

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326412866>

A Confucian conception of citizenship education

Preprint · July 2018

CITATIONS
0

READS
162

1 author:



[Charlene Tan](#)

Nanyang Technological University

155 PUBLICATIONS 1,394 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Tan, C. (2018). A Confucian conception of citizenship education. In Peterson, A., Stahl, G. & Soong, H. (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Citizenship and Education* (pp. 1-13). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

DRAFT

Abstract

This chapter examines a Confucian conception of citizenship education by focusing on Confucius' teachings and actions as recorded in the *Analects (Lunyu)*. Confucius' belief in the historicity and potential of human beings motivates him to emphasise the inheritance, acquisition, critical reflection and appropriation of traditional knowledge for citizenship education. He balances teacher directiveness and student autonomy by foregrounding human beings as both recipients and creators of their own culture. Three main characteristics of a Confucian worldview of citizenship education are highlighted in this chapter. First, that the goal of citizenship education is to nurture *junzi* (exemplary persons) who perform their social roles and participate actively in their communities in accordance with *zhengming* (rectification of names). Second, that a Confucian citizenship education curriculum reflects a 'thick' conception of human good through a substantive framework of beliefs and values that centres on *dao* (Way). Third, that a recommended pedagogical approach, as demonstrated by Confucius, is dialogue to foster reflective citizens. A Confucian conception of citizenship education as outlined in this chapter debunks the perception that Confucius and Confucianism necessarily promote authoritarian leadership, unquestioning obedience to authority, passive citizenship and political indoctrination.

Keywords: citizenship education, Confucius, *dao* (Way), dialogue, *junzi* (exemplary person), *zhengming* (rectification of names)

Introduction

A core identity in our modern world is that of citizenship. Broadly speaking, citizenship in a democracy comprises the following: "(a) gives membership status to individuals within a political unit; (b) confers an identity on individuals; (c) constitutes a set of values, usually interpreted as a commitment to the common good of a particular political unit; (d) involves practicing a degree of participation in the process of political life; and (e) implies gaining and using knowledge and understanding of laws, documents, structures, and processes of governance" (Abowitz & Harnish 2006, 653).

Education of/through/for citizenship has become a primary concern in many countries in their endeavors to nurture citizens who possess the capacity to address local and global issues rationally (Gilbert 1996; Crick 1998; Criddle, Vidovich, and O'Neill 2004; Noddings 2013). A survey of the developments in citizenship education for the past few decades reveals a shift from state formation and patriotic education to wider conceptions such as supranational, multicultural, critical and cyber citizenship (Kerr 1999; Johnson and Morris 2010). Citizenship education is a general, contested and evolving term that encompasses, *inter alia*, civics, democratic education, national education and political education (Carr 1995; McLaughlin 1992; Amadeo, Schwille, and Torney-Purta 1999; Kerr 1999). The specific definitions of and pedagogical

approaches to citizenship education depend on a host of contextual factors such as historical tradition, geographical position, socio-political structure, economic system, and global trends (Kerr 1999). Different writers have devised various concepts, models, frameworks and analytical tools to explain citizenship education (e.g. Galston 1989; Carr 1995; McLaughlin 1992; Cogan and Derricott 1998; Kerr 1999, Westheimer and Kahne 2004; Johnson and Morris 2010). In their literature review, Abowitz and Harnish (2006) identify seven distinct but overlapping frameworks, with the ‘civic republican’ and ‘liberal’ frameworks being the two most influential in shaping current citizenship education.

Citizenship education may be predicated upon a ‘thin’ or ‘thick’ conception of human good or perfection (McLaughlin 1992). These two conceptions reflect the extent to which a citizenship education approach stipulates specific substantial frameworks of belief and value for citizens. Citizenship education that adheres to a ‘thick’ conception of human good provides a comprehensive account of human life and how it should be lived; such a conception is invoked to constitute, support and justify the notion of the public good (McLaughlin 1992). A ‘thin’ conception of human good or perfection, on the other hand, requires the state to be neutral on matters of private good. As explained by McLaughlin (1992):

What is needed for this purpose is a ‘thin’ conception of the good, free of significantly controversial assumptions and judgments, which maximize the freedom of citizens to pursue their diverse private conceptions of the good within a framework of justice. An example of an aspect of a ‘thin’ conception of the good is a commitment to the requirements of basic social morality. The label ‘thin’ here refers not to the insignificance of such values, but to their independence from substantial, particular, frameworks of belief and value (240).

