National and international education in South-East Asia: are they in conflict?[1]

Isabel Nisbet, Cambridge International Examinations, Singapore
(Nisbet.i@cie.org.uk)[2]

> *"Is it possible for an educational system to be conducted by a national state and yet the full social ends of the educative process not be restricted, constrained and corrupted? … This question is concerned with the reconciliation of national loyalty, or patriotism, with superior devotion to the things which unite men in common ends, irrespective of national political boundaries." (Dewey (1918))*

> *"Learning about Singapore.. our history, our geography, the constraints we faced, how we overcame them, survived and prospered, what we must do to continue to survive. That is national education." (Singapore former Prime Minister Goh, 1996[3])*

> *"All young Australians… [should] become … responsible global and local citizens." (from Goal 2 of the Australian National Curriculum)*

Abstract

The paper introduces the debate about the compatibility of national and international education by seeking to define and distinguish some of the terms used , including "national education", "international" and "global" (in educational contexts). It proposes a framework for looking in detail at the substance of specific national and international programmes. Finally, it explores five different answers to the question "Are national and international education in conflict?" and proposes an approach involving a dynamic relationship between the two approaches, in which each can inform and improve the other.

……

In most countries of the developed world, schools are choosing or are being required by their governments to provide education with an international flavour. Some schools – including some represented at today's seminar – have an explicit international ethos or belong to an international grouping of schools. At the same time, these same schools – particularly if they are financed or run by national or state governments – are increasingly being expected to provide "national education", with content that is specific to their own country. Indeed, recent years have seen a flurry of "national education" initiatives in several South East Asian countries. What do these concepts mean? Do they denote extra subjects or activities for which schools are expected to find time in an already crowded school day? Or is the whole curriculum somehow expected to deliver these agendas? And is it possible to deliver both international and national education, or are the agendas in conflict?

[1] Paper first delivered to a seminar for Cambridge schools in Indonesia held in Jakarta, Indonesia, on 27 February 2013

[2] Isabel Nisbet is a Senior Education Adviser to Cambridge International Examinations, based in Singapore (www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/singapore. The views expressed in the paper are the author's own and not necessarily those of Cambridge International Examinations.

[3] In his speech to the National Day Rally, 9 August 1996

This paper is offered by way of introduction to a seminar at which representatives of Cambridge schools across Indonesia will consider some of these issues in the light of their experience. I shall seek to define and distinguish some of the terms used in these debates, and I shall cite some examples from South East Asia, but mainly from countries outside of Indonesia, in order to provide a broader context for the discussion.

Terms

"National education"

It is helpful to distinguish two uses of this phrase. In the first, wider, sense, it simply denotes the education system of a nation-state and the laws, regulations and policies which govern it. Many countries state the purposes of education in law and these can be spelled out in White Papers, Blueprints and the like. There may also be national curricula, at least for the years of compulsory schooling, and these may be assessed by national examinations or tests. The curricula or tests can be required by law and/or can be mandatory in practice by being made a condition for national funding.

It is important to note that, in this sense of the term, it is quite possible for "national education" requirements to include some international content, and many do. Almost all require teaching of a foreign language, and this can be justified in terms of the national interest, particularly in countries or regions such as Hong Kong and Singapore which seek to prosper as trade hubs, or where the country is seen as economically dependent on others. A famous example of a linguistic policy justified in these terms (as well as because of perceived wider educational benefits of bilingualism) is Lee Kuan Yew's "Bilingual journey" for Singapore (Lee (2012)).

More interesting for the purposes of this paper is a second, more specific, usage, where "national education" refers to a subset of the national educational programme, aiming to promote knowledge about the student's own country and (in many cases) patriotism and commitment to "national" values. We shall consider later the different domains (cognitive, affective etc) in which these aims can be pursued, but at this stage, it should be noted that countries can have different reasons for promoting "national education" in the narrower sense. Vickers (2009) describes the role of "national education" in "state formation", when a country is redefining itself (for example, Meiji Japan in the late 19th century) or inventing a new, manufactured, identity (Singapore). National education may also be seen as a tool for holding together large nation-states such as China, which has worked hard to encourage children in the newly-returned Hong Kong to "learn to love the motherland" (Vickers (2011)). The negative example of the breakup of the USSR has been seen as motivating national leaders in China, to do all they can through education (as well as

other means) to avoid the same happening there[4]. Vickers also describes examples where national education has been a tool of ”survivalism”, when loyalty and willingness to fight for one’s country was seen as necessary for national survival, as in Singapore in the 1990s.

