civil-service examinations for staffing the Chinese literati bureaucracy; the Four Books (*Great Learning*, *Doctrine of Mean*, *Analects*, and *Mencius*) were added to the examination list in the Song dynasty (960CE–1279CE).

For over two millennia, the Five Classics, Four Books and other Confucian writings have dominated Chinese curricular content and examinations, becoming the canon of the Chinese Confucian heritage. Despite their being seen as modern, Western products, the basic elements of the concepts of nation-state and citizenship

can be found in these Chinese classical texts, including: state (*guo*), borders, membership (in terms of government-people), and obligations (such as taxation and loyalty to the ruler and the state; Mencius, 2003). Despite dynastical changes and until the 1911 overthrow of the Qing dynasty, Confucian education at home and in schools emphasized moral cultivation for the purpose of social harmony by observing rites and practicing self-control over mind, word and deed (Law, 2011). It perpetuated Confucian cultural and socio-political values that favored monarchical rule (e.g., loyalty and filial piety) and fostered an obedient citizenry.

Reforming the Confucian Curriculum: The Supplementary Approach

In the 19th century, Confucian-oriented education and curricula were criticized as barriers to development and progress; at the same time, China's national survival and identity were threatened by foreign military aggression. While the Industrial Revolution (1750–1850) spawned tremendous technological, economic, and social progress elsewhere, Qing dynasty China (1655–1911) continued to be inward-looking and to emphasize Confucian-oriented education. In the 1840s and 1890s, military defeats forced China to cede territory to, and open ports for trading with foreign powers. These defeats confronted China with its economic and technological backwardness, shattered its Sinocentric worldview, reduced people's pride in Chinese civilization (Wang, 1977), and challenged the relevance and usefulness of its Confucian-oriented cultural identity (Gray, 1990). On the other hand, these military defeats were regarded as national insults, and a later impetus for national rejuvenation (Lovell, 2011).

To address external military and economic threats and revive China, the late Qing state expanded Chinese education's mainly socio-political focus to include development. In a reform edict (collected in MacNair, 1927), Chinese Emperor Guangxu (1875–1908) recognized Western technological and military achievements and criticized China's failure to provide practical, scientific education. To remedy this, the state began to establish a public school system, mainly modeled on Zhang Zhidong's supplementary approach, *zhongti xiyong* 中体西用 (Chinese learning as essence and Western learning for utility; You, 1993).

The Qing state, while still emphasizing Confucian classics through its Moral Cultivation subject, introduced Western-style vocational and technical education, including arithmetic, agriculture and commerce, and science. This approach, which reflected the tension between preserving China's Confucian-oriented cultural heritage and pursuing national development, was abandoned following the 1911 overthrow of the Qing dynasty.

The Republic of China (1912–1949): The Synthesis Approach

The dilemma between development and the loss of national identity persisted in the ROC's school curricula. Having inherited the economic and technological backwardness of Imperial China, and confronted with an ideological struggle between capitalism and communism. The ROC pursued West knowledge to revive China, while retaining Confucian heritage as part of its new national identity. Specifically, the KMT-led state upheld Sun Yat-Sen's "Three Principles of the People" (nationalism, democracy, and people's livelihood) as its guiding ideology and the core of Chinese identity. Sun's (1985) principles selectively merged Confucian values (e.g., benevolence, righteousness, propriety, loyalty, and filial piety) and Western ideas (e.g., the separation of powers).

To foster a modern citizenry, the ROC adopted a Western-style academic structure: six years of primary education, six of secondary, and four of university. The Chinese curriculum emphasized equipping students with language and science competences. Students were required to study Chinese from Grade 1, and English from Grade 7 (Ministry of Education, Republic of China, 1934), and were taught general science in primary school, and botany, zoology, chemistry and physics in Grades 7 to 9.

The KMT-led state also stressed students' moral and political cultivation. It used citizenship education to foster among students good personal ethics, a sense of collective responsibility for society and loyalty to the country. After the late 1920s, curricula and textbooks were revised to reflect Sun's "Three Principles of the People." From Grade 1, students studied Sun's principles and the KMT's interpretations thereof (Culp, 2007). From Grade 7, students were taught history and geography that focused on China and those countries and international organizations that had relations with China, and citizenship education was expanded to include the lifestyles and cultures of select foreign countries. The KMT-led state also emphasized the teaching of traditional Chinese values, including loyalty, filial piety, benevolence, love, trustworthiness, righteousness and peace. It even designated four traditional Chinese values—propriety, righteousness, integrity, and a sense of shame—as the common motto of all ROC schools. At the same time, Chiang Kai-Shek opposed communism and the Communist Party of China (CPC), which began to take root in China. The KMT-led state's efforts to make a modern citizenry, however, were interrupted by foreign aggression from the late 1930s onward and civil wars with the CPC between 1945 and 1949.

Mao's China (1949–1976): The Replacement Approach

After founding the PRC in 1949, the CPC, under the leadership of Chairman Mao Zedong, replaced the KMT's curriculum with its socialist curriculum for nation building and construction of a new socialism-oriented national identity. Like the KMT, the CPC wanted to develop a new national identity for the Chinese people, and sought solutions from outside China; unlike the KMT, the CPC rejected capitalism and Western political thought as imperialist tools, eschewed Confucianism and downplayed China's traditional culture as feudal. Instead, it adopted a replacement approach that highlighted socialism as the means of modernizing China, the only state-supported governance ideology, and the essence of a new Chinese national identity. Education in the CPC-led state struggled between "red and expert," i.e., between the political task of making a socialist citizenry and the economic task of generating manpower for domestic economic development. As this and next section argue, this tension has persisted, with different emphases and to different extents, in China's socialist modernization since 1949.

In the 1950s, the CPC put nearly equal emphases on the economic and socio-political tasks of education. Its dualistic ideological framework and limited involvement in the world led the CPC to reform China by importing Soviet economic, political, and educational systems, and using the curriculum to inculcate Chinese students as "new socialist" persons who were both "red and expert" to further China's modernization (Chen, 1969).

This emphasis was reflected in, for example, its 1953 secondary-school curriculum, which stressed language proficiency and basic science literacy. Students spent seven and six class hours per week studying Chinese at primary and secondary levels, respectively (Chen & Hu, 1993), and three and four class hours a week at the junior- and senior-secondary levels, respectively, on a foreign language. Although China had severed diplomatic relations with most Western countries, English was still offered in secondary schools, although more schools offered Russian. Physics, chemistry, and biology were given more class hours than arts and humanities, and vocational and technical education was excluded (Chen & Hu, 1993). Following the Soviet model, the science curriculum was over-specialized; for example, biology was divided into botany, zoology, anatomy, and fundamental Darwinism.

Although there were no specific political curriculum or textbooks in the early 1950s, secondary students spent two class hours per week on the China's revolutionary history, Marxist-oriented social sciences and the 1949 Common

Program of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (which then served as the PRC's constitution and outlined its political, economic, and social systems; Chen & Hu, 1993). Political classes were heavily oriented towards Maoist socialism, promoted a dualistic worldview in which capitalist countries were enemies and socialist countries friends, emphasized the superiority of communism, and stressed the need for class struggle to build a communist China.

