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Civic education has regained momentum over the past one to two decades when more and more governments in various jurisdictions are awakened by a greater need for allegiance, responsible behaviours, and participation from their citizens. With the escalating impacts of globalization, the conventional notion of civic education founded on nation-states has been subject to rigorous challenges. Critics keep questioning whether contemporary citizens need to play a more active role in the global milieu. People in Hong Kong who live in an international cosmopolitan are for sure no exception. The global development trend in civic education is thereby unstoppable. It is a pity that global citizenship education has drawn the attention of local school educators and researchers not until the end of the last millennium. Hitherto, not so many relevant research reports have been published locally. Of the limited amount of research studies, none is related to the understanding and explanation of teachers’ global perception of civic education within a particular context. The study in this thesis is an attempt to bridge this gap.

This thesis concludes the significance of global citizenship education in civic education of Hong Kong. It also examines the influential factors for the formation of the perception of teachers of global citizenship education, who teach the independent civic education curriculum at the junior secondary sector in Hong Kong. The factors are extracted from the socio-political, personal, educational, curricular and school contexts. Data are collected through a mixed method approach comprising a questionnaire survey and a follow-up interview. The data analysis is based on a conceptual model developed from the Cultural Historical Activity Theory. In brief, the key findings are that most of the abovementioned contextual factors, except collectivism and the Confucian value of education in the socio-cultural domain, are found influential in shaping the studied civic educators’ global perception of civic education. Positive correlations are also found between most of the contextual factors,
except collectivism and the Confucian value of education, and the teachers’ global view towards civic education.

The study results have implications for policy and practice of preparing competent school civic educators under the new global era of civic education. In practice, pre-service and in-service teacher education programmes in Hong Kong should be better designed to suit the contextual needs and global development as identified in the study. On the policy side, education policy makers are expected to work hand in hand with all the stakeholders such as teachers, school leaders and teacher educators to ensure a sufficient and adequate provision of teacher education opportunities for civic education teachers in Hong Kong.
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CHAPTER ONE  INTRODUCTION

1. 1 Why Civic Education Is Relevant?

The Growing Importance of Civic Education

Understanding of civic education differs from nation to nation, from race to race, from place to place, or even from people to people (Heater, 1990). Varied interpretations come up even within the same nation (Sears, 1994). Not only is this due to a lack of a coherent social, moral and ethical system in various societies or to individuals cultivating such variation, but discord may possibly be another major reason (Lo & Man, 1997). This is evidenced by at least two studies conducted by S. H. Cheung (1996) and Sim (1992) in which civic education are found differently from country to country to comply with what types of citizen a ruling party would like to nurture. In fact, civic education is itself an elusive term (Heater, 1990; Janowitz, 1980, Pratte, 1988). A number of comparative studies in civic education, including Kennedy (1997), Hahn (1998), and Torney-Purta et al. (1999, 2002), explicitly reveal that a broad range of interpretations of civic education stems from the complex and contested nature of the notion of citizenship. As a result, some argue and advocate that civic education should be understood in context. The understanding may take various forms including cultural, political, social, or even economical.

In Hong Kong, school civic education has undergone substantial changes since the end of Second World War. According to the analyses of Morris (1997a) and Morris & Chan (1997), the role of civic education since 1945 can be divided into three distinctive periods. From 1945 to 1969, the subject, once called Civics, was primarily used to counter any direct threats to the legitimacy of the colonial government. Between 1965 and 1984, the focus shifted to the economic development
of Hong Kong and the avoidance of offending the sensitivity of China. From 1984 onwards, the school subject was increasingly impacted by the impending reversion of sovereignty and the resulting crisis of legitimacy for the colonial government. The similar analysis can also be found in Tsang (1998) and Lee (2005a). The implementation of civic education in Hong Kong before 1997, the year for the return of the sovereignty of Hong Kong to China, was largely criticized as ineffective by local academics (e.g. Chan, 1996; Tse, 2000b; Tsang, 1994; Leung, 1997). It is because the indoctrination consequent from the colonial education is seen as stressing heavily on alienation and depoliticization; and trivialized (Leung, 2006; Ng & Leung, 2004; Lee, 2005a).

Another reason might be that the school subject was deliberately marginalized to alleviate its influence upon students’ emotional attachment to their motherland, Mainland China. In the past, Hong Kong Education Regulations Number 98 prohibited political activities in schools and the Director of Education (now Secretary for Education) had the authority to dispel students who involved in political activities (Cheung & Leung, 1998). It is unsurprising that the restriction on the discussion of sensitive political issues in schools was relaxed not long ago with an amendment of the Education Regulations in allowing schools to organize activities that do not have adverse effects on students’ welfare and education and to disseminate “unbiased” political information and opinion (Law, 2007).

Whatever the actual reason might be, there is little doubt that the importance of civic education has been inclining since 1997 with the advocacy of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) Government. The Government’s initiative and commitment as such was openly reflected in the first Chief Executive’s first policy address (Tung, 1997) in which civic education was recognized as the top
priority for attention in the Hong Kong society. Well before this policy address, the Hong Kong Education Department (now the Education Bureau) spelt out clearly in the Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools,

“Within the last decade, Hong Kong is experiencing rapid changes in social, economic and political development. In the transition to the twenty-first century and with the resumption of the exercise of sovereignty by China over Hong Kong in 1997, there is a special need for schools to strengthen civic education, with a view to preparing students to become rational, active and responsible citizens in facing challenges arising from the above changes” (Education Department, 1996 p.1).

Following the footsteps of his predecessor, the current Chief Executive of the HKSAR Government, Mr. Donald Tsang, made it very clear in his 2006/07 and 2007/08 policy addresses (Chief Executive, 2006 & 2007) that civic education should continue to be promoted in Hong Kong. He considers that Hong Kong needs to encourage quality people to pursue a political career in order to prepare for the democratic development of the territory. The school curriculum should provide five essential learning experiences in moral and civic education, intellectual development, community service, physical and aesthetic development, and career-related experiences for lifelong learning, and whole-person development of students. The promotion of national education is an established education policy and one of the priority areas in the curriculum reform.

Civic education is not uniquely emphasised in Hong Kong but has been identified as a general trend in other parts of the world (Kennedy, et al. (2002); Print 2000). Murray Print remarks an increased interest in civic education in recent years worldwide including countries in the Asia and Pacific region. Cogan & Morris (2001) assert,

“Civics education and its role in the development of citizens has, over the last decade, emerged as a critical area of discussion and concern as societies strive to develop educational policies and school curricula
designed to promote a variety of conceptions of a ‘good citizen’” (p.1).

Based on their observation, the governments of England, Australia, the United States, Taiwan, Japan, and Thailand have made immense efforts to promote civic education in their countries in the last decade. One emergent and rising trend was on the inculcation of youngsters’ global perspective in schools. Such observation was validated by Morris et al. (2002) who undertook a comparative overview of civic education across six countries located in the Pacific Rim (Australia, Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, and the United States). The study partly concludes,

“In all the societies the state has increasingly engaged in developing explicit government policies designed directly to orient the school curriculum to promote civic education and inculcate students with civic education” (p.170).

With the growing importance of civic education in both Hong Kong and the international community, questions about its meaning in the local context will become unavoidable and necessary. A brief introduction of the local environments in relation to civic education is provided in the next section.

The Case of Hong Kong

Hong Kong provides nine years of free and universal basic education, six years from Primary One to Primary Six and three years of junior secondary from Secondary One to Secondary Three. All students aged six to fifteen are entitled to free school places (Olsen & Burges, 2006). Since the 2008/09 school year, the free secondary education (i.e. Secondary Four and Five) has been provided through public sector schools (HKSAR Government, August 2009). In the same year, there were 246,514 students pursuing studies at the junior secondary sector in 503 local secondary schools (except the international schools) as reflected in the statistics of the Education
Bureau (the education authority of the HKSAR Government).

Currently, Civic Education is one of the secondary school subjects under the key learning area (KLA) of Personal, Social and Humanities Education (PSHE) in the Hong Kong junior secondary school curriculum. The PSHE KLA was introduced in the local curriculum reform in the early 2000s. The other subjects are Economics & Public Affairs, Religious Education, Geography, History, Integrated Humanities, Social Studies and Life & Society (under consultation). Schools are at large given a freehand on the choice of the subject(s) to suit their own needs based on the concept of “School Based Curriculum Planning” as manifested in the School Administration Guide issued by the Education Bureau on 27 January 2010. That is, schools try to decide on the contents that their students should learn by making reference to the curriculum framework prepared by the Curriculum Development Council (CDC), which is a free-standing advisory body appointed by the Chief Executive of the HKSAR Government to advise on matters relating to curriculum development for the local school system. The nature of 'school-based curriculum development' thereon varies between schools and is essentially the outcome of a balance between directions from the CDC and the autonomy of the schools and teachers in adapting the CDC curriculum.

It should be gratifying to note the launch of the independent Civic Education syllabus at the junior secondary school sector in 1998 which exemplifies the emphasis of civic education and global citizenship education in Hong Kong. The syllabus has a broad coverage of citizenship related topics and areas such as citizenship & civic society, major global issues, and international community in the lyrics. Unfortunately, the independent syllabus has been gradually sidelined due to the local curriculum reform in the early 2000s with a strong emphasis on curriculum integration.
Consequently, not a big portion of the local secondary schools keep offering the independent syllabus. More and more schools offer the curriculum of “Integrated Humanities”, which has a broader orientation to meet six strands of objectives including personal & social development, time, continuity and change, culture & heritage, planet environment, resources & economic activities, and social system & citizenship. While some may argue that civic elements can be imparted through the last objective, the diluted attention towards civic education in the new subject elicits doubt whether the new generation’s citizenship and civic competency will be one way or another weakened.

In examining the implementation of current educational reforms in Hong Kong, Morris & Scott (2003) criticize that civic education is a prototype of symbolic policy. Albeit the related official guidelines are provided little support for its implementation is actually in provision. They continue to concede that in the post-colonial era, there were controversies in the promotion of civic education between the emphasis on patriotism, nationalism and Chinese cultural identity on the one hand, and to the quest for critical thinking and active and democratic citizenship on the other.

The emphasis of national education can be seen in the current Guide to the Secondary One to Five Curriculum (http://www.edb.gov.hk/index.aspx?nodeID=3206&langno=1&print=yes) in which considerations are given to the social, economic, political and cultural arenas when the rationale for the aims of the secondary curriculum is elaborated. For the political consideration, students are expected to develop social and civic awareness, a sense of civic responsibility, and the power of analytical thinking for making rational judgment. Equally important, students should be enabled to acquire greater understanding of China through both
formal and informal curricula. As a matter of fact, there has been a pressing need for national education in Hong Kong since the 1997 handover (Tse, 2007 a & b).

It is discernible that a closer tie lies between Hong Kong and China since 1997 (Yam, 1997) due to economic integration, and the transfer of sovereignty. The powerful influence of China on Hong Kong’s school curriculum is observed by Morris, et al (1997). Morris (1997b) argues that the Hong Kong government changed the criteria for the selection of valid curriculum knowledge given the impending transfer of sovereignty in 1997. The concern of the sensitivity has shifted from the colonial government towards Mainland China. Some sensitive political issues and aspects of Mainland China are more acceptable for discussion, e.g. the suppression of the student movement in Tiananmen Square in 1989. Despite such relaxed restriction, it is doubtful if Hong Kong has genuinely benefited from the rational kind of nationalism, namely critical patriotism or suffered from hegemony of loyalty (Fairbrother, 2003). Whether the current civic education curriculum is sophisticated enough to instill a sense of nation among school students are doubted by Hughes & Stone (1999).

The divergent political institutions in the two places cause the fundamental differences in the civic education orientation (Tse, 1999; P. L. Cheung, 1996; Fairbrother, 2004). The Fairbrother’s (2003) study results cited by Hahn & Alviar-Martin (2008) illuminate that China’s civic education is primarily to promote for an ideology of patriotism, nationalism and morality whereas civic education of Hong Kong is depoliticized. Apart from the different orientations, the highly centralized and controlled mode of implementation of civic education in China is hard to be accepted by the Hong Kong people (Lee, 1998). Politically, conflicts deriving from the different ideological orientation between Hong Kong and Mainland China are brought
to light by the study of Ho, et al. (2003) wherein a collision of divergent political cultures of the two places can be contingent upon the transfer of sovereignty from Britain to China in 1997 and that can result in two antagonistic political orientations that predicted confidence in the future of Hong Kong.

How effective Hong Kong people’s national identity can be cultivated, as literally expected, through the current civic education curriculum is queried by Hughes and Stone (2009). They cast doubt if the curriculum is able to resolve the tension between nation-building and democratization. The tension is caused by the conflicting curriculum aims to the emphasis of Chinese nationalism on the one hand, and the development of political literacy for the working of complex, globalised and increasing democratic societies on the other.

Expansion of Civic Education

Before setting out a deeper search for the meaning of civic education in Hong Kong, an understanding of its evolution in recent decades or centuries should be grasped. Needless to argue, what civic education connotes depends closely upon what is meant by citizenship from which the subject originates. In the past, citizenship was usually understood as a legal status and identity in a political community in which an individual was bestowed with some kind of rights enshrined by the law. Starting from the 1950s, the commonly accepted rights of an individual expanded from civil rights to political rights and social rights following the prominent writing, “Class, Citizenship, and Social Development: Essays” of the Englishman T. H. Marshall (1964). This expansion continued and that citizenship no longer merely connotes membership of a legally constituted political community, a civil society, but transcends the boundary of a civil society into a global environment. The physical
distance between citizens in different places has been shrinking resulting from a rapid
development of communication technology.

Apparently, contemporary educators attach greater and greater importance to
the nurturing of global citizens (Ramirez, 1997; Mahlstedt, 2003). Osler & Starkey
(2006) identify six key contextual factors leading to the considerable growth in the
citizenship education over the past decade: global injustice and inequality,
globalization and migration, concerns about civic and political engagement, youth
deficit, the end of the cold war and anti-democratic and racist movements. It is
obvious that these factors are global specific. The international community has
confirmed the central value of global citizenship education (Pigozzi, 2006). In an
official statement in England, the National Curriculum Council (1990) states,

“Education for citizenship embraces both responsibilities and rights in the
present and preparation for citizenship in adult life. It helps pupils by
supporting them as they develop from dependent children into independent
young people. It is of paramount importance for a country in a democratic
and in a world undergoing rapid change” (p.1).

A similar view is held by Gross & Dynesson (1991) who indicate that
citizenship education is a means of assuring the establishment and maintenance of the
republic of the United States of America. In Australia, Kennedy (1997) also
maintains,

“It [citizenship education] can ensure that people are able to live their
lives based on principles of peace, harmony, respect and tolerance and
that they will know when these principles are being violated. They will
also be aware of their responsibilities and how they can exercise them. In
this sense, citizenship education provides the foundations on which a truly
democratic society can be built” (p.5).

Despite the predominance of civic education, there is not much empirical
evidence on its actual implementation and that more research studies are in demand
(Dunkin, et al., 1998). As VanSledright & Grant (1994) stress,
“Although scholars have provided extended conceptual accounts concerning citizenship education, few empirical studies exist to provide portraits of this education in practice” (p.305).

Kennedy (1997) also reminds us that the major challenge facing civic education is how to balance global citizenship developments with national developments and the realities of life in modern society as experienced by the new generation. In short, the necessity for a civic education study is clear and the quest for a new meaning of civic education in Hong Kong is crucial as well.

1.2 Problems for Research

With the popularity of the Internet, international trading businesses, supranational non-government organizations, and some other contemporary features, the boundaries of civic education have become blurred and are no longer confined to the national border within which citizens solely enjoy rights and resume duties predetermined by their responsible nation. Multiple citizenship showing transnational identities demonstrates one of the strains on national sovereignty (Weekley, 1999). Tse (2003) conceives that the idea of ‘citizenship’ is at the core of citizenship education. New emphases on human rights, multiculturalism, and global citizenship or education in recent years have created new international standards. Divergent citizenship conceptions have portrayed a more diffused and ever-changing scope of citizenship education, and made the civic education curriculum almost a hotchpotch.

On the other hand, some may argue that civic education originates from the concept of nationality and legal status in a nation-state. Even if, as Axtmann (1996) asserts, the global influence is becoming stronger and stronger in many aspects, whether civic education will be dominated by global citizenship is still questionable. In fact, the development of some important constituent elements in global citizenship,
such as global democracy and global civic value, still remains in a pre-mature stage.

Moreover, teachers are usually regarded as the key change agents in curriculum implementation (e.g. Crandall, 1983; Fullan, 1992 & 1993), so as the core persons for the success of education reform (Law, 2003; Nelson & Drake, 1994). Teachers are also viewed as one of the most important elements of the learning context and the key persons in the definition of what is knowledge (da Ponte, 1994). O’Loughlin (2001) considers teachers as guardians of culture who are not merely gatekeepers for the received wisdom of culture but more importantly key-holders with means to unmask authoritative knowledge and cultural domination. The teachers’ central positions in the curriculum reform and implementation have been affirmed in the recent yardstick curriculum reform document in Hong Kong, namely “Learning to Learn (2001)”. The Curriculum Development Council (CDC), one of the key advisory groups for the local education authority, issued the document in the early 2000s (http://cd1.emb.hkedcity.net/cd/cdc/en/). Notwithstanding this, Kennedy, et al. (2002) point out that research studies on the teachers’ roles in the implementation of civic education are in shortage.

Given the abovementioned unambiguous development of global citizenship and the tension between global citizenship and national citizenship, there is a reason to believe that school civic educators will run into some kind of dilemma in the delivery of civic education in the classroom. In the long run, students or even the entire Hong Kong society will suffer. Furthermore, understanding of teacher perceptions of civic education and global citizenship education, especially their formulation, is always neglected in civic education research studies. Larsen & Faden (2008), for instance, are disappointed to note the limited empirical research on the implementation of global education in the classroom. Much less research focus can be
found on the role of teachers as global citizenship educators, exemplifying the paucity of research reports and literature on global citizenship education.

Paradoxically, teachers are the key players when it comes to the implementation of citizenship education in school (Lee, 2006a; Kennedy & Fairbrother, 2008). Grossman & Lo (2008) share this viewpoint and their case studies confirmed the key role of classroom teachers as gatekeepers and mediator of social education curriculum in practice. To abide by the curriculum policies and frameworks, teachers still have considerable leeway at the classroom level in the curriculum implementation (p.210). As Lee (2005c) concedes, knowing teachers’ views is significant in the citizenship study. It is because teachers are the ones who face immediate citizenship issues, and they are the ones to implement the citizenship curriculum. Their concerns and views are both legitimate and valuable for policymakers and academics in understanding citizenship issues.

Not limited by a broad-brush understanding of teachers’ perceptions, it will certainly be useful to extend our knowledge level from “what” to “why” and “how”. In other words, contributing factors for the teachers’ perceptions will need to be carefully studied, analysed and discussed. Zaman (2006) criticizes, “teachers, generally, and civic educators in particular have been assumed as influential agents within school system for political socialization. However, few studies illustrate how teachers do influence and change their students in regard to political issues” (p.8-9). Gilbert, et al. (1995) echo, studies of the role of educators for citizenship are very rare. Given all these facts, the value of the study in this thesis is self-evident.

The study of this thesis sets out to examine the following:
1. Is global citizenship education an important feature of civic education in Hong Kong?
2. In what ways, if any, does global citizenship education reflect Hong Kong civic education teachers’ thinking about civic education?

3. What are the factors affecting civic education teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship education?

4. How have civic education teachers’ perceptions been shaped?

To answer the above questions, a mixed-method research study which is composed of both qualitative and quantitative methods was undertaken. As Denzin (1970) indicates, this kind of mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods is of great advantage in unveiling the truth via the mutual complementarity of these two methods. In the past two decades, this school of thought has won more and more support from field researchers (Patton, 1990; Keeves, 1997; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003; William & Lisa, 2006).

On the quantitative method in the study, a self-constructed questionnaire was used to collect data on a sample of Hong Kong civic education teachers’ perceptions of the meaning of global civic education locally and the contributing factors for the formation of the perceptions. The teachers were teaching in Hong Kong secondary schools where the independent civic education subject was on offer.

For the qualitative part of the study, a critical review of the literature pertaining to the contemporary trend of civic education and global citizenship education, the implementation of civic education in Hong Kong and the adoption of activity theory in education, among others, was done. Semi-structured interviews were administered to voluntary participants from the data subjects of the questionnaire survey. The findings of the interviews were supposed to be complementary and supplementary to those of the questionnaire survey.
1.3 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is divided into seven chapters. The first chapter serves to introduce the relevance of civic education to the research study in the thesis, the related research problems and the research questions and objectives. The second chapter is a review of the literature on civic education with a special reference to the inflation of civic education towards the global orientation and the possible impacts of such globalised civic education trend on civic education teachers in Hong Kong. The literature review also covers an understanding of civic education in context and activity theory, as well as factors affecting civic education teachers’ perceptions of civic education. In the third chapter, the conceptual framework of the study is elucidated. The research methodology is described in the fourth chapter. The fifth chapter is devoted to the presentation of the data of the questionnaire survey and the follow-up interview. The sixth chapter outlines the analysis and discussion of the research findings. The last chapter is dedicated to the conclusions and the implications of the research results.
CHAPTER TWO      REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 An Overview of the Chapter

This chapter sketches an overall picture of civic education, from its contemporary connotation in a global sense against its conventional interpretation related to civil obligations and responsibilities to its form of existence and meaning specific to the context of Hong Kong. Some particular phenomena of civic education in the Hong Kong context are highlighted including but not limited to the emergence of the notions of global citizenship education, the development of civic education curriculum at the junior secondary school level, the promulgation of the independent civic education subject, and the training opportunities with regard to civic education and global citizenship education in the territory. In so doing, the central background scene for an exploration of the perceptions of a sample of Hong Kong civic education teachers, who delivered the independent civic education subject at the junior secondary sector at the time of the study, are formed. A number of selected contextual factors contributing to the shaping of the civic education teachers’ global perception of civic education are also examined.

Activity theory, framed under the premises of cultural psychology, is explored to see whether it is suitable to form the basis of the analytical framework for the study conducted in this thesis. Based on the notions of activity theory, the civic education teachers’ perceptions are studied and explained.

The purpose of this chapter is also to lay down the theoretical underpinning for the conceptual framework of the study delineated in Chapter Three, and for the empirical study with its design described in Chapter Four, as well as for the study findings and discussion depicted in Chapter Five of this thesis. Lastly, the relevant
literature reviewed in this chapter is believed to be able to offer a reasonable ground for the discourse on the implications of the study results for teacher education in Hong Kong pertaining to civic education and global citizenship education.

To grasp the rudiments of civic education so that the basic scene of the entire inquiry could be set, the literature concerning the meaning of civic education is reviewed in the first place.

2.2 The Quest for the Meaning of Civic Education

According to the International Encyclopedia of Education (Husen & Postlethwaite, 1994), civic education is broadly concerned with the development of citizenship or civic competence through which the unique meaning, obligation, and virtue of citizenship in a particular society are conveyed or the acquisition of values, dispositions, and skills appropriate to that society is facilitated. It includes both explicit and implicit aims, which may be disseminated through statements of educational goals, curriculum guidelines, textbook contents and teacher lessons, through explicit routines and rituals, and through explicit and implicit teaching practices. In the Encyclopedia of Educational Research (Alkin, 1992), civic education (or citizenship education) is interpreted as an explicitly stated and implicitly expressed curriculum of educational institutions which socializes individuals to membership in their political community. Its explicit aims often entail loyalty to the nation, knowledge of the history and structure of political institutions, positive attitudes towards political authority, obedience to laws and social norms, belief in fundamental values of the society such as equality, interest in political participation, sense of political efficacy, and skills in analyzing political communications.

A more recent and embracive understanding of civic education can be found in
the Encyclopedia of the Developing World (Leonard, 2006) whereby the subject, otherwise referred to as citizenship education, is conceptualized along two dimensions. In a societal perspective, it is the process through which public knowledge, public values, attitudes and group identification norms, perceiving to be germane to political stability, are transmitted from one generation to the others. From an individual’s angle, civic education encapsulates the process of public knowledge as well as values and group identifications being accorded private meaning and internalized as guides for behaviours. Generally speaking, civic education encompasses both explicit and implicit goals that may be articulated through an array of educational programmes, activities, and statements. The most obvious of these include a statement of educational goals, curriculum guides, a context of instructional textbooks, and teacher-prepared lessons. Explicit routines and rituals, such as reciting the national anthem, using a community service, engaging in group conversation, using discussion as a teaching goal, and learning strategies, further exemplify the variation of ways in which civic education is transmitted within the educational realm.

In terms of the format of delivery, civic education is implemented through different titles such as Civics, Civic & Moral Education, Government Studies, History or Social Studies in various parts of the world. Actually, the interpretation of civic education orientation varies by region and country. For instance, in the West, civic education can be understood either as a means of promoting patriotism and national pride or a means of instilling in students a range of values that will motivate them to play their parts as informed, responsible, committed, and effective members of the modern democratic system. However, in the East Asia, where the Confucian tradition provides clear legitimization for schools to assume an active role in moral education, the emphasis of civic education is placed on moral education. The same discrepancy
in the interpretation of civic education can also be found in S. H. Cheung (1996) who undertook a comprehensive study of civic education practices in ten Eastern and Western countries.

In Cogan et al. (2002), civic education is envisioned in three different ways. First, as a normative concept, it is signified as an educative process by which young people learn to become informed and active citizens in their society. Secondly, in a traditional perspective, civic education is a study of government, constitutions and political institutions. Finally, civic education can be an evolutionary conception to understand the process of democracy and active participation in the public domain. Heater (1990 & 2004a) define civic education as a composition of civic knowledge, skills and value through which students can be developed into all-rounders who are able to live successfully in their polity.

In particular, students are expected to be conversant with the institutions and structure of their government. An acquaintance of the principles and political process is particularly necessary to enable them to participate in a democracy (Anderson, 1993). Based on Torney-Purta’s (1985) citation on various educationalists’ manifestations of civic education which are all aimed at instilling in students a list of procedural values revolving around justice, freedom, toleration, human rights, respect for truth and reasoning, participation and obligation for the public good. These values are essential for maintaining a democratic system.

Sometimes we may come across difficulties in distinguishing two very close terms: civic education and citizenship education. In fact, some scholars such as S. H. Cheung (1996) give a synonymous meaning for these two terms. To him, the two terms can often be used interchangeably. However, some academics take a different view. Kennedy (1997, p.vii), for example, posits civic education as formal
programmes of instruction whereas citizenship education is a broader term encompassing the multiple ways in which citizens are encouraged to pursue their roles in a democratic society. McPhie (1981) defines citizenship education as a way to develop in individuals a democratic related attitude and behavioural pattern so as to make them perform appropriate skills in a democratic society. Tse (2003) opines that civics and citizenship education are the cultural transmission and acquisition with regard to the notions of citizen and citizenship which take place within schools. Broadly speaking, citizenship education can be construed as an educative process conducted beyond the boundary of the school context.

In fact, civic education is more commonly and officially used than citizenship education in the related official documents in Hong Kong such as the Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools, 1996 and the Syllabuses for Secondary Schools – Civic Education for Secondary 1 to 3, 1998. Moreover, the study in this thesis mainly focuses on the teachers’ perceptions relevant to the independent civic education curriculum within the local school context. In view of all these, the term civic education will be used throughout this work. An operational definition of civic education is adopted for which it is regarded as a formal school subject aiming to help students acquire citizenship within the education system. Alkin (1992), however, reminds us that civic education differs from other school subjects in that it lacks consensus about the knowledge and attitude base. There are in fact diverse views about how much detailed factual knowledge of history or government structure is required for effective citizenship. Given the lack of an absolute connotation of civic education worldwide, it appears to be sensible to argue that civic education should be understood in context (e.g. Kerr, 2000; Tse, 2007b). In this regard, the question: “what exactly does civic education mean in Hong Kong?” will be addressed later in
Before proceeding, civic education teachers’ views about civic education are worth a thorough exploration at the outset of the entire investigation. In pursuit of this, the findings of the yardstick international study spearheaded by Judith Torney-Purta and her colleagues from different parts of the world (Torney-Purta, et al. 2001) are definitely the valuable reference. The study results showed that the vast majority of teachers from the 28 participating countries took a view that the ideal conception of civic education should be related to critical thinking or values while its reality should concern knowledge transmission, rights and social movement and higher levels of controversy. The studied teachers considered civic education salient for students. The discourses of rights and the social movements were ranked high on the list of curricular concerns for teachers so as international problems. The rankings of these issues are much higher than the result in the first phase of the international study where teachers held a more traditional view towards civic education (Torney-Purta, et al. 1999).

Given that civic education is well built on the tenet of citizenship, a thorough understanding of what citizenship connotes should be absolutely necessary and essential.

2.3 Reasons for Elusive and Irreconcilable Notions of Civic Education

“The evidence of history provides little cause to believe that any search for an agreed, all embracing and permanent definition of citizenship might be successful. Both its theory and practice has constantly changed in response to particular economic, social and political circumstances” (Heater 1990, p.282).

Pratte (1988) also maintains that the meaning of the term citizenship has in fact become less and less clear and the term itself is filled with paradoxes: loyal
persons versus critical questioners, private interests versus public interests, patriotism versus redefining conditions of social justice, and national pride and identification versus criticizing and judging the values and limits of national pride.

From the epistemological point of view, the variation in the understanding of civic education may be attributable to the unclear connotation of the term citizenship, which can be viewed as the end product of civic education. Actually, the reality of citizenship is itself elusive. As Fouts & Lee (2005) posit,

“A number of factors attribute to the continual diversities or elusiveness around the term ‘citizenship’. The difficulty is sometimes attributable to cultural and historical differences, sometimes to deep and abiding philosophical differences, sometimes to language usage, and sometimes to a variety of other reasons. Often times, these factors work in concert with one another, and sometimes the factors work independently, to obfuscate the entire concept” (p.20).

Fundamentally, citizenship is a complex term with various meanings (Janowitz, 1980). At least three distinctive meanings exist. First, it can be a moral judgment on how a good citizen is recognized depending on the morality judgment of his or her behaviour. Secondly, it can be an empirical and descriptive term whereby citizenship rights and obligations are emphasized. Last but not least, it can be an analytical term with the focuses on the citizens’ participating opportunities and the country’s protection of its citizens.

As Grossman & Lo (2008) maintain, citizenship is a contested concept. How to define good citizens and implement civic education can vary considerably across spaces and times depending on the interest of the ruling party of a polity. This phenomenon can be particularly obvious in the Asian region where moral, values or character education are emphasized as a means to promote ethno-cultural harmony and national unity. Evans (2006) echoes this from another angle by pointing out that the contemporary conceptions of civic education reflect a certain level of ambiguity.
Other than the varied understanding of citizenship offered by the dominant views from republican and liberal, the conceptions of citizenship is further complicated by other perspectives such as communitarian, social democratic, multiculturalist, and post-national. These perspectives bring to light the contradicted interests in the conceptual understanding of citizenship within areas including individualism versus collectivism, political rights versus social right, and localism versus globalism.

In essence, the concept of citizenship originates from ancient Greece connecting to polis, the city state, in which the “citizen” – the Greek polites or Latin civis – is defined as a member of the Athenian polis or Roman res publica. At that time, citizenship mainly referred to membership of a polity whereby citizens were all who shared views openly and publicly on the civic life and played ruling and being ruled in turn. However, only a small number of Athenians could enjoy the privilege of the citizens and most of the others were excluded. Although this mode of citizenship sounds contradictory to the modern ideal of citizenship where equality, equitability and democracy are stressed, it has laid down the cornerstone and some classic ideas for the developments of citizenship.

Following the collapse of the Roman Empire, there was a long time of domination by the monarchy and the Church in the public life in both the Western and Eastern blocs of the world. The dominance of the Monarchy was even longer in the Eastern world, probably due to as Heater (1990 & 2004a) cites Max Weber’s explanation, the notion of citizens of the state being unknown to the world of Islam, and to India and China. It thereby comes as no surprise that the ongoing development of citizenship has been happening so far mainly in the western world.

With the growing awareness of participation in public life and in civic consciousness during the Renaissance and the seventeenth century, citizenship is no
longer solely viewed as the straightforward formula of rule and being ruled, but rather perceived as a more equal relationship between the citizens and the rulers. There was a strong outcry for a higher degree of control over public life, including participation in political activities, from the citizens who had an increasing demand for democracy. That means the citizens were no longer satisfied with their subject role but tended to look for a higher level of participation in the society.

The modern concept of citizenship emerges in alignment with the formation of the nation-states. Gellner (1993), as cited by Green (1997), states, the nation-state is a term used in the sense of sovereign and includes a diversity of ‘nations’ or ‘people’. Nation-states are basically formed for the purpose of achieving and maintaining national sovereignty; constructing national public institutions and economic infrastructures; and popularizing the notions of citizenship and national identity to bind the nation-states and their citizens together. In other words, citizenship is interpreted as membership of a nation-state that provides a legitimimized context for the citizens to attach in order to claim identity by meeting certain inclusive criteria such as cultural identity and to exercise their rights and to fulfil their obligations.

Janowitz (1983) posits citizenship as an expression of the political relations between the individual and the state which is closely related to the concepts of nationalism and the nation-state. For some, nationalism is a binding force furnishing people with collective and self-identities. With these identities, people can have the incentive for fulfilling their civic obligations.

As a twin product of civic obligations in citizenship, the concept of civic rights has gained wide recognition since T. H. Marshall (Rees, 1996) promulgated his classic three dimensions of citizenship: civil, political and social. For him, citizenship
should extend its coverage beyond the traditional civil and political rights to the social sphere since the social component of citizenship is regarded as one of the pillars of democracy. In this respect, all forms of citizenship should be institutionalized in the welfare state and the existence of welfare state is in turn a requisite of democratic citizenship.

In fact, there are many problems with Marshall’s theory of citizenship, such as the lack of a normative or an empirical outline of citizenship (Delanty, 2000). Many other left-inclined critics even tend to dismiss citizenship as a state-centred strategy of social control in that citizenship is seen as a state-led project serving the structures of capitalist inequality rather than a means to enhance the power of people.

To extend Marshall’s three dimensions of citizenship and to move the goals of citizenship away from dominant social groups, Turner (1997) proposes an expansion of the realm of citizenship to cultural rights. Byrne (1999) further suggests that other forms of collective identities such as race, gender, and ethnicity should substitute social class to become the primary source of societal ties and solidarity.

Advocates of the welfare state enjoyed their golden age in the fifties and sixties in the last century but started to lose appeal from the seventies due to the downturn of economic development in major western countries. Therefore, tensions in citizenship occurred rapidly when the opponents called for a deep reflection of citizenship in shifting its focus from the individual level back to the collective level. This change is conceivably attributable to what Ichilov (1998) attributes this shift of focus to the transformation of the driving forces of the ideologies of citizenship from social equality and freedom to economic development and national power.

To some extent, we can probably observe that the everlasting changes in the concept of citizenship are commensurate with time and space. Some of the concepts...
can be seen in antithetical positions such as nationalism and democracy. The former focuses on the collective benefit of a nation whereas the latter emphasizes individual rights. In a similar vein, another intensifying antithesis lies between the private and public citizens. Other pertinent controversies in various concepts of citizenship will be elaborated in the subsequent sections.

From a practical point of view, this evasive meaning of civic education, arising from the previously mentioned contested notions of citizenship, can result in a predicament for schools. Heater (1990) describes, with an elusive perception of British citizens, the school continues to face the difficult task of transmitting an appreciation of an amorphous concept. Of course, this kind of adverse situation can also happen in Hong Kong schools because a relatively clear notion of citizenship came out when the official guiding document for the implementation of civic education was issued in 1996. In this light, the meaning of civic education may somehow become restless.

Besides citizenship, other factors continue to portray the outlook of civic education. Butt (1980) identifies eight ways that civic education has been conceptualized and implemented in the schools. They are the academic disciplines approach, law-related education approach, controversial issues approach, critical thinking approach, value clarification approach, moral education approach, community involvement approach, and institutional reform approach. Apparently, some internal conflicts can be found in between these models. For instance, under the moral education approach, a mechanistic view may be most likely undertaken in which conformity to social rules with good behaviour rewarded and bad behaviour is adopted (Scharf, 1978).

By contrast, proponents of the institutional reform approach highlight the
importance of giving learners the full rights and responsibilities of citizenship. As Apple (1975) ascertains, teachers must be able to bring to a conscious level those hidden epistemological and ideological assumptions that help to structure the decisions they make and the environments they design to the students. In this sense, students, rather than conforming to the traditional ethical rule inadvertently, should be enabled to make independent decisions.

After all, it is unsurprising to find a diverse understanding of civic education which is not solely because of the changing concept of citizenship from time to time and also the divergent emphases of the above eight approaches to civic education.

Apart from the evasive meanings of citizenship and civic education on their own rights, the problem of achieving an accurate understanding of civic education can be intensified by the contentious concepts between citizenship and civic education.

2.4 Controversies in Civic Education

Alder and Sim (2008) observe that the concepts of citizenship and civic education are contested. The same view is held by Osler & Starkey (2006). A dilemma sometimes persists whether the goal of civic education is to nurture good citizens who are loyal to the state or to develop active citizens who are willing to participate in public and political activities or both. Civic education can be the basis for both socialisation and ‘counter-socialisation’, where the former involves the cultivation of love of one’s nation and obedience to laws and norms, whereas the latter signifies independent thinking and responsible social criticism. Heater (2004a) shares a similar view that teaching for citizenship can be a hazardous undertaking. In case the state demands a biased expectation for absolute allegiance, the teacher who is neither utterly self-interested nor ideologically committed to the regime will be faced
with a dreadful decision to compromise his professional judgement.

The deep-rooted controversies are further evidenced in different approaches to civic education. As Pratte (1988) asserts, the goals and specifics of civic education are for long not entirely agreed upon. For some, civic education is the teaching of civic literacy. Students learn the rights and duties of citizenship as a mere academic matter and keep politics and morality at arm’s length. For the others, civic education is responsible for producing citizens who possess a national loyalty, a sense of obligation, and a strong desire to serve the nation and to die in its defense when necessary.

Not only can this sort of dissonance be identified in different modes of civic education as mentioned by Butt (1980) in the last section and other scholars in the earlier part of this section, Gross & Dynesson (1991) also put forth another twelve approaches to civic education each of which has its unique point of significance and peculiar expectation for the cultivation of citizens.

As mentioned previously, the absence of a consensus in the interpretation of civic education to a great extent derives from the diverse nature of citizenship. Traditionally, citizenship is often viewed a dichotomy between two classical conceptions of citizenship: liberalism and republicanism (Heater, 1990 & 2004a). Simply put, the former focuses on the freedom and rights of the individual whereas the latter emphasizes citizenship as a status and a set of duties borne with pride. Cheung (1998) distinguishes these two traditional views of citizenship in terms of their varied emphases. Liberalism and republicanism take seriously the interest of individual citizens and the ruling body respectively.

By holding diverse or even opposing views towards citizenship, perennial criticisms are aimed at liberalism and republicanism from each other’s camp of
advocates (Oliver & Heater, 1994). Republicans criticize liberalism as being weak in fostering a commitment to the citizen’s particular community and its traditions. Liberalism is also deemed to be too apolitical. That is, it tolerates the wish of too many to be ‘private citizens’ and this ‘free-rider’ mentality is the very antithesis of civic virtue and destructive of that communal harmony which is the prerequisite for the cultivation of citizenship.

On the contrary, liberals query the republicanism’s appropriateness for modern states that are too socially and culturally homogenous, and are not compact enough for constant and direct political participations. Moreover, if republicanism is strictly applied, it is too intrusive into private life. By confining ones social and political horizons to the established conception of the communal good, there is danger of dulling ones critical faculty.

With reference to Turner (1994), liberal theory poses threats to the idea of citizenship because it jeopardizes the idea of political community that is reducible neither to an aggregation of individuals nor to a conjunction of identity-constituting groups. Another heated debate in the realm of citizenship stems from the dichotomy between the demands of nation-state and world citizenship. There has been a common speculation, starting from Karl Marx as early as in the late nineteen century, that the decline of nationalism was led by the economic and political globalization process. Many other scholars like Brezezinski, Rifkin, and Hobsbawn took a similar view to anticipate that nation-states reduce their imperative in citizenship, including the guarantee for the fortunes of the marketplace and as the social changing force (Ichilov, 1998). However, Ichilov further argues that nationalism will not be eroded by economic globalization as there are no alternative guarantees of dignity available other than nationality and nationalism will not be eroded by the economic
globalization.

Giddens (1990) maintains that globalization takes root in the system of nation-states. Considering the recent developments in Europe and other continents, nation-states appear to be diversifying and developing rather than dying (Mann, 1993). Therefore, I am of the view that globalization does not aim to extinguish the nation-states but rather intends to catalyze their development and transformation.

Needless to say, the changing times make the concept of citizenship more complicated than before (Lynch, 1992; Cogan et al., 2000). New concepts such as multiple citizenship (Heater, 1990 & 2004a), globalization (Branson, 1999), multicultural citizenship (Banks, 2008) and world citizen postmodernism (Gilbert, 1992) have come into place to prompt a rethinking of the new meaning of citizenship. With the influence of all these factors, an inflation of citizenship inevitably occurs for tomorrow’s citizens (Minogue, 1995) and that will most probably lead to a new meaning of citizenship and civic education.

2.5 Evolution of the New Meaning of Civic Education

The concept of civic education continues to change and evolve (Gross & Dynesson, 1991). The change is mainly elicited by the extended needs of a society from solely developing in each succeeding generation the shared civic literacy valued by the society to preparing the youth to become independent citizens with critical minds in facing the challenge of the new era. This view is shared by Pratte (1992) who observes a fundamental change in the nation’s political and social climate that leads to an endless philosophical mood shift in every generation of Americans.

As Gilbert (1992) points out, a major cultural reorientation, postmodernism, occurs exclusively in Western society that has implications for knowledge, morality,
politics and individual identities. In this respect, the future of citizenship is inevitably under pressure for change. Admittedly, Cogan (1998) puts it,

“The complexity, scale and interconnectedness of the challenge facing us at the close of this century and the dawn of the next simply cannot be met through conventional means” (p.1).

In fact, the rapidly changing world triggers new and ongoing challenges to human beings. An increase of inter-state conflicts and wars, questions of civil disobedience, restructuring social value systems, emergence of multiple citizenship, environmental crisis, and dissolution of national boundaries or political reform all call for a rethinking in civic education curriculum (Lynch, 1992). Various challenges resulting from unprecedented pace of global change for countries are described by Kerr (2003). These challenges entail the rapid movement of people within and across national boundaries; a growing recognition of the rights of indigenous people and minorities; the collapse of the existing political structures and the fledging growth of new ones; the impact of the global economy and changing patterns of work and trade on social, economic and political ones; the effects of the revolution in information and communications technologies; an increasing global population and the consequences for the environment; and the emergence of new forms of community and protest. There is little doubt that these challenges touch on complex concepts and issues lying at the centre of citizenship, encompassing pluralism, multiculturalism, ethnic and cultural heritage, diversity, tolerance, social cohesion, collective and individual rights and responsibilities, social justice, national identity, and freedom, amongst others. As a consequence, a review of citizenship should be necessary.

Specific to citizenship, the associated challenges are comprised of diversity, location (e.g. international or transnational citizenship), social rights and participation. Kerr (ibid) considers participation is most relevant to many countries when talking
about the decreasing interest and involvement of the younger generations in public and political life. Diaz et al. (1999) indicate that modern technology has contributed to the shrinking of the world; it has, indeed, expedited the process of globalization. Global education thus comes to the fore as one of the popular forms of civic education. Pratte (1988) states,

“To adapt to the new world, it is necessary to plump for a renewed democratic life of active, participatory citizenship fueled by a virtuous civic culture” (p.9).

Although it is mentioned earlier that understanding of civic education should be context specific, there is no point in believing that Hong Kong civic education can be insulated from the impact arising from the aforementioned contemporary trend. Based on Grossman’s (2000) conference paper, namely “New Millennium: Implication of Multidimensional Citizenship for Teacher Education”, at least four global trends, including global economy, technology and communication, population and environment, and global movement dominate the global scene and are faced by citizens in the new millennium. Questions may arise whether citizens adopting the traditional percept are capable of surviving in the modern world.

Grossman cites a multinational citizenship education policy study (CEPS) conducted by Cogan & Derricott in 1998 to back up his standpoint in which a multidimensional view of citizenship was found to be most suitable to help people adapt to the changes in the new era. This multidimensional model in civic education will be described in further detail later in this thesis. From his point of view, this model is a vital and suitable means for the education of civic education teachers in Hong Kong. The actual influence of the above mentioned trends on Hong Kong will be discussed later in this chapter.

In this respect, those traditional civic education orientations that solely
concentrate on political knowledge transmission or patriotism promotion suffer from an all-round critique for failing to meet the new challenges in the new epoch (Barbalet, 1988; Pratte, 1988). There is no surprise as Banks (1997) concedes,

“As we approach a new century, it is essential that educators explore the possibility of transforming citizenship education so that it will deal with struggle, tension, conflict, and the need to construct an authentic unum [structure], not one imposed on those who are victimized and marginalized” (p.4).

From the interview findings of Kubow’s (1996) study on pre-service teachers, civic education is no longer narrowly viewed as educating students about their own nation and government as well as law-related and civics-oriented perspectives. Citizens need to be informed about the global situation and practised in critical thinking and decision-making. In other words, civic education in a global age means “developing in citizens a greater awareness of the world by addressing cultural diversity and by examining global issues”. It is evident that any definition of civic education cannot dismiss the importance of attitudes and values, which precede action on global issues.

