CONTENTS

Editorial

Feature Articles

EDITORIAL

Educating young people to take their place as citizens – the critical role of Civics and Citizenship education

Dr Deborah Henderson

Queensland University of Technology

Dr Deborah Henderson

This edition of The Social Educator focuses on the nature of Civics and Citizenship Education (CCE) at a time of major curriculum change and uncertainty in Australia. Educating young people to take their place as citizens is a central concern for all societies and in Australia and this concern was manifest in the agreed Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (MCEETYA 2008) which informs the development of the Australian Curriculum. In this curriculum, Civics and Citizenship is a defined subject in the Humanities and Social Sciences learning area. Indeed, the Melbourne Declaration provided a clear national policy to guide the development of Civics and Citizenship Education (CCE) with the stated aim that all young Australians will become active and informed citizens (Goal 2).

Collectively, the papers in this edition provide insights into CCE's significance and value in a range of contexts; however before referring specifically to each contribution, it is necessary to encapsulate the current status of CCE in the Australian Curriculum. This is because however succinct the goal of active and informed citizenship might seem, an uncertain period lies ahead for the implementation of the Civics and Citizenship Curriculum in the wake of the January 2014 announcement of a review of the Australian curriculum, as briefly articulated below.

Following the public review process, the Civics and Citizenship Curriculum was finalised in November 2013 under the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) curriculum development processes. However, this version of CCE was not endorsed. Rather, State and Territory education ministers meeting with the new federal Education Minister in the Abbot government, Christopher Pyne, at the Standing Council on School Education and Early Childhood (SCSEEC) meeting on 29 November signalled a pause. It was simply acknowledged that the Civics and Citizenship Curriculum (and others in the Phase 3 sequence for the Australian Curriculum including the Arts, Health and Physical Education, Technologies, Economics and Business) had been completed. In a sign of what would eventuate, the Communiqué for this meeting made reference to the fact that Australian Government intended to undertake a review of the Australian Curriculum.

By 10 January 2014, Minister Pyne announced a review to "evaluate the robustness, independence and balance of the Australian Curriculum by looking at both the development process and content" (Pyne 2014). Considerable controversy accompanied the review's purposes, timeline and Pyne's appointment of two critics of the current curriculum, Kevin Donnelly and Professor Ken Wiltshire, to head the review process. With specific reference to Civics and Citizenship, Donnelly had been strident in his critique of the May 2013 CCE draft (ACARA, 2013) available for public consultation. Donnelly (2013) claimed that the curriculum writers had embraced "a politically correct, postmodern view of society" and took issue with statements in the document that Australia is "a secular nation with a multicultural and multi-faith society", and a society where students are taught to "value their own cultures, languages and beliefs" (p. 2). Further, Donnelly asserted that "a relativistic stance" had been adopted and "the curriculum also embodies a subjective definition of citizenship on the premise that "citizenship means different things to people at different times and depending on personal perspectives, their social situation and where they live" (Donnelly, 2013, p. 2). Such comments raise concern about the ways in which the review might be conducted.

By mid-January, the 2014 version of the Civics and Citizenship Curriculum together with the other completed Phase 3 learning areas, were uploaded on the ACARA web site and identified as completed but not endorsed by Ministers as national curriculum. Despite this awkward status, ACARA noted that, at the request of the ministerial council, these documents were available for states and territories to implement if they wish to do so. On 18 February, ACARA sent notification that the Australian Curriculum F-10 (Version 6.0) for the Arts, Health and Physical Education, Technologies, Economics and Business, and Civics and Citizenship were now available for viewing on the Australian Curriculum website during the review process. In acknowledging the Australian Government's review of the national curriculum, the Chair of the ACARA Board, Professor McGaw, noted that the F–10 curriculum developed by ACARA was placed in one location to "ensure openness and that everyone is able to see and read the full scope of what the Australian Curriculum covers" (ACARA, 2014a). Accordingly, Civics and Citizenship was posted with the descriptor "(a)vailable for use, awaiting final endorsement" (ACARA, 2014b). Submissions to the review closed on 28 February and it is this uncertain context that teacher educators and teachers face as we await the outcomes of the review. A core question might be what sort of CCE will result from the review process?

The papers in this edition of *The Social Educator* were written during the second half of 2013 following the public review process for the Civics and Citizenship Curriculum. The first paper provides a regional context for considering the broader purposes of CCE in a nation's education system, by exploring a recent curriculum controversy in Hong Kong. The authors reflect on an attempt by the Beijing-based government to impose a form of national education in Hong Kong schools during 2012 through a compulsory school subject titled Moral and National Education. This subject aimed at projecting a particular version of national identity and citizenship in the curriculum that aligned with the interests of the central government. The notion of citizenship embedded in Moral and National Education prompted a public outcry and mass demonstrations. Large numbers of citizens took to the streets in Hong Kong to protest against this extremely biased attempt to secure compliant citizenry thought a curriculum intervention. In their discussion of the controversy about Moral and National Education, George Siu-Keung Ngai, Yan-Wing Leung, and Timothy Wai-Wa Yuen examine the nature and purposes of civics and citizenship education and consider whether this effort to secure a national approach to education was in fact a form of indoctrination.

The second paper takes up the theme of 'what sort of citizenry' and revisits the development of Civics and Citizenship in the Australian Curriculum by focusing on the nature of "active citizenship" in this learning area. Brian Hoepper argues that the *Draft Shape Paper for Civics and Citizenship* placed emphasis on active citizenship whilst also noting that the curriculum would help students to practise citizenship behaviours in local and virtual communities. Hoepper reviews the developmental process for the Civics and Citizenship Curriculum as it continued through a final *Shape* paper and a consultation *Draft Curriculum*. He concludes that the early promise of a curriculum that emphasised active citizenship was substantially weakened in the *Draft Curriculum*.

In the third paper, a teacher who volunteered to trial the CC Curriculum during its development reflects on the experience. Jim Orpe, from The Friends' School in Hobart, Tasmania, considers how the curriculum could be linked with his school's values and vision and raises practical issues such as time availability, and the role of the General Capabilities and Cross Curricula Priorities, in his discussion of the program approach chosen at the school.

All three papers affirm the value and importance of Civics and Citizenship in the education of young people. However, at this juncture in time it remains to be seen how the review process will impact upon the current version of the Civics and Citizenship in the Australian Curriculum. Will CCE be seen as essential in enabling young people to become active and informed citizens who will participate in and sustain Australia's democracy? Only time will tell.

References

ACARA. (2011). NAP-Civics & Citizenship Years 6 & 10 Report, Retrieved January 25, 2012, from http://www.nap.edu.au/verve/_resources/NAP-CC_Report_2010_251011.pdf

ACARA. (2012). *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum*: *Civics and Citizenship, October*, Retrieved October 16, 2012, from http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Shape_of_the_Australian_ Curriculum__Civics_and_Citizenship_251012.pdf012.

ACARA. (2013). *Draft Years 3-10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship, May,* Retrieved May 28, 2013, from http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Shape_of_the_Australian_Curriculum__ Civics_and_Citizenship_251012.pdf012

ACARA. (2014a). *ACARA Update extra*. Retrieved February 20, 2013, from http://www.acara.edu.au/ acara_update_18022014.html

ACARA. (2014b). *The Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship* (Available for use, awaiting final endorsement) Retrieved February 20, 2014, from
http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/humanitiesandsocialsciences/civicsandcitizenship/Rationale

Donnelly, K. (2013). Gillard's classroom gospel, *Quadrant*. Retrieved December 29, 2013, from http://quadrant.org.au/opinion/qed/2013/05/gillard-s-classroom-gospel/

Pyne, C. (2014). Review of national curriculum to put students first. Press release. Retrieved January 12, 2014, from http://ministers.education.gov.au/pyne/review-national-curriculum-put-students-first

Dr Deborah Henderson taught History and Social Education in Queensland secondary schools for many years and currently lectures in History Curriculum Studies and Studies of Society and Environment for middle and secondary pre-service teachers in the Faculty of Education at QUT.

ARTICLE

The turmoil about efforts to implement national education in Hong Kong: An overview and analysis

George Siu-Keung Ngai, Yan-Wing Leung, and Timothy Wai-Wa Yuen

Hong Kong Institute of Education

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of the considerable turmoil that erupted in Hong Kong following attempts to impose a form of national education in schools. From mid July to September 2012, mass gatherings and street demonstrations occurred in Hong Kong in response to the decision by the government to introduce a compulsory school subject titled Moral and National Education. A teaching kit titled the "China Model National Conditions Teaching Manuel" prompted a public outcry for its approach to embedding a particular version of national identity and citizenship in the curriculum which was considered by many citizens in Hong Kong to be extremely biased. Parents and students in Hong Kong were alarmed when they discovered that many supporting teaching materials, suggested teaching plans, and even organised visits to the Mainland were biased, aiming only at presenting a positive picture of China to the students. This approach to developing a national identity was regarded by many protestors as not representative of the freedom of opinion and association that citizens in Hong Kong regarded as essential for citizenship and as part of understanding their rights in China under "One Country, Two Systems". The introduction of this program led to debates about the nature and purposes of civics and citizenship education and whether efforts to secure a national approach to education are in fact a form of indoctrination. This paper outlines the context for these questions about embedding a form of national identity and citizenship in the curriculum in Hong Kong and discusses the purposes of civic education. In our discussion of these issues we conclude that students should have access to effective civics and citizenship education that allows them to develop their own sense of identity and opinions about their community as "critical patriots".

Introduction

Great turmoil erupted in Hong Kong in response to the decision by the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) government to implement a new national education program in schools. From July to September 2012, mass gatherings and street demonstrations occurred as parents and students took to the streets to protest. At the heart of the debates and turmoil was the introduction of a compulsory subject, Moral and National Education (MNE). Parents and students were particularly alarmed when they found out that teaching materials, suggested teaching plans, and even organised visits to the Mainland, did not give fair representation of the country or give freedom of opinion to students in understanding their identity as Hong Kong residents of China. By way of providing an overview of the factors that prompted such turmoil over efforts to secure this form of national education, first we outline briefly the historical context for the return of Hong Kong to China under "One Country Two Systems". We then offer insights into the development of civic and citizenship education in Hong Kong and provide an overview of the debates about its purpose and form. We conclude the paper by arguing that students should have access to effective civics and citizenship education which allows them to develop their own sense of identity and views about their community whilst engaging in learning opportunities to develop as "critical patriots" capable of exercising citizenship in multiple ways. We contend that this form of civic education should include political education and opportunities to appreciate multiple civic identities, including those at local, national, and global levels. Furthermore, programs for civics and citizenship should have a strong place in classroom learning and be supported by other learning experiences in the school curriculum.

The context for different views about civic education: The pan democratic camp and the pro-establishment camp

The recent protests in Hong Kong over the introduction of Moral and National Education in schools are indicative of broader and longstanding tensions that have been simmering in Hong Kong following its sovereignty transfer to the People's Republic of China in 1997. Prior to the 1997 transfer, debates emerged about the nature and shape of future programs for civic education in Hong Kong. For example, on the one hand, supporters of the Chinese Government, or pro-establishment camp, advocated strengthening national and patriotic education in schools. They contended that this approach was necessary in order to inculcate the younger generation with a sense of national identity, pride and loyalty, together with an understanding of the Basic Law and China's policy of One Country, Two Systems. On the other hand, pan democrats suggested that more emphasis should be placed on democratic education instead of national education in Hong Kong schools (Ngai, 2005; Tse, 1997; Lee, 2004).