In 1957, Mao (1977) reiterated the political importance of education as a means of equipping Chinese laborers with a socialist consciousness and culture. One year later, Mao specified two major political tasks for education: to serve the proletariat politically and to integrate education and labor for production, moving the Ministry of Education (MoE) (1957) to formalize political education as a separate subject for secondary students. Grades 7 and 8 students, in *Cultivation of Youth*, were encouraged to develop communist moral values, love the nation (including the CPC, government, leaders, and army), labor and science, serve the people and construct a socialist China. Grade 9 students, in *political knowledge*, focused on China's socialist state structure and nation-building tasks. Grade 10 and 11 students took knowledge of social sciences to study dialectical materialism and historical materialism, whereas Grade 12 students, in *socialist construction*, studied more abstract socialist concepts. The new classes absorbed one and two class hours per week for students in Grades 7 and 8 and Grades 9 to 12, respectively. Beginning in 1959, the MoE required junior-secondary students to take *political knowledge*, which covered communist morality, the development of socialism, socialist revolution and modernization, and senior-secondary students to take *economic knowledge and dialectical materialism*, as well.

Besides political lessons, the CPC-led state used other subjects (such as Chinese language and music) and examinations to transmit its political views and positions. For example, the 1954 college entrance examination asked students to translate sentences conveying explicit political messages conveying ideas and feelings such as the joy of meeting Chairman Mao, the importance of studying Marxism-Leninism, the existence of United States aggression, and the importance of Soviet assistance.

After the late 1950s Sino-Soviet split, the CPC-led state began to develop its own socialist school curriculum, which continued to stress the "red and expert" formula for socialist modernization. In 1963, it promulgated new curriculum standards for primary and secondary schools (Chen & Hu, 1993) which, for economic reasons, gave more class hours to science subjects, cut arts and humanities by one half and dramatically increased secondary students' class time for foreign languages studies; secondary students spent 412 class hours over six

years on politics (*zhengzhi*), for example, compared to 303 for history and 210 on geography. Moreover, Grades 6 and 9 students took two lessons per week on knowledge of production, while senior-primary and secondary students “labored” for two and four weeks per year, respectively, in social services or in factories or villages to learn from and work with workers and peasants.

This balance between “red and expert” was interrupted by the Cultural Revolution (1966–1976), during which the economy seriously declined (Liu & Wu, 1986) and politics took center stage. In political lessons, students were compelled to study Mao’s words and to criticize others and themselves. Chinese traditional culture was severely attacked, knowledge was despised, intellectuals and teachers criticized, and schools and universities suspended. As a result, the economic role of education was utterly undermined, while its political role was pushed to an extreme. Mao’s personality cult dominated socialist China until his death in 1976.

Post-Mao China since the Late 1970s: The Pragmatic Approach

In the late 1970s, under Deng Xiaoping’s leadership, the PRC tried to recover from the disastrous Cultural Revolution by reviving its economy and restoring order to society and education. In 1978, Deng began to implement the policy of reform and opening to the world, gradually introducing a series of pragmatic policies and strategies for national development, including establishing diplomatic ties with capitalist countries and applying for membership in the GATTs (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade later renamed the World Trade Organization), emphasizing economic construction over class struggle, introducing market mechanisms into the economy, and letting some areas and people get rich first. As a result, the economy and education were opened to the world in the 1980s and 1990s to facilitate economic recovery and domestic development, and school curricula were further reformed in response to globalization in the 2000s; in short, the “red and expert” formula was gradually modified to reflect global citizenship and China’s cultural heritage.

Before the examination of Deng’s pragmatic approach to education for nation re-building, it is useful to clarify some terms which might cause confusion in understanding citizenship education in post-Mao China. In addition to political education, the CPC-led state has, since the 1980s, used other terms (in CPC Central Committee documents, for example) to describe and implement its various political socialization projects or movements in school and society, and

to address specific social issues and problems in different periods. These include moral or moral character education, patriotic education and citizenship education. In the 1980s, moral education was promoted to fight the negative impacts of market-oriented economic reform, such as moral decline and extreme individualism (Communist Party of China Central Committee, 1988). As Lee (1996) observed, moral education also emphasized students' psychological health and development. In the early 1990s, patriotic education was stressed as a means to boost patriotism among students and guard against attempts by hostile foreign forces to overthrow China's socialist system (Communist Party of China Central Committee, 1994). In particular, in the early 2000s, after the promulgation of the *Implementation Outline on Ethic Building for Citizens*, the concepts of citizens' qualities and citizenship education were used to foster Chinese people's ethical qualities and to fight against the moral decline seen among its people and officials (Communist Party of China Central Committee, 2001).

Despite differences in terminology, these projects were all interrelated. An analysis of relevant CPC's documents, as Law (2006) demonstrated, shows that the relations and contents of these projects were interwoven and almost inseparable, and served a single purpose: to socialize people (including students) into the norms, values and ideologies deemed acceptable to and prescribed by the CPC-led state. *People's Education* (2001), an official journal of the Ministry of Education, admitted these complicated relations, noting that patriotism is an important theme in the construction of ethics among citizens, and that the main goal of moral education is to strengthen citizens' ethic qualities.

Opening the School Curriculum to the World for Domestic Development between the Late 1970s and the 1990s

Between the late 1970s and 1990s, Deng (1978a, 1978b) took a pragmatic approach to developing human capital and reforming China's socialist education and curriculum, advocating the using of science and education to make China prosperous and "respecting knowledge and respecting trained personnel" rather than persecuting intellectuals (including scientists and engineers). The "red and expert" formula was retooled to require education to meet the demands of *sange mianxiang* 三个面向 (the three orientations, modernization, the world, and the future) and to produce *siyou xinren* 四有新人 (well-educated "new socialist" people with socialist ideals, virtues and discipline; Deng, 1983). In the mid-1980s, the Communist Party of China Central Committee (1985) used this revised formula to reform the Chinese educational system to produce

professionals, sub-professionals and skilled workers able to meet the challenges of an increasingly globalized economy.

To that end, the CPC-led state introduced a series of major pragmatic education measures, including the 1977 reinstatement of the national college entrance examination (suspended during the Cultural Revolution); the 1977 importation of over 2,000 foreign textbooks (including from Britain, France, Japan and the United States) to revise China's curriculum (Lu, 2002); reinstating English as the first foreign language for all students from the junior-secondary to post-secondary levels; re-introducing keypoint schools in the primary- and secondary-education sectors to train high-calibre personnel and facilitate rapid economic reform; instituting nine-year compulsory schooling for children aged 6 to 15 to meet labor market demands for a large, skilled and literate workforce; and expanding senior-secondary and higher education in the 1990s to meet high-end manpower needs.

At the same time, the state continued to emphasize political education in school to create a socialist citizenry. The MoE (1978) required schools to provide political lessons and activities through which students could integrate learning with labor and learn from workers, peasants, and the army. Besides political lessons, upper-primary and secondary students took *Laodong* 劳动 (labor) and *Laodong jishu* 劳动技术 (labor skills), respectively, to understand the socialist definition of production and to master basic production knowledge and skills before entering the labor market. Political messages about class struggle were toned down, while those about, for example, the superiority of communism/socialism and the CPC's role in saving China from foreign aggression were kept.

