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Global citizenship education and Hong Kong’s secondary school curriculum guidelines
From learning about rights and understanding responsibility to challenging inequality
Eric K.M. Chong
The Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong, China

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to analyse the major development of global citizenship education (GCE) as part of Hong Kong’s secondary school curriculum guidelines, which reveals how it has developed from, first, asking students to understand their responsibilities as citizens to now challenging injustice and inequality in the world. Hong Kong’s curriculum guidelines started to teach GCE as a result of the last civic education guideline issued just before the return of sovereignty to China in 1997. Through documentary analysis, this paper examines how GCE has developed against the backdrop of globalization in Hong Kong’s various secondary school curriculum guidelines.

Design/methodology/approach – This study used documentary analysis to examine the developments in the teaching of GCE via Hong Kong’s official secondary school curriculum guidelines. It has studied the aims, knowledge and concepts that are related to GCE by coding the GCE literature and categorizing the findings from the curriculum guidelines.

Findings – From the coding and categorizing processes employed, it has been found that GCE in Hong Kong’s official curriculum guidelines has evolved from learning about rights and responsibilities in the 1990s to challenging injustice, discrimination, exclusion and inequality since the late 1990s. Indeed, understanding the world and especially globalization, in terms of comprehending the processes and phenomena through which people around the globe become more connected, has presented challenges for the teaching of civic education. For example, categories of GCE have developed from the simpler expression of concerns about the world to encompass moral obligations and taking action. Similarly, the concerns for the maintenance of peace that were studied initially have since grown and now include work about challenging inequalities and taking action on human rights violations.

Originality/value – This study would have implications for the understanding of GCE in Hong Kong as well as other fast-changing societies in this age of globalization, as civic education curricula need to respond to the impacts of globalization. GCE is an under-researched area, but topics concerning world/international/global affairs have been covered in Hong Kong secondary school curriculum guidelines for several decades.
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1. Introduction

This paper attempts to analyse the development of global citizenship education (GCE) in the official curriculum guidelines of Hong Kong’s secondary schools from the 1990s to the 2000s. Citizenship and citizenship education are very much on the world’s educational agenda (Osborne, 2011). Scholars also argue that national identity is giving way to multiple and transnational civic affiliations, as borders become increasingly blurred by migration flows, advancement in information technologies and growing economic interdependence (Giddens, 2002; Spiro, 2007). Since citizenship education is
about understanding and participating in contemporary society (Davies, 2010), it seems
obvious that the work of citizenship education focuses on contemporary matters.

Chiu (2004) documents the extent of social polarization that has accompanied the
process of globalization. During the 1990s, Hong Kong experienced a process of
occupational polarization and widening income inequality as a result of its transformation
from an industrial colony to a service-driven global city. This globalization process has
implications for gender dimensions and for the reshaping of social structures. Lee et al.
(2007) have argued that Hong Kong is no exception to the new kind of poverty
experienced elsewhere in the world that has been induced by a post-industrial phase of
capitalism that emphasizes the role of knowledge, information, global networks and global
finance for capital accumulation and profit generation. Lee et al. (2007) argued that while
Hong Kong does not conform to the narrowest definition of social polarization, in terms of
absolute income polarization and the serious problems caused by income inequality, there
is a low-income poverty trap that affects the lower class and creates the spatial and
economic segregation of migrant groups. The Hong Kong people’s identity issue has also
been discussed by Brewer (1999), who argued that there existed a dual identification by
citizens based on their region (Hong Kong) and their ethnicity (Chinese), which was forged
among Hong Kong Chinese residents during the period prior to the former colony’s
transition into the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR). This identity
change has had implications for political stability since the return of sovereignty to China
in 1997. Vickers (2005) also noted the strong localized identification that had developed in
colonial Hong Kong. Therefore, issues of globalization and its impacts on identity are
relevant to the study of citizenship in Hong Kong.

Teaching and learning about globalization as a phenomenon, and about its
causes, processes, consequences and impacts, started to appear in Hong Kong’s
education system in the 1998 curriculum guidelines for Civic Education: Secondary 1-3
(Curriculum Development Council (CDC), 1998) and for Integrated Humanities (IH)
(Curriculum Development Council and the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment
Authority (CDC and HKEAA), 2003) in the early 2000s. Actually, the theme of learning
about the world was found in the junior secondary subject syllabuses of Social Studies
and Economics and Public Affairs (EPAs) in the 1970s and the 1980s. Then, the theme
of the world was found in a revised Social Studies secondary school syllabus in 1997
(Curriculum Development Council (CDC), 1997). Globalization was one of the core
modules in IH (CDC and HKEAA, 2003) following the education reform of the early
2000s. Globalization was also included in the revised Moral and Civic Education
Framework in 2008, and then it was instated as a core module in senior secondary
liberal studies (Curriculum Development Council and the Hong Kong Examinations
and Assessment Authority (CDC and HKEAA, 2007) for introduction in 2009/2010, as
well as becoming a key learning element in junior secondary Life & Society courses
(Curriculum Development Council and the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment
Authority (CDC and HKEAA, 2010). In all of these official curriculum guidelines, as this
paper will show via the coding and categorization of the GCE occurrences in them,
understandings of citizenship in GCE have exhibited a tendency of developing from
thin conceptions to thick ones, i.e. from learning about rights and responsibilities, to
challenging discrimination, exclusion and inequality. However, there is a lack of
research on GCE in the cosmopolitan city of Hong Kong, where teaching topics about
the world have been a part of education since the late British colonial era. Research and
debates about whether a new, distinct and globally oriented ideology might be
emerging are still unfolding in the citizenship education literature (Schattle, 2008). This
paper aims to fill this gap on citizenship education research by revealing the developments of GCE in Hong Kong that may be of reference value for international citizenship education scholarship.

Although the data used in this study are mostly found in Hong Kong, the discussions could also offer lessons about studying GCE in other countries, especially for similarly dynamic eastern Asian education systems (Cummings and Altbach, 1997). Indeed, after Hong Kong’s reunification with the People’s Republic of China in 1997, there was an upsurge of interest in analysing Hong Kong’s education system with focuses on the intersection between cross-national and intranational comparisons (Bray and Yamato, 2003), and also on making intracultural or intranational comparisons by using Hong Kong’s and Taiwan’s cases (Liao et al., 2005). The following section will review the related conceptual debates.