Branson (1989) asserts that contemporary civic education must sharpen students’ awareness of their responsibilities of citizenship extending far beyond national boundaries and recognizing the fact that the conventional concepts of civic education are challenged vehemently by the irreversible global changes. Competent and responsible citizens with global perspectives, knowledge and skills will certainly have higher capability of participating more effectively in local state, national and international affairs. A typical argument in civic education nowadays is that "today's citizen is increasingly a world citizen" and educating "for global citizenship" is important (Sears & Hughes, 1996). Therefore, understanding of global civic culture gradually becomes a core issue in contemporary civic education curricula (Boulding,
The nation-states, as the fundamental unit of citizenship, have long been seen as an essential constituent in citizenship which are far too crucial to be neglected. As a matter of fact, they provide citizens with the basic structures such as rule of law, social security system, protection, government services, citizenship identity, etc. for conglomeration of citizenship. They also form the basis for the rights system advocated by T. H. Marshall (1964). As Bodin (1967) puts it, citizens enjoy privileges as members of sovereign states which aliens do not have, and cannot claim on the grounds of sheer humanity. When the times move on, the existence of nation-states is put into question by someone who argues on the false supposition of the traditional citizenship that the interests of fellow citizens should take priority over duties to the rest of the human race. Rather, cosmopolitan citizenship should foster the citizen to support global political institutions and sentiments so as to weaken the grip of exclusionary separate states (Linklater, 1998).

According to Camilleri and Falk (1992), there are five macroscopic trends that undermine the principle of national sovereignty:

- internationalization of trade;
- globalization of the security system;
- rapid transformation of technology;
- accompanying spread of ecological problems; and
- emergence of new social movements.

Even though the nation-states might strive to extend their influence on these areas, it would be in vain since the above five are global trends causing challenges from beyond the nation-state’s boundary and authority.

Similarly, there are four explicit global trends existing and catalyzing the emergency of multidimensional civic education identified by Cogan & Derricott...
They are:

- global economy - individual national economics move away to a global one;
- technology and communication – the increased popularity of on-line access by using the Internet;
- growth in population – immigration pressures increase as a result of population growth, thus raising tensions between the industrialised and non-industrialised worlds; and
- raised concern about the environment.

Also, the emergence of newer and large cross-border or supranational organisations, such as the World Trade Organization, and European Union, exert greater and greater impact on a nation’s sovereignty leading to a decline of nationalism and a reposition of civic education (Ichilov, 1998). No one can deny that the world is becoming more and more united.

Axtmann (1996) clearly states,

“We live in an era of ever-increasing global interconnectedness of people, places, capital, goods and services. Globalization is a multi-faceted process that manifest itself in such forms as global tourism and the global reach of nuclear, environmental and health risks” (p.118).

In a nutshell, the current globalization trend will exert greater and greater challenges on the traditional Western conceptions of citizenship which link to national identity and to the imperative and narratives of nation-states. Therefore, cultural, ethnic and social identities are more diverse and openly recognized, and the importance of celebrating pluralism and difference is more accepted (Schugurensky, 2000). Barbar (1999) comments that economic globalization in the absence of civic and political globalization means we have globalized our vices without globalizing our virtues. For this reason, it can be argued that theories and practices of citizenship will have to address issues of global citizenship. Conclusively speaking,
“Citizenship education should promote global awareness, and the realisation that circumstances that affect our immediate moral and physical well-being are located on transnational arena as well” (Ichilov, 1998:227).

Before proceeding, the meaning of globalization and some of its related terms should be clarified. As Tikly (2001) maintains, there is a lack of precise definition of the term globalization due to the plurality of views within social sciences. The lack of a precise definition of globalization is unfortunate given the slippery nature of the term and makes it difficult to assess the usefulness of the concept.

Nevertheless, Tikly quotes Held (1999) who strives to distinguish three broad approaches to globalization: the hyperglobalist approach, the sceptical approach, and the transformationalist approach. The hyperglobalist approach is premised on the idea that the global age actually comes in the form of the triumph of global capitalism and the advent of distinctively new styles of global culture, governance and civil society. Taking a rather ironical angle, advocates of the sceptical approach argue that the global capitalism has led to a great polarisation between the ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ countries. It also leads to a greater significance for the nation-state in managing the deepening crisis tendencies of capitalism. Finally, transformationalists, though recognizing the experience of unprecedented levels of global interconnectedness, question whether we are entering a totally new global age of economic, political and cultural integration. Rather, they perceive globalization as a historically contingent process replete with contradictions. Under this situation, globalization will result in greater fragmentation and stratification where some states may become increasingly enmeshed in the new global order while others are becoming increasingly marginalised.
The core contradiction caused by globalization is the disjuncture between the high level of global economic integration, on the one hand, and the lack of intercultural understanding and political institutionalization among nation-states resulting from the new global political economy, on the other (Davis, 2008). Globalization has hence both advantages and disadvantages and it provides opportunities at the same time that it posits dangers. This is because globalization carries with it unanticipated and often contradictory and polarizing consequences (Branson, 1999). Davis (ibid), however, points out that the rise of global civil society, comprising non-governmental organisations (NGOs), international non-governmental organisations (INGOs), and transnational networks (TNs), compete or even fiercely challenge the control of a nation-state over a given territory and jural rights. Some particular areas such as human rights, the environment, and women’s rights are becoming more and more out of control of nation-states under challenge since they are always major concerns of those global non-governmental groups. As such, we should not deny the interconnection between globalization and civic education.

A comprehensive description of the influence of globalization on educators can be found in Bottery (2006). He starts with an analysis of globalization as a complex term containing a variety of meanings which do not always fit neatly together. It is intimately connected with the way a person views his or her place and meaning on the planet, and can thus provide unique avenue to self-exploration and self-development. At least six different forms and types of globalization have prevailed as a result. They consist of, inter alia:

(i) environmental globalization (i.e. an expression of a human concern with the ecology and global interdependence of living things, and particularly with
humanity’s influence upon such processes);
(ii) cultural globalization (including the globalization of cultural variety and the globalization of cultural standardization);
(iii) demographic globalization (i.e. the growing tension between increasingly ageing population and those with a much younger profile);
(iv) political globalization (i.e. the relocation of political power away from the nation-state by the supra-national bodies like the European Union, and the transnational companies, and the spread of political ideas);
(v) American globalization (i.e. over-domination of the United States);
(vi) economic globalization (i.e. unrestricted movement of finance around the globe).

These types of globalization interact and influence one another in diverse ways, producing a complex and difficult world, and that consequently triggers off tensions for the work of educators such as the challenge of sub-national groups and supra-national organizations for nation-states to strengthen their legitimacy as the sole provider of citizenship. To overcome these tensions, Bottery considers that the school educationalists should give particular attention to six professional requirements: developing a greater ecological and political awareness, supporting notions of public good, embracing a sophisticated accountability, building trust and constituencies, embracing an epistemological provisionality, and practising a greater degree of professional self-reflection.

The actual effect of globalization on education is demonstrated by the cross-national comparative survey conducted by the international organization, namely the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), in 2007 (Zajda, 2008). Upon examining education systems in 30 OECD member
countries, the study reflected that nation-states are likely to lose their power and capacity to affect their future directions in the domains of language, policy, education, and national identity. This is because the struggle for knowledge domination, production, and dissemination becomes a new form of cultural domination, and a knowledge-driven social stratification. The evolving and ever-changing notions of national identity, language, border policies and citizenship need to be critiqued within the local-regional-national arena, which is also contested by globalization.

The aforementioned global trends do not exist in vacuum. Parker et al. (1999) carried out a nine-nation study by research means of Cultural Futures Delphi procedures to investigate the curriculum needs for the future citizens. Having explored the views of 182 members of a multinational research team in four years, the most important characteristic of a future world citizen was found to be the possession of the ability to deal with serious worldwide problems as a member of a worldwide society. In response to the findings of the study, the authors put forward a multidimensional citizenship model for civic education. This model is similar to the one that I will elaborate on later. Despite all those mentioned earlier in this section, Marshall & Arnot (2008) recognize vibrant debates about the value and meaning of a global perspective in citizenship education over the recent years, and realize that there have also been calls for global citizenship education for the twenty-first century from a variety of sources. Davies (2006) also argues that while global citizenship is an abstraction, it is one that captures a rising consensus on the importance of teaching students to understand their actions, as well as their rights and responsibilities, within a global network. Global citizenship education should go beyond global education’s
emphasis on global interconnectedness to the promotion of an active model of citizenship. This active approach to citizenship is evident in the emphasis of global citizenship education concerning social justice, human rights and peace activism.

The Meaning of Global Citizenship Education

As a concomitant of the evolution of globalization, the term global citizenship comes into being. The concept of global citizenship emerged after World War II, and was influenced by the spirit of the United Nations and world federalism (Davis, 2008). Global citizenship entails the development of a normative consciousness in students that enables them to take an empathetic approach to understand how the changes in global society have impacted other countries. This is particularly relevant to non-Western societies where political and economic inequality often produces hostility to a country, such as the United States. Walkington (1999) perceives global citizenship as deeds involving actively exercising one’s rights and responsibilities as a global citizen. Accordingly, global citizenship education should provide students with knowledge, skills and attitudes to understand their rights and responsibilities as global citizens. According to Ian Davies et al. (2005), global citizenship refers to three different categories of understanding. The first category is connected with people who feel linked to others and who often take it upon themselves to act in the interests of the world community. The second category associates with the thinking that a global polity is necessary before global citizenship can exist. The third and final category pertains to varying forms of law: natural law, international law, and international criminal law.
Heater (2002) considers global citizenship to be an enigma which never exists in any legal or political senses that are the accepted signifiers of citizenship in the usual state context, yet the expectation that there should be a world citizenship to parallel state citizenship. However, the awareness of the venerable tradition of cosmopolitanism revived, its adherents persisted vigorous demonstrations of its relevance to the current age. The burgeoning interest in cosmopolitanism since the 1990s is self-explanatory and that contributes to the escalating attention to global citizenship. Global citizenship diversifies further the nature of citizenship and challenges to the integrity of traditional state citizenship so its impact on civic education is significant. Global citizenship also affects an individual by inserting another ultimate layer of rights for the individual’s protection and of responsibilities for the individual to discharge, imposing need to know and understand world issues in addition to the local and national ones. Some uncertainties about global citizenship education are outlined by Marshall & Arnot (2008) whose concern was given in various respects. First, the discursive framing of global citizenship education is recent, and is, not surprisingly, weak. Secondly, the concept of the global citizen is not only debatable and may also have negligible political meaning. Thirdly, global citizenship education is associated with complicated changes in global climates and discourses.

The concept of global citizenship may be challenged by the contentious development of the new global policies on increased international collaborations and the grassroots counter-movements against economic globalization. The concept of promoting responsible global citizens are more likely to be framed within a liberal, individualist and often colonial human rights model, in contrast to the civic republican, active but state-bound model.
Oxfam’s Curriculum for Global Citizenship (Oxfam, 1997) lists key areas of knowledge, skills and attitudes including a concern for social justice and equity, for the environment and for the development of critical thinking skills. Oxfam (2006) further confirms the value of global citizenship education to help young people meet their current and future challenges. This is because the younger generation is shaped by what happens in other parts of the world. They are in need of knowledge, understanding, skills, and values if they need to participate in ensuring their own and others’ well-being and make a positive contribution, both locally and globally. Mary Joy Pigozzi, Director of the Division for the Promotion of Quality Education at UNESCO Paris, considers it necessary to attend to global citizenship education, not solely attributing to the 9/11 tragedy itself but the perils highlighted by this terrible event for decades from now (Pigozzi, 2006). In her view, all the recent violent phenomena are partially caused by globalization which contributes to the sense of loss of identity, and to the search for what is perceived as an older purity and coherence. The ongoing migration and increasingly diversified societies threaten the peace of the societies that deserves serious attention by authorities of education systems in different parts of the world.

Pigozzi considers quality education significant to address the interactions of an individual with his family, community, society, country and the world. It must also encompass all aspects of human development: values, knowledge, attitudes, and skills. Moreover, quality education must also serve to prevent violence, to strengthen a climate of tolerance and security, and to foster the development of values of peace, tolerance, and mutual understanding as well as capacities for the non-violent resolution of conflicts. Global citizens, who can act
both locally and globally, should possess four core values: respect for the dignity and human rights for all people throughout the world and a commitment to social and economic justice for all; respect for human rights of future generations and a commitment to intergenerational responsibility; respect and care for the greater community of life in all diversity which involves the protection and restoration of the Earth’s ecosystem; and respect for cultural diversity and a commitment to build locally and globally a culture of tolerance, non-violence and peace.

For the purpose of educating citizens in the global environment, Falk (1994) conceives five characteristics of global citizens. First, they should play the role of a global reformer who perceives a better way of organizing the political life of the planet and favours a utopian scheme that is presented as a practical mechanism. Secondly, they should have reflection on the actual impact on identity of globalization of economic integration. Thirdly, the management of the global order, practically its environmental dimensions but also its economic dimensions should be another major focus for the global citizens. Fourthly, acute attention should be paid to the rise of regional political consciousness. Finally, global citizens should have alertness over the emergence of transnational activism.

Davies et al. (2004) realized from their research study conducted in the West Midland, UK that global citizenship is in growth in schools and the most outstanding concern for students is war and conflict. In this respect, peace education should be placed high in the school agenda and teachers should play an active role to tackle both difference and indifference about war (Davies, 2005). The investigated teachers in that study saw cultural heritage, current events, development issues, and local-global connections as important in the content of education of global citizenship. In the study of Larsen & Faden (2008), teachers thought global citizenship education
relating to an awareness of the global issues and events and the diversity of the world’s culture; and the interconnections between students and the world around the and how one’s own actions can affect others. Two other major lines of thoughts emerged from the study were that the emphasis on a more activity-based pedagogy to promote change and the need to go beyond teaching students about global issues to focus on their responsibility as global citizens to consider not their own interests but those of others outside of their communities.

Macintyre (1996) identifies a new movement of citizenship for the new millennium in which new global civic values are necessary for maintaining the continuity of the world. Therefore, teaching of these values to the youth is of vital importance. In addition, Boulding (1988) asserts that students should be familiar with the “global civic culture” so as to help them recognize their obligations to their own nation and to the planet at large.

Overall, the coverage of global citizenship is very broad extending far beyond the boundaries of modern citizenship with major emphasis upon nation-states. Considering Delanty’s (2000) argument,

“Citizenship and nationality have today become separated and that the state is no longer the exclusive reference point of sovereignty. This is the negative definition of cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitan citizenship in the positive sense refers to new possibilities for participation and rights both within and beyond the state” (p.53).

We have to be very cautious of our intention and interpretation to the term. In this regard, a change of the existing model of citizenship focusing on the power distribution between citizens and their responsible nation-state apparently comes to the fore. This standpoint is echoed by Ibrahim (2005) who states that the concept of global citizenship implies a shift towards more inclusive understandings of citizenship and suggests a need to reinterpret the objectives of civic education. In the
context of global interdependence there is a need to develop a vision of global citizenship education that encourages a critical understanding of and respect for human rights and responsibilities. Global citizenship education must also empower students to work for a more just and sustainable world through democratic processes.

In light of the prime value of global citizenship education for students, whether global citizenship and global citizenship education have played a part in Hong Kong civic education is worth exploring. Like other places of the world, Hong Kong, as an international cosmopolitan centre with well-developed communication networks, cannot for sure immune from the influences of the outside world, nor of course can she be insulated from the impact of her motherland – China. In particular, after Hong Kong’s sovereignty was reverted back to China in 1997, the link between the two places became closer and closer (Hughes & Stone, 2009).

Suffice it to say, because of the different political institutions between the two places, certain fundamental differences in their civic education orientation can be identified (Tse, 1999; Cheung, 1996; Fairbrother, 2004). Hahn & Alviar-Martin (2008) cite Fairbrother (2003)’s study of political socialization in the two places to illuminate the fundamental differences in the two systems whereby China promoted an ideology of patriotism in the 1990s whereas Hong Kong promoted an ideology of depoliticization and students did not develop political sentiments towards the nation. In China, civic education emphasizes mainly patriotism, nationalism and morality whereas civic education of Hong Kong gradually moves from subject oriented towards democratic and political education (Tsang, 1996; Chan, 1996; Liu, 1998). In this light, the highly centralized and controlled mode of implementation of civic education in China may not be acceptable to Hong Kongers (Lee, 1998).

Yet a decentralized policy will become more and more prominent in China
when implementing civic education in future. Lee & Ho (2005), in examining the ideological shifts and changes in moral education policy of Mainland China in the past twenty years, discerned that political socialization was at the centre of Chinese moral education in the past. Moral education was thus co-named as ideological education (*sixiang jiaoyu*) or political education (*zhengzhi jiaoyu*) and/or ideopolitical education. From this perspective, one may argue moral education can be seen as partially adopted as a substitute of civic education in China. Consistent with the advent of the open economic policy, the current moral education in the mainland has shifted to the recognition of the entrepreneurs and been opening up to the global world. The moral education curriculum addresses the needs of the Chinese society in the process of its modernization and opening up to the world, and has resulted in the liberalization of the citizenship curriculum to focus on individual growth rather than political socialization. In specificity, three focal points of discussion emerged comprising nationalistic education, education for democracy, as well as individual well-being and the moral quality of citizen.

Moreover, since China adopted the “Open Door Policy” from 1979 (Hayashi, 2003), her influence in the international society has been growing dramatically. Following her participation in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 2001, China’s influence upon international affairs was seen to be greater and greater. It is speculative that changes in her civic education policy may be speeding up accordingly. In effect, there is no exaggeration to suppose a place for global education in order to prepare the Chinese citizens to become more effective participants in world affairs.

Despite a possible sign that contradictions in civic education orientation may be minimized in the future between Hong Kong and China, it is a bit too naive to expect the incongruity to vanish immediately. Subsequent to the reemergence of
China into the world community, it is discreetly optimistic that the gap will go away one day.

Irrespective of the above optimistic speculation, some other laden crises and paradoxes in fact warrant our serious attention. The 1997 transition exposed a deep-rooted identity crisis amongst Hong Kong civilians. Most people in Hong Kong identify themselves as Hong Kongers rather than Chinese. This phenomenon can be vividly shown in the findings of the studies conducted by the Commission on Youth (1998) & Lee (1999). Lau (1997) also reports that the Hong Kong Chinese ethnics tend to identify themselves as Hong Kongese when they are asked to make a choice between the identities of Hong Kongese and Chinese. This identity issue has remained ambiguous for Hong Kong people seven years after the handover (Lee & Leung, 2006a).

According to a study on national identity undertaken by the governmental Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education (Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education, 2004), only 21% of the surveyed Hong Kong people who aged below 40, locally born and highly educated, felt being a Chinese, 12% felt being a Chinese citizen, and 17% of them respected political and legal systems in China. This result suggested vividly that Hong Kong people’s national identity continues to fluctuate, especially among the young generation.

Conceivably, the Chinese government recognises the detachment of Hong Kong people by introducing the ‘One Country, Two Systems’ model in which Hong Kong has been permitted a high degree of autonomy. The preamble of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR) of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) (China, 1991) reads, “Upholding national unity and territorial integrity, maintaining the prosperity and stability of Hong Kong, and taking account of its
history and realities, the PRC 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 PRC, and that under the principle of "one country, two systems", the socialist system and policies will not be practised in Hong Kong”.

After the 1997 handover, the people of Hong Kong have been introduced to a special identity as citizens of a SAR of Mainland China. This may one way or another create a crisis of dual affiliation for the Hong Kong residents so as to deepen the identity crisis of the Hong Kongers. At the end of the day, this brings about the dichotomy of dual citizenship (Chong, 1999). This uncertainty was further highlighted by Tse (2006) who enunciates, “the long separation between Hong Kong and mainland China and the different rules of governance led to Hong Kong’s distinctive socio-economic development and the development of an indigenous culture and ‘Hongkongese’ identity. With the designated return of Hong Kong to China in 1997, change in political membership became a pressing issue as the change of sovereignty meant that Hong Kong people would require new national identities as citizens of the PRC. Nevertheless, Hong Kong students were often criticized for their lack of civic consciousness and low awareness of their nation and state. The situation invoked worries over the political future of Hong Kong, and elicited public concern for civic education in schools (p.292-230)”.

To alleviate the identity crisis of the Hongkongese originating from their dual citizenship (or allegiance), global citizenship seems to be a good antidote. Based on Chong’s (1999) critical review of the feasibility of global citizenship education in Hong Kong, this new developmental trend of civic education is appropriate for Hong Kong in future. First, with the emphasis of an ultimate allegiance to the whole
humankind in global citizenship, it helps to lessen the intensity of the identity crisis. On the other hand, it also helps to nurture a balanced view of globalism amongst the people in Hong Kong, in which the awareness of global issues and responsibilities is stressed. This is certainly vital for making Hong Kong to become a genuine international city. Overall, while a transformation from urban citizenship to national citizenship is in great demand, the adoption of global citizenship is believed to be feasible to keep Hong Kong as an international city.

Secondly, with the underpinning principles of global citizenship wherein universal rules and multiculturalism are emphasized, it is easier for the Hong Kong Chinese to cope with the mainlanders, who are both similar to and different from the Hong Kong people.

Lastly, global citizenship education helps to promote self-knowledge, since the learning of other cultures helps to promote a critical examination of one’s own values.

The divergent orientations of Hong Kong civic education and that of China as well as the identity crisis of the people of Hong Kong can hence be viewed at least on the surface as two substantial driving forces for the flourish of global citizenship education in Hong Kong. A more affirmative conclusion can certainly be drawn up when a comprehensive review of the development of civic education in Hong Kong has been conducted on the premises of understanding civic education in context as delineated above. Such review is outlined in the ensuing paragraphs.

**2.6 Connotation of Civic Education for Hong Kong**

Based on the discussion so far, there appears to be an extension or inflation of civic education, in alignment with an extension of citizenship from unilateral national
oriented to a supranational level. Some insights in finding a unilateral and universally accepted understanding of civic education for the future society can also be obtained from Kennedy’s (1997) statement,

“In suggesting that there are different conceptions of citizenship education, I want to suggest that citizenship education is capable of being constructed in multiple ways that it is important to be aware of how those constructions take place” (p.1).

In the early 1990s, Heater (1990) proposes a comprehensive pattern of multifaceted citizenship, the cube of citizenship, for citizenship education in which the extension of citizenship is obviously taken into account. In this model, there are three dimensions: geographical level, education and civic elements. While the geographical level consists of four layers revolving around provincial/local, nation-state, continental/regional, and world, the education aspects feature three elements – knowledge, attitude and skills. The civic elements embrace five components involving identity, virtue, legal/civil, political, and social. Heater remarks that the components of each dimension must be interconnected. He also provides justifications for the feasibility of multiple citizenship in the following three ways:

The first rests on the psychological part of a citizen who may experience the dilemma in multiple identity and loyalty. In transcending the psychological barrier of the orthodox citizenship concept wherein identity and locality are hinged on the nation-state, Heater (1990) argues that the citizen will identify with his locality, state or the world depending on circumstances. A concentration of identity and loyalty on the nation-state only is psychologically artificial. In the twenty-first century, a greater mobility in population as well as advancement in communication and education are going to make obsolete identity entirely determined by the nation-state.

Pragmatic reasons underline Heater’s (1990) second justification. First and foremost, total identification with the state is not always in the citizen’s best interest.
The good of the locality is not always necessarily equal to the good of the state as a whole. The citizen, in this sense, tends to sustain his/her allegiance to his/her locality or he/she may devote his/her loyalty to the whole human species for the practical purpose of sheer survival.

Morally, Heater regards an individual as having both a need and a right to shape his/her own good life. It appears unreasonable to expect the state to be able to satisfy all facets of this life, so holding sole concentration of identity and loyalty to the state is unjustified. The citizen should look beyond the state as necessary towards the component of a consciously integrated humanity.

Besides Derek Heater, Kubow et al. (2000) describe another multidimensional framework of citizenship. Based on the nine-nation’s CEPS data, there is a need for a much more complex conception of citizenship and citizenship education. Multidimensional citizenship (MDC) is described as the complex, multifaceted conceptualization of citizenship and citizenship education that will be needed if the citizen is to cope with the challenges in the twenty-first century.

The MDC framework is composed of four key dimensions: the personal, the social, the spatial and the temporal with a goal to develop eight characteristics in students. They should be able to:

- look at and approach problems as a member of a global society;
- work cooperatively with others and to take one’s societal roles and duties;
- understand, accept, appreciate and tolerate cultural differences;
- think in a critical and systematic way;
- resolve conflict in a non-violent manner;
- change one’s lifestyle in order to protect the environment;
- be sensitive towards and to defend human rights; and
- participate in politics at local, national and international levels.

To attain the above goal, the four dimensions of the MDC model should be
actualized in compliance with the concrete requirements in each dimension. For the personal dimension, the citizen should develop a personal capacity for and commitment to civic ethic characterized by individually and socially responsible habits of mind, heart and action. In other words, the citizen should acquire and internalize a set of dispositions to behave in the civic sphere in concert with the eight characteristics described above.

In the social dimension, citizens should learn the notability of participation and be willing to involve in social affairs, since citizenship is itself in essence a social activity. Equally important, citizen actions should be the result of reflection and deliberation and be undertaken with full respect for the rights of others.

Within the spatial dimension, citizens should see themselves as members of several overlapping communities – local, regional, national and multinational. As the world is becoming more and more interconnected and interdependent, citizens are required to be able to live and work at a series of interconnected levels, from the local to the multinational.

By the temporal dimension, finally, citizens should not pay attention to the present, but also to the past and the future. This is by virtue of the fact that heritage and tradition are influential in helping citizens understand what citizenship is about. Citizens should also be aware of their present action that may have impact on the citizens of the future.

As far as the above two models are concerned, it is not hard to identify certain similarities and commonalities. First, they both adopt a multidimensional approach to civic education. Secondly, they both concentrate upon the widening scope of citizenship from the national to the spectrum of the local to the international level. Thirdly, education of world citizens is their common goal. In this regard, these two
models should be considered as not mutually exclusive but mutually complementary. In particular, Heater’s justifications of his multilevel model seem applicable to construing some of the key theoretical underpinning of the MDC model such as the extension of the geographical dimension and the spatial dimension.

As a matter of fact, there seems to be an obvious trend that more and more scholars attempt to tie up the multiple-faceted model with the instillation of a global perspective in students. An example can be found in Selby (1995) who puts forward a four dimensional model of global education comprising three outer and one inner dimension. The outer dimensions are: the spatial dimension, temporal globality, and attention to all global issues. The inner dimension refers to the reflection on one’s belief system in the global aspect.

Some may argue that the impact of the global trend is yet to be determined as absolutely positive. As mentioned previously, those holding a skeptical view towards globalization may criticize it as the strategy of the developed countries in exploiting and marginalizing countries in the third world. This may be true in some senses. However, when we focus on citizenship in which civic identity, loyalty, rights and obligations are taken into account, the global trend is bound to be irreversible and irresistible. The expansion of the citizens’ global contact with the outside world which is followed by the inflation of citizenship in turn leads to the extension of citizenship, i.e. multiple citizenship. It is hence worthwhile to examine the impact of the global trend on the fundamental meaning of civic education as civic education is regarded unquestionably as a means to nurturing citizenship.

According to Kubow’s (1996) analysis, there are two prevalent conceptualizations of civic education including the “practical social competence approach” and the “deliberation-oriented approach”. The former is concerned about
the development of a “sociological imagination” in students. A person who possesses a sociological imagination has consciousness of social causes, consequences, and relationships as an attribute of social competence and democratic mind. The key role of civic education under this approach is to develop in students a competency to apply reflective thought for revealing the real nature of social problems and conflict and posing new social orientations.

The importance of deliberation is embedded in the deliberation-oriented approach. Civic educators adopting this approach must instill in their students the skills of deliberation, the essential skills for them to think publicly. In other words, students are taught a way of thinking and knowing depending on public dialogue. To an ultimate end, students are fostered to perform participatory citizenship and democratic competency.

Taking into consideration the above two approaches it is not difficult to discover that education of the democratic mind, including the way of knowing and the skills of participation, is central to civic education. While the practical social competence approach advocates the exercise of critical mind in forming the individual orientation towards societal events, the deliberation-oriented approach sheds much light on public dialogue based on the individual’s critical thinking.

Unsurprisingly, democracy is ascertained as the crux of civic education (Dewey, 1916). As a central value system of civic education, democracy remains essential no matter whether the global citizenship model is adopted. This is because democracy comprises some core values for the preservation of the citizenship institution. They include autonomy, social justice, tolerance, independent thinking and participation. Without these values, no citizens can really enjoy their public and private life in the society.
In discussing the maximal and minimal paradigms of civic education, McLaughlin (1992) succinctly maintains that what is at stake in education for citizenship is to allow public virtues and controversial issues to be discussed thoroughly by students. This means that students should be better helped to develop a certain degree of critical understanding and questioning of orthodox beliefs on social and political issues under the roof of the maximal mode of civic education. This attribute is of utmost importance for citizens to live democratically in the complex global environment.

Similarly, Girouox (1983) discusses three generic models of civic education: the citizenship transmission model, the reflective model and the critical model. The citizenship transmission model is concerned with the traditional way of didactic teaching in which the students are encouraged to totally accept what the teacher teaches. In the reflective model, the learners are encouraged to undertake reflective thinking on what the teacher says based on existing and traditional values. Finally, the critical model encourages learners to review critically on what the teachers say without the limitation of the existing and traditional value system. By comparison, the critical model has an overt advantage over the other two models. This consequence is built on the conviction that in order to cultivate a sense of democracy on the part of students, training of critical thinking towards orthodox beliefs is fundamentally necessary.

Hence, educating for the democratic mind for students to adapt to the political change as the result of the handover of the sovereignty of Hong Kong to China (Fok, 1997) and developing the globalised mind for Hong Kong students to live in the globalizing world (Lee & Leung, 2006b) should be deemed as the two most essential components in Hong Kong civic education. Of course, these ultimate aims seem to be
universally true so I have little reason to doubt their appropriateness to civic education in Hong Kong.

As a local civic education expert, Kennedy (2003a & b) affirms the above stance by advocating the new form of globalization arising out of very specific social and political contexts initiated by the terrorist attacks of September 11. The new form of globalization seeks to attain by force what the older form sought through economic, political and cultural hegemony. The real challenge for schools, therefore, is how to respond to the impacts of globalizations where, daily, new uncertainties are heaped on old uncertainties. In this light, educators are required to rethink social education in times of uncertainty. Civic education curriculum needs to be reoriented to achieve the purposes of teaching beyond national borders, providing instruction in cultural understanding, helping students understand the effects of propaganda, developing historical perspective, showing the effects of changes in interpreting the concept of civil liberties, and developing critical thinking skills. Through this curriculum reorientation, three board messages can be discerned including teaching beyond borders, teaching beyond the disciplines, and teaching to bring hope. In a broader sense, civics and citizenship education should be refocused on civil society, ‘authentic’ learning contexts, and ethics, values and morality. When discussing the curriculum for tomorrow’s school, Kennedy (2005) maintains,

“Citizens of the future will be international citizens. They will require a knowledge base that will help them feel as comfortable in other countries as they do in their own. Regional groupings such as the APEC, NAFTA, and EU indicate that national boundaries are becoming irrelevant as nations seek advantages from cross-national activities and enterprises. Common reference to “European citizenship” for example highlights how far at least one region of the world has become just 50 years after a devastating war. There will always be local citizenship, but in the future it will be exercised in a different context; global communication and international travel. Young people need to be prepared for such a future so that the international and the national can co-exist and feed off one another. There is surely a role for civics education here if young people are to be prepared for such a future” (p.44).
2.7 Civic Education Development in Hong Kong

There was a previous discussion in this work to see whether the development of Hong Kong civic education would need to follow that of China. The discussion was grounded on the contention that Hong Kong is subject to Chinese influence, both in political and economic terms owing to its geographical attachment to the motherland (Lee, 2005b). Politically, national identity is always a thorny issue in the territory. Economically, Hong Kong is moving gradually away from self-sufficiency and reliant more and more on the support of China. In terms of daily necessities, Hong Kong has to rely on food and water supplies from the Chinese mainland. However, as mentioned previously, due to years of segregation between the two places, their social institutions, political orientations and ways of living, are for too apart. Maintaining a high degree of autonomy in Hong Kong can be conducive to avoid maladjustment of Hong Kong people under the new sovereignty. Actually, some form of autonomy is enjoyed by the people of Hong Kong, for example, the perseverance of the education system independent of that of China is stated in the article 136 of the Basic Law (China, 1991) which states,

“On the basis of the previous educational system, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region shall, on its own, formulate policies on the development and improvement of education, including policies regarding the educational system and its administration, the language of instruction, the allocation of funds, the examination system, the system of academic awards and the recognition of educational qualifications.

Community organizations and individuals may, in accordance with law, run educational undertakings of various kinds in the Hong Kong Special AdministrativeRegion”.

Despite this, Hong Kong seems to be experiencing ideological dilemma in many aspects of relationships with Mainland China. The obvious one is that the “democratic” system which Hong Kongers have enjoyed for years might not be
valued and appreciated by Mainland China where communism has long been adopted. Disputes taking place in different forms have easily occurred attributed to this ideological or structural discrepancy (Patten, 1998). Under this situation, Hong Kongers might be extremely confused as to whether they should nurture their citizens in their own democratic way or try to follow the footsteps of China.

Some may argue that a liberal rather than democratic system has been built up in Hong Kong. However, according to Lau (1993), democracy appears to have been developed in the entire Hong Kong society. Hong Kong people have developed a kind of relaxed, flexible and ambivalent understanding of what democracy is, and quite diverse judgements regarding how far and how fast the territory should be democratized (Lee, 2005b). The notion of ‘consultative democracy’ is prima facie prevalent. Unarguably, people in Hong Kong nowadays enjoy a greater opportunity to participate in political activities, compared with their predecessors several decades ago. However, to achieve the genuine and ideal democratic stage in which they actually have control over their public affairs, there is still a long way to go. To a certain extent, I therefore prefer saying that democracy is developing in Hong Kong. Anyway, if the new generation does not know how to live in a democratic society, Hong Kong will eventually suffer and be in peril. In fact, effective civic education that teaches adolescents how to participate and effect positive change within their communities is critical to the development of a lasting commitment to civic participation.

In addition, some surveys conducted in Hong Kong such as Wong & Sham (1996) and Commission on Youth (1998) reveal unequivocally that young people in Hong Kong are generally in serious civic deficiency. As Lai (1999) indicates,

“Various research findings reflect that young people are apathetic in political and community affairs, weak in basic civic knowledge and
“social awareness” (p.205).

On the contrary, it is heartening that the 2001 2nd phase of the IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) international comparative study including 28 countries and places indicates that 14-year old Hong Kong students performed better than the international mean on the civic knowledge and skills (Torney-Purta, 2006). Analyzing through the angle of citizenship, Tsang (2006) also concludes that Hong Kong students felt more politically efficacious than their older counterparts. They felt less skeptical and helpless about politics.

In spite of the conflicting conclusions in the above studies, very few of them shed light in the global context. In this regard, neither do the youngsters have ample knowledge of the Hong Kong society or the global context, nor do they show high interest in knowing about societal matters. This situation is definitely far from satisfactory. It is also not difficult to imagine that young people may become vulnerable when facing challenges in the second millennium. Not only will they fail to keep abreast of the pulse of the fast changing world, more seriously, they may not be able to know even how to survive in a democratic way of living.

To conclude, given the prime value of civic education and global citizenship education as well as the dearth of the relevant literature in the local arena, there is a clear necessity for conducting an in-depth research study about civic education in the context of Hong Kong with a special focus on the teachers’ global perspective.

2.8 The Development of Civic Education Curriculum in Hong Kong

Regarding the imperative of civic education mentioned so far, one might anticipate a smooth development of the subject in Hong Kong. As a matter of fact,
this has not been the case. The Government and schools for long overlooked or even condemned civic education (Morris, 1997a; Morris & Chan, 1997; Leung & Ng, 2004; Lee, 2005a & b). This phenomenon is indeed not peculiar to Hong Kong, but common in other countries as well (Torney-Purta et al, 1999). In particular, civic education-related curricula such as Liberal Studies, Social Studies, Government and Public Affairs (GPA), and Economics and Public Affairs (EPA) emerged in Hong Kong at different times mostly due to political considerations (Morris, 1995). Most of these subjects fail to gain popularity in schools simply by virtue of their lack of a direct linkage to subjects on the all-important Hong Kong Certificate of Education Examination (HKCEE), which is a high-stakes public examination administered at the end of the five-year secondary schooling. Taking social studies as an example, Morris et al. (1997) claim the unpopularity of the subject in the school to its inability to conform to actual conditions in schools.

Chan (1996) accounts for the above phenomenon from a macro view and attributes the adverse situation to the government’s ambiguous orientation towards political culture. In facing a greater and greater demand for political participation, the Hong Kong government fails to extend its policy by offering such opportunities for citizenry to take part. This results in a bad effect on civic education, even though a large amount of resources have been put in. In short, Fok (1997) generalizes, “Civic education has never had an important place in the Hong Kong school curriculum” (p.89).

Lee (2008b) details the curriculum development progress from the contextual perspective since the confirmation of the change of Hong Kong’s sovereignty in 1984. The heated debates and discussions on how civic education should be developed and implemented after the handover in 1997 led to the government’s publication of the Guidelines on Civic Education in School in 1996. After 1997, the degree of intensity
of the debate about civic education lessened. The development of civic education in schools was impacted by the change of sociopolitical and economic circumstances in the society. The civic curriculum was heavily driven by two forces entailing the need to face the challenges of globalization, such as the emergence of the knowledge-based economy and the pressure for more patriotic education. As a result, the development of global awareness and strengthening of national identity education overtly dominated the prevailing civic education curriculum in Hong Kong. The 1998 junior secondary Civic Education syllabus widely captures global citizenship, as one of the six themes of the subject (family, neighbouring community, regional community, national community, international community, and civic quality and civil society) (Lee, 2005a).

2.9 Emergence of Civic Education as an Independent Subject

Fortunately, changes and opportunities appear to have been brought about by the political transition in 1997. Since Hong Kong reverted to Mainland China’s sovereignty, there has been a social outcry for the strengthening of civic education in the territory (Lee, 1998; Lee, 2008b). Suddenly, the spotlight converged on the issue.

The “Guidelines on Civic Education in School, 1985” was the first civic education guiding document on the implementation of civic education for Hong Kong schools, (referred hereinafter as “the guidelines”) which was widely reckoned as obsolete and no longer suitable for the new age (Tse, 2000b). With the major tone in advocating social solidarity, encouraging cooperation and obedience on the part of students, the guidelines were criticized vigorously as depoliticized, conservative and vague on the one hand. On the other hand, it was censured as turning a blind eye on ethnic identity (Leung, 1997). As Lee (1987) remarks,
“Civic education in Hong Kong is conceptualized to be moral education, stressing human and social relationships. It is also looked upon as similar to political education, where politics is to serve the purpose of consolidating the status quo, rather than introduce changes. Guided participation is the rule while political action is belittled” (p.15).

Consequently, an overall review of the guidelines was embarked upon in 1995 with the forming of an ad hoc working group. A year later, the new “1996 Guidelines on Civic Education” (hereinafter called the “new guidelines”) came into being. For the very first time, the new guidelines put forward a comprehensive conceptual framework of civic education. Moreover, the strengths and weaknesses of various implementation methods were reviewed while a list of indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of civic education in schools was proposed (Lee, 1997).

In comparison with its predecessor, the new guidelines proposed a more inclusive approach in order to strike a balance among various interest groups’ needs (Wong, 1998). The “civic eyereach” that it advocates stretches from the individual level to the global level. Students are envisaged to become global citizens with a critical mind to make judgments and decisions on social issues (Morris, 1997a). From another angle, Tse (1999) remarks, it is so apparent that the major purpose of the new guidelines is to prepare students for the political changes in 1997. Students are simultaneously nurtured with national identification, a sense of belonging and patriotism.

More importantly, the new guidelines abandoned the conservative approach. Rather, the participative nature of political education is emphasized (Cheung & Leung, 1998). Further, students are encouraged to become critical thinkers who hold broader views towards the world. This development was obviously, to a greater extent, in line with the contemporary notion of civic education as mentioned before. Another major discord between the old and new guidelines is in the approach to curriculum
organization. While a permeated approach was highly advocated in the 1985 guidelines, three modes, including permeated, integrated and specific-subject, were underlined in the new guidelines. As one of the core members of the captioned working group in producing the new guidelines, Lee (1997) succinctly indicates that whether civic education should be taught as an independent subject was at the centre of the debate when the old guidelines were revised. While some school principals had hesitation about the true value of the independent civic education subject approach based on their practical considerations of their schools, this proposal was widely accepted by the majority of other stakeholders in the local education community.

Why the independent-subject mode is preferred may be partly attributable to the unfavourable effect of the cross-curricular style. In Tse’s (1997) analysis, the cross-curricular approach was not found to be effective. By virtue of the subject streaming at senior secondary schooling, the majority of students who opt for the science stream automatically lose their chances to study the civic-education-related subjects. Moreover, the lack of sufficient coordination among different subjects may inevitably lead to the marginalization of civic education. Such insufficient coordination may also lead to a situation that teachers may be unaware of what other colleagues actually are doing for civic education (Cheung & Leung, 1998).

A new civic education syllabus for Hong Kong Secondary One to Three students (12 to 15 years old) was issued in 1998 by the Curriculum Development Council in accordance with the concepts and curriculum framework proposed in the 1996 Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools (Lee, 2008b).

Hence, there is no surprise that Chung (1998) pays high compliment to the idea of introducing the new independent subject. He regards the innovation as a positive move to react to the needs of drastic societal changes. The new independent
subject is also viewed as an effective vehicle in cultivating students with an all-round ability to think critically and independently.

To me, the specific-subject mode is the one to which I am more inclined to adhere from among these three approaches. Not only are there the shortcomings of the cross-curricular approaches mentioned earlier, the advantages of delivering civic education through an independent subject are self-evident. At the foremost, Lee (1998) stresses,

“In a depoliticized social context, where civics was found in scattered fragments within a variety of school subjects and accompanied by a weak recommendation of a ‘whole-school’ approach to its implementation (in 1985), it is not surprising that there was at best a half-hearted implementation of civic education in schools and sometimes none at all” (p.334).

More explicitly, Chung (1998) emphasizes that the introduction of the independent subject of civic education is of paramount importance. By implementing the new subject, not only can the pace of school democracy be improved, students are equipped as all-rounders who possess higher order thinking skills.

“It would be more systematic and better focused if civic education is taught as a specific subject” (Education Department, 1996: 44).

In truth, there is up till now no definite answer to ascertain which mode of delivery is most suitable for civic education in schools. However, Entwistle’s (1971) view could give us a clue. Compare the two common modes of delivery in civic education: the incidental approach and the independent subject approach, the former is thought to be more fragmented, scattered, and conceptually ambiguous than the latter. In this regard, I have little hesitation to believe that implementing the civic education curriculum in the form of an independent subject seems to be more feasible and applicable.

As a matter of fact, the emergence of the new guidelines won widespread
applause from the Hong Kong public (e.g. Cheung, P. L., 1996; Tse, 1999). There were however critics such as Tsang (1996) who alleged that the guidelines were too broad in coverage and lacking of in focus that might lead to difficulties in putting it into practice in schools.

Complying with the new guidelines, a multidimensional conceptual framework is adopted in the independent subject. For the world dimension, concerning the international community, there are topics such as a world of diversity (Secondary one), heritage of human civilizations and historical events of worldwide significance (Secondary two), and major global issues (Secondary three). On the whole, through the subject, the students’ horizon is expected to expand to the international level where the betterment of humankind is concerned. Regrettably, to the limited knowledge of the author of this thesis, there has been hitherto no empirical research study on the effective implementation of the new guidelines. It is thus unsurprising to acknowledge that

“It is too early to tell whether implementation of civic education activities under the new Guidelines has led to a more active citizenship among the youths” (Commission of Youth, 1998: 83).

Despite this, I strongly believe it is prime time to take a closer look into the subject. As a matter of fact, it sets up an ideal context where focused teaching in civic education inside the classroom can be explored. Nevertheless, in consideration of the wide coverage of the subject curriculum (41 topics are covered in the six areas in each year from Secondary 1 to 3), it is certainly far too reaching for me to explore all areas of it, due to my limited time and manpower. Echoing the concept of globalised civic education mentioned earlier, I will stick to the topic in relation to “Globalization”.

More recently, the official syllabus of civic education (Education Department, 1998) suggests six core areas of study in each of the levels from Secondary One to
Three, including family, national community, international community, neighbouring community, regional community, and citizenship & civil society. Apparently, teachers’ global perspective is at the centre when they need to handle topics such as major global issues in the area of international community as well as fairness and justice, and critical thinking in the area of citizenship and civil society. When teachers strive to instill the notion of global citizenship in their students, relevant areas comprising economic and social justice, protecting the earth, social and cultural diversity, and educating for peace are absolutely unavoidable (Noddings, 2005). Therefore, whether teachers have adequate global perspective may be reflected by how they rate importance for those issues as mentioned. It is also noteworthy that globalization is one of the six core units of study in the new Liberal Studies subject for Secondary Four to Six students under the new 3-3-4 (three years’ junior secondary, three years’ senior secondary and four years’ university undergraduate studies) academic structure in Hong Kong (Curriculum Development Council and Hong Kong Examinations & Assessment Authority, 2005). A good grasp of appropriate knowledge, skills and attitude in the global domain at the junior secondary level is not just beneficial to students for progressing studies of civic education or a related discipline at a higher level and also to teachers for teaching civic education or a related discipline at a higher level.