The CPC-led state developed a more accommodative, multileveled-multidimensional framework for socialist citizenship education, comprising global, national, local and personal-social domains. This framework was implicitly embedded in the citizenship curriculum, and could be revealed by careful analysis of the curriculum content of, for example, Thought and moral character courses (State Education Commission, 1986), in which primary students were taught about the impact of Deng's policies on their relationship to the world. Students were expected to understand why China needed to communicate with and learn from foreign countries (including capitalist ones), and to learn how to show hospitality to foreigners while protecting China's dignity. At the national level, the subject encouraged primary students to know that they are Chinese, to master basic information about China (including its national anthem and flag) and the CPC (including its party flag, history, and important leaders), and love the CPC and China fervently. Regarding the local

domain, it asked students to know and to love their home town or village and keep it harmonious. In the personal-social domain, primary students were encouraged to develop healthy habits and civilized manners, resist an unhealthy ethos, and observe laws and rules so that they could deal with new relationships and problems arising from China's gradual transition to a socialist market economy and an increasingly pluralistic society. A similar implicit multileveled-multidimensional socialist citizenship education model can be identified in the political education curricula for junior- and senior-secondary students (State Education Commission, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c, 1988d).

Despite these changes, the school curriculum was criticized for failing to equip students to face the challenges arising from China's changing society and relationship to the world. In the late 1990s, the Communist Party of China Central Committee and State Council (2000) reiterated the importance of enhancing the quantity and quality of China's talents in various fields of international competition and education's essential role in doing so. They also expressed grave concerns about China lagging behind other countries in education, curriculum and pedagogy, and admitted education's inability to develop well-rounded students of the calibre required by the 21st-century global economy. Some 10 years later, the CPC Central Committee and State Council (2010, July 30) expressed similar concerns in the *Outline of China's National Plan for Medium- and Long-term Education Reform and Development (2010–2020)*, which re-constructed Deng's version of "red and expert" in terms of "putting moral education as the first priority" and "persistence in emphasis on competences."

Reforming the School Curriculum for Global Competition since the 2000s

In the 2000s, fearing China would lag behind other countries in an increasingly competitive global economy, the state twice revised its primary and junior-secondary curricula in an effort to turn China's huge population into a national human resource asset. The MoE (2001; 2012, February 8) promulgated experimental curriculum standards for 19 subjects in 2001 and fine-tuned versions in 2011, both of which reveal the tension between education's developmental and socio-political tasks, and specify basic qualities Chinese students need to acquire to face global challenges. Unlike the 1990s curricula, which focused on domestic development, both the experimental and fine-tuned standards emphasized preparing students for global competition by fostering their broad knowledge base, basic competences for lifelong learning, and global

consciousness. These two curriculum sets stressed socio-political tasks by emphasizing training students to be functioning citizens within a socialist framework; however, the latter were more Sino-centric, incorporating more elements specific to China's traditional culture and contemporary developments.

Encouraging Students to Master Basic Competences and Get Closer to the World

The 2001 and 2011 school curriculum versions shared three approaches to preparing students to be globally competitive. First, they sought to establish a broad knowledge base for changing domestic and international labor markets by highlighting science, humanities and the social sciences. They also employed curriculum integration principles to group subjects into eight learning areas—language and literature, mathematics, humanities and social studies, sciences, technology, art, physical education and health, and integrated practical activities—and amalgamated related subjects, including the arts (music and art), science (physics, chemistry and biology), and history and social studies (history and geography). Schools could offer amalgamated subjects or their components.

Second, the curricula sought to expand Chinese students' learning to include skills and competences for a changing economy and society (as emphasized in the *Outline of China's National Plan for Medium- and Long-term Education Reform and Development (2010–2020)*), including transnational skills to help students communicate globally, such as foreign language and information technology (IT). The 2001 experimental curriculum strategically extended the teaching of English from junior-secondary education to primary Grade 3 nationally, and allowed junior-secondary schools to offer Japanese and Russian as elective secondary foreign languages. The MoE (2000a) also sought to popularize IT education in primary and secondary schools by 2011; compulsory IT courses were offered in all senior-secondary schools nationwide, in junior-secondary schools in medium-to-large cities by 2001 and nationally by 2005, in primary schools in developed areas by 2005, and in over 90% of schools nationwide as early as possible. These courses were expected to equip students with basic IT knowledge and skills; develop students' ability to search for, transfer and process information, and use IT; and lay the foundations for learning, working, and living in the future knowledge society (MoE, 2000b).

Other state-promoted survival skills include generic skills, intended to help students become lifelong learners in a changing society and world. These include active participation and practice, critical thinking, collaborative exploration, searching for and processing information, acquiring new knowledge, problem

solving, communicating, and collaborating, and echo UNESCO's (1996, 2000) four pillars of learning (learning to know, to do, to live together, and to be) and Marginson's (1999) "skills of globalization" (p. 29). To help students master and integrate these skills, the 2001 curriculum required schools to introduce compulsory comprehensive practical activities from the primary to senior-secondary levels, including using IT, project learning, engaging in community services and practice, and developing labor skills and technologies.

Third, both versions explicitly adopted a multileveled-multidimensional citizenship education framework to help students develop multiple—global, national, and local—identities. This was first seen in the experimental Grades 3 to 6 *Curriculum Standards for Moral Character and Society* (MoE, 2002), which comprised six major spheres (individuals, family, school, community and home town/village, nation and the world) intersecting with three dimensions: social contexts (time, space, sociocultural environment, nature), social activities (daily, cultural, economic and political activities) and social relations (human relations, social norms, regulations, law and systems). The theme of the global sphere was "getting closer to the world," and emphasized cultivating global awareness. Primary students were required to (a) master basic knowledge about the world and world civilizations; (b) know and respect life habits and customs from other countries, regions, and ethnicities; (c) develop a preliminary understanding of how science and technology affect people's lives and social development; (d) learn about common global problems (e.g., environmental deterioration, population growth, and resource scarcity) and the importance of harmonious coexistence between people, and between humans and nature; (e) recognize the importance of peace and the sufferings caused by war; and (f) know which international organizations and covenants China had joined, and their functions.

While the same requirements can be identified in the 2011 curriculum standards (MoE, 2011c), there were three changes: the theme of global citizenship was changed to "our common world"; primary students were taught the "increasing influences of China on international affairs"; and, students were urged to collect pictures and information on international events hosted by China. In other words, teaching about the world involved teaching about China in the world.

Reinforcing Students' Chinese Cultural Identity within a Socialist Framework

While encouraging students to remain globally competitive, the state sought to reinforce their Chinese cultural identity within a socialist framework. The CPC Central Committee and State Council (2010, July 30) repeatedly emphasized

“moral education as first priority” and the urgency of making Chinese students “qualified socialist citizens.” To that end, the MoE infused the 2011 basic education curriculum with socialist values, continuing a practice that has been a part of Chinese curricula since 1949, particularly citizenship curricula. Interestingly, more emphasis was placed on cultivating in students a national identity oriented towards traditional Chinese culture, a change from past practice and one informed by China’s new policy of exploring and utilizing Chinese culture for nation development and revival purposes.