2. Globalization

After the Second World War, there was a transformation of citizenship which consisted of the delegitimization of racism and extreme nationalism, and the parallel rise of universal human rights (Joppke, 2007). Traditionally speaking, however, citizenship has been a statement of national belonging and a mechanism of exclusion. It has defined who may and may not access the benefits offered by membership of a particular state (Bates, 2012). Brubaker’s (1992) agenda-setting work on nationhood and citizenship defended citizenship as the master status in the modern state. Citizenship struggles in late twentieth-century society, however, were often about claims to cultural identity and cultural history, such as sexual identity, gay rights, gender equality and aboriginality (Turner, 1997). Most debates about citizenship in contemporary political theory are about the contested collective identity in a context of radical pluralization (Mouffe, 1992). Indeed, there are multiple ways of understanding citizenship: e.g. as a status conferred by a nation state; as a personal identity constructed in response to particular circumstances; or as a social identity developed out of group membership (Kennedy, 2010). They are not mutually exclusive: an individual may experience “citizenships” that integrate these legal, personal and social identities. As for discussions on the identity felt by Hong Kong people, a number of writers (Matthews et al., 2008; Ma and Fung, 2007; Ma, 2007) have addressed their evolving and changing identifications, especially since the handover of sovereignty to China in 1997 and in light of the impacts of globalization. Ma and Fung (2007) found from a survey that more and more Hong Kong people claim a mixed identity by seeing themselves as both Hongkongers and Chinese. However, though their perceptions of differences between Hong Kong and mainland China are disappearing in terms of economic values, they are still conspicuous with regard to political values. Though they identify with the cultural and historical aspects of their national Chinese identity, their political identification with the mainland remains weak. Ma and Fung (2007) proposed a multidimensional understanding of the formations of Hong Kong’s national identity. Ma (2007) categorized and analysed the competing discursive processes to show where previously desinicized discourses of localism and internationalism have been renegotiating with the new discourses of nationalism and patriotism in post-1997 Hong Kong. Furthermore, bottom-up discourses on nationalism have been powerful in reshaping national imaginations among Hong Kong people because they have emerged from sources close to their everyday living experience. Matthews et al. (2008) argued many Hong Kong people have lacked any sense of national identity and that they have not understood what it means to belong to a nation or a country. In the decades after
the Second World War, particularly from the mid-1960s, Hong Kong society developed a strong local identity. While some people have been eager to accept their new Chinese national identity since the territory’s sovereignty returned to China, others have remained sceptical of the idea of “belonging to a nation”.

In the era of globalization, the notion of citizenship has been facing challenges, and there has emerged a concept of “global citizenship” (Balarin, 2001; Heater, 2004; Myers, 2010; Bates, 2012), which is a response to globalization. The subscription to global citizenship can be characterized as being expansive, holistic and concerned or affective, as well as cognitive, as its expression is sought via concrete achievements in terms of justice (Davies, 2010). Globalization has brought about convergence as well as divergence across the world, as different nations have responded to its impacts differently according to their local priorities and needs, while they have made concurrent efforts to adapt to the forces of change (Arnowe, 2007; Neubauer, 2007; Reed, 2004; Waters, 2001). Globalization’s processes, such as economic integration, increased immigration, improvements in the rapidity of communication, as well as the emergence of global elites, transnational imaginaries such as Europe and global diasporas (Bates, 2012), have altered relations within and among nation-states. They are changing not just the political and economic contexts of nation-states, but also the identities and actions of citizens living in them (DeJaeghere, 2002). In particular, migration between states is increasingly a feature of contemporary societies. The very foundations of a nation-state, such as a homogenous culture and society, are being challenged (Castles, 2004). However, in the Chinese world, it remains to be seen whether migration flow, which has been exhibited on a smaller scale there than in the western world, has challenged the foundation of a nation-state in either China or Hong Kong. Globalization processes also determine who can access the rights and privileges of an emerging transnational/global citizenship. Robinson (2004) and Sklair (2001) have described the emergence of the transnational capitalist class, of the transnational state and of a transitional class of marginalized citizens – the “global proletariat”. Thus, global citizenship, in terms of multiple citizenships amongst the higher echelons of the world hierarchy based on their ability to migrate easily between countries (Bates, 2012), “stands in rather tense relation with the vast numbers of marginalized citizens across the globe, [...] marginality appears to be the hidden other of global citizenship” (Balarin, 2001, p. 355). For Hong Kong, it is interesting to read Lee et al. (2007) who have argued that there is a low-income poverty trap that operates against the interests of the lower class and which causes the spatial and economic segregation of migrant groups. Whether marginality is the flipside of global citizenship is a question worthy of further investigation.

Thus, globalization processes exert impacts on the nature of citizenship in both the local and national communities where citizenship has formerly been associated and it alters how citizens identify and act in contexts other than that of the nation-state (Green, 1997; Mittelman, 1997). For example, Camicia and Zhu (2011), after analysing the discourses of citizenship, called for awareness of how discourses of nationalism, globalization and cosmopolitanism have become fractured, context specific and dynamic in both China and the USA, and they proposed that the discourse about globalization and cosmopolitanism be merged and strengthened within citizenship education courses. Multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka, 2003, 2008) has also been put forward to address the idea of assimilationist ideology by which immigrant and minority groups can retain important aspects of their languages and cultures and still have full citizenship rights (Banks, 2009a). The notions of citizenship education, thus, go beyond the borders of the limited nation-state to the global community (Kymlicka, 2004). Of course, in strictly legal
terms there is no global state that guarantees citizenship, nor is there a singular meaning for global citizenship in education (Myers, 2010). From the above discussions, it could be said that there are several possible conceptions of global citizenship (Bates, 2012) which reflect how citizenship has moved beyond the conventional, national idea of citizenship, which usually confined itself to the rights and responsibilities of individuals within a single nation-state, towards discussions in terms of “global citizenship”.

This paper attempts to investigate how Hong Kong’s official secondary school curriculum guidelines address GCE in response to the unfolding processes of globalization. It attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the sociopolitical contexts that impact on the development of GCE in Hong Kong’s secondary school curriculum guidelines?
2. How is GCE developing in Hong Kong secondary school curriculum guidelines?
3. How should GCE be categorized in Hong Kong?

As such, this paper aims to contribute to the citizenship education literature by analysing the developments of GCE in Hong Kong’s official curriculum guidelines before and after the handover of 1997. First, this paper will review the literature about GCE and present an overview of what is meant by GCE in Hong Kong. The methodology of documentary analysis and how it is employed in this study, as well as how categories were developed for analytical purposes will be explained. Next, the sociopolitical contexts of Hong Kong’s civic education will be examined to trace how a soft conception of “rights and responsibility” unfolded in citizenship education in the 1980s and early 1990s. It moves on to discuss the context of Hong Kong’s civic education in which GCE curriculum guidelines developed in the 1990s and the 2000s to include the “thick conception” matters of challenging inequalities and discrimination. A discussion section will categorize GCE in Hong Kong’s official curriculum guidelines, which is intended to inform the international citizenship education literature. Finally, some implications of understanding GCE in Hong Kong will be advanced.

3. Emergence of GCE
3.1 Literature about GCE

Citizenship can be defined as the relationship between individuals and nation-states (Lawson and Scott, 2002). Citizens should have and cultivate a range of qualities, values and virtues, including equality, autonomy, solidarity and judgement (Figueroa, 2004). A goal of citizenship education in most nation-states is to “help students develop allegiance” (Banks, 2009b, p. 105), and this allegiance has been one of the major aims of civic education in Hong Kong too (Education Department, 1996; CDC, 1998). However, citizenship is increasingly being understood as membership of an interconnected world, which challenges us to define ourselves in a much broader context and to expand our self-conceptions to include a global identity (Heater, 2004).