It should be clarified that these two interpretations are not the only two approaches to citizenship education, nor are they mutually exclusive. Instead, a plurality of interpretations exists along the spectrum with overlaps among them.

Besides understanding citizenship education in terms of its relationship with human good or perfection, it is also important to identify the ideological and cultural underpinnings of citizenship education. A review of literature published in English shows that the existing citizenship education frameworks are largely premised on Western/Enlightenment histories, traditions, developments and presuppositions. The term ‘citizenship’ is a Western concept that originates from Athenian democracy (Carr 1995). Abowitz and Harnish (2006) point out that the dominant citizenship discourses of civic republicanism and liberalism are both “Enlightenment-inspired” (654). The ‘Western imagination’ – the Enlightenment settlement, its values, practices and institutions – has been exported to the rest of the world as objective and universal worldviews (Kennedy 2004). Relatively little attention has been paid to non-Western conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education, especially East-Asian viewpoints. Although there is a growing body of literature on Confucian perspectives of citizenship and citizenship education, these works are primarily concerned with aspects of citizenship such as democracy, liberalism, human rights, civil society, equality and individuality (e.g. Shils 1996; Nuyen 2001, 2002; O’Dwyer 2003; Ackerly 2005; Kim 2010; Yung 2010; Spina, Shin and Cha 2011; Shih 2014; Wang 2016; Zhai 2017). There is, to date, no systematic presentation of a Confucian conception of citizenship education based on the teachings and actions of Confucius himself.

This chapter introduces a Confucian conception of citizenship education through a textual analysis of the *Analects* (*Lunyu*). A Confucian canon, the *Analects* compiles the sayings and conduct of Confucius and his disciples. The concept of citizenship is defined broadly in this chapter to refer to a practice through which humans actively participate in their communities, negotiating their range of identities as they do so (Peterson & Brock, 2017). The methodology of this chapter, it should be added at the outset, is theoretical rather than empirical, with a focus on the philosophical basis for citizenship education as advocated by Confucius. The next section elucidates the key features of a Confucian conception of citizenship education based on relevant passages from the *Analects*.

A Confucian Conception of Citizenship Education

There is no historical record of Confucius (551–479 B.C.E.) discussing the membership status and political identity of citizens or the legislation, systems and processes in a nation-state since these concepts and practices did not exist during his time. But we should not thereby conclude that citizenship education and issues related to citizenship are of no significance to Confucius. On the contrary, Confucius has much to say about citizenship education in terms of an individual's commitment to the common good and active participation in one's community (Abowitz and Harnish 2006; Peterson and Brock 2017). Confucius states that a person is takes part in government simply by being a good son and brother (*Analects* 2.21). Clarifying Confucius' position, Shils (1996) writes, "Confucius means that maintaining the family is a contribution to maintaining public order or social harmony and hence is a contribution to the work of the government" (49). We could identify three main characteristics of a Confucian conception of citizenship education from the philosophy and conduct of Confucius, and these will now be considered.

***Junzi* (Exemplary persons) and *Zhengming* (Rectification of Names)**

First, the goal of citizenship education is to nurture *junzi* (noble or exemplary persons) who perform their social roles and participate actively in their communities in accordance with *zhengming* (rectification of names). The term 'junzi', literally 'son of a lord', was already in circulation during Confucius' time and denoted members of the aristocratic society. Confucius borrowed this term by extending it to all human beings: anyone can and should be a *junzi* by becoming a morally noble person. A *junzi* is exemplary as such a person is distinguished by humanity or benevolence (*ren*): Confucius observes that a *junzi* "does not leave *ren* even for the space of one meal" (*Analects* 4.5; all citations are taken from this text and translated to English by the author, unless otherwise stated). *Ren* encompasses all virtues such as reverence, sincerity, empathy, tolerance, trustworthiness, diligence and generosity (see *Analects* 12.1, 17.6) (Tan 2017). While all human beings are encouraged to become *junzi* although not everyone will eventually succeed in doing so, a person who aspires for political office and leadership must be a *junzi*. Confucius identifies five virtues of a *junzi*-ruler: "The *junzi* is generous without being wasteful, works the people hard without their complaining, has desires without being covetous, is at ease without being arrogant, and is awe-inspiring without being fierce" (20.2). As a *ren* (humane) leader, a *junzi* follows the footsteps of sage-kings such as Yao and Sun "to cultivate