In order to understand the debates about the sort of civics and citizenship education that can occur in Hong Kong under One Country, Two Systems, it is necessary to examine some aspects of the historical context that prompted the issuing of *The Basic Law of The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China*, hereafter, the Basic Law. This is because the Basic Law is "essentially a mini-constitution for Hong Kong and sets out in detail the political system . . . used to regulate Hong Kong after its transition to Chinese rule and a special administrative region in 1997" (Henderson, 1994, p. 98–99).

Whilst Hong Kong's status as a British colony (and later territory) was finalised during the late 19th century under the Treaty of Nanjing (1842) and the Convention of Beijing (1860), during the 1970s it became apparent as Britain's 99 year lease on the New Territories was close to expiring, that *all* of Hong Kong (including Hong Kong Island, the Kowloon Peninsula and the New Territories) was due to return to Chinese rule on 1 July 1997. In stark contrast to much of the political apathy that characterised the colonial days in Hong Kong under British administration, the impending changeover of 1997 prompted an interest in what citizens' rights would be under the new system. According to the Basic Law of 1990:

> Upholding national unity and territorial integrity, maintaining the prosperity and stability of Hong Kong, and taking into account of its history and realities, the People's Republic of China has decided that upon China's resumption of the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, a Hong Kong Special Administrative Region will be established in accordance with the provisions of Article 31 of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, and that under the principle of "one country, two systems", the socialist systems and policies will not be practiced in Hong Kong. . . . In accordance with the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, the National People's Congress hereby enacts the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, prescribing the systems to be practised in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, in order to ensure the implementation of the basic policies of the People's Republic of China regarding Hong Kong. (*Basic Law,* 1990, § preamble)

Hong Kong citizens have become actively interested in politics following 1997, as evidenced in the annual July 1 march in Hong Kong to mark the handover to Beijing. This peaceful demonstration has developed as a rallying point for pro-democracy activists. For example, in 2003, half a million citizens marched, angered by the proposed national security legislation under Article 23 of the Basic Law. During the 2013 march to mark the 16th anniversary of the handover to China, many citizens marched to protest against Hong Kong's pro-Beijing leader and Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying and the pace of political reforms, amidst concerns that Beijing is increasingly meddling in local affairs (Ngai, 2013). As many citizens in Hong Kong have a perception that the centre of political power lies in Beijing, they are keen to see the realisation of Beijing's December 2007 promise of universal suffrage in Hong Kong by 2017. This desire to realise universal suffrage, anxieties about a widening income gap and soaring property prices are some of the concerns driving citizens in Hong Kong to demonstrate for democratic reforms. However, supporters of the Chinese Government/pro-establishment camp oppose the pro-democracy supporters on not only political, economic and social issues, but also on issues related to national education and civic education.

Different views on national identity between Hong Kong and the Chinese mainland

Whilst the pace of economic and administrative integration suggests that Hong Kong is increasingly aligned with the Chinese mainland following its designation as a Special Administrative Region of China in 1997, there has been increasing anxiety among many Hong Kong residents about the relationship with the mainland. Conflicting values and mutual distrust, particularly over issues of human rights, democracy and autonomy, have generated demonstrations and protests on a monumental scale in recent years (Yep, 2007). Although many Hong Kong citizens still maintain a sense of superiority over the mainlanders, these sentiments are, to a large extent, offset by the economic reality of growing dependence on China's economy (Yep, 2007). It is these mixed feelings which nurture social distance and tensions between the people across the border.

In the process of merging with China, many Hong Kong people have been searching for their own national identity whilst also maintaining their Hong Kong identity. Most do not reject a Chinese identity, but give priority to their status as "Hongkongese". As revealed in the polls that provide options for people to nominate their national identity, a greater number of individuals claimed that they are Hongkongese instead of Chinese (Leung & Ngai, 2011. Given China's poor records in human rights issues and claims about corrupt practices of government officials, many individuals do not identify with China and a form of local identity and loyalty to Hong Kong is developing. During recent demonstrations, some people waved the British Union Jack flag and the dragon-lion flag of colonial Hong Kong, suggesting that they treasured the good old days of British colonial rule (Ngai, 2013). This phenomenon might also reflect a backlash prompted by dual and competing identities, namely a Hong Kong identity versus a Chinese identity that is perceived as repressive (Leung & Ngai, 2011), indicating that the sense of national identity and patriotism between Hongkongese and Mainland Chinese (Yuen & Byram, 2007) is quite different.

Hong Kong's civic education history

Civics education in Hong Kong was commonly seen as depoliticised and focused on moral education during the days of the British colony prior to 1997 (Ngai, 2005; Tse, 1997), and this has continued since the establishment of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (Leung, Yuen & Ngai, in press). There is a view that civic education had never been effectively implemented during the 155 years of British rule, as Hong Kong was a colony rather than a political entity, and people living in Hong Kong were residents but not citizens (Chan, 1996). The colonial government simply depoliticised Hong Kong's civic education to fit its own agenda, for example to avoid conflicts between the pro-Beijing and pro-Taiwan factions, and to avoid the rise of national sentiment amongst the local population (Leung & Yuen, 2009).

It was not until the very last decade of British rule that the colonial government started to reinstate political education in Hong Kong's civic education, which previously had remained non-political, parochial, and with a strong moral flavour (Leung & Yuen, 2012a). With the publication of the *Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools* (Curriculum Development Council, 1985) and the *Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools* (Curriculum Development Council, 1996), it was suggested that civic education, with more emphasis on the learning and teaching of politics (such as democracy and human rights), should be incorporated into the school curriculum and that the modes of implementation be school-based (Curriculum Development Council, 2012). This attempt was regarded as a response by the colonial government to the forthcoming political and constitutional changes associated with the handover in 1997. Sweeting (1990) claimed that the rationale reflected a desire to develop a democratic political system in Hong Kong, which would ensure its autonomous status after 1997 (Leung & Yuen, 2012a). This was welcomed by the pro-democracy camp and the liberal elements of civil society and it was assumed that a gradual democratic development in Hong Kong and education for democratic citizenship would result (Lee & Sweeting, 2001; Leung & Yuen, 2012a).

However, after 1997, the Hong Kong SAR Government tried to re-depoliticise civic education by promoting a form of cultural national identity in an effort to avoid controversial political issues. It also emphasised moral training by involving the inculcation of traditional Chinese virtues (Leung & Ng, 2004). Thus, in the 2001 curriculum reform, Civic Education was replaced by Moral and Civic Education.

The change meant that content related to politics, democracy, and human rights were substantially downsized (Leung & Yuen, 2012a).

Turmoil arising from the introduction of Moral and National Education as a compulsory subject

Concerns about the loyalty of Hong Kong citizens to the mainland were apparent when the President of the PRC at the time, Mr Hu Jintao, visited Hong Kong for the 10th Anniversary of the handover in 2007. In urging young people in Hong Kong to learn more about national education, Hu Jintao made clear that he and senior PRC officials were concerned about the nationalistic feelings of the Hong Kong people, despite the fact that education about cultural aspects of China had been strengthened through moral and civic education (Leung & Ngai, 2011). By 2008, some new amendments to the moral and civic education curriculum framework were announced by the government to further strengthen national education and during a 2010/2011 policy address, the then Chief Executive, Mr Donald Tsang, announced that an independent subject of Moral and National Education (MNE) would replace Moral and Civic Education (MCE).

Consultation on the new curriculum for MNE commenced in May 2011. After one year of public consultation, in May 2012 a revised curriculum guide was issued by the Curriculum Development Council (CDC) and endorsed by the Education Bureau (EDB), titled the *Moral and National Education Curriculum Guide (Primary 1 to Secondary 6)* (CDC, 2012). The resolution was that MNE would replace MCE and it would become a mandatory and independent subject in primary and junior secondary classes, after a three year transition period. However, as noted earlier in this paper, from July to September 2012 a series of social movements including mass gatherings, street demonstrations, petitions and hunger strikes occurred in Hong Kong against the introduction of MNE. It is significant that this mass movement was prompted by the biased nature of this form of national education, for at the core of the proposed government-funded materials to support MNE was the fact that an unbalanced presentation of national identity and citizenship was being pushed (Leung et al., in press).

Tens of thousands of protesters marched in Hong Kong in early August of 2012 against the introduction of the *China Model National Conditions Teaching Manual* (Advanced Institute for Contemporary China Studies, 2012). This teaching manual for the territory's schools was prepared by the Hong Kong Patriotic Education Services Centre organised by the 26,000-member Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers – a teacher's alliance run by the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong, a Hong Kong political party with the closest ties to the mainland's communist government. The previous Tsang administration provided HK$13 million to the Centre to produce the booklet. Critics claimed that the manual whitewashes the crimes of the communist regime as the teaching manual referred to the Communist Party as an "advanced, selfless and united ruling group [translation by authors]" (Advanced Institute for Contemporary China Studies, 2012, p. 10), whist denouncing the Democratic and Republican Parties of the United States as a "fierce inter-party rivalry [that] makes the people suffer [translation by authors]" (Advanced Institute for Contemporary China Studies, 2012, p. 10).

Though many Hong Kong people do not totally accept the concept of western democratic mechanisms, they do value the right to be heard and represented in the political entity. As the teaching manual was seen as biased during the peak of the debate about the Moral and National Education Curriculum, it did further trigger other controversies and opposition. In fact, teaching kits of similar nature have been used in schools for quite some time (Leung, 2012), making the general public even more concerned about this most recent effort to pursue a form of biased national education. Such concerns meant that the focus of the debate in Hong Kong shifted beyond the guidelines for Moral and National Education to include many other issues. The main concern seemed to be that classroom teaching would be informed and directed through biased teaching materials. In the following part of the paper, the controversial issues relating to the implementation of national education are examined and an overview of the broad positions evident in the debates is provided.

Is the proposed national education a form of indoctrination?

Discussion about whether national education can be related to indoctrination should commence with a discussion about its conceptual focus. Broadly speaking, the literature seems to interpret indoctrination in

a negative way, as it is often compared to concepts such as brainwashing and robbing others of their rights to freedom of thinking. Green (1972) specifies that leading another person to a "correct" answer and not correspondingly demonstrating concern whether an individual arrives at that answer on the basis of sound reason is a form of indoctrination. Brownhill and Smart (1989) provide an insightful discussion about the meaning of indoctrination. They suggest that a teacher can indoctrinate his or her students by asking them to believe something in an unquestioning way. Such indoctrination might include incomplete exposure to truth or the use of opinion disguised as objective truth. A highly authoritative, ready-to-intervene-and-correct mode of teacher attitude usually accompanies such instruction and indoctrination.

Critics have drawn attention to the problem of national education, by referring not only to the official Guidelines for Moral and National Education but also to the teaching resources the authority sponsored. They conclude that there is a risk of indoctrination and in the following section we summarise the discussion according to the key points raised by the critics. It was argued that under the proposed MNE:

(i) students, whose national identity is actually a form of membership of a political community, will be educated in a deliberately depoliticised way, either by twisting the concept of national identity or/and by avoiding the teaching of politics especially in relation to the People's Republic of China (Leung et al., in press);

(ii) students, who should be able to identify with their mother nation, are required to identify, explicitly or subtly, with a regime or party;

(iii) students are required to love their country and value the nation's achievements without the opportunity to learn about problems, shortcomings and policy failures whilst negative aspects about the nation are deliberately ignored, down-played or even denied (Leung et al., in press);

(iv) students are only allowed to arrive at a "correct" answer on questions where personal judgment is implied and securing the required response is supported by sanctions, such as a teacher's approval and grading in assessment and examination results. Such questions, for example, require a student to indicate "how far I feel myself part of the nation", and "how proud I am of my country". Even peer-pressure to conform is implied in the MNE materials.