For the implementation of the civic education independent subject, there appears to be uncertainty whether or not the local civic education has been implemented on a right track. According to Leung & Ng (2004), a very limited local research study on the implementation of civic education in the local lower secondary setting is available. Subject marginalization, moralization, and unambiguous civic education policy and strategy are adverse factors for implementing civic education in
secondary schools in Hong Kong (Leung, 1997). Leung’s study showed that it was clear that global topics such as the understanding of international affairs and cultural tolerance were not placed very high in the school civic education objectives and not frequently discussed in class. The lack of sufficient training was also identified as a detrimental factor for teachers to deliver the subject in schools.

Besides this study, there is, regrettably, a dearth of other local studies on a similar topic leaving the whole true picture of the implementation of civic education in Hong Kong blurred. Without sufficient empirical research findings, we are also unsure whether Hong Kong civic education teachers, who need to deliver the new civic education concepts emanated from the new 1996 guidelines, possess the requisite global or world view that enables them to excel in the subject teaching.

In the governmental document, ‘Learning to Learn’ (Education Bureau, 2001), ‘Moral and Civic Education’ (MCE) is recommended as one of the four key learning tasks (the other three are ‘Reading to learn’, ‘Project Learning’, and ‘Information Technology for Interactive Learning’). The key tasks are understood as “what teachers can do to help students develop independent learning capabilities through key learning areas (KLAs) and across KLAs more readily (p.83)”. MCE is considered significant because it is one of the five essential learning experiences in Primary One to Secondary Three (Grade One to Nine) schooling. It is believed the development of positive attitudes and a sense of commitment provide the affective basis for students to learn more effectively. Some key messages about MCE revolve around,

- MCE is one of the essential learning experiences required for whole-person development and is vital in helping students build up positive values and attitudes;
• A holistic perception of MCE covering various issues related to value development such as sex education, environmental protection, media education, religious education, ethics and healthy living is proposed for promotion in schools;

• In the domain of values and attitudes, national identity, a positive spirit, perseverance, respect for others and commitment to society and nation are the five values and attitudes regarded as paramount to students’ personal development during the short-term phase; and

• The implementation of MCE should be learner-focused. Learning opportunities should be provided for students to develop and reflect on their values and attitudes using events relevant to their daily life (p.84).

Pursuant to this, the central school curriculum advisory body, CDC, subsequently released two follow-up supporting documents in 2002, “Basic Education Curriculum Guide - Building on Strengths (Primary 1 - Secondary 3)” (Curriculum Development Council, 2002a) and “Key Learning Area / General Studies Curriculum Guides” (Curriculum Development Council, 2002b) to elaborate in greater detail about their notion of the curriculum reform. Of the eight proposed KLAs, the “Personal, Social, and Humanities Education (PSHE)” KLA is mostly specific to civic education, though not all the embedded themes are pertinent. There are six learning targets, one of which is closely relevant to civic education, i.e. “to demonstrate active and responsible citizenship based on an understanding of the roles, rights and responsibilities of individuals and groups, the importance of social justice and concern for local, national and global issues, a respect for all these (Key Learning Area / General Studies Curriculum Guides, p.24).

Given this, it is interesting to observe that a more global perspective is advocated vis-à-vis the ingredients of MCE which sound a bit obsolete and old fashioned. Nevertheless, there is yet a clear indication that the global perspective will
be put in the top priority. Perhaps this is attributable to the change of educational and political environment in Hong Kong since 1997 (Leung & Ng, 2004) that the emphasis of civic education is usually envisaged to be placed on the national level or below in order to promote local stability and solidarity. Truly speaking, the ever-changing and globalising world does need competent inhabitants who have global views to sustain so that emerging global issues can be well handled. Likewise, people do need global views to survive in such a rapid moving world.

Hypothetically, the above speculation might be true in some senses. In fact, the last chapter has explained that nation-states are, sometimes and somehow, integral grounds for deliberation of global issues to take place. However, too much emphasis on the national issues, such as nationalism and patriotism, can be problematic (Fairbrother, 2004) because critical thinking has to stand aside somewhere. As a British colony for more than a hundred year, identity crisis (i.e. a Hong Kong citizen as a Hong Kong Chinese, a Chinese, a Hong Kong resident) has long been a problem, even though the situation is somehow improving after nine years since the handover have lapsed (see a survey conducted by Civic Education Promotion Committee in 2005, www.cpce.gov.hk). The underlying reason can be the deep-rooted phobia of most Hong Kong people, who are refugees from the mainland in the 50’s, over communism. This was evidenced by a recent large-scale political action for more half a million Hong Kong citizens took the street on a petition in 2003 for the objection of the anti-subversion legislation relating to the Article 23 of the Basic Law. In this regard, a globalised civic education perspective is espoused to be helpful for students (or even teachers) to take a more critical mind towards the subject, which is a vital survival skill for them in the complex and increasingly complicating world.
2.9 Recent Research Studies in Civic Education and Global Civic Education in Hong Kong

There was a wealth of civic education studies taking place in the past dozens of years in Hong Kong and the list is indeed exhaustive. Therefore, I attempt to concentrate on a sample of them here. The first one was conducted by the Curriculum Development Council (1995) trying to find out the impact of school civic education on civic awareness and attitudes of the secondary students. From the findings of the student questionnaires and interviews with school principals and teachers, school effects were found more prominent for the junior secondary students than for those in the senior classes. Moreover, the school ethos mattered much to the formation of students’ civic attitudes and its effect was even greater than the formal curricula.

With a major focus of investigating the political socialization of the Hong Kong younger generation during the political transitional period, Leung (1997) used the data collected through student questionnaires and interviews with school staff to demonstrate that the youth was socialized to be alienated from the Chinese government. This was caused by the macro-socialization factor, political events, and a number of micro-socialization factors, negative messages of the Chinese government from parents and stereotyping, the depoliticization and trivialization of civic education in secondary schools, and three schooling factors, namely, the quality of school, grade level, and subject groups.

By interviews with principals, teachers and students of six secondary schools, Lee & Leung (1999) identified the institutional constraints on the implementation of civic education in secondary schools in terms of resource allocation, formal curricula, informal curricula and gate-keeping of controversial issues. Tse (2000a) utilized the method of content analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of the syllabus and textbooks
of the junior secondary Economics and Public Affairs (EPA). The results depicted,

“Most of the textbooks still pointed to a rather partial, passive and parochial conception of citizenship” (p.107).

Morris and Morris (2002) conducted a case study on the implementation of civic education in two secondary schools in Hong Kong, one of which was new and the other was long-established. The school principals, teachers and students in the two schools were interviewed. The findings manifested that the civic education goals promoted by the government was not a key feature of the schools’ implemented policy as somehow reflected by the avoidance of controversial issues in the civic education curriculum in both schools. In comparing the two schools, the new one placed emphasis on the development of high academic achievers while its long-established counterpart stressed moral agenda with encouragement of student participation in extra-curricular activities. All in all, the conventional and traditional way of civic education implementation was apparently adopted by both investigated schools.

Mahlstedt (2003) studied a sample of global citizenship education in practice in the United World Colleges including the one in Hong Kong (UWC is a college providing the curriculum of International Baccalaureate for senior secondary students) through multiple means of document analysis as well as a questionnaire survey and interviews of teachers. The investigated teachers defined global citizenship education within at least one value amongst universalism and relativism, state of the planet awareness, interdependence of all life, connection of the local and the global and cross-cultural awareness. This finding is congruent with the discussion of global citizenship education presented earlier in this chapter. To gauge more in-depth data on the topic, an ethnographic investigation of classroom practice was called upon.

Hong Kong and Guangzhou, China teachers’ perceptions of future citizens in
Hong Kong and Guangzhou were examined by Grossman (2004). 117 social studies teachers who pursued postgraduate studies in the Hong Kong Institute of Education and their 150 counterparts studied at the South China Normal University, China participated in a questionnaire survey. Multidimensional citizenship (Cogan and Derricott, 2000) was conceptualized as the framework of analysis. With respect to the personal dimension, both groups valued self-cultivation the most. For the social dimension, both parties attached low importance to political participation, the defence of human rights and making difficult decisions for the benefit of the community. Comparatively speaking, both groups of teachers emphasized the personal rather than the social dimension of citizenship. In terms of the spatial dimension, neither sample particularly supported the ability to look at and approach problems as a member of a global society. Both samples ranked the loyalty to one’s nation very low. By comparison, Hong Kong teachers placed more stress on the cross-cultural context of citizenship than their mainland counterparts. Finally, on the temporal dimension, the study result indicated that none of the two samples regarded the ability to make difficult decisions for the benefit of the community imperative for future citizens. All in all, the findings suggested that teachers from the two places attached significance to the non-political dimension of citizenship.

Lee (2004b) utilized Delphi study to investigate perceptions of Asian education leaders from 12 Asian countries or cities, including Hong Kong, on citizenship qualities. The results revealed that common topics in global citizenship encompassing diversity and multiculturalism, peace and conflict resolution, ecological awareness, global awareness and democracy were considered as essential values in values education curriculum. However, when asked about the reasons for values education, the education leaders gave the top priority to issues of individual character
development. Those on collective concerns were placed in the middle while those related to global concern and gender issue were ranked at the bottom. Global issues were again ranked low when the informants were asked what should be emphasized in values education curriculum. It is quite explicit that even though the concern over global issues is on a rise, their predominance within the Asian context has yet to be distinctive.

Commissioned by Oxfam, Hong Kong, Li & Gu (2004) conducted a comparative study on the implementation of global citizenship education in Hong Kong and Shanghai secondary schools. Through varying research methodologies including questionnaire surveys, focus interviews, and exchanging views with partner institutions, teachers’ and principals’ views from 719 local secondary schools were gauged. The results revealed that topics of global citizenship education have been one way or the other covered in various subjects. One third of the respondents expressed satisfaction over the implementation of global citizenship education in their school, ensued by another one third on dissatisfaction and the remaining one third on nil opinion. The views were quite divergent across the institutions. It was also intriguing to find conflicting views between the participating principals and teachers where the principals found the ‘active school policy’ having been put in place for the implementation of global citizenship education than the teachers. The school heads also considered the onus of the implementation of global citizenship education rested on the teachers whereas their teaching colleagues thought the opposite.

By contrast, the participating teachers considered a lack of active school policy on the implementation more than the school leaders. All in all, the study signified a number of vantage points, viz.

(i) school principals and teachers in Hong Kong generally found the international
issues interesting and considered it imperative to strengthen students’ “global citizenship education”;

(ii) in spite an apparent permeation of international issues in formal and informal secondary curricula, schools have yet to have an effective implementation strategy;

(iii) the prevailing curriculum contents were less focused on civic issues of politics, culture, rights, and civil participation;

(iv) students were considered less interested in international issues;

(v) a lack of sufficient subject knowledge was prevalent, and thus the related training was in need;

(vi) global citizenship education should cover topics like religion, value system, culture, sustainable development, environmental protection, war, peace, race, poverty, globalization, international economic and political ties, citizenship, and China-Hong Kong relationship;

(vii) global views and global citizenship education was delivered by the participating schools through various means such as weekly assembly, overseas exchange programmes, social services, and class discussion in Liberal Studies, Civic/Moral Education, Ethics, Religion Studies, Social Studies, Geography, Integrated Humanities, or Economic & Public Affairs. However, very few schools have succeeded in whole-school participation;

(viii) education authority’s position is central to the success of the school implementation;

(ix) views on whether global citizenship education should be delivered through independent subject or cross-curricular approach were diverse;

(x) over 60% of the respondents did not see a special advantage over the
implementation of global citizenship education in school. Implementation burdens include a shortage of teaching time and teaching resources, as well as the lack of subject knowledge among teachers;

(xi) the related activities were taken charge not by teachers with specific subject knowledge; and

(xii) teaching goal priority was given to subject knowledge rather than the cultivation of students’ critical thinking skills and value judgement abilities.

Hong Kong, Hangzhou and Guangzhou teachers’ perceptions of citizenship were explored in another Lee’s (2005c) study. A sample of primary and secondary civic education teachers from the three places took part in a questionnaire survey and a follow-up interview. The overwhelming majority of the respondents demonstrated a strong perception of social dimensions of citizenship (including social concern, social awareness, and community awareness). When asked about the perception of social concern, Hangzhou teachers concerned most about patriotism, Hong Kong teachers showed negative disposition towards obedience as a citizenship construct, and finally their Guangzhou counterparts rated tolerance of diversity within society the top priority. Both the crucial roles of school and teacher in the cultivation of civic knowledge and skills were confirmed.

Overall, it was concluded that classical, social and national citizenship were predominant in all the three cities. Whilst classical and national citizenship were emphasized more by teachers from the two mainland cities, Hong Kong teachers attached higher importance on social citizenship. There were some traits of multiple citizeships in both Hong Kong and Guangzhou. However, Hong Kong teachers did not perceive differently that parents and teachers are the most important factors in the development of good citizenship and so is the Chinese tradition.
More recently, Po & Lo (2008) conducted a case study at two junior secondary schools in Hong Kong on the development of an integrated approach to social education in the humanities and social sciences, a Key Learning Area (KLA). The study illuminated the adoption of a thematic approach in both schools to integrating the curriculum of Personal, Social, and Humanities Education (PSHE) at the junior secondary level. However, their school-based Liberal Studies programmes differed in goal, scope, sequence of learning, and curriculum structures despite the great similarities in the curriculum and pedagogical practices which resulted in the minimalist approach versus the maximalist approach. This disparity had implications for both the learning process and outcomes.

The researchers further summarized the findings into four major observations. First, a multidisciplinary instructional design using broad themes rather than an interdisciplinary approach to the curriculum integration was widely adopted in both schools under investigation. The primary concern of both students and teachers was given to the acquisition of content knowledge, which was inconsistent with the integrated approach to learning. Secondly, teachers found themselves a lack of broad knowledge base for the development and teaching of the multidisciplinary topics. Thirdly, learning tasks and activities in class were delivered in a cumulative rather than a developmental manner. Last but not least, teachers did not have the sufficient curriculum space in promoting a more holistic learning in class due to the examination-driven curriculum.

Judging from the above research studies, global citizenship education has emerged as a prime issue of civic education in Hong Kong after 2003. The studied teachers, though maintaining a proper interpretation of the subject, failed to put such a progressive conception into real teaching situation. The prohibitive factors comprise
the examination-driven curriculum, lack of subject knowledge and pedagogy, insufficient teaching time and school support, ambivalent government policy, and ambiguous school policy. Notwithstanding these, these studies contribute good reference points for the design of this study. Although local teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship education are somehow illustrative in some of aforementioned studies, the studies fail to offer an informed explanation on how the associated contributing factors come about. This is exactly the primary value of this study lies.

2.1.1 Current Teacher Training Opportunities in Hong Kong with regard to Civic Education or Global Citizenship Education

The significance of teacher education for Hong Kong was confirmed by Hinton (1975) over 30 years ago. He argued that,

“If we want our teachers to teach, even in the narrow sense of the word, competently, then they must be given some initial professional education and opportunities for pursuing that professional education throughout their teaching careers. If we want them not only to teach a subject but to guide the children in the direction of good citizenship, with all that that term involves by way of self-respect, respect for others, concern for the community and a strong sense of responsibility, then their professional teacher education becomes even more essential.” (p.60)

In Hong Kong, all graduates of pre-service teacher education training places for primary and secondary schools should be degree holders since 2004/05 school year (University Grants Committee, UGC, 2009). To enter the teaching profession, teacher registration should be sought from the Education Bureau, of the HKSAR Government (UNESCO, 2008; Wang et al., 2003). To qualify for the teacher registration, a person should have completed an approved teacher education programme offered by a recognized institution. Once the teacher registration
succeeds, the applicant will be granted the qualified teacher status through the issuance of a teacher certificate by the EDB, which is valid for life with no need for renewal. No mandatory requirement on professional development for in-service registered teachers except for those who wish to apply for promotion to senior positions.

Pre-service teacher education programmes are mainly offered by four UGC-funded tertiary institutions, namely the Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIED), the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU), the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), and the University of Hong Kong (HKU) (University Grants Committee, 2009). Bachelor of Education (BEd in four-year full-time studies) and Postgraduate Diploma in Education (PGDE in one-year full-time studies) are the two major types of teacher qualifications. The key learning areas in these two qualifications include English, Chinese, Mathematics, General Studies, Science Education, Technology Education, Personal, Social & Humanities Education, Arts Education, Physical Education, and Liberal Studies. In general, graduates holding a BEd qualification or graduates with an undergraduate degree plus PGDE are qualified to become teachers in Hong Kong. Teacher training opportunities are also provided to in-service teachers by these institutions or the Education Bureau (EDB).

Referring to the Internet, there were at the time of writing this thesis no specialized pre-service and in-service teacher education programmes in civic education or global citizenship education. Part of the reason was that the curriculum reform in Hong Kong in the early 2000s facilitated the replacement of Civic Education with new subjects including Liberal Studies and Integrated Humanities at the junior secondary sector. Topics such as globalization, sustainable development, China & the world, current development in citizenship education, environmental
studies, Chinese culture, society & culture, contemporary political ideologies, international politics value education, moral education, and global civic education were one way or the other captured in the curricula of one BEd in Liberal Studies, one PGDE, and two Master programmes offered by the CUHK; one BEd in Liberal Studies, one PGDE, and one Master of Education (MEd) programmes by the HKU; two PGDE and one MEd programmes by the HKBU; as well as one BEd, two PGDE, and one MEd programmes by the HKIED. The similar kind of training opportunity was also offered by the Open University of Hong Kong, which is a non-UGC-funded tertiary institution, through one MEd and two PGDE programmes in Liberal Studies. Apart from these formal teacher training opportunities, both the EDB and HKIED normally offer seminars and workshops on the civic education-related topics in an interval of once per two months. However, very few of them are concerned with global citizenship education. Overall, the level of professional development provision for Hong Kong civic education teachers to prepare for the teaching of civic education and global citizenship education should by no means be considered adequate and sufficient.

The importance of teachers’ professional development is outlined in the Third Report on Teachers’ Continuing Professional Development publicized by the Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and Qualifications in Hong Kong (ACTED, June 2009). Given a knowledge-based society characterized by seamless changes in various respects such as the wider socio-economic milieu, educating students in Hong Kong is definitely not an easy task. A high degree of teacher professionalism is in tremendous need to meet the challenges. Upon a questionnaire survey investigation of Hong Kong school teachers’ and principals’ attitudes to continuing professional development (CPD), the Report reveals a vast majority
agreement on the principles underpinning CPD, including that teachers are responsible for their own professional development through life-long learning; teachers’ CPD should cater for the development of individual teachers, the collective wisdom of the whole school and the school’s development needs; and teachers should contribute to colleagues’ professional development.

The contributions of external teacher education and school-based teacher education to teacher competence are widely recognized by Hong Kong teacher educators such as Cheng (1998). He conceives that teacher effectiveness is closely linked with the achievement of a school’s multiple functions, including the knowledge about political functions. In particular, effective teachers can help individual students develop positive civic attitudes and skills and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, can support their schools to act as places for encouraging critical discussion of political issues, and can play a crucial role in the community and society in promoting awareness of democracy and in facilitating political developments and changes.

Hence, there is little doubt that teachers’ professional development is a key to the successful implementation of civic education and/or global citizenship education in Hong Kong. However, the heart of the issue appears to be how a delicate balance can be struck between the professional development demand and the supply in Hong Kong. The inadequacy of civic education preparedness in Hong Kong has been highlighted in the results of the IEA Phase Two study (Mintrop, 2002; Torney-Purta, et al., 2005). Of course, how teacher education programmes can be more thoughtfully designed to meet the needs of civic education teachers of Hong Kong should be another crux of issue. It is very true for Elliott & Morris (2001) to argue,

“The teacher education curriculum [of Hong Kong] will need to be
reconstructed to prepare student teachers to handle the realities and complexities of multi-level change in classrooms and schools, rather than simply preparing them to either fit into a presumed status quo, or to adopt to idealized models of good practice that neglect the contexts of practice” (p.162).

Upon comprehension of the contextual developments of civic education and global citizenship education in various respects in Hong Kong, it comes to a question how the investigated civic education teachers’ perceptions of civic education can be understood and theorized. Activity theory can be a gateway to a satisfactory answer.

2.12 Civic Education in Context and Activity Theory

It was mentioned at the onset of this work that civic education should be interpreted contextually. An international comparative study conducted by Tye (1999) has somehow confirmed such stance. In this sense, it is logical to infer contextual factors to be the cornerstone in the understanding of perceptions of key players of civic education. There is little question that the influence of context is a major concern of the recent approaches to cognition (da Ponte, 1994). Kennedy (2004) rightly points out that civic education cannot stand by itself, independent of cultural norms, political priorities, social expectations, national economic development aspirations, geopolitical contexts and historical antecedents. The imperative of culture for civic education is indeed recognized by Sears (1994) and Nelson & Drake (1994).

Similarly, Bridges (1994) makes a point that civic education must draw on civic culture and it must reflect that culture. In pursuit of an informed understanding of the contextual factors and how these factors affect the concerned people’s perception, a relevant theory should be put in place.

As civic education is essentially social in nature, understanding of the
incumbent’s perception (psychological phenomenon) should transcend the traditional
cognitive research paradigm confined to individualistic level. Rather it makes more
sense to understand an individual through an analysis of interactions between an
individual and his/her environment (Koszalka & Wu, 2004). There seems reasonable
to consider that culture, being understood as a system of enduring behavioural and
thinking patterns that are created, adopted, and promulgated by a number of
individuals jointly, is a dominant environmental factor shaping an individual’s
perception (Ratner, 2002). In short, culture is generally defined as the totality of
socially constructed behaviours, beliefs, and objects of an individual (Ratner, 2000).
This paradigm has lately catalyzed the emergence of cultural psychology in the
psychological world.

The Socio-cultural Theory

Within cultural psychology, activity theory is a vital analytical framework for
understanding the formation of people’s conception (Ratner, 2002) and of the totality
of human activity in context (Bodker, 1991). Succinctly put, according to its
originator’s (the Russian Psychologist Lev S. Vygotsky) line of thought embracing
the concept of activity commencing in the early 1930s, four tenets of activity theory
with respect to culture came into place (Ratner, 2000). First, humans collectively
devise activities such as producing goods, raising children, educating the populace,
treating disease, etc. Through these socially organized activities, humans survive and
realize themselves by interacting with the world of objects, other people, and even
themselves. Secondly, humans are stimulated by practical, socially organized
activities to collectively construct concepts about people and things. Thirdly,
psychological phenomena are constructed from, and reflect, social activities, and their
corresponding cultural concepts. Fourthly, culture subsumes in practical, socially organized activities, cultural concepts, and psychological phenomena. It is quite obvious that culture and psychology are interrelated. In simplicity, human’s psychology is fundamentally organized by three cultural factors, viz. activities, artifacts and concepts. These three factors interacts each other in a way to formulate the psychological phenomenon of an individual.

Dialectically in theory, activity theory originates from the socio-cultural or socio-historical perspective spearheaded by Vygotsky (Osuna, 2003; Bendy et al., 2000; Daniels, 2001, 2004a & b). This perspective connects human activity to historical past through which transformation (or expansive learning) of human’s cognition and behaviour is achieved. Activity mediates human development through cultural artifacts, including conceptual and actual instruments such as language, employed by humans to achieve objectives of their actions (Osuna, 2003). In other words, individuals act upon the environment through mediated actions to transform the reality and themselves (Rodriguez, 1998).

Artifact is conceptualized as a material object that has been modified by human beings as a means of regulating their interactions with the world and each other (Cole, 1999). It performs a cultural meditational role and usually takes form of tool, sign, book, weapon, technology, etc (Ratner, 2002). In order to understand the higher order mental function of human beings, Vygotsky introduced a triad ‘consciousness-culture-behaviour’ in which the use of material and psychological tools is argued as the major deterministic factor of psychological development (Bendy, et al., 2000).

Tools are understood as a socio-cultural phenomenon that encodes special kinds of operations and that socially determine practical actions and mental operations.
As tools possess a mediation function, they are called signs when they mediate mental activity. When an internal tool is later transformed into an internal sign, the notion of internalization comes in. This transforming process depends upon social interactions. Daniels (2001) manifests the concept of mediation by quoting Cole’s (1996) basic triangular representation of mediation (see figure 1) consisting of artifact, subject and object at each of the three apaxes. Simply put, the subject-object relations are either unmediated, direct and in some sense natural or they are mediated through culturally available artifacts. Ratner (1991) values mediations by conceiving that being self-constituted through mediations is what distinguishes human sensitivity and responsiveness from biologically dictated, animal analogues. Since mediations canalize human sensitivity and responsiveness, mediations are the true subject matter of psychology” (p.16)

![Figure 1: The basic triangular representation of mediation](image)

**Activity Theory**

Some researchers (e.g. Karasavvidis, 2009; Osuna, 2003) maintained that activity theory was initially developed by Alexei Nikolaevich Leont’ev. Leont’ev developed a distinction between the concepts ‘activity’ and ‘action’ which were underdeveloped by Vygotsky (Daniels, 2001). Activity is construed as a collective and systemic formation that has a complex meditational structure while an activity system produces actions and is realized by means of actions. Human individual
activity is also understood as a system in the system of social relations and the specific form in which it exists is determined by the form and means of material and mental social interaction (Cole & Hatano, 2007). Activity is, however, not reducible to actions. Actions are relatively short-lived and have a temporally clear-cut beginning and end whereas activity systems evolve over lengthy periods of socio-historical time, often taking the form of institutions and organizations.

The study of collective activity as the unit of analysis in Leont’ev’s activity theory broadened the scope of mediation initiated by Vygotsky (Osuna, 2003). The collective activity mediates an individual’s actions to achieve his object (i.e. objective), so mediated activity is intrinsically goal-oriented. The activity is mediated by artifacts which have been created by human agents bound to cultural and historical local settings. When the activity changes, artifacts evolve to mediate the activity and people are subsequently transformed to use the new artifacts.

Aligned with the socio-cultural perspective, activity theory considers mediated activity is appropriated through internalization which is a consequence of the conversion of external process and objects into the internal mental plane. For easy comprehension, Bendy et al. (2000) translate the general schema of components and unit of analysis into a simple progression map (see Figure 2) whereby activity and task are regarded as objectives while action, operation (i.e. any action includes several components) and function block represent units of analysis. Notwithstanding a lot of similarities between the socio-cultural theory and activity theory, Daniels (2004b) teases out a major disparity which rests on their focus hereof the former theory emphasizes on the semiotic mediation with a particular interest in speech and the latter centres activity as the unit of analysis.
Broadly speaking, activity theorists seek to analyse the development of consciousness within practical social activity settings. Their emphasis is on the psychological impacts of organized activity and the social conditions and systems which are produced in and through such activity (Hardman, 2005; Daniels, 2004a). In essence, the theory suggests that the combined foundational elements of an activity are the unit of analysis that represents the minimum elements of an object-oriented, collective, and culturally mediated human activity. It is the internal tensions and contradictions within and amongst the elements of a human activity that lead to the transitions and transformation of knowledge (Engestrom, 1987).

The evolution of activity theory has been rapid and fruitful (Osuno, 2003). Yrjo Engestrom (1987, 1999 & 2000) put forth the second and third generations of activity theory (Daniels, 2001, 2004a & 2004b). For the second generation, he advocates the study of artifacts as integral and inseparable components of human functioning but argues that the focus of the study of mediation should be on its relationship with the other components of an activity system. Based on this conviction, the original triangular representation of activity systems has been expanded to the notable triangle, which captures all the basic elements of an activity, including subject, object, tools (artifacts), community, rules and division of labour (see Figure 3).

The main focus of any activity is the production of an outcome (object), physical or mental while the subject, an individual or a group, determines that there is a need or motive to fulfil, the object. Using the tools the subject moves towards
accomplishing the object. The community members set rules and norms under which the subject operates and establishes how the community members organize (division of labour) to meet goals. All the elements influence the others and are influenced by social, cultural, and historical factors, such as background knowledge, personal bias, availability of tools, and other factors. Each individual activity is also affected by other surrounding activities that may have a primary tool, community, rules, or some other activity element focus.

![Figure 3: The structure of a human activity system](image)

By expanding the framework of the second generation, the third generation of activity theory intends to develop conceptual tools to understand dialogues, multiple perspectives, and networks of interacting activity systems (Daniels, 2004b). The engendered new thought grows from a concern to address interactions that occur when two activity systems meet each other and incorporate the idea of boundary objects (see Figure 4). Where two or more activity systems are in touch there may be contradictions and tensions through which expansive learning is possible (Robertson, 2008).
Application of Activity Theory in Education

According to Osuna (2003), education like other disciplines has drawn and continues to elicit understandings from psychological research for more exhaustive conceptualization about teaching and learning. The nature of learning is elucidated through the examination of teaching practice that informs different approaches to teaching to better support learning. A wealth of such type of recent research studies is all over the place (e.g. Karasavvidis, 2009; Koszalka & Wu 2004; Osuna, 2003; Roth & Tobin, 2002; Zurita & Ryberg, 2005; Pearson, 2009; Hedegaard, 1999; Hardman, 2005), and all these studies have proven the value of activity theory as an effective analytical tool in different educational settings. For instance, Osuna (ibid) concludes favourably that activity theory does not only offer a theoretical foundation accounting for the complexity of teachers’ professional development but also serves as a viable methodology from which to explicate the multiple and intricate interconnections intersecting in the professional transformation of teachers as it evolves over time and space. Pearson (ibid) points out that activity theory has been used to examine complex social networks and has been applied to education in general, and to particular curriculum areas. The meditational model of activity theory provides useful
tools for educators for the development of an understanding of pedagogy (Daniels, 2004b).

**Weaknesses of Activity Theory**

Regardless of the strengths of activity theory in the context of education, the theory is subject to critiques. Ratner (1999) sums up its weaknesses. First, it is demonstrated by an oversight of the specific psychological characteristics embedded in social characteristics. Activity is thereby commonly seen as having essential general characteristics. Tools are similarly described quite generally and such orientation leads to an overlooking of the particular features and functions of instruments which reflect the needs of particular social activities. Secondly, some activity theorists generally ignore how activity shapes physical phenomena where the fact that activity influences psychology is identified but no process is delineated. Finally, activity theorists also often overlook the opposite direction by which people construct, maintain and reconstruct activity.

A fuller account of the critical perspective of activity theory is provided in Martin & Peim’s (2009) paper. First of all, transformation, a central element of activity theory, is an ambiguous value implying that it is not necessarily synonymous with predictable and linear development growth. For instance, pedagogies may not be unambiguous means to specific and predictable ends. Therefore, if transformation is not necessarily an end in itself, programmed, controlled, managed transformation might be delimiting.

Secondly, the focus of theoretical and empirical research on local systems is interpreted as a grave limitation of activity theory. This theory may not be able to accommodate the macro-social perspectives and processes that act on, shape and
inform local dilemmas. The role of power and social structure in the activity theory appear to be under-theorized.

Thirdly, for Engestrom’s activity theory, some may argue that the promise of transformation of social relations as claimed does not hold. This is because any account of macro-social and political context is absent from the activity theory, and the inability of the theory to address notions of power and social antagonisms in activity systems that are expressions of macro-social and political context.

Lastly, some critics question the status of activity as a theory inheriting the Vygotskian legacy by emphasizing the tension on the impetus to provide an empirical method for improving the operations of specifically located activity. Despite all these shortcomings, the paper concludes positively and ascertains that

“There is no question that activity theory has become a live force for education discourses and for projects seeking to develop practice in positive directions. What’s more, the global reach of activity theory, as Engestrom warns, and perhaps fears, ensures that the theory will not remain singular, will not adhere to a monolithic model – and the very process of activation in radically different contexts also guarantees that the meaning of activity theory is destined to be transformed and constantly re-appropriated. The present collection offers critique, we believe, the form of an invitation to consider the lacunate, the contradictions and the underdeveloped aspects and elements of an influential theory that may have the potential to both draw from and enhance much theory in the field of social anthropology and philosophy that it appears at preset to be insulated from. The legacy of Vygotsky may be positively transformed by such new connections and alliances” (p.137).

Given the aforementioned characteristics, there has been a proliferation of research studies to show that activity theory is of growing significance in the field of education (e.g. Zurita & Ryberg 2005; Hardman, 2005; Branco, 2001). In short, there is ample evidence to support that activity theory is an appropriate theoretical model underpinning the study of this thesis.
2.13 Influence of Globalization on Civic Education Teachers

The preceding sections have discussed the important paradigm shift and expansion of civic education from the local and national level to the global level. Merryfield & Kasai (2004) outline the impacts of globalization on American teachers who teach global education. Multiple perspectives, global interconnectedness, global issues, and cross-cultural are four common strategies for teachers to help students understand the globally interconnected world, its issues, histories, and conflicts. However, many teachers feel unprepared for such a new challenge owing to the lack of relevant undergraduate studies and teacher education. Such view of teacher unpreparedness is also found in Merryfield (1997). Conceivably, civic education teachers’ perception of the subject they teach can one way or another be affected. What exactly are the impacts may be identified from the following research studies.

In using a questionnaire survey and follow-up interviews with 147 student teachers in social studies teacher preparation programmes in Canada, England and the United States, Kubow (1996) unveils that civic education should be viewed within a global context. From the respondents’ perspective, the goal of citizenship education should be to broaden people’s views from a nationalistic to a global understanding of citizenship. They interpreted their citizenship educator role as making secondary students, as well as themselves, aware of global perspectives and the possible roles individuals can play in the world.

Davies et al. (1999) surveyed 201 primary and secondary school teachers in England with questionnaires and interviewed 69 of them. It was found that one of the central qualities of good citizens was being a citizen of Europe or of the world. The secondary school teachers conceived of the community within which good citizenship was to be exhibited more globally than did the primary school teachers. Worldwide
issues were ranked first by the surveyed group as the most important classroom activities to promote good citizenship.

The impacts of globalization on Hong Kong and Shanghai secondary school teachers in their perception of global citizenship education were reported in the study of Lee & Leung (2006b). The results unraveled that the pressure from the examination-oriented curriculum, lack of training, lack of support from the school and government, a lack of self-efficacy were common problems and difficulties for the teachers in both places. Interestingly, the Shanghai teachers were more interested in global affairs whereas the Hong Kong teachers favoured local affairs. In terms of global citizenship education, the Shanghai teachers focused more on knowledge and skills whereas the Hong Kong teachers stressed values.

In fact, there is a burgeoning research studies showing an increasing infusion of a global awareness into instruction in the social studies field in the United States (Anderson, et. al., 1997; Kirkwood, 2001 & 2002).

The outcome of the international IEA study, however, appeared to be somewhat in contrast with the above research findings (Torney-Purta, et. al. 2001, Mintrop, 2003). In the study, the topics of civic education that the teachers deemed important and felt confident teaching were found as national history, human and citizens’ rights and environmental concerns. Surprisingly, international and social welfare topics were those at the bottom.

Given the above conflicting research outcomes, it is by and large hard to conclude if civic education teachers are inclined to view civic education through the global lenses no matter which jurisdictions they are serving in. From another angle, teachers may somehow not be able to keep abreast of the current development of civic
education. If that is the case, the effective implementation of the new civic education subject at the junior secondary level in Hong Kong will be seriously jeopardized which in turn adversely affects the nurturing of future good Hong Kong citizens. It is fortunate that the teachers involved in the IEA study took a confirmed view that civic education does matter in preparing citizens for society.

Both Thornton (1991) and Kirkwood (2002) maintain that teachers play a key role for the success of the implementation of social studies curriculum by exercising their influence as curricular and instructional gatekeeper. That means no matter how well the curriculum is designed, without teachers’ cooperation and implementation, no hope of success can be expected. This point is verified by Hertzberg (1981) who observes that many of the social studies reform movements failed to penetrate the classroom because reformers ignored the realities of that teaching environment.

On the other hand, since the emergence of the new civic education independent subject in 1999, it is a pity that not a single study has been done to evaluate how well teachers believe they are successful in the implementation of the subject. Very little attention has been given to the issue by the public and even the educators. Nor has sufficient discourse taken place. All these have proven the value of further exploring civic education teachers’ views towards the subject through this study.

2.14 Challenges for Civic Education Teachers in Hong Kong

As previously mentioned, there have been substantial changes to the landscape of civic education in Hong Kong. Some significant events happened in recent years in Hong Kong which might further shape teachers’ perception and beliefs about the
subject. At the macro level, the resignation of the first Chief Executive of the HKSAR Government might have brought about a big change of the political culture in the territory. Some even commented that it was the second largest political change after the 1997 handover had taken place. This change might further become more acute when there was an obvious increase of influence from Mainland China on the governance of Hong Kong. Can we claim that local civic education teachers turn a blind eye to this change when they deliver teaching in the classrooms? The answer is obviously no since civic education is somewhat a politics-laden subject suffering from the impact of the political change in a wider context.

The Hong Kong Government decided to launch a new 3-3-4 academic structure in the senior secondary and higher education sectors in 2012 in which an examinable subject, namely Liberal Studies, will become compulsory in the senior secondary curriculum since 2009/10 school year (Education and Manpower Bureau, 2004). Part of the subject is concerned with the development of students’ political knowledge, attitude and skills. Debates and controversies have been sparked off in the territory as to whether the subject should be tied in with the public examination which determines students’ access opportunity to higher education. Scepticism also rests with whether the new subject can articulate well with the civic education independent subject at the lower secondary level. Whether teachers are appropriately trained to deliver the subject is another major concern. It is reasonable to infer that the existing civic education teachers will be expected to teach the new subject in the light of a short supply of qualified teachers. Will the new subject change the depoliticised civic education (Lee, 2004b) *per se* be awaited to see? As a local teacher educator in civic education, Lee (2004a) reminds us not to try to blindly lean towards the western style of citizenship notions. He states,
“Perhaps the quality of individuals is inarguably significant in any society, but perhaps in the East, in addition to autonomy and rationality, equal concern towards individual responsibility can offer a significant reminder, if not a supplement, to the elements of civic society” (p.33).

This useful reminder should keep Hong Kong teachers alert to the significance of contextual factors in shaping their perspective in civic education. Lee (2004b), being the researcher from Hong Kong in the IEA study – phases one and two, reported the results of the Hong Kong case. Concomitantly, four major challenges to civic education in Hong Kong were discussed warranting local civic education teachers’ close attention. First of all, interpretation of democracy has yet been a consensus. A good knowledge of democracy though does not necessarily go hand in hand with a democratic political structure. Deeper thoughts should thereby be thrown on the meaning and implementation of democracy for the best interest of Hong Kong.

Low civic participation was another problem. The depoliticised classroom atmosphere appears not favourable for discussing politics. Although students participating in the second phase of the IEA study expressed a desire to participate more, the kind of participation is more socially and environmentally rather than politically oriented. Philips (1995) attributes the similar challenge for Australian school children to the realization that the actual socialization often happens later in life and the gulf between the perceptions of young people and the older generation always prevails.

The third challenge comes from the attitude towards the nation. The second phase of the IEA study reveals an interesting paradox that the respondents from Hong Kong love Hong Kong but do not trust the Hong Kong government. This rather negative attitude might dampen the credibility of the civic education subject, either new or existing, to develop good future citizens in Hong Kong. Finally, it is not
surprising that there was at best a half-hearted implementation of civic education in local schools, and sometimes none at all. A lack of financial support, guidelines for teachers and interest among students as well as competition with examination-oriented subjects and other extra-curricular activities are all common difficulties in implementing civic education in the schools. Lee (ibid) comments that, despite the presence of the guidelines and the subject syllabus, enhancing civic education remains a slogan rather than reality. Schools tend to define civic education in a loose manner, so that whenever asked, there can be a justification that some kind of civic education is in place in the school curriculum or activities.

Another local civic education teacher educator, Kerry Kennedy considers the emergence of a new era of globalization, being brought about by the catastrophic terrorist attacks of September 11 (Kennedy, 2003a & b). The new form of globalization seeks to attain by force what the older form sought through economic, political and cultural hegemony, and that creates a lot of new uncertainties. Civic education, as a component of the school curriculum, should be effective to respond to those uncertainties. To this end, the future civic education curriculum should place heavy emphasis on three essential aspects: teach beyond borders, teach beyond the disciplines and teach to bring hope. At the same time, civic education should be reoriented to focus more on: civil society and civil institutions, “authentic” learning contexts, ethics, values and morality. Kennedy believes that only by so doing can the conflicts between different nations be resolved and can a genuine peaceful world come into being. More alarmingly, he criticizes that today’s schools are largely the creations of modern nation states and are not built on uncertainty. The schools may well not be reactive to the needs of the new globalization. With little doubt, civic education teachers, as core constituents of the schools, should make changes
accordingly.

Law (2003) elucidates both threat and opportunity of globalization for the Hong Kong teaching profession. He concludes that the government is the principal actor in the selection and translation of global imperatives. Schools are not just brokers and enforcers of government policy, but can be an important buffer between the government and teachers by helping them cope with the imposed imperatives at the school level. Teachers can be key players in accepting or rejecting such imperatives. Government’s strategies are insensitive to teachers’ needs and practical concerns create more problems and solutions.

Recent civic education reforms in both Hong Kong and Taiwan were compared by Law (2004), wherein tripartite frameworks for civic education at local, national and global levels are emphasized in the two places. However, the schools of both societies have paid more attention to local and national than to global concerns. Moreover, not much attention has been given to the tripolar tension between global, national and local identities that has been soaring. Given all these, he called for a more prudent selection of school curriculum.

The above studies and literature have affirmed the influence of globalization upon civic education teachers in general, and especially the civic education teaching force of Hong Kong. Pursuing a more structured understanding of the influential factors on civic education teachers’ perception of civic education can certainly be utile.
2.15 Factors Affecting Civic Education Teachers’ Perception of Civic Education

According to Sully (2008), perception is defined as sense impressions that are spelt out by people when objects are presented to them. In other words, perception is a mental activity employed about sense impressions with a view of knowledge. Putting it in the context of education, Rueda et al. (2004) understand that teachers’ perceptions are formed of teachers’ teaching experiences, their relationship with students, students’ previous achievements, students’ personality traits and behaviours, and the impact of teachers’ perceptions on students’ behaviours has been demonstrated in much education research. That is, teachers deliberately make instructional decisions to cultivate desired students’ behaviours based on their own perception of students. Teacher perception is interpreted by Cantu (2001) as personal attitudes, values, beliefs, principles and ideals that help a teacher justify classroom decisions and actions. It can refer to a theory of action that is taken into account a broad value of factors, including the teachers’ background, beliefs, and the contexts of the classroom and the school, as well as how these elements factor on the teachers’ actions.

Personal, Educational, Professional, and School Factors

Beyond the above mentioned factors, some other contributing factors can have a bearing on civic education teachers’ views and belief of civic education which are far too difficult to be overlooked or underrated.

A host of factors have been identified by various researchers including the teacher’s background, beliefs and assumptions; the context of the classroom and the
school how elements are interpreted and the interpretation’s influence on the teacher’s actions (Ross, 1987). Stodolsky & Grossman (1995) identify some features of subject matter that impact on teachers’ perception of social studies: (1) it is a poorly defined subject with many disciplinary roots; (2) the broad scope of social studies results in less course rotation; and (3) it is less sequential than other subjects; and (4) it is a more dynamic subject.

Only the school is in a position to ensure everyone acquires a minimum amount of knowledge about politics, democracy, and citizenship (Dekker, 1994). Colleagues (Levstik, 1989), school building and community (McNeil, 1986), instructional materials (Luehmann, 2001), concerns over classroom management (Parker & Gehrke, 1986), perceptions of what instruction is appropriate for their students (Fang, 1996), teachers’ underlying beliefs, values and experiences (Cornett, 1990; Dunkin, et al., 1998; Merryfield & Kasai, 2004), are influential factors for teachers’ decision making in their instruction. Watson & Manning (2008) studied factors influencing the transformation of new teaching approaches in science education from a programme of professional development to the classroom. Two key factors leading to the resultant change of the teachers’ perspective and practice included the way the teachers perceived their needs interacting with the learning opportunities offered by the programme, and the degree of support available inside the school which affected the introduction of new pedagogy in the classroom. The researchers argued that the result stayed consistently with other research studies that teachers’ pedagogical style illuminating the influential factors comprising the school’s working, expectations of the school management, and demands of external examinations and their use to judge the quality of the schools.

Guskey (2002) conceives professional development programmes as systematic
efforts to bring about change in the classroom teachers’ practices, especially in their attitudes and beliefs, and in the learning outcomes of students. From the study of Kwakman (2003) about factors affecting teachers’ participation in professional learning activities, it is interesting to find a discrepancy between theory and practice in opportunities for professional learning at the workplace. The study revealed the minor effects of task and work environment factors in teachers’ participation in professional learning activities which are incongruent with the significant role of the school context as being laid down in different theories. The effect of the school contextual factors is mediated by personal characteristics.

Mumtaz (2000) reviews the literature on factors affecting teachers’ use of information and communications technology through which three interlocking factors were identified. They are institution (i.e. the school and its supports for the teachers to take up the new technology, and its cultural beliefs about the student-teacher relationship), resources (i.e. availability of facilities, software, technical back-up, and financial resources), and the teacher (i.e. teachers’ personal beliefs about how their subjects should be taught). Grainger & Tolhurst (2005) brought to light some organisational factors affecting teachers’ use and perception of information and communications technology. These are the school leadership style and perceptions, the availability of relevant training, and management approaches to the information technology system implementation. In brief, there are many factors affecting teachers’ perception.