National education in this sense is most commonly reflected in the curriculum content of history, language and literature, as well as “civics” or “social education”, and in the structure of school life around national symbols and rituals of various kinds (see Box 1 for an example from Singapore).

Box 1: Singapore: key dates to celebrate in schools (and more widely in the city/state)

Total Defence Day (15 February): marks the day in 1942 when Singapore fell to the Japanese – reminds students that everyone has a part to play in the total defence of Singapore

Racial Harmony Day (21 July): marks the day in 1964 when bad race riots broke out in Singapore – reminds students that they need to continue to build inter-racial understanding and toleration

National Day (9 August): marks the day in 1965 when Singapore seceded from Malaysia

International Friendship Day (21 September) [added later]: marks the day in 1965 when Singapore joined the United Nations as an independent, sovereign, nation (adapted from Chia (2012))

Telling the national story, particularly of traumatic events which have shaped the nation, can be part of this enterprise, particularly if the new generation of children is thought to be worryingly ignorant of its national past. The quotation from the former Prime Minister of Singapore at the head of this paper is a good example of that view. It is more difficult, however, for schools to reflect aspects of the “national story” which some might regard as a matter for shame rather than celebration. There have been bitter controversies about the impact of “national education” on history curricula and textbooks, particularly in Japan and China, with accusations of bias or omissions of some challenging episodes (such as the Tiananmen Square demonstrations in 1989). The strength of feeling on such matters in Hong Kong was illustrated recently

[4] This was emphasised by Professor Roderick McFarquhar in a lecture to the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy in Singapore on 17 January 2013 entitled “China in Transition” (see http://www.spp.nus.edu.sg/home.aspx)

by mass protests – in which a few teachers even went on hunger strike - about a proposed "national education" programme, which is now being reconsidered[5].

Another motivation for emphasis on "national education" can be fear of young people developing loyalties to militant radical causes overseas. This concern is by no means confined to Asia – in my own home country, the UK, there was considerable shock when we learned that the suicide bombers in London in July 2005 were young Englishmen who had been to school in Yorkshire. Whether schooling alone can prevent young people from becoming terrorists is another matter, but the experience gave added impetus to the wish for education to produce patriotic British citizens.

I shall return later to the debate about whether it is desirable for programmes of national education, in my second sense, to be replaced by more internationally-focussed education. At this stage suffice it to say that there is no sign of any such trend in South East Asia. National education – aiming to promote knowledge and love of the home country – is very much part of 21st century educational life here and it would be foolish to overlook that fact or underestimate its importance.

International education

Let us now turn to the "international" side of the coin. Some attending this seminar come from "international schools", and this phrase can mean several different things:

- A school run by an international organisation, which has schools in more than one country
- A school following a curriculum or preparing for qualifications obtained in more than one country (for example, programmes leading to Cambridge International qualifications or the International Baccalaureate). There is no contradiction if all the students in an "international school", in this sense, are of the same nationality.
- A school intended primarily for children of citizens of one overseas country, often teaching in that country's language and offering programmes and qualifications in the overseas country's national system. Such schools are perhaps best described as "overseas" schools.
- A school following the national curriculum of the country in which it is situated, but particularly emphasising "international" curriculum content and experiences. This might be done, for example, by "twinning" arrangements with a school in another country or by having visiting teachers from overseas. In this sense, quite a lot of schools – whether run by the state or private - might wish to describe themselves as "international", while some might be selected to give this particular emphasis.