It can be discerned from the summary above that points (i), (iii) and (iv) could be identified as forms of indoctrination according to Brownhill and Smart's (1989) concept, as students studying MNE would be given an incomplete exposure to adequate information, and taught in an authoritarian way. These points also align with Green's (1972) concept of indoctrination as concerned with achieving desired results at the expense of valuing and respecting reason. Point (ii) is especially problematic because it reflects both Green's (1972) and Brownhill and Smart's (1989) concepts of indoctrination. Heater (1990) reminds us that that there is a boundary between indoctrination on the one hand and political literacy on the other, the latter being aimed at nurturing critical understanding of politics. The first point raised by critics of MNE is also reflected more broadly in the literature that focuses on the trend to depoliticise civic education in Hong Kong following the handover in 1997 (Leung & Yuen, 2012a, 2012b). Points (ii), (iii) and (iv) raised above can be further contextualised with reference to evidence the critics cited. The following three examples are provided to further indicate the reasons for such concerns.

Example One: Secondary school teaching kit – *China Model National Conditions Teaching Manual*

The *China Model National Conditions Teaching Manual*, published by the National Education Services Centre (NESC) in 2012 under government funding, was intended to be adopted for teaching of secondary students. It was found to be biased towards the Communist Party of China and the so-called "China model". The teaching manual called the Communist Party an "advanced, selfless and united ruling group [translation by authors]" (Advanced Institute for Contemporary China Studies, 2012, p. 10), while denouncing the Democratic and Republican Parties of the United States as a "fierce inter-party rivalry [that] makes the people suffer [translation by authors]" (Advanced Institute for Contemporary China Studies, 2012, p. 10). The general public in Hong Kong could hardly accept the fusion of nation and party as well as the explicit and lopsided praises given to the Communist Party (point (i) and (ii) above) in the manual. Furthermore, the accusation about the American system of democracy without any thorough discussion was also considered as an attempt to push through a desired conclusion in a biased and authoritative way (point (iv) referred above). It should be noted that the teaching kit was produced for use

by school teachers with direct funding support by the government. This prompted concerns by critics of the materials that the government might be deliberately pushing forward biased teaching approaches and resources in order to indoctrinate the students.

Example Two: *A test of national identity*

Ming Pao, a prestigious local Chinese newspaper, revealed that a so-called "test of students' national identity", recommended by the Education Bureau's section on moral and civic education, required students to indicate how they would feel if they were mistakenly identified as Japanese. The report noted that students would be requested to perform self-criticism if they answered that it was an honour to be identified as Japanese (Fung, 2009).

Example Three: Primary teaching kit – *I Have Learnt the National Song*

This teaching kit was produced for the instruction of junior primary students. According to the guidelines, after teachers have instructed students that playing the national song often causes an emotional response and that some people will cry in response to hearing it, students are required to recite out aloud that they are Chinese and that they are also proud to be Chinese. This indicates that teachers were expected to teach in a manner that pressurises students to respond in a certain way. Efforts to prompt a correct emotive response (point iii) can be discerned as a form of indoctrination. Such biased teaching materials are not singular incidents, for as noted earlier, teaching kits of a similar nature have been used in schools in Hong Kong for quite some time (Leung, 2012). However, this most recent effort to push a particular approach to national identity through the education system prompted an outpouring of unrest amongst the general public in Hong Kong.

In discussing these examples of the potential for indoctrination and bias in the case of national education in Hong Kong, we must reiterate that the Moral and National Education curriculum was shelved before its implementation as in September 2012, the Chief Executive, Mr CY Leung, announced that the MNE curriculum would be suspended. Furthermore, given the fact that Hong Kong was only recently reunited with mainland China, it is understandable that national curriculum documents would be concerned with the nurturing of national identity and promoting patriotism amongst students. However, at question is the degree of emphasis and balance so that what is achieved does not fall into forms of indoctrination and the use of biased materials.

Should the focus be national education or civic education?

One of the major arguments put forward by the government to support the replacement of civic education by national education was that all countries in the world have their own form of national education and hence there should be no exception for Hong Kong. However, this view clouds the fact that though all countries have some form of civic education, it is rarely called national education (Leung, 2012). In fact, creating a subject titled national education which specifically aims at promoting national identity and patriotic feeling is not in accord with world trends. Japan's effort to nurture national belonging, for example, is not through a national education subject, but instead focuses on promoting learning experiences about national identity through subjects such as language, art and history. Similar approaches can be identified in the curricula of Taiwan, U. K., and Australia. In these countries, nurturing a sense of belonging to the nation is accompanied by an emphasis on critical thinking, independent judgment and democratic values (Yuen, 2013).

Similarly, Ben-porath (2007) notes that in many democratic states education 'about' the nation is framed within civic education and framed by a democratic vision of society. Both Pang (2013) and Yuen (2013) argue further that the term national education is commonly used to denote basic, compulsory education and the associated education policy and system of a country in the literature. In fact, even in the consultative document for MNE, the countries quoted in the document used the term civic education instead of national education, with the exception of Singapore which used both civic education and national education together (CDC, 2011). Moreover, MNE was self-contradictory because it adopted an expanding, concentric circle model of multiple citizenships, starting from the personal and developing outward to the family, and then to local, national and global forms of citizenship (CDC, 2011), which is

similar to Heater's (1990) Cube of Citizenship model that identifies the multiple facets of citizenship. In this model it is clear that national citizenship is only a subset of multiple citizenships and it can by no means replace the whole of it.

Should MNE be a mandatory, independent subject for schools?

Another argument against the implementation of MNE in schools was that the timetable in schools is already full and there is no room to insert MNE as an independent subject into the existing timetable as suggested by the government (Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union, 2011). Moreover, claims were made that this subject would cause an overlap in the teaching of content in General Studies in primary schools and in Liberal Studies, Chinese History and Chinese Language in secondary schools (Ngai, 2013). On the other hand, approaches such as permeation in which elements of civic education are permeated or infused in different subjects in the formal curriculum and in extra-curricular activities, were preferred by teachers (Fraillon, Schultz & Ainley, 2012; Lee & Leung, 2001).

Critics such as Leung (2012) argue that if national education is to be framed within civic education for democratic citizenship, as suggested by Ben-porath (2007), an independent subject may be necessary, because considerable time is required for the teaching and learning of civic knowledge, values and skills. The *Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools* released in 1996 by the Curriculum Development Council of the Education Department summarised the arguments for a specific subject approach as being systematic and better focused. Furthermore, there were numerous calls from politicians, educators, academics and civil society to make civic education a mandatory, independent subject, and this was accompanied by requests for the government to shift from capacity building measures (such as the provision of teacher training, teaching packages, and the adoption of a school based approach) to establishing a mandatory subject. It was argued that this approach would be in the interests of securing more effective implementation of citizenship education (Fairbrother, 2010; Fairbrother & Kennedy, 2011).

Such approaches should not be understood in vacuum but considered against the realities facing the education of young people in Hong Kong. Although a packed timetable can be a problem with civic citizenship as can be seen in the experience of the United Kingdom (Whiteley, 2012), there are cogent reasons to argue for devoting specific timeslots in the school timetable to the teaching of civic education in schools in the case of Hong Kong. In fact, Morris (1992), by examining the ill fate of the *Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools* (1985), has already made the case that civic education can fall into oblivion once it has no visible slots in the school timetable. Furthermore, concerns have already been raised about the limited allocation of suggested hours per year for civics and citizenship education in Australia in the forthcoming implementation of the first national curriculum in that country (Tudball & Henderson, 2013). However, due to school-based curriculum development in recent years, school autonomy and control over curriculum content has been widely accepted as beneficial to cater for learners' differences and this should be respected (Fairbrother, 2010). A school-based curriculum development approach becomes particularly important in civic education involving national identity and fostering loyal sentiments towards the nation given that the students can be substantially different due to place of origin, race, and even political affinity.

With reference to balancing the concerns of teachers and the required teaching and learning time for civic education, it was suggested that specific timeslots should be assigned to the implementation of civic education which should be taught in its own right according to school-based planning (Leung, 2012). However, the essence of an immersion approach, that is, making effective use of learning activities about civics and citizenship in other subjects, is reinforced when it is also embedded in a whole-school approach informed by the school's ethos or philosophy and extended into cross- and extra-curricular activities. This will strengthen the civic learning of students on the one hand, and reinforce other learning experiences at the same time. The perceived problem of curricula overlap will not be a serious issue as long as it stays short of repetition, which of course can be managed through effective planning and coordination.

Looking forward: What's next?

Following the debates, protests and final withdrawal of the Moral and National Education document by the HKSAR government, we would like to suggest a third way through which civics and citizenship can

be achieved in Hong Kong. We contend that a form of non-indoctrinatory national education can be achieved by reframing national education within civics education for multiple forms of citizenship (Leung et al., 2012). In this approach, civic knowledge and understanding would be framed within political education so that students can learn about politics, democracy, traditions, structures and process and how society is managed, by whom and to what end. At the core of this approach to civic education in Hong Kong is the concept of the 'critical patriot', as detailed below. The civic education we envisage should be based on a new set of guidelines, which have the above characteristics, and can position civic education in a national and globalised context in ways that avoid the indoctrination which parochial national education can bring. We argue that the notion of civics in *Civic Education Guidelines from Civil Society* (Leung et al., 2012) can be considered as a starting point of reference.

Reframing national education within civic education for multiple citizenships

We contend that Moral and Civic Education must replace Moral and National Education and that national education must be reframed within the scope of civic education, with a democratic vision. Our position on civic education in Hong Kong is that this form of education is not limited to developing a national identity. Rather, civic education provides opportunities for students to consider themselves as citizens with multiple identities of which national identity is one part. Whilst national education is significant, it is one component of the multiple forms citizenship people experience in the 21st century. McLaughlin's (1992) maximal view of citizenship is relevant to the discussion for he implies a broad and inclusive approach to civics education, often referred to as education for democratic citizenship. This approach "encompasses skills and attitudes for participation in democratic processes, as well as knowledge necessary for citizenship" (Osler and Starkey, 2005, p. iii).

Political education as the core of civic education

The civic education of students in Hong Kong schools has long been depoliticised by mixing civic education teaching content in with sex education, interpersonal education, and moral education, etc (Leung & Yuen, 2012b; Ngai, 2005). This is problematic in the education of young people as future citizens of Hong Kong. Hong Kong's constitutional status as a special administrative region means that Hong Kong cannot decide its own constitutional future. Given this hybrid regime under the Basic Law and its power dependence on China, the dynamics of civil society in Hong Kong are complex. As citizens in Hong Kong anticipate the democratisation of the political system, it seems that Hong Kong might be able to elect its Chief Executive in 2017 and Legislative Council in 2020 by universal suffrage. Hong Kong is an international city with strong connections to global and regional communities, and young people need opportunities to be educated in ways that prepare them to respect plurality and fulfil their civic responsibilities at the local, national and global levels, in accordance with universal values, such as human rights, social justice, rule of law, amongst others. It is clear that depoliticised approaches to civic education in Hong Kong are obsolete (Leung & Yuen, 2012a) and cannot prepare young people for the realities of negotiating the challenges of the 21st century. The nurturing of democratic political culture through education is vital for the future of Hong Kong and its citizens. In order to assist our students to understand the coming democratisation and their new national identity, as well as making informed judgments over political controversies, political education is critically and urgently needed. It is important, however, that the teaching of politics should be done in a non-indoctrinatory way, aiming at the nurturing of politically literate, critically thinking and active, participating citizens.