Specific to the implementation of global citizenship education in school, Davies et al.’s (2004) study pinpoint some inhibiting factors for teachers entailing a lack of sufficient training in teaching controversial issues, a shortage of teachers trained to teach education for global citizenship, the overemphasis on literacy,
numeracy and examinations in the school curriculum, and a deficiency of up to date resources covering mixed achievement classes. Initial teacher training was also found in their study mainly skill-based which failed to cover actual global issues and the related teaching methodology to incorporate those issues into actual teaching. Some of these implementation burdens were also mentioned by the participants in Li & Gu’s (2004) study conducted in Hong Kong. The two exceptions were composed of a shortage of teaching time and the overshadowing of value cultivation by content knowledge. It appears to be sensible to broadly categorize all the abovementioned factors into the teachers’ personal factors (e.g. teachers’ beliefs), educational factors (e.g. the education policy and curricular change), professional factors (e.g. professional education and training), and school factors (e.g. teaching load, leadership support, students’ performance, colleagues’ performance, resources availability, working environment). Of course, this list of factors is not exhaustive and other factors are worthwhile to be explored in future research pursuits.

**Socio-cultural Factors**

As mentioned previously, civic educators’ perception is inevitably subject to the impact of culture. While civic education has its rich Western legacy, there have been critiques on the “Western imagination” (Kennedy, 2004). The “East Asia modernity” and the “Asian values” have been employed to argue for an alternative of the Western modernity as the basis of civic education. The emphasis in this sense has shifted from the cultivation of autonomous individual to the advocacy of the collective entity, whether it being the family, the community, or the nation-state. Confucian values are therein the core basis. This observation is echoed by Cummings (2001) who argues that the Asian values are characterized by collective concerns. In
terms of citizenship, individualism and collectivism is always regarded as a dichotomy, whereby the two concepts are mutually exclusive.

Chinese social behaviour is preoccupied by Confucianism since its predominance in the Han Dynasty of the ancient China about 2,000 years ago (Bond & Hwang, 2008). Confucianism was favoured by most rulers in the Chinese history not only due to its emphasis of the duty of officers to serve with dispassionate loyalty but also its ideology congruent with the long-lasting agricultural tradition of China. The agricultural economy enmeshed the vast majority of the population to the farm land and supported them only at a subsistence level. The educated elite, who became part of the ruling party through passing public examinations, transmitted cultural values by advocating Confucian philosophy and creating folklore for the peasantry as ways of rationalizing the political and social order. In so doing, the social order can be easily maintained. The Confucian tradition is characterized by two basic features, including (i) man exists through his relationships to others and the relationships are structured hierarchically, and (ii) social order is ensured through each party’s honouring the requirements in the role relationship.

As regards the collective behaviours of the Chinese people, Bond & Hwang (ibid) quote a cross-national study conducted by Geert Hefstede for people of 53 cultural units, three of which were Chinese from Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan. The study concluded that the Chinese people from all the three places were highly collective. An important aspect of Chinese collectivism is that the family is usually perceived as a basic social unit. Any conflict occurs will be handled within the family without exposing to ‘outsiders’.

In unfolding the Chinese’s cognition, Liu (2008) signifies three behavioural rules of the Chinese people which entail the ‘respect superiors’, the ‘memorize lesson’, and
the ‘practise skill’ rules. Yet Yang (2008) argues for a change in Chinese personality. He cites a number of studies to illustrate the change of Chinese temperament under the influence of social change, in terms of higher in extroversion, ascendance, flexibility, tolerance, and masculinity, and lower in anxiety, cautiousness, friendliness, conscientiousness, perseverance, and femininity. Chinese youth’s value orientations have gradually shifted from a preference for inner development and collectivism to a preference for achievement and individualism.

The negativity of collectivism on civic education is not supported by Lee (2001; 2004a) who argues that the civil society should be supported and participated by members with collective self-consciousness. In this regard, civic education can be viewed as individual and collective capacity building, and that the individual and the collective, rather than being seen as a dichotomy, are instead more accurately characterized in the context of civic education as a continuum, as complementary and reinforcing.

Hong Kong is a melting pot of the Chinese and Western cultures because of its colonial legacy for more than 150 years. The impact of the Chinese culture prevails nowadays in Hong Kong (Cheng, 2004). Apart from the Chinese traits, whether or not the indigenous culture of Hong Kong, i.e. utilitarianistic familism (Luk, 2001) affects the school civic educators’ perceptions of civic education is worthy of consideration when civic education is interpreted in context. By the same token, the influence of the local cornerstone societal events (for instance, the 2003 mass petition against the legislation of the anti-subversion clause under the Basic Law) is also worthwhile to be studied.

To pursue a clear understanding of Hong Kong civic education teachers’ perception of civic education and global citizenship education, all the above factors
being categorised into different domains should be taken into serious account so that the mysterious issues in this study can be uncovered.

2.16 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter summarizes the main ideas of traditional and contemporary civic education. Based on the discussion, it is reasonable to argue that global citizenship education should stand out to be the main theme of civic education in future elsewhere. Putting the discussion in the Hong Kong context, the development and implementation of civic education in Hong Kong has been reviewed and discussed, particularly for that related to the evolution of global citizenship education. There is evidence to substantiate that global citizenship education should be the future for civic education in Hong Kong. To ensure the success of the implementation of civic education, teachers who are the key implementers have been determined as the main subjects of this study. In this light, factors affecting the teachers’ perception of civic education have been studied. Activity theory was hired as the basis of the conceptual framework in the analysis of the teacher’s perception. It is hoped that the causes and factors contributing to the formation of the teachers’ perception can be found. However, the inadequacy of teacher training opportunities in Hong Kong can be seen as a point of concern to affect the healthy development of civic education and citizenship education in the territory in the long run.
CHAPTER THREE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Overview of the Chapter

This chapter aims to outline the major idea of this study. Using activity theory as the conceptual basis, the perception of civic education (particularly global citizenship education) of a sample of teachers who teach civic education at the junior secondary level of the Hong Kong schools is explored, analysed and discussed. It is envisaged that the significance of global citizenship education in civic education in Hong Kong and the major contextual factors such as culture in the formation of the studied teachers’ perception of civic education are suitably identified. Discussion is made why activity theory can be considered as the basis of the conceptual framework for the study.

3.2 Conceptual Discussion

The preceding chapters have confirmed the vitality of civic education for the future well-being of a citizen, a society, a nation-state, and even the world. With the perennial impacts of globalization, civic education has been expanding and moving into the new global arena. Teachers, as the key implementers of the civic education subject, have to abandon the old way of thinking and will need to be geared up to the new global thinking so as to keep abreast of the global development. It is undeniable that teachers’ participation sits at the centre of success in the implementation of civic education in school.

There are a handful of local and overseas studies (e.g. Lee, 2005c; Davies, et. al, 1999) illuminating the connection of teachers’ perception with civic education. However, the factual findings generated from these studies appear insufficient to provide answer for the core question, “why do civic educators think that way?”
Without taking a deep look of the substance of the matter, the whole quest will be left superficial and incomplete. In this venture, a certain analytical tool should be brought in to bridge the gap.

After decades of being dominated by the individualists and reductionist paradigms, the study of psychology has recently turned to contextual and cultural facets of human development. Over the past century, social scientists and psychologists have been increasingly sensitive to the cultural nature of human development. The human mind in particular has been gradually acknowledged as a contextualized phenomenon, contributing to the social mind. Socio-cultural contexts play desirable roles in creating opportunities for development (Oers, 2008). This implies the structural uniqueness and developmental course of human psychological processes emerge in the process of humanity’s culturally mediated, historically developing, and practical activity (Kitayama & Cohen, 2007). In other words, human cognition is a social collaborative activity that cannot be reduced either to the physiological process in the brain or to any individual information processing occurring in the head. Rather, cognition is viewed as stretching beyond the individual isolated mind into the cultural system of artifacts and activities that follow for the cognitive processes to be accomplished and into the social communities of which these processes are only a part (Vygotsky, 1987).

Activity theory is de facto one of the approaches to cultural psychology. Its central premises are that psychological phenomenon is formed as an individual engages in socially organized activity insofar as such activity is the primary cultural impact on psychology (Ratner, 1999). Hence, compared to the traditional cognitive psychology focusing on individual dimension, Activity theory stemming from cultural psychology is a more viable and valid analytical tool to examine human mind and
activity. It provides a useful framework for people to think about and identify the larger societal influences on the individual’s conception of their tasks (Waite, 2005). This attribute fits in well with the social nature of civic education.

The effect of activity theory in explaining teachers’ perception is reflected by Osuna (2003) who concludes from her study of a group of middle school English teachers in the United States on their involvement in professional development activities that activity theory does not merely offer a theoretical foundation that accounts for the complexity of teachers’ professional development but is also a viable methodology from which to explicate the multiple and intricate interconnections intersecting in the professional transformation of teachers as it evolves through time and space. In her study, a pool of influential contextual factors for teacher professional development was examined and analyzed. By a similar vein, through an examination of all the essential components of the theory, including artifacts, activities, concepts, and psychology, it is believed that a clear picture of how the teachers’ perception is formulated can be well achieved through this study.

It is imperative to note that activity theory is advantageous to afford a platform to unify and standardize terminology and attempts to present that obtained in a systematic fashion (Bendy, et al., 2000). Activity theory is also useful to offer a systemic-structural method of study. All these are beneficial to the study of the complex system in the formation of the investigated civic educators’ psychological phenomena specific to the topic.

3.3 The Activities, Artifacts, Concepts, Community, Rules and Division of Labour considered in the Study

As illustrated in the last chapter on literature review, activity conceptualizes a
collective and systemic formation that has a complex meditational structure. Activity mediates human development through artifacts used by humans to achieve their objectives. Upon this discernment, activities in this study signify contextual and cultural factors embodied in the activity system, which perpetuate the studied civic educators’ psychology (i.e. perceptional understanding) of global citizenship education. These factors aptly include the delivery of the independent civic education syllabus, the promotion of nationalistic education in Hong Kong, the unification of Hong Kong with China, recent political incidents in Hong Kong specific to nationalism and globalization, changes to Hong Kong civic education curricula since 1985, an introduction of the independent civic education syllabus in Hong Kong in 1996, the civic education change in Hong Kong, China’s influences on Hong Kong, China political reform, the support of the school management, and sufficiency of teaching resources.

Artifact is theorized in the reviewed literature as a tool and sign performing the meditational role in activity to regulate interactions between an individual and the environment and each other. In this premise, artifacts in this study are utterly composed of the national identification with China, collectivism, the Confucian value of education, the local culture, Hong Kong economy, China’s blooming economy, the local common understanding of global citizenship education, and civic education curricula.

Concept refers to something formed in mind, that is thought or notion. Concept about things and people may not be on a par across societies where different systems of laws, religion, customs, social structures, and mentality are operating. By this definition, concepts adopted in this study entail the informants’ personal perception of global citizenship, civic education and global citizenship education, disposition of
global responsibilities, civic education curriculum, teaching efficacy backed up by adequate and sufficient education training and professional development, and other teachers’ and students’ perceptions and behaviours.

According to Ratner (2002), activity, artifact, and concept interact in complex, dynamic ways with each other, and with psychological phenomena (psychology). It is believed that humans transform and achieve self-actualization through participations in socially organized activities. This implies that the structures of higher mental functions stand for a transfer into an inward relation of a social order that constitutes the basis of the social structure of the human personality. Merging such primary socio-cultural perspective with the socio-cultural or socio-historical oriented activity theory, an endeavour was ventured to capture additional essential elements of Engestrom’s activity system model including community, rules, and the division of labours in the conceptual model of this study. The rules are cardinally pointed to the examination-driven curriculum in school while teaching time for civic education in school belongs to the division of labour.

Rather than directly adopting the Engestrom’s triangular representation of activity system, this study is conceptualized in a broad-brush understanding of the formulation of the civic educators’ perception of global citizenship education in the Hong Kong context but not a pursuit of understanding of the topic within a more well-defined activity context. To address one of the major weaknesses of activity theory as described in the literature review in relation to the overlook of the macro-socio-political context in the Engestrom’s model, certain factors such as China’s political reform, China’s economic development, etc. have been taken into consideration.

It is noteworthy that this study is by all means not over-ambitious to examine in great detail each of the aforementioned factors which are so multifaceted and
highly complex on their own merits. Nor is the study sophisticated enough to critically observe their inter-relationships which are supposedly complex enough to warrant a series of future research studies. The ultimate tenet is primarily to create a new angle of recognition of all the relevant factors, which categorize themselves as activities, artifacts and concepts within an overarching system, for the contribution of the formation of the data subjects’ perception.

3.4 Diagrammatic Presentation of the Conceptual Framework

Hence and in brief, the following conceptual model is constructed as the theoretical underpinning of the study in this thesis (see Figure 5).

*Figure 5: The conceptual model of the study (modified from Ratner (2002))*
3.5 Conceptual Framework in Practice

As elucidated previously, human psychology is not solely formulated and mediated by inner self, but is also subject to the influence of a whole bunch of factors, including those from the surroundings. Within the concept of cultural psychology, culture plays a core part in this process. In the era of globalization, cultural impacts can arise from the local, national and global levels (Law, 2004). Therefore, concepts deriving from the cultural historical activity theory can be borrowed for the establishment of the analytical framework of this study to examine relevant factors to determine their relevancy to the teacher’s perception of civic education, particularly when global citizenship education is concerned. Making the analysis more pertinent to civic education, two other prominent models, including the Derek Heater’s (1990 & 2004) cube of civic education and Cogan & Derricott’s (1998 & 2002) multi-dimensional civic education, were adopted as analytical tools to examine what and how the participating teachers think about the importance of global citizenship education in Hong Kong and its impact on the teachers’ thinking about civic education.

3.6 Contextual Factors Influencing the Teacher’s Mind

There is no intention whatsoever to underestimate the complexity of the contextual factors that affect the civic education teacher’s mind in this study. Apart from those factors manifested earlier in the chapter of literature review and the section 3.3 above, two factors are particularly worth highlighting. In terms of culture, the teacher might be somehow driven by the collectivism due to their Chinese origin. In fact, it might be too naïve to overestimate the impact of the mainland, who sovereigns Hong Kong. While different institutions being operated in the two places, the
Law, aside from the “One Country, Two Systems” policy, the mini-constitution of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR), pins down the independence and autonomy of the education system in Hong Kong,

“Educational institutions of all kinds may retain their autonomy and enjoy academic freedom. They may continue to recruit staff and use teaching materials from outside the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. Schools run by religious organizations may continue to provide religious education, including courses in religion. Students shall enjoy freedom of choice of educational institutions and freedom to pursue their education outside the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region” (Article 137).

Moreover, based on the recent essays on the implementation of civic education in China, it might not be exaggerating to postulate that a latent reform has been taking place to make the subject bridge with the global trend somehow and somewhat. Liu (1998) observes,

“... frequent political campaigns and ideological debates have greatly influenced official civic and moral education policies. Currently, the education of a fully competent citizen requires training in critical and creative thinking...” (p.1).

What happened in the local community and in the serving secondary schools of the studied civic educators were for sure critically essential in influencing the educators’ minds when they lived as social beings.

3.7 Summary of the Chapter

The focus of this chapter falls on a conceptual discussion on the adoption of activity theory as the basis of the analytical framework or tool to examine and explain the teachers’ perception of civic education in the local junior secondary context. For illustration, a diagrammatical presentation of the conceptual framework of this study has been depicted. Contextual factors influencing the teachers’ mind of the subject have been briefly discussed. All these constituted the basis of the study which would be described in the next chapter.
4.1 Purpose of the Study

On encapsulation of the literature review in the chapter before the last, it is quite obvious that civic education has been subject to acute global impacts which are concomitant with the intensifying phenomena of globalization. This may drive school civic educators to abandon their traditional conviction and practice of civic education such as the direct transmission of civic right and responsibility. Compared to the other three common approaches of rationality in civic education, including the hermeneutic, emancipatory, and intercultural models, it is conceivable that the technical mode can be considered as the least effective and most obsolete (Feng, 2006). Many new terminologies such as globalised citizenship education, international education, and world studies, have been duly evolving in the arena of the subject. The school civic education is no longer merely expected to prepare students to become competent citizens in their own place of residence, but also to become world citizens who are capable of surviving in a wider context, the globe. With no exception, Hong Kong, for long being an international cosmopolitan city and a special administrative region of the People’s Republic of China, appears not to be immune from the similar sort of challenge.

The international trend of civic education has continuously mediated the approach and contents of local civic education. Under this circumstance, it is not unreasonable to envisage school civic educators in the territory must earnestly gear up themselves to keep abreast of the contemporary development in order to help their students learn how to live successfully in the fast changing global milieu. However, there is yet confirmed evidence which informs us whether Hong Kong civic education
really moves alongside with the international trend but rather revives its prime focus to nationalistic education due to the China factor. If this being the case, it is quite worrisome as to whether our next generation will be in peril in the fast developing world. This study is partially dedicated to test such inference.

However, the Western notion of citizenship founding upon civic virtues coupled with individuality, human rights, and democracy is not deep-rooted in the Chinese culture. There is hence no surprise to note Feng’s (2006) comment that some education scholars in China are beginning to bring up issues such as human rights and democracy that are hardly found in the literature of citizenship before, given that citizenship has risen in subtle but significant ways in the Country in the last few decades. Monarchy and collectivism have dominated the Chinese culture for ages that overshadowed the concept of individualism for sharing rights between ruled and rulers. An account is given by Xu (2002) who describes, “throughout China’s long history, managing the country has always been the business of a few people. The populace was never encouraged or permitted to become involved in decision-making on political and other major issues that concerned the state. In fact, they were required to be interested in affairs such as politics and adjudication, except when they were coerced to perform military service. The state was regarded as the private property of the imperial families and running the country the task of men chosen by the emperors. Political participation by commoners was only possible through violent rebellion and the overthrow of an existing dynasty. The capacity of ruling was completely separated from that of being ruled, and the issues of who would rule the ruler were never broached (p.289)”.

The notion of mutual surveillance between the ruler and ruled embedded deeply in the Western democracy has in fact only taken shape in the Hong Kong
society not until the release of the first White Paper on constitutional reform in 1984. It was a consequence of the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration for preparing the reversion of the sovereignty of Hong Kong to Mainland China in 1997 (Bray & Lee, 1993). The democratization process was further brought forward by the 1988 White Paper which pledged the election of some seats in the Hong Kong Legislative Council through the universal suffrage from 1991. Bray and Lee considered that the widespread demands for faster democratization in the territory were catalyzed by the 1989 Tiananmen incident in China. They had also the view that Hong Kong was facing difficulty of achieving democratization due to the long-lasting promotion of depoliticisation by the colonial government in the process of decolonization.

Over 95% of the Hong Kong population is ethnic Chinese (Hong Kong 2006 Population By-census) whose ancestors being migrants from the mainland in the middle of the last Century, there is little question that Hong Kong people are predominately influenced by the Chinese culture throughout their upbringing. There was not much tension and tangle from the British culture even when Hong Kong was under Great Britain’s sovereignty for more than a hundred years before 1997, probably due to the colonial effect in making the British culture at the upper class and was overtly intimated by the local rich Chinese.

Whether the Chinese or Hong Kong culture plays a significant part on the Hong Kong civic educators’ perception to civic education would need to be pinned down by research. Nevertheless, according to the Vygotsky’s activity theory (Ratner, 2005), human psychology is organized by three cultural factors, viz. cultural activities, cultural artifacts, and cultural concepts. Simply put, these three factors interact in dynamic ways with each other to structure a human being’s psychological phenomenon. In this juncture, it would be logical to presume a positive connection
between culture and human’s perception. Hypothetically, there is little doubt Hong Kong civic educators’ perception of the contemporary civic education would be portrayed by cultural factors.

Summing up the above, interesting questions may literally arise. In light of the predominant role of civic education implementers, whether the globalising trend of civic education would be actually weakened in Hong Kong by virtue of the Chinese cultural trait in the local school civic educators would be by all means worthy of exploration.

Aside from the foregoing cultural factors, it would be theoretically insensible to exclude other contextual variables such as politics and environments in the way of formulating the understanding of the subject. Taken into account all these, this study is devoted to answering the following four key research questions:-

(i) Is global citizenship education an important feature of civic education in Hong Kong?
(ii) In what ways, if any, does global citizenship education reflect Hong Kong civic education teachers’ thinking about civic education?
(iii) What are the factors affecting civic education teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship education?
(iv) How have civic education teachers’ perceptions been shaped?

4.2 Design of the Study

Determination of Research Paradigm

According to Mertens (2005), paradigm is boiled down to a way of looking at the world which is composed of certain philosophical assumptions that guide and direct thinking and action. Research, serving to well function as a systemic inquiry of
knowing and understanding, should be founded in an appropriate paradigm. In terms of ontological, epistemological and methodological points of view, research can be broadly classified into four major paradigms, inter alia, positivism/postpositivism (e.g. experimental, quantitative), constructivism (e.g. naturalistic, qualitative), transformative paradigm (e.g. critical theory, participatory, emancipatory), and pragmatic paradigm (mixed methods and mixed modes). Without an intention of detailing these fours paradigms here, the simple distinction amongst them might be depicted at the angle of ontology. The positivistists understand the nature of reality as unique, knowable within probability while the constructivists view it variably as multiple and socially constructed. A different angle is taken by the transformativists and pragmatists that the former group considers the realities are multiple and shaped by a wide variety of values including social, political, cultural, economic, and gender and so on, while a simpler logic of “what is useful determines what is true” is adopted by the latter. Partly based on these differences, the use of research methodology varies across paradigms.

By a similar logic, Best & Kahn (2003) outline four broad categories of educational research including historical research (describe “what was”), quantitative descriptive research (use quantitative methods to describe “what is”), qualitative descriptive research (use non-quantitative methods to describe “what is”), and experimental research (describe “what will be”). This simple and comprehensible classification boils down the complicated differentiation of research paradigms to the practical consideration, and facilitates an easy selection of research design.

Some researchers employ a simpler typology of investigation in terms of qualitative versus quantitative research (e.g. Wiersma and Jurs, 2005; Creswell, 2002; Berg, 2007). In essence, Bell (1987) maintains, qualitative research is mainly
concerned with the understanding of an individual’s perceptions of the world whereas quantitative methods are for statistical analysis. For Fraenkel and Wallen (2006), qualitative researchers prefer to know more than merely “to what extent” or “how well” something is done. Their intent might be on a more complete picture of what goes on in a particular situation. In fact, the qualitative/quantitative debate has prevailed for years as reflected in the citation of Walker & Evers (1998) for Husen’s statement (Keeves, 1997),

“The twentieth century has seen the conflict between two main paradigms [qualitative and quantitative] employed in researching educational problems. The one is modeled on the natural sciences with an emphasis on empirical quantifiable observations which lend themselves to analyses by means of mathematical tools. The task of research is to establish casual relationships, to explain. The other paradigm is derived from the humanities with an emphasis on holistic and qualitative information and to interpretive approaches” (p.23).

Each style of educational research, literally, has its own strengths and weaknesses. Simply put, quantitative research is unable to take full account of many interactions in social settings whereas qualitative inquiry is more apt to understand the complex and dynamic quality of the social world (Cronbach, 1975). Cohen et al. (2000) doubt whether positivism fits for social science by putting forward quite a number of related striking criticisms on the positivistic social science. For instance, it fails to take account of the subject’s and unique ability to interpret their experiences and represent them to themselves. In fact, the subject is able to construct theories about themselves and their world. Moreover, its findings are often too banal and trivial, and of little consequence to those for whom they are intended, namely teachers, social workers, etc.

Moreover, noting from the views of the qualitative purists, multiple-constructed realities abound, that time- and context-free generalizations are neither desirable nor possible, that research is value-bound, that it is impossible to
differentiate fully causes and effects, and that knower and known cannot be separated because the subjective knower is the only source of reality; therefore a passive style of writing is not suitable nor preferable (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

Most of the time, the choice of research approach is mainly determined by the nature of the research problem and the objectives set for the research study. The decision is usually made on a case-by-case basis. Regardless of the distinctions between quantitative and qualitative research, to escape from the endless and ardent argument between these two dominating research paradigms and find the third way out, there are a growing number of researchers who believe that the two kinds of research can be effectively combined in the same research project (e.g. Patton, 1990; Bryman, 2006).

From the epistemological point of view, a unity of the two traditionally contrasting research paradigms, humanistic and scientific approaches, will lead to the best position in knowledge pursuit (Keeves, 1997). Both quantitative and qualitative research designs are considered important and useful in mixed methods research, and its goal is not to replace either of quantitative and qualitative approaches but rather to draw from the strengths and minimize the weakness of both in single studies and across studies (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Literally, this school of thought, apparently, also sits in well with the philosophy of pragmatic paradigm as mentioned at the outset of this section.

With the long lasting controversies given rise by the proponents of quantitative and qualitative camps, the field of mixed methodology, namely the “third methodology movement” has evolved as a result and as a pragmatic way of using strengths of both approaches (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Mixed methods research, which first emerged in the late 1950s, is commonly understood as a procedure for
gathering both quantitative and qualitative data in the same research study, and analyzing and reporting this data based on a priority and sequence of information (Creswell, 2002; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). This research design has broadly four advantages. Firstly, it may avoid unimethod bias. That is the use of more than one method in the same study allows the researcher to capitalize on the strengths of each method. Secondly, it appeals to a wider audiences, some of whom may have stronger preference on quantitative approach while the other on qualitative research. Thirdly, it can enable the research to look at the research problem form a variety of perspectives, so as to give a more complete understanding of the phenomenon being explored. Finally, it addresses multiple questions such that the researcher is allowed to investigate diverse questions. Notwithstanding all these advantages, its disadvantage should never be overlooked. This design requires both training in both quantitative and qualitative research. It is thereby rather difficult to make the researchers who do not have the pertinent background to employ the method. The extensive time used for data collection may be hard for single researchers to manage. The above views are echoed by William & Lisa (2006) who argue that,

“Mixed method strategies afford special opportunities to use multiple sources of information from multiple approaches to gain new insights into the social world. Varying the data collection approach can (i) provide information from one approach that was not identified in an alternative approach; (ii) reduce non-sampling error by providing redundant information from multiple sources; and (iii) ensure that a potential bias coming from one particular approach is not replicated in alternative approaches. Although every data collection approach may be characterized by some types of bias, replicating empirical evidence across approaches characterized by various forms of bias substantially increase confidence in the empirical results. Thus mixed method strategies are extremely valuable tool for social research” (p.1-2).

This study is primarily devoted to an investigation of Hong Kong school civic educators’ perceptions of globalised civic education and the contextual factors contributing to the formation of such perception. In this connection, purely
quantitative research may not be feasible to lead to an understanding of in-depth perceptional features while solely qualitative research may be too time-consuming for understanding such a complicated phenomenon. From both the practical and pragmatic points of view, mixed mode research stands out as an appropriate option.

Construction of the Research Instruments and their Administration

This mixed methods research study was composed of two major parts, a quantitative questionnaire survey which was followed by a schedule of qualitative interviews. The questionnaire survey had a purpose to achieve a broad understanding about the subjects’ perception of global citizenship education and the associated impact on the implementation of civic education in Hong Kong junior secondary arena. This is an important step to set the scene for the next part of study concerning the interview, which is envisaged to give rise to a deeper understanding of the topic.

Construction of the Questionnaire and its Administration

The self-constructed questionnaire was designed on the basis of a wide search and review of the relevant literature. It laid out a total of 30 questions, apart from those devoted to the collection of the data subjects’ demographic data, 21 of which are presented at a 6-point Likert response scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” and the remaining two in open questions. According to McNabb (2004), a Likert scale is the most favoured attitude measuring tool in use today as it does not require a panel of judges to rate the scale items. In comparison with another common Thurstone-type measuring scale, Kothari (2005) observes some advantages of the Likert-type scale. The scale is relatively easy to be constructed without the employment of a panel of judges; it is more reliable as it can provide more
information and data; it permits the use of the statements that are not manifestly related to the attitude being studied; it can be easily used in respondent-centred and stimulus-centred studies; and it takes much less time to construct. For generating a less stereotypic response from the subject and higher validity of the instrument, those 28 questions were phrased positively and negatively at random. Oskamp and Schultz (2005) regard that as an approach to reduce response agreement bias. The use of reverse-coded items has become common practice in attitude measurement with a view to resolving acquiescence bias. Foxall et al. (1998) remark that attitude items are often reverse worded so as to avoid potential ‘halo’ bias that can arise if all items are worded in one direction and to check that respondents are really reading the attitude items. With this in mind, some questions were reversely set purportedly, including the second, the eighth, the fifteenth, and the sixteenth ones.

The last seven questions, other than those used for exploring the data subjects’ interest to participate in the follow-up interview, were tailored for collecting the demographic data of the respondents, including their gender, age range, year of teaching experience in general and related to civic education, and teaching responsibilities specific to civic education in their serving secondary school.

For the data analysis, descriptive statistics in terms of frequency, mean, and standard deviation were computed in all the questions of the questionnaire, except the two in open-ended responses to test their significance. Pearson’s correlation coefficient was calculated to test and reaffirm the significant relationships between different items (or factors).

The way of matching the aforementioned 21 items against the four research questions is illustrated in Table 4-1 below.
### Table 4-1 Classification of the questions in the survey instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Item on the Questionnaire</th>
<th>Unit of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Global citizenship education is an important feature of civic education in Hong Kong</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>The cube of citizenship for citizenship education model &amp; the Multi-dimensional civic education (MDC) model; descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Hong Kong civic education teachers’ thinking is affected by global citizenship education</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>The MDC model; descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three &amp; Four</td>
<td>The factors affect the civic education teaches’ perception of global citizenship education and the reasons.</td>
<td>13-21</td>
<td>The modified cultural historical activity theory model; correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an attempt to guard against the response rate, the questionnaire invited anonymous responses. The questionnaires were initially planned to be distributed to target participants via the office bearers of the Hong Kong Civic Education Teachers’ Association, which was in faith a representative group of civic education teachers in Hong Kong. Without keeping a full list of the relevant schools, the President of the Association advised the researcher to approach the principal of individual school concerned direct, in accordance with the 2007/08 secondary school profiles published by the Committee on Home-School Co-operation, an advisory body of the Education Bureau (the local education authority), which was available on the website of the Education Bureau (Appendix 1).

At that juncture, the questionnaires (both in English and Chinese) (Appendix 2)
were sent to the school principals of the 41 target secondary schools for distribution to their relevant teaching staff, coupled with a cover letter (both in English and Chinese) (Appendix 3) explaining the objectives of the study and a self-addressed return envelope. A copy of the recommendation letter issued by the Supervisor of this thesis to the target secondary schools was utilized, which was proven to be useful to stimulate the response rate. Serving as another reinforcer for return, a small token were enclosed in each of the letters for the targeted civic education teachers who were willing to complete the questionnaire.

Construction of the Interview Protocol and its Administration

As mentioned previously, a questionnaire survey might not be beneficial to gather in-depth perceptual data, especially those related to “why” and “how” questions. To rectify this shortcoming, a qualitative interview protocol (Appendix 4) was self constructed to invite a sample of respondents of the questionnaire survey to take part in an interview session with a view to supplementing, clarifying and triangulating the information gauged in the questionnaire survey. As Kvale (1996) defines, an interview is to obtain a description of the [inner] world of the interviewees with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomenon. Interview highlights the advantages of qualitative research in offering an apparently ‘deeper’ picture than the variable-based correlations of quantitative studies (Silverman, 2001, p.18). Skilful Interviewers can follow up, lead, probe questions, investigate motives and feelings, which a questionnaire can never do (Wragg, 1989). Similarly, Wiersma (2000) proposes that in contrast to a questionnaire, an interview provides the option of elaborating or clarifying items after they are presented to the respondent. In other words, interviewing can offer a guard against confusion over questionnaire items.
Actually, the presence of an interviewer generally decreases the number of “don’t know” and “no answers” within the context of the questionnaire (Miller & Crabtree, 1994).

Wragg (1989) categorises interview into three types, viz. structured interview, semi-structured interview and unstructured interview. A structured interview is a carefully worded interview schedule which frequently requires short answers or the ticking of a category by the interviewer while an unstructured interview is a way of interviewing where questions can be changed or adapted to meet the respondent's intelligence. Last but not least, like the structured interview, a semi-structured interview is also a carefully worded interview schedule assembled, but in this case much latitude is permitted. That means the method is more flexible, which allows new questions to be brought up during the interview as a result of what the interviewee says.

This study is neither directed at yes or no answers as expected in structured interviews. Nor is it targeted at a free flow of ideas as in unstructured interviews. The study is rather of an ultimate purpose of illuminating a framework of formation of civic education teachers’ perception of global citizenship education. Lucidly and logically, semi-structured interviews take the priority. The interviewing instrument incorporates altogether 21 open questions, which complements the questionnaire by exploring more deeply about the respondents’ perspective of certain significant issues. Open questions were used based on what Anderson (1990) claims that when free expression questions are utilized, interviewees can use their own words instead of those chosen for them by someone else, and they may discuss items which might not have occurred to the designer of the research. He also argues that open questions tend to be easy to answer and pose little threat since there is no right or wrong answer.
The interviewees’ responses for each of the 21 questions were carefully transcribed; and the responses from all the interviewees in each question were analysed at a time for a fuller understanding of the respondents’ views in each aspect.

A question was deliberately placed at the end of the questionnaire to invite respondents to take part in the follow-up interview. The respondents were given a free choice for their participation. Despite the anonymity of the questionnaire, the indication of the interest of participation in the questionnaire could still help the researcher to cross compare the feedback of the participants who took part in both two research processes.

Pilot Study

The value of piloting is affirmed by Kelly et al. (2003) who point out that a research tool should be tested on a pilot sample of members of the target population. This process will allow the researcher to identify whether respondents understand the questions and instructions, and whether the meaning of questions is the same for all respondents. The pilot study can also highlight potential problems such as poor response. Berends (2006) underlines potential advantages of pilot testing. It is first of all able to provide valuable information about how long the study takes such that the researcher can adjust the length of the instrument to avoid unresponsiveness. Through pilot testing, ambiguous questions can also be brought to light.

In practice, the draft questionnaire was tried out with a local civic educator, who had ample knowledge and experience about the independent civic education curriculum. Apart from the useful view given for a greater clarity of some terminologies and statements used in the instrument as well as the time span of the study, the researcher was strongly advised to translate the questionnaire into Chinese
in order to encourage participation. With a similar purpose, the researcher was also advised to give a free choice on the language of response in the interview session.

4.2 Sampling Strategy

Cohen et al. (2000) concede, the quality of a piece of research not only stands or falls by the appropriateness of methodology and instrumentation but also by the suitability of the sampling strategy that has been adopted. While a sample is a subset of the population on which the research is focused, sampling strategy is an act of selecting a suitable sample, or a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population. Wiersma & Jurs (2005) cite Kish’s (1965) four broad criteria for a good sampling design, encompassing goal orientation, measurability, practicability, and economy. Simply put, the sampling design should closely tie in with the goal of research, the level of data sufficient for analysis, the applicability in real situation, and finally the financial manageability. Theoretically, although random sampling is the best opportunity to minimize sampling error and bias, nonrandom sampling approach is adopted sometimes due to the factors such as it might not possible to find many people to participate in the study (Gay & Airasian, 2003).

In light of the above, it would be sensible to start with the determination of the population of the study. In fact, the first step in sampling is to define the population (Gay & Airasian, 2003). According to the Secondary School Profile 2007/08 (http://chsc.edb.hkedcity.net/secondary/) available in the website of the Committee on Home-School Co-operation (CHSC), which was established by the Hong Kong Government in 1993 to promote home-school co-operation, there are currently 41 secondary schools offering the Civic Education independent subject at Secondary
Three classes. It was understood that more and more local secondary schools jumped on the bandwagon in offering the new curriculum of Integrated Humanities or Liberal Studies to substitute the independent civic education subject which was contingent upon the comprehensive reform of Hong Kong school curriculum starting off in early 2000. According to the experience of the investigator who was a school civic education teacher before, a secondary school on average assigned about two teaching staff to teach the subject. The target population totaled approximately 82 secondary school teachers. Sending questionnaires to such inconsiderable number of respondents should be manageable so far as the four criteria for a good sampling design, as mentioned in the preceding paragraph, are concerned. Generally, when surveying a professional population, 70 percent is considered a minimum response rate (Weirisma & Jurs, 2005). Ideally, a total of 55 completed questionnaires will be envisaged and that will form a reasonable basis for a statistical analysis for which at least 30 cases are required (Cohen, et al., 2000; Gay & Airasian, 2003). It was however noteworthy that school accessibility has been a longstanding problem for researchers in Hong Kong (Leung, 1997).

The number of participating interviewees depended largely on how well the questionnaire survey was received by the data subjects. When the participations in both the questionnaire survey and the follow-up interview were voluntary, it was hard to predict the actual number of the participating survey respondents who would eventually turn up in the interview, even though a statement of invitation was included at the end of the questionnaire. Kvale (1996) puts it, there are few standard rules or common methodological conventions in qualitative research community, hardly any general texts have exhibited in which questions of method including sample size were discussed. The sample size does not matter too much as Silverman
(2001) maintains that qualitative interview studies are often conducted with sample
samples and its core value is to gather an authentic understanding of people’s
experiences.

Treating the respondents’ feedback in strict confidence was a central ethical
issue always borne in the researcher’s mind, no matter when the questionnaire survey
or the interview was concerned. Such promise was relayed to the respondents through
the cover letters and introductory text of the questionnaire, and at the outset of the
interview sessions. The issue of research ethics would be discussed in greater detail
later in this chapter.

4.3 Validity and Reliability

Fraenkel & Wallen (2006) assert that the quality of the instruments used in
research is central for the conclusions draw are based on the information they collect
using these instruments. Generally speaking, validity refers to the appropriateness,
meaningfulness, correctness, and usefulness of the inferences a research makes while
reliability refers to the consistency of scores or answers from one administration of an
instrument to another, from one set of items to another. As Cohen et al. (2007) posit
both qualitative and quantitative methods can address internal and external validity.
For internal validity, the research findings must accurately describe the phenomena
being researched. Ways to ensure validity in either qualitative or quantitative research
are manifold. Triangulation is certainly one of them, and the qualitative interview in
this study plays that part. External validity refers to the generalisability of the
research results to the wider population, cases or situations. Instead of a pure
quantitative design, this mixed-method study has no intention of arriving at a broad
generalisation of phenomenon in the widest sense. Rather, it serves to interpret
generalisation as comparability and transferability. That means the research findings might be comparable and transferable to another situation. On the surface, the sample, setting and construct in this study are peculiar to a certain group, and therefore transferability of results appears to be improbable. Nonetheless, as Cohen et al. (2000) quote Schofield (1992), it is of prime importance in qualitative research to provide a clear, detailed and in-depth description so that others can decide the extent to which findings from one piece of research are generalisable to another situation. As such, the chance of transferability of results still stands.

Construct validity of a research instrument can be achieved by means of a wide search of literature (Cohen, et al., ibid). Chapter two of this thesis serves this purpose. Anderson and Arsenault (1998) explain a pilot study as a useful measure to test research instruments to see whether there will be any possibility that worthwhile results will be found. If promising results do not appear in the pilot run, rationale and design of the study will have to be reconsidered. Thus it provides an excellent way of avoiding trivial and insignificant research (p.10). In this light, a pilot study was employed for validating the questionnaire and research protocol utilised in this study with a local civic educationalist. The questions and implementation strategies for the questionnaire survey and interview will be adjusted accordingly where appropriate. Equally important, expert academics were consulted about on the suitability of the design of the two intended instruments.

For research to be reliable it must demonstrate that if it is to be carried out on a similar group of respondents in a similar context, then similar results will be found (Cohen, et al., 2000). Anderson & Arsenault (1998) supplement that in qualitative research reliability different researchers might come to different conclusions while exposing to the same situation. When I was the sole investigator, the probable inter-
interviewer bias had to be aptly minimised.

Considered the hybrid of qualitative and quantitative design in this study, the discourse that validity and reliability be dealt with differently in quantitative and qualitative design (Morse, et al, 2002; Golafhani, 2003) could not be underscored. Maxwell (2002) quotes Salmer (1989) that existing categories such as concurrent validity, internal/external validity and criterion-related validity originated from the positivist assumption, and that qualitative research should have its own procedures for attaining validity that are simply different from those of quantitative approaches. Maxwell further refers validity to an account rather than data/methods, and the account is relative to purposes and circumstances and is a description at a very low level of inference and abstraction. In this sense, a method by itself is neither valid nor invalid; methods can produce valid data and accounts in some circumstances and invalid ones in others. Eventually, conclusion reaches by using that method in a particular context for a particular purpose. Patton (2002) also cautions that validity and reliability are two factors which any qualitative researchers should be concerned about while designing a study, analysing results, and judging the quality of the study.

With a view to safeguarding validity of reliability of the study, verification strategies put forward by Morse et al. (2002) had been circumspectly followed. The strategies encompass fourfold. The first aspect is concerned with methodological coherence which aims to ensure congruence between the research questions and the components of the method. Second, the sample must be appropriate, consisting of participants who best represent or have knowledge of the research topic. Third, data should be concurrently collected which forms a mutual interaction between what is known and what one needs to know. Last but not least, the researcher should think theoretically, who moves with deliberation between a micro perspective of the data
and a macro conceptual/theoretical understanding.

4.4 Research Ethics

Strike (2006) maintains, “members of the research communities have responsibilities to and for the research community that include adhering to and taking collective responsibility for the maintenance of the community’s ethical norms and for ensuring that the institutions and practices that shape the community’s activities conform to them” (p.57). In other words, education researchers should strive to protect children and other populations, to whom being often directed in education research, maintain the integrity of their research and their research community, and those with whom they have professional relations. In practice, data subjects should be assured that researchers are conscious of their intrusive potential, and should seek to minimize any intrusion; the confidentiality of the data must be respected and protected by positive measures; and data subjects should be told the purpose of research and should have adequate opportunity to withhold their cooperation (Burgess, 1989).

The respondents of this study were unambiguously informed in the questionnaire that anonymous response was expected and the response was treated in strict confidence and would not be divulged to the third party without their prior consent. The researcher’s programme of study and the operating university as well as the researcher’s contact point were disclosed as a kind of assurance. At the start of the interview session, the similar sort of assurance was made to the interviewees. Privacy of the interviewees was also watched carefully partially through the seeking of their consent before the interview contents were audio-taped.
4.6 Limitations of the Study

This study is absolutely not intended for a generalization of civic educators’ views on the subject across the territory. Rather, a large-scale national study, with ample resources back-up, may do. This small-scale study sets forth to achieve a certain level of contextual understanding about local civic educators’ perception of the adoption of global citizenship education in their teaching. It is envisaged to shed much light on the future development of the subject, such as the selection of teaching materials and strategies for global citizenship education.

Considering the limited resources, a smaller sample of informants was chosen. As mentioned in Chapter Two, under the recent change of the local education policy, schools have gradually replaced the independent Civic Education subject with some broader based curricula such as Integrated Humanities, Liberal Studies, or Social Studies at the junior secondary level. Consequently, the number of schools with the independent Civic Education subject has duly dropped from 54 in 2006/07 to 41 in 2007/08. Such wince of sample size may one way or the other call generalisability of the study results into question. Nevertheless, this study is dedicated primarily to unveil local educators’ perception of globalised citizenship education, and that the foregoing boarder based subjects should be outweighed by the independent Civic Education subject as the most ideal interface. Moreover, given the mixed method design of the study, it is unrealistic to envisage the generalization of the research results quantitatively, which relies heavily upon the proportionality of the sample size and population. The focus should fall upon, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, the transferability and comparability of the mixture of the qualitative and quantitative outcomes.

There is a dearth of research report on the implementation of the independent
Civic Education locally that leads to a lack of comparability basis for this study. Nor is the absence of local and overseas research studies of the formation of civic educators’ perception of global citizenship education. On the other hand, the contributing factors for shaping civic educators’ perceptions should be more manifold and multi-dimensional, as well as not exhaustive. As a matter of fact, the investigator of this study has no intention whatsoever of claiming a complete testing of all the possible factors which shape civic educators’ mindset, which may never be feasible through such scale of study per se.

4.7 Summary of the Chapter

The locus of this study is framed on an understanding of a sample of local school civic educators’ perception of global citizenship education and the constituent factors for its formation. Various aspects of the research design as well as the research instrument construction and administration are articulated. To contextualise the study, a sample of civic educators who deliver the independent civic education subject in junior secondary classes in local schools was selected to participate in a mixed method design research comprising a questionnaire survey and a follow-up interview. The entire study is conducted by the sole investigator who is the author of this thesis. The findings will be analysed in the next chapter.
5.1 Introduction

This study was devoted to an examination of a number of features revolving around civic educators’ perception of global citizenship education, first of which relates to the popularity of global citizenship education in Hong Kong secondary schools from the eyes of teachers who teach the independent civic education subject at the junior secondary sector, particularly at Secondary Three in the first place when the subject was phasing out from the local secondary schools and replaced by the curriculum of Integrated Humanities or Liberal Studies under the recent years’ curriculum reform in Hong Kong secondary education, which are more broad brush in essence. Secondly, the civic educators’ perceptions of global citizenship education was also explored and understood. The research investigation was guided by four research questions, which were developed on the basis of the review of the literature captured in the second chapter of this thesis. The research questions are presented below:

(i) Is global citizenship education an important feature of civic education in Hong Kong?
(ii) In what ways, if any, does global citizenship education reflect Hong Kong civic education teachers’ thinking about civic education?
(iii) What are the factors affecting civic education teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship education?
(iv) How have civic education teachers’ perceptions been shaped?

The study targeted local civic education teachers who were delivering the independent civic education subject at the junior secondary sector where the topics of
globalization were delivered. The data were collected through two research instruments: a questionnaire survey and a follow-up interview.