oneself in order to bring peace to the multitude” (14.42). Rather than imposing authoritarian rule, an office bearer is a *junzi* who is sensitive to the needs of the common people (1.5, 12.20, 20.2). An example is Zichan who is a minister praised by Confucius for being a *junzi* in performing his duties: “He had the way of the *junzi* in four respects: he was reverential in the way he conducted himself, respectful in serving his superiors, generous in caring for the common people, and appropriate in employing the services of the common people” (5.16). Calling for active citizenship, Confucius envisions himself and his disciples assuming political leadership so that they could eliminate the oppressive regime and enact humane policies for the common good.

How then should one perform one’s social roles – whether as a ruler or the ruled – and contribute to the larger good? The answer, according to Confucius, is to conduct oneself according to *zhengming* (rectification of names). The *Analects* records an episode where Duke Jing of Qi asks Confucius about governance (12.11). Confucius replies, “Let the lord be a true lord, the ministers true ministers, the fathers true fathers, and the sons true sons” (translation by Slingerland 2003). Upon hearing Confucius’ response, the Duke says, “Indeed! If the ruler be not a ruler, the subject not a subject, the father not a father, the son not a son, then even if there were grain, would I get to eat it?”. Another passage in the *Analects* illuminates the principle of *zhengming*:

When names are not correct, what is said will not be used effectively; when what is said is not used effectively, matters will not be accomplished; when matters are not accomplished, ritual propriety and music will not flourish; when ritual propriety and music do not flourish, punishments will miss the mark; when punishments miss the mark, the people will not know what to do with themselves (13.3, italics added).

The expression, ‘names are not correct’ refers to not living up to the expectations commensurate with one’s name or social role, be it as a ruler, subject, father or son (Tan 2013a). Confucius’ point is that one’s name brings with it not just descriptive content but also normative force. As Lai (1995) explains, “individuals have to live appropriately according to the titles and names, indicating their ranks and statuses within relationships, by which they are referred to” because these terms “prescribe how values upholding the various roles are to be realized within the fundamental reality of the lived human world” (252). A ruler has a ‘correct name’ when such a person fulfils one’s calling as a true ruler, i.e., becoming a *junzi*-ruler who is marked by *ren*. The words of such a ruler will then ‘be used effectively’, i.e., his or her policies will accomplish their goals. Such a ruler succeeds in demonstrating and upholding wisdom, benevolence and ritual propriety (15.33), promoting virtuous officials and keeping immoral persons at bay (12.22), and winning the hearts of the multitude by modeling qualities of reverence, tolerance, trustworthiness, diligence and generosity (17.6). By the same logic, a subject is a *junzi* who lives appropriately to one’s name by being loyal to one’s ruler and performing one’s multiple roles in society, whether as a mother, sister, colleague, friend and neighbor. It should be added that the subject’s loyalty to the ruler is not unconditional as Confucius discourages unquestioning obedience to authority. Confucius himself critiques the office-holders during his time as “petty bureaucrats” (13.20) and announces his vexation with political rulers for their immoral and oppressive behaviour (3.26, 3.1, 3.2). Rather than a blind allegiance to those in power, Confucius advises those serving

one's lord to be honest and speak up for what is right at an opportune time (14.22). In his exchange with Duke Ding on what causes a state to perish, Confucius observes:

If what the ruler says is good, and no one opposes him, is this not good? On the other hand, if what he says is not good, and no one opposes him, does this not come close to being a single saying, that can cause a state to perish?" (13.15, translation by Slingerland 2003)

With reference to 13.15, the standard for determining what is good or otherwise is not the prevailing norm espoused by the ruler or the masses. Instead, it is *dao* (Way), which brings us to the next characteristic of a Confucian conception of citizenship education.