Conclusion: The concept of the critical patriot

Hong Kong is one of most advanced and dynamic cities in the world. It has a vibrant civil society, a large middle class, free press, and an independent judiciary. We argue that the focus of education in the Hong Kong SAR should not be on indoctrination. The cultivation of patriotic students who are loyal to their country without a critical mind is a form of education that denies citizens of their civic rights and suppresses their potential to participate effectively in society. Rather, emphasis must be placed on preparing young people to be actively participating and critically thinking citizens in Hong Kong. If educated as critical patriots (Fairbrother, 2003; Leung, 2007), young people will encounter opportunities to learn how to function through multiple forms of citizenship as they develop their awareness of their identity as citizens of Hong Kong and China.

In terms of what this means in the classroom, when teachers are teaching aspects of national education, they should provide learning experiences for students to engage with the bright side of China (emphasis on the achievements of the People's Republic of China [PRC]) together with the dark side of China. In this way, students can critically engage with the complexities of modern China as a dynamic nation and be cognisant of the challenges of citizenship in the PRC and in Hong Kong. As critical patriots, mindful of their identity shaped by history and politics, students can also engage with the challenges of contemporary citizenship that include dealing with those global challenges resulting from demographic shifts such as inclusion and exclusion, diversity and unity in the context of a growing multi-ethnic society (Leung & Yuen, 2009). Schools should provide opportunities for their students to experience and reflect in critical ways on these diverse civic experiences without being indoctrinated (Leung et al., in press) and students should be equipped with an appropriate civic education so they can be active and informed citizens in varied contexts.

References

Advanced Institute for Contemporary China Studies. (2012). 中國模式國情專題教學手冊 [China Model National Conditions Teaching Manual]. Hong Kong: National Education Services Centre.

The Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. (1990).

Ben-porath, S. (2007). Civic virtue out of necessity: Patriotism and democratic education. *Theory and Research in Education*, 5(1), 41–59 .

Brownhill, R., & Smart, P. (1989). Political education. London: Routledge.

Chan, K. K. (1996). 香港公民教育的回顧與前瞻 [A review and preview of civic education in Hong Kong]. In K. K. Lau & S. C. Lee (Eds.), 道德與公民教育：東亞經驗與前瞻 [Moral and civic education: Experiences and the future of the East Asiaregion] (pp. 229–248). Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, The Hong Kong Institute of Education Research.

Curriculum Development Council. (1985). *Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools*. Hong Kong: Author.

Curriculum Development Council. (1996). *Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools*. Hong Kong: Author.

Curriculum Development Council. (2011), *Moral and national education curriculum guide (Primary 1 to Secondary 6) (Consultation Draft)*. Hong Kong: Author.

Curriculum Development Council. (2012). *Moral and national education curriculum guide (Primary 1 to Secondary 6)*. Hong Kong: Author.

Fairbrother, G. P. (2003). The effects of political education and critical thinking on Hong Kong and mainland Chinese university students' national attitudes. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 24, 605–620.

Fairbrother, G. P. (2010). Alternative policy measures for improving citizenship education in Hong Kong. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 6(1), 77–90.

Fairbrother, G. P., & Kennedy, K. J. (2011). Civic education curriculum reform in Hong Kong: What should be the direction under Chinese sovereignty? *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41, 425–443.

Fraillon, J., Schulz, W. & Ainley, J. (2012). *ICCS 2009 Asian Report: Civic knowledge and attitudes among lower-secondary students in five Asian countries*. Amsterdam: IEA.

Fung, L. L. (2009, October 4). 初小推愛國教材家長憂洗腦 [Junior secondary national education teaching materials make parents worry about brainwashing]. *Ming Pao*, A14.

Green, T. F. (1972). Indoctrination and beliefs. In I. A. Snook (Ed.), *Concepts of indoctrination* (pp. 25–46). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Heater, D. (1990). *Citizenship: Civic ideal in world history, politics and education*. London: Longman.

Henderson, D. (1994). Imperialism in Hong Kong. In C. Mackerras (Ed.), *Imperialism, colonialism and nationalism in East Asia – History through documents* (pp. 71–106). Melbourne: Longman Australia.

Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union. (2011). 支持真正國民教育 [In support of a genuine civic education] [Press release]. 9 August, 2011. (In Chinese).

Lee, W. O. (2004). Citizenship education in Hong Kong: Development and challenges. In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy, & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), *Citizenship Education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and Issues* (pp. 59–80). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre.

Lee, W. O., & Leung, S. (2001). Institutional constraints on promoting civic education in Hong Kong secondary schools: Insights from international educational achievement data. In L. Limage (Ed.), *Democratizing education and educating democratic citizens: International and historical perspectives* (pp. 267–289). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Lee, W. O., & Sweeting, A. (2001). Controversies in Hong Kong's political transition: Nationalism versus liberalism. In W. O. Lee & M. Bray (Eds.), *Education and political transition: Themes and experiences in East Asia* (pp. 101–121). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre.

Leung, Y. W. (2007). Understandings and teaching approaches in nationalistic education: The case of Hong Kong. *Pacific-Asian Education*, 19(1), 72–89.

Leung, Y. W. (2012). 國民教育爭議的回顧與前瞻 [A review and preview of the national education debate]. In Y. C. Ip (Ed.), 為下一代覺醒 [Awaken for the next generation] (pp. 74–82). Hong Kong: Enrich Culture.

Leung, Y. W., & Ng, S. W. (2004). Back to square one: The "re-depoliticizing" of civil education in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 24(1), 43–60.

Leung, Y. W., & Ngai, S. K. G. (2011). Competing citizenship identities in the global age: The case of Hong Kong. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 6(3), 251–267.

Leung, Y. W., & Yuen, W. W. T. (2009). A critical reflection on the evolution of civic education in Hong Kong schools, *Pacific–Asian Education*, 21(1), 35–50.
Leung Y. W., & Yuen W. W. T. (2012a). Competition between politicized and depoliticized versions of civic education curricula: The case of Hong Kong. *Citizenship Social and Economics Education*, 11(1), 46–57.

Leung Y. W., & Yuen W. W. T. (2012b). The development of civic and moral education in Hong Kong's changing context. In J. J. Cogan & D. L. Grossman (Eds.), *Creating socially responsible citizens. Cases from the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 35–56). USA: Information Age Publishing.

Leung, Y. W., Yuen, W. W., & Ngai, S. K. (in press). Personal responsible, participatory or justice-oriented Citizen: The case of Hong Kong. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*.

Leung, Y. W., Cheung, Y. F., Li, C. W., Chong, K. M., Ip, K. Y., Tang, Y. N., et al. (Eds.) (2012). [*Civic education guidelines from civil society*]. Retrieved September 11, 2013, from http://www.hkptu.org/education/wp-content/uploads/civic-education-2012.pdf

McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235–50.

Morris, P. (1992). The abuse of educational evaluation: A study of the evaluation of the implementation of the Civic Education Guidelines. In P. Morris (Ed.), *Curriculum development in Hong Kong* (2nd ed., Education Paper 7, pp. 102–119). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, Faculty of Education.

Ngai, S. K. G. (2005). *What kind of political socialization in secondary schools is needed in Hong Kong in the 21st Century*? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hull, England.

Ngai, S. K. G. (2013). Be fair to national education. In Hong Kong Institute of Education Student Union (Ed.), *Our ideal civic education: Controversies on moral and national education* (pp. 30–34). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education Student Union.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democratic and inclusion in education*. London: Open University Press.

Pang, I. W. (2013). What I see, think and hear about national education. In Hong Kong Institute of Education Student Union (Ed.), *Our ideal civic education: Controversies on moral and national education* (pp. 77–80). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education Student Union.

Sweeting, A. (Ed.). (1990). *Differences and identities: Educational argument in late twentieth century Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.

Tse, K. C. (1997). *The poverty of political education in Hong Kong secondary schools*. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies.

Tudball, L., & Henderson, D. (2013). *A new civics curriculum for Australian schools – Is it national education?* (CGC Working Paper Series No. 2013/001). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education, Centre for Governance and Citizenship.

Whiteley, P. (2012). Does citizenship education work? Evidence from a decade of citizenship education in secondary schools in England. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 2012, 1–23.

Yep, R. (2007). Links with the mainland. In W. M. Lam, P. L. T. Lui, W. W. H. Wong, & I. Holliday (Eds.), *Contemporary Hong Kong politics: Governance in the post-1997 era* (pp. 245–264). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Yuen, W. W. T. (2013). Viewing the controversies of national education in Hong Kong from the perspective of a civic educator. In Hong Kong Institute of Education Student Union (Ed.), *Our ideal civic education: Controversies on moral and national education* (pp. 212–214). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education Student Union.

Yuen, W. W. T., & Byram, M. (2007). National identity, patriotism and studying politics in schools: A case study in Hong Kong. *Compare*, 37(1), 23–36.

Dr George Siu-Keung Ngai is an assistant professor at the Department of Education Policy and Leadership of the Hong Kong Institute of Education. He holds a doctorate from the University of Hull, England. His research interests and projects cover various aspects of the field of education including civic and citizenship education, principal leadership, gender and small class teaching. Dr Ngai helps to run programs related to principal training and certification for principalship in Hong Kong and he holds the award of the certification for principalship issued by the Education Bureau. Dr Ngai also serves as a school manager of two schools in Hong Kong.

Dr. Leung Yan Wing is an associate professor of the Education Policy and Leadership Department and the co-Director of the Centre for Governance and Citizenship, the Hong Kong Institute of Education. Dr Leung received his Ph.D. in civic education from the University of Sydney. Currently he researches and teaches on civic education, human rights education, national education, values education, civic missions of schools, political socialization, democratic school governance, students' participation, civil society and educational policies. Dr Leung has published widely in international, regional and local journals and has presented papers in many international and local conferences.

Dr Timothy W.W. Yuen serves as an Assistant Professor in the Education Policy and Leadership Department of the Hong Kong Institute of Education. His research interests focus on citizenship/political education and education policies. Dr Yuen's recent publications can be found in Intercultural Education, International Journal of Educational Management, Compare, Citizenship Teaching and Learning, International Studies in Educational Administration, and Citizenship, Social and Economics Education: An International Journal.

ARTICLE

"Words, not deeds": "Active citizenship" and the Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship

Brian Hoepper

Abstract

This paper describes the changing fortunes of "active citizenship" in the Civics and Citizenship learning area of the evolving Australian Curriculum. Early publications by the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) affirmed the importance of active citizenship. This began with the *Draft Shape Paper's* acknowledging that the field of Civics and Citizenship Education was changing – with increasing emphasis on active citizenship – and declaring that the curriculum would help students to practise citizenship behaviours in local and virtual communities. However, as the developmental process continued through a final *Shape* paper and a consultation *Draft Curriculum*, that early promise was weakened substantially. A final curriculum document is, at time of writing, imminent. In the face of this unpromising prospect, this paper derives both warning and encouragement from a UK longitudinal study, and describes two initiatives that demonstrate, in markedly different ways, the possibilities of active citizenship.

Introduction

A warm glow of anticipation, even optimism, arises when a curriculum document references the *Melbourne Declaration of Educational Goals for Young Australians* (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs [MCEETYA], 2008). The statement includes so many laudable and visionary sentiments that it is sometimes hard to believe it was published by a gathering of education ministers. Ever since the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) and its antecedent National Curriculum Board began producing Australian Curriculum documents, its publications have referenced the *Melbourne Declaration* in almost reverential terms. ACARA has declared that the *Melbourne Declaration* provides direction for the development of the Australian Curriculum. Not surprisingly, that has raised great expectations.