After Mao’s death in 1976, the CPC-led state had begun to reverse its hostility towards Chinese culture and its efforts to replace Confucianism with socialism as the main state-supported value system; under Deng Xiaoping’s leadership, however, the state was more sympathetic to Chinese culture. The 1980s saw the selective use of Chinese culture to address social problems and issues arising from the transition to a socialist market economy, such as crime, corruption, individualism and hedonism. Classical Chinese texts and stories, such as the traditional tale of the greater difficulty in breaking a batch of arrows than a single arrow, were selectively included in school textbooks, in this instance, to illustrate how community is more powerful than individualism (Guangdong Provincial Textbook Team for Thought and Moral Character in Primary Schools, 1996).

In the early 2000s, the CPC-led state began to officially reinstate the status of Chinese culture in state governance, with then-President Jiang Zemin’s “Three Represents” theory, which stated the CPC represents the most advanced cultural and production forces, and the fundamental interests of most Chinese. The theory was incorporated into the CPC’s charter in 2002, and China’s Constitution in 2004. Since then, despite continued rhetorical emphasis on China’s socialist culture, national leaders have increasingly used classical Chinese texts and sayings in public speeches and governance policies, as when then-President Hu Jintao (2006) invoked China’s traditional “eight honours and eight shames” (*ba rong ba chi*, a set of eight dos and eight don’ts) to fight declining moral standards among officials and citizens.

In the early 2010s, the development of Chinese culture became official national strategy with the Communist Party of China Central Committee’s (2011, October 26) decision to promote cultural development, strengthen China’s cultural systems and industries, and build a “socialist core value system.” The decision acknowledged the Chinese cultural value of prosperity as being of overriding importance to development, the first priority of governance, and integral to China’s revival.

The decision can be seen as a response to Hu Jintao’s (2007) efforts to position

Chinese culture within the socialist framework as an important strategic “soft power” for domestic development and global rejuvenation. On the one hand, it recognizes the increasing importance of Chinese culture in four key domestic areas: ethnic solidarity and innovation; comprehensive national competition strength; socioeconomic development; and, cultivating the cultural dimension of people’s “spiritual life” in a prosperous society (a national development goal to be achieved by 2020). On the other hand, the state wanted to use Chinese culture to defend China’s “cultural security,” resist cultural aggression by other countries, increase its international cultural influence, and showcase the Chinese people’s spirit and China’s achievements in reform and opening to the world. To spread Chinese language, culture and history globally, China established, three hundred and fifty eight Confucius Institutes (similar to the UK’s British Council, France’s Alliance Française, and Germany’s Goethe-Institut) between 2004 and early 2012 at overseas higher-education institutes, and more than 500 Confucius classrooms in primary and secondary schools in over 100 countries and regions (Wen, Zhang, & Zheng, 2012, May 24). Some countries, however, have seen this as a form of cultural imperialism, and as constituting a global threat.

Having shifted from rejection to re-acceptance of Chinese culture, in the 2000s the CPC-led state revised its citizenship and whole school curricula to help students develop, within a socialist framework, a strong national identification rooted in Chinese culture. In the curriculum standards for Grades 3 to 6 “Moral Character and Society,” for example, although the experimental national citizenship theme, “I am a Chinese,” was changed to “Our Country” in the fine-tuned version (MoE, 2002, 2011c), the contents of both are almost the same. Both standards cover basic information about China, its development in areas ranging from agriculture to modern communications, and the basic rights and duties of its citizens. In addition, both reflect the CPC’s political positions and historical perspectives on such topics as Taiwan (a part of China); ethnic diversity; the role of foreign aggression and Chinese resistance since the 1840s; the CPC’s contribution to founding the PRC in 1949; and China’s achievements since 1978. Moreover, both standards encourage students to treasure Chinese cultural heritage, feel solidarity with those Chinese facing natural disasters and nurture a passion for China’s territories, the socialist motherland, the CPC, and the army.

The CPC-led state also used other subjects to help students learn more about and identify with China’s cultural traditions and contemporary achievements. The 2011 curriculum is more Sino-centric than its 2001 counterpart, and stresses the importance of learning “excellent” Chinese cultural traditions and achievements and incorporating these into different subjects, in three main ways.

First, by enhancing students' Chinese spoken and written language proficiency, which has declined due, in part, to students' increased focus on learning English, the rise of internet language, and weakened Chinese language education. To improve students' Chinese proficiency, the 2011 curriculum standard requires Grades 1 to 9 students to master *Hanyu Pinyin* (Romanized Chinese characters), know roughly 3,500 Chinese characters, read Chinese outside of class, and memorize 240 Chinese and translated poems and written works (MoE, 2011f).

To cultivate students' passion for the Chinese language, the 2011 Chinese language curriculum increased the number of Chinese poems and classical writings to be memorized from 130 to 136 (correspondingly reducing the number of contemporary Chinese and translated foreign writings). Moreover, Grades 1 to 9 Chinese language students must both learn to write Chinese characters with an ordinary pen and take calligraphy lessons. From 2013/2014, students in Grades 3 to 4 need to learn how to use a writing brush (rarely used in daily life) to *linmo* 临摹 (copy and trace) block style Chinese calligraphy; Grades 5 to 6 students are required to brush-write *kaishu* 楷书 (regular script) and appreciate the beauty of written Chinese characters; and Grades 7 to 9 students should emulate the styles of famous Chinese calligraphers and appreciate the aesthetics of Chinese calligraphy (MoE, 2013).

Second, more Chinese elements were added to arts and humanities to expose students to and familiarize them with Chinese cultural traditions. The 2011 music curriculum, for example, features more Chinese traditional and ethnic/local music; Grades 1 to 9 students are expected to perform several new folk songs annually, while Grades 3 to 9 students must learn one Beijing or local opera segment each year (MoE, 2011e). The 2011 science curriculum has also undergone Sinification. Mathematics students are expected to know the contributions of *Jiuzhang suanshu* 九章算术 (the Nine Chapters on Mathematics), one of China's earliest mathematics texts, containing 246 ancient mathematics problems (MoE, 2011d). Grades 1 to 3 students are expected to know the importance of the abacus in ancient China and use it to show a figure's first three digits.

Third, the 2011 curriculum standards emphasize pride in China's achievements and advances under the CPC's leadership. The general science curriculum, for example, asks junior-secondary students to observe and collect information about China's achievements in astronomy, space technology and industry (MoE, 2011a), while the history curriculum reviews China's achievements since the 16th CPC National Congress in 2002 (MoE, 2011b)—including hosting the 2008 Beijing Olympics, the PRC's 60th anniversary in 2009, the CPC's formulation of socialism with Chinese characteristics, and President Hu Jintao's scientific theory

on development—to help students “persistently uphold” the CPC’s leadership and “firmly believe” in Chinese socialism (p. 22).

Whether these additional Chinese elements will foster students’ national identity and pride remains to be seen. The state’s new cultural policy, however, is a tacit admission that it cannot rely solely on socialism for nation-building and that China’s national development, rejuvenation, and identity cannot be separated from its traditions, civilization and culture. The Chinese state has entrusted the new school curriculum with an important human capital development mission for the 21st century: to develop students’ knowledge, skills and attitudes to enable them cope with changing global demands and function as responsible members of their local, national, and international communities.

