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Abstract

In the field of Human Rights Education, there is little research on China’s education system. China is cautious to fully embrace international operationalization of Human Rights because of the implications it could have on the stability of the culture and society while western and international entities are critical of policymakers for their lack of effort. This study uses Human Rights Education Methodology to examine and interpret the goals/values of China’s Moral and Patriotic Education courses through the analysis of the policy documents that shape the objectives of the courses. It locates and contextualizes emerging themes of Chinese characteristics and point of saturation of goals/values within the policy documents, then connects relevant terms/phrases from the policy documents to Human Rights Education methodology. The research pulls together two perspectives that have yet to be connected and then identifies the incorporation of Human Rights within China’s national curriculum policies.
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Introduction

In the wake of the devastation caused by the Second World War, the United Nations (UN) was created with the mission to promote peace and to prevent this type of destruction from happening again. The General Assembly of the UN’s first action was the writing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which would assist their efforts towards ensuring the equality of all human beings. This Declaration pushes the notion that the 30 shared rights within it are inalienable and universal. They, along with the Charter of the United Nations, provide a roadmap for development, cooperation, and the end to suffering of all peoples. Since the creation of these overarching statements, a series of actors, including governments, civil society organizations, academics, key stakeholders, and citizens alike, have found flaws within the universality and the cultural relativity of their wording and actions and endeavors taken under their name. Yet, despite the resistance, these actors have also reacted to their responsibility to put forth the effort to adapt the UDHR to better fit culturally contextual norms (United Nations, 2013b, 2014).

Over the past few decades, the field of study now known as Human Rights Education (HRE) has rapidly developed, expanded, and legitimized, and within the field, scholars have examined several different definitions, frameworks, models, contexts, and outcomes based on its application within various cultural settings (Bajaj, 2011; Tibbitts, 2008; Tibbitts & Kirschlaeger, 2010). While this field has many defined goals and objectives, perhaps the most basic definition, as expressed within comparative and international education research, is “rights to education; rights in education; and rights through education” (Phillips & Schweisfurth, 2007, p. 109). This definition is all-encompassing, hits on the key points of the UDHR’s stance on education, and encourages the incorporation of Human Rights concepts into cultural norms (Phillips
&Schweisfurth, 2007). In 1995, the UN began the Decade for HRE which marked the beginnings of the transition from the universal norms surrounding HRE to its contextualization. World leaders began to realize that for the incorporation of this educational entity to work, there needed to be an understanding of the daily life, culture, and social reality of those taking part in the curriculum (United Nations General Assembly, 1995).

The adoption and adaptation of HRE has had varied implementation and embracement in different countries. The UN, as well as other international organizations, are continuously pushing nation-states to incorporate the topics of the UN and the UDHR into their national policy, yet, even when these ideas are fully incorporated into national curriculum, the concepts rarely trickle down to the local curricula or textbook level. For example, in South Africa the reforms have focused on selectively accepting certain rights and disregarding others, while in Cambodia, the national curriculum was reformed to incorporate a more Buddhist-focused interpretation of Human Rights. In both cases, the researchers claim that it is uncertain whether these new policies have reached the local curricula or textbook level because of the common inconsistencies with implementation (Chin, 2003; Keet & Carrim, 2006).

For various reasons, many other countries have been completely reluctant to embrace efforts to incorporate HRE into national curricula, claiming capacity, educational values, cultural values, etc. One of these countries is China. As homeland of one fifth of the world’s entire population, even the slightest actions taken by this country draws international attention and scrutiny. The government has faced a great deal of backlash on both ensuring the Human Rights of its citizens and incorporating the values into their national curriculum. Chinese officials posit that western definition of Human Rights and the western education models proposed for international standards conflict with the norms of Chinese culture. They choose instead to focus
their efforts on “economic, social and cultural rights and the right to development” (Kent, 2001, p. 66). Moreover, Chinese policymakers claim that their own framework of HRE is infused in the national curriculum and falls within the spectrum of universal Human Rights. Most of the scholarly research conducted within China focuses on HRE within higher degree law classes and not the compulsory national curriculum (Oud, 2006).

In the early 1990s, China began to deeply explore the concept of Human Rights and