5.2 The Questionnaire Survey

Response Rate

A total of 82 questionnaires were sent to 41 secondary schools where the independent Civic Education subject was on offer at junior secondary three in which the topics on global citizenship were touched upon. It was assumed that two teachers in each school would be tasked with the responsibility for teaching the subject, so two questionnaires were distributed to each target school. In catering for exceptional cases, the schools were encouraged to request for additional copies of the questionnaire when necessary. As a result, additional 10 questionnaires were subsequently sent. Consequently, 53 questionnaires were returned, four of which were incomplete and thus disregarded in the analysis. The actual response rate was 58% which is higher than the normal expectation of the response a postal questionnaire of 40% (Cohen, et al., 2004, p.263), and not far away from the high 67% response rate in postal questionnaires as posited by Bloch (2004). In order to foster responses, the respondents were given the liberty to complete the questionnaire in either English or Chinese. Perhaps due to the fact that the independent civic education subject was normally delivered in Chinese in class, it turned out that only three of the 49 completed questionnaires were in English.

Demographic Information of the Respondents

Gender

There were 20 male and 29 female teachers responsive to this questionnaire
survey. Table 5-1 displays the gender distribution. Apparently, the female secondary school teachers outnumber their male counterparts in a ratio of 6 to 4.

Table 5-1 Gender of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N=49)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>[40.82%]</td>
<td>[59.18%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

The age range of the respondents varies quite significantly. The 36-45 age range has the highest frequency while the 25-35 comes next. The lowest frequency group falls on the youngest age group. The numbers of the two highest frequency groups are close together implying that middle age secondary teachers are most likely appointed to the delivery of the subject. Presumably, the young staff members were not trusted by the school management having had an adequate level of maturity and experience in delivering the curriculum which involved a lot of complex value judgement in various contexts and sensitive political issues. Nor were the aged group considered appropriate when most of them were senior staff whose business time was mostly spent on the school administrative work. Table 5-2 shows a summary of the age distribution of this sample.

Table 5-2 Age of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Below 25</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>Above 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N=49)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>[4.08%]</td>
<td>[32.65%]</td>
<td>[36.74%]</td>
<td>[26.53%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year of Teaching Experience

The highest frequency group lies in the range of 16-20-year group, ensued by
those of 6-10 years and the 11-15 years. These three groups altogether account for over 70% of the entirety. That means the majority of the civic education teachers in this sample possess teaching experience ranging from 6 to 20 years. Should the year of 15 (a moderate figure) be taken as the dividing line between the experienced teachers and their novice counterparts, this sample illuminates a ratio of 23 to 26 which is quite close to an even distribution. A breakdown of the figures in each individual range of year of teaching experience is depicted in Table 5-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>≤ 5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>≥ 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N=49) [%]</td>
<td>5 [10.2%]</td>
<td>11 [22.45%]</td>
<td>7 [14.29%]</td>
<td>17 [34.7%]</td>
<td>3 [6.12%]</td>
<td>4 [8.16%]</td>
<td>2 [4.08%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching of civic education or related subjects in school

An overwhelming majority of the respondents (i.e. 42/86.71%) were teaching the independent Civic Education (CE) subject while the rest delivered related subjects including Life Education (LE), Social Studies (SS), Integrated Humanities (IH), Liberal Studies (LS), and Economic and Public Affairs (EPA). The distribution of the informants’ responsible civic education or related subjects is shown in Table 5-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject(s) taught</th>
<th>CE only</th>
<th>CE &amp; related subjects</th>
<th>LS only</th>
<th>SS only</th>
<th>IH only</th>
<th>EPA only</th>
<th>LE only</th>
<th>LS &amp; EPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Years of experience in teaching civic education related subjects in junior secondary

Most of the respondents possess 4 to 6 years of related teaching experience, followed squarely by those with 7 to 10 years and over 10 years of experience. Teachers with the least relevant teaching experience were less likely assigned taking up the teaching duties. Inferentially, the subjects require a certain amount of relevant teaching experience to safeguard the effective delivery. The overall frequency distribution table is available in Table 5-5.

Table 5-5 Years of teaching experience in civic education related subjects in junior secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Related Teaching Experience</th>
<th>≤ 3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>≥ 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N=49)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>[14.29%]</td>
<td>[36.73%]</td>
<td>[24.49%]</td>
<td>[24.49%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possession of formal degree-level education related to civic education

Table 5-6 displays the frequency distribution of respondents who have and have not received formal degree-level education pertaining to civic education. The figures succinctly unveil that a majority (over 83%) of the informants do not have the related degree education.

Table 5-6 Formal civic education related education possessed by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree-level civic education related education</th>
<th>Yes¹</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N=49)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[%]</td>
<td>[16.33%]</td>
<td>[83.67%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The related formal degree education comprises bachelor’s degree in Sociology and Social Policy, MEd in Liberal Studies, MEd (Civic Education and Moral Education), Master in Cultural Studies, and a bachelor’s degree in Religious Education.
Participation in professional development activities or training related to civic education

As shown in Table 5-7, slightly more than half of the respondents (57.14%) have participated in various kinds of professional development and training activities associated with civic education. The most popular sort of activities the teachers took part in were short seminars and workshops organized by the Education Bureau, the official education authority in Hong Kong. None of them expressed attempt to pursue a formalized advanced education studies that is in lack as reflected from the results of the last section.

Table 5-7 Civic education related professional development or training participated by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in related professional development and training activities</th>
<th>Yes(^2)</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number (N=49) [%]</td>
<td>28 [57.14%]</td>
<td>21 [42.86%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 The Interview

Response Rate

At the end part of the questionnaire, a question was posed to explore as to whether the respondents were interested to participate in the follow-up interview. As explained to the questionnaire survey informants, the interview was purported to shed more light on the interviewees’ perception of the topic including the underpinning rationales. Check boxes of yes or no were provided for facilitating easy response. Perhaps due to the fact that interview participation was voluntary and the teachers’ concern over the long participative time in the interview, only four interviewees

\(^2\) The CE related professional development or training quoted by the informants include relevant seminars and workshops organized by the Education Bureau and the Hong Kong Institute of Education
agreed to take part in the end (8.16%). One of them could not make it eventually owing to the personal hectic schedule despite the investigator’s strenuous and repeated efforts in inviting her to attend. Consequently, three interview sessions were successfully conducted after the confirmation of the interview schedule with the interested parties. The participants were given a free choice of the language (English or Cantonese) used in the interview. All the three interviewees chose Cantonese at the end. The interview session was audio-taped with the permission of the interviewees. The contents of the interview sessions were transcribed and translated into English. The transcripts of the interviews are displayed in Appendix 4.

Demographic Information of the Interviewees

Of the three interviewees, one was male and the other two were female. All of them were serving in aided secondary schools (In Hong Kong, there are three major types of secondary schools namely the government school, aided school and the private school. The aided secondary schools are those operated by non-profit-making organization with the financial aid from the government. The aided secondary schools dominate the grand total). The male participant was the youngest in the group. Their overall teaching experience ranged from 2 to 15 years while their teaching experience in relation to civic education ranges from nearly one year to 7 years. None of them held a relevant degree in civic education or a related discipline but all of them had participations in civic education related professional development activities. Whilst the number of interviewees was not large, the representativeness of the sample can be arguable taking into account the participants’ distribution in gender, age, teaching experience in general and that related to civic education.
5.4 Perception of the Significance of Global Citizenship Education for Civic Education in Hong Kong

The significance of global citizenship education (questionnaire data)

The first five items of the questionnaire were deliberately developed to explore the respondents’ perception of global citizenship education in Hong Kong and that how global citizenship education is significant for civic education in Hong Kong. The findings are depicted in Table 5-8.

Table 5-8 Mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ score rating in items 1 to 5 of the questionnaire (N=49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judging by the scores of the mean values in these five items, the respondents’ support to the centrality of global citizenship education in local civic education is moderate. Without an overwhelmingly dominant support, it is still obvious that global citizenship education can be regarded significant for local civic education. The results of SD, except for the item 2, reveal a certain degree of spread of opinions across respondents. The responding civic education teachers, however, held a strong view that contemporary civic education can never merely revolve around global citizenship education. This notwithstanding did not run contradictory to the imperative of the global citizenship education for Hong Kong civic education because civic education is by nature a very complex and multifaceted subject which cannot be easily pinned
downed to one or two single schools of thought, as mentioned in literature reviewed in the second chapter of this thesis.

The significance of global citizenship education (interview data)

The three interview sessions were conducted on 10, 11 and 14 July 2008 respectively at night after the school hours with the sole aim not to interfere with the informants’ normal teaching duties. In terms of sequence, the youngest gentleman went through the process first, followed by the most experienced lady and then her younger counterpart. Following this order of appearance in the interview sessions, the male interviewee was codified as I(1), the most experienced female interviewee as I(2) and her younger female counterpart as I(3).

All the interviews took place in a private corner of different restaurants and each session lasted for at least an hour. Prior to the start of the interview questioning, the interviewees were explained about the interview purpose in ascertaining correct understanding. They were given assurance that their responses would be made anonymous and kept strict confidence which would be used in this study only. The interviewees were also offered a free choice of the interview language (English or Cantonese). With no surprise, all the three interviewees finally picked Cantonese. The interviewees were engaged as equally as possible with the use of a set of standardized interviewing procedures. The interview questions were probed one by one and sufficient time was spared for the interviewees to respond in turn. Clarifications and elaborations were sought whenever necessary. All the interviewees were generally helpful and enthusiastic, especially for the two younger teachers. Therefore, the overall quality of the data was valuable for the verification of the corresponding data in the questionnaire survey. The quotations of the interview
episodes in the section and throughout this chapter were selected due to their significance in reflecting the interviewees’ prime notion of the issue.

There were unanimous views amongst the three interviewees that global citizenship education should be a central component in the future civic education in Hong Kong as reflected from their responses to the questions 4 to 6 in the interview protocol. The youngest interviewee pointed out unequivocally,

“I(1): People living in Hong Kong, which was an international city, should carry the character of international habitants. Hong Kong should be a gateway to the international world of China. The city should have the responsibility to lead other Mainland cities to the international community. To achieve this, it was imperative for the people of Hong Kong to bear the world vision so as to help the Chinese political system to become more open and democratic. Therefore, global citizenship education was of paramount importance for the future of Hong Kong”.

Notwithstanding the above, another interviewee doubted the readiness and maturity of the current students at junior secondary class to acquire the difficult concept of global citizenship education. A phased approach was thus reckoned as more favourable to develop the students’ knowledge in some basic civic education competencies before cultivating them with the higher order of notions of global citizenship education. On the face of this viewpoint, it sounded more relevant to the implementation strategy rather than the fundamental support for the importance of global citizenship education for the local civic education. Interestingly enough, the same informant suggested global citizenship education was important for Hong Kong in future.

“I(3): students at the lower grade did not have the related concepts. They were not able to digest what was taught. For instance, in the teaching of national education, students could not see the problem of not knowing how to sing the national song, and why national flag should be raised and they did not realize their role as a national citizen. They just thought the topic boring. Therefore, when talking about global citizenship education, it was too difficult for the students. Their focus was merely confined to
When asked about if global citizenship education should be taught in Hong Kong schools, the opinions were positive in general. This result complied with the logical inference that global citizenship education is crucial for Hong Kong civic education and civic education is defined as a formal school subject aiming to help students acquire citizenship within the education system (see the footnote 1 of the questionnaire). The reasons for this positive feedback rest in the understanding that global citizenship education contributes centrally the instillation of essential values such as equitable trade, rich and poverty, and right and responsibility for students. However, one interviewee suggested that this kind of higher order value be better taught in the higher level of secondary schooling when the students become more mature. Another informant offered a sensible reminder that was,

“I(2): Yes, it was important to teach global citizenship education in Hong Kong schools. However, it would be essential to avoid the delivery of certain topics superficially. According to my experience, students were interested in certain topics such as unfair international trade only when they were given a thorough analysis of the background of the issue”.

5.5 The way global citizenship education features the respondents’ thinking about civic education

The socio-cultural factors (questionnaire data)

Items 6 to 14 are intended to a measurement of the socio-cultural factors that shape the civic education teachers’ perception of global citizenship education. Table 5-9 displays the descriptive statistics of the findings.
Table 5-9 Mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ score rating in items 6 to 14 of the questionnaire survey (N=49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Mean (µ)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the surface, the respondents rated quite positively for the majority of the nine items. In comparison, the item 14 has specifically the highest score and the lowest value of standard deviation. That means a majority of the civic education teachers unanimously perceive global citizenship education as a kind of moral disposition that makes people realise their responsibility to alleviate local and global inequalities. Except for items 11 and 12, the other six items followed quite closely where a small range of mean values falling between 4.01 and 4.35 together with the standard deviation values of 0.86 to 1.15 were found. At the other extreme, the item 11 received the lowest rating but the highest standard deviation. The unification of Hong Kong with China was least likely regarded as influential to the shaping of the respondents’ perception of civic education more globally vis-à-vis the other factors, so are the factors of collectivism and Confucian value of education. However, the views of the respondents were a bit divergent judging by the high value of standard deviation. Notwithstanding this, the positive feedback of the informants (i.e. the percentage of rating greater than equal to 3) towards most of the nine factors
confirmed their significance for the constitution of the civic education teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship education.

The socio-cultural factors (interview data)

The questions 7 (a) to 7 (f) were designed to collect the interviewees’ deeper thoughts about the socio-cultural factors constituting their globalised perception of civic education. First and foremost, all the interviewees agreed that globalization is a factor contributing to their way of thinking towards civic education more globally. This is because modern human beings live along with the globalization phenomenon which affects all walks of life, particularly when Hong Kong is an international city. Civic education should also be a learning experience associated with daily life affairs, not just with those indigenous but also roles in different temporal contexts including the international society. There was no surprise to note the interviewees’ views as follows:

“I(1): I would regard myself as a person of Shatin, Hong Kong, Canton (China), China (national), Asia and the World. Any person would thereby need to play varied roles in different contexts, and more importantly, such person needed to evaluate how to play the roles in the specific contexts successfully. Should there be any conflict in those roles the person should be able to make the right decision”.

“I(2): Owing to the rapid development of communication technology, we were subject to influences from other parts of the world from time to time. Teaching of global citizenship education was thereby crucial in civic education”.

When asked about the impact of national identity crisis on the perception of civic education, two out of the three interviewees were affirmative. However, none of the three interviewees supported the negative influence of the unification of Hong Kong with China being postulated on making their civic education perception less globalised as Hong Kong still remains the international gateway to the world under
the protection of the “one country two systems” agreement. Fundamentally, all the three interviewees asserted the significance of national identity for an individual. One of them said,

“I(3): Hong Kong people do not attach importance to national education and consider themselves as Hongkongese, especially the young generation. They did not care about their motherland and generally held a negative view towards China. Therefore, national education should come first. After the people gained the sense of national education, their attention could be extended to the global level”.

National identity crisis might somehow and somewhat cause a certain degree of uncertainty on an individual’s identification of roles as an international citizen on which the national identity is built. However, the sole negative informant believed that the two things could be segregated by virtue of the presumption that an individual’s global perception of civic education should not be bounded by the national identity. The two concepts are not mutually exclusive. In this sense, national identity crisis should not be part of the contributing constituents to the shaping of an individual’s global civic education mind. By and large, the interview results were aligned with that of the questionnaire survey.

In understanding how nationalistic education shapes the interviewees’ thinking of civic education, there was a majority view that nationalistic education played a crucial part on making the civic education teachers think civic education more globally. As such, the significance of nationalistic education in the questionnaire survey was reaffirmed in this interview. As explained by the interviewees, the government has recently stepped up measures on the advocacy of nationalistic education in local secondary schools. The tie between civic education and nationalistic education has been growing stronger and stronger, and becoming a dominant topic in the subject. A diverse view emerged at this point that the most experienced interviewee considered this development quite natural as Hong Kong is
now part of China but such a stance was opposed by her younger colleagues. The two less experienced interviewees argued that nationalistic education currently propagated in schools was overtly biased towards China, lacking a critical view. Under this adverse situation, they considered it necessary to hold a balanced global viewpoint striking a sensible decisive mindset of issues of universal values, such as justice, equality and democracy. Not solely was this balanced and critical viewpoint central for civic education teachers, it was also equally imperative for students. One of these supportive teachers unveiled,

“**I(1):** By nature, nationalistic education is not a bad thing but a biased view towards the subject is. I did not want the students forget about the existence of such polity other than the Chinese government. I would take this as a balance force for the overwhelming promotion of national admiration in Hong Kong in the recent years. While the local government authority kept stressing the national identity, I would question myself how a Chinese should actually perform”.

In terms of collectiveness in Chinese culture, there was one interviewee who was sure about it as a factor in portrayal of the globalised perception of civic education teachers. However, she concurrently expressed a reserved view that,

“**I(3):** It would sometimes be right to have people move ahead collectively for the benefit of the country. It would sometimes be right to have people move ahead collectively for the benefit of the country. However, the collective value might not be correct all the time. People should have a critical mind to distinguish right and wrong rather than being passive recipients”.

The other two respondents were less certain about the contributing value of collectivism and one of them maintained,

“**I(1):** I basically had no objection to the collectivism since it could bring about something good sometimes. However, it was unfair that individual rights should be sacrificed for the benefits of the collectivity. If the society kept leaning towards the collective benefits, I would take the opposite stance as a balance”.

In short, this interview result was more or less in alignment with that of the
questionnaire survey within which no positive correlation between the factor of collectivism and teacher global perception of civic education was suggested. Conclusively speaking, the reasons offered by the interviewees were twofold. Firstly, people were easily driven by collective interests particularly in the post-colonial era. Under the ruling of China, collectivism as part of the Chinese virtue and culture had been increasingly emphasized in Hong Kong. Individual rights had to give way inevitably. All these confused in some senses people’s critical mindset upon which civic education should be relied. Taking a more globalised angle was espoused to be able to bridge the gap. Secondly and lastly, an overemphasis on collectivism would discourage participation of individuals in societal activities during which interests of individuals and marginalized sectors were defended.

The Confucian approach to education is often seen as closed and conservative, an orientation which runs contrary to the open and progressive rhetoric of global citizenship. It was, however, interesting to record the Confucian value of education which was not considered by all the three interview informants as a factor to shape their perception of civic education globally. Two respondents could not agree on the relevancy between these two aspects. The remaining one argued that the Confucian value of education could be considered positive in some sense and he commented,

“I(1): I did not agree with what Confucianism was currently denoted. It was rather a lively concept, e.g. the six basic skills, which were concerned about a very broad perspective. Actually, Confucius travelled round the country for teaching, so his concept of the world did not contradict with what we had today. As a matter of fact, Confucianism was a good asset for me to deliver the concept of global citizenship education”.

Overall, the results of the questionnaire survey and this interview in this respect were consistent with one another.
Last but not least, the interviewees were questioned whether the local culture (i.e., utilitarianistic familism) would have a bearing on their globalised perception of civic education. There were unanimous supportive views. One interviewee manifested that civic education was primarily related to things happening around. In Hong Kong, people were often affected by incidents in connection with money which led to some sort of local common behaviour pattern giving rise to the local culture. This observation was echoed by another informant who further thought family businesses should contribute equally. Presumably, this local culture appears to be a bit negative. To leverage it, the interviewees considered global citizenship education a sensible solution.

Further to the above result, local current affairs were considered essential in forming the local culture. In particular, local societal incidents connected with the international issues such as the 2003 WTO Ministerial meeting held in Hong Kong and the mass protest against the legislation of Article 23 in the Basic Law were vivid examples drawing people’s attention to some universal tensions including trade inequality, human injustice, and anti-democratization. All these reminded people that a narrow view of citizenship would not suffice to help them survive in the international context where the issues were much more acute and influential to the daily life than before. Overall, the interview results were congruent with that of the questionnaire survey.

The curricular and professional factors (questionnaire data)

The items 15 to 19 are contrived to attempt to understand if educational and professional factors affect the respondents’ perception of global citizenship education and the delivery of global citizenship education. The average and dispersion of the
responses are summarized in Table 5-10.

**Table 5-10 Mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ score rating in the items 15 to 19 of the questionnaire (N=49)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Mean (µ)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four items, except number 15, received a mean value higher than 3.5 which is the mid point of the 6-point scale. The SD value fell within a small range of 1.03 to 1.25. The item 18 resulted in the highest mean value while the item 15 made the least. The less favourable score in the item 15 typified the dissatisfaction of the civic education teachers towards the current subject curriculum. The subject was supposed to be providing a comprehensive framework on the development of civic education competency extending from the personal to global dimension. Judging from what the civic education teachers perceived, the implementation of the curriculum might not have been the case. Nevertheless, the respondents considered the development of the civic education curricula since 1985 positive in making themselves to adopt a more globalised civic education perception conceptually. One interviewee echoed this by saying,

“T(3): The change had sent out a clear message that global citizenship education should be delivered through civic education starting from the junior secondary sector rather than by Liberal Studies or Integrated Humanities which were more related to thinking skills and integrated project learning.”

However, in terms of implementation, the same interviewee pointed out that,

“T(3): The prevailing curriculum was too simple and focused too much on information providing rather than value building. For instance,
within the normal duration as short as 35 to 40 minutes in a lesion, topics about the nation could only be delivered through the introduction of national flag, national anthem, and the like. That could be seen superficial. Value cultivation was also often the negligence”.

On the professional side, a majority of the respondents valued the imperative of the relevant and formal degree level education as well as sufficient professional development opportunities in the formation of their globalised civic education perception. However, none of them hold a relevant degree related to civic education. This point was far from difficult to understand as the contemporary civic education and training are not disconnected with the building of global views. It was considered vital for all the three interviewees for the delivery of global citizenship education and civic education. One of them stated,

“I(2): Professional education and training were very important. Many civic education teachers like me were not civic education or related disciplines trained. Learning how to teach the subject was of vital importance”.

A more specific statement was given by another interviewee who said,

“I(1): Most of the teachers, as I observed, would not know how to do if they were not provided with suitable education and training. The professional education and training should first and foremost serve to clarify the basic concepts of the subject. Some civic education teachers delivered some fundamental concepts such as human rights and democracy without having a good grasp of their actual meanings. The success of the implementation of the global citizenship education relied to a great extent on the teachers’ professional know-how”.

The curricular and professional factors (interview data)

The respondents’ views were principally captured in the questions 7(g) and 7(h). The views varied dependent on the different school situations they were in. A positive comment came from the most experienced interviewee who commended that civic education had received more attention in schools. A radiated framework on the teaching of civic education right from the individual to the global level had been put
in place through which a more globalised perception amongst incumbents was evident. Her positive comments in respect of the current civic education curriculum were highlighted below:

“I(2): Schools had flexibility in the selection of contents to be delivered. Should the school not wish to deliver too much content on national education, it could make the call. Normally, the choice was made depending on the stage of development of the school. If the schools considered themselves mature enough, they would tend to choose more topics at the global level”.  

However, less positive remarks were noted from the other two younger participants. While both of them admitted the impact of the two issues upon their thinking of civic education, they were concerned about the lack of sufficient coverage of global citizenship education in the current civic education curriculum. The current foci of the curriculum leaned too much towards nationalistic education and moral education which overshadowed the topics in democracy and critical decision more relevant to global citizenship education. Despite this, the result of this interview is generally tallied with the questionnaire survey.

“I (1): The current civic education curriculum was in general quite week and merely leaned towards national education. Concepts mostly relevant to civic education such as freedom, rule of law democracy, and contemporary citizen virtues were not adequately covered. Overall, the formal civic education curriculum was not sufficient in Hong Kong schools. Sometimes, informal curriculum activities such as the election of class representatives could be more useful to help students develop the basic notions of civic education”.

The school factors (questionnaire data)

The respondents’ perception of the school factors (i.e. factors occurring within the serving school of the individual respondent) was explored through the item 20 which was broken down into seven sub-items, namely 20.1 to 20.7. The sub-items include other teachers’ belief and behaviour, availability of teaching materials and
support, attention from school management, students’ belief and behaviour, examination-oriented curriculum, self-efficacy among teachers, and availability of preparatory time for teaching. The means and standard deviations of these sub-items were computed and interpreted. The findings are presented in Table 5-11.

Table 5-11 Mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ score rating in items 20.1 to 20.7 of the questionnaire (N=49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Mean (µ)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum (item 20.7) and the minimum (20.5) mean values fall within a tacit range. It was quite clear that the civic education teachers considered the availability of preparatory time for teachers most central, followed closely by the attention from school management. What concerned the civic education teachers least was the examination oriented curriculum. The second last one belonged to other teachers’ belief and behaviour. All the mean values were higher than 3.5, the mid point of the 6-point scale, representing a supportive stance of the civic education teachers for the impact of the school factors on their globalised civic education perception. This was further proven by the percentage of scores higher than 50% in every single sub-item in the item 20. However, it was interesting to note a high standard deviation value in the sub-item 20.3 denoting a high divergent view amongst
The school factors (interview data)

All the three interviewees made comments on the school policy on civic education which was considered central to the successful implementation of global citizenship in school. One interviewee warned that an overemphasis of a narrow sense of nationalistic education in school would one way or the other jeopardise the instillation of a critical mind in students which was essential for a contemporary global citizen. This view was shared by another interviewee who further stressed the significance for the school management to make a right choice over the civic education curriculum and that should be well understood by teachers in the process of implementation of the curriculum.

“I(3): The most important thing was the major direction of school. For example, national education focus in recent years overshadowed all other areas of developments and topics in civic education. It was therefore important for the teachers to develop the students’ value system. Because of this, the teachers’ perception of civic education was of prime importance”.

While the colleague factor was not rated very high in the questionnaire survey, the three interviewees attached importance to the competency level of their colleagues in the delivery of the subject. In general, they could not see a sufficient level of understanding and skills on global citizenship education in their teaching teams. Self-efficacy among teachers came out at this point. The quality of delivery was inevitably undermined. More seriously, no obvious motivation for the teachers to gear up themselves as expected could be observed. Equally important, the interviewees also agreed that a lack of sufficient preparatory time for teaching adversely affected the quality of teaching of global citizenship education, especially when the subject matter
was new to the implementers. One interviewee disappointedly commented,

“I(2): Sometimes I realized from the problems of students (such as a lack of understanding of racial discrimination and that probed me to teach more related topics to them. Most of my colleagues, I observed, did not concern much about civic education. Nor did they consider teaching civic education important”.

The interviewees were quite neutral to the other two issues on the examination-oriented curriculum and students’ belief and behaviour. Perhaps these two aspects were considered within the civic education teachers’ locus of control, and that their effect on the civic education teachers’ perception of civic education was weak. Overall, there was not much discrepancy between the results of the questionnaire and this interview. One interviewee disclosed that,

“I(3): In general Hong Kong students’ views and visions were narrow, no matter which socio-economic stratum they came from, and they were easily influenced by external factors. Therefore, the students should be helped to develop a wider scope of vision at the world level. For teachers, amongst the 81 colleagues in my serving school, very few had the appropriate level of understanding of the topic. Therefore, my contribution could be seen missionary”.

The factors outside school (questionnaire data)

The item 21 was planned to explore the informants’ perception of the external school factors, encompassing seven sub-items 21.1 to 21.7. Considering the political, economical, educational and personal natures of global citizenship education as well as its multi-layered framework, the sub-items cover areas in China’s influence in Hong Kong, China’s booming economy, China’s political reform, Hong Kong’s booming economy, change of related local education policy, personal belief about global citizenship education, and understanding of global citizenship education in the local context. The mean and standard deviation of the responses are engulfed in Table 5-12.
Table 5-12 Mean and standard deviation of the respondents’ score rating in items 21.1 to 21.7 of the questionnaire (N=49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Mean (µ)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest mean value lies in the item 21.6, ensued closely by the item 21.7. Apparently, the civic education teachers’ personal belief about global citizenship education affected their perception the most. The notion of making sense of civic education through a radiation model embarking upon the individual self appears to be proven valid with this finding. By the same token, it is not surprising to note the second most crucial factor coming under the understanding of global citizenship education in the local context. The lowest two mean values rest on the items 21.4 and 21.5. There is no difficulty of noting that Hong Kong blooming economy received the least attention, probably because of the growing influence from the economy of China. The attention has been shifted. However, it is not easy to understand why the change of related local education policy did not matter much. One possible answer for this might be that the teachers were tired of the impeccable changes of education policies in recent years in Hong Kong. Overall, the seven factors were found relevant to the formation of the civic education teachers’ perception of global citizenship education.
The factors outside school (interview data)

There is little argument that the impact of China has been growing in Hong Kong. China is also playing a more and more important role in the stage of the world. These views were unanimously shared by the three interviewees. At this juncture, their perception of global citizenship education is somehow configured by the China elements, bearing mind the effect of the global view in maintaining a delicate balance with the narrow sense of nationalism. One interviewee revealed,

“I(1): With the soaring impacts of China on Hong Kong, students would unavoidably consider the China factors more significantly. It was therefore imperative for students to have a balanced view and appropriate value system under such growing influence. I wished my students to develop a world vision, or even a universal perspective. Overall, the students should have a proper vision covering the layers of the universe, the world, the nation-state, the community, the family and finally the self. Only through this, the students could develop an understanding and acceptance of different cultures and values”.

As agreed among the three interviewees, personal beliefs about global citizenship education should come to the forefront. With this belief, an inner value system would be built up to guide an individual’s reasoning and behaviour. One interview respondent commented,

“I(3): My change of perception was a result of the change of curriculum. In the future, I would prefer putting global citizenship education in a more important position in teaching civic education at the junior secondary classes since senior secondary students would need to have a global view under the new 3-3-4 academic structure. However, whether or not this deed could be operationalised was dependent upon how much autonomy I could gain from the school”.

5.6 Correlation between the significance of global citizenship and various factors in the questionnaire survey

The socio-cultural factors

When the interval scale of measurement is adopted in the questionnaire, a normal distribution of scores is assumed. Pearson correlation, falling within the parametric statistics can be used as the unit of analysis (Ravid, 2000). Pearson r was computed to determine the significance between different factors, and the results are in Table 5-13.

Table 5-13 Correlation between the significance of global citizenship education and the socio-cultural factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>0.1046</td>
<td>0.2055</td>
<td>0.2987*</td>
<td>0.3276*</td>
<td>0.3391*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>0.8734**</td>
<td>0.1890</td>
<td>0.2771*</td>
<td>0.2981*</td>
<td>0.2993*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>0.2894*</td>
<td>0.1987</td>
<td>0.2987*</td>
<td>0.3010*</td>
<td>0.3017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>0.6532**</td>
<td>0.1034</td>
<td>0.2109</td>
<td>0.3891**</td>
<td>0.3309*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>0.3893**</td>
<td>0.2149</td>
<td>0.2701*</td>
<td>0.3990**</td>
<td>0.3646**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>0.1437</td>
<td>0.1870</td>
<td>0.2070</td>
<td>0.1772</td>
<td>0.1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>0.2481</td>
<td>0.2027</td>
<td>0.2161</td>
<td>0.2011</td>
<td>0.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>0.2643*</td>
<td>0.1761</td>
<td>0.2499*</td>
<td>0.2996*</td>
<td>0.3797**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>0.3716*</td>
<td>0.2001</td>
<td>0.2628*</td>
<td>0.3003*</td>
<td>0.2999*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P < 0.01 * P < 0.5 df = 48   N = 49

The results of the above table enlighten a significant level of correlation between the respondents’ perception of the significance of global citizenship education for Hong Kong civic education and the impact of socio-cultural contributing factors to their perception of global citizenship education, except for the factors of Confucian value of education and collectivism. However, the item 2 is interestingly not very much correlated significantly with the items 6 to 14.
The curricular and professional factors

The significance of global citizenship education and the curricular and professional factors are compared to see whether they are correlated. The correlation coefficients ($r$) are depicted in Table 5-14.

**Table 5-14 Correlation coefficients between the significance of global citizenship education and the curricular and professional factors in the questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>0.5139**</td>
<td>0.1256</td>
<td>0.2949*</td>
<td>0.2929*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>0.4448**</td>
<td>0.0921</td>
<td>0.2883*</td>
<td>0.3880**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>0.2526</td>
<td>0.1574</td>
<td>0.2663</td>
<td>0.2977*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>0.3958**</td>
<td>0.1635</td>
<td>0.2986*</td>
<td>0.3950**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>0.2881*</td>
<td>0.2888*</td>
<td>0.2992*</td>
<td>0.3873**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P < 0.01 * P < 0.5 df = 48  N = 49

Items 4 and 5 correlate significantly with Items 15 to 19, compared to a relatively moderate correlation in Items 1 and 3. Broadly speaking, the curricular and professional factors can be deemed affecting the civic education teachers’ perception of the significance of global citizenship education. However, it is worth pointing out that similar to the results in the section 5.6, Item 2 turns out with the weakest correction. Ironically, the item was singled out by the respondents less influential to their perception formation and this phenomenon was reflected in the results in the foregoing sections.
The school factors

Table 5-15 Correlation coefficients between the significance of global citizenship education and the school factors in the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 20.1</td>
<td>0.3157*</td>
<td>0.2163</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.2920*</td>
<td>0.3449*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20.2</td>
<td>0.3999**</td>
<td>0.2987*</td>
<td>0.2972*</td>
<td>0.3211*</td>
<td>0.2939*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20.3</td>
<td>0.3918**</td>
<td>0.3086*</td>
<td>0.2890*</td>
<td>0.3155*</td>
<td>0.2911*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20.4</td>
<td>0.2906*</td>
<td>0.2266</td>
<td>0.2468</td>
<td>0.2597</td>
<td>0.2373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20.5</td>
<td>0.2624</td>
<td>0.2436</td>
<td>0.2295</td>
<td>0.2047</td>
<td>0.2264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20.6</td>
<td>0.3923**</td>
<td>0.2576</td>
<td>0.2550</td>
<td>0.2770</td>
<td>0.2583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20.7</td>
<td>0.3990**</td>
<td>0.3283*</td>
<td>0.2937*</td>
<td>0.2988*</td>
<td>0.3358*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P < 0.01 * P < 0.5 df = 48  N = 49

On the whole, correlation exists between the school factors and the significance of citizenship education perceived by the surveyed civic education teachers. In comparing the level of significance amongst the school factors, the items 20.1, 20.2, 20.3 and 20.7 outweigh the other three items. This finding is consistent with that in the section 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 where its cause can also be found.

The outside school factors

Table 5-16 Correlation coefficients between the significance of global citizenship education and the related factors outside school in the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 21.1</td>
<td>0.1557</td>
<td>0.1823</td>
<td>0.2130</td>
<td>0.2933*</td>
<td>0.2898*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21.2</td>
<td>0.2999*</td>
<td>0.1914</td>
<td>0.2945*</td>
<td>0.2755</td>
<td>0.3169*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21.3</td>
<td>0.2918*</td>
<td>0.2418</td>
<td>0.2950*</td>
<td>0.2871*</td>
<td>0.3121*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21.4</td>
<td>0.2206</td>
<td>0.2302</td>
<td>0.2156</td>
<td>0.2292</td>
<td>0.2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21.5</td>
<td>0.2624</td>
<td>0.2286</td>
<td>0.2355</td>
<td>0.2789</td>
<td>0.2690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21.6</td>
<td>0.3923**</td>
<td>0.2898*</td>
<td>0.2896*</td>
<td>0.3778**</td>
<td>0.3721**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21.7</td>
<td>0.3142*</td>
<td>0.2929*</td>
<td>0.3450*</td>
<td>0.3184*</td>
<td>0.3859**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P < 0.01 * P < 0.5 df = 48  N = 49
Compared to the other factors, the factors outside of the school are less closely correlated with the significance of global citizenship education perceived by the respondents. Notwithstanding this, a moderate degree of correlation still occurs. Relatively speaking, the items 21.4 and 21.5 received a lower value of correlation coefficient than the others.

5.7 Areas for improvement on the implementation of global citizenship education in school

The 22nd item in the questionnaire was deliberately set for the solicitation of the respondents’ views on at least three aspects requiring improvement about the implementation of global citizenship education in their school. The second last question in the interview supplemented more detailed information about the respondents’ perception. The results are captured in the two subsequent sections.

The questionnaire results

A total of 42 respondents expressed their views, 34 offered views on all the three aspects, four shared two and the rest disclosed one. The teachers’ views are summed up in Table 5-17.

Table 5-17 A summary of the respondents’ views on the areas of improvement for the implementation of global citizenship education in their school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (in descending order of importance)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Insufficient coverage of global citizenship education in the current civic education curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Insufficient teaching resource</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Insufficient teaching time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Insufficient attention from the school management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interview results

The interview informants highlighted a list of priorities encompassing appointment of a team of competent teachers, support from the school leadership, appropriate choice of assessment strategy, lowering of teaching load, supply of more teaching resources, better coordination across relevant subject panels, provision of more training, establishment of a clear school policy and implementation plan, and increase of teaching time for the topic. Among these aspects, the majority of the respondents emphasized relatively more on the importance of releasing the current heavy teaching load to make room for the delivery of the topic, the availability of more teaching resources, and the provision of more professional training. This result is very much similar to what the questionnaire survey comes by. One interviewee’s
response was exemplary,

“I(3): Firstly, the school should lay down clearly its civic education policy and draw up the relevant implementation plan in order to show the school support for the implementation of global citizenship education. After that, teachers of different subjects should join forces for the implementation within which civic education teachers should play the central part of coordination. Secondly, more support from school, including the teaching load and resources should be made available. Thirdly, teaching hours of civic education should be increased substantially”.

5.8 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter presents and summarises the findings of the questionnaire survey and the follow-up interview. It is affirmative that the outcomes of the questionnaires and the follow-up interview are to a great degree in line. That means the perceptions of the participating civic education teachers under investigation were affected significantly by the socio-cultural, curricular & educational, professional, personal and school (from within and outside) factors, except the Confucian value of education and collectivism in the socio-cultural domain. The discussion of these findings in the context of existing theory and research the four research questions is detailed in the next chapter on discussion and analysis.
6.1 Introduction

The last chapter presented the findings of the mixed-methods research study in this thesis which was composed of the questionnaire survey and the follow-up interview. The study was primarily to investigate the civic education teachers who taught the independent civic education subject at the junior secondary sector in Hong Kong through which the participants’ perceptions of global citizenship education were explored and understood. This chapter contributes to an analysis of and discussion on the findings against the review of literature and the conceptual framework manifested in chapters two and three of this thesis respectively. Through this process, the four research questions were attempted to be addressed. The four research questions are, inter alia, as follows:-

(i) Is global citizenship education an important feature of civic education in Hong Kong?

(ii) In what ways, if any, does global citizenship education reflect Hong Kong civic education teachers’ thinking about civic education?

(iii) What are the factors affecting civic education teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship education?

(iv) How have civic education teachers’ perceptions been shaped?

6.2 Data Analysis and Discussion Against the Research Questions

The data were analyzed and discussed corresponding to the four research questions one by one in the following paragraphs:

**Research Question One**: Is Global Citizenship Education an important feature of civic education in Hong Kong?
Whilst disagreeing on the uniquely central position of global citizenship education for civic education in Hong Kong, the majority of the questionnaire respondents did not deny its vital value in local civic education for the essential purpose of preparing students for becoming competent global citizens. Unanimously to a considerable degree, none of the interviewees objected to the centrality of global citizenship education in civic education of Hong Kong. This result was consistent with the similar understanding of the questionnaire informants.

As mentioned in the chapter of literature review, civic education is never an unambiguous term and is contentious in orientation (Heater, 1990, 2004a; Lee, 2005a; Evans, 2006; Tse, 2007b). It can embrace a wide range of components, including teaching of civic literacy, learning of rights and duties of citizenship, and producing citizens possessing a national allegation, so on and so forth (Pratte, 1988). The narrow mind of taking global citizenship education as the mere crux of civic education should thereby be dismissed. Yet there is an undeniable inflation of civic education (Minogue, 1995), at least in the spatial dimension corresponding to the globalizing world, even though some argued that the modern nation-states should be seen from a certain angle the founding block for the evolution of globalization (e.g. Giddens, 1990; Delanty, 2000; Linklater, 2007) and global citizenship education (Heater, 1990, 2004b; Cogan & Derricott, 1998 & 2000). The significance of global citizenship education for civic education in Hong Kong has been confirmed by Law (2004) and Li & Gu (2004) in their research studies. The similar findings can also be found from overseas civic education studies carried out by Kubow (1996), Parker, et al (1999), and UNICEF (2000).

In short, without the attempt of confirming the sole importance of global citizenship education for Hong Kong civic education, the results of the study in this
thesis have implied a globalised trend in the local civic education arena. All the above are apt to suggest that contemporary civic education, as being asserted by Branson (1990), should move ahead with the direction of global citizenship education.

In a bid of understanding why the responding civic education teachers perceived Hong Kong civic education globally, first and foremost, Heater’s (1990, 2004a) cube of citizenship for citizenship education model was adopted as an unit of analysis. This model intends to relate the world, continental/regional, nation-states, and provisional/local citizenship (Hudson and Kane, 2000). Its higher relevancy to the context of civic education than the other citizenship frameworks, for instance, T. H. Marshall’s three-faceted approach (Rees, 1996) make the model speak for itself a suitable unit of analysis. Even comparing with another citizenship cube theory in civic education (Potter, 2006) that embodies four layers: issues, ethos, pedagogy, and partnerships with parents and community, Heater’s three-dimensional model is simpler and embrace more essential dimensions in both citizenship and civic education. Heater (2004a) stresses that the three dimensions of the cuboid of citizenship provide a mental construct of the human social animal as a multiple citizen. Such reality lends the model, presumably, strength to analyse the data subjects’ global psychology of civic education from a viable perspective.

As elaborated in the previous chapter on literature review, Heater’s cube of citizenship covers three interrelated dimensions: the geographical dimension, the education dimension and the civic dimension. To make sense of citizenship, the three dimensions must interconnect themselves in harmony. For the geographical dimension, multiple identity and loyalty are the two major points of discourse. Along the spectrum from the local/provincial regime to the world end, an individual inevitably experiences varied identities in different contexts and is subject to different
expectations of allegiance.

One interview informant pointed out that, “I(1): Global citizenship education was more important than the other topics in civic education, including national education. Everyone should have a sense of being a world citizen. Instead of merely knowing the cultural heritage of being a Chinese, we needed to realize ourselves as a member of the world such that tolerance to other ethnics would be possible”. This observation, obviously, sits in well with what Davies et al. (2005) posit that new forms of citizenship are growing in the face of globalization though national citizenship still remains a strong force and education still largely serves the nation-state. The declining power of the welfare state and the rise of globalization imply a need for greater integration between the two areas.

Another interviewee who shared the similar viewpoint considered that a phased approach was appropriate for the implementation of global citizenship education in Hong Kong secondary schools. A solid foundation of national education was taken as a pre-requisite for imparting the knowledge of global citizenship education to students. The phased approach was also supported by the remaining interview respondent who manifested that local schools would tend to manoeuvre to the global dimension of civic education after attaining a certain level of maturity in the discipline area.

The existence of the diversified layers of citizenship in Hong Kong, at least at the national and global levels, was realized by the interviewed school civic educators. This finding is in line with the observations of Hughes & Stone (2009). Moreover, Mathews et al. (2008) unveiled the paradoxical feeling of Hong Kong teachers on the acceptance of their national identity through an empirical study. The study results showed that a widespread of ambivalence occurred amongst the data informants in
their love for the Chinese state today. Some of the teachers said they loved the
Country, the Chinese tradition, but not the Communist Party. In part, this ambivalence
is explicable to the generational shift where most of the teachers were educated under
the colonial era. Facing with the crisis of national identity, there was no surprise that
the civic education teachers under study in this thesis tended to take a global
perspective of the subject they taught, which can offer a relatively more balanced
view of citizenship, relaxing identity crisis of the people of Hong Kong, and
defending Hong Kong’s valuable asset as an international city (Chong, 1999). This
balancing force can be squarely important for students as revealed by the interviewees
in the study of this thesis.

The education dimension features the instillation of knowledge of public
affairs, attitudes of civic virtue, and skills to participate in the political arena in
students. Both the survey and interview results confirmed that the civic education
policy and curriculum had an impact on the studied subjects’ perceptions of civic
education. There was also a majority view on the ultimate aim of civic education to
cultivate students with the knowledge, skills and attitude/value pertaining to global
citizenship education.

Yet all the three interview participants did not approve of the contents of the
current civic education curriculum. The negative comments mainly lay on the
insufficient coverage of global citizenship education and the bias towards national
education. Leung and Ng (2004) concur on such standpoint. The reasons for the data
subjects’ discontentment over the existing syllabus might also be drawn from Davies,
et al.’s (2004) research study. The study reported that the participating civic education
teachers in their study in West Midland of the United Kingdom were generally found
not certain about the genuine meaning of global citizenship and how it could be
delivered. Without a good understanding about the subject, the study respondents did not show a high confidence in its delivery. Morris & Scott (2003) attribute the ineffective implementation of civic education in Hong Kong to inadequate support from the education authority. Albeit an acknowledgement of the complexity of the notion of global citizenship, Davies (2006) recognizes the significance of global citizenship and its education and supports the absorption of global citizenship into the school curriculum in a more radical and politicized form.

Owing to the factors of sovereignty and proximity, though not very explicitly, Hong Kong’s school curriculum seems to be impossible to totally escape from the influences of China particularly in the implementation phase (Morris, et al., 1997; Kennedy, 2005). The emphasis of patriotism in China (Fairbrother, 2003) might more or less reinvent the wheel of Hong Kong civic education. It is instructive from various research studies (e.g. Commission on Promotion of Civic Education, 2004; Torney-Purta et. al, 2001) that national identity did not receive satisfactory attention from Hong Kong people at large after the 1997 handover of sovereignty. Ideologically, an alignment of the conception of citizenship is unsurprisingly envisaged, substantiating a growing emphasis on nationalism and patriotism in the Hong Kong civic education curriculum in recent years (Curriculum Development Council, 2001). The immediate past Secretary for Education and Manpower, Prof Arthur Li made it clear in his reply to a legislator’s question on the promotion of national education in 2004 that,

“With the return of Hong Kong to our motherland, there is a need to develop students’ national identity. It is one of the seven curriculum goals under the curriculum reform. The aim is to enhance students’ national identity through different Key Learning Areas (KLA) and by providing them with various learning experiences. Moral and civic education is one of the four key tasks advocated in the curriculum reform of which national identity is one of the priority values schools have to develop among students... Teacher development programmes for primary and secondary
school teachers were organized by the then Education and Manpower Bureau [now Education Bureau] in the form of seminar with themes on Chinese culture, history, geography and politics etc. The EMB has also commissioned local tertiary institutes to organize moral and civic education curriculum modules with themes on interaction between contemporary China and international society, traditional Chinese culture and national education (Li, 2004, p.272)”.