The idea that human beings are “citizens of the world” has been discussed in some literature. Diverse allegiances to one’s community, culture, nation and an appreciation of these in their global context has encouraged the idea of the “global citizen” to arise (Steiner, 1996; Clough and Holden, 1996; Dower and Williams, 2002; Heater, 2004). A “global citizen” is a member of the wider community of all humanity, in the world that is wider than that of a nation-state (Heater, 2004). This membership is important in the sense that it involves a significant identity, loyalty or commitment beyond the nation-state. It was actually a leading idea amongst the Stoics of ancient Greece and Rome (Heater, 2004).
In relation to citizenship, notions such as post-national citizenship, supranational citizenship, intercultural citizenship and multidimensional citizenship, etc., have become increasingly important (Cogan, 2000; Fouts and Lee, 2005). Across the English-speaking world, “global citizenship” is aligned with four ideological constellations: moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism, neoliberalism and environmentalism (Schattle, 2008). Schattle (2008) argued that discourse related to global citizenship in education, which proliferated rapidly, had not yet validated a prospective ideology such as “globalism”, but it illustrated how established ideologies, most notably pluralist liberalism, were adapting to global interdependence.

Citizenship education is usually characterized by a sensitivity to other people’s needs and by views and consideration of the potential impacts of choices and actions on others (Arthur and Wright, 2001). This has become a norm in the curricula of nations such as England and Canada (Davies et al., 2005). However, citizenship education has entered a new era in which different concerns, such as ecological, gender and economic citizenship have emerged. International research also shows a trend for adolescents to express their interests in civic participation outside of formal political systems (e.g. political parties and national political issues) and to be engaged by social movements and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) concerned with transnational issues, e.g. the environment and human rights (Torney-Purta et al., 2001; Kennedy et al., 2008). The major goals of citizenship education have thus expanded to develop students’ understandings of “interdependence” among nation-states in the transnational community. This helps students to clarify their attitudes towards other nations and people and encourages them to develop global and cosmopolitan identifications (Banks, 2004; Moon, 2010). Discussions about the meanings of GCE have arisen (Rapport, 2010) and there are areas of learning such as development education or global education that have followed from this (King et al., 1976; Anderson, 1979; Pike and Selby, 1988; Dekock and Craig, 1989; Inman and Wade, 1997; Cabezudo et al., 2010), but it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss them.

For Blakenship (1990), it is important that citizenship education develops world-mindedness among students. According to Lynch (1992), citizenship education teaches global democracy, global pluralism and sustainable development. For Van Steenbergen (1994), cultural and ecological citizenship should be a part of global education. For Falk (1994), the fact that opportunities for travel around the world have increased has necessitated the development of global education. If we neglect to nurture a global perspective, students are likely to continue viewing the world narrowly through the perspectives of their own interests, locations and cultures (Evans and Reynolds, 2005). In a similar vein, Nussbaum (1994) has argued that world citizenship education enables us to see beyond “national traditions and identities” in order to recognize what is most worthy of respect in people, and Heater (1997) has explained that there is an array of meanings that can be applied to global citizenship, which range from the vague ends of being a “member of the human race” and taking “responsibility for the condition of the planet”, to the precise ends of being an “individual subject to moral law” and fostering the “promotion of world government”. Democratic citizenship (Barber, 1984; Heater, 2004) gained much attention too. In his historical review of democratic citizenship, Heater (2004) showed that citizenship has developed from its formal, legal and rights-based emphases to accommodate ideas of multiple and global citizenship that require commitments beyond state-defined duties and responsibilities. Indeed, various forms of GCE have developed that are based upon various conceptions of global citizenship (Bates, 2012). While there is enormous diversity, Schultz (2007)
argues that fundamentally there are three categories of GCE in the west: the neoliberal, the radical and the transformational. The neoliberal views the purpose of GCE as being to prepare global citizens as travellers whose economic and social relationships can be constructed freely “across time and space without being encumbered by national boundaries” (Schultz, 2007, p. 251). The neoliberal citizen “strives to create a space beyond national boundaries and local restrictions where he or she can access political, social, economic and environmental rewards of participation in a global society” (Schultz, 2007, p. 251). The radical approach to GCE focuses upon analyses of the global structures that create deep global inequalities (Schultz, 2007, p. 252). Global structures are seen to be “implicated in the intensification of global poverty, deprivation, conflict and violence” (McGrew, 2000, p. 351). This radical conception of GCE is opposed to the global institutions, “particularly financial institutions that are the main architects of global economic liberalism” (Schultz, 2007, p. 254). Meanwhile, the transformational view of GCE rejects both the neoliberal single global market economy and the radical view of global institutions as simply mechanisms of imperialism. Instead, it recognizes that globalization has “resulted in a complex and dynamic set of international, national and local relationships that has created new patterns of inclusion and exclusion” (Schultz, 2007, pp. 254-255). The transformational global citizen is one who is concerned about economic and social justice, the Earth, social and cultural diversity and peace (Noddings, 2005).

By reviewing different GCE approaches in the west there arises the implication of an urgent need to categorize GCE in Hong Kong, which has not been adequately discussed before.

3.2 An overview of GCE in Hong Kong

Civic education has been obvious as an important part of the curriculum of Hong Kong since the late 1980s (Leung and Yuen, 2009a). The anticipated return of Hong Kong to China in 1997 and the preparation for rule by Hong Kong people necessitated civic education (Tse, 1997, 1998). Hong Kong’s youth had to develop the qualities of citizens (including political awareness and the skills of social/political participation) which had been played down in the years of colonial government. Indeed, a big challenge for an education curriculum is to strike a balance between the local and the global, the past and the present, the unified and the diverse, and the ideal and the real (Banks, 2008; Pike, 2008), and civic education fulfils many of these functions. In relation to identity issues, there have been some useful investigations and arguments about the multiple identities of Hongkongers, with particular references to GCE (Lee and Leung, 2006). Indeed, with both globalization and localization processes at work, there are competing claims and different versions of local, national and global identities in Hong Kong. Yan-Wing Leung argued that, instead of risking the disillusionment of local youths by promoting a partial picture of reality based on a nationalistic version of citizenship education, Hong Kong’s curricula would be better if they evolved by advancing a conceptualization of “multiple citizenship” to teach students about their own community, Hong Kong, China and the world (Lui, 2013). This echoes with a construction of global identity which has gained weight in discussions of citizenship education (Banks, 2004; Heater, 2004; Moon, 2010). After all, citizenship (education) is de facto a political and spatial concept and should be considered in local, national and global contexts (Tse, 2007).