[5] See background at http://www.scmp.com/topics/national-education

Whether a school describes itself as an “international school” in any of these senses, it may purport to offer “international education”. Malcolm McKenzie (McKenzie 1998) has usefully distinguished five different senses in which the word “international” is used to describe education:

- “non-national”, referring to matters which are not specific to any particular country. Presumably, abstract subjects such as mathematics might be non-national in this sense, as might highly generic empirical subjects such as chemistry.
- “Pan-national” (applying across all – or most- countries). This sense is important for much of the international education movement, where there is a wish to focus on what unites people across the world rather than what divides them.
- “Ex-national” (expatriate). What I have described above as “overseas schools” (such as “the German school in Singapore”) offer education of this kind, which is really a form of exported national education in my first, general, sense of that term).
- “Multinational”, including examples and experiences relating to more than one country.
- “Transnational”, equipping students to cross national borders physically and mentally in the future. This sense is strongly present in discussions about the implications for education of increasing globalisation of employment and trade.

Our task is complicated further by the frequent use of the word “global” – and phrases containing that word – to describe international education. Sometimes the use of “global” is just pretentious, but in essence it appears to denote matters which apply to *all* countries, while “international” matters may concern relations between countries or be confined to a selected group of countries. Hence “global warming” might be described as an atmospheric phenomenon affecting all parts of the earth, even if its effects are more keenly felt in some than others.

Global education can be thought of as a response to “globalisation”, which normally refers to the speedy increases in recent years in inter-country industrial and financial transactions, economic interdependence, frequent and easy international travel and communication, cultural diffusion and exposure to ideas and influences from across the world. In the words of Professor Anthony Giddens in his 1999 Reith Lectures:

> “The changes are being propelled by a range of factors, some structural, others more specific and historical. Economic influences are certainly among the driving forces, especially the global financial system. Yet they aren't like forces of nature. They have been shaped by technology, and cultural diffusion, as well as by the decisions of governments to liberalise and deregulate their national economies.” (Giddens (1999))

Some welcome these trends, as potential forces for raising the quality of life, world peace, toleration and the spread of social justice in such areas as the rights of women, where, it is argued, international examples and comparisons have led to desirable change in many countries. Others, more disapprovingly, see "globalisation" as a euphemism for "Americanisation" or "Westernisation", and point to the ubiquity of Coca Cola and MacDonalds and, more generally, to the American culture of celebrity, including some figures whom we would not normally welcome as role models. Some of the language and literature of "globalisation" has been criticised as dominated by Western/US ideals prizing capitalism, representative democracy and social and political rights above all, and it would be understandable for such concerns to lead to caution in introducing Western packages of so-called "global education" uncritically in Asia.

Two phrases including the word "global" are frequently used as labels for international curricula or educational objectives. The first is "global perspective(s)". Indeed, Cambridge offers an IGCSE with that title (in its plural form), and a little more information about it is at Appendix A.

According to the dictionary, a perspective is "a way of regarding something", "a point of view". One presumes, therefore, that an educational programme labelled "global perspectives" aims to increase the points of reference and experience which students may bring to subjects – for example, by enabling them to compare a development in their own country with the way similar problems have been addressed elsewhere. Strictly speaking, if the perspectives are "global", rather than just "international", they should refer to the whole of the world, rather than to selected overseas countries. Some of the literature about "global perspectives" talks as if there were a single, identifiable "global perspective" (in the singular), which could be compared with regional, national and local perspectives, but I have not seen any clear explanation of what that means.

Even more problems are raised by the much-used concept of "global citizenship". Many countries state that they want their children to be educated to become "global citizens" – often also wanting them to be national citizens. What does this mean?

The dictionary defines "citizenship" as "the position or status of being a citizen of a particular country". By definition, citizenship of one country distinguishes the citizen from non-citizens or citizens of another country. And everyone pities the unfortunate "stateless" person who has no citizenship at all. So is it possible to talk of being a "global" citizen? Who/where are the non-citizens with whom global citizens are compared? Or is the phrase just a deliberate paradox? (Davies (2006)) In the Australian National Curriculum one of the stated desired outcomes for "citizenship education" is that "People who live in Australia should think of themselves as Australian first regardless of their background or country of origin" (ACARA (2010)). But they also want the children to become "global citizens". Are these objectives reconcilable?

There is no clarity of thought or discussion about this, and the phrase “global citizens” is often used carelessly. However, it may be helpful to think of it as an informative metaphor, designed to take some of the concepts normally thought of as part of citizenship education in a national context and applying them to pan-national aspects of the curriculum.