Concurrently but perhaps not contradictorily, the emphasis of national education in the Hong Kong civic education curriculum is irresistible. However, to ascertain Hong Kong’s future competitive edge and sustainability, Hong Kong students are expected to be instilled with global level competencies to meet various challenges in the globalizing world through the school curriculum including that of civic education. The school’s value for such purpose is confirmed by the IEA study (Torney-Purta, et al, 1999). This is also reflected in Mr. Raymond Wong’s, the current Permanent Secretary for Education who is a very senior education officer in Hong Kong, speech in the annual speech day of a secondary school in 2008 that,

“We are at a time when education is more important than ever. The world has changes as the process of globalization has taken hold. The pace of transformation is unprecedented. New technology has jumped geographical barriers and borders, unleashing the flow of information, paving way for the integration of emerging economics into world markets. In the 21st Century, prosperity depends on our capacity to compete effectively in global market. To remain at the forefront of economic, social and cultural advances, our next generation needs the creation of new ideas along with the capacity to acquire the knowledge, skills and values which can lead to new knowledge and technology (Wong, 2008)”.

The notion of inclusive citizenship theorizes that people in whatever area of government they are involved, are respected, so that people can increasingly ‘change places’ with others, whether these others are neighbours in the same bloc, people of their nation or region, or members of countries in distinct parts of the world. That means global citizenship implies a respect for others, a concern for their well beings and a belief that the security of each person depends on the security of everybody else – does not operate in contradiction with regional, national and local identities. It
expresses itself through them (Hoffman, 2004). Hence, the notions of global, national and local citizenship are, *prima facie*, not mutually exclusive despite their contentious natures in some senses. Chong (1999) has proposed that global citizenship can be used to overcome the loophole of a deficiency of national identity in Hong Kong. The interviewed teachers also shared a view that the recent over-emphasis of national education in their schools could be delicately balanced by the development of rational global mindset in students.

From a broader perspective, operating an open system, there is no way for Hong Kong to stay in vacuum from the impacts of the international affairs. The recent global financial tsunami is a vivid example from which Hong Kong suffers arduously in economic term. It is also unarguable that the recent years’ local education reforms are consequent upon the changes of education policies and notions around the globe (Lee, 2008a).

In Hong Kong, the conception of globalizing civic education principally blossomed since the advent of the multi-dimensional school civic education guidelines in 1996 (Tse, 1999; Li & Gu, 2004). The more than 10 years’ time should suffice to synthesise the local civic education teachers’ global mind through the tripartite framework at the local, national and international layers, especially when the new guidelines received a wide recognition in the community at the time of its issuance (Cheung, 1996; Tse, 1999). The causality effect of education reform on teachers’ perceptions and practices can be found in Chou (1999) and Lowenstein (2003) in the cases of Taiwan and the United States respectively. The 1996 guidelines were later translated into the syllabus of the independent civic education for junior secondary students issued in 1998 (Education Department, 1998) to equip them with the relevant civic knowledge, skills and attitude (Morris & Morris, 2002).
The long-time delivery of the independent subject should be a useful catalyst to mould the studied civic education teachers’ global mind.

The Committee on Secondary School Civic Education of the Curriculum Development Council in 1997 conducted an opinion survey on the draft Syllabus of the Secondary Schools Civic Education for Secondary One to Three (Curriculum Development Council, 1998). The opinions from the total of 128 surveyed secondary schools affirmed that the draft Syllabus was well supportive (89.8%), particularly in terms of its aim and objectives, student-centred orientation, multiple-angled reflective and practical teaching approach, and open-minded and creative teaching suggestions. In congruence with the prescribed components of the educational domain of the Heater’s (1990 & 2004a) cube citizenship, the independent subject aims to help students acquire the critical and reflecting thinking skills, to encourage students’ participation in civic affairs, and to prepare students to learn to exercise their rights and responsibilities as citizens. Its curriculum organization revolves around six community areas, ranging from family, neighbour, region, nation, world, as well as citizenship and civil society (Grossman, 2004). With this content coverage and the emphasis of the civic education in the school curriculum, the teachers’ global mind of civic education can be naturally mediated and transformed.

Lastly, the civic domain characterizes the components in identity, virtue, legal/civil, political, and social senses. The identity discourse has been discussed in the foregoing paragraph. There was no major dissonance between the outcomes of the questionnaire survey and the interview about the value of global citizenship in developing a citizen’s global responsibility to safeguard local and global inequality. The independent civic education syllabus captures the global citizenship topics on the pluralistic word and global citizenship at Secondary One, the heritage of human
civilization and significant historical events in the world at Secondary Two, and major
global issues at Secondary Three (Lee, 2005a). Lee (2008a) further comments that
globalization powerfully penetrates the new curriculum documents in Hong Kong,
placing strong emphasis on generic skills and global citizenship values, such as
plurality, democracy, freedom, liberty, and human rights. With this global emphasis,
both students’ and teachers’ sense of identity can be considered to have been driven
beyond the local and national borders. Along the strengthening of global element in
the school curriculum, there is not much surprise to see a broadening of the studied
teachers’ perspective to the global level.

Dagger (1997) refers civic virtue to the role of citizen that a person may
occupy. Civic virtue demands the person to look outward to do what he or she can do
to promote common good. From this perspective, civic virtue has a deep root in
republicanism. Global civic virtue is framed by Hoffe (2007) as the world citizens’
dispositions which are required when they extend their political commitment beyond
their own state to the world republic. In other worlds, they do not limit their social and
cultural activities within the boundaries of the belonged societies. To this end, global
civic virtues correspond to four major genres of world citizens, comprising the
morally modest world citizen, the constituent member of a positive world legal order,
a person who is content with a sense of global rule of law, and a person who is
faithful to a global legal order, are essential. That implies the transition from national
citizenship to world citizenship is legally and morally required.

Against the above understanding, the global civic virtue components in the
Junior Secondary Civic Education syllabus and the associated textbook (Chau &
Cheung, 1999) were briefly examined in this thesis. It is fair to say that the related
content coverage cannot be considered on the high side. With such limited coverage,
students are primarily expected to grasp a brief understanding of the matter of concern for the world, and be cultivated with an open-mindedness and objectivity towards different cultures, values and ways of life. A lack of adequate emphasis on the actual legal engagement in the world affairs and the necessary participatory skills in the world businesses leaves the idea of global civic virtue a bit blurred.

However, on the moral side, both the Syllabus and the textbooks should be able to convey some basic knowledge and attitude in relation to global citizenship, such as caring for the diversity, joining hands with people in other parts of the world in dealing with problems arising from poverty, and war and peace. Through this process of cultivation, students may be able to develop a supra-national moral courage to give hands to those without the legally-bounded civic identity in their place of belonging. This is reckoned by Linklater (2007) as one of the prime attributes in global citizenship. Hence and also taken the aforementioned positive response from the secondary schools on the draft Syllabus, I have to argue that the world-laden civic education syllabus should be a capstone starting point in emancipating local civic education teachers’ minds in civic education from the straightjacket of the local and national borders.

Regarding the legal/civic, political and social components, the Syllabus, so far as its global citizenship coverage is concerned, succeeds in widening students’ citizenship horizon in the global dimension. Some may argue there is not adequate coverage in the curriculum document about the essential political and legal institutions underpinned global citizenship (Hoffe, 2007), such as the world non-governmental organizations (e.g. the United Nations), and supranational legal organization (e.g. the International Court of Justice). The inadequate mentioning about the international laws (e.g. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,
and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) tends to weaken students’ participatory ability in exercising their global responsibilities. This may be true in some senses as reflected by the one interview participant’s comment. The current Hong Kong civic education curriculum appears to be too content-oriented rather than value building. Contents of global citizenship education seem to be not in-depth enough as well.

However, my counter argument is that the current syllabus, targeting at the junior secondary sector, cannot be expected to be omnipotent. This kind of higher-level understanding is expected to be suitably complemented in the students’ further studies in subjects like Liberal Studies at senior secondary and Government and Public Affairs at the sixth form. As argued above, teachers’ perception is predominantly influenced by students’ behaviour. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that civic education teachers’ perception are one way or another impacted by the global elements in the independent Civic Education Syllabus.

All in all, the developments of the globalizing civic education in Hong Kong can be considered fitting in well with Heater’s cube of citizenship model.

For a more cogent argument over the findings of this part of study, Cogan & Derricott’s (Cogan & Derricott, 1998 & 2000) multi-dimensional civic education (MDC) model was adopted as another unit of analysis. The reason for choosing this model is very much akin to that in the selection of Heater’s cube of citizenship as discussed earlier on. Conceptually, it was explained in the earlier chapter on literature review that the MDC model is a complex and multi-faceted conceptualization of citizenship and civic education that citizens will need to cope with the challenges in the new 21st century. Multidimensional citizenship can be best construed in four key interrelated dimensions: personal, social, spatial and temporal (Grossman, 2004). For
greater clarity, the personal dimension refers to a personal capacity for and commitment to a civic ethic characterized by responsible habits of mind, heart and action. The social magnitude refers to the capacity to live and work together for civic purposes.

In other words, as successful social beings, citizens must be able to engage in public debates and discussions, to participate in public life, to deal with problems and issues, and be equipped to deal respectfully with people whose ideas and values differ from their own (Kubow et al., 2000). The engagement in political activities and civil society are necessitated. The spatial domain alludes to the capacity to see oneself as a member of several overlapping communities at the local, regional, national and multinational levels. Finally, the temporal dimension is relevant to the capacity to local present challenges in the context of both past and future with a view to focusing on long-term solutions to the difficult challenges. That means citizens, in coping with contemporary challenges, must not be so preempted with the present that they lose sight of the past and future. Simply put, heritage and tradition are influential in helping citizens understand the essences of citizenship while citizens should at the same be aware of the impacts on future citizens in tackling the contemporary challenges (Kubow et al., ibid).

On the personal dimension, the civic education independent syllabus proclaims at the outset that it is written from the learner’s perspective (Education Department, 1998). Students are expected to acquire knowledge, skills and attitude to become responsible citizens at various levels of attachments. One of the Syllabus’s aims clearly states,

“*To develop in students’ positive civic attitudes, values and a sense of belonging to the family, the community and the state so that they are ready to contribute to the betterment of the family, the state and the world*” (p.2).
The embodiment of essential civic conceptions and skills including the rule of law, democracy, human rights and justice, and critical thinking and problem-solving skills in the Syllabus is one way or the other of primary value for students to learn to perform their global citizenship role in daily life. Along this reasonable analysis, it is justified to say the investigated civic education teachers take a global perspective of the local civic education syllabus.

Turning to the social dimension, the social dimension of citizenship is somewhat embedded in the Syllabus and the associated textbook. For example, the pertinent concepts of human rights, tolerance of diversity, and sustainable development are engulfed. While there might be critiques about the insufficient highlight of political participations, the reality is that the concepts having been just mentioned together with the other imparted liberal civic conceptions including the social justice and democracy which are espoused to be able to lay seeds to cultivate students’ democratic and participative minds for living in a globalizing world, perhaps in the soul of their teachers too. Notwithstanding this, it should be fair to admit the support of social citizenship under-weighs that of the personal citizenship in the civic education curriculum document.

Given the above dialectic discourses, the alignment of the Civic Education Syllabus with the spatial magnitude sounds self-evident. Throughout the learning process, students are positioned as members of multiple levels of jurisdictions in order to nurture their sense of belongings and responsibilities in the global milieu. Human beings’ long-term sustainability and civilization appears to be the ultimate goal. Considering this moral high ground, I would not expect a strong objection from the studied civic education teachers to the agreement of the significance of global citizenship education in local civic education syllabus. As a matter of fact, all the
three interviewees did not oppose to such stance.

With respect to the temporary dimension, it is discernible from the civic education curriculum and textbooks that the historical component such as the world history and the future elements such as sustainability development and world peace have been incorporated. While the basic ideas are there, whether or not students are genuinely able to apply them in coping with the relevant challenges may be questionable. The author of this thesis has no intention of addressing this question as the subject implementation issue falls outside the scope of this study. However, the interviewed teachers held a view that students should be developed with a civic capability to deal with societal problems with reference to the relevant historical incidents no matter when the incidents happen. One interviewee asserted, “students should be cultivated with a world vision, including at least an understanding of histories and cultures in different parts of the world”. The temporal viewpoint seems to be prevalent among the teachers interviewed, even though an interviewee made the point less implicit by saying that students should be cultivated with civic virtues which enable them to care more about incidents happening in the society. The resulting inference on the globalized view of the studied civic education teachers towards the local civic education is thereby reasonable.

In light of the above analyses, the independent Civic Education Syllabus sits in well with the two analytical frameworks pertaining to global citizenship. Its inspiring global components were found by the majority of the study respondents to be able to pin down the perceptions of the participating teachers of the curriculum. The findings were also consistent with what Li & Gu (2004) unfolded in their study that the strengthening of students’ global citizenship education was widely supported by the local school educators. This finding, however, runs contradictory to the
research result of Lee (2004b) where the Asian educational leaders, including Hong Kong, did not rank global citizenship education high in their agenda.

The disparity might be attributed to the perception held by different groups of data subjects in these studies. The frontline educators tended to take a more down-to-earth position than their colleagues from the educational authority. On the other hand, with the similar multilayered structure as the MDC model, teachers delivering the Civic Education Syllabus should hold a globalised view as Grossman (2000) maintained. To him, teachers must serve as role models of multidimensional citizenship if children and youth are to take the concept seriously. Without teachers as living models of what the students are to embody, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to succeed. When discussing teaching about conflict through citizenship education, Davies et al. (2005) observe, “teachers have to model commitment to action, and teacher education has a role in preparing dispositions to act” (p.33).

The responses of the study participants in this thesis appeared to have confirmed that contemporary civic education in Hong Kong should not remain conventional and traditional. Otherwise, it will certainly lag itself behind the rapid moving international world. In this regard, the study of global citizenship and global citizenship education should be adequately and sufficiently embraced in the contemporary and even future civic education curriculum to deepen students’ competency spatially in citizenship and its bestowed responsibilities at different levels of engagements in public life. It was unfortunate that there was not sufficient empirical evidence to support that global citizenship education had exerted tremendous threat on the central position of nation-state in civic education. The two entities should be seen as interlocking but not mutually exclusive. To test this in full, another empirical research study will be necessary. Taking one step forward, the
above results are of prime value to set the scene for the understanding of the civic
education curriculum as an artifact in activity theory in shaping the civic education
teachers’ perceptions of local civic education globally. This viewpoint would be
further explained in the ensuing paragraphs when the research findings corresponding
to the other three research questions were discussed.

Research Question Two: In what ways, if any, does global citizenship education
reflect Hong Kong civic education teachers’ thinking about civic education?

The investigated civic education teachers’ thinking about global citizenship
was further examined in the sixth and fourteenth questions of the questionnaire and
the third question in the interview protocol. The relevant findings in the questionnaire
survey suggested that civic education contributes to the cultivation of students with
the knowledge, skills and attitude/value pertaining to global citizenship, on the basis
of the understanding that global citizenship refers to a moral disposition which guides
individuals understanding of themselves as members of communities—both on local
and global levels—and their responsibility to these communities. Conceptually,
global citizenship education has been featured in this study as the education to enable
students to develop their moral disposition as required in global citizenship. It
empowers individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their
cultures and contexts, to imagine different futures and to take responsibility for their
decisions and actions. In principle, such conception has no major deviation from
what Oxfam (1997 & 2006), Walkington (1999), and Heater (2002) propose as
described in the preceding chapter of literature review.

Conceptually, this reality in the comprehension of global citizenship by the
respondents sits side by side with what Steiner (1996) argues that global citizenship is
a complex concept denoting to the sense that T. H. Marshall’s conventional categorization of citizenship is no longer adequate in the context where supranational economic forces and common borderless environmental problems. The public sphere in which citizens can exercise their rights has been expanded by international conventions and courts of law. Schattle (2007) proposes an understanding of global citizenship based on her study of teachers’ views in the United States. In essence, global citizenship is primarily featured in various respects in terms of awareness, responsibility, participation, cross-cultural empathy, achievement, and mobility in the global context. Actually, the concepts of global citizenship are complex (Steiner, ibid). For a generic understanding, Golestani (2006) precisely defines global citizenship as the need to work against injustice, and so it is not merely a way of thinking but a way of being and acting in the global realm. That is, global citizenship needs to embark upon with knowledge of the world and a readiness to increase one’s loyalty beyond ones own nationality.

In further contemplating the topic, the answer for the question, “what is meant by global citizenship?” might not be that straightforward by virtue of the contesting and diverse issues arising from the topic (Noddings, 2005). Inherited from the concept of citizenship which is in tradition politically oriented, global citizenship is unsurprisingly dwelt with identity, rights and responsibilities, and the political institution for participation. The current absence of global government, binding international laws, as well as global political culture and institution undermine the realisation of global citizenship (Linklater, 2007). Unless all these essential constituents can be put in place, global citizenship will become meaningless. This is obviously premised on an assumption that citizenship only exists within nation-states, and advocates of global citizenship are queried to empty the citizenship of all
meaning. In the opposite camp, proponents of global citizenship assert that
citizenship can refer to dispositions and practices which are harnessed to transform
political community and the global order so that they can conform to universalistic
moral commitments. To exercise such moral obligations to those less-privileged from
outside of one’s own country can be a vivid example. Promotion of the
democratisation of world politics by the growing dominance of the global role of the
international non-governmental organisations can be another example. Golestani
(2006) maintains,

“Although from a legal standpoint, global citizenship does not exist. This
term is increasingly used in educational and development arenas to
describe ones citizenship, adherence, and allegiance, not only to a loyalty
on nation but to the planet” (p.115).

Perhaps the conception of global citizenship should be more appropriately
manifested in a spectrum as the one suggested by Carter (2001) through his discourse
on models of global citizenship. Neo-liberalism and socialism occupy the two
extremes where the neo-liberals unreservedly welcome the concept without holding
a moral/political connotation of citizenship while the socialists are sceptical and
resisting to global citizenship. Those in between are mainly liberalists who take a
relatively more impartial position and participate at different degrees in international
networks and global civil society. It is quite clear that the outcome of the
questionnaire survey in this thesis supported the ethical model rather than the
institutional model of global citizenship. Similar findings could be found in the result
of the follow-up interviews. One of the interview respondents, for example, indicated
judging from the semantic meaning of global citizenship education, it should at least
cover the essential elements of citizenship such as universal values of human rights,
rule of law, and national loyalty. Another respondent interpreted global citizenship as
an extension of national education, i.e. the expansion of the understanding and
recognition of an individual’s roles and responsibilities from the national level to the
global level.

As a supporter of global citizenship, Dower (2008) emphasizes on the
significance of global citizenship education to serve dual purposes. It is to prepare
students to accept all human beings, including themselves, as global citizens in a
basic sense. At the same time, it is to make the students aware of the idea that they are
engaged as active global citizens. In a nutshell, effective global citizenship education
is purported to develop future global citizens who have a strong moral sense of
responsibility and are to be in the activist sense later on. Dower supports the topics of
global citizenship being an integral part of civic education for three reasons. First, if
the topics are delivered in different subjects, competitions for resources and attention
among the subjects will be unavoidable and conflicting agendas may arise. Secondly,
global citizenship helps to inform the character of citizenship by strengthening the
perception of civic education which is not just about civics, political institutions, and
democracy, but also about the core values and virtues of human beings. Thirdly, civic
education, can, on the contrary, complement global citizenship as not being merely an
ethical conception, but concerning also institutional and political dimension.

An elaborate account of the substance of global citizenship education can be
found in Noddings (2005) who suggests a list of core topics which are worth
considering. Teachers can help students understand hot issues in the world,
comprising (i) economic and social justice and the related phenomena such as
poverty, capitalism, human rights, and cultural differences; (ii) the earth protection
and the related topics on environmental protection and ecological thinking; (iii) social
and cultural diversity in terms of racial, ethnic, and religious differences; and (iv)
peace education which is closely entwined with global citizenship. Likewise, Davies
et al. (2005) recommend a range of curricular areas which are important for global citizenship education include cultural heritage, current events, development issues, and local-global connections.

As mentioned above, globalization can be a threat for nation-states. Interestingly, it was also discussed earlier on that national education and global citizenship education may not be mutually exclusive. There is no surprise to find that the majority of the questionnaire informants did not agree on the hindrance of global citizenship education to the development of national education in Hong Kong. The results of the follow-up interviews were less convergent. Two interviewees held the consensual view that global citizenship education can be a delicate balancing force against the imposition of national education in Hong Kong secondary schools while the other one took an opposite stand. This phenomenon can be to a certain extent explained by the concept of multiple citizenship (Weekley, 1999; Lynch, 1992) whereby an individual’s moral disposition and responsibilities can be executed at and beyond the border of his or her belonged nation-state to the global community. Two interviewees of the study in this thesis unreservedly agreed on the significance of the exercise of one’s multiple identities effectively at various layers of engagement in public life. Such standpoint on the multiple identities in citizenship is fully supported by the cube of citizenship education model and the multidimensional citizenship education model, which are both layered design in construction.

Admittedly, the independent Civic Education Syllabus may not be fully able to achieve the aforesaid aims and contents of global citizenship and global citizenship education on par and in a comparable depth. Nor can the Syllabus de facto offer a distinction between the moral and institutional emphases of global citizenship. It is, however, arguable that, in the exposure to the global citizenship topics in the Syllabus,
the teachers appeared to have actually moved forward from the conventional political orientation of citizenship to a more globalised citizenship conception with formidable moral responsibility of human kind as reflected from the interviewees’ projected views on the perceived role of students in the global context. In particular, two out of the three interviewees considered it useful for their students to broaden views at the global issues so that the students can be less dominated by the overwhelming emphasis of nationalistic education in schools. A reflection from this is that the local curriculum consultation committee’s and the education authority’s preference for nationalistic education over global education since the early 2000s (Li & Gu, 2004) might not be so agreeable to the teachers under investigation. The studied teachers’ perceptions might not just be a resultant consequence of the Civic Education Syllabus, but could also be a result of other surrounding factors from the contexts of personal, social, political, educational, cultural, etc. Whether or not those factors have actual impacts upon the civic education teachers’ perceptions of global civic education would be validated in the subsequent paragraphs. At least one thing, notwithstanding, can be conclusively assured is that the data subjects in the study of this thesis accepted the contemporary global conception of civic education and the constituent of this line of thought is part and parcel driven by the moral disposition for contributing to the betterment of human beings. Of course, globalization should have played a crucial part in facilitating such psychology.

**Research Question Three:** What are the factors affecting civic education teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship education?

**Research Question Four:** How have civic education teachers’ perceptions been shaped?

The sixth to twenty-first items in the questionnaire were used to examine the
influential factors for the participants’ globalizing perceptions of civic education. The results disclosed the positive correlation between the participating teachers’ perceptions of global citizenship education and the socio-cultural (except for “Confucianism” and “Collectivism”), curricular and professional, as well as the inside school and outside school factors. The socio-cultural factors refer to the nationalistic education, unification of Hong Kong with China, national identity crisis, recent local political incidents, local culture, and personal understanding of global citizenship. The curricular and professional factors cover the current civic education curriculum, change of civic education curricula since 1985, introduction of the independent civic education in 1998, preparatory education and training, and professional development and training.

The multi-faceted school-level factors include colleagues’ beliefs and behaviour, availability of teaching support, attention from school management, students’ beliefs and behaviour, examination-oriented curriculum, self-efficacy among teachers, and availability of preparation time for teaching. Finally, the outside school factors comprise China’s influence on Hong Kong, China’s blooming economy, China’s political reform, Hong Kong’s blooming economy, change of related education policy, the participants’ personal belief, and the participants’ understanding of global citizenship education in the local context. This finding was unequivocally verified by the outcome of the interview. Of course, the factors might not be exhaustive but they are all limited to those being most appealing to the author of this thesis.

The Global Level

Globalization was affirmed by the majority of the survey respondents as
influential in thinking of Hong Kong civic education more globally. They also believed Hong Kong students should learn to be global citizens. The significance of globalization in formulating school civic educators’ globalizing perception of civic education was further testified by the follow-up interviews. The interview results particularly disclosed that the data subjects, including their students, were subject to constant impacts of global matters on their perception of citizenship and civic education. One of the interviewees in the study of this thesis reflected that her students’ emotional attachment to their motherland was not stable. They often held fluctuating views on their identities as Chinese, Hongkongese or even international inhabitants.

Supposedly, activity can take place at different levels, permeating from the local context right through to the global configuration. In the global domain, no matter which of the three prevalent approaches, the hyperglobalist, skeptical, or transformationalist view (Held, 1999; Tikly, 2001) is adopted, and not talking about the concomitant advantages or disadvantages in general (Davis, 2008; Branson, 1999) or for education (Bottery, 2006), globalization, *de facto*, represents the impending multifaceted social phenomena, taking form of activities in the economic, social, technological, cultural, political, and ecological spheres which transforms people’s thinking and behaviour. The significance of globalization is also ascertained by Davies, et al. (2005) who argue that “globalization does exist, its nature can be described and it has significant potential to impact upon the nature of education that is experienced. The need to recognize the potential, and need, for new forms of education is a central part of what we are suggesting.” (p.69). Actually, the effect of globalization on civic education has been ascertained by various investigators, such as Zajda (2008), and Marshall & Arnot (2008).
From the economic point of view, on balance, Hong Kong has so far been a beneficiary of globalization, who has responded to the challenges and opportunities of globalization successfully (Wang, 2000). The success is, to a certain extent, attributed to its proximity to China whose economy booms rapidly, and its well-established institutional factors including the policy independence, its inhabitants’ adaptive tradition and capabilities to changes, and the system of the rule of law. Being proud of its remarkable economic achievement, it is believed that the people of Hong Kong at large take globalization positively. Coupled with the colonial heritage, Hong Kong people have long perceived themselves as “Chineseness plus Westernness” in which the Westernness is referred to “internationalness” that really matters to them as if it represents modernity (Mathews, 2000). Again, a positive mark of the outward and westernized preference of globalization has been planted deeply in the Hong Kong people’s mind. Of course, the investigated school civic educators should not be exception.

With regard to the impact of globalization on the Hong Kong teaching profession, Law (2003) takes a rather ambivalent position and considers globalization playing both a threat and an opportunity for the Hong Kong teaching profession. The threat is derived mainly from the pressing force for teachers to enhance their skills in English language and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) to meet the demand of the globalized society. Yet such driving force can be regarded a positive actor in change rather than just a passive instrument of globalization. Though sounding a bit reserved, this standpoint does not dismiss the positive view of Hong Kong people, including teachers, towards globalization. Law (2004) further recognizes the essentiality of globalization in the conception of citizenship and civic education in Hong Kong, notwithstanding his criticism on the unsatisfactory selection
of school curriculum which brings about the tensions amongst localism, nationalism and globalism. Such tensions can reasonably be anticipated to elicit the studied teachers’ internal contradiction leading to a transformation from the traditional civic education premise to its contemporary form relating to global involvement in accordance with the concept of activity theory.

The study of Li & Gu (2004) revealed distinctly the local civic educators’ affirmation of the significance of global citizenship in civic education in Hong Kong. In a macroscopic sense, globalization can be considered as a cultural artifact providing a contextual environment for the studied civic educators to shape their perception globally, especially when the teachers have been exposed to the changing landscape of the local civic education arena to the global direction.

The majority of the data subjects in both the questionnaire survey and the interview had no major disagreement on the essence of global citizenship which is about the instillation in students with a moral disposition so noble for them to act responsibly in the global community. Actually, global citizenship is involved in many aspects of globalization, namely the development of global citizens (Walkington, 1999; Davies, et al., 2005; Banks, 2004) and the fostering of global civil society (Dower & William, 2002). It is considered that morally, global citizenship refers to a disposition which guides individuals to understand themselves as members of communities, both on local and global levels, and their responsibilities to these communities. With this understanding, the individuals are believed to be capable of being competent world citizens. This essential tenet is well captured in Young and Commins (2002) where global citizenship is about an understanding of the need to tackle injustice and inequality, and having the desire and ability to act on them. It is a way of thinking and behaving, an outlook of life, and a belief that people can make a
difference. Because of this noble aspiration to safeguard the sustainability of the earth, global citizenship should lie at the heart of education. There is a wealth of academic literature, as partly presented in the previous chapter on literature review (e.g. Macintyre, 1996; Ibrahim, 2005), confirming the challenges of globalization on people’s mind on conventional citizenship which is mainly nation-state specific as well as the need for students to be educated to acquire the requisite knowledge, attitude, and skills for living in a globalizing world.

Equally important, students should be cultivated with courage to act responsibly in global issues for the benefits of the whole humankind. All in all, though there is insufficient evidence emerging from the study of this thesis about the informants’ complete understanding of global citizenship and global citizenship education with regard to the above multifaceted description, it can still be certain that the informants did recognize and accept the value of moral disposition of global citizenship and realize globalization as an influential factors for civic education and their perception of civic education on the one hand. Globalization can be taken as one of relevant activities in contributing to the psychology of the data subjects on civic education, where it may interact aptly with the artifacts and concepts in the formation of the ultimate psychology on the other.

The National Level

Neither the interview participants nor the majority of the survey respondents denied the unshakable influence of China, including her blooming economy in recent years, on the affairs of Hong Kong in recent years. It is speculative that the investigated teachers’ globalizing perception of civic education was partly influenced by the impacts from China. Subject to the cultural and political influences from the
mainland, and being an important trading port on coastal China, Hong Kong’s connection with China has been growing stronger and stronger (Yam, 1997; Hughes & Stone, 2009). However, the connection can be principally classified into the cultural and ethnical domains rather than the political domain. It is sometimes embarrassing for those Hong Kong people to talk about national identity, who are alienated from their motherland for long because of political reasons and painful experiences on the mainland, and those who hold foreign passports (Fairbrother, 2004). The special political relationship between Hong Kong and China can for sure never shield off the impact of the “giant” on its special administrative region. The Articles 13 to 14 of the Hong Kong Basic Law (China, 1991) stipulate that the defence and the foreign affairs relating to Hong Kong rest with the Central People's Government of China. It is obvious that the autonomy of Hong Kong is not unlimited.

Relative to civic education, the China’s impact was fully recognized by Morris (1997b) and Morris, et al. (1997), Fairbrother (2003 & 2004) and Tse (1999 & 2006) owing to the different political institutions in two places where China places a higher emphasis on patriotism and nationalism. However, on the positive side, Lee & Ho (2005) have observed a radical change to China’s civic education in recent years which made it more align with the international practice.

The majority of the interviewees expressed concern over the over-promotion of non-critical national education in schools, though they agreed with the remaining participant that the development of national education was essential for civic education. In this regard, it is comprehensible that unification with Hong Kong to China and the national identity crisis were found to be influential factors in shaping the studied teachers’ globalizing perception of civic education.

Conventionally, citizenship has strong ties to citizenship identity within a polity
from which citizens are enshrined with the statutory rights and responsibilities by national law (Green, 1997; Janowitz, 1983). The reality is that Hong Kong has, however, gone through a peculiar saga giving rise to the sensitivity of national identity throughout the years: the absence of national education before and after the resumption of sovereignty to China and the salience of national education thereafter (Tse, 2007a). After the handover of Hong Kong’s sovereignty to China in 1997, national identity has become a pressing issue so far as the change of sovereignty implies a change to political membership. Now that the residents of the territory have acquired a new identity as Chinese nationals they felt alienated (Tse, 2007b). It appears that the longstanding conservative and isolated image of China has been fading away gradually ten years after the handover of the sovereignty of Hong Kong to its motherland (Ma, 2007). Given the geographical proximity (Lee, 2005b) and population composition where almost 95% of its seven million residents are ethnic Cantonese speaking Chinese (Ho & Law, 2009), Hong Kong has never walked out of the shadow of China.

Owing to the gulf of ideological and material conditions between the two places, many Hong Kong people view their identity and the issues of nationalism and patriotism differently than that of the central government in Beijing (Chong, 1999; Committee on Promotion of Civic Education, 2004). This viewpoint was confirmed by the study of Lee (2005c) on comparing Hong Kong, Hangzhou and Guangzhou teachers’ perception of citizenship. The apolitical policy featured in the colonial legacies on local schooling system puzzled many Hong Kong teachers about the meaning of national identity and cumbersome them from introducing national education in schools.

Leung & Print (2002) conclude from their study that civic educators in
secondary schools in Hong Kong rejected education for totalitarian nationalism and were in favour of nationalistic education of a cosmopolitan, civic and cultural nature. This view was unambiguously supported by the interview participants in the study of this thesis. In Hong Kong, it is controversial in promoting national identity, especially patriotism and love of country, because it may run into value conflicts related to different kinds of political conviction – normally the pro-Beijing campus is versus the pan-democracy camp (Yuen & Byram, 2007). Yuen & Byram studied a sample of Government and Public Affairs (GPA) teachers in Hong Kong secondary schools and supported the above view that the teachers’ understanding of national identity and patriotism are in contrast with those upheld in the mainland. The insistence of using a rational and critical approach in teaching politics was evident. Coincidentally, Fairbrother (2005) reflects that the promotion of the value of national identity as an upward expansion in Hong Kong in the last three decades, of the exercise of national power over individuals. He is of the view that the promotion of national identity can be compatible with democracy only if individual rights are well-respected.

Lee (2008b) discussed the emphasis of national identity and global citizenship in the post-1997 curriculum reform in Hong Kong where the former is grounded in political and obligatory terms while the latter is justified in economic terms related to the territory’s continuous competitive edge. Compare these two underlying justifications, national identity has not enjoyed the same status as globalization which has a more acceptable basis. The tensions underlie these two themes are also intact. In implementation, “delocalized nationalism” and “localized internationalism” emerges as two interesting and unfavourable phenomena.

When discussing external forces that shape civic education, Tse (2007b) highlights the tensions amongst the local, national, and global levels. In examining
the interactions of Hong Kong with the nation-state and the global community, it appears that these triple processes in a dynamic manner and should be understood as a complex of economic, political, cultural, and social phenomena which carry complementary, contradictory and uncertain outcomes. As a result, Hong Kong civic education has emerged from a clash of discourses emanating from aspects of these phenomena, which has given rise to unfinished struggles by a new social movement against national and neo-liberal hegemony. A further elaboration is offered by Tse (2008) who indicates that the state government finds it harder and harder to recognize and accommodate differences and diversity as well as to maintain unity and identity when the notion of multiculturalism has become more and more prevalent. Also national education has been facing the challenges generated by globalization. That means increasing global interdependence and international exchange necessitate the national curriculum to be designed to encourage the essential abilities and skills necessary for living in a global village.

In short, as also agreed by the interviewees in the study of this thesis, the presently prevailing form of national identity or nationalistic education appears not well received in Hong Kong due to its political nature, particularly within the school sector. In spite of the comment made by Ma (2007) that the avoidance of the Beijing government from interfering with Hong Kong’s internal affairs, its deferment of the request for democratization from local people (Tse, 2007a) might have somehow dampened its face value of trustworthiness and brought resentment for the localities. As such, the tension between the local and national levels inevitably grows which merits serious attention (Law, 2004).

One of the interviewees pointed out that the deferral of democracy in Hong Kong might one way or the other adversely affect students’ perception of their
motherland. As mentioned previously, global citizenship stands for a noble moral disposition and responsibility for the benefits of the whole mankind. It renders avenues and opportunities for an individual to contribute at different levels of daily life engagements, not limiting to the national level. As Law (2006) puts it, globalization promotes diversity in local communities and individual life and encourages a shift in citizenship’s focus from the national to the local or individual level. Globalization can also provide individuals with a wide range of identities from which they can choose, and more opportunities to create self-identity.

In the above light and bearing in mind the aforementioned adverse situation of nationalistic education in Hong Kong, there is no surprise to see the civic educators under this investigation held a globalised perception of civic education. From the premise of activity theory, the civic educators appeared to be caught in a dilemma between the natural emotional attachment to their motherland under the temporal dimension of multidimensional citizenship as mentioned previously and the gap of satisfaction with the indoctrination of national identity in schools which sparked internal contradiction about their perception of the nationhood type of civic education. The evolution of global citizenship in the recent curriculum reform served as a suitable artifact in modulating their perception of civic education in an appropriate manner.

The Local Level

It is revealing in the research studies that culture does have a bearing on civic education curriculum in different places (Kerr, 2000; Himmelmann, 2006; Lee, 2008). This may be because culture is situated in one’s place within a society and the social networks within which one is embedded should influence the aspects of “culture” to
which one has access (Oyserman & Lee, 2007). The Eastern Confucian ethic and the Western Protestant ethic constitute the popular cultures in the two central blocs of the world (Lee, 1996). Kennedy and Fairbrother (2008) realise the marked distinctiveness about civic education in Asian societies than Western version. Asian perspectives are mediated by culture, religion, national identity, social context, and political values, and the perspectives can be traced back to deep cultural roots within different Asian countries which are utterly guided by Confucianism and/or Islam.

Research on teachers and teaching in schools and higher education reflects that teachers’ thinking and actions are influenced by contextual factors in their cultural and social environments (Kompf & Denicolo, 2003). The case studies of geography teachers in Australia, China and Hong Kong conducted by Lam & Lidstone (2007) further verified this position. This orientation is synonymous with Hamilton’s (1993) proposition thereof the study of beliefs within the context of culture is considered as essential to understanding teachers’ actions and choices in the classroom. A greater awareness amongst teachers of cultural factors may also facilitate their reflection upon practice. There is thus little question that teachers’ perception is significantly shaped by cultural factors, especially those surrounding the individuals.

Asians, including the people of Hong Kong who have strong Chinese cultural traits (Cheng, 2004) and are believed to be affected by the Confucian tradition, attach great significance to education, emphasizing obedience to school authority and school regulations, and success in examinations (Luk, 2001; Liu, 2008). The results of Hue’s (2007 & 2008) study uncovered the predominance of Confucianism on school guidance in Hong Kong and Hong Kong secondary school guidance teachers’ expectations on how to counsel their students. Chinese culture, especially
Confucianism, should have dominant influences on the everyday life of Hong Kong and moral education, in particular (Cheng, 2004). Actually, the first Chief Executive of the HKSAR Government emphasized the strengthening of Confucian culture in the territory (Tse, 2005). So there is no surprise to note an upsurge of discourses in the integration of moral education and civic education after the 1997 handover, particularly subsequent to the local curriculum reform in the early 2000s. Such emphasis has been tacitly disclosed in various studies on civic education such as Lee (2004a) and Torney-Purta, et al. (2001).

Interestingly, the study respondents did not agree that the Confucian value of education had a contribution to the formulation of their global perception of civic education. The reasons could be somehow discerned from the response of the follow-up interview participants. Two interviewees did not really think the factor in a negative way and the remaining one did not think such factor relevant to the shaping of her perception of civic education globally. One even held an entirely different perspective of the idea proposed in the interview question. After all, there appears to be no sufficient evidence to conclude that Confucian value in education counteracts the teachers’ global perception of civic education.

In other words, not every cultural trait within the activity system of an individual will lead to a transformation of the individual’s psychology in certain respect. Through examining the striking effect of globalization on education, Lau (2004) argues that it should be positive to see moral-oriented and humanistic nature of Confucian value of education being a delicate balancing force for the intellectual-oriented industrial civilization and capitalistic culture partly given rise by globalization. Kennedy (2005), similarly, refers Confucian humanism to an attempt of building a humanistic agenda on the foundations of traditional Confucian teaching. It
represents a source of knowledge for values and looks to the individual and the processes of self-cultivation to develop a concern for self, community and the environment. Unlike the autonomous self in the West, Confucian humanism is the interconnected self looking first to self knowledge that will lead not only to self transformation but transformation of family, community and environment.

Instead of being a counteracting force to globalization, it is arguable that Confucian traditions can be complementary to the Western traditions in Hong Kong (Luk, 2001; Lee, 2004a). A fine combination of these two traditions can bring about a balanced personal and social education to meet the needs of students and society. Yeung’s (2006) study confirmed that the local teaching strategies and learning styles are subject to the long-standing influence of the Confucian philosophy. It was also believed that Hong Kong teachers’ positive beliefs to teach the educational disadvantaged students, communicate with their parents, and the caring-of-others natured of the Confucian principle, multicultural education can be optimistically developed in the local mainstream schools. Moreover, Yang (2008) observed that the contemporary Chinese youngsters are less and less conservative. All in all, Confucian value of education should neither be counted as a determinant nor an inhibitor to the shaping of global perception of the studied civic educators.

Similar as in the case of Confucian values of education, collectivism, while being recognized as a central cultural trait of Chinese, did not stand out as a contributing factor for the formation of the data subjects’ global perception of civic education in the study. One interviewee attributed this to the fact that collectivism should not be taken as a bad thing in every respect. What really matters is to ensure that collectivism should not be manipulated to jeopardise the individual rights unreasonably. The actual and full reason may be far more complicated than what has
just been described, and that deserves a separate piece of research work for affirmation.

In theory, Western societies emphasize individualism, or the individual, in contrast to Eastern societies emphasize collectivism, or the group (Patterson, 1996; Watkins and Biggs, 2001). However, it was observed by Yang (2008) that the Chinese youth tended to be more individualistic than their older generations. To date the two contrasts that have the most captured popular appeal are individualism and collectivism in the studies of culture (Oyserman & Lee, 2007) and conflicts can exist between these two popular concepts (Patterson, 1996). However, there is augment argument that the two paradigms should not be dichotomized (e.g. Lee, 2001a) and should be rather placed on a continuum (Kennedy & Fairbrother, 2008). Actually, collectivism is not a uniquely Asian principle but also exists in the Western countries in certain respects as shown in empirical studies (e.g. Hui & Villareal, 1989; Oyserman & Lee, 2007). Despite all these and presumably, the negligence of individuals in the collectivism paradigm may challenge Asian people’s belief in global citizenship where the notion of individual-based human rights lies at the centre.

Lee (2008a), however, argues that the concept of “self” in the Asian/Chinese culture is not on a par with that in the Western world. Individualism or individual interests emphasized in the West should be contextualized in the East as individuality or individual development. An individual is expected to go through a continuous process of self-cultivation or self-enrichment in an active manner to achieve the stage of self-advancement or self-perfection throughout his life time. This concept is in substance akin to the notion of self-actualization in the Western traditions. In this sense, civic education can be understood as a process of individual and collective capacity building within which the individual and the collective should be seen as a
continuum rather than a dichotomy.

With this individualistic understanding of collectivism in mind, the collective paradigm should not be taken as an opposite force to the development of the global perspective of the studied civic educators. The outcome of this study supported this proposition. Following this line of thought, there is no surprise to note the absence of significant correlation between collectivism and the studied civic education teachers’ global perception of civic education.

The findings of the questionnaire survey in this thesis showed that utilitarianistic familism, which is known as the core local culture, had a significant influence on the data subjects’ global perception of civic education. This standpoint was reaffirmed by all the informants in the follow-up interviews. One interviewee gave an additional account of the teaching of civic education and asserted that civic education was concerned with things happening day-to-day around people. The local culture must therefore have an impact on what needed to be taught in the syllabus. Interviewees emphasized people’s attention to universal values such as democracy and human rights should go beyond the family to the global arena, and global citizenship education can be a valid counter balance for the adverse effect to the said local culture including the satisfactory democratic situation in Hong Kong nowadays.

‘Utilitarianistic familism’, the concept developed by a local political academic Lau, Siu Kai, typifies the Hong Kong culture, which signifies that people put family interest above other interests, and material interests about other familial interests (Luk, 2001). It is not hard to understand this conception as the Chinese always attach prime importance to the family in their culture (Bond & Hwang 2008). Under the spirit of utilitarianistic familism, the indigenous people can be considered obsessively concerned with the material betterment of themselves and their families, and have
little interest in politics or community affairs so long as they do not impinge on this
(Vickers, 2003). Hong Kong people have maintained a Chinese culture, especially
those with a strong allegiance to the family life, but have also mixed it with other
cultural influences from the West (Cheng, 2004).

Alongside the social development and a proliferated number of settled and
educated population in the territory, utilitarian familism appears to have gradually
been giving way to “egoistical individualism” (Wong & Lui, 2000). There has been
an expansion of public interests, and those public interests are expected to be met and
regulated by a more active local government. Lam (2004) also comments that Lau’s
familial-centre and utilitarian conception and its resultant stance of political aloofness
of Hong Kong people is not well-grounded with adequate inquiries. He found Lau’s
evidence provided was inconclusive and open to alternative interpretations. The
examination of political participation was insufficient due to the narrow definition of
political participation. By contrast, Hong Kong society had numerous social
organizations that clearly had the ability to mobilize for political purposes. Hong
Kong society had the ability to place demands on the government and participation in
political activities, and they were not as minimal, utilitarian, or bounded as purported
in the traditional view of political apathy.

Taking a less optimistic view, Bray & Lee (1993) did not consider the
democratization process in Hong Kong taking a good shape. Ma (2003) also observes
that Hong Kong’s democracy movement has left in a crossroads subsequent to the
1997 sovereignty handover. The democratization process is somehow constrained by
the Basic Law, and the local pro-democracy parties are subject to the challenges of
escalated internal divisions, detachment from civil society, and disillusionment from
the public at large. The protracted and partial nature of democracy is de-mobilizing,
and creating obstacles for the long-term development of democracy in Hong Kong.