Whether addressed in classroom practices or by NGOs activities, GCE in Hong Kong usually includes learning about knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and actions (Oxfam Hong Kong, 2011). Typical themes of GCE courses include: understanding interactions in human societies and environments; shaping preferred futures; the exploration of change; interdependence; identity and diversity; rights and
responsibilities; peace-building; poverty and wealth; sustainability and global justice; developing skills of cooperation; shared responsibility; critical thinking; and communication. Lee and Leung (2006) also found that there were different expectations of GCE between those teachers in Hong Kong and those in Shanghai, with the former’s emphasis in GCE being on understanding and accepting diversity in values, while the latter set of teachers emphasized raising the students’ competitiveness by improving their international understanding. GCE has also been championed by some NGOs in Hong Kong which are concerned about global issues (Lee et al., 2006). The concern for teaching GCE among NGOs was a response to the developments and impacts of globalization upon different societies, and they would usually point to the obligations on individuals to understand the world at large and shoulder their responsibilities as global citizens (Lee et al., 2006). Since Hong Kong teachers usually need to teach a substantial number of sessions and prepare students for the pressures of examinations, NGOs can have a positive role to play in helping to provide GCE.

3.3 Analytical theoretical constructs: thin and thick conceptions of citizenship
There exists a framework of thin and thick citizenship. Anver Saloojee (2003, p. 9) differentiated between the “formal equality” associated with democratic citizenship – i.e. a thin conception of citizenship – for example, “the right to vote, to freedom of association, freedom of religion, etc.” and “substantive equality which can be categorized as challenges to discrimination, exclusion and inequality” – i.e. a thick conception of citizenship. For Saloojee (2003), democratic citizenship is threatened when substantive equality cannot be guaranteed for all citizens: “Social inclusion begins from the premise that it is democratic citizenship that is at risk when a society fails to develop the talents and capacities of all its members. The move to social inclusion is eroded when the rights of minorities are not respected and accommodated and minorities feel ‘othered’” (Saloojee, 2003, p. 9). This analytical framework will be applied in the sections further below when analysing how GCE in Hong Kong’s official curriculum guidelines exhibits a development from a thin to a thick conception of citizenship.

4. Methodology
This study analyses the developments of GCE in official curriculum guidelines, and thus it is a form of documentary analysis. Documentary analysis focuses on institutional records or artifacts produced or contained in the setting under study. Examples of educational documents for assessment might include curriculum plans, syllabuses, classroom handouts, journal and diary entries or other personal narratives, student papers, diagrams or drawings depicting relationships, or capstone portfolios (Chism and Banta, 2007). In this paper, the study of curriculum guidelines looks into their aims, objectives, topics and teaching strategies (Hughes, 1997). Documentary analysis could also study the signs and symbols in documents to find out the meanings attached to them (Yin, 2009), and the motives and meanings underlying the content of a document (Lawson et al., 2001). Indeed, Lee and Leung (2006) argued that studying whether the GCE planned and designed in Hong Kong is really GCE is important. By studying the development of GCE in official curriculum guidelines, one can tell what will likely happen in the teaching environment, especially in an education system like Hong Kong’s in which school text-books are written according to official curriculum guidelines and should be approved by the government.

To use a document as a source of data can utilize the following types of qualitative techniques: semiotics, qualitative comparative analysis, constant comparison analysis,
keywords-in-context, word count, secondary data analysis, classical content analysis and text mining (Leech and Onwuegbuzie, 2008). The author used the method of constant comparison analysis (Glaser, 1978, 1992; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987) for documentary analysis of the official curriculum guidelines. Some authors use the term “coding” when referring to constant comparative analysis (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Ryan and Bernard, 2000). First, the author developed GCE-related codes based on a literature review of academic journal articles and book chapters on any topic related to GCE. The procedure was to find all occurrences of the word hypertext as they appeared. Then, the analyst adopted open coding, which is “like working on a puzzle” (Strauss and Corbin, 1998, p. 223) by chunking the relevant data from academic journal articles and book chapters into smaller segments, and then a descriptor, or “code”, was attached for each segment (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). For the next stage, known as axial coding, researchers grouped the codes into similar categories. To arrive at some meaningful categories after axial coding, two repeated but separated coding exercises were involved in the analysis of the same data. The same procedures for generating categories were used in order to establish inter-coder reliability and to minimize inconsistencies and inaccuracies (Gall et al., 2007). The above coding processes culminated in relatively distinct GCE categories and some derived categories included: globalization, global identity, global change, global affiliations, transnational movements, justice, moral commitment, multiple identities, intercultural understanding, empathy, critical literacy, equal opportunity, human rights, cooperation, cultural diversity, cosmopolitanism, sustainable development, imagined communities, etc. Then, the author applied these GCE categories to analyse the aims, suggested contents and questions in the official curriculum guidelines related to civic education, i.e. Civic Education (CDC, 1998), Social Studies (CDC, 1997), IH (CDC and HKEAA, 2003), History (Personal, Social and Humanities Education Section, Education Bureau (PSHE), 2014), Liberal Studies (CDC and HKEAA, 2007), and Life & Society (CDC and HKEAA, 2010), since these official curriculum guidelines exert significant impacts on the learning of Hong Kong’s students because of their standard nature as subject positions in schools. Whenever the contents of these curriculum documents had such GCE categories, the author noted them down and marked them as relevant for analysis by this study.

The following section will review the sociopolitical contexts of colonial Hong Kong’s civic education when themes such as understanding about the world, international cooperation and globalization were adopted by the official curriculum guidelines.

5. Sociopolitical contexts of colonial Hong Kong’s civic education (pre-1980s-early 1990s)

This section reviews the key issues and debates which exerted impacts on civic education curriculum guidelines in colonial Hong Kong between the 1980s and the early 1990s. Under colonial British rule it was said that, “the purpose and content of secondary education in Hong Kong are derived from the idea of a liberal education as it has been understood and developed in Britain. This general purpose ‘accords with the expectations and values of the local community’” (Board of Education, 1973, p. 39). The British colonial authorities also prevented the political exploitation of education and the dissemination of subversive political propaganda by certain schools and Communist Party sympathizers (Hong Kong Hansard, 1952). Justifications for this measure were made in the name of protecting students’ welfare from prejudicial influences, as well as maintaining public safety, order, morals and security
(Fairbrother, 2006a). For example, in 1952, Section 84(1)(m) of Hong Kong’s Education Ordinance declared that “The Governor in Council may make regulations providing for [...] the prohibition of political, subversive or tendentious activities or propaganda in schools and amongst teachers and pupils” (Hong Kong Government, 1971). Therefore, this restrictive policy deprived Hong Kong students of chances to learn about local or national politics, not to mention those of other parts of the world.

The signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration between the Chinese and British governments in 1984, which confirmed the terms for the handover of Hong Kong’s sovereignty to China in 1997, raised new issues between the government and the population (Fairbrother, 2006a). Next, the 1984 White paper on the further development of representative government in Hong Kong called for the strengthening of civic education to ensure that youths would be “educated more effectively and comprehensively in political and constitutional matters”, so they would be able to take up their gradually increasing political rights more effectively. This initiative accompanied earlier grants of civil and social rights as the basis of Hong Kong “citizenship” (Hong Kong Government, 1984, p. 12). This signaled a change, which allowed the discussion of politics in schools. In 1990, in response to a call in the Legislative Council to “improve civic education and the ideas of democracy among young people”, the government proposed the Education (Amendment) Bill 1990 to repeal the power to restrict political activities in schools, proposing that the Director of Education should retain only limited control through the power to issue guidelines reminding schools that their political activities be relevant and appropriate to the aims of civic education (Hong Kong Hansard, 1989, 1990a, b). Legislators supporting this move described the then existing Education Regulations as anachronistic, a violation of human rights and superfluous (Fairbrother, 2006a). Passage of the final Bill repealed the prohibitions on teaching politics, and this made the development of local, national and the international civic literacy possible.