This means that an education in “global citizenship” is a deliberate attempt to introduce to the curriculum ideas referring to the whole world which we would normally think of as applying to national citizenship education. We are asking children to develop some of the same kinds of knowledge, skills, attitudes and feelings about the whole world that they do about their own country. It is *not*, however, about educating them about the whole world as if it were a (big) nation-state and a rival bidder (against their homeland) for their patriotic sentiments. Talk of “global citizenship” is a metaphor, not a competitor with national citizenship.

Citizenship education

When considering how compatible or incompatible programmes of national and international education really are, it may be helpful to consider these programmes using a typology that distinguishes different domains which can apply to both kinds of programme. This is illustrated in Box 2:

Box 2: A framework for comparing objectives of national and international education

Domain	National	International
Cognitive (knowledge, skills)		
Affective (feelings)		
Ethical/religious		
Participative		

If we can populate these domains with actual examples from national and international curricula in our own contexts, that should help to provide an evidence base for reflecting in a considered way on whether the two types of programme are in conflict or not.

It would require a much longer study to do justice to curricula used in individual South East Asian countries (or elsewhere), but an initial look at some examples immediately reveals many objectives and programmes that are common between national and international education, some that belong to one or the other but seem

able to co-exist uncontroversially, but a few instances in one kind of curriculum that might be seen as more provocative or confrontational to the other.

The cognitive domain (knowledge and skills) will include knowledge of national and international governmental systems and of how to exercise the rights and responsibilities of a citizen. The need to understand the civic systems in one's own country is unproblematic, however much or little the national system allows for multi-party democracy or free speech. However, read with an Asian eye, some of the literature of "international civics" is dominated by the United Nations and its derivatives and reflects that organisation's institutions and ideological priorities. Although almost all SE Asian countries are members of the United Nations (the exception being Taiwan), several (Brunei, Burma, Malaysia and Singapore) have not signed the main covenants[6] that give legal force to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. Hence an international programme such as has been promoted for UNESCO's "Associated Schools" in Europe and the Middle East (Box 3) does not seem so relevant in an Asian context:

.

Box 3: UNESCO
Human Rights on the Front Line

Associated Schools take for reference the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Rights of the Child, UNESCO's 1974 Recommendation, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004). Discussions must be based on the students' own experience in order to make them aware of their rights, duties and responsibilities. (UNESCO (2006))

The affective domain (feelings and attitudes) is reflected clearly in the extract at Box 4, from Singapore's "Desired Outcomes of Education":

[6] International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1976 and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1976

Box 4: Singapore
The Desired Outcomes of Education (2009)

"At the end of Primary school, students should:
...
know and love Singapore.

At the end of Secondary school, students should:
….
believe in Singapore and understand what matters to Singapore.

At the end of Post-Secondary education, students should :
…..
be proud to be Singaporeans and understand Singapore in relation to the world." (MOE, Singapore)

However, some tensions begin to creep in when we consider more radical expressions of the objectives of some international education programmes. In the UK, a "curriculum for global citizenship" offered by the international famine relief charity Oxfam expected children to be "outraged" by social injustice and determined to take action to put matters right (see Box 5). One wonders how many SE Asian national governments could honestly accept this as an educational objective consistent with their approach to national education.

Box 5: Oxfam (a UK-based international famine relief organisation)
We see the global citizen as someone who:

- is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen
- respects and values diversity
- has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally
- *is outraged by social injustice* [italics added]
- participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from the local to the global
- is willing to act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place
- takes responsibility for their actions. (Oxfam (1997))

At the level of ethics and values, there is much commonality between the objectives of many national and international programmes. Both tend to emphasise social responsibility and respect for others. A particularly strong bond between national and international education in many South East Asian countries is the need for children to develop inter-racial respect and understanding. The threat of racial conflict is very high on the national priorities of many countries in Asia – as in other continents, including Europe – and recent episodes of international terrorism have heightened the risks from disaffected racial groups.