A 'Thick' Conception of Human Good through *Dao* (Way)

The second feature of a Confucian framework of citizenship education is the centrality of *dao* (Way) that comprises a substantive framework of beliefs and values. Such a framework reflects a 'thick' conception of human good or perfection. Recall that a 'thick' conception of human good provides a comprehensive and normative account of human life that constitutes, fortifies and substantiates the notion of the public good (McLaughlin 1992). A 'thin' conception of human good, in contrast, is devoid of ostensibly controversial assumptions and judgments; this conception maximizes the freedom of citizens to pursue their diverse private conceptions of the good within a framework of justice (McLaughlin 1992). *Dao* (Way) refers to the Way of sage-kings such as Yao, Shun, and Yu in ancient China. Confucius teaches that "it is human beings who are able to broaden *dao*, not *dao* that broadens human beings" (15.29). To broaden *dao* is to "make and remake appropriate ways of living" through the conscious efforts of human beings (Kim 2004, 123). A *junzi* is "anxious about *dao*" (15.32) and "learns in order to reach that *dao*" (19.7). So important is *dao* for a *junzi* that he or she is prepared to take up an official position only if doing so advances *dao*. The *Analects* records Confucius praising Qu Bo-yu who is "prepared to hold an office only when *dao* prevailed in a state" (15.7). Confucius hopes to nurture a community of *junzi* who broaden *dao* by transforming society's political structure from rule by law and punishment, to rule by virtue.

It is important to locate Confucius' perspective on citizenship education within his worldview of the historicity and potential of human beings. Such a belief motivates him to give weight to the inheritance, acquisition, critical reflection and appropriation of traditional knowledge. On the one hand, Confucius' cognizance of the condition of human beings as historical beings leads him to respect the inheritance and acquisition of cultural knowledge as part of citizenship education. Confucius' assertion that he "transmits but does not make; trusts in and loves antiquity" (7.1) reveals his wish to transmit the *dao* of the sage-kings as epitomized in the Zhou culture. He advises his own son to learn the poems from the Book of Songs (16.13) and teaches his students the ancient 'arts' (7.6) that comprise ritual propriety, music, archery, charioteering, calligraphy and mathematics. What qualifies as 'good' and 'right', for Confucius, emanates from and is continuously shaped by Chinese history, cultural tradition and epistemology. Hall and Ames (1987) elaborate on the cultural embeddedness of knowledge for Confucius:

For Confucius, knowledge is grounded in the language, customs, and institutions that comprise culture. Culture is the given world. Thinking is cultural articulation that renders this givenness effective. There is no knowledge to be gained of a reality which precedes that of culture or transcends its determinations. The ‘world’ is always a human world (67).

A Confucian citizenship education curriculum, therefore, should not be primarily derived from and organized by the students’ own views of the world. Instead, it should include the history, norms and cultural practices of one’s tradition (Tan 2017). This means, for example, introducing the music of the Zhou dynasty to students for them to appreciate the Confucian ideal of harmony, rather than letting students choose or compose their own music in whichever way they like.

Confucius’ attention to cultural inheritance does not imply that he endorses a wholesale transmission of traditional knowledge. Instead, he supports a selective adoption of the normative tradition that showcases the ability of human beings to change the world of history. Although human beings are entrusted with the mission to extend *dao*, *dao* is by no means fossilized and unchanging. Instead, *dao* “consists of the process of generating an actual order in the world rather than an already fixed order” and “human beings have to set boundaries for themselves and for other things as they move forward in the world” (Li 2006, 594). A content mastery of cultural knowledge does not mean that human beings are pre-determined and mere objects. On the contrary, Confucius’ conviction that human beings are subjects in the historical process prompts him to propagate a critical reflection and appropriation of received knowledge. Confucius cautions against accepting conventional wisdom and social norms unconditionally, since they are situated in their own historicity. Confucius himself does not subscribe to any preconceived ideas of what is permissive or not (18.8). Instead, he arrives at his own conclusions through a critical awareness of the object of the knowledge.