6. GCE in colonial Hong Kong’s secondary school curriculum guidelines (1980s-early 1990s): thin conception of learning about rights and responsibilities

An analysis of the curriculum guidelines from the 1980s to the early 1990s exhibits a trend in GCE which urged students to learn about their rights and responsibilities towards the world.

6.1 Learning about rights and responsibilities

The colonial education authority issued the Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools in September 1985 to establish civic education in schools. These Guidelines called for civic education to be infused throughout the school curriculum (CDC, 1985) as a response to the building of a representative colonial government. However, the restrictions on politics in schools embodied in the Education Ordinance were viewed as inhibitive of its full implementation (CDC, 1985). Meanwhile, the government’s recommended junior secondary school subjects such as Social Studies (CDC, 1997) and EPAs shouldered the responsibilities of teaching rights and responsibilities from the early 1980s. However, these two subjects were regarded as inadequate for students to understand politics, and so the colonial government introduced Government & Public Affairs for senior secondary students in the early 1990s, which included politics, national government and international affairs. For junior secondary Social Studies, the syllabus suggested that students should learn about their rights and responsibilities in their daily lives, but
only limited international topics such as war and peace, poverty, food and hunger were addressed by courses.

6.2 Teaching the global in civic education curricula before and just after the handover

In 1996, the colonial Hong Kong government issued *Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools (Draft)* (Education Department, 1996), which was an improved version of its predecessor in 1985. Subsequently, in 1998, the Curriculum Development Council formally issued a Civic Education Syllabus for Junior Secondary School (Form 1-3) (CDC, 1998). It called for recognizing the need of students to learn about the concepts of global citizenship, global responsibilities and human rights in this “global village” of a world (Education Department, 1996). It also contained aims for cultivating an understanding of the importance of the rule of law, democracy, human rights and justice (CDC, 1998, p. 2) by making reference to international conventions on rights. Since the 1996 Guidelines were the last official civic education curriculum guidelines published before 1997, in its Preamble, there are wordings such as, “Belonging to Hong Kong and China, and willing to contribute to the society, nation and the world”, while the Aims listed out concepts such as rights and responsibilities, democracy, freedom, international concerns, concerns for peace, equality, human rights, the rule of law, openness to cultures and values, and the enactment of them in lives through civic awareness, judgement, communication and fairness, which are GCE categories derived from the coding process. These Guidelines have been regarded as urging schools to teach human rights and democracy (Leung and Yuen, 2009a), and the agenda for civic education was expanded to include the understanding of politics and government, national identity, the rule of law and the promotion of global perspectives (Leung and Ng, 2004). In this way they are considered to fulfil the criteria of what a civic education curriculum should have in terms of democratic beliefs and values (Newmann, 1975).

For GCE, the Civic Education Syllabus (Form 1-3) in 1998 included GCE categories of global citizenship, rights and responsibilities, a world of diversity, the heritage of the human world, life and dignity, equality, freedom, understanding historical significant events of the world, global problems, peace concerns, appreciation, empathy, self-determination, humanity, kindness, interests, reflection, civilization, cooperation, communication, creative thinking, participation, international agency, education/individual/group/action/value can make a difference, and global issues (CDC, 1998). In particular, one of the syllabus’s aims was that students should develop a sense of belonging to the nation and “make contribution to the family, community, nation and the world” (CDC, 1998, p. 2). In curriculum sequencing, it proposes a concentric circle scheme for making contributions to local, national and then global communities, as well as adopting school-based principles within independent subject modes or integrated modes (CDC, 1998). It also urged students to reflect and take actions by listing some guiding questions for themselves: e.g. examining equality issues, defining discrimination, considering how to protect equality, determining actions that can be taken to eliminate discrimination against other people, and thinking about how to protect those who face inequality, etc. (CDC, 1998, p. 15).

The 1998 Civic Education Syllabus, however, remained at the level of recommendation only and implementation was left up to individual schools (Kennedy et al., 2008). Most Hong Kong schools adopt a progression of curriculum sequence by teaching about the self, the family and the community in junior forms, and then teaching the nation and the globe in their senior forms. In spite of this non-prescriptive approach, it has made GCE teaching possible. In short, the HKSAR government’s approach to civic education exhibited few
changes from the relatively hands-off approach of the colonial Hong Kong government at first. Its actions consisted primarily of recommendations through curriculum guidelines and of continuing support for cross-curricular delivery and resourcing for a variety of extracurricular activities (Fairbrother and Kennedy, 2011; Fairbrother, 2006b, 2008). In terms of curriculum content, a thin conception of citizenship could be found with its emphasis on learning about rights and responsibilities and on contributing of oneself to the local, national and global spheres.

7. Sociopolitical contexts of the HKSAR’s civic education (late 1990s-2000s)
The following section reviews the key issues and debates surrounding civic education since the late 1990s, which apprise of GCE curriculum guideline developments in the period.

7.1 From passive to active citizenship
Research findings have long echoed public concern about civic education with regard to Hong Kong’s youths’ civic knowledge and democratic consciousness. Hong Kong’s youths were once portrayed as lacking in civic knowledge and consciousness, as politically immature and apathetic, and as having a weak understanding of the rule of law, government policies and of political affairs (Fairbrother, 2005; Law, 2004). Some studies found students to be apathetic towards democratic development, unable to exercise their civil rights, and lacking in the will to participate actively in political affairs because of civic powerlessness (Fairbrother, 2005; Kennedy et al., 2008; Law, 2004; Lee, 2003). All these qualities portrayed a passive citizenry. Yet, stepping forward into the 2000s, a comparative study (Kennedy et al., 2008) of young people in Australia, the USA and Hong Kong found that, though traditional political activities such as joining political parties were seen quite negatively by students in each place, Hong Kong students still tended to have relatively robust and active civic attitudes towards voting, women’s rights and engagement in community activities. Leung (2006) also interviewed Hong Kong students identified as being “active citizens” and found that they became socially or politically active because of political socialization. Kennedy and Chow (2009) found that Hong Kong students respond to the law in a relativist way and are prepared to protest against unfair or unjust laws. When investigating student conceptions of “active citizenship”, Kennedy (2007) found that students were able to distinguish between “political obligations” and “political rights”, and so taking action could be feasible. Kennedy (2010) also found that local students seemed to have developed positive civic attitudes and civic-mindedness despite their colonial heritage, which is a way of exerting identity in an alien political environment. Students also identified with legal obligations related to the civil authorities, personal obligations to support other members of the community and patriotic obligations to support the nation-state (Kennedy, 2010). In short, students see themselves as members of multiple groups and having multiple responsibilities but, of course, there may be some scepticism about how many students would act upon such claims of belonging to multiple groups and of having multiple responsibilities. Nevertheless, an active citizenship seems to be forming which stresses the active roles played by citizens in this globalized era.