Thus, the objective of developing respect for other races is common ground of many national and international curricula. This is illustrated in the extract at Box 6 from the Malaysian "Education Blueprint" and also in the example of a class exercise in Scotland (Box 7). In this context, readers may also be interested in the example, reproduced at Appendix B, of an Australian test question about national identities in a multiracial context.

Box 6: Malaysian Education Blueprint (2012)
Shift 3: Develop values-driven Malaysians

What success will look like: every student leaves school as a global citizen imbued with core, universal, values and a strong Malaysian identity. The values they have learnt are applied in their day to day lives, leading to more civic behaviour such as an increase in volunteerism; a willingness to embrace peoples of other nationalities, religions and ethnicities; and a reduction in corruption and crime. Every student also leaves school prepared to become a leader, whether in their own lives and families, or as part of the broader community and nation. (Ministry of Education, Malaysia (2012)

Box 7: Scotland (UK): Developing global citizens within Curriculum for Excellence
(Example of a school project)

'Threads in the tartan' provides a vehicle for the examination of the role of the individual in the context of the wider community based on the core values of wisdom, justice, compassion and integrity. It provides a motivational basis for learners to develop skills in research and investigation and addresses experiences and outcomes in religious and moral education, literacy, health and wellbeing and social studies.

In order to deepen the learning experience, representatives of the [local] police and an African poet work with the learners to contextualise their learning in real-life settings. Through poetry, drama, storyboarding and film making the children and young people communicate their own personal experiences, thoughts and feelings regarding social inclusion for all. (Learning and Teaching Scotland (2011))

Some programmes of international education derive from, or seek their legitimacy from particular positions on "global" ethical imperatives such as world peace, universal human rights or promoting sustainable development. Indeed, there is a separate literature on "education for sustainable development", which is defined by the (UK) Council for Environmental Education in the following terms:

> "Education for sustainable development enables people to develop the knowledge, values and skills to participate in decisions about the way we do things individually and collectively, both globally and locally, that will improve the quality of life now without damaging the planet for the future." (CEE(1998))

Again, however, there is much common ground between this theme and national imperatives regarding waste management, conservation of resources and policies on such matters as fuel sourcing and the preservation of agricultural land. An interest in sustainable development is not exclusive to international education.

Finally, there can be tensions in the domain of action. Many programmes of international education include the slogan "Think global[ly], act local[ly]" and in practice for most children the arena for them to put their learning into practice will initially be their school and local community. Many schools have councils or mock-parliaments for students to develop political skills and many encourage conservation projects and community service. However, there may be differences concerning the distance governments want students to travel in in the arenas of political activism

and the extent to which they want them to study international social movements or overseas models for communicating dissident views.

Finally, a distinction which cuts across the categories I have set out in Box 2, and which applies to both national and international educational curricula, is between programmes which are presented as discrete subjects, to be added on to the existing curriculum, and those which are supposed to be reflected in the way that all subjects are taught. In the case of national and/or international education in several Asian countries, including Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore, there has been a tendency to move from the first approach (a discrete subject) to the second (an aspect of all). Thus, for example, national values are to be reflected in the teaching of history and literature, and international issues such as conservation and human rights can be reflected in science classes. In Singapore, the "National Education" program me of the 1990s is now subsumed into the broader "Character and Citizenship Education" which is to be delivered across all aspects of the curriculum and school life.

This integrated approach may ease some problems, such as finding curricular time for the "extra" subject(s), but it can raise others, as teachers will need help to reflect national or international policy aims in all their subject teaching[7]. It is not obvious what "patriotic maths" would look like, and that would not be a trivial question for a maths teacher expected to deliver national education objectives in his or her classroom.

Conclusion: what is the relationship between national and international education?

Having considered specific national and international programmes in the way I have suggested, we shall be better equipped to consider whether they are in conflict or not – particularly in a SE Asian context. I shall conclude by briefly outlining four possible answers to that question, and then a fifth which I commend for further exploration.

The first answer is that of the sceptic: that either international education or national education will die out naturally, and so the question will answer itself. In the past, some Western sociologists have argued for an inevitable progress of a secular form of international capitalism, linked to the decline of the nation state. Perhaps this was wishful thinking on their part. But, as I have stated earlier in this paper, there is no evidence to support a theory of declining emphasis of the nation state, particularly in SE Asia. Neither, I would add, is there evidence to support any assumptions of an international spread of secularism, other than (perhaps) in Western Europe.