Confucius’ disregard of popular opinion is evident in his decision to give his daughter in marriage to Gongye Chang, who is a convicted criminal. At first glance, this decision is puzzling since most fathers would not desire their daughters to marry someone who has transgressed the law. But *Analects* 5.1 informs us that Confucius has prior knowledge that Gongye Chang is “not guilty of any crime”. By assessing Gongye Chang’s character, Confucius concludes that he “will be a suitable choice for a husband” (5.1). Confucius’ judgement therefore goes against societal norms and is based on facts and a person’s moral attributes. In another episode, when asked what he thinks of a person who is liked by all the villagers, rather than praising such a person, Confucius asserts that it is better “for the good villagers to like that person and those who are not good to hate that person (13.24). Confucius’ point is that we should strive to be moral persons who make good judgements that would attract like-minded people to us, rather than seeking to please everyone. The implication is that the learning of one’s normative tradition in citizenship education does not mean that the tradition should be accepted unconditionally, or that such learning should take place uncritically. On the contrary, as I have argued elsewhere, learners within a Confucian framework are encouraged to critique the cultural traditions and knowledge they have received:

As part of the reservoir of information, tools, and resources for praxis, at least one normative tradition from within the learners’ culture should be introduced to the learners. The objective is two-fold: to provide the learners, especially

children, with the cultural coherence and an initial framework for them to acquire a substantive set of practices, beliefs, and values; and to prepare the learners to subsequently critique the normative tradition itself and develop their own views (Tan 2017, 10).

In short, citizenship education from a Confucian viewpoint is enacted through comprehending and realizing the reading of the text (normative tradition of the Way and passed down through classic texts) and reading of the context (the prevailing social and political oppression in China).

The Utilization of Dialogue to foster Reflective Citizens

The third characteristic of a Confucian conception of citizenship education is the recommended pedagogical approach of *dialogue* to foster reflective citizens. Confucius eschews indoctrination by stating that a person who can recite three hundred poems but is unable to perform an official duty and exercise one's initiative when sent abroad has wasted one's effort in memorising the poems (13.5). He also cautions against merely repeating what one has heard without verifying the truth for oneself (17.14). Instead, Confucius stresses the primacy of fostering reflective thinking in his disciples. Reflection is premised on the love of learning (1.14, 17.8) and the harmonization of learning and reflection (2.15). Underlining active learning, Confucius avers, "I do not know what to do with a person who does not say, 'What should I do? What should I do?'" (15.16) He also highlights the need to ask questions (19.6) and inquire into a matter deeply. As he puts it, "When the multitude hates a person, you must examine the matter yourself; when the multitude love a person, you must examine the matter yourself" (15.28). Confucius also supports flexibility and openness by replacing dogmatism with contextual understanding (4.15) and discretion (9.30). Underscoring the importance of adjusting one's responses in accordance with the other person's readiness to listen, he teaches: "If someone is open to what you have to say, but you do not speak to them, this is letting the person go to waste; if, however, someone is not open to what you have to say, but you speak to them anyway, this is letting your words go to waste." (15.8, translated by Slingerland 2003). Reflective thinking equips individuals to abide by *zhengming* as the former guides a person to self-examine one's role performance as follows: "Have I done my best in my undertakings on behalf of others? Have I been trustworthy in my interactions with friends? Have I failed to put into practice what was passed to me?" (1.4) Through reflective thinking, Confucius aims to nurture citizens who exercise their agency by participating purposefully and ethically for the public good.

A defining teaching approach propagated and modelled by Confucius is dialogue. The *Analects* is essentially a compilation of 'ordered sayings' of Confucius that can be traced to his discourses with people around him (Slingerland 2003). The conversations provide a platform for Confucius to instruct his disciples by engaging them in real-life personal, social and political issues. Yang and Yang (2016) elaborate that "there was no separation between classroom and society, Confucius's classroom was the entire world 'under the sky or heaven,' and the process of his teaching was life itself" (110). An interactive form of teaching encourages his disciples to critically reflect and discuss the political and social state of affairs against the standard of *dao*, and the practical steps they could take to redress the prevailing unrest. Using the analogy of a square with four corners, Confucius sees the teacher as providing only

the basic content ('one corner') and the students are expected to make their own inferences ('the other three corners') (7.8). In the process, mutual teaching and learning take place, where the teacher is being (re)formed and the student forms him/herself.