During the early transition period in the late 1990s, Hong Kong’s policymakers only sought to strengthen civic education via encouragement and capacity-building measures which included the provision of teacher training and other resources
According to Guidelines on Civic Education issued in 1996 and the Basic Education Curriculum Guide promulgated in 2002, schools were advised to choose their GCE strategy from different curricular approaches towards civic education, e.g. teaching GCE as an independent subject, as an integrated subject in courses such as IH or Social Studies, or as part of a whole-school permeation approach where civic education content was infused into other subjects (Fairbrother, 2006b; Morris and Morris, 2001). Thus, the implementation of civic education depended on the school’s own preference.

7.2 Politicization of Hong Kong SAR society after 1997
Lee and Sweeting (2001) argued that, anticipating the return of sovereignty to China in 1997, debates after the 1996 Civic Education Guidelines were between national education and anti-national education. During the education reform of the early 2000s, civic education was “depoliticized” in the sense that the civic elements in Moral and Civic Education were removed (Leung and Ng, 2004), but the humanities and history curricula have been entrusted with elements of nationalistic sentiment in order to foster Chinese nationalistic identification (Vickers, 2005). This period of “depoliticization” of civic education (Leung, 2004) was accompanied by the cultivation of national identification via other subjects. Meanwhile, Vickers (2005) argued that there was a “growing and distinctive sense of local identity, with one that is full of contradictions. ‘Hongkongese’ identity has largely consisted of a sense of pride in the local way of life, and the cosmopolitan sophistication of this ‘international city’” (Vickers, 2005, p. 75). Thus, a localized identity stood in the way of fostering any nationalistic education in anticipation of the return of sovereignty to China in 1997 and limited the scope for a GCE which would prepare students for a globalized age. Hong Kong has also undergone a rapid transformation into a post-industrial city and entered the globalized condition at a pace greater than its citizens could have imagined (Pun and Wu, 2004). Indeed, in the 2000s, a widening and deep social class structure, social immobility, ongoing issues of identity, increasing cultural and multi-faith diversity, the challenges of globalization, and democratic development concerns shaped the unfolding social and political contexts of Hong Kong (Pun and Wu, 2004), which certainly have had implications for civic education. Although the HKSAR government prides itself on being The World City of Asia, with all the setbacks for salary structures and social mobility that have resulted from globalization, it became highly relevant to teach globalization and the obligations of citizens to the world.

8. GCE in Hong Kong’s secondary school curriculum guidelines in the 2000s: thick conception of challenging discrimination, exclusion and inequality
A qualitative analysis of GCE curriculum guidelines in the 2000s exhibits a trend for adopting emphases on students taking up obligations to challenge discrimination, exclusion, injustice and inequality. A thick conception of citizenship in Hong Kong’s official curriculum guidelines could be found in their requirements to ask students to have obligations to all other citizens of the globe, privileged or not, and in their presuppositions that the inclusion of excluded and marginalized people as global citizens is possible in defiance of discrimination, exclusion and inequality. The following sections will present the findings of GCE categories derived from the aims, major contents and topics of the related official secondary school curriculum guidelines since the early 2000s.
8.1 GCE in education reform in the 2000s – moral and civic education

Education reforms in Hong Kong aimed at preparing citizens better for an increasingly globalized world (Law, 2004; Mok and Welch, 2003). The official reform document highlighted life-wide learning opportunities for students and the need to cultivate global awareness in response to economic, social and informational technology changes (Education Commission, 2000). The education reforms also cultivated in young people a respect for diversity and positive attitudes for addressing value conflicts. Since then, Hong Kong students have been engaged in different kinds of civic education and participatory learning activities (Leung and Yuen, 2009b). Regarding GCE, primary and secondary schools used project learning to extend students’ understanding about global issues and topics, as well as cultivating their global outlooks (Lee et al., 2006). Students conduct inquiries on controversial world issues to expose matters such as inequalities and discrimination. Common topics are widening and deepening social class structures, social immobility, ongoing issues of identity, increasing cultural and multi-faith diversity, the challenges of globalization and democratic development.

8.2 GCE in the life and society curriculum guide of Personal, Social and Humanities Education (PSHE) in the junior secondary (S1-3) curriculum

In PSHE, schools are advised to strengthen the links between classroom learning and social reality (PSHE, 2014). The strand of social system and citizenship states that students should learn about social systems and citizenship at local, national and global levels. In developing students’ knowledge about the world, the Education Bureau (PSHE, 2014) suggests that teachers should raise students’ concerns about peace, and increase their awareness of inequalities and discrimination in the world. Since 2012/2013, the Education Bureau has encouraged secondary schools to offer a junior secondary curriculum of Life and Society (S1-S3), which aims to bridge the learning between upper primary schools and senior secondary schools and it contains a strand of Social System and Citizenship in which the processes of globalization and the meanings of being “global citizens” are suggested topics (CDC and HKEAA, 2010). Regarding GCE, it aims to cultivate students’ sensitivity about diversity, and bring to light their interests and concerns for local, national and global issues (CDC and HKEAA, 2010). In relation to GCE, this curriculum suggests that teachers should teach students a sense of global awareness about inequalities and practices that are unfavourable to developing countries. Furthermore, consideration of the outcomes of taking action to address the impacts of globalization is emphasized. Other GCE categories include globalization, global citizenship, interdependence, justice, cooperation, international politics, international order, international organizations, global citizen awareness and contributions to the world, etc.

8.3 GCE in IH

In the junior secondary IH curriculum, globalization is one of its core modules and it requires students to analyse the phenomenon of globalization (CDC and HKEAA, 2003). The IH curriculum guidelines suggest adopting an integrated and interdisciplinary curriculum structure. It suggests globalization as a topic that may extend students’ understanding, and it includes subjects such as competition between local and western restaurants, local vs transnational corporations, and the changing nature of pop culture, etc. Examples of GCE categories that are found in these curriculum guidelines are globalization, global institutions, cultural globalization, interdependence,
cosmopolitan society, cultural conflict, cultural imperialism, cultural resistance, decolonization, hegemony, the Human Development Index, deregulation, empowerment, free trade, global ethics, global unity, multinational corporations, neoliberalism, privatization, terrorism, thinking locally and acting locally, global capitalism, the world division of labour, and the World Trade Organization. A “thick” conception of citizenship can be discerned here with its emphasis on asking students to inquire into the inequalities and discrimination that are associated with imperialism, colonization and hegemony.