Discussion and Conclusion

This article has traced the trajectory of China’s struggles in its education and citizenship curricula between accommodating global influences and preserving China’s national identity and cultural heritage since the late 19th century. It has demonstrated that, in an increasingly globalized world, China and its curricula must compete with other countries for economic development and withstand their economic, political, ideological, and cultural influences. China’s four historical approaches—the late Qing dynasty’s supplementary approach, the ROC’s synthesis approach, Mao’s rejection approach, and Deng’s post-Mao pragmatism—reflect the attempts of different leaderships to further China’s development, rejuvenate the Chinese nation, modernize its citizenry, in the ways they shaped the economic and socio-political domains of Chinese curricula in different eras. The trajectory of these approaches suggests that, since the end of its millennia-old imperial system in 1911, China has continued to pursue nation-building and a national identity. Despite this, the trajectory suggests that, as social constructs, China’s national identity and citizenship education are state-prescribed and have varied with changes of leadership and their responses to domestic and global contexts, and that making and fostering a modern Chinese citizenry in the 21st century is linked to China’s cultural heritage, contemporary domestic contexts, and an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world.

Specifically, China’s trajectory reveals that its citizenship education has been nation-specific and is marked by three major interrelated continuities. First, Chinese citizenship education is state-led, rather than society-led. The state is the principal definer of citizenship education, which embeds the will of rulers or

leaders and is used to consolidate and sustain their leadership. Second, the political orientation of Chinese citizenship education tends to be exclusive. On the one hand, it favorably transmits a particular set of beliefs and ideologies for state governance and/or nation building that are strongly supported or advocated by national leaders (e.g., Confucianism in Imperial China, the Three People's Principles in the ROC, and different versions of socialism adapted to the Chinese context at different stages in the PRC). On the other, it discourages those views or positions that are deemed (by national leaders) unacceptable or that threaten political and social stability (e.g., communism during the ROC period and capitalism in the Mao era). Third, with the exception of the Mao era, Chinese culture has always been an important element in Chinese citizenship education. It is not only an integral component of Chinese identity, but also has values that leaders can promote or co-opt to facilitate their continued leadership and governance, such as personal ethics, responsibility to society and the country and social harmony and stability.

Despite these continuities, citizenship education in China has experienced three major changes. First, the state-supported value system transmitted in Chinese citizenship education has changed from Confucianism (which reflected the collective social wisdom of pre-1911 China) to systems specifically developed by national leaders in post-1911 China, including Sun in the ROC and Mao and Deng in the PRC. Second, in different times in post-1911 China, citizenship education has conveyed more explicitly different national leaders' views, positions and policies on nation building and state governance. Third, the scope of citizenship education has expanded; once mainly focused on the cultivation of personal morals and social harmony, it now follows an explicit multileveled-multidimensional framework covering personal-social, local, national and global domains.

China's case has four theoretical implications for understanding globalization, nation building, and education for making a modern citizenry in a global age. The first is that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to development, nation-building and national identity formation. Despite the predictions of modernization theory, China has resisted Western political traditions and institutions and uses traditional Chinese culture, once considered a barrier to modernization, to link China to the world and address domestic social issues arising from modernization and urbanization. The curriculum is now used to preserve Chinese civilization and re-establish Chinese culture as an integral part of national identity. Also, contrary to dependency theories, China has not experienced underdevelopment, despite its increased engagement in unequal

economic exchanges with core countries. On the contrary, it has, since 1978, made remarkable economic progress, and overtaken Japan as the world's second-largest economy. Despite leadership changes, Chinese citizenship curricula have, for over a century, propagated the state's ideology and principles as an essential part of Chinese people's collective identity, rather than reinforcing foreign powers' interests in China.

Unlike the convergence thesis of globalization, China's case suggests the state continues to play a significant role in domestic and foreign affairs, resisting Western political models, and defending its domestic affairs against foreign intrusions; national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the preservation of Chinese cultural identity remain important to China. As such, China's case seems to support the world-systems theory and the developmental state thesis. Despite its zigzagging path, China has shaped its own model of development, allowing the coexistence of a market economy and central planning under CPC/state guidance (Zhang, 2012). It has demonstrated its capacity to turn unequal exchanges with other countries to its advantage, and has become a rising global economic power. China's case supplements existing schools of thought by showing the importance of cultural heritage to a nation-state's domestic development and of intercultural interactions between nation-states that are accompanied by unequal economic exchanges. China has revised its curriculum to prepare its students to compete globally, while still cultivating their Chinese identity within a socialist framework. China has also established Confucius Institutes around the world as an active strategy to protect its culture and promote it to the world.

The second theoretical implication relates to the importance of cultural heritage to nation-building and national identity in a global age. Competing for development and striving for cultural heritage are equally important concerns, and traditional culture can be both an important foundation for development and an integral component of national identity; China's case suggests the state can adjust the equilibrium between these two concerns by emphasizing one at the expense of the other. The state can protect or suppress domestic culture and traditions, and facilitate or inhibit domestic and foreign cultural interactions. Its four approaches to development and making a modern Chinese citizenry suggest China has enthusiastically learnt about economic development from other countries, both capitalist and socialist. The supplementary, synthesis, and pragmatic approaches, however, point to China's fear of losing its cultural identity in face of potentially challenging or inconsistent foreign traditions and values. The radical (rejection) approach of the PRC under Mao attempted to

sever China's traditional culture from its national identity and replace it with a foreign ideology (socialism) in education and the wider society, but did so in vain. Indeed, as time passes, the more it opens itself to the world and the more it develops, the more China relies on its traditional culture rather than socialist doctrines and principles to promote itself to the world and to address domestic social issues and problems. While using education to prepare its students for the challenges of globalization in the 21st century, post-Mao China reminds them that their historical and cultural roots are an integral part of their national identity, rather than something to renounce, and that they should take pride in the achievements of both contemporary and ancient China. The reinstatement of Chinese culture in the school curriculum is expected to provide opportunities for students to understand and develop both their national Chinese identity and local/ethnic identities, and their relations with peoples of other cultures around the world.

The third theoretical implication concerns the relationship between development and citizenship education for training students to become active citizens in a globalized world in the 21st century. In an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world, curricula as social constructions no longer serve only to prepare students to meet the needs of society and the domestic market; they also help nations compete globally while maintaining their national distinctiveness in an increasingly interconnected world. China's case supports the promotion of inclusive citizenship education models, rather than global education models. Like other countries, China has reformed its school curriculum to accommodate global education imperatives and has used school curricula, including citizenship education, to transmit CPC-prescribed socialist values to students and to link Chinese traditions to contemporary China under the CPC's leadership. In this sense, the state functions as a principal selector of school curricula, choosing knowledge, skills, values and attitudes from a multicultural and multileveled world (including individual, local, national, and global levels) to be passed to future generations in response to societal and global changes, based on national conditions and needs. While encouraging the cultivation of multiple identities, Chinese citizenship education, as a state socialization project, promotes national identity ahead of local and global identities. This can be explained by Banks (2004a) who advocated that the multicultural model of citizenship education seeks to help students "function within the nation-state rather than in the global community" (p. 4).