Two passages in the *Analects* shed further light on Confucius's employment of dialogue to foster an environment where the teacher and students teach and learn from each other. The first passage is taken from 3.8:

Zixia asked, "Her entrancing smile with dimples, Her beautiful eyes so clear, Unadorned upon which to paint'. What does this mean?"

The Master replied, "The plain base comes first, then the colors are applied."

Zixia said, "Just like ritual propriety that come after?"

The Master replied, "Zixia, you have stimulated my thoughts. It is only with someone like you that one can discuss the Songs."

In the above exchange, Confucius and Zixia are discussing a line from the Book of Songs. After Confucius replies to Zixia's first question, the latter responds with a second question. This time, Zixia ingeniously relates the meaning of the poem to an ethical question on the relationship between the concepts of ritual propriety (colors) and rightness (plain canvas). Such an inference between two topics is not planned nor expected by Confucius, prompting him to remark that Zixia's comment has stimulated or awakened his thought on the topic. The above dialogue is an instance where the student arrives at his own conclusion while the teacher gains new insights from his student.

The second passage is taken from 17.4 where Confucius, through a dialogue with another disciple, is corrected of his own mistake (translation by Slingerland 2003):

When the Master went to Wucheng, he heard the sound of stringed instruments and song. Smiling gently, he remarked, "Why use an ox-cleaver to kill a chicken?"

Ziyou replied, "In the past, Master, I have heard you say, 'If the gentleman learns *dao* he will be able to care for others, and if the commoners learn the Way they will be easy to manage.'"

[Addressing the disciples who had accompanied him to Wucheng,] the Master said, "Take note, my disciples! What Ziyou says is true. My earlier comment was meant only as a joke."

In the above passage, Confucius appears to despise Ziyou's effort to educate the masses in Wucheng by teaching them the music of the sage-kings. Confucius holds that it is not fitting and a waste of time for Ziyou to promote fine music and songs to the uneducated commoners. But Ziyou replies by reminding Confucius of the latter's exhortation for everyone, including the commoners, to learn the *dao* of the sage-kings. This prompts an apology from Confucius who clarifies that his comment is only a joke and that what Ziyou is doing is correct. We see here how the teacher, in this case, Confucius, is not one who always knows all and the student is not one who knows nothing. Instead, the teacher is able to learn from the student in an equal and mutually beneficial relationship. Making the same argument, Elstein (2009) asserts that Confucius is not presented in the *Analects* as infallible or authoritarian; neither are his

students portrayed as completely submissive and accepting of Confucius' opinions all the time.

A challenge faced in furthering citizenship education in democratic societies is how to produce loyal, responsible and united citizens without indoctrinating them or handicapping the development of their rational autonomy (Callan 1991; Tyack and Cuban, 1995). It is pertinent that research shows that citizenship education in Confucian Heritage Cultures tends to underscore passive, responsible, rule-following behavior rather than one's rights, entitlements and status (e.g., see Hill and Lian 1995; Cummings 2001; Thomas 2002; Lee 2004a, 2004b; Ahmad 2004; Roh 2004; Sim and Print 2005; Tan 2007, 2008). Kennedy (2004), for example, maintains that "the emphasis for citizens is not so much the rights they enjoy but the responsibilities they have towards family and the community" (15). Researchers have also noted the prevalence of teacher authority, a hierarchical relationship between the teacher and students, didactic teaching and passive learning in countries such as China, South Korea and Japan (e.g., Kim 2009; Han and Scull 2010; Oh 2011; Tan 2013b; Wu 2013; Wang 2014; Guo and Guo 2015; Chou and Spangler 2016; Dawson 2016). The nature of citizenship education programmes in Confucian Heritage Cultures has given rise to a perception that Confucian approaches to citizenship education necessarily promote unquestioning obedience to authority and suppress rational autonomy of citizens.