8.4 GCE in history
GCE can be found in the History subject curriculum guidelines for both junior and senior secondary schools (PSHE, 2014). The senior form history curriculum (Curriculum Development Council and the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (CDC and HKEAA, 2014) emphasizes the history of modern western liberal democracies and the transformation of modern China and it includes selected histories of the world. Factual information, analyses of causes, processes and the consequences of historical issues are emphasized. Examples of GCE categories found in these History curriculum guidelines are western supremacy, western expansion, colonial empires, international cooperation, colonialism, modernization and transformation, coexistence and interaction of cultures, militarism, decolonization, independence, rivalries and conflicts, population and resources, international order, the Cold War, poverty, apartheid, peace-making, economic cooperation and integration, terrorism, cultural imperialism, popular culture, nuclear proliferation, gender inequality, environmental protection, etc. In particular, one curriculum aim is to enable students to “cultivate both national consciousness and the consciousness of being citizens of the global community” (CDC and HKEAA, 2014, p. 2). Students are expected to appreciate the difficulties and challenges that humankind has faced (CDC and HKEAA, 2014, p. 3). A “thick” conception of citizenship can be found here as students are engaged in examining the processes and impacts of colonialism and colonial empires.

8.5 GCE in liberal studies of senior secondary (S4-6) and other learning experiences (OLE)
Senior secondary Liberal Studies (CDC and HKEAA, 2007), which was implemented after 2009, has a module known as, “Impacts of Responses under Globalization”. The curriculum objectives of Liberal Studies are to ask students to appreciate the views and values of people from different social and cultural backgrounds and to reflect on and develop their multiple identities, responsibilities and commitments as citizens in their community, their country and the world. The suggested questions for inquiry are: the characteristics and development trends of globalization; responses to globalization; and values and attitudes brought about by the impacts of globalization, such as justice, interdependence, cooperation, adaptation, diversity, cooperative, openness, etc. In analysis, the GCE categories found in this Liberal Studies curriculum guideline include reflection, inequalities, commitments, justice, interdependence, etc., which lead to the analysis of issues and problems related to GCE from a critical perspective.

There is also an informal curriculum for OLE, according to which, schools are required to provide civic and service learning experiences for senior secondary students. Schools can provide activities such as joining learning programmes organized by NGOs to explore different issues in GCE, e.g. studying and responding with critical thinking on issues of global poverty and injustice, analysing social structural factors, personal responsibility and responsibilities of different stakeholders.
9. Discussion: categorizing GCE in Hong Kong’s official secondary school curriculum guidelines

Based upon the analyses of the above curriculum guidelines, GCE in Hong Kong reveals the following changes in aims, knowledge and concepts, values and attitudes, and skills, and points to its adopting the values of a “global teacher”.

9.1 Aims of GCE

(1) Cultivating global citizens. In recent years, cultivating global citizens has attracted the attention of education practitioners and researchers. A global citizen would be aware of the world around them, would respect and value diversity, take action for human rights, social justice and sustainability and take responsibility for their own actions (Print, 2007). In Hong Kong, terminology about cultivating a “global citizen” could be found in the aims of official curriculum guidelines (CDC, 1998; CDC and HKEAA, 2010) which are targeted at developing confident, informed and responsible persons (CDC and HKEAA, 2010) and ones who are tolerant of, and have respect for, other cultures (CDC and HKEAA, 2014).

(2) Knowledge and conceptual development. In the British colonial period, teaching was oriented to emphasize the delivery of declarative and technical knowledge to students (Biggs and Watkins, 1995). Now, since teaching GCE Hongkongers’ education has changed to include knowledge and concepts that include understanding interconnectedness and interdependence, environmental, economic and social sustainability, diversity, democracy, the rule of law, tolerance, equality, discrimination, human rights, change management, conflict resolution and peace-building, etc. (CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010, 2014). In fact, according to the curriculum guidelines, citizenship knowledge and understanding should be acquired and applied while using and developing citizenship skills (Keast and Craft, 2010).

(3) Values and attitudes. Personal identity and self-esteem, care and compassion, responsibility and cooperation, social justice, respecting diversity, democratic values, having an empathetic manner, cherishing environmental and social sustainability, etc., can be found in the curriculum guidelines (CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010; CDC, 1997, 1998), in order to address the demand for global and cosmopolitan identifications (Banks, 2004; Moon, 2010). Values and virtues, which include equality, autonomy, solidarity and judgement, are what citizens should have and cultivate (Figueroa, 2004).

(4) Skills and processes. Since the education reform of the 2000s, Hong Kong schools are keen to foster students’ global civic skills in intercultural competences and to enhance their sensitivity by promoting cross-cultural experiences. Since the onset of globalization, education reform targets have been set for enhancing students’ language proficiencies and interview skills, and for engaging students in overseas exchange activities which fit the purposes of developing their inquiry and communication skills and their capacities for understanding global issues (CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010).

(5) Action and participation. There are suggestions for experiential learning and civic participation to equip students for a globalized world in the official curriculum guidelines (CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010). Community involvement, the identification and investigation of action opportunities, consideration of consequences, overcoming
action barriers, the cooperation and value participation of others, and reflection on and evaluation of actions enable students to take action. Indeed, global citizenship can be construed by analysis of Hong Kong’s teaching of GCE as global social activism, engaged in efforts to improve the world (Myers, 2010).

9.2 Knowledge and concepts
There appears to be a diversification of knowledge and concepts for planning GCE teaching as suggested by the official curriculum guidelines (CDC, 1998; CDC and HKEAA, 2003, 2007, 2014), e.g. they cover cooperation, peace and conflict, interdependence, sustainable development, diversity, empathy, human rights, democracy, multiple identities, fairness, justice, the rule of law, etc. There are also multiple themes in the recent curriculum guidelines, e.g. moral obligations to the world, global awareness, intercultural understanding, respect for other ethnicities, anti-discrimination, caring for the underprivileged, etc. (CDC and HKEAA, 2003; CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010, 2014). In recent years, teachers have been expected to link up local and global issues in their teaching to enable students to see how global issues can be linked to daily experiences (CDC and HKEAA, 2014).

9.3 Values and attitude learning
Learning about the world necessitates intercultural understanding (Tuomi et al., 2008) and adoption of a view of multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka, 2003, 2008). Values and attitudes learning about intercultural understanding that are found in the official curriculum guidelines include respect and empathy for others, concern and commitment for environmental sustainability, appreciation of world images, recognition that others have different views, identification of human rights and social justice issues, understanding differences and similarities, etc. (CDC, 1998; CDC and HKEAA, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2014).

9.4 Skills learning
Skills that are needed in a globalized world include cooperation and conflict resolution, the ability to investigate and argue effectively, creativity, critical and informed thinking – i.e. considering what, why and how dominant views are constructed. In particular, critical thinking means critical engagement with different perspectives on a controversial issue (Hahn, 1998) which could be found in guidelines (CDC, 1998; CDC and HKEAA, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2014). Students could also learn via dialogue with overseas visitors or international NGOs (CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010).

9.5 Teaching as a “global teacher”
In fact, concluding the GCE findings in this study reveals that there is a need for teaching as a “global teacher” using the following perspectives, approaches and methods.