Mrs. Anson Chan, the former head of the Hong Kong civic service and Chief Secretary shared the similar thought that Hong Kong people want democracy, not for its own sake but because they understand that it is a basic prerequisite to good, transparent and accountable governance (Chan, 2007). She quoted a number of local recent studies in supporting her view that the people of Hong Kong do look for a higher level of democracy. Lee (2005b) attributes this phenomenon to the HKSAR government’s wish to maintain the territory depoliticized, leading to downplay of civic education and political education in schools. However, against such unfavourable background, Hong Kong people have on the contrary developed good knowledge of democracy.

Taking a wider perspective from the outside, Hong Kong was ranked 84 among the total 167 countries worldwide in the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Index of Democracy 2008 conducted by the Economist magazine (The Economist, 2007) which is much lower than those western democratic countries and even its major competitor Singapore. In short, there is a reason to believe that the gradual change of the local culture and the discontented democratization process per se will probably drive the local incumbents’ desire for a greater demand of democracy which cannot be satisfied currently and fully at the local and national levels but possible at the global level rather, at least spiritually.

The recent political incidents happened locally were regarded by the majority of the participating teachers as influential to the formation of their global perception of civic education. This factor also correlates positively to the data subjects’ globalised perception of civic education. One interviewee took the view that the local incidents can be a useful basis of comparison for students with those happening in the
external world so as to widen people’s eyesight. This viewpoint was shared by another interviewee but not the third one. The youngest informant could not see the real association between these two aspects, probably due to his lack of thorough understanding about the essence of global citizenship. Despite this, there seems to be ample evidence to support that local society factors have positively affected the global perception of civic education of the participating Hong Kong civic education teachers in the study of this thesis.

Actually, Arendt (1993) contends that “political thought arises out of the actuality of political incidents, and my assumption is that thought itself arises out of incidents of living experience and must remain bound to them as the only guideposts by which to take its bearing” (p.14). There should be a reasonable inference on the impacts of the recent political incidents on the local inhabitants’ political thought. The unforgettable epical 500,000-people mass demonstration against the legislation of the anti-subversion law in article 23 of the Basic Law on 1st July 2003 clearly sent out a strong message that Hong Kong people desire democracy (Clifford, 2003; Fitzpatrick, 2003).

In parallel, the local people’s political fear and inefficacy was pushed up drastically by the political incidents as reflected in Zheng & Wong’s (2003) study. As such, with an obvious desire for democracy, it is believed giving Hong Kong people a strong drive for seeking democracy in a broader perspective as explained in the foregoing paragraph is by all means critical. This observation was affirmed by Bray and Lee (1993).

This proposition can be elaborated from the other perspective. Human rights should be at the top of the agenda of the World Trade Organization (WTO) which deserve serious attention at the WTO ministerial conferences of (Pettersmann, 2000;
Schott, 2000). In fact, Branson (1999) has already mentioned in the chapter of literature review that global issues such as human rights and environmental conservation are always major concerns of global civil society. With the striking impression derived from the unprecedented riots of the South Korean peasants during the 2005 WTO Ministerial Conference in Hong Kong, it was unlikely that the Hong Kong general public would totally turn a blind eye to the criticality of human rights. Unfortunately, the Amnesty International Report 2009 (Amnesty International, 2009) disapproved a fine materialization of human rights in Hong Kong. While noting the essentiality of human rights in the conception of global citizenship, it should be unsurprising to see that the local people would assume a higher hope that human rights can be gained from a wider scope in the global context. This analysis appears to be in parallel with the implicit understanding of the interviewees of which at least one considered human rights not well covered in the current civic education curriculum, and another one did not see human rights a focal point of concern of students in general.

As reflected from the results of the interviews in the study of this thesis, the respondents did not attach too much importance to the influence of the past history of Hong Kong, including the colonial era, upon their global perception of civic education. Identification with China was not a big concern of them, at least at the cultural dimension. Implicitly, they might have some reservation about the total acceptance of the Chinese government which delays the direct elections in Hong Kong and that will harm the development of democracy in the territory (Shiu, 2008). With such a mixed and split emotion towards the motherland, it is not astonishing to see the investigated data subjects’ expression that unification of Hong Kong with China did not very much cause them to perceive civic education more globally. This kind of ambivalent
feeling of the local people also helps to explain why the study respondents reacted quite consistently to the related questionnaire item.

Historically, Hong Kong was a British colony before the handover of its sovereignty to China on 1st July 1997 (Lau, 2000b). During the 150-year colonial ruling epoch, especially in its early and mid phases, Hong Kong people were overtly treated as subjects than citizens by the Hong Kong government. Under this “subject political culture” (Tsang, 2006), the Hong Kong people were expected to be strictly obedient to the bureaucratic polity’s totalitarian governance and the British ruling under the principle of rule of laws. Their primary attention was scrupulously directed to economy rather than political participation with a view to preserving the societal harmony and stability. Such ruling strategy was proven effective particularly when the one-party communist China was so economically backward at that period in time. That was the reason why the right of voting emerged not until the 1980s. Some skeptics, mainly from the left-wing, accounted for such radical opening-up of the voting opportunity as a deliberate counter-productive force to the commencement of Sino-British negotiations of the handover of Hong Kong to China including the signing of the Sino-British Joint Declaration in 1984.

Nonetheless, Hong Kong had indeed benefited from political stability at least in a neutral sense (Lau, et al., 1984), and such politically stable situation added fuel to the economic development of the territory. On the other hand, the overall apolitical situation in Hong Kong was, however, critical for academics (e.g. Ma, 2007) who summarize the pre-1980s era as “lack of politics” where meaningful elections, political parties or full-time politicians, and open debates on political conflicts were almost absent.

“In the last two decades of the British colonial rule, the territory was
convulsed by momentous events and changes that promised to transfer it into a socially qualitatively different from that before the early 1980s” (Lau, 2000a, p.1). There were widespread fears of the 1997 transition among the people of Hong Kong that triggered off the large-scale emigration and the blurred identity of the incumbents which split between “Hongkongese” and “Chinese” (Lau, ibid). The identity crisis was partially induced by the long-time political separation from Hong Kong to China, and the Hong Kong people’s fears of the socialist reign in China. As a un-formidable causality, Chinese nationalism and anti-colonialism were never potent forces in shaping the identity of the Hong Kong Chinese and the Hong Kong people were mostly politically detached and public revulsion against politics in China. The June 4 incident at large awakened the people of Hong Kong about their miserable and uncertain political fate similar as their compatriots in the mainland, and they were disillusioned with the Chinese government (Lau, 2000b). Morris & Chan (1997) comment, the social psyche of Hong Kong citizens includes a low-level of loyalty to the state and has been described as defiant to the government of both Hong Kong and China, lacking a sense of community and individualism, and lacking a clear cultural identity.

Unsurprisingly but paradoxically, the people of Hong Kong had at large a strong sense of identification with the Chinese nation in the ethno-cultural sense. Close to the unification with China, the process of partial democratization (i.e. injection of elective element into the legislature) was observed on account of the Sino-British confrontations between 1984 and 1997 for the reversion of the Hong Kong’s sovereignty to China (Lau, 2000a).

The national identity crisis was accepted by the majority of the study participants as a contributing factor to the formation of their global perception of civic
education. Politically, the post-1997 situation has been far from satisfactory at least from ordinary people’s point of view. The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) Government falls into a deep legitimacy and governance crisis which was evidenced by the general outbreak of the 500,000-people demonstration on July 1, 2003 against the impending enactment of the National Security Bill under the Basic Law (Ma, 2007). There also appears to be a widespread support for democracy locally albeit fighting for democracy seems not a cup of tea for en mass of the public of the general in Hong Kong. Sing (2004) explains this phenomenon that the local support for democratic reform has not stemmed from any conception of a ‘right of democracy’ or the intrinsic value of democracy, but primarily on a desire to fence off the Chinese Government’s interference in Hong Kong’s freedom. Another derivative comes from the economic crises in Hong Kong, ambivalently coupled with the booming economy of China in recent decades.

The Chinese Government’s aversion to the speedy implementation of full speedy democratization in Hong Kong has left the people of Hong Kong a strong feeling of political powerlessness to demand speedy democratic changes. Finally, the political reversal marginalized the political parties which operated actively before the 1997-handover. The Hong Kong governance crisis has deep roots in the incapability of the political institution to cope with the governance needs, particularly in providing a coherent leadership, a good governing political machine and in aggregating social and political interests from society. The underdevelopment of political society in Hong Kong leads to a lower interest between the state and the society and is finally consequent upon rising confrontations between the government and the civilians. That is probably the reason why there is a widespread political aloofness among Hong Kong students as described by the three interviewees in the study of this thesis. They
actually felt the impacts of China on Hong Kong matters but were quite reluctant to actually learn about what was happening in their motherland and showed hesitation of the total acceptance of China. Once again, the impact of China on the data subjects’ global perception of civic education more globally is reaffirmed.

Inasmuch as the unsatisfactory political developments in Hong Kong so far as described above and in the previous chapter of literature review, the overall confidence of the people of Hong Kong over the HKSAR and the Chinese Governments can be considered at stake. Both the questionnaire and interview participants in the study of this thesis and the students referred by the interviewees appeared to have confirmed this observation. Any impingement from these two sources of power, being either positive or negative, is believed to be influential to the Hong Kong people’s perceptions. Ergo, there is no surprise to see the positive correlation between the germane factors at the macro socio-cultural level (i.e. the recent political incidents in Hong Kong, Hong Kong’s economy, China’s influence on Hong Kong, China’s political reform, national identification with China, and China’s blooming economy) and the globalised perception of civic education of the informants.

In fact, these factors were considered as the cultural artifacts and activities which mediated the respondents’ perception of the studied civic education teachers under the tenet of the socio-cultural activity theory. That means, once these political factors contradict to the civic education teachers’ internal belief system and cultural understanding of the entire activity system, incongruence within the individuals arises which would transform their psychological phenomena.

The change of the Hong Kong civic education curriculum being a contributive factor to the formation of the studied teachers’ global perception of civic education
was confirmed by the study outcomes. Pang (2001) maintains that education reforms in Hong Kong impose challenges on the local teachers since the special requirements of the reforms in the curriculum, teaching, and assessment involve a shift in the philosophy of, and attitudes towards learning and teaching, and demand special competencies. An analogy happened for local civic education. With no intent to replicate the description of the milestone developments of civic education in Hong Kong here, the similar anecdotal can be located in Hahn & Alvair (2008). Hong Kong is an interesting case since it reflects a mix of Eastern and Western cultures and people’s views of their national identity are divergent. Against this background, the emphasis of the recent circular reforms on moral education alongside with civic education and national education to promote identity with Chinese is somehow understandable but intrinsically controversial. Given the deep-seated disparity between the moral-driven against the democratic-oriented ideologies of civic education in the East and West respectively (Print, 2000) and the long-lasting blend of Eastern and Western cultures in Hong Kong, the participating civic educators in this study were sensibly envisaged to disapprove of such a narrow and instrumental sense of the civic education reforms and be rather mediated to lean towards the broader view and more meaningful sense of global citizenship education.

Kennedy (2005) is supportive of this proposition and argues that the concern for national identity in the Hong Kong curriculum can be viewed within the global discourses about multiple cultural and civic identities rather than the status quo. Leung & Ng (2004) particularly reprehend the current reform of the Hong Kong civic education curriculum leading to re-depoliticization of civic education prevalent under British colonialism. The depolarization ideology currently promoted in Hong Kong is not constructive to help students develop political sentiment towards their nations.
(Fairbrother, 2003). Under this adverse situation, school civic education in Hong Kong is inevitably left to be anational and apolitical (Tsang, 2006).

Turning to a more macro perspective, the local education reforms in Hong Kong are the results of the changes in the domestic and international economic, social and political contexts of Hong Kong that have redefined the territory’s needs and requirements for its labour force (Law, 2007). The primary reforms include the promotion of new local and national identities through education; curricula reform to prepare students for the challenges of economic globalization; the introduction of a medium of instruction policy; the increase in parental choice and strengthening of private education; and the democratization of school governance. Apparently, the first two are closer to civic education and most likely prone to mediate the local educators’ thinking of civic education in a broader sense – not merely a focal point at the local and national levels in the past (Law, 2004) but rather an expansion to the global arena.

Control of school curriculum has long been perceived as a primary tool to maintaining and legitimizing political power and the ideology of those in power (Cheung & Leung, 1998). Morris & Morris (2002) witness this phenomenon in Hong Kong and vehemently assert that the planned curriculum in Hong Kong is the responsibility of the government, which controls all aspects of curriculum development. However, they note an exception in the area of civic education where the government primarily provides advice and devolved the actual decisions concerning curricula provision and implementation to schools. This observation was verified by the interviewees in the study of this thesis.

Despite this, the issuance of the two cornerstone school civic education guidelines in 1985 and 1996 marked the milestone developments of civic education in Hong Kong (Cheung & Leung, 1998). The 1996 guidelines, in particular, transcended
the conservative approach adopted in the 1985 version and it was well received by local civic educators in schools (e.g. So, 1998; Chung, 1998). Law (2007) commends the 1996 guidelines for providing an explicit conceptual framework of civic education and civic learners. It also appropriately lays out a tripartite foundation for civic learners to acquaint with their triple citizenship roles in the local, national, and world levels. However, he is disappointed that local civic education is biased towards the national rather than local and global dimensions, and political identity rather than cultural identity in implementation despite the existence of the remarkable tripartite framework. The 1996 guidelines also suggested an expansion of the modes of delivery from the past “permeated” or “whole school” approach to curriculum organization to “permeated”, integrated with a subject”, and “the creation of a new subject” (Morris & Morris, 2002). This suggestion catalyzed the reinvention of the independent subject in civic education for junior secondary students in 1998 long after the school subject “civics” was first introduced in the Hong Kong school curriculum in 1935 (Cheung & Leung, 1998). In fact, the permeated/inclusion approach is dismissed by So (1998) who considers the difficulty of coordination across subject panels and a lack of implementation plan within local schools. This argument again reaffirms the correct selection of the independent civic education curriculum as the focal point of the study in this thesis.

With a primary aim to set out the direction of civic education in Hong Kong, the launch of the 1985 civic education guidelines and the implementation of the 1996 guidelines can be considered as purposeful social activities in mediating the incumbents’ perception of the topic within the mediating process the independent civic education subject can be regarded as the cultural artifact. As mentioned previously and considering the views of Kennedy, et al. (2002), Law (2003), Lee,
2006a, Grossman & Lo (2008), and Kennedy & Fairbrother, 2008, teachers’ collaborative participation is the key to the success of curriculum reforms, including those for civic education. Assuming the studied local civic educators at the centre of the mediation process should be thus well grounded.

The study results suggested that both the change of the local civic education policy since 1985 and the implementation of the independent civic education subject positively related to the participating teachers’ global perception of civic education. Most of the participants did not find the current civic education curriculum adequate to develop students’ knowledge, skills and attitude in global citizenship. In fact, a number of local researchers (e.g. Morris & Chan, 1997; Morris & Morris, 2002; Leung & Ng, 2004; Li & Gu, 2004) comment that the implementation of civic education in Hong Kong schools is not as satisfactory as planned. Such dissatisfaction can reasonably spark the civic educators’ internal contradiction and finally lead to the transformation of their perception to fit in with the ultimate goal of the subject curriculum. Actually, the influence of education reform on teachers’ perceptions and practices has been pointed out by Chou (1999) and Lowenstein (2003).

Moreover, the insufficient coverage of global citizenship education elements in the current independent civic education curriculum and the unsatisfactory implementation of the subject have somehow affected the study informants’ perception. That was why a certain portion of the respondents took a holding back position in this respect. A gradual shift to the new integrated curriculum in humanities and liberal studies in the Hong Kong junior secondary sector might trigger a question on how school educators’ perceptions of civic education would be affected. This interesting and meaningful question is worthwhile to be addressed in further research studies.
The study outcome displayed a widespread shortage of a degree qualification in civic education or a related discipline amongst the participants. It is, however, encouraging to see a certain portion of them did take part in various in-service professional training to upgrade their teaching know-how and know-why. Formal education and professional development were widely accepted by the studied school civic educators as necessary and essential for them to deliver topics in global citizenship education and the upgraded knowledge in relevant areas would make them perceive civic education more globally. The significance of teachers’ expertise for better implementing global citizenship education in schools was ascertained by most of the survey respondents who rated it high on the improvement agenda. The interviewees in general reaffirmed this point and pointed out a general unfavourable phenomenon for teachers without proper education and training to be deployed in the teaching of civic education in local secondary schools. A high motivation among these teachers in upgrading the subject knowledge and pedagogies could thus not be seen.

An explanation on the above can be glimpsed in the IEA’s 1999 study of the international practices of civic education in which many teachers across the 24 investigated countries or places, including Hong Kong, were found lacking in confidence in teaching political topics partially by virtue of the deficiency in related formal education and sufficient training on civic education (Mintrop, 2002; Torney-Purta, 2007). In that study, teachers from Confucian societies reported lower levels of confidence relative to their Western counterparts. The insufficient training among civic education teachers was identified in at least two local civic education studies including Li & Gu (2004) and Lee & Leung (2006b), and such a view was concurred by Merryfield & Kasai (2004) for civic education teachers in the United States.
Based on the IEA study data, Kerr (2002) comments, the inadequacy of the preparation of teachers to handle civic education in the school curriculum relates not only to a lack of teacher content knowledge but also an incapability to employ a range of learning and teaching approaches for civic education. The IEA cross-country data was further examined by Torney-Purta, et al. (2005) who conclude that initial teacher preparation and subsequent professional development of civic education teachers somehow influence students’ civic knowledge. This result is by and large consistent with many other empirical studies whereby teacher education and preparation is found significantly related to increases in student achievement (Ingersoll, 2007).

Alviar-Martin, et al.’s (2008) comparative study conducted across Hong Kong, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom came to the conclusion that Hong Kong teachers were the least confident in teaching civic education. The study also suggested that to boost civic educators’ confidence, they could be trained to explore issues through divergent points of view, and that there was a need for teachers to be better prepared, especially to address controversial issues. Hence, it is reasonable to infer that the better the investigated teachers considered they were well-educated and trained for the teaching the higher confidence they had to cultivate a global mind in their students and then themselves. Davies, et al. (2004) also contend that relevant and sufficient training can be an essential element to boost civic education teachers’ confidence in teaching civic education, especially when controversial issues in the global domain are concerned.

All in all, professional education and training can serve as an effective artifact to make the data subjects realize their deficiency and development need about the new global area of civic education. In consequence, their perception of civic education was shaped globally as a result of internal transformation of thinking about the topic.
All the seven school factors identified in this study, comprising other civic education teachers’ belief and behaviour, availability of teaching materials and support, attention from school management, students’ belief and behaviour, examination-oriented curriculum, self-efficacy among teachers and availability of teaching preparation time, were found influential in the survey data subjects’ global perceptions of civic education. These factors were also found positively correlated with the subjects’ global perception of civic education. Some of them, for example support from the school leadership, were ranked high by the respondents on the improvement list for implementing global citizenship education in their serving secondary schools.

The interviewees supported the survey findings. More than one respondents in the follow-up interview highlighted the attention of the school management as the crux to the successful implementation of global citizenship education in school and that would make them think whether or not civic education should be perceived globally. Apparently, the contextual factors within school played a crucial part in shaping the studied civic education teachers’ perception of civic education.

The above outcome should be predictable since school plays an important part in the shaping of teachers’ decision making (Nelson & Drake, 1994) and school factors are considered paramount by school civic education teachers in the implementation of global citizenship education in schools (Li & Gu, 2004). The similar institutional factors were identified in Lee & Leung (1999 & 2006b) and Leung & Ng (2004) as a hindrance for the effective implementation of civic education in Hong Kong secondary schools. The international IEA study also recognized school as a useful avenue for imparting civic education knowledge and skills (Torney-Purta, et al., 2001). Kerr (2003) analyzed the IEA study results and concluded that schools
modelling democratic practices are most effective in promoting civic knowledge and
gagement, and schools and community organizations that have untapped potential
to influence positively the civic preparation of young people.

teachers’ confidence is positively correlated with their attitude conformed to the
Confucian societal values. The teachers’ attitude and beliefs were heavily formulated
by their nation’s cultural and historical traditions. The national civic education policy
(e.g. the lack of distinct subject for civic education), and the school-level factors (e.g.
the absence of specific examination for civic education leading to devalued status of
the subject, the lack of supportive guidance, textbooks) adversely affect the teachers’
self-efficacy. Tse (2008) underlines hurdles of implementing civic education in Hong
Kong schools which are composed of the non-examination nature of the subject, the
undertrained teacher and the over-crowded curriculum.

The recent UK experience revealed that although teachers were generally
positive about their role for schools in fostering good citizenship; they still lacked
confidence in articulating how they specifically could best do this. Their continuous
concern lay on those factors, which negatively impacted on their ability and
willingness of teachers to engage in citizenship issues; the pressures of workload, a
prescriptive curriculum and a culture dominated by standardized testing and
examination (Wilkins, 2003). The Kerr’s (2000) study found the centrality of teacher
in civic education and the need for better targeted training for teachers and the
development of a broader range of user-friendly teaching resources.

Fisher et al. (1993) concluded from various studies that if teachers have a
healthy working environment then better student achievement will result. That means
every school has a pervasive culture, which can influence the behaviour of teachers
and students to succeed in teaching and learning. Laffitte (1993) explicates that teaching practice is influenced by teachers’ own teaching experience, students, professional ideology, colleagues, in-service training, and initial training. Cantu (2001) identifies a broad range of factors that have a bearing on teacher perception from the social studies teacher belief studies in the last 15 years. These factors include the teacher’s background, beliefs, values, attitude and assumptions, the teacher’s beliefs about subject matter and student thinking, college preparation, and the contexts of the classroom. In Hong Kong, the civic education teachers strongly believe school support, teacher preparation, staffing resources, teaching support, and teacher training are of vital importance for the implementation of global civic education in school (Li & Gu, 2004). These findings are one way or the other congruent with the informants’ feedback on the open-ended question number 22 in the questionnaire and the question number nine in the interview protocol who thought that the largest hurdles for their serving schools to provide global citizenship education hinge on the insufficiency of teaching expertise, teaching resources, teaching time, attention from the school management, and coverage of global citizenship in the current civic education curriculum.

To a certain degree, this finding is in parallel with what Lee & Leung (1999 & 2006b) found about the institutional constraints on the implementation of civic education in secondary schools in Hong Kong. Similarly, the finding is also in line with the barriers to teaching global citizenship education identified from the study of Larsen & Faden (2008). The barriers contain the lack of knowledge about global issues and how to teach global issues in the classroom, the absence of existing accessible global education curriculum and teaching resources, the discomfort or fear in teaching controversial issues and the lack of support from school administration or
other teachers.

An analogous result was found in the outside school factors against that of the school factors. How the China and local factors affect the studied teachers’ global perception of civic education was somehow explained previously. It is notwithstanding unwise to neglect the data subjects’ personal perception of global citizenship education even when the social side of civic education is emphasized and the social-based framework of conceptual model is adopted in the study of this thesis. The study result showed that the investigated teachers’ global perception of civic education was guided by their perception of global citizenship education. This outcome is conceptually in line with the findings of the studies of Dunkin, et al. (1998) and Li & Gu (2004). Basically, the respondents’ interpretation of global citizenship and global citizenship education did not majorly depart from what the investigator put forth which is aligned with the factors identified in Mahstedt’s (2003) study of global citizenship education conducted in Hong Kong.

Hitherto, a host of contextual factors existing at different levels of encountering of the data subjects in the study of this thesis were found relevant in shaping and transforming the global perception of the studied local civic education teachers in secondary schools towards civic education. As mentioned earlier on, these factors, most of which are derived from the Hong Kong context, are believed to have acted effectively as activities, artifacts and concepts in the process of the perception formation within the macro- and micro-activity systems with regard to the data subjects’ public life, especially the part associated with citizenship and civic education. The proposed conceptual framework which is built on the Cultural Historical Activity Theory thereby can be said standing out well as envisaged. This outcome should be particularly important for civic education in Hong Kong.
6.3 Summary of the Chapter

The findings of the study in this thesis were analyzed and discussed against the four research questions in the preceding paragraphs. The cube of citizenship model (Heater, 1999, 2004), the multidimensional citizenship model (Cogan & Derricott, 1998 & 2000), and the conceptual model theorized from Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) were adopted as the units of analysis for the data collected from the questionnaire survey and the follow-up interview. The analysis and discussion were conclusive that global civic education was an important feature of civic education in Hong Kong. The participating teachers perceived Hong Kong civic education globally and such thinking was analysed as coupled with the global development of the local civic education curriculum. A host of factors in the socio-cultural, educational & curricula, professional, personal, within-school and outside-school domains were found positively correlated with the global perception of the participants of the study in this thesis, except “collectivism” and “the Confucian value of education” in the socio-cultural domain.
Global citizenship education is a new area of development in civic education compared to the orthodox beliefs in rights and responsibility in the West and the moral emphasis in the East. It opens a new frontier for people to think seriously and critically how their role and participation can extend beyond from the indigenous nation-states to which they belong up to the wider globe. This is particularly important for students who are going to live in a globalising world than the older generation. Presumably, it is believed only in so doing can the humankind survive in the globalizing world in the long run. It is thus unsurprisingly found in the chapter of literature review that more and more local and overseas civic education and social sciences academics are geared up to bringing this paramount issue to the fore and ring the bell for the priority attention of educators, education authorities and even members of the public all over the world. Such viewpoint has fundamentally no major departure from the opinions of the participants in the study of this thesis.

To learn more about how global citizenship education has been implemented in Hong Kong secondary schools, an investigation of what and why civic education teachers who taught the independent subject in civic education in the junior secondary curriculum perceived the topic should be deemed appropriate. Plausibly, teachers are widely recognized in the literature as the key central agents in the delivery of curriculum and for the success of curriculum reforms. This proposition is applicable to global citizenship education (Lee, 2005c) as well. In redefining the role of education professionals under the impact of globalization on education, Bottery (2006) argues that education professionals are at an important crossroads at which they must opt to either promoting the public good by embracing a global awareness or else
retreat to insularity. With this understanding in mind, a mixed method research study comprising a questionnaire survey and a follow-up interview was carried out.

A total of 49 teachers from among the 41 target secondary schools in Hong Kong where the independent civic education curriculum was on offer returned the completed questionnaires (i.e. 58%) and three of them voluntarily participated in the follow-up interview sessions at last. The study results, being consistent with the study conducted by Li & Gu (2004) locally and those by Kubow (1996) and Parker, et al, (1999) overseas, showed that the participating civic education teachers generally considered global citizenship education a crucial element in Hong Kong civic education in the first place. They believed their global view towards civic education was mainly influenced by the relevant changes to the civic education curriculum in Hong Kong over the past three decades and their perceived role to prepare their students to live in the global village. They were also of the view that global citizenship education was important for Hong Kong in the future. One more thing can be ascertained from the study result is that contemporary civic education should no longer remain orthodox and rather expands its spatial coverage from the national level to the global arena corresponding to the rapid unifying world as the result of the impact of globalization. Consistent with what the literature has widely indicated (e.g. Larsen & Faden, 2008; Kerr, 2003; Davies, 2006), global citizenship education, as agreed by the interview participants in the study of this thesis, should not merely be restricted to the development of moral disposition for students to take up responsibilities outside of their communities and to defense justice and equity in the world, but the courage to act to make real changes.

A positive correlation was found between various contextual factors in the socio-cultural, curricula and professional factors, within school, and outside-school
realms and the participants’ global view of civic education. In the chapter of literature review, Chinese cultural factors were presumed to be influential in shaping the data subjects’ perception of civic education, especially when there is a hypothesis that they have a strong Chinese cultural traits and civic education is considered as social-oriented. An interesting exception was found in the factors of “the Confucian value of education” and “Collectivism” subsumed under the socio-cultural domain. The explanation could partially be that Hong Kong is a cosmopolitan city mixed with Chinese and Western culture so that the two terms were interpreted differently and less negatively than their original meanings considered conventionally. The mix of the two cultures is presumably a result of the colonial history of the territory.

The national factor, in fact, is always influential as Banks (2004) argues that in a democratic multicultural society global citizenship should intend to help students acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to make reflective decisions and to take actions make their nation-states more democratic and just. In other words, citizenship education should help students acquire dispositions, knowledge, and abilities to function in cultural communities other than their own within national culture and community in a macro-global world. The data subjects’ personal perception of global citizenship education contributed to the shaping of their global perception of civic education.

In addition to the redefinition of the perception of global citizenship education as well as the unfolding and illustration of the contributing factors for the formation of the investigated civic education teachers’ global perception of civic education, this study identified the implementation barriers of global citizenship education in school and the results are analogous with most of the relevant research studies conducted before such as Li & Gu (2004), Larsen & Faden (2008) and Davies, et al. (2004). The
commonest hurdles identified in this study were the insufficiency of teaching expertise, teaching resources, teaching time, attention from the school management, and coverage of global citizenship in the current civic education curriculum. These observations were substantiated by the interview participants so the local secondary schools should pay more efforts in improving the implementation of global citizenship education for the long-term benefits of their students. Otherwise, it may be questionable how the students can be aptly and timely prepared to realize their global citizen roles and responsibilities to live in the globalizing society of Hong Kong effectively in adulthood, and also be cultivated with the necessary skills and attitudes to participate and act in public and political life. All these are extraordinarily essential for the future well-being of the society of Hong Kong.

For the data analysis and discussion, the cube of civic education model, the multidimensional citizenship education model and the modified conceptual model from the Cultural Historical Activity Theory were applied. The study outcome was conclusive that the participating teachers’ perceptions were shaped by various factors embedded in the idiosyncratic nature of historical, cultural, political, and societal developments of Hong Kong. As an international cosmopolitan and a special administrative region of the People’s Republic of China, the global and Chinese factors certainly played a crucial part in the shaping of the perceptions. Under the impacts of these factors and judging from the overall global views of the teachers towards civic education, the related activities, artifacts, concepts are believed to be intertwined and interacted vehemently to contribute to the global perceptions of the participating teachers. How the conceptual model coming to terms can be seen, for example, from the interconnected associations among globalization (activity), the globalised independent civic education curriculum (artifact), the study informants’
conception of global citizenship education (concept), which have mediated and transformed the investigated civic educators’ perception of civic education to become more globally. Similar effects are evident in other relevant combinations of relationships within the activity systems.

The study is primarily significant in a number of ways. It attempted to unfold the mystery of what, why, and how school civic educators think about global citizenship education that is a breakthrough of research interest in civic education. The results should be illuminative to the education and continuing education of school civic educators. Conceptualizing the Cultural Historical Activity Theory to the theorizing framework of the study is certainly another novel attempt in the research of civic education. The inherited systematic nature of the Theory framed and guided the data analysis and discussion in a structured manner.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned benefits, the study is definitely imperfect. It is limited in scope with the participation of only a small portion of the whole civic education teacher population in Hong Kong. The findings may be criticized as being unrepresented due to the small sample. Also owing to its limited scope, the study fails to provide a comprehensive account of how the various chosen factors interact with each other in the formation of the participating teachers’ psychology which should be useful to further open the black box of what the civic education teachers are thinking. Delimited by the research methodology, the study also fails to pursue an understanding of how individual civic education teachers think and behave in his or her classroom. To achieve a deeper understanding about the formation of the local civic education teachers’ perception in context, further studies (e.g. by means of case studies) are worth considering. Moreover, the lack of an absolute meaning of certain terms in social sciences (such as the Confucian value of education and collectivism)
left the data subjects’ interpretation of the terms arbitrary and that had more or less undermined the accuracy and reliability of the data gathered. This sort of independent variables is so difficult to manage and deserves a higher level of attention of researchers in future research pursuits.

Apart from calling for future research studies to deepen and broaden the understanding of civic education teachers’ perception of civic education, the study outcome should also have implications for education of school civic education teachers. As Gilbert, et al. (1995) point out, “yet given the centrality of teachers in the teaching process, any policy or program which aims to promote the teaching and learning of citizenship will need to include a clear focus on the characteristics of the teachers who will teach it” (p.39). Not solely did the data subjects confirm the significance of professional education and training for the effective conduct of global citizenship education, the literature (e.g. Davies, 2005; Li & Gu, 2004; Larsen & Faden, 2008) has also widely supported this standpoint. Studies in the last two decades have affirmed that teachers’ beliefs lead to their actions and that impact students’ learning for better or worse (Woolfolk & Weinstein, 2006). Richardson (2003) thus suggests teacher education programmes to ask for teacher candidates to identify and assess their beliefs in relation to classroom actions. For civic education, the second phase of the IEA international comparative study unleashed a consensus among case studies authors from across the 28 participating countries/places that an essential route to improvement in civic learning opportunities for students is to better prepare teachers (Torney-Purta, et al, 2005). Hahn (2008) cites Ehman’s (1980) statement that teachers’ attitudes and behaviours can affect how students made meaning of their political knowledge, development civic attitudes and skills, form expectation of civic participation. Kennedy (2002) reminds us that teaching civics is
relevant to real life issues and challenges so the teachers must be educated to act as the role model for their students to defense and support democracy as the core civic value. James (2001) considers teacher education programmes in the global age imperative to help student teachers develop clarified cultural and national identifications and rethink race, culture and ethnicity.

However, it is questionable as to whether the current teacher education programmes are suitable and sophisticated enough to meet the needs of the globalizing development of civic education. Agnello, et al. (2006) take a skeptical position after considering the situation in the United States and contend,

“As natural and political exigencies demand participation, societies respond and change. However, until critical situation arises, people and empires often remain reticent and slow to respond to the obvious clarion call for alternations in the status quo. Teacher education has finally embraced diversity in many institutions, but teacher education competencies focused on internationalization have barely begun to approach the radar screen of transformational potential of colleges of education... Even global citizenship and information literacy have received a modicum of consideration within teacher education” (p.312).

As a solution, they come up with an innovative model of teacher education curriculum which interlocks twenty-first century technologies (i.e. computer literacy such as the use of the World Wide Web), literacies (i.e. ecological identities and critical thinking skills), and world citizenship (e.g. social issues and place-based and bioregional education) in the macrocosm of the globe. Specifically, place-based and bioregional education refers to the necessity of basing the teaching of global and local citizenship on the culture in which the students reside. Overall speaking, the model is believed to be able to enable the students to develop critical thinking, reading and writing skills through the utilization of digital computer mediated tools, and then apply these skills to see the stories of the many cultures and their contributions in the process of human development and global stories.
While the above model of teacher education curriculum can be trusted to be useful to secure qualified and competent teachers for the challenges of civic education in the new era, it is a bit frustrating to learn from Davies, et al. (2007) that there is no consensus about what should constitute basic elements of what a beginning teacher should know and do. To bridge this gap, they suggest working at least three areas for the development of a more precise elaboration of citizenship in the relevant initial teacher training. First, a great insight into the nature of useful subject knowledge should be developed. Secondly, greater understanding of the essential elements associated with interactive teaching and learning methods should also be development. Thirdly, a clearer elaboration of what counts as evidence should be provided for trainees who work beyond and within the classroom. Merryfield (1997) opines that infusing global perspectives into teacher education is a seamless process of defining and redefining ways so that the youngsters can be better prepared for diversity, equity and interconnectedness in their own community and the world. To this end, contents and issues in global education, including controversial topics, should permeate all courses and field experiences in a globally oriented teacher education programme.

Integrating these suggestions into the curriculum framework proposed by Agnello, et al. (2006) appears to be a good starting point for the devise of an effective teacher education curriculum for global citizenship education in Hong Kong. However, it is imperative to bear in mind that the curriculum should be effective to feature those factors as outlined by the study of this thesis which are influential to civic educators’ global perception of civic education. Without a good knowledge of what is essential to be captured, the teacher educators’ effort will be in vain. A good understanding of what teachers think is recognized by Clark & Lampert (1986) conducive to teachers and teacher education which leads to genuine professional
Guyton (2000) also reminds us, one of the fundamental layers of a powerful teacher education programme falls on how teachers learn and what they need to know and be able to do to educate their students.

The IEA civic education study reveals that civic education teachers in Hong Kong join their counterparts from Hungary, the Czech Republic, etc. consider teacher preparation for their civic teaching inadequate. This is perfectly in line with the desktop study of the Hong Kong civic education teacher education programmes as described in the chapter of literature review. The drawbacks of inadequacy of teacher preparation are highlighted by Mintrop (2002) who criticizes when teachers are not well prepared, civic education is likely to consist of “common-place knowledge, norms and practical wisdom” rather than “a formal, codified body of knowledge”. Sensibly enough, the data of the IEA study also reflect that teachers who are better prepared have a higher level of confidence (Torney-Purta, et al., 2005). In other words, a higher level of education and training will most likely result in higher confidence in civic education teachers. With the low level of teaching preparation, Hong Kong civic education teachers’ confidence was found relatively low, and felt least confident teaching topics associated with international relations, international problems and social welfare. Probably due to such a low level of confidence, Hong Kong teachers were inclined to transmit factual civic education knowledge to their students through lectures and recitation. In a more general term, initial teacher education programmes in Hong Kong were censured quite negatively by Cooke (2000) as conventional and conservative, reflecting major ideas and developments in mainstream teacher training more typical of the 1960s and 1970s than of the last decades or so. A redesign of the curriculum of the Hong Kong teacher education programme was called upon by Elliott & Morris (2001). In view of the foregoing, deliberate programmes of civics...
instruction are by all means urgently needed for the benefits of both students and teachers in Hong Kong.

Other than the IEA study, Hong Kong civic education teachers’ confidence was also not found high in another study on the implementation of global citizenship education in schools of Hong Kong and Shanghai (Lee & Leung, 2006b). The study results showed that teachers in both Hong Kong and Shanghai had encountered problems and difficulties such as lack of training, pressure from the examination-oriented curriculum, lack of support from the school and government. Other difficulties included a lack of self-efficacy, and not feeling that personal efforts can bring about changes in the world. Without a team of confident and well-trained teaching professionals, the success in the implementation of the local civic curriculum which aligns the global developments would far less likely be possible.

To alleviate the ill conditions of teacher education in both civic education and global citizenship education in Hong Kong, it is recommended that teacher educators ponder the useful suggestions given by Shah (1996). At first, it should be understood that education for global citizenship is a challenge for teacher educators since it is a broad concept rather than a discrete body of knowledge. Prospective teachers should be cultivated with the understanding of issues in global citizenship, the belief in the relevance of global citizenship for students, the ability to select the right teaching contents, resources and methods, the appreciation of the significance of non-formal education within education institutions, and the skills for self-development. To be more specific, the task of teacher education is to broaden the attitudes of the student teachers so that the meaning and rationale for global citizenship can be understood and accepted. A commitment to a global method of citizenship should also be developed in the prospective teachers. They should be able
to be reflective, critical, innovative and adaptable. The overall emphasis is on the student teachers’ personal development and development of professional skills whereby they would pass their commitment and readiness to take actions, as appropriate to their students.

Another reference to how a proper teacher education programme in global citizenship education is operated can be drawn from a lively example in McLean, et al. (2008) thereof a Canadian one-year pre-service teacher-education programme to promote effective teaching of peace and global education was studied and analysis. The result concluded that disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical skills are influential for the preparation of novice teachers with the rationale for addressing questions of peace and global education.

Whilst noting the relationship between beliefs and actions in teaching well, Richardson (2003) argues about the actual causality relationship between teachers’ beliefs and actions. There seems no uncertainty as to whether beliefs guide actions or actions guide beliefs or that they interact such that beliefs or actions may be dominant and affect the other depending on many factors. No matter what the actual causality may be, local teacher educators are strongly advised to take into account the contextual factors identified in this study that have a bearing on the local civic educators’ thinking about global citizenship education when designing initial or in-service education or training programmes for the prospective or practicing school civic education teachers in Hong Kong.

All in all, teacher education has proven itself the core factor of the successful implementation of global citizenship education in Hong Kong secondary schools. It is albeit frustrating to observe an inadequate teacher education provision specific to civic education and/or global citizenship education presently in Hong Kong. Only if
sufficient and proper education and training are provided can the local civic education
teachers be able to build up self-confidence and self-efficacy to the delivery of global
citizenship education in schools. No matter how well the teacher education
programme or activity is devised, the shortage of sufficient attention from the
education authorities as reflected in the study of Lee (2004b) would easily make the
effort go astray. Following this trajectory, to guard against the success of global
citizenship education in Hong Kong, the support of the Education Bureau is
unquestionably central and essential.
Appendix 1

LIST OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS WITH CIVIC EDUCATION INDEPENDENT SUBJECT IN THE 2007/08 SCHOOL YEAR
(Source of Information: 2007/08 Secondary School Profiles Published by the Committee on Home-School Co-operation)

CENTRAL AND WESTERN
1. 樂善堂梁𨱇琚書院
   LOK SIN TONG LEUNG KAU KUI COLLEGE

KWUN TONG
2. 中華基督教會蒙民偉書院
   CCC MONG MAN WAI COLLEGE
3. 觀塘瑪利諾書院
   KWUN TONG MARYKNOLL COLLEGE
4. 寧波第二中學
   NING PO NO.2 COLLEGE
5. 聖言中學
   SING YIN SECONDARY SCHOOL
6. 匯基書院(東九龍)
   UNITED CHRISTIAN COLLEGE (KOWLOON EAST)

SAI KUNG
7. 景嶺書院
   KING LING COLLEGE
8. 保良局甲子年中學
   PO LEUNG KUK 1984 COLLEGE

YUEN LONG
9. 趙聿修紀念中學
   CHIU LUT SAU MEMORIAL SECONDARY SCHOOL
10. 裘錦秋中學(元朗)
    JU CHING CHU SECONDARY SCHOOL (YUEN LONG)
11. 天水圍官立中學
    TIN SHUI WAI GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOL

KWAI CHUNG & TSING YI
12. 天主教母佑會蕭明中學
    DAUGHTERS OF MARY HELP OF CHRISTIANS SIU MING CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL
13. 裘錦秋中學(葵涌)
    JU CHING CHU SECONDARY SCHOOL (KWAI CHUNG)
14. 樂善堂顧超文中學
    LOK SIN TONG KU CHIU MAN SECONDARY SCHOOL
15. 保祿六世書院
    POPE PAUL VI COLLEGE
SHATIN
16. 浸信會呂明才中學
   BAPTIST LUI MING CHOI SECONDARY SCHOOL
17. 馬鞍山崇真中學
   MA ON SHAN TSUNG TSIN SECONDARY SCHOOL
18. 沙田循道衛理中學
   SHA TIN METHODIST COLLEGE

TAI PO
19. 佛教慈航智林紀念中學
    BUDDHIST CHI HONG CHI LAM MEM COLLEGE
20. 聖公會莫壽增會督中學
    SKH BISHOP MOK SAU TSENG SECONDARY SCHOOL

NORTH
21. 鳳溪第一中學
    FUNG KAI NO 1 SECONDARY SCHOOL
22. 東華三院李嘉誠中學
    TWGHs LI KA SHING COLLEGE

TUEN MUN
23. 青松侯寶垣中學
    CHING CHUNG HAU PO WOON SECONDARY SCHOOL
24. 鐳輝慈善社胡陳金枝中學
    CHUNG SING BENEVOLENT SOCIETY MRS AW BOON HAW SECONDARY SCHOOL
25. 保良局百周年李兆忠紀念中學
    PO LEUNG KUK CENTENARY LI SHIU CHUNG MEMORIAL COLLEGE
26. 保良局董玉娣中學
    PO LEUNG KUK TANG YUK TIEN COLLEGE
27. 崇真書院
    TSUNG TSIN COLLEGE
28. 東華三院鄭錦士中學
    TWGHs MR & MRS KWONG SIK KWAN COLLEGE

YAU TSIM & MONGKOK
29. 麗澤中學
    LAI CHACK MIDDLE SCHOOL
30. 聖公會諸聖中學
    SKH ALL SAINTS’ MIDDLE SCHOOL
31. 聖芳濟書院
    ST FRANCIS XAVIER’S COLLEGE

WONG TAI SIN
32. 五旬節聖潔會永光書院
    PHC WING KWONG COLLEGE
33. 保良局何蔭棠中學
    PO LEUNG KUK CELINE HO YAM TONG COLLEGE
SHAM SHUI PO
34. 長沙灣天主教英文中學
   CHEUNG SHA WAN CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL
35. 香島中學
   HEUNG TO MIDDLE SCHOOL
36. 寶血會上智英文書院
   HOLY TRINITY COLLEGE
37. 德貞女子中學
   TACK CHING GIRLS' SECONDARY SCHOOL

KOWLOON CITY
38. 聖公會蔡功譜中學
   SKH TSOI KUNG PO SECONDARY SCHOOL
39. 華英中學
   WA YING COLLEGE

SOUTHERN
40. 香港仔浸信會呂明才書院
   ABERDEEN BAPTIST LUI MING CHOI COLLEGE
41. 香港真光書院
   HONG KONG TRUE LIGHT COLLEGE
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Global Citizenship Education at Hong Kong Junior Secondary Level
Questionnaire for Civic Education Teachers

Dear Colleague,

Thank you very much for your participation in this questionnaire survey which is aimed at pursuing an understanding of the perception of teachers who teach civic education (CE) at junior secondary level in Hong Kong secondary schools. Your precious response will be of tremendous value to illuminate the implementation of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) through the civic education subject you deliver. The findings of the survey are believed to be able to shed light on the improved way of implementation of GCE in Hong Kong secondary schools.