[7] For a discussion of this dilemma in the context of Indonesian national education, see http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2013/02/21/new-national-curriculum-leaves-teachers-experts-confused.html

The other group of cynics argue that international education, global citizenship and the likes are just fads and can be ignored while we concentrate on concerns closer to home. Again, I think that this is unsustainable: as we have seen, many issues are shared between the national and national arena in multi-cultural societies, and through TV, social media and the internet, students will experience an international curriculum in life, whether or not they do at school.

The second answer stems from an internationalist ethical position: that there *is* a potential conflict between nationalism and the aims of international education, and it is desirable for international education to prevail. This position should not be discounted, as its supporters include such names as John Dewey (in the quote at the beginning of this paper) and the 1999 Reith lecturer Anthony Giddens. In reply, I would point out, first, that there is much common ground between national and international education, so they are not always in conflict. However, it must be true that exposing students to other cultures and points of view may encourage them to question what they have previously been taught. At the very least, as Davies has said, they will be "less likely to accept passively the imperatives of unquestioning allegiance to cultural traditions." (Davies (2006)). I would argue, with Dewey and Giddens, that all national governments should be prepared to open up their national programmes at least to scrutiny from a "global perspective". However, I would add that the values underpinning the (largely Western) internationalist position are themselves open to question from national and other traditions, and therefore that the rights and wrongs of this contest – if it is a contest – are not as heavily slanted in favour of internationalism as Dewey and Giddens would have us believe.

The third answer is that there is no problem – national and international educational programmes are always fully compatible. I hope that some of the examples in this paper have shown that the problem cannot be dismissed so complacently. Despite the large amount of common ground, we have seen several examples of actual or potential tensions. There is a case to answer – even if, as I believe, the evidence will support a conclusion that the two types of educational programme are largely compatible. .

The fourth reply is that national education should be expected to flourish in the foreseeable future, particularly in SE Asia, as an antidote or balance to the excesses of internationalism. In the words of Kennedy and Lee:

> "Increasing liberalization – whether it was in relation to trade or the school curriculum – was not seen in any way to be a reason for discarding traditional values. In the minds of many [Asian] leaders there seemed to be an inverse relationship – the freer and more globalised the trading environment and the freer and more liberal the school curriculum, the more necessary it was to retain local values." Kennedy and Lee (2008)

On this analysis, the more Asian countries open up to international trade and welcome international intellectuals, the more they will need to compensate for the cultural ill-effects by programmes of "national education". An example of this "balancing" view of national education is found in statements by the Thai Government about "the 21st century Thai learner", where the seventh of eight headings is:

> "7. Thai values and morals. Nurturing and developing a strong set of Thai and moral values is important *given the threats placed by Globalisation on national language and identity.*" (Ministry of Education, Thailand (undated) (italics added))

The Kennedy and Lee analysis may be realistic as a descriptive account of what to expect in SE Asia in the next few years, but it is not clear what its authors' normative position is – what they think ought to happen. I shall therefore conclude with a fifth option, which reflects my own developing position and which I would invite others to consider.

My (fifth) reply to the question is that there should be an ongoing dynamic relationship between international and national education. This is particularly important in SE Asian countries as there are differences between the traditions of Western post-war internationalism (based on the United Nations) and the philosophies of many of the newer nation states in SE Asia and of the older Eastern civilisations. International education should be able to inform and challenge national education, *and vice versa*. Arguably, international education in the second half of the 21st century would be richer if it were to take on board Eastern concepts of the family, the dignity due to the elderly and respect for the spiritual dimension. And in the other direction, exposure to international thinking could equip young South East Asians to persuade their governments to allow them to play a more active part in their national political and social arenas without this been seen as a challenge to national loyalty or patriotism.