Great expectations

In the evolving story of the *Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship*, expectations have been raised and, in some cases, dashed. This article refers to one example – the promise to embed active citizenship in the curriculum. The promise featured in the earliest ACARA iterations of Civics and Citizenship (CCE). But, as it transpired, it was not wholly secure. This article analyses the fate of the active citizenship approach, beginning with the seminal *Draft Shape Paper in Civics and Citizenship* (ACARA, 2012a).

The paper referenced the *Melbourne Declaration* as follows:

> Civics and Citizenship education in schools helps citizens to sustain their democracy. The link between schooling, citizenship and democracy is enshrined in every set of Australian education goals, most recently in Goal 2 of the *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australia* (MCEETYA, 2008), which states that all young Australians should become active and informed citizens [who]:
>
> • act with moral and ethical integrity
> • appreciate Australia's social, cultural, linguistic and religious diversity, and have an understanding of Australia's system of government, history and culture
> • understand and acknowledge the value of Indigenous cultures and possess the knowledge,

skills and understanding to contribute to, and benefit from, reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians
- are committed to national values of democracy, equity and justice, and participate in Australia's civic life
- are able to relate to and communicate across cultures, especially the cultures and countries of Asia
- work for the common good, in particular sustaining and improving natural and social environments
- are responsible global and local citizens. (ACARA, 2012a, p.4)

Many of the words are powerfully evocative: moral and ethical integrity, reconciliation, justice, common good, responsible. But, surprisingly for such an important public declaration, there is a puzzling ambiguity in the overall message. Put simply, are the young people in Australia's schools expected to only learn about these powerful ideas, values and actions … or to put them into practice as essential elements of their education in Civics and Citizenship? Will they, for example, simply examine what it means to act with integrity, contribute to reconciliation, relate across cultures, work for the common good and participate in Australia's civic life? Or will they have opportunities to do those things they have learned about? The message of the *Melbourne Declaration* is that young Australians should become "responsible global and local citizens"(MCEETYA, 2008, p. 8–9) – which could be interpreted to mean either while they are still at school or later, as adults.

This is more than playing with words. The difference between learn about and put into practice lies at the heart of debates about what CCE should be. For example, Tudball and Gordon (2014) declared recently that:

> Through learning experiences in school that involve students actively in local issues, or in debates about contemporary issues at the national or global level, students can be active citizens while they are still at school, rather than deferring participation in community life. (p. 305)

A sharp distinction among approaches to the field of Civics and Citizenship Education was proposed back in 1992 by McLaughlin, who posited a continuum from minimal to maximal. The minimal tag, with which he labelled civics education, was described as formal, content led, knowledge based and didactic transmission. By contrast, the maximal tag, with which he labelled citizenship education, was described as participative, process led, values based and interactive interpretation. While this distinction between civics and citizenship is crude and challengeable, the continuum does provide some markers for describing how ACARA has defined and developed the CCE field in its *Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship*.

The evolution of the Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship

By late 2013, the process of developing the *Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship* had involved draft and final *Shape* papers and a consultation draft curriculum document. The consultation process informed the final *Years 3-10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship*, due for publication by the end of the year.

The Draft Shape Paper

In the *Draft Shape Paper in Civics and Citizenship*, ACARA (2012a) seemed to position itself firmly in the maximal camp. For example, it declared that:

> The preparation of active and empowered citizens includes opportunities for students to apply democratic principles, practise behaviours and to actively engage in practical citizenship activities within schools, in the community and online. (p. 3)

and listed a "set of skills that will enable students to be active and engaged as well as informed and critical participants in their multiple communities" (p. 10). Clearly, the practice was to be active and the scope was to be extensive.

In later pages, the *Draft Shape Paper* reinforced and extended these admirable aims. It advocated "opportunities for students to engage in activities as a member of a group, to address problems and issues for themselves and positively influence social outcomes that are relevant to their lives now and in the future" (ACARA, 2012a, p. 7) and envisaged students being "encouraged to become increasingly active in forms of citizenship participation, from class and whole school activities to community and global projects" (p. 12). Middle and senior secondary students in particular would come to "see themselves as active players in community life . . . concerned about national and international social and environmental issues and the ethical implications of human activity and knowledge" (p. 13).

Contextualising this advocacy, the *Draft Shape Paper* noted a recent and important shift in the CCE field, viz.:

> Over the past two decades in Australia and internationally, there has been a broadening of the concepts, processes, and practices in Civics and Citizenship education. In particular there has been an increased emphasis on the role of active citizenship, both as explicit content and as a key outcome of Civics and Citizenship education. (ACARA, 2012a, p. 8)

So, it seems, CCE was to position active citizenship as curriculum content and as curriculum outcome. And, as the previous quotes indicate, the active citizenship would focus on issues and ethical implications, was to have positive effects both now and in the future, and was to extend from the classroom, into the community, and onto the global stage.

Given the above, it is little wonder that the *Draft Shape Paper* declared that the *Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship* would present "exciting and challenging opportunities for school authorities, schools and teachers" (ACARA, 2012a, p. 2).

The Final Shape Paper

The *Draft Shape Paper* was a consultation document, and the subsequent consultation informed the final *Shape Paper* published in October 2012. This latter paper maintained much of the visionary tone of the consultation version, beginning with its embrace of the Melbourne Declaration. However, for those keen to see the vision not diluted, there were some worrying differences. One difference, possibly signaling a circumscribing of the original vision, was in the treatment of active citizenship. Here is how this term was defined in the *Shape Paper's* section on Key Terms and Definitions:

> Active citizenship refers to involvement and informed participation in the civic and political activities of society at local, state, national, regional and global levels. For the purpose of this curriculum, reference to active citizenship is primarily about student citizenship in a school and community context that ultimately contributes to the development of students as adult citizens. (ACARA, 2012b, p. 23)

Note how the second sentence qualifies the first in a significant way. ACARA's approach to active citizenship would see it limited primarily to the school and community context. Participation at state, national, regional and global levels would be the preserve of adult citizens. This seems a far cry from the consultation draft's depiction of students being increasingly active in not just the school and the community but also in "global projects" (ACARA, 2012a, p. 12) and "actively . . . working with national and international NGOs" (ACARA, 2012a, p. 2).

While the *Shape Paper* appeared to tone down some of the visionary elements of its consultation antecedent, a more important question was how visionary the final curriculum document for CCE would be. At the time of writing this article, that stage had not been reached. But, in May 2013, the penultimate document – the *Draft Years 3–10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship* (ACARA, 2013) – was published. It too was a consultation draft, and that public consultation process continued until August.

The Draft Years 3-10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship

Given the promise of the Shape papers – which did indeed raise hopes for a curriculum of exciting and challenging opportunities – this consultation draft is disappointing. Put bluntly, the document seems to be

located largely within McLaughlin's (1992) minimal approach. The focus is more on civics than on citizenship, and therein lies the danger that the final curriculum will be content led and knowledge based rather than participative, values based and interactive. Should that eventuate, the curriculum runs the risk of being bland and boring rather than exciting and engaging.

The disappointment doesn't arise, however, from a reading of the preliminaries of the curriculum draft. In fact the Rationale expresses many valuable and admirable intentions about "effective participatory citizenship", "the multidimensional nature of citizenship", "the role of the citizen today within an interconnected world", "critically analyzing", "diverse perspectives", and contributing to "the common good" (ACARA, 2013, p. 4). The last of four Aims perhaps sums up the intention of the curriculum: "to ensure that students develop . . . the capacities and dispositions to participate in the civic life of their nation at a local, regional and global level" (ACARA, 2013, p. 5).

But the disappointment emerges when the specific Content Descriptions and Elaborations for each year level are examined. The greatest cause for concern is the lack of commitment to an active approach to citizenship. This is described below.

"Planning, not doing"

An approach used consistently across the curriculum can be characterised as "planning, not doing". In terms of a sporting analogy, it is akin to a team training, drilling and practising . . . but never playing a game. Here is an example from Year 4:

> **Content Description**
> Problem-solving and decision-making
> *Work in groups to identify problems, possible solutions and a plan for action.
>
> **Elaborations**
> *Dividing tasks between members of a group to facilitate collaboration.
> *Identifying possible solutions to a problem, for example, people breaking a particular law, and locating people or organisations within the local community that could be approached to help resolve the issue. (ACARA, 2013, p. 17)

At first glance, this all seems worthwhile. But the significance is in the verbs. For example, problems, possible solutions and a plan for action are to be *identified*; useful people are to be *located* who *could* be approached; and those people *could . . . help resolve the issue*. But, in terms of actually doing something to solve the problem, nothing is to be attempted. There will be a plan for action, but no action – rendering the heading "problem-solving and decision-making" rather misleading. In fact, developing a plan for action is a mandated activity in every year level from 3 to 10. But not once is there any suggestion that the plan be translated into action. Even at Year 10 level, when the most adventurous and sophisticated active citizenship might be expected, the only suggested activities in the Elaborations are:

- interviewing people with connections to a country in the Asia region
- developing a survey to conduct an opinion poll
- developing an information session for people intending to become dual citizens (ACARA, 2013, pp. 33–35)

Meanwhile, at the other end of the spectrum, Year 3 students go no further in action terms than "organising and running class meetings that involve collaborative decision-making processes" and perhaps being both motivated and frustrated by "investigating how they *could* [italics added] participate in a school or community project" (ACARA, 2013, p. 14).

Verbs, in fact, are a giveaway throughout the curriculum document. Overwhelmingly, the verbs in the Content descriptions and Elaborations signal study but not action. When describing what students will do, the verbs that predominate are identifying, exploring, defining, discussing, recording, analysing, explaining and (yes!) planning for action. The same emphasis is seen in each Achievement Standard. Even at Year 10, the processes to be assessed are compare, identify, describe, recognise, evaluate, analyse, develop an argument, reflect, present their ideas and planning for action.

All of these processes are vital and important. They reflect the inquiry process that infuses the curriculum. Through these processes, students will develop the underpinning knowledge without which they will not be in a position to participate as active and informed citizens. But, for any CCE curriculum to embrace the *Draft Shape Paper's* vision of "citizenship participation, from class and whole school activities to community and global projects" (ACARA, 2012a, p. 12), those inquiry processes need to be complemented by processes of active and authentic engagement.

The complete but disappointingly short list of active and participatory proposals in the *Draft Curriculum* is as follows:

Year 3
Organising and running class meetings that involve collaborative decision-making processes; creating and presenting a position on an issue (ACARA 2013, pp. 14, 15)

Year 4
Investigating the impact of services provided by local government (p. 17)

Year 5
Participating . . . in the school's decision-making process; using digital technologies to share and discuss ideas about how people can work together as local and global citizens to develop strategies for environmental sustainability; identifying the audience for a digital presentation about an issue and using communication strategies that appeal to, and connect with, that audience (pp. 18, 19)

Year 6
Conducting an interview to learn about [family or community members'] experiences of being an Australian citizen; examining the impact that a local community proposal might have on different groups (p. 22)

Year 7
Recording evidence of diversity in the local community (p. 24)

Year 8
Interviewing community members (p. 28)

Year 9
[None]

Year 10
Developing a survey to conduct an opinion poll; interviewing people with connections to a country in the Asia region; developing an information session for people intending to become dual citizens (pp. 33, 34, 35)

Even with this short list, a caveat is necessary. In some cases, it is not clear whether real action – or simply preparation for possible action – is envisaged. For example, in Year 10, it is not clear whether the opinion poll will be conducted. Nor is it clear whether the planned information session will be delivered to the group of people intending to be dual citizens.