The fourth theoretical implication relates more to citizenship education in China. China's development trajectory suggests that the more the Chinese state

pursues national rejuvenation in an increasingly competitive, globalized world, the more politically and ideologically open and accommodating its education (particularly citizenship education) must be, and the more its students must develop multiple identities and function as active and responsible citizens of a multileveled and multicultural world. This could be an important ongoing mission for Chinese education and curriculum in the 21st century. Its realization, however, would likely depend on the ability and willingness of China's leaders and the CPC to entertain social, economic and political values and ideas that may contradict the tenets of Chinese socialism; to tolerate opposition voices from a politically active citizenry; to evaluate, objectively and honestly, the continued relevance of the socialist principles and values in Chinese citizenship education to students' daily life; to acknowledge the pivotal role of Chinese culture in maintaining China's national identity in a globalized world; to afford schools and teachers the autonomy to develop and implement a politically and ideologically open citizenship curriculum; and to treat students as autonomous persons and allow them the freedom to evaluate, critically, the various positions and values taught in citizenship education, and to freely choose the extent to which they are willing and able to identify with local, national, and/or international communities.

To conclude, opening to the world for development and preserving national identity and cultural heritage for nation building and making a modern citizenry are not necessarily mutually exclusive in a global age. China's struggles with this issue have shown that learning from and engaging with other countries is vital for national development in a competitive world, and that modernization and development based on traditional culture is both viable and sustainable. As principal agenda setters and selectors, nation-states like China can, in an era of globalization, adapt their education and citizenship curricula, not only for development purposes, but also to inherit and pass on their national cultural heritage to future generations while promoting cultural diversity in a multicultural world. In students' cognitive and affective association and identification with their nation and the world, their nation's cultural heritage, contemporary developments, institutions, and values are integral to their national identity and an important point of reference when forming their global identity.

References

- Amsden, A. H. (1989). *Asia's next giant: South Korea and late industrialization*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Andrews, R., & Mycock, A. (2007). Citizenship education in the UK: Divergence within a multi-national state. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 73–88.
- Arnett, J. J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist*, 57(10), 774–783. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.57.10.774
- Arnove, R. F. (1980). Comparative education and world-systems analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, 24(1), 48–62.
- Arnove, R. F. (2009). World-systems analysis and comparative education in the age of globalization. In R. Cowen & A. Kazamias (Eds.), *The international handbook of comparative education* (Vol. 22, pp. 101–119). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Banks, J. A. (2004a). Introduction: Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 3–15). San Francisco, NC: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2004b). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco, NC: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129–139. doi: 10.3102/0013189X08317501
- Bottery, M. (2006). Education and globalization: Redefining the role of the educational professional. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 95–113. doi:10.1080/00131910500352804
- Castells, M. (1992). Four Asian tigers with a dragon head: A comparative analysis of the state, economy, and society in the Asian Pacific rim. In R. P. Appelbaum & J. Henderson (Eds.), *States and development in the Asian Pacific rim* (pp. 33–70). London, England: SAGE.
- Chen, M. R., & Hu, X. Z. (1993). 学科中心课程在我国的历史命运 [The historical fate of subject-oriented curriculum in China]. In Y. H. Yang (Ed.), 中国课程变革研究 [China's curriculum reform] (pp. 390–416). 西安, 中国: 陕西人民教育出版社 [Xi'an, China: Shaanxi People's Education Press].
- Chen, T. H.-E. (1969). The new socialist man. *Comparative Education Review*, 13(1), 88–95.
- Christou, M. (2010). Education in real time: The globalization of synchronized learning. *Current Sociology*, 58(4), 570–596. doi: 10.1177/0011392110367999
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (1985). *Reform of China's educational structure*. Beijing, China: Foreign Languages Press.
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (1988). 关于改革和加强中小学德育工作的通知 [A notice concerning the reform and strengthening of moral education in primary and secondary schools]. In C. M. Gao, C. Z. Zhao, K. R. Bai & C. L. Zuo (Eds.), 学校德育全书 [A complete work on moral education in schools] (pp. 541–547). 北京, 中国: 九州出版社与人民日报出版社 [Beijing, China: Jiuzhou Press and People's Daily Press].
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (1994). 爱国主义教育实施纲要 [Outline for the implementation of education in patriotism]. In C. M. Gao, C. Z. Zhao, K. R. Bai & C. L. Zuo (Eds.), 学校德育全书 [A complete work on moral education in schools] (pp. 602–610). 北京, 中国: 九州出版社与人民日报出版社 [Beijing, China: Jiuzhou Press and People's Daily Press].
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (2001). 公民道德建设实施纲要 [Implementation outline on ethic building for citizens]. 北京, 中国: 人民出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Press].
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (2011, October 26). 关于深化文化体制改革

- 推动社会主义文化大发展大繁荣若干重大问题的决定 [Decision concerning the major issues of deepening cultural system reforms, promoting the great development and prosperity of socialist culture]. 人民日报 [*People's Daily*], pp. 1, 5–6.
- Communist Party of China Central Committee, & State Council. (2000). 关于深化教育改革全面推进素质教育的决定 [Decision concerning the deepening of education reform and the full-scale promotion of qualities education]. In China Education Yearbook Editorial Board (Ed.), 中国教育年鉴 2000 [*China education yearbook, 2000*] (pp. 1–8). 北京, 中国: 人民教育出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Education Press].
- Communist Party of China Central Committee, & State Council. (2010, July 30). 国家中长期教育改革和发展规划纲要 (2010–2020) [The outline of China's national plan for medium- and long-term education reform and development (2010–2020)]. 中国教育报 [*China Education Daily*], 1–3.
- Culp, R. (2007). *Articulating citizenship: Civic education and student politics in Southeastern China, 1912–1940*. Boston, MA.: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Deng, X. P. (1978a). 在全国教育工作会上的讲话 [Speech at the National Conference on Education]. In Central Committee of Communist Party of China Document Editorial Commission (Ed.), 邓小平文选: 一九七五—一九八二年 [*Selected Work of Deng Xiaoping, 1975–1982*] (pp. 100–107). 北京, 中国: 人民出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Press].
- Deng, X. P. (1978b). 在全国科学大会开幕式上的讲话 [Speech at the Opening Ceremony of the National Conference on Science]. In Central Committee of Communist Party of China Document Editorial Commission (Ed.), 邓小平文选: 一九七五—一九八二年 [*Selected Work of Deng Xiaoping, 1975–1982*] (pp. 82–97). 北京, 中国: 人民出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Press].
- Deng, X. P. (1983). 为景山学校题词 [Message written for Jingshan School]. In Central Committee of Communist Party of China Document Editorial Commission (Ed.), 邓小平文选: 一九七五—一九八二年 [*Selected work of Deng Xiaoping, 1983–1992*] (p. 35). 北京, 中国: 人民出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Press].
- Frank, A. G. (1971). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical studies of Chile and Brazil*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Giddens, A. (1993). *Sociology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (2002). *Runaway world: How globalisation is reshaping our lives*. London, England: Profile Books.
- Gray, J. (1990). *Rebellions and revolutions: China from the 1800s to the 1980s*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Green, A. (1999). Education and globalization in Europe and East Asia: Convergent and divergent trends. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 55–71. doi: 10.1080/026809399286495
- Guangdong Provincial Textbook Team for Thought and Moral Character in Primary Schools. (1996). 思想品德 [*Thought and moral character*]. 中山, 中国: 广东教育出版社 [Zhongshan, China: Guangdong Education Publishing House].
- Guibernau, M. (2007). *The identity of nations*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Hu, J. T. (2006). 牢固树立社会主义荣辱观 [To consolidate the socialist concept for honour