You are assured that your responses will be treated in strict CONFIDENCE, and will be solely used in this research study. Thank you very much again for your great effort and kind co-operation!

Jordan Cheung
PhD Student
University of Leicester, UK (jc2507ab@yahoo.com; 9223 1650)

*************************************************************************

Part One: Perception of CE and GCE (please rate the statements below on the following scale by checking the appropriate box)

(1: Strongly disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Slightly disagree; 4: Slightly agree; 5: Agree; 6: Strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Civic education(^3) should primarily aim to cultivate students with the knowledge, skills and attitude/value pertaining to global citizenship(^4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contemporary civic education should not be centred around global citizenship education(^5).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Civic education denotes a formal school subject aiming to help students acquire citizenship within the education system. Civic education is used interchangeably with citizenship education in this study.

\(^4\) Global citizenship refers to a moral disposition which guides individuals understanding of themselves as members of communities—both on local and global levels—and their responsibility to these communities.

\(^5\) Global citizenship education refers to the education enabling students to develop the moral disposition denoted in Point 2. It empowers individuals to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their cultures and contexts, to imagine different futures and to take responsibility for their decisions and actions.
(1: Strongly disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Slightly disagree; 4: Slightly agree; 5: Agree; 6: Strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In Hong Kong (HK), civic education should focus less on global awareness than the development of national identity and patriotism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It is essential for HK junior secondary students to learn to become global citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I believe civic education is an integral tool for the development of global citizenship in students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Global citizenship education hinders the development of nationalistic education in HK.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Globalisation(^6) makes me think HK civic education more globally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The unification of Hong Kong with China does not affect my globalised conception of Hong Kong civic education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The national identity crisis is influential for my globalised understanding of civic education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The recent local political incidents (e.g. 2003 popular demonstration against the legislation of Article 23 of the Basic Law, 2005 WTO Hong Kong Conference anti-globalisation movement) make me think civic education more globally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Collectivism(^7) adversely affects the development of global citizenship education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Confucian values of education (placing great significance on education, emphasising obedience to school authority, and attaching importance to success in examinations) affect my globalised perception of civic education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Local culture (emphasising family and money) is one of the crucial contextual factors shapes my overall perception of global citizenship education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Global citizenship makes me be aware that human beings have the responsibility to alleviating local &amp; global inequality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The current civic education curriculum is inadequate to help me develop students’ knowledge, skills and attitude in global citizenship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The change of local civic education curricula since 1985 does not affect my globalised perception of civic education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The introduction of the independent civic education subject in 1998 affects my globalised perception of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Globalisation refers to increasing global connectivity, integration and interdependence in the economic, social, technological, cultural, political, and ecological spheres.  

\(^7\) Collectivism refers to a term used to describe any moral, political, or social outlook, that stresses human interdependence and the importance of a collective, rather than the importance of separate individuals.
civic education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. My education and training is inadequate for my teaching of global citizenship education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Insufficient professional education and training will adversely affect my delivery of global citizenship education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1: Strongly disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Slightly disagree; 4: Slightly agree; 5: Agree; 6: Strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Within school, my perception of global citizenship education is influenced by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.1. Other CE teachers’ belief and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2. Availability of teaching materials and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3. Attention from school management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.4. Students’ belief and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.5. Examination-oriented curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6. Self-efficacy among teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.7. Availability of preparation time for teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Beyond school, my perception of global citizenship education (GCE) is influenced by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.1. China’s influence on Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2. China’s booming economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.3. China’s political reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4. Hong Kong’s booming economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5. Change of related local education policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.6. My personal belief about GCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7. Understanding of GCE in the local context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. In your views, please name at least three aspects which need to be improved about the implementation of global citizenship education in your school.

1. 

2. 

3. 
3. ________________________________________________

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

23. Any additional comments you would like to make in this topic.

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

Part Two: Teaching Experience and Education (Please check the appropriate box. For Question 24, you may check more than one box where appropriate)

24. What civic education subject(s) do you teach this school year?
   Civic education…□  Liberal Studies…□  Social Education…□
   Integrated Humanities…□  Economic & Public Affairs…□
   Others (Please specify): _________________________________________________

25. How many years have you been teaching? ______________ year(s)

26. How many years have you been teaching civic education related subjects at junior secondary level?
   Below 3 years… □  4-6 years…□  7-10 years…□  Above 10 years…□

27. Do you have formal degree-level education (e.g. degree studies in a related discipline) related to civic education? No…□ Yes…□
   If yes, please indicate the formal education.
   ________________________________________________

28. Have you had participation in professional development activities or training related to civic education? No…□ Yes…□
   If yes, please indicate the activities and/or training.
   ________________________________________________
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29. What is your age?          | Below 25… □ | 25-35… □ | 36-45…□ | Above 45…□
30. What is your gender?      | Female…□   | Male…□   

~ End of questionnaire ~

Thank you again for making use of your precious time in filling this questionnaire!

*******************************************************************************

Invitation for Follow-up Interview

Based on the results of this questionnaire survey, a series of interview sessions will be conducted to facilitate a deeper understanding of the teachers’ perception. To help me understand if you wish to participate in the interview session, please check the appropriate box below:-

□ I am interested to participate in the interview session.

Name: __________________________ School: __________________________

Contact tel. no: __________________ Email: __________________________

□ I am not interested to participate in the interview session.
『公民教育教師對《全球公民教育》在香港初中階段施行的意見』問卷

尊敬的老師：

非常感謝閣下參與此問卷調查，其目的在於了解初中公民教育科教師對全球公民教育的看法及理解。閣下的寶貴意見將對該課題在本港初中公民教育科中落實提供重要基礎，長遠對其在本港中學公民教育科施行具參考作用。

在此保證閣下所提供的寶貴意見將會作絕對保密處理，並只在此研究中使用。再次感謝閣下的幫忙和合作！

張超民
英國萊斯特大學
哲學博士學位學生敬上
(jc2507ab@yahoo.com, 9223 1650)

*************************************************************************

第一部份：對公民教育和全球公民教育的看法及理解「請在適當的空格中加上√號。」

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>請點選</th>
<th>極不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>稍不同意</th>
<th>稍同意</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>極同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 公民教育的主要目的應是培養學生全球公民精神。</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 現代公民教育不應單圍繞全球公民教育。</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 在香港，公民教育應較集中於培養國家身份認同及愛國精神，而少於在全球意識上。</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 讓香港初中學生學習如何成爲全球公民是非常重要的。</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 我相信公民教育科是培養學生的全球公民意識的主要工具。</td>
<td>□ □ □ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 公民教育是指一門正規學校科目，其目的在於幫助學生在教育系統中掌握公民精神。公民教育與公民精神教育兩詞在此研究中互換使用。

9 全球公民精神是指一種道德氣質能帶領個體明白他們是本土及全球層面中的各社區成員，並瞭解對該些社區所應盡的責任。

10 全球公民教育是一門使學生能夠建立第一點中所指的道德氣質的教育。它使個體有能力對其文化及環境過程作出批判思考；對未來作不同想像及對其所作的決定及行動負責。
<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>在香港，全球公民教育妨碍国家认同教育的发展。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>全球化⑪使我对香港公民教育采取更全球化的观点。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>香港回归中国并未影响我对香港公民教育采取更全球化的观点。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>国家身份认同危机影响我对香港公民教育采取更全球化的观点。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>我对香港公民教育采取更全球化的观点是受近年香港发生的政治事件（如2003年反基本法23条立法大游行、2005反全球化示威等）影响。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>集体主义⑫对全球公民教育的发展具负面影响。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>儒家思想中的教育价值（即对下一代的教育非常重视、服从学校权威、注重考试成绩等）使我对香港公民教育采取更全球化的观点。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>本地文化（即强调家庭及金钱）是构成我对香港公民教育采取更全球化的观点的主要因素之一。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>全球公民精神使我明白到人类有责任消除发生在本土及全球中的不公平现象。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>现今的公民教育独立科的课程未足够帮助我发展学生全球公民精神的知识、技能及态度。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>自1985年以来的本地公民教育课程改革并未影响我对香港公民教育采取更全球化的观点。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⑪全球化是指全球在经济、社会、科技、文化、政治及生态领域加强联系及相互依赖。
⑫集体主义乃一强调人类互相互依的词汇，形容任何道德、政治或社会形式下集体的价值均凌驾在个体之上。
17. 1998 年推出的公民教育獨立科影響我對香港公民教育採取更全球化的觀點。

18. 我所受的教育及培訓對我教授全球公民教育課題並不足夠。

19. 不足夠的專業教育及培訓對我教授全球公民教育課題有負面影響。

20. 在學校中，我對全球公民教育的看法及理解受下列因素影響：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>因素</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>不</th>
<th>稍不</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>极同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.1 其他公民教育教師的信念及行爲</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2 足夠的教學材料及支援</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3 學校管理層的關注</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.4 學生的信念及行爲</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.5 課程太側重考試</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6 教師間缺乏自我策動力</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.7 足夠備課時間</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. 在學校以外，我對全球公民教育的看法及理解受下列因素影響：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>因素</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>不</th>
<th>稍不</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>极同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.1 中國對香港的影響</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2 中國經濟起飛</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.3 中國政治改革</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4 香港經濟起飛</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5 本地相關的教育改革</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.6 我對全球公民教育的信念</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7 本地對全球公民教育的理解</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. 就閣下而言，請舉出最少三項在貴校推行《全球公民教育》需改善的地方。

1. 

2. 
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第二部份：教學經驗及教育

「請在適當的空格上加上√號。如適用，問題24中可選多於一項。」

24. 在本學年中，閣下任教哪門初中公民教育有關的科目？

公民教育科...□ 通識教育科...□    社會教育科...□
綜合人文科...□ 經濟及公共事務科...□

其他「請說明」：______________________________

25. 閣下從事教學工作多久？ _____年

26. 閣下有多少年在初中階段任教公民教育或相關科目的經驗？

3年以下...□ 4至6年...□ 7至10年...□ 10年以上...□

27. 閣下是否曾接受與公民教育或有關學科的學位程度教育？

沒有...□ 有...□

如有的話，請指出該教育為何。_____________________________________
_____________________________________
_____________________________________
28. 閣下有否曾參與公民教育有關的專業發展或訓練活動？  

沒有...□  有...□

如有的話，請指出該專業發展或訓練活動為何。


29. 閣下的年齡為： 25 以下...□  25 至 35...□  36 至 45...□  45 以上...□

30. 閣下的性別為： 女...□  男...□

～問卷完～

再次感謝閣下的寶貴意見及時間！

******************************************************************************

邀請參與跟進面談

根據這問卷調查的結果，一系列跟進面談將會舉辦以加深了解教師的看法及理解。請在下列適當的空格中加上 √ 号，以幫助我明白閣下是否願意參加跟進面談：

□ 我願意參與面談

姓名: ________________________  學校: _______________________

聯絡電話: ____________________  電郵: _______________________

□ 我不願意參與面談
21 May 2008

Dear Principal,

**Invitation for Teachers’ Participation in the Research Study on Civic Education**

My name is Jordan Cheung who is a part-time Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) student at University of Leicester, UK, and I am conducting a study of **Global Citizenship Education (GCE)** in Hong Kong secondary schools. The study primarily aims to understand perception of GCE of civic education teachers who deliver the independent Civic Education subject at Junior Secondary Three. It is pleasing to note from the 2007/08 Secondary Schools Profiles published by the Committee on Home-School Co-operation, the independent Civic Education subject is being offered at your esteemed school. I therefore sincerely invite your civic education teachers concerned to participate in the study.

Please find enclosed with this letter a recommendation letter from my Research Supervisor, Prof Paul Cooper, a set of documents for each respondent enclosing a self-constructed questionnaire (in both English and Chinese versions), a stamped envelope with the return address, and a small token of thanks. I should be most grateful if you would help distribute the documents to the teachers concerned. It is hoped that the respondents will complete either the English or Chinese questionnaire and return it to me by post.

Should there be any enquiry or need for more questionnaires, please feel free to contact me at 9223 1650 or at jc2507ab@yahoo.com. Your kind assistance is absolutely essential for the success of the study. Thank you in advance for your kind assistance and support.

Yours sincerely

Jordan Cheung Chiu Man (Mr)
PhD Student
University of Leicester
尊敬的校長：

邀請貴校教師參與公民教育研究

本人為英國萊斯特大學哲學博士學位的兼讀生。現正就香港中學初
中階段的《全球公民教育》進行研究。這研究的主要目的是了解在初中
三級中任教公民教育獨立科的老師對全球公民教育的看法及理解。從家
庭與學校合作事宜委員會出版的中學概覽 2007/08 網上版高興得知，
貴校正於中三級提供公民教育獨立科，故特函誠邀在 貴校任教該科
目的老師參加是次研究。

隨函附上由是次研究的指導導師 Paul Cooper 教授的推薦信、給
各參與老師的資料乙份，內含自行設計的中英問卷各一、貼上郵票的
回郵信封乙個及表達感謝的小禮品乙份。 煩請代為分發給各有關老
師，希望老師完成填寫中或英文問卷後把其寄回給我。

如有任何查詢或索取額外問卷，請致電 9223 1650 或電郵
jc2507ab@yahoo.com 與我聯絡。這研究的成功與否全賴 閣下的鼎力支持
和幫助，衷心感謝！ 敬祝

金安

張超民
英國萊斯特大學
哲學博士學位學生

二ＯＯ八年五月二十一日
Appendix 4

Global Citizenship Education in Hong Kong Junior Secondary Schools
Interview for Civic Education Teachers

Name: _______________________
School: _____________________
Date: _______________________

Interview Questions

Introduction

Thank you very much indeed for making use of some of your valuable time to help me better understand how a civic education teacher perceives global citizenship education in a junior secondary school in Hong Kong. Please answer the questions I ask you as openly as you can. Your perceptions are important. Please be assured that your responses will be kept confidential. I hope to present an aggregate report to you after the data are compiled.

1. When did you first start teaching civic education?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

2. What is your opinion on civic education curricula in Hong Kong?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

3. What do you understand by global citizenship education (GCE)?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________
4. How important an element of civic education is GCE? If not, which element is more central?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. How GCE is important for the future of Hong Kong?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. Do you think GCE should be taught in Hong Kong schools? Why?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. Which of the following factors shape(s) your conception and perception of civic education globally and how?

(a) □ Globalisation

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(b) □ National identity crisis

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
(c) □ Nationalistic education

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

(d) □ Collectivism

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

(e) □ Confucian values of education

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

(f) □ Utilitarianistic Familism as the local culture

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

(g) □ Change of local civic education policy and curricula

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................
(h) □ Current civic education curriculum

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

(i) □ Local society factors

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

(j) □ China factors

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

(k) □ School factors (students, other teachers)

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

(l) □ Own perception of civic education

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
8. Is professional education/training essential for the delivery of global citizenship education? Why? If so, please suggest the appropriate professional education/training.

9. In your opinion, please state three most important things for improving the implementation of global civic education in your school with supporting reasons.

10. Are there any additional comments you wish to make in this?

Thank you again for your tremendous assistance.

~ The End ~
Appendix 5

Transcript of Interview with Mr. Yung (Interviewee One/I(1))

Date of interview: 10 July 2008
Place of interview: Mongkok, Kowloon, Hong Kong
Brief background of the interviewee:
Mr. Yung was a young gentleman who started his teaching career quite recently. He graduated from the Shatin Government Secondary School and began his teaching profession at the current secondary school immediately after graduation from the Chinese University of Hong Kong with a Bachelor Degree in Biology. Mr Yung was now deployed to teach Integrated Science and Civic Education curricula in junior secondary classes.

Question: When did you first start teaching civic education?
Answer: I started teaching civic education from this academic year. By now, I had been teaching the subject for just 10 months.

Question: What was your opinion about the current civic education curriculum in Hong Kong?
Answer: The curriculum was in general quite week and merely leaned towards national education. Concepts mostly relevant to civic education such as freedom, rule of law democracy, and contemporary citizen virtues were not adequately covered. Overall, the formal civic education curriculum was not sufficient in Hong Kong schools. Sometimes, informal curriculum activities such as the election of class representatives could be more useful to help students develop the basic notions of civic education.

Question: Did you think global citizenship education has been covered in the current civic education curriculum?
Answer: Yes a bit. The topic should be covered more in the formal curriculum.

Question: How did you interpret global citizenship education?
Answer: Judging from its semantic meaning, global citizenship education should at least cover the essential elements of citizenship such as universal values in human rights, national allegiance, rule of law, etc. At the global level, students should be cultivated with a world vision, including at least an understanding of histories and cultures in different parts of the world. After all, students’ understanding of their roles and responsibilities as members in different levels of communities should be
developed. They should also be able to take responsibility for their decisions and actions when necessary.

**Question: How important was global citizenship education in civic education for the development of people’s civic virtues?**

Answer: It was very important because of the deficiency of the pertaining world vision among the general public in Hong Kong.

**Question: Compared with other popular topics such as right and responsibility education and national education, how important was global citizenship education for civic education?**

Answer: Global citizenship education was more important than the other topics in civic education, including national education. Everyone should have a sense of being a world citizen. Instead of merely knowing the cultural heritage of being a Chinese, we needed to realize ourselves as a member of the world such that tolerance to other ethnics would be possible.

**Question: How important was global citizenship education for the future of Hong Kong?**

Answer: People living in Hong Kong, which was an international city, should carry the character of international habitants. Hong Kong should be a gateway to the international world of China. The city should have the responsibility to lead other Mainland cities to the international community. To achieve this, it was imperative for the people of Hong Kong to bear the world vision so as to help the Chinese political system to become more open and democratic. Therefore, global citizenship education was of paramount importance for the future of Hong Kong.

**Question: Did you think global citizenship education should be taught in Hong Kong schools and why?**

Answer: It depended on how the subject was delivered. If students were only indoctrinated with factual information and the achievement was primarily measured by assessment, the subject would become valueless. By contrast, if the subject was more about the development of appropriate value in students, it would be valuable to be taught in schools in Hong Kong. In fact, it was observed that teachers did cultivate students with the civic values not confined within the formal class. Students were guided how to select their leaders and learn how to analyse of civic issues such as duties and responsibilities and civil rights, and learn how to contribute for the benefits of the wide community. By the same token, global citizenship education should be
taught in Hong Kong schools. It would be beneficial students to grasp the basic knowledge and concept of the world issues and matters, i.e. what was happening in other countries. Despite all these, it was worth noting that the concept of global citizenship education was not an easy topic to be taught.

**Question:** How did you perceive yourself as a citizen?
**Answer:** I would regard myself as a person of Shatin, Hong Kong, Canton (China), China (national), Asia and the World. Any person would thereby need to play varied roles in different contexts, and more importantly, such person needed to evaluate how to play the roles in the specific contexts successfully. Should there be any conflict in those roles the person should be able to make the right decision.

**Question:** Was globalization an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
**Answer:** I was profoundly affected by a course mate at the university who rendered me a concept of world system within which globalization was not interpreted as its prevailing connotation. For instance, the East-West trade was not a contemporary aspect but occurred in two thousand years ago in the era of “Silk Road”. The discovery of silver mine in America and Spain centuries ago impacted the history development European heavily too. Therefore, the current scenario of globalization could be considered as the continuous development from the past. People living in different parts of the world influence each others’ lives for long and the influence was seamless. Not matter whether the prevailing trend of globalization was current, civic education should be viewed globally. In fact, my students were observed to be strongly influenced by external affairs.

**Question:** Was national identity crisis an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
**Answer:** Not really. I had never denied myself as a Chinese. I loved the Chinese culture and history so I did not have any national identity crisis.

**Question:** Was national education an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
**Answer:** Yes, it was. I deliberately talked about Taiwan with my students. This was because I did not want the students forget about the existence of such polity other than the Chinese government. I would take this as a balance force for the overwhelming promotion of national admiration in Hong Kong in the recent years. While the local government authority kept stressing the national identity, I would question myself
how a Chinese should actually perform.

**Question: Was collectivism in Chinese culture an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?**
Answer: It might be. I basically had no objection to the collectivism since it could bring about something good sometimes. However, it was unfair that individual rights should be sacrificed for the benefits of the collectivity. If the society kept leaning towards the collective benefits, I would take the opposite stance as a balance.

**Question: Was Confucian values of education in Chinese culture (i.e. emphasis on examination success and obedience of authority) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?**
Answer: Not really. I, first and foremost, did not agree with what Confucianism was currently denoted. It was rather a lively concept, e.g. the six basic skills, which were concerned about a very broad perspective. Actually, Confucius travelled round the country for teaching, so his concept of the world did not contradict with what we had today. As a matter of fact, Confucianism was a good asset for me to deliver the concept of global citizenship education.

**Question: Was the local culture (i.e. utilitarianistic familism) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?**
Answer: Yes, it was. People’s vision should go beyond the family, though family was not considered unimportant. That was family should not be an inhibiting force of the development of the world view in an individual. Universal values such as democracy, human rights, should be considered beyond the familial and local boundaries.

**Question: Was the change of the civic education policy and curricula since 1985 (including some milestone developments in 1996 and 1998) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?**
Answer: I could not comment on this as I was so young that did not go through this process.

**Question: Was the current civic education curriculum an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?**
Answer: Yes, it was. The current curriculum did not have sufficient coverage on globalization citizenship education, and that drove me to deliver more relevant contents to my students.
Question: Were the local society factors (i.e. the local political incident such as the appointment of under-secretaries, and the 1995 mass demonstration against the legislation of Article 23 in the Basic Law, and 2005 WTO ministerial meeting in Hong Kong) influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: The effect was not obvious. The local political incidents appeared to have had not much association with the implementation of global citizenship education.

Question: Were the China factors influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, they were. With the soaring impacts of China on Hong Kong, students would unavoidably consider the China factors more significantly. It was therefore imperative for students to have a balanced view and appropriate value system under such growing influence. I wished my students to develop a world vision, or even a universal perspective. Overall, the students should have a proper vision covering the layers of the universe, the world, the nation-state, the community, the family and finally the self. Only through this, the students could develop an understanding and acceptance of different cultures and values. For instance, from the perspective of the world structure, the European system did not merely consist of Britain and France which the students were so familiar with but also other countries like Turkey and countries in Central and Eastern part of the continent. In fact, the living standard of some Turki people might be similar to that of the Chinese. As such, the students’ horizon should hence be widened so that they could learn how to show respect and tolerance to other cultures.

Question: Apart from tolerance, what did you see the responsibility?
Answer: I would discuss with my students on how the matter happened in one country would affect the others. Took the devaluation of the US dollars, the students should be able to learn the actual impacts of the US policy on finance and external relations on the other countries. The financial system in the US was also talked about.

Question: Were the school factors (e.g. behaviours of other teachers, students and the school principal) influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, they were. In general Hong Kong students’ views and visions were narrow, no matter which socio-economic stratum they came from, and they were easily influenced by external factors. Therefore, the students should be helped to develop a wider scope of vision at the world level. For teachers, amongst the 81 colleagues in my serving school, very few had the appropriate level of understanding
of the topic. Therefore, my contribution could be seen missionary. In school, attention was often very much given to examination that distorted the real spirit of learning.

Question: How did those outside-school factors matter with your perception of civic education globally, and why?
Answer: Yes, they did matter. As mentioned above, the impacts of China’s and Hong Kong’s economical development were phenomenal, particularly when Hong Kong is an open economic system and a financial centre in the world.

Question: Was your own perception of civic education an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: I perceived civic education unconventionally which was merely related to an individual’s loyalty to his or her nation. Now, the focus of civic education should expand to the global level. As mentioned above, I attached equal importance to the global and national dimensions, but comparatively less to the community level. A teacher’s perception would more or less affect his or her understanding about civic education.

Question: As shown in your questionnaire response, professional education and training were important for the delivery of citizenship education. Could you supplement the reason?
Answer: Most of the teachers, as I observed, would not know how to do if they were not provided with suitable education and training.

Question: What did you think was the relevant professional education and training?
Answer: The professional education and training should first and foremost serve to clarify the basic concepts of the subject. Some civic education teachers delivered some fundamental concepts such as human rights and democracy without having a good grasp of their actual meanings. The success of the implementation of the global citizenship education relied to a great extent on the teachers’ professional know-how. Currently, it seemed that relevant continuous development programmes in the discipline of education were not much. As a matter of fact, education programmes in Politics, History, or Philosophy could be useful for teachers to formulate a conceptual framework specific to global citizenship education.

Question: What did you think of the three most important things for improving the implementation of global citizenship education in your school and why?
Answer: The appointment of a team of teachers who were competent enough to deliver the subject should come first. Of course, support of the school principal was also a success factor. Secondly, assessment methods should be carefully chosen. The question and answer type of assessment used in the Hong Kong Certificate of Education Examination might no longer be useful. Rather, essay writing type of assessment with the support of some sort of research study would be worthy of consideration. Lastly, appointment of more teaching staff to release the heavy workload of the current teachers (who worked 20 more lessons per week) would be helpful.

*Question: Did you have any other comments that fell outside the scope of the above questions?*

Answer: Nothing special I guessed. However, for the best interest of the students, it would be essential for the school to find a suitable way to implement global citizenship education to students.

- The End -
Transcript of Interview with Ms. Ho (Interviewee Two/I(2))

Date of interview: 11 July 2008
Place of interview: Yuen Long, New Territories, Hong Kong

Brief background of the interviewee:
Ms. Ho was trained as an English teacher who had been teaching at a Secondary School situated in Shatin, New Territories for 23 years. She was now the responsible person for the implementation of moral education and civic education in the School. The School had been phasing out the independent civic education subject and replacing it with the Integrated Humanities (IH), which adopts a relatively comprehensive mode of curriculum integration in the Personal, Social and Humanities Education Key Learning Area (PSHE KLA) at the junior secondary level (i.e. Secondary One to Three).

Question: When did you first start teaching civic education?
Answer: I had been teaching the subject since 2001. I was also the civic education and moral education coordinator in my school starting from 2000.

Question: What was your opinion about the current civic education curriculum in Hong Kong?
Answer: My school had been transiting to the IH curriculum in alignment with the current trend. However, it was so unfortunate to find the difficulty of communication between teachers who were teaching civic education and IH. As a discipline coordinator, all I could do was to provide an oversight of what was delivering such that any unnecessary duplication in the contents of delivery across the two curricula could be avoided. I did not teach IH so I was not completely sure about the actual connection between the two sets of curricula. My general impression was that topics covered in the two curricula were fragmented and trivial, scattering across different subjects. This situation was indeed unsatisfactory and not beneficial for enabling students to develop a proper value framework in a holistic sense. Generally speaking, the current civic education curriculum failed to equip students with a proper framework of civic values to live in the future society. To rectify this, a clearer framework and model of civic education should be provided for teachers and students.

Question: How did you interpret global citizenship education?
Answer: It’s about the understanding of one’s identity, transcending beyond his or her community and nation-state, to the world level. His or her interests should not be limited to the national level. In this regard, global citizenship education should touch upon universal values such as the global interests, democracy and justice. That meant
an individual should learn their responsibilities in different layers of community and how they could exercise these responsibilities in appropriate occasions.

*Question: Did you think global citizenship education was an important component of civic education?*
*Answer: Yes, it was. Owing to the rapid development of communication technology, we were subject to influences from other parts of the world from time to time. Teaching of global citizenship education was thereby crucial in civic education.*

*Question: Was global citizenship education the most important component in civic education?*
*Answer: Yes, it was. It was of the utmost importance for helping students develop a value system to enable them to live successfully in the globalised world.*

*Question: How important was global citizenship education for the future of Hong Kong?*
*Answer: It was very important. No matter how the topic was taught, students were under the constant global impacts in their daily life, e.g. through the Internet. Teachers should therefore have the responsibility to teach their students about the related issues.*

*Question: Was it important to teach global citizenship education (e.g. the development of a world vision) in Hong Kong schools and why?*
*Answer: Yes, it was important. However, it would be essential to avoid the delivery of certain topics superficially. According to my experience, students were interested in certain topics such as unfair international trade only when they were given a thorough analysis of the background of the issue.*

*Question: Were the students’ global views were widened after being taught about those world issues?*
*Answer: Yes, their views were broadened. If teachers mentioned more about current global affairs such as the election of the US president, students would learn more and care more.*

*Question: Was globalization an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?*
*Answer: Yes, it was. Many incidents happening in Hong Kong such as the recent legislation of anti-racial discrimination ordinance would make people, including
students and me, think more about more cultures and care more about things emerging in surroundings.

*Question: Was national identity crisis (especially after the handover of the Hong Kong sovereignty to China in 1997) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?*

Answer: Yes, it was. Execution of justice and equity should go beyond the national boundary. Understanding of global identity could help students care more about justice and equity. Actually, students’ identification of China fluctuated pending to incidents happening around them. The Beijing Olympic brought about a positive feeling of national identity for the students.

*Question: Was national education an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?*

Answer: Yes, it was. I was basically in opposition of the indoctrination of national education. For my school perhaps due to its Christianity background, national education was not prevalent and highly emphasized. Students’ understanding about their nations was generally not high.

*Question: Was collectivism in Chinese culture an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?*

Answer: I am not so sure. Collectivism might not be a bad thing. However, democracy which was related to individual rights was sometimes downplayed by the collective interest such as that from the nation-state. For example, the definition of the petition of the Democratic Party for more democracy was as anti-social was not right since everyone should have the freedom of speech.

*Question: Was Confucian value of education in Chinese culture (i.e. emphasis on examination success and obedience with authority) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?*

Answer: I was not so sure. It was however necessary to guide students to think more deeply and not limited to the shallow concept you just mentioned.

*Question: Was the local culture (i.e. utilitarianistic familism) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?*

Answer: Yes, it was. Global citizenship education could be a useful balancing force to act against the impacts of this kind of adverse local culture on an individual, including a lack of sufficient attention to those important universal values such as democracy,
human rights and justice.

**Question:** Was the change of the civic education policy and curricula since 1985 (and some other important developments in 1996, 1998 and the introduction of the new IH curriculum in recent years) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?

**Answer:** Yes, it was. It was obvious that the curriculum had been moving away from the conventional mode concentrating on right and responsibility and rather emphasizing more and more on a comprehensive framework focusing more broadly on self, family, community, nation and the world. Under this change, teachers were more concerned about the global domain. It was also quite clear that local schools had been attaching more importance to the implementation and promotion of civic education.

**Question:** Was the current civic education curriculum an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?

**Answer:** Yes, it was. Again it could be a good balance force for students against the overflow of emphasis on national education in Hong Kong schools.

**Question:** Did you think the current Hong Kong civic education curriculum had a revival to the orientation of national education?

**Answer:** I did not think so. In fact, according to my experience in visiting a considerable number of secondary schools because of my capacity as the discipline coordinator, the schools had flexibility in the selection of contents to be delivered. Should the school not wish to deliver too much content on national education, it could make the call. Normally, the choice was made depending on the stage of development of the school. If the schools considered themselves mature enough, they would tend to choose more topics at the global level.

**Question:** Were the local society factors (e.g. recent political incidents such as Hong Kong people’s financial assistance for the Sichuan earthquake and the appointment of undersecretaries, 2003 mass demonstration against the legislation of subversion law, and 2005 WTO ministerial meeting in Hong Kong) influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?

**Answer:** Yes, they were. The incidents could be used for comparison with what were happening in the external world so to widen the scope of the students.
Question: Were the China factors influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, they were. Global citizenship education could balance the increasing impact of China upon Hong Kong when necessary.

Question: Were the school factors (e.g. behaviours of other teachers, students and the school principal) influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, they were. Sometimes I realized from the problems of students (such as a lack of understanding of racial discrimination and that probed me to teach more related topics to them. Most of my colleagues, I observed, did not concern much about civic education. Nor did they consider teaching civic education important. The examination orientation culture did drive teachers’ thinking of how their responsible subject should be taught. Teachers’ global view of civic education should not be bounded by such narrow mind school culture.

Question: How did those outside-school factors mentioned in the questionnaire matter with your perception of civic education globally, and why?
Answer: They did matter quite a lot. I did not deny the impacts of China’s and Hong Kong’s economical development on my global perception of civic education, particularly when Hong Kong is an international city.

Question: Was your own perception of civic education an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, it was. I had to admit that my personal perceptional had somehow moved away from the traditional thinking of civic education. However, I still regarded moral was at the centre. If one’s individuality (self-cultivation) was well developed who could actualize the concepts of civic education such as equity and justice in daily life, he or she could undoubtedly become a good citizen even though a limited amount of information was given to them in civic education. However, the innate development of self could not be isolated from the society. Therefore, moral education and civic education should be inter-dependent.

Question: You mentioned in the questionnaire response that global citizenship education did not matter if an individual was able to develop his or her personal virtue. Could you please elaborate?
Answer: Yes. If a good citizen was understood as the one who would respect justice and equity, the public interests, and honesty, these values could be developed in all
contexts which were useful for students to face any kinds of challenges.

Question: Your above observation seemed to be related to value education which could embrace global citizenship education. Did you agree?
Answer: Yes. There was not contradiction at all so long as global citizenship education was purported to instill in students a set of values applicable in the global context.

Question: Was professional education and/or training important for the delivery of global citizenship education and why?
Answer: It was very important. Many civic education teachers like me were not civic education or related disciplines trained. Learning how to teach the subject was of vital importance.

Question: Did you receive any professional education and training that is relevant and appropriate?
Answer: I only attended some very general training on moral and civic education. The course which I recently attended at the Hong Kong Institute of Education was about IH rather than global citizenship education. Despite this, the course was to a certain extent useful for me to deliver some civic education topics. When I learned more, I would perceive civic education more globally.

Question: You had mentioned that civic education had been gaining grounds in your school in which global citizenship education was a component. What did you think of the three most important things for improving the implementation of global citizenship education in your school and why?
Answer: First of all, a better coordination amongst different implementation units such as IH, religious studies and civic education panels of subject should be in place. Secondly, more resources should be given to the development of teaching materials aside from the current source of reference, PATHS provided by the Chinese University of Hong Kong. The third one was concerned with teacher professional development. The fourth one should be students’ readiness.

Question: Did you have any other comments that fell outside the scope of the above questions?
Answer: Global citizenship education was not a new thing. In Hong Kong, it was unfortunate that important areas of civic education including national education and global citizenship education were not in general implemented within a solid
framework. Schools’ emphasis on civic education was yet to be sufficient.

Question: What other factors outside of those I mentioned above did you think relevant would affect your perception of civic education more globally. 
Answer: Nothing special.

Question: Did you think your colleagues had the concept of global citizenship education?
Answer: Not really.
Transcript of Interview with Ms. Yan (Interviewee Three/I(3))

Date of interview: 14 July 2008
Place of interview: Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong
Brief background of the interviewee:
Ms. Yan was a young lady who studied Chinese at the university. She taught Chinese and Civic Education (CE) at a subsidized secondary school situated in Shamshuipo, Kowloon. She embarked upon her teaching career seven years ago in the same school after graduation from the university. In the School, there were altogether three teachers teaching CE including the subject panel head.

Question: When did you first start teaching civic education?
Answer: I had been teaching civic education since 2002.

Question: Did you teach the independent civic education syllabus?
Answer: Yes, I did.

Question: What was your opinion about the current civic education curriculum in Hong Kong after teaching the subject for 6 years?
Answer: The prevailing curriculum was too simple and focused too much on information providing rather than value building. For instance, within the normal duration as short as 35 to 40 minutes in a lesion, topics about the nation could only be delivered through the introduction of national flag, national anthem, and the like. That could be seen superficial. Value cultivation was also often the negligence. Components of global citizenship education were not very sufficient.

Question: What values did you think were more important?
Answer: Recognition of national identity and social responsibilities should be the priorities. Yet it was difficult to explore with students why these values were important. Students were always told the significance of the values. A lack of discussion with students made the youngsters difficult to take the values in.

Question: Did you think global citizenship education should be included in the current civic education curriculum?
Answer: Yes, I did. This was because the world was unified, people’s attention going beyond the boundary of the nation to the globe. In this regard, humans had to transcend their role from the national level to the global level.
Question: It was noted from your relevant response in the questionnaire survey that teaching of global citizenship education was not an important tool in civic education. Could you please elaborate?
Answer: Global citizenship education was concerned with a wide range of topics, e.g. poverty and rich in the Secondary Three civic education syllabus. Other than civic education, such topic could be touched upon in other subjects, e.g. Geography. It was in fact not manageable for a civic education teacher to cover the broad base issues embedded in the topic by the 40-minute lesson within the 6-day cycle in the school timetable (i.e. meeting with the students three times a month).

Question: How did you interpret global citizenship education?
Answer: To my understanding, global citizenship education referred to the extension of national education. That meant people should extend their understanding and recognition of their roles and responsibilities from the national level to the global level. They should also be responsible for their decisions and actions made in necessary situations.

Question: What was the difference between a national citizen and a global citizen?
Answer: National citizen focused on issues at the national level, e.g. national identity. Global citizens focused on a bigger picture whereby broader groups of people such as the rich and the poor, and those living in the developed and developing countries or places should be attended to.

Question: What did you think were the virtues of global citizens?
Answer: The virtues could involve giving more attention to incidents happened in the surroundings and in the past and participating actively.

Question: What was the role of civic education in the delivery of global citizenship education?
Answer: The current curriculum hardly covered global citizenship education.

Question: Was that because of the selection of curriculum contents?
Answer: After reviewing all the government curriculum documents, textbooks and other related sources of information due to my capacity as the person-in-charge of curriculum integration in school, very few reference materials pertaining to global citizenship education could be located. The reason might be that the topic was too difficult for students to understand. Students nowadays did not even care about current affairs happening around them, not talking about an understanding of issues at
a broader context such as human rights. Owing to the weakness in the promotion of national education in Hong Kong as criticized by someone in the society, the government tended to place the national education at a higher priority than global citizenship education as a consequence.

Question: Did you think national education had been strengthened in Hong Kong?
Answer: Yes, I did. A lot of resources had been allocated to schools in recent years.

Question: Did you cover topics in global citizenship education, such as environmental protection, in your teaching of civic education to help students develop their global perspective?
Answer: Not as much as it was expected. But while doing curriculum integration, I had assisted colleagues in designing the collaborative teaching plan during which the topics on environmental protection and poverty and rich were touched upon.

Question: Did you get the feedback?
Answer: No I did not. But there were follow-up activities such as “hunger relief” organized by Oxfam Hong Kong and the students’ responses were very positive.

Question: How important was global citizenship education as compared with other topics in civic education, such as national education?
Answer: Global citizenship education should not take precedence because Hong Kong people do not attach importance to national education and consider themselves as Hongkongese, especially the young generation. They did not care about their motherland and generally held a negative view towards China. Therefore, national education should come first. After the people gained the sense of national education, their attention could be extended to the global level. A step-by-step progression was necessary.

Question: How important was global citizenship education for Hong Kong in future?
Answer: It was not very important at this moment in time but of course significant in future. This was because the world has been unifying and Hong Kong was subject to the impacts of globalization.

Question: Did you think global citizenship education should be implemented in Hong Kong secondary schools?
Answer: Yes but it would be better to be confined in the senior grade. This was because students at the lower grade did not have the related concepts. They were not
able to digest what was taught. For instance, in the teaching of national education, students could not see the problem of not knowing how to sing the national song, and why national flag should be raised and they did not realize their role as a national citizen. They just thought the topic boring. Therefore, when talking about global citizenship education, it was too difficult for the students. Their focus was merely confined to self, family and school.

Question: Was the above situation a result of the lack of development of the students’ mindset of global citizenship education in the first place as the learning progression might not necessarily be in the step-by-step pattern?
Answer: It was understood but the students did not get a good grip of some very basic concept even at the final year of junior secondary schooling, e.g. rich and poverty. In general, the students lacked a global view, and failed to understand problems from the perspective of individual countries. They just did not care and that was a common phenomenon of the young generation.

Question: Was globalization an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, it was. Students could easily get in touch with those globalised institutions such as McDonald and Mickey Mouse in their daily life. This was particularly obvious when Hong Kong was in a mix of Chinese and Western cultures. This led teachers to consider the necessity to teach this kind of global topic. Actually, teachers, including me, had plenty of chances to have daily encounter to those global aspects.

Question: Was national identity crisis an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, it was. People should have different roles in different contexts. It would be risky to place attention too narrow at the national level.

Question: Was national education an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, it was. However, global citizenship education might not be able to play a perfect balancing force for the overemphasis of national education nowadays in school. This was because the pushing force from national education was too huge in schools and everybody needed to jump to the bandwagon for its implementation.
Question: Would the overemphasis of national education make the students take precedence over China in their decision-making on certain international incidents?
Answer: No, it would not. The students were generally not very satisfied with what was happening in China as reflected from the low scoring in the surveys done by the school on the perception of China. The students’ perception was constantly affected by the negative stance of the local press towards Mainland.

Question: Did the emphasis of national education in school affect the students’ perception of China?
Answer: Yes, it did. According to the post survey’s result conducted recently, the students’ feeling of China improved.

Question: Would the improved attitude towards China affect the students’ critical thinking in international events?
Answer: No, it would not. The students were easily affected by the press as mentioned above. For example, the recent news about the fake food in China had dampened the students’ perception of China drastically. However, the students could also be affected by other issues on the positive side. For instance, the Sichuan earthquake had made the students become more positive about their national identity. On the contrary, the deferral of direct election in Hong Kong by the Chinese government caused the opposite. In most of the cases, the students did not take a deep thought over the event so that their judgment could be sometimes irrational.

Question: Was collectivism which is prevalent in the Chinese culture an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: It might be. It would sometimes be right to have people move ahead collectively for the benefit of the country. However, the collective value might not be correct all the time. People should have a critical mind to distinguish right and wrong rather than being passive recipients.

Question: Was Confucian value of education (i.e. emphasis on examination achievement and compliance with authority) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: This was not relevant.

Question: Was local culture (i.e. familial utilitarianism) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?
Answer: Yes, it was. Civic education was concerned about day to day happenings.
The local culture must have an impact on what needed to be taught in the civic education curriculum. However, I thought more and more people of Hong Kong nowadays placed emphasis on money making but not on family. More attention should be given to those universal values such as democracy, human rights, equity, etc.

*Question:* Was the change to the local civic education policy and curriculum since 1985 (including the milestone developments in 1996 and 1998) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?

*Answer:* Yes, it was. The change had sent out a clear message that global citizenship education should be delivered through civic education starting from the junior secondary sector rather than by Liberal Studies or Integrated Humanities which were more related to thinking skills and integrated project learning.

*Question:* What was your opinion on the current civic education curriculum?

*Answer:* Its focal point was on the development of the youth’s value system corresponding to their roles at personal, societal and national levels. Such kind of value education was to a certain extent helpful for the development of global citizenship education.

*Question:* Were the local society factors (i.e. the recent political incidents such as the 2003 WTO ministerial meeting in Hong Kong, and 2003 mass demonstration against the legislation of anti-subversion law) influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?

*Answer:* Yes because the local incident could bring about current issues which would be valuable for the students to learn. While understanding the value of incorporation of these current affairs in the curriculum, it was paradoxically uncertain whether the students could understand them.

*Question:* Were the China factors influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?

*Answer:* Yes, they were. The China factors were unavoidably influential especially those which truly interested students.

*Question:* Were the school factors (e.g. support of the school management, other colleagues’ perception and behaviour, students’ perception and behaviour) influential for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?

*Answer:* Yes but the most important thing was the major direction of school. For
example, national education focus in recent years overshadowed all other areas of developments and topics in civic education. It was therefore important for the teachers to develop the students’ value system. Because of this, the teachers’ perception of civic education was of prime importance.

*Question: How did those outside-school factors matter with your perception of civic education globally, and why?*
*Answer: Yes, they did matter. I think nobody would deny the blooming economy of China and China would make the local people think more globally when Hong Kong operated an open trading and financial systems.*

*Question: How did you perceive civic education?*
*Answer: I tended to perceive civic education less traditionally like the sole emphasis on responsibilities and loyalty to the nation state or voting. At the early years of my teaching of civic education, I stayed impartial probably owing to the lack of the related training and education. A tendency was however observed in recent years that the national achievements were overtly stressed, especially the time was close to the Beijing Olympic.*

*Question: What virtues did you wish to cultivate in students?*
*Answer: The central virtue useful for students was to care about the society and things happened around so as to help them understand what was going on.*

*Question: How civic education differed from moral education?*
*Answer: To me, they were the same. Many moral education topics were subsumed in civic education.*

*Question: Was your perception (probably changing over time) an influential factor for you to perceive civic education more globally and why?*
*Answer: Yes and my change of perception was a result of the change of curriculum. In the future, I would prefer putting global citizenship education in a more important position in teaching civic education at the junior secondary classes since senior secondary students would need to have a global view under the new 3-3-4 academic structure. However, whether or not this deed could be operationalised was dependent upon how much autonomy I could gain from the school.*

*Question: Was professional education and training important for the delivery of global citizenship education?*
Answer: Yes, it was. Some simulating and interesting workshops would be relevant to help teachers to adjust their lessons as appropriate. An example was my attendance of a workshop organized by the Hong Kong Drama Teachers Association on the topic of selling coffee in the international trade which was very much helpful for me to understand fuller the issue. Those workshops would be even more useful than the pursuit of a Master of Education degree. Hope other colleagues could have the chance to attend those kinds of training activities in order to enhance their teaching effectiveness.

Question: What were the three most important things which would need to be done for the implementation of global citizenship education in your school?
Answer: Firstly, the school should lay down clearly its civic education policy and draw up the relevant implementation plan in order to show the school support for the implementation of global citizenship education. After that, teachers of different subjects should join forces for the implementation within which civic education teachers should play the central part of coordination. Secondly, more support from school, including the teaching load and resources should be made available. Thirdly, teaching hours of civic education should be increased substantially.

Question: Did you have any overall comment and other comments which were not related to the above questions?
Answer: I did not have any.
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