A Year 9 element is particularly unclear. One Elaboration lists "*proposing* [italics added] different options to resolve a contentious issue and *identifying* [italics added] the benefits for all parties involved and acceptable compromises" – suggesting planning rather than actual working through of a contentious issue with all parties involved. The corresponding Achievement standard, in mangled prose, states that "When *planning* [italics added] for action, students *use democratic processes* [italics added] . . . to *use appropriate strategies for the negotiation and resolution* [italics added] of these issues" (ACARA, 2013, p. 32). What that means is anyone's guess!

There is a notable statement in the consultation *Draft Curriculum* that could explain why learning through action is not a key element of the curriculum:

> Students' interest in and enjoyment of civics and citizenship can be enhanced through participation in school and community activities, for example, student governance, community service programs, parliamentary education programs and the work of non-government organisations (including at the international levels). (ACARA 2013, p. 13)

As already noted, the content descriptions for the various year levels offer limited opportunities for students to experience these avowedly interesting and enjoyable activities. But, most disappointingly, the statement implies that the curriculum writers recommend the activities as interesting and enjoyable, but not as powerful and effective forms of learning.

So, not surprisingly, the document's description of Civics and Citizenship Skills states: "The Civics and Citizenship Skills strand focuses on the skills of questioning and research; analysis, synthesis and interpretation; problem-solving and decision-making; and communication and reflection" (ACARA 2013, p. 5). As acknowledged earlier, these are all vital and valuable. But participation is not mentioned and, in the related detail, planning for action is as adventurous as it gets.

Lessons from the United Kingdom

In terms of active citizenship, there seem to be valuable lessons to be learned from the recent history of CCE in the UK, where Citizenship Education has also been included in the national curriculum initiative. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) commissioned the National Foundation for Educational Research to conduct a longitudinal study of the implementation of Citizenship Education from 2001 to 2009. In 2005, the project's fourth annual report was published, focused on Active Citizenship. The report's context was "a growing recognition of the link between citizenship education in schools and wider policy initiatives which attempt to increase the participation and engagement of children and young people in society" (DfES, 2005, p. iv).

The report was largely bleak but mildly optimistic. It concluded that "the perceived contribution of citizenship education to the creation of opportunities for active participation within school did not appear to be, overall, very great among the teachers and students interviewed" (DfES, 2005, p. 49). In a telling comment that could have implications for the Australian experience, the report proposed a causal factor – that the case-study schools "appeared to have concentrated on developing the curriculum aspects of citizenship education more than the area of active participation" (p. 49). What the report labeled curriculum aspects were what in the *Australian Curriculum* would be termed civics and citizenship knowledge, and the report expressed concern with students being overly focused on "learning details" (p. 80). Overall, the report observed that this "delivery focus" meant that "in some schools the citizenship curriculum has become divorced from the notion of citizenship as an active practice with links to the school culture and wider communities beyond school" (p. 74).

The report proposed a complex list of reasons for the delivery focus on learning details, and some have particular pertinence for the Australian situation. The report stated that "the leading challenges were precisely those arising from curriculum delivery, namely pressure on time, assessment, status of the subject and teachers' subject expertise" (DfES, 2005, p. 74). It's worth pausing to reflect on the extent to which these very same factors have impacted upon the implementation of the Phase 1 subjects of the *Australian Curriculum* and might impact increasingly on the Phase 2 and 3 subjects, including Civics and Citizenship. And, in a comment both dispiriting and promising, the UK report stated that "tellingly, engaging students, links with the local community and student participation in the school, the elements of citizenship as an active process in and beyond school" were identified by teachers as "lesser challenges" than the "leading challenges" listed above (p. 74). That suggests that, were the oppressive demands of the leading challenges to be reduced, teachers might find implementing an active citizenship approach neither too daunting nor too difficult.

Another promising factor identified in the UK report was the apparent readiness and willingness of young people to embrace an active approach to CCE. As the report stated:

> Many of the young people interviewed clearly valued both the concept and practice of participating in a community, whether inside or outside of school. . . . Many also showed a willingness to take responsible action in their local neighbourhoods to make them better and safer places to live. . . . This enthusiasm and sense of social obligation, provides a sound basis upon which schools might develop opportunities for active citizenship. (DfES, 2005, p. 70)

That sound basis, of course, will come to nothing unless teachers create appropriate opportunities. The report concluded that there was a need for "citizenship education delivery in schools to develop a more active focus" (DfES, 2005, p. 80) but was undecided about the likelihood of that happening, and mused about whether the lack of active citizenship was "merely a stage in the process of citizenship bedding down in schools" or "a more permanent and limiting development" (p. 86).

It's worth thinking about how the forthcoming Australian implementation will compare with this British experience. At present, the ACARA context seems less encouraging than the British. In Britain – as the report's very existence indicates – active citizenship is very much on the official agenda. There is no official impediment to its implementation. Rather, the challenge is to have teachers embrace it. Here in Australia, it's a bit different. Over time, the emphasis on active citizenship has lessened in the successive ACARA documents providing scant official support for its practice. And thus the challenge for teachers will be to embed active approaches in their taught curriculum despite the fairly unsupportive official document.

For those teachers, signposts abound. The following section describes two projects which demonstrate – in markedly different ways – approaches to active citizenship. One project is global in reach and professional in organisation; the other is local and small-scale.

What is possible?

The first – the Round Square project – might be beyond replication in many Australian schools, but its boldness could inspire Australian teachers to reconsider what is possible in their own situation.

Round Square

A stark contrast exists between ACARA's increasingly unadventurous formulations of Civics and Citizenship and the extraordinary vision and program of Round Square, a decades-old global association of over a hundred schools (including some in Australia). Round Square's vision does not mention the word "citizenship", but its statements resonate with the most expansive and ambitious notions of active, global citizenship. It "promotes six IDEALS of learning: Internationalism, Democracy, Environment, Adventure, Leadership and Service. These are incorporated into the curriculum throughout all member schools" (Round Square, 2012a, para. 2).

Beyond the formal curriculum, students in Round Square-affiliated schools can be involved in exchanges, conferences and projects both locally and further afield. Most ambitious are the community projects undertaken in developing countries.

> Tasks tackled through the community projects include building schools, classrooms and community centres; building clean water systems for remote hill-tribes or creating and maintaining trails in National Parks. Local materials are used, and teams always work with local people ensuring that they take ownership of the work once it has been completed. (Round Square, 2012a, para. 4)

The project claims that "the Round Square spirit permeates each school community. This promotes transformational action, participatory responsibility and character development in every individual" (Round Square, 2012b, para. 2). While both Round Square and the *Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship* aim to equip school children for the future, the former is clearly more ambitious and adventurous in pursuing that aim. As suggested, it might encourage Australian teachers to rethink what is possible in their own setting.

The Boondall Project

Far removed from the scope and resources of Round Square is a school-based project from over 20 years ago. Many readers will probably know or have participated in something similar. Countless imaginative initiatives have been developed in Australian classrooms over the years, some embracing citizenship in both name and focus, but others reflecting commitments to education for sustainability, school improvement, community development or service learning. The Boondall Project is a tiny part of that broad and valuable movement.

Two teachers and an academic developed the project in a 60-strong Years 4–6 team-teaching class in a Brisbane school. In brief, this is what happened. The students studied a local issue – the proposal to develop the nearby Boondall wetlands to provide infrastructure for hosting an Olympic Games and for post-Games urban development. Over 10 weeks, significant time was given to the project, incorporating the curriculum areas of Social Studies, English, Science and the Performing and Visual Arts. Students visited the site, studied the development plans, met with community groups, were visited by conservationists and a city councilor, and followed the issue through official documents, media releases, press coverage and activist publications. With deliberate focus, Critical Thinking was named, explained, demonstrated, practised and applied as a central process of the project. The students worked towards "D" (for "decision") Day, when each chose to be pro-development, anti-development or compromise/undecided. Then, in those respective groups, they worked for several weeks towards an advocacy event – a night when parents and others were invited to the school to view informational and persuasive displays and to experience an hour of dramatic and musical performances aimed at convincing the audience. The finale was a critical thinking song – Weigh It Up – composed using the creative help of a willing and talented parent and sung together by the three mingling groups.

The project was described in an article which focused on the comments students wrote in the ensuing evaluation. Here are four comments selected from dozens:

- I do not think I will ever forget Boondall as it is the first subject where I have really used my brains. (Melanie, 8)
- I also learnt how to think critically about things and not just jump into everything. (Lisa, 9)
- I learnt to be tolerant of people and respect their values and to help them with their work too. (Lisa, 9)
- Get with other people affected and put forward your case at a meeting, to the council, the complaints tribunal, or the company involved. (Ross W., 11) (Hoepper and Knight, 1996, pp.33–34)

The student responses indicated that they appreciated a curriculum experience in which they engaged with a real world issue, had access to stakeholders, were challenged intellectually and were able to advocate in a heartfelt way to a significant audience. These seem desirable outcomes for a Civics and Citizenship curriculum (but, lamentably, outcomes not promoted in the ACARA document under scrutiny).

A key factor in the Boondall Project was the creation of sufficient time for in-depth investigation by integrating a number of subjects. This overcame the frustrations of the "only 30 minutes a week" lament about those subjects outside the privileged literacy and numeracy fields. The generous slabs of time for the project allowed patient and careful approaches to some aspects, particularly the development of critical thinking. It also allowed the students to stay focused on the project for extended periods – particularly welcome when the groups were constructing displays and writing/rehearsing the final performance. In these ways, Boondall reflected Wallace, Venville and Rennie's (2005) advocacy of community focused integration – "Starting from a real-life community issue rather than within a discipline" (p. 163) – as the most valuable approach.

Lessons for ACARA

Two lessons for ACARA can be gleaned from the above.

First, an integrated approach could advantage the new *Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship*, which might otherwise struggle to gain a toehold in the already crowded school day. A focused active

citizenship curriculum unit using an integrated approach across, for example, Civics and Citizenship, English, History, Geography, Economics and the Arts, could overcome the frustrating tyranny of timetabling. Strangely, the consultation draft makes no mention of integration other than the integration of the civics and citizenship strands. The words "history", "geography" and "economics", for example, do not even appear in the document. And yet the precursor *Shape Paper* had insisted that the curriculum would present "an opportunity to build on strong synergies with particular humanities and social science subjects as well as other learning areas and subjects" (ACARA, 2012b, p. 21). The draft curriculum offers no encouragement or advice on such synergies. Teachers, perhaps, will know better.

The second lesson is that a simple but powerful revision could rescue the new curriculum from the weakness described in this paper. Put simply, the curriculum's repeated advice to have students plan for action can be extended to include authentic action itself. So, for example, the Year 3 meeting that presents a position on an issue could go on to plan and enact a response to that issue; the Year 6 interview that probes the impact of a local community proposal could inform a report on how to enhance the positive and minimise the negative impacts of that proposal; the Year 10 developing an information session could extend to developing, publicising and conducting that session with the intended audience. The audiences for the various student actions will vary, but will include ones already familiar to many CCE teachers – school assemblies; parents; specific community groups; local councils; local newspapers, radio and television; commercial organisations; governments at state and local levels. But wider audiences might also be found through social media appropriate to the particular students. Ideally, the selected issue, the targeted audience and the planned action will be real and appropriate. In a word, authentic.