- and shame]. 求是 [Seeking truth], (9), 1.
- Hu, J. T. (2007). 高举中国特色社会主义伟大旗帜为夺取全面建设小康社会新胜利而奋斗: 在中国共产党第十七次全国代表大会上的报告 (2007年10月15日) [Hold high the great banner of socialism with Chinese characteristics and strive for new victories in building a moderately prosperous society in all respects: Report to the Seventeenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China on October 15, 2007]. 北京, 中国: 人民出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Press].
- Jenkins, R. (1992). Theoretical perspectives. In T. Hewitt, H. Johnson & D. Wield (Eds.), *Industrialization and development* (pp. 128–166). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, C. (1982). *MITI and the Japanese miracle: The growth of industrial policy, 1925–1975*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kennedy, K. J. (2010). Neo-statism and post-globalisation as contexts for new times. In A. Reid, J. Gill & A. Sears (Eds.), *Globalization, the nation-state and the citizen: Dilemmas and directions for civics and citizenship education* (pp. 223–229). London, England: Routledge.
- Krasner, S. D. (1999). Globalization and sovereignty. In D. A. Smith, D. J. Solinger & S. C. Topik (Eds.), *States and sovereignty in the global economy* (pp. 34–52). London, England: Routledge.
- Kubow, P., Grossman, D., & Ninomiya, A. (2000). Multidimensional citizenship: Educational policy for the 21st century. In J. J. Cogan & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education* (pp. 131–150). London, England: Kogan-Page.
- Law, W.-W. (2006). Citizenship, citizenship education and the state in China in a global age. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(4), 597–628. doi: 10.1080/03057640601049322
- Law, W.-W. (2009). The developmental state, social change, and education. In R. Cowen & A. Kazamias (Eds.), *The international handbook of comparative education* (pp. 257–275). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Law, W.-W. (2011). *Citizenship and citizenship education in a global age: Politics, policies, and practices in China*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Lee, W. O. (1996). Moral education policy: Developments since 1978. Guest Editor's introduction. *Chinese Education & Society*, 29(4), 5–12.
- Levy, M. J. (1952). Some sources of the vulnerability of the structures of relatively non-industrialized societies to those of highly industrialized societies. In B. F. Hoselitz (Ed.), *The progress of underdeveloped areas* (pp.113–125). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Liang, S. M. (2006). 东西文化及其哲学 [Cultures and philosophies of the East and West] (2nd ed.). 北京, 中国: 商业出版社 [Beijing, China: Commercial Press].
- Liu, S., & Wu, Q. (Eds.). (1986). *China's Socialist Economy: An Outline History (1949–1984)*. Beijing, China: Beijing Review.
- Lovell, J. (2011). *The Opium War: Drugs, dreams and the making of China*. London, England: Picador.
- Lu, D. (2002). 邓小平旗帜指引中小学教材改革和发展 [The reform and development of curriculum for primary and secondary schools under the banner of Deng Xiaoping]. In L. B.

- Gao & Z. S. Zhuang (Eds.), 基础教育课程改革研究 [Curriculum reform for basic education in China] (pp. 3–22). 广州, 中国: 广东教育出版社 [Guangzhou, China: Guangdong Education Publishing House].
- MacNair, H. F. (1927). *Modern Chinese history: Selected readings*. Shanghai, China: Commercial Press.
- Mao, Z. D. (1977). 关于正确处理人民内部矛盾的问题 [On the correct handling of contradictions among the people]. In 毛泽东文集 [Selected Writings of Mao Zedong] (Vol. 7, pp. 204–244). 北京, 中国: 人民出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Press].
- Marginson, S. (1999). After globalization: Emerging politics of education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 19–31. doi: 10.1080/026809399286477
- Mencius. (2003). *Mencius* (D. C. Lau, Trans.; bilingual ed.). Hong Kong, China: Chinese University Press.
- Meyer, J. W., Ramirez, F. O., & Soysal, Y. N. (1992). World expansion of mass education, 1870–1980. *Sociology of Education*, 65(2), 128–149.
- Ministry of Education. (1957). 关于中学, 师范学校设置政治课的通知 [Circular concerning the establishment of political subject in secondary schools and normal colleges]. In Curriculum and Teaching Materials Research Institute (Ed.), 20世纪中国中小学课程标准教学大纲汇编: 思想政治卷 [Collection of curriculum standards and teaching guidelines of primary and secondary schools in the twentieth century: Ideological and political education] (pp. 198–202). 北京, 中国: 人民教育出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Education Press].
- Ministry of Education. (1978). 全日制十年制中小学教学计划 (试行草案) [Teaching plan for full-time primary and secondary schools of the 10-year track (pilot)]. 北京, 中国: 教育部 [Beijing, China: Ministry of Education].
- Ministry of Education. (2000a). 中小学普及信息技术教育的通知 (33号) [A circular concerning the popularization of information technology education in primary and secondary schools (no. 33)]. 北京, 中国: 教育部 [Beijing, China: Ministry of Education].
- Ministry of Education. (2000b). 中小学信息技术课程指导纲要 (试行) [Provisional syllabus for information technology education in primary and secondary schools]. 北京, 中国: 教育部 [Beijing, China: Ministry of Education].
- Ministry of Education. (2001). 基础教育课程改革纲要 (试行) [Guidelines on the curriculum reform of basic education (trial)]. 北京, 中国: 教育部 [Beijing, China: Ministry of Education].
- Ministry of Education. (2002). 品德与社会课程标准 (实验稿) [Curriculum standard for moral character and society (pilot)]. 北京, 中国: 北京师范大学出版社 [Beijing, China: Beijing Normal University Press].
- Ministry of Education. (2011a). 义务教育初中科学课程标准 [Curriculum standards for junior secondary science education]. 北京, 中国: 北京师范大学出版社 [Beijing, China: Beijing Normal University Press].
- Ministry of Education. (2011b). 义务教育历史课程标准 [Curriculum standards for history education]. 北京, 中国: 北京师范大学出版社 [Beijing, China: Beijing Normal University Press].
- Ministry of Education. (2011c). 义务教育品德与社会课程标准 [Curriculum standards for moral and social education]. 北京, 中国: 北京师范大学出版社 [Beijing, China: Beijing

Normal University Press].

Ministry of Education. (2011d). 义务教育数学课程标准 [Curriculum standards for mathematic education]. 北京, 中国: 北京师范大学出版社 [Beijing, China: Beijing Normal University Press].

Ministry of Education. (2011e). 义务教育音乐课程标准 [Curriculum standards for music education]. 北京, 中国: 北京师范大学出版社 [Beijing, China: Beijing Normal University Press].

Ministry of Education. (2011f). 义务教育语文课程标准 [Curriculum standards for language education]. 北京, 中国: 北京师范大学出版社 [Beijing, China: Beijing Normal University Press].