Bibliography

ACARA (2010*), [Australian] National Assessment Program – Civics and Citizenship: Assessment Framework*, May 2010, downloaded from http://www.nap.edu.au/nap-sample-assessments/napsa-assessment-frameworks.html

Beedle, Paul (2000), "How global? How local? Culture as an ingredient in the assessment design mix", paper delivered to the 2000 conference of the International Association for Educational Assessment (www.**iaea**.info/) (copy obtained from the author)

Chia Yeow Tong (2012), "What is national education? The origins and introduction of the 'national education' programme in Singapore", in Tan, Jason (ed) (2012)

CEE (1998), *Education for sustainable development in the schools sector: a report to the Panel for Education for Sustainable Development* (Council for Environmental Education (UK), cited in Davies (2006) (below)

Davies, Lynn (2006), "Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action?", *Educational Review*, 58:1, February 2006, pp 5-25.

Dewey, John (1916), *Democracy and Education*, PDF available online from pdfbooks.co.za

Giddens (1999), "Runaway world", BBC Reith Lectures 1999, by Professor Anthony Giddens, videos and texts at http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/events/reith_99/

Hayden, Mary and Thomson, Jeff (eds) (1998), *International Education: Principles and Practice*, Taylor & Francis, London and New Yorkj

Heng, S K (2001): Speech by (Singapore) Education Minister Heng to the Workplan Seminar, September 2011, reported at http://www.moe.gov.sg/media/speeches/2011/09/22/work-plan-seminar-2011.php

Kennedy, Kerry J and Lee, John Chi-kin (2008), *The changing role of schools in Asian societies*, Routledge, London and New York

Kennedy, Kerry J and Mellor, Suzanne (2005), "Developing a Democracy of the Mind: lessons for Australian schools from the IEA Civic Education Study", in Wilde (ed) (2205), pp 49 – 59

Lall, Marie and Vickers, Edward (eds) (2009), *Education as a Political Tool in Asia* , Routledge, London and New York

Law, Wing-Wah (2011), *Citizenship and Citizenship Education in a Global Age: Politics, policies and practices in China*, Global Studies in Education, Vol 2, Peter Lang, New York

Learning and Teaching Scotland (2011), *Developing global citizens within Curriculum for Excellence*, www.LTScotland.org.uk/globalcitizenship

Lee Kuan Yew (2012), *My lifelong challenge: Singapore's bilingual journey*, Straits Times Press, Singapore

Lee, W O (2005), "Aspirations for Democracy in the Absence of a Democracy: civic education in Hong Kong before and after 1997", in Wilde (ed) 2005), pp 61 – 85

McKenzie, Malcolm (1998), "Going, going, gone… global!", in Hayden and Thomson (eds) (1998), pp 242-252

MCEETYA (Ministerial Council for Education Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs, Australia) (2008), *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*, 5 December 2008, http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/mceecdya/melbourne_declaration,25979.html

Ministry of Education, Malaysia (2012) *Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013-2025*, www.moe.gov.my/userfiles/file/PPP/Preliminary-**Blueprint**-Eng.pdf

Ministry of Education, Thailand (undated), *Towards a learning Society in Thailand: Developing 21st century skills*, downloaded at http://www.bic.moe.go.th/th/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=285&catid=44&Itemid=50

MOE (1997), Ministry of Education (Singapore) , Press Release No : 017/97 ("National Education"), http://www.moe.gov.sg/media/press/1997/pr01797.htm

Muller, Gotelind (ed) (2011), *Designing History in East Asia Textbooks: Identity politics and transnational expectations*, Routledge, London and New York

Oxfam (1997) *A curriculum for global citizenship*, Oxfam, Oxford

Pasternak, Michael (1998), "Is International Education a Pipe Dream? A Question of Values", in Hayden and Thomson *eds) (1998), pp 253-275

Tan, Jason (ed) (2012), *Education in Singapore: taking stock, looking forward*, Pearson, Singapore

UNESCO (2000), *Globalisation and Living Together: The Challenges for Educational Content in Asia*, UNESCO, Paris, downloaded from www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user.../finrep_newdelhi_99.pdf

UNESCO (2006), *Learning to live together*, information sheet accessed from www.unesco.org/education/asp

Vickers, Edward (2009), "Education, identity and the politics of modern state formation in Asia", in Lall and Vickers (eds) (2009), pages 10-32