Summing up

Tudball and Gordon (2014) claim that "research has shown that for students to be active citizens, they must learn through purposeful investigations of issues in local, national or global contexts. If their participation extends into these communities in authentic ways, the learning can be powerful" (p. 317). Early developments in Civics and Citizenship in the Australian Curriculum laid a promising foundation for such powerful learning. The later consultation Draft Curriculum, however, eroded that foundation. Unless the final curriculum document reinvigorates that initial promise, Australian students will be poorly served in the quest to be "informed and critical participants in their multiple communities" (ACARA, 2012a, p. 10).

References

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012a). *Civics and Citizenship: Draft shape paper.* Sydney: Author.

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012b). *The shape of the Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship*. Sydney: Author.

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2013). *Draft Years 3–10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship*. Sydney: Author.

Department for Education and Skills. (2005). *Active citizenship and young people: Opportunities, experiences and challenges in and beyond school. Citizenship education longitudinal study (4th annual report)*. Annesley, UK: DfES Publications.

Hoepper, B., & Knight, J. (1996). Boondall – A controversial issue in the classroom. *Bulletin / Bicentennial Australian Studies Schools Project*, 6, 30–34.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235–250.

Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. (2008). *Melbourne declaration on educational goals for young Australians*. Carlton South: Author.

Round Square. (2012a). Welcome. Retrieved July, 15 2012 from http://www.roundsquare.org/

Round Square. (2012b). Where we do it. Retrieved July, 15 2012 from, http://www.roundsquare.org/where.php

Tudball, L., & Gordon, K. (2014). Teaching for active and informed citizenship. In R. Gilbert & B. Hoepper (Eds.), *Teaching humanities and social sciences: History, geography, economics and citizenship in the Australian Curriculum* (pp. 297–320). South Melbourne: Cengage.

Wallace, J., Venville, G., & Rennie, L. (2005). Integrating the curriculum. In D. Pendergast & N. Bahr (Eds.), *Teaching Middle years: Rethinking curriculum, pedagogy and assessment* (pp. 149–163). Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Brian Hoepper taught history and social science subjects in secondary schools and subsequently taught in QUT's education faculty at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. In recent years he has worked for the National Centre for History Education and was contracted by ACARA as an adviser in the development of the Australian Curriculum: History. Brian has developed curricula at state and national level, co-authored texts for school and university and presented Professional Development programs for state, Catholic and independent teachers. His most recent publication is Teaching Humanities and Social Sciences (Cengage 2013), co-edited with Professor Rob Gilbert.

ARTICLE

Trialling the Draft Years 3–10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship – A teacher's perspective

Jim Orpe

The Friends' School, Tasmania

Abstract

This paper provides a teacher's perspective on the May 2013 *Draft Years 3-10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship* (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2013) made available for public consultation and trialled in selected schools. In particular, it focuses on the experience of trialling the curriculum at The Friends School in Hobart, Tasmania during June 2013 through the conceptual frames of Values and Vision, Policies, and Practice. In doing so, the paper considers how the curriculum might be linked with the values and vision of The Friends' School and raises practical issues such as time availability, and the role of the General Capabilities and Cross Curricula Priorities, together with an overview of the program approach chosen at the school.

Introduction

As a teacher at The Friends' School, Hobart it is always a pleasure to be involved in discussions about professional matters, particularly those directly related to teaching and learning. I am fortunate that our school encourages staff to participate in trials and other professional activities. So, I signed up to trial aspects of the May 2013 *Draft Years 3–10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship* (ACARA, 2013), and I also volunteered to trail Economics and Business (but that's another story!).

My role at The Friends' School is as a member of the Humanities Faculty; one of a group of teachers who have been grappling with the introduction of four curriculum documents in the Australian Curriculum for the areas of History, Geography and now Economic and Business, and Civics and Citizenship. This is a challenge both from policy and practice viewpoints. Not least amongst these issues is the battle for time in the school timetable. When considering how to approach the daunting task of writing a reflective paper about this experience, I fell back on one of my favourite analytical tools, by breaking down my thoughts and reflections under the headings Values and Vision, Policies, and Practice.

Accordingly, the paper is structured as follows. The discussion of values and vision will consider both the school's value set and the values underlying the Civics and Citizenship (CC) curriculum. The discussion will also consider how well the *Draft Years 3–10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship* (ACARA, 2013), henceforth *CC Curriculum draft*, fits with the longer term outcomes developed during a secondary education. Under Policies I will consider how The Friends' School is approaching the implementation of the new CC Curriculum (alongside the other Humanities curricula). Finally in the section on Practice, I will examine aspects of the trial held at the school earlier this year together with some practical issues relating to the implementation at grass roots level. I am writing from the perspective of a secondary school teacher of students in Years 7–12, and therefore I have considered the impact at the primary school level only in passing.

Values and Vision

The Friends' School has a clear values base to its curriculum, both in the explicit/formal and implied/social curricula as set out in the school's statement on Purpose and Concerns:

> The Friends' School is a co-educational Quaker school based on fundamental values such as the intrinsic worth of each person, the recognition of 'that of God' in everyone, the desirability of simplicity and the need to establish peace and justice. As a learning community, we are

concerned for the academic, cultural, physical, social and spiritual development of each person in our care.

We seek to help our students develop into men and women who will think clearly, act with integrity, make decisions for themselves, be sensitive to the needs of others and the environment, be strong in service and hold a global perspective.

We believe that these aims can best be achieved with the active support of all members of our School community. (The Friends' School, n. d., para. 1–3)

This values emphasis on encouraging students to be informed citizens aligns with the conceptual approach to citizenship in the CC Curriculum document. The statement of aims in the CC Curriculum makes this clear in the first and fourth bullet points that refer to "the active and informed citizen" and "having the capacities and dispositions to participate in the civic life at a local, national and global level" (ACARA, 2013, p. 5). As evidenced in the above extract from the Purposes and Concerns, encouraging student to be informed citizens is core business at the Friends' School and in taking the opportunity to trial part of the CC Curriculum, we were interested in the ways in which the CC Curriculum could be embedded with some of our current approaches to teaching Democracy and Law.

Clearly though, the concept of citizenship is more than just providing the factual information about the institutions of democracy and the law. As stated above, the Aims of the curriculum make this clear: its conceptual focus is concerned with the active and informed citizen who is equipped to take a participatory role in civic society. I particularly like the use of the terms capacities and dispositions here (ACARA, 2013, p. 5), notably as the term disposition is understood to include both moral will and the ability to act. This alignment between the CC Curriculum emphasis and the philosophy of the Friends' School helped to inform our approach to the implementation of the new curriculum in the classroom.

In terms of vision, I contend that both the school and the CC Curriculum seek to embed longer term outcomes than those simply measured in a traditional secondary education focus. This is to be welcomed, as in recent times too much emphasis is often given to immediate outcomes. It is my view that the authentic success of secondary school education is found and realised in the development of socially positive, societally active and informed adults.

Policies

So how do we, as a school, a faculty and as individual teachers go about the planning of the implementation of this new curriculum? As stated earlier, we have the daunting prospect of trying to manage the implementation of four new curriculum documents under the push for the Australian Curriculum in our faculty. As a Phase One discipline, History was the "first off the block" in the suite of the Humanities and Social Sciences curriculum areas to be implemented at the school, and this curriculum has already taken a great deal of our thoughts and actions to reach the position we are now in. History will soon be followed by the implementation of Geography in the F–10 years and then Civics and Citizenship and Economics and Business.

At a school level the friendly, professional but intense battle for time and resources naturally ensues. Mathematics and Science in particular have a wish for more time not less, and yet where is the time for implementing those subjects identified in the Humanities and Social Sciences of the Australian Curriculum to come from? To complicate the challenge of an already crowded curriculum, we also have to deal with securing adequate time for implementing The Arts and Technology as part of the agenda for a national curriculum. This issue of time is a central one in the implementation of new curricula. The drive is always on to make sure no important area of study is omitted, and yet at the same time, the expectations within each discipline area seem to increase both in terms of quantity and quality. Twenty hours a year may not seem much for the CC Curriculum, but when this subject needs to be combined with the demands of History, Geography and Economics and Business, the facilitation of adequate time is actually difficult to achieve. As well as the time dimension, there is a curriculum creep of expected depth going on. That is, more depth needs to be encountered in knowledge and understanding together with associated skills as

students progress through their schooling, and this is made explicit in the Achievement standards for each discipline in the Australian Curriculum.

The Australian Curriculum has three design elements that include the disciplines, the General Capabilities (GCs) and the Cross Curricula Priorities (CCPs). Consideration has to be given as to how the knowledge, skills and dispositions that apply across subject areas which equip students to be lifelong learners (the seven GCs) and three contemporary issues, identified as CCPs, will also be appropriately embedded during implementation. My experiences in the introduction of new curricula in three countries (UK, New Zealand, and now Australia) make me wary that these aspects of the Australian Curriculum will receive adequate attention. It could be argued that teachers and their management leaders will continue to think in discipline or subject terms alone, and not consider the three dimensional design of the new curriculum. As the structure of the Australian Curriculum does emphasise a discipline focus for learning, my view is that teachers will continue to have some concerns regarding how and who should coordinate the GCs and the CCPs to ensure they are addressed. At The Friends' School we have a cross curricular program called Connections which seeks to have a wider view and deal with topics in a broader cross curricula way. It may be that policy attention at school level will be needed to address the way in which the GCs and CCPs are catered for at the secondary level.

The next part of the paper address the policy outcomes addressed thus far in planning for implementation at The Friends' School. As noted earlier, at a school level, the battle for time remains on going, but is mainly resolved by teachers making the most of the available time. With reference to the challenges of implementing GCs and CCPs, the school climate is such that it is assumed teachers across the faculties will be professional in planning for these in their specific learning areas. This is not surprising, and it has been my experience that subject specific curricula are better understood and more often implemented than whole or cross curricula approaches. This doesn't mean that teachers and their managers do not agree with these capabilities' importance, rather it indicates that the main organisational and professional trend in secondary education is still towards subject delivery. It is wise, therefore, that the CC Curriculum document specifically suggests how the GCs and CCPs might be incorporated, as this is the way these areas will most likely be addressed in schools, that is, via embedding them in specific subject areas. New texts and resources emerging for History have shown that it is possible to integrate the subject content, the subject skills and selected and relevant aspects of the GCs and CCPs, and I hope this will prove to be the case for Civics and Citizenship.

Another policy consideration is to ensure that the structure of the curriculum is clear and understood by the teachers designing school-based programs. Is the Civics and Citizenship structure written so that teachers find it accessible? I think the Aims are clear (see Values and Vision section). The year level descriptions and achievement standards are appropriate, clear, and crisp, and helpful for writing program guides and assessment criteria. The tables making distinctions between content descriptions and elaborations is a useful idea. However, I am still not sure whether it is wise to split the tables between knowledge and understanding and skills. The merging of these two aspects is left to the designers of school programs and teachers. Progression through the year levels from local to national and then global perspectives is reasonably clear, with the very clear emphasis on global considerations in Year 10. This is a strength in the CC Curriculum. Given the discussion thus far, the next section details how the Civics and Citizenship curriculum be implemented at The Friends' School.

The Year 7 and 8 curriculum will be delivered through the Humanities program which immediately raises the major issues of time and balance. The Humanities program at these levels will be seeking to address History, Geography, Civics and Citizenship and Economics and Business. In an already crowded timetable, the time allowance is two 1 hour lessons a week. The Phase One introduction of the *Australian Curriculum History: F-10* as a compulsory subject to Year 10 has, not surprisingly, already taken up much of the planned time. How this will pan out in practice is yet to be seen, as the introduction of the two newest curricula here will not be a priority for 2014, and are more likely to emerge in 2015.