Ministry of Education. (2012, February 8). 教育部就印发义务教育课程标 (2011) 准答记者问 [Press conference on the issue of the curriculum standards for basic education (2011)]. 中国教育报 [China Education Daily], p. 2.

Ministry of Education. (2013). 中小学书法教育指导纲要 [Guidelines for calligraphy education in primary and secondary education]. 北京, 中国: 教育部 [Beijing, China: Ministry of Education].

Ministry of Education, Republic of China. (1934). 第一次中国教育年鉴 [The first China education rearbook]. 上海, 中国: 开明书店 [Shanghai, China: Kai-ming Book Company].

Ohmae, K. (1990). *The borderless world: Power and strategy in the interlinked economy*. New York, NY: HarperPerennial.

Ohmae, K. (1995). *The end of the nation state: The rise of regional economics*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Oommen, T. K. (1997). Introduction: Conceptualizing the linkage between citizenship and national identity. In T. K. Oommen (Ed.), *Citizenship and national identity: From colonialism to globalism* (pp. 13–51). New Delhi, India: SAGE.

Osler, A. (2010). Citizenship and the nation-state: Affinity, identity and belonging. In A. Reid, J. Gill & A. Sears (Eds.), *Globalization, the nation-state and the citizen: Dilemmas and directions for civics and citizenship education* (pp. 216–222). London, England: Routledge.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 243–254. doi:10.1080/0013191032000118901

Otsu, K. (2008). Citizenship education curriculum in Japan. In D. L. Grossman, W. O. Lee & K. J. Kennedy (Eds.), *Citizenship Curriculum in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 75–94). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Pashby, K. (2008). Demands on and of citizenship and schooling: “Belonging” and “diversity” in the global imperative. In M. O’Sullivan & K. Pashby (Eds.), *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 9–26). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

People’s Education Commentator. (2001). 加强公民道德教育是学校德育的重要内容 [Strengthening education in citizens’ ethic is an important part in moral education in schools]. 人民教育 [People’s Education], (12), 1.

Priestley, M. (2008). Global discourses and national reconstruction: The impact of

- globalization on curriculum policy. Retrieved August 25, 2013, from <https://dspace.stir.ac.uk/bitstream/1893/405/1/Globalization-draft.pdf>
- Qian, M. (2004). 文化与教育 [Culture and education]. 桂林, 中国: 广西师范大学出版社 [Guilin: Guangxi Normal University Press].
- Russell, B. (1922). *The problem of China*. London, England: Allen & Unwin.
- Scott, T., & Cogan, J. J. (2008). Democracy at a crossroads: Political tensions concerning educating for citizenship in the United States. In D. L. Grossman, W. O. Lee & K. J. Kennedy (Eds.), *Citizenship curriculum in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 165–179). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Smelser, N. J. (1969). Mechanisms of and adjustments to change. In T. R. Burns (Ed.), *Industrial man: Selected readings* (pp. 43–68). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity*. London, England: Penguin.
- So, K., Kim, J., & Lee, S. (2012). The formation of the South Korean identity through national curriculum in the South Korean historical context: Conflicts and challenges. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(6), 797–804.
- Soyсал, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- State Education Commission. (1986). 全日制小学思想品德课教学大纲 [Curriculum guideline for thought and moral character for primary education]. In Curriculum and Teaching Materials Research Institute. (Ed.), 20 世纪中国中小学课程标准: 教学大纲汇编思想政治卷 [Collection of curriculum standards and teaching guidelines of primary and secondary schools in the twentieth century: Ideological and political education] (pp. 56–62). 北京, 中国: 人民教育出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Education Press].
- State Education Commission. (1988a). 初级中学中国社会主义建设常识改革实验教学大纲 [Curriculum guideline for China's socialist construction in junior secondary schools (Pilot Version)]. In Curriculum and Teaching Materials Research Institute (Ed.), 20 世纪中国中小学课程标准: 教学大纲汇编思想政治卷 [Collection of curriculum standards and teaching guidelines of primary and secondary schools in the twentieth century: Ideological and political education] (pp. 291–292). 北京, 中国: 人民教育出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Education Press].
- State Education Commission. (1988b). 高级中学经济常识改革实验教学大纲 [Curriculum guideline for economic knowledge in senior secondary schools (Pilot Version)]. In Curriculum and Teaching Materials Research Institute (Ed.), 20 世纪中国中小学课程标准: 教学大纲汇编思想政治卷 [Collection of curriculum standards and teaching guidelines of primary and secondary schools in the twentieth century: Ideological and political education] (pp. 295–297). 北京, 中国: 人民教育出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Education Press].
- State Education Commission. (1988c). 高级中学科学人生观改革实验教学大纲 [Curriculum guideline for scientific perspective on life in senior secondary schools (Pilot Version)]. In Curriculum and Teaching Materials Research Institute (Ed.), 20 世纪中国中小学课程标准: 教学大纲汇编思想政治卷 [Collection of curriculum standards and teaching guidelines of primary and secondary schools in the twentieth century: Ideological and political education] (pp. 293–294). 北京, 中国: 人民教育出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Education Press].
- State Education Commission. (1988d). 高级中学政治常识改革实验教学大纲 [Curriculum

- guideline for political knowledge in senior secondary schools (Pilot Version)]. In Curriculum and Teaching Materials Research Institute (Ed.), 20 世纪中国中小学课程标准: 教学大纲汇编思想政治卷 [Collection of curriculum standards and teaching guidelines of primary and secondary schools in the twentieth century: Ideological and political education] (pp. 295–297). 北京, 中国: 人民教育出版社 [Beijing, China: People's Education Press].
- Sun, Y.-S. (1985). 建国方略 [Fundamentals of national reconstruction]. In Y.-S. Sun 孙中山全集 [Complete collection of Sun Yat-sen's writings] (Vol. 6, pp. 177–493). 北京, 中国: 中华书局 [Beijing, China: Zhonghua Book Company].
- UNESCO. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2000). *Globalization and living together: The challenges for educational content in Asia*. Paris, France: UNESCO.
- Urry, J. (1998). Globalisation and citizenship. Retrieved January 23, 2002, from <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/research/publications/papers/urry-globalisation-and-citizenship.pdf>
- Wallerstein, I. M. (1974). *The modern world-system*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, I. M. (1975). The present state of the debate on world inequality. In I. M. Wallerstein (Ed.), *World inequality: Origins and perspectives on the world system* (pp. 12–28). Montreal, Canada: Black Rose Books.
- Wallerstein, I. M. (1979). *The capitalist world-economy*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, G. W. (1977). *China and the World since 1949: The impact of independence, modernity and revolution*. London, England: Macmillan.
- Wen, X., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, Q. (2012, May 24). 美国签证新规为难孔子学院教师 单方喊停令人困惑 [New visa regulations of the United States make teachers of Confucius Institutes difficult to work]. 人民日报 [People's Daily], p. 22.
- You, M. J. (1993). 我国学校课程和教材的发展与改革 [The development and reform of school curriculum and textbooks in China]. In Y. H. Yang (Ed.), 中国课程变革研究 [China's curriculum reform] (pp. 344–352). 西安, 中国: 陕西人民教育出版社 [Xi'an, China: Shaanxi People's Education Press].
- Zhang, W. W. (2012). *The China wave: Rise of a civilizational state*. Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific Publishing.