Here it is important to distinguish the conception of citizenship education as advocated by Confucius, and the formulation of citizenship education as practiced in Confucian Heritage Cultures. As expounded in the foregoing, Confucius' belief in the historicity and potential of human beings motivates him to put an emphasis on the inheritance and acquisition of cultural traditions, *and* the critical reflection and appropriation of traditional knowledge. Confucius would understandably repudiate any citizenship education programme that is targeted at stifling the independent thinking and agency of the learners. That said, Confucius also foregrounds human beings as recipients of their own culture, situated within and dependent on particular social and political formations in ancient China. Therefore, a balance is needed in a Confucian conception of citizenship education between cultural transmission and the development of rational autonomy – a task that poses a considerable challenge for policymakers and educators.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined a Confucian conception of citizenship as advanced by Confucius – one that synthesizes the goal of producing committed citizens and developing their critical faculties. An accent on cultural transmission and role performance does not mean that critical reflection and civil engagement are necessarily imperiled in citizenship education. The condition of humans as historical beings explains Confucius' preference for 'traditional innovation' where his novel teachings are circumscribed by prevailing socio-cultural realities. At the same time, he promotes learner freedom by encouraging his students, as subjects and makers of history, to reflect and transform society, thereby broadening *dao*. Confucius subscribes to a 'thick' conception of human good in the form of *dao* (Way) that provides a substantive and normative framework of human life and the public good (McLaughlin 1992). A citizenship education programme, from a Confucian standpoint, should be one that develops a generation of *junzi* who perform their varied

social roles and participate actively in their community. Guided by *zhengming* (rectification of names), all members of the society are motivated and equipped to broaden *dao* as a public good. Overall, a Confucian citizenship education debunks the perception that Confucius and Confucianism necessarily promote authoritarian leadership, unquestioning obedience to authority, didactic teaching and mechanical learning.

References

- Abowitz, K. K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 653–690.
- Ackerly, B. A. (2005). Is liberalism the only way toward democracy? Confucianism and democracy. *Political Theory*, 33(4), 547–576.
- Amadeo, J.-A., Schwille, J., & Torney-Purta, J. V. (1999). *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA civic education project*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Callan, E. (1991). Pluralism and civic education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 11(1), 65–87.
- Carr, W. (1995). Education and democracy: Confronting the postmodernist challenge. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 29(1), 75–91.
- Chou, C. P., & Spangler, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Chinese education models in a global age: Transforming practice into theory*. Singapore: Springer.
- Cogan, J.J., & Derricott, R. (1998). *Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Crick, B. (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools: The final report of the advisory group on citizenship*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Criddle, E., L. Vidovich, & M. O’Neill. (2004). Discovering democracy: An analysis of curriculum policy for citizenship education. *Westminster Studies in Education*, 27(1), 27–41.
- Cummings, W. K. (2001). The future of values education in the Pacific Basin. In W. K. Cummings, M. T. Totto, & J. Hawkins (Eds.) *Values education for dynamic Societies: Individualism or collectivism?* (pp. 277–290). Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Dawson, W. (2010). Private tutoring and mass schooling in East Asia: reflections of inequality in Japan, South Korea, and Cambodia. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 11(1): 14–24.
- Elstein, D. (2009). The authority of the master in the *Analects*. *Philosophy East and West*, 59(2), 142–172
- Galston, W. (1989). Civic education in the liberal state. In N. L. Rosenblum (Ed.), *Liberalism and the moral life* (pp. 71–88). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gilbert, R. (1996). Identity, culture and environment: Education for citizenship for the 21st century. In J. Demaine & H. Entwistle (Eds.), *Beyond communitarianism: Citizenship, politics and education* (pp. 42–63). Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Guo, S., & Guo, Y. (Eds.). (2015). *Spotlight on China: Changes in education under China's market economy*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