(1) Adopting active citizenship. GCE in Hong Kong uses a multitude of active participatory teaching and learning approaches (CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010). These methods are not unique to GCE but they help students to reflect on controversial and complex global issues and develop their knowledge, skills and values as global citizens (Dower and Williams, 2002; Heater, 2004). Indeed, active citizenship refers to involvement in community campaigns, identifying, investigating and evaluating alternative courses of action, devising strategies to overcome barriers to active participation, and reflecting and evaluating the effectiveness of action (Kennedy, 2007; Print, 2007). Teachers involve students in political action outside the classroom.
(Osborne, 2011) such as environmental campaigns, the protection of human rights, investigations of community problems, etc. Leung (2006) found that some Hong Kong students could be identified as “active citizens” who are socially/politically active.

(2) Teaching with a “global” perspective. In the examined curriculum guidelines, there are aims to cultivate sensitivity, interests, concerns and commitment for local, national and global issues in students (CDC, 1997, 1998; CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010, 2014), and these can be categorized as having the characteristics of a “global teacher”. Being a “global teacher” sounds obscure on its surface, but in obligatory terms, one who is interested in and concerned about events and movements in the local, national and global communities can be qualified as being a “global teacher”. A “global teacher” actively seeks to keep informed whilst maintaining a sceptical stance towards sources of information; and also takes up a principled stand and supports others who work against injustice and inequalities relating to race, gender, class, physical or mental abilities (Steiner, 1996). A “global teacher” is also concerned about environmental issues and values democratic processes as the best means of bringing about positive change and engagement in social action to support beliefs. Teaching thus goes beyond viewing the world narrowly through an individual’s interests, location and culture (Evans and Reynolds, 2005) and reaches out to recognize global interdependence.

(3) Challenging stereotypes. GCE in Hong Kong has developed to teach students to challenge stereotypes (CDC and HKEAA, 2010). History teaching also requires students to examine different perceptions and tolerate different opinions (CDC and HKEAA, 2014). GCE asks for a challenging of recognized stereotypes, and an analysis and discussion of the bases and underlying causes of such, using a wide variety of sources and images to counter stereotypes, thereby developing skills to question and critique them (Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice (CSSGJ), 2006). By doing these things, students can develop their skills to discern different perspectives (Richardson, 1990).

(4) Dialogue and enquiry. Open Spaces for Dialogue and Enquiry is a methodology for the introduction of global issues and perspectives in educational contexts, such as those of teachers, adults, and higher and secondary education students (CSSGJ, 2006). It aims to develop critical literacy and independent thinking, which are transferable skills that help learners at school and beyond (CSSGJ, 2006). In Hong Kong’s curriculum guidelines, questioning techniques are recommended in Social Studies (CDC, 1997, 1998), while interactions between students and teachers, and debriefings are emphasized in Liberal Studies (CDC and HKEAA, 2007) and Life & Society (CDC and HKEAA, 2010).

(5) Experiential learning. Experiential learning (e.g. drama, interactive scenarios), out-of-classroom learning, collaboration with NGOs (e.g. citizenship projects), overseas study tours that aim at forming new knowledge (Savicki, 2008), international linkages (e.g. school partnerships), and role plays or debates (e.g. model United Nations simulations) are recommended for GCE (CDC, 1997, 1998; CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010) because experiential learning enables students to examine the issues of inequality and injustice and taking action.

(6) Project or issue inquiry. Project work is important in citizenship education because it presents an opportunity for young people to take responsibility for their learning and is a form of active learning (Llewellin, 2010). Project or issue inquiry contributes to students’ self-directed learning capacities (Evans et al., 1996). Project learning utilizes a wide evidence base for assessment judgement and it allows peer assessment. Teachers can provide feedback and feeding forward for students’ improvement (CDC and HKEAA, 2003, 2007, 2010). Meanwhile, issue inquiry...
emphasizes depth instead of breath and it requires the development of conceptual understanding (CDC and HKEAA, 2007). Also, by collaborating with others, students can develop their higher-order thinking and reflect on issues from different angles. This encourages them to choose practical solutions from among alternatives and to take effective action (Evans et al., 1996).

9.6 Assessment practices of GCE

Traditional views of assessment should be adjusted in light of global changes in knowledge production and dissemination. The shift towards autonomous learning that integrates knowledge acquisition with creativity, values and commitments presents a significant problem for undertaking traditional forms of assessment (Bates, 2012). Journal writing and reflection on learning (CDC and HKEAA, 2007, 2010) facilitate reflection by students on their learning about global issues. Indeed, pupils should be encouraged to recognize, reflect and act upon values and dispositions underlying their attitudes and actions as individuals and as members of groups or communities (Crick, 1998).

10. Conclusion: lessons of GCE in Hong Kong for other places and future research areas

Since the 1980s, GCE has been adopted in Hong Kong’s official schools’ curriculum guidelines in response to the need to teach schoolchildren about the world. The developments of GCE in Hong Kong tell us that GCE has evolved from presenting a thin conception of citizenship that emphasized rights and responsibilities, to a thick conception of citizenship that emphasizes making challenges to inequality, discrimination, exclusion and taking actions to address them. This would have implications for understanding developments of GCE in other fast-changing societies such as those in East Asia where there has been dynamic educational development (Cummings and Altbach, 1997). The present study shows in order to teach about the world and address the processes and impacts of globalization, requires a transformation from learning about moral responsibilities in the world or understanding international relations, to challenging inequality, discrimination and promoting social justice by analysing and scrutinizing the impacts of globalization on different people and societies worldwide. It also requires the raising of questions such as whether globalization facilitates international understanding or aggravates the conflicts between nations, religions and cultures. Does globalization brings benefits to all or just facilitates the exploitation of developing countries by developed countries or international capital? Does globalization create mutual exclusion or evolution? How can one evaluate the impacts of globalization on domestic industries and livelihoods, especially since globalization processes determine who can access the rights and privileges bestowed by an emerging transnational/global citizenship? How should non-western countries respond to the three categories of GCE above, i.e. the neoliberal, the radical and the transformational (Schultz, 2007), which are based upon western citizenship education literature? All these pose questions concerning conceptual, skill and value learning, and assessment practices in civic education, in particular to those Asia-Pacific societies which are facing similar education reforms and responding to similar globalization impacts as Hong Kong.

In all likelihood, “global citizens” are made, not born, and one of the key issues for future research on GCE is to identify those factors in the broad social and political infrastructure that influence students as they develop commitments to and an understanding of their global citizenship obligations. The present study is limited by
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focusing on curriculum guidelines and so future research areas could include the gap between GCE policy and classroom implementation, how GCE is conceptualized by teachers, students, policy planners and researchers, the impacts of GCE on students’ values, attitudes and actions, what would be the possible differential understanding of GCE in diverse immigrant student communities (e.g. those of mainland origin or ethnic minorities), as well as comparing policy documents and the curricula of GCE across countries. This study, hopefully, provided a foundation on which future steps for exploring different analytical angles related to GCE can be undertaken.
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