At Year 9 and 10, there will be a new option which will combine the CC Curriculum and the Economics and Business curricula. This policy decision has led to feverish preparations with professional development days already used in the planning for this new direction. The student selection process for 2014 has

already been completed, and healthy numbers of students have chosen this course. The new option is called Economics Business and Law (EBL). EBL leads neatly into our senior college Years 11 and 12, where a range of Humanities subjects are offered at pre-tertiary level. These include Economics, Business Studies, Accounting and Legal Studies. The Civics and Citizenship curriculum also fits well with our implied/social curricula, as our senior college has a strong emphasis on service, participation and citizenship.

Practice

The trial of a selected aspect of the Draft CC Curriculum took place during June 2013. It was decided that we would use the opportunity presented by using a Year 9 Humanities program which already included a Unit on Australian Democracy to trial a selected aspect of the draft curriculum. The Civics and Citizenship content chosen for the trial was *The role of contemporary political parties and independent representatives in Australia's democracy and the formation of Government*.

This part of the curriculum was not novel for the school having formed part of the Year 9 Humanities program in a related form for a number of years. This content followed on from History curriculum content considering the period of Federation, and the structures of government of Australia that developed as a result. Bringing the content up to contemporary times was therefore relatively straight forward. The specific trial item was delivered as a 1 week (three 1 hour lessons) component of the wider content on Australia's democratic system. The three lessons were structured as follows:

- one lesson focused on student research using the internet to investigate political party's national and local websites. It was decided to use a group research structure with short presentations using visual (Powerpoint etc) support as a conclusion;
- one lesson for presentations and questions from audience;
- one follow up lesson to ensure coverage of the role of parties in the formation of government, using the 2010 general election as a case study. Being in Hobart, we have a particular interest in the role of independents and the formation of Government.

The time allowance of three hours for this content coverage seems the right balance when the full draft curriculum would require 20 hours during the year for effective delivery. Using a rough guide, there are seven content description areas in the Year 9 section of the curriculum, so each might be allocated an average of three hours for delivery. This allowance of time dictated the depth to which the investigation and follow up could go. On this occasion there was no homework set nor any formal assessment as these can extend or reduce the time available for coverage.

The groups were chosen by the teacher to ensure mixed abilities and ranges of skills in each group. This class has the benefit of a support teacher from our student support centre, with a remit to assist students known to require learning assistance. There were six groups, and they were allocated by lucky draw to investigate the Liberal Party, the Labor Party, the National Party, the Greens, Katter's Australian Party and the Socialist Party. Each group used web and text resources to create a short presentation (5 to 8 minutes) on each party's platform (Who are they? What do they stand for?). The follow up lesson included a discussion of key vocabulary and main terms, and a discussion of the current make up of Parliament with a minority Government. The 2010 results were used as a case study.

Students were surveyed on their response to both this trial and a parallel one on the Economics and Business curriculum. Students were positive in their view that the content was appropriate to their age and enjoyed the research and the presentations. However, they also felt there should have been more time to discuss the parties' views and platforms, and to go a bit more into the way the 2010 Government was formed.

So, what was gained from the trial? In this case, the timing of three hours indicated clearly the level of coverage and depth that was going to be possible, that the content material could be delivered and was appropriate for the Year 9 level. This gave a degree of confidence going forward to more detailed planning for 2014. However, the content chosen was a safe choice. It was closely aligned to existing program material.

Are there issues in planning for 2014 at Years 9 and 10?

The Year 9 curriculum content does not seem to pose any particular problems of preparation and delivery. The content areas are ones which we already have some understanding of, and practice in delivering through teaching-learning programs. Certainly the Government and Democracy and Law and Citizens sections are ones we can source information on and feel reasonably comfortable with. The Citizenship, Diversity and Identity section would be more novel and maybe could be related to English and Media programs and resources.

The Year 10 curriculum poses some challenges. I appreciate the global nature of the content here, but finding resources and information has already begun to be a challenge. The section on Government and Democracy is great in intention, but appropriate materials at a Year 10 level are not easy to find. I have endeavoured to make contacts with schools in Asian countries to team up over the comparison of political systems and this may be an exciting future direction, however it requires contacts, luck and a lot of work. The other content areas too, take the subject to depths not currently well covered in texts and resources. Hopefully publishers will provide some resources as the curriculum is implemented. Maybe there is a need for a national approach to the sharing of contacts and information, but who would this be organised by and through? This is an issue for the revision of the draft curriculum following the trail phase and public consultation.

Related to this is the need to address the Asian region as part of Australia's response to globalisation, for if the nation is serious about the Asian Century (Commonwealth of Australia, 2012) and filling in the gaps in our national knowledge about the various countries and peoples in this region, the education sector is going to need to find some ways to get the information, perspectives and resources to do this job. I personally do not feel I have enough knowledge myself to teach about many Asian countries.

Overall, I am excited about the new possibilities afforded in the CC Curriculum and reasonably happy we can deliver an effective program at Year 9. I am apprehensive about the Year 10 program and finding age-appropriate information and resources to support this level. Student response to the information provided for the 2014 option program in Economics Business and Law (EBL) has been positive. The numbers of students choosing the option for next year suggest that they are interested in these areas and enthusiastic about the program.

Another area of practical concern is the link between secondary and primary programs. My colleagues at primary level tell me that they already struggle to have staff with the required expertise to cover disparate specialist subject areas and do them justice. I have had only the most cursory discussion with our own primary section on this matter, and they are concerned about the Year 5 and 6 content in this curriculum. Their concerns seem to be the depth of the content and the ability of generalist staff to adequately deliver this. Also, where do teachers find the time to plan for the new curriculum's requirements? The issue for me is how confident can I be that the earlier year levels in the curriculum will be adequately addressed before the students arrive in Year 7? Or will we need to do bridging on arrival in the secondary program to address the shortfall in student knowledge and understanding? This is not a criticism of our primary colleagues, but a concern about their workloads and about continuity and progression when the various disciplines encompassed by the Humanities and Social Sciences in the Australian Curriculum are implemented.

Conclusion

There is much to be welcomed in the approach of the CC Curriculum. First, the values and vision underlying the document fit well with the need to develop an engaged and participatory society with capable citizens willing to take active roles as citizens. Second, issues and discussions remain over the amount of time available within the secondary timetable to accommodate this and other curricula. The amount of time suggested for Civics and Citizenship means that it can be covered at one level, but the time available does dictate the level of depth to which this can be done. The trial held at The Friends' School supports this conclusion. Whether the depth that will be achievable will meet the intentions of the curriculum writers and Advisory Panel remains to be seen. Third, there are concerns that the General Capabilities and Cross Curricula Priorities will be seen as a supplementary areas of lesser significance

and not afforded due emphasis during implementation. Fourth, issues of resourcing the new areas of study also remain, in particular with regard to the Year 10 content. Finally, as with all curricula which cover both Primary and Secondary years, there are the issues of continuity between the sections, and the difficulties of resourcing in Years 8 and below. As with all new approaches to curricula, the potential of the new Civics and Citizenship Curriculum will be determined by how teachers implement it in their classrooms.

References

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2013). *Draft Years 3-10 Australian Curriculum: Civics and Citizenship*. Sydney: Author. Retrieved July 20, 2013, from http://consultation. australiancurriculum.edu.au/Static/docs/HSS/Draft%20Years%203%20-%2010%20Australian%20 Curriculum%20-%20Civics%20and%20Citizenship%20-%20May%202013.pdf

Commonwealth of Australia. (2012). *Australia in the Asian Century White Paper*. Canberra: Australian Government. Retrieved November 15, 2012, from http://asialink.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_ file/0004/645592/australia-in-the-asian-century-white-paper.pdf

The Friends' School (n. d.). *Purpose and Concerns*. Retrieved September 25, 2013, from www.friends. tas.edu.au/welcome/purpose_and_concerns

Jim Orpe is currently a teacher at The Friends School, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia. His current teaching areas are Economics, Business, and Civics and Citizenship. Jim has extensive experience in secondary school teaching and education management roles in England, New Zealand and Australia. Jim is a former National Assessment Officer for the New Zealand Qualifications Authority and National Manager (Resources) for the Qualifications Development Group, Ministry of Education, New Zealand. Jim has been involved in the development of national qualification systems and national curriculum implementation in both England and New Zealand.

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

The Social Educator provides a forum for innovative practices and research in relation to Social and Citizenship Education. The journal encourages submissions of manuscripts from educational researchers, teachers and teacher educators and invites contributions that address Social and Citizenship Education curriculum broadly and the teaching and learning of it in schools and tertiary education.

Feature Articles

The journal encourages authors to contribute manuscripts that analyse and contribute to the field of Social and Citizenship Education, including: original research, theoretical analyses, social commentary and practitioner exchange. The journal conducts a rigorous peer review process for all manuscripts submitted. To this end, The Social Educator continues to present outstanding work in the field of social and citizenship education writ large that connects local studies with global impact and blurs the boundaries between national and international settings.

Guidelines for manuscripts

Articles for consideration should be sent in electronic format (WORD.doc or .docx) to the Co-editors, Peter Brett at peter.brett@utas.edu.au or Angela Colliver Education Consultant accspty@gmail.com

Papers should address Social and Citizenship Education curriculum broadly and/or the teaching and learning of it in schools, tertiary education and/or community contexts.

Articles should be no more than 5000 words in length (inclusive of references and spaces taken by tables and/or figures which are calculated at 500 words per page).

Papers are to be typed in 12 point font, paginated, with generous margins and formatted with 1.5 line spacing. All pages are to be numbered. Each paper should include an abstract if approximately 150 words. Resource reviews may be between1000 and 3000 words in length. Authors will be asked to use a proforma for such work. Articles are to follow conventions for scholarly work and be print ready. Any images should be high resolution. Acronyms should be explained in full when first mentioned.

Please note: If you are using images and figures, please contact the Editor to ensure that the work will meet print requirements.

For anonymity in reviewing, author's name(s), affiliations, postal addresses, emails and telephone numbers should only be on a separate covering page.

References should follow the guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA). Authors are asked to avoid the use of footnotes and to use endnotes sparingly. References should be cited within the text of your paper and be listed alphabetically, in full, at the end of the paper, using the APA Style:

Dowden, T. (2007). Relevant, challenging, integrative and exploratory curriculum design: Perspectives from theory and practice for middle level schooling in Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 34(2)*, 51-71.Retrieved August 21, 009, from http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=263863;res=AEIPT

Gilbert, R. (2004). Studies of society and environment as a field of learning. In R. Gilbert (ed.), *Studying society and environment: A guide for teachers* (3rd ed., pp. 4-21). South Melbourne: Macmillan.

Reynolds, R. (2009). Teaching studies of society and environment in the primary school. South Melbourne, Victoria: Oxford University Press.

Victoriana Curriculum and Assessment Authority. (2005). *Victorian Essential Learning Standards: Overview*. East Melbourne: Author. Retrieved July 19, 2005, from http://vels.vcaa.vic.edu.au/about/overview.html

Copyright

The Social and Citizenship Education Association of Australia holds copyright for all materials published in The Social Educator. It is a condition of copyright that all authors include a transfer of copyright agreement when submitting articles. Access the transfer of copyright agreement on the SCEAA website at http://www.sceaa.org.au