Vickers, Edward (2011), “learning to love the motherland: ‘National Education’ in post-retrocession Hong Kong”, in Muller (ed) (2001), p 85

Wilde, Stephanie (ed) (2005), *Political and citizenship education: international perspectives*, *Oxford Studies in Comparative Education* , Vol 14, No 2, Symposium Books, Oxford

Appendix A

Cambridge IGCSE Global Perspectives

Extracts from syllabus for assessment in 2013
(http://www.cie.org.uk/qualifications/academic/middlesec/igcse/subject?assdef_id=998)

1.2 Why choose Cambridge IGCSE Global Perspectives?

Cambridge IGCSE Global Perspectives provides opportunities for enquiry into, and reflection on, key global issues from a personal, local/national and global perspective.

Young people globally face unprecedented challenges in an interconnected and information-heavy world, not least in how they will gain a sense of their own active place in the world and cope with changes that will impact on their life chances and life choices.

Students will have opportunities to acquire and apply a range of skills, including:
- gathering, synthesising and communicating information
- collaborating with others to achieve a common outcome
- analysing and evaluating planning, processes and outcomes
- developing and justifying a line of reasoning

Students will explore stimulating topics that have global significance. They will assess information critically and explore lines of reasoning. They will learn to collaborate with others from another culture, community or country, directing much of their own learning and developing an independence of thought.

The syllabus emphasises the development and application of skills rather than the acquisition of knowledge. Students will develop transferable skills that will be useful for further study and for young people as active citizens of the future.

Cambridge IGCSE Global Perspectives encourages awareness of global problems and offers opportunities to explore possible solutions through cooperation and collaboration. The course is not about getting everybody to think identically; rather it is a matter of opening minds to the great complexity of the world and of human thought, and opening hearts to the diversity of human experience and feeling.

3.1 Aims

This syllabus will appeal to candidates not simply because it will extend their understanding of the world, but also because it will develop their potential to understand different perspectives and to make reasoned responses; skills which will be useful in their study of other disciplines and for their life-long learning.

Candidates examine a range of global issues from a variety of different perspectives, drawing on a variety of subjects. Global issues should be explored from a personal, local/national and global perspective, and could include almost any discipline, from the literary to the scientific, but should include a cross-cultural perspective.

Cambridge IGCSE Global Perspectives aims to develop learners who:
• are independent and empowered to take their place in an ever-changing, information-heavy, interconnected world
• have an analytical, evaluative grasp of global issues and their causes, effects and possible solutions
• enquire into and reflect on issues independently and in collaboration with others from a variety of different cultures, communities and countries
• can communicate sensitively with people from a variety of backgrounds
• work independently as well as part of a team, directing much of their own learning with the teacher as facilitator
• consider important issues from personal, local/national and global perspectives and who understand the links between them
• critically assess the information available to them and make judgements • can support judgements with lines of reasoning
• have a sense of their own, active place in the world
• can empathise with the needs and rights of others#

3.2 Assessment objectives

Throughout the course, candidates gather, analyse and present information about a range of global issues, researching different perspectives.

AO1	Research, understand and present global issues from different perspectives, including personal, local/national and global, as well as cross-cultural perspectives.	20%
AO2	Analyse and evaluate issues and sources. Explore the current situation, the causes and effects and suggest possible consequences and courses of action.	30%
AO3	Explore and reflect on personal perspectives and	25%

	on the perspectives of others on a variety of global issues. Develop a line of reasoning to support a view, decision or course of action.	
AO4	Collaborate with others to plan and carry out a project leading to a clear outcome. Evaluate the project and personal contributions to and learning from the project.	25%

Appendix B

Australia: Civics and citizenship, sample assessment question

Years 6 and 10

The photograph below is of girls wearing the Australian flag as their hijab. A hijab is a scarf that many Muslim girls and women choose to wear.
What **attitudes** are these girls showing by using the Australian flag as their hijab?

……..

Scoring Categories

Full Credit

*Refers to positive attitudes towards **both** a Muslim and Australian identity*

Partial Credit

*Refer either to (positive attitudes towards**)** the Australian identity or Muslim **i**dentity*