- Hall, David L., & Ames, Roger T. (1987). *Thinking through Confucius*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Han, K., & Scull, W. (2010). Confucian culture in the mainstream classroom: A case study of an Asian American student. *The International Journal of Learning*, 17(1), 601-616.
- Hill, M., & Lian, K. F. (1995). *The politics of nation building and citizenship in Singapore*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, J., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal*, 21(1), 77-96.
- Kennedy, K. J. (2004). Searching for citizenship values in an uncertain global environment. In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), *Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and issues* (pp. 9-24). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Kerr, D. (1999). Citizenship education in the curriculum: An international review. *The School Field*, X(3/4), 5-32.
- Kim, K. H. (2004). An attempt to elucidate notions of lifelong learning: *Analects*-based analysis of Confucius' ideas about learning. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 5(2), 117-126.
- Kim, S. (2010). Confucian citizenship? Against two Greek models. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 37(3), 438-456.
- Kim, T. (2009). Confucianism, modernities and knowledge: China, South Korea and Japan. In R. Cowen and A.M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education* (pp. 857-872). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Lai, K. L. (1995). Confucian moral thinking. *Philosophy East & West*, 45(2), 249-272.
- Lee, W. O. (2004a). Concepts and issues of Asian citizenship: spirituality, harmony and individuality, In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), *Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and issues* (pp. 277-288). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Lee, W. O. (2004b). Perceptions of citizenship qualities among Asian educational leaders. In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), *Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and issues* (pp. 137-155). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Li, C. (2006). The Confucian ideal of harmony. *Philosophy East & West*, 56(4), 583-603.
- McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235-250.
- Noddings, N. (2013). *Education and democracy in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nuyen, A. T. (2001). Confucianism and the idea of equality. *Asian Philosophy*, 11(2), 61-71.
- Nuyen, A. T. (2002). Confucianism and the idea of citizenship. *Asian Philosophy*, 12(2), 127-139.
- O'Dwyer, S. (2003). Democracy and Confucian values. *Philosophy East and West*, 53(1), 39-63.

- Peterson, A., & Brock, C. (2017). Citizenship. In F. Moghaddam (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of political behavior* (pp. 84–86). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781483391144.n46
- Roh, Y. R. (2004) Values education in the global, information age in South Korea and Singapore. In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.) *Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and issues* (pp. 257–274). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Shih, C.-y. (2014). Relations and balances: Self-restraint and democratic governability under Confucianism. *Pacific Focus*, 29(3), 351–373.
- Shils, E. (1996). Reflections on civil society and civility in the Chinese intellectual tradition. In W.-m. Tu (Ed.), *Confucian traditions in East Asian modernity* (pp. 38–71). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sim, J. B. Y., & Print, M. (2005). Citizenship education and social studies in Singapore: A national agenda. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, 1(1), 58–73.
- Slingerland, E. (2003). *Confucius Analects: With selections from traditional commentaries*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., Inc.
- Spina, N., Shin, D. C., & Cha, D. (2011) Confucianism and democracy: A review of the opposing conceptualizations. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 12(1), 143-160.
- Tan, C. (2017). To be more fully human: Freire and Confucius, *Oxford Review of Education*, DOI: 10.1080/03054985.2017.1391763, 1–13.
- Tan, C. (2007). Islam and citizenship education in Singapore: Challenges and implications. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 2(1), 23–39.
- Tan, C. (2008). Creating ‘good citizens’ and maintaining religious harmony in Singapore. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 30(2), 133–142.
- Tan, C. (2013a). *Confucius*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tan, C. (2013b). For group, (f)or self: Communitarianism, Confucianism and values education in Singapore. *Curriculum Journal*, 24(4), 478–493.
- Thomas, E. (2002) Values and citizenship: cross-cultural challenges for school and society in the Asian Pacific Rim. In M. Schweisfurth, L. Davies, & C. Harber (Eds.) *Learning Democracy and Citizenship: International Experiences* (pp. 241–254). Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Tyack, D. B., & L. Cuban. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, C. (2016). Individuality, hierarchy, and dilemma: the making of Confucian cultural citizenship in a contemporary Chinese classical school. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 21(4), 435–452.
- Westheimer, J., & J. Kahne. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2): 237–269.
- Yang, L., & Yang, J. (2016). The classical image of Confucian teachers from the *Analects* and *Xueji*. In X. Di & H. McEwan (Eds.), *Chinese philosophy on teaching and learning: Xueji in the twenty-first century* (pp. 97–120). Albany: State University of New York.
- Yung, B. (2010). Can Confucianism add value to democracy education? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 1919–1926.
- Zhai, Y. (2017). Do Confucian values deter Chinese citizens’ support for democracy? *Politics and Religion*, 10(2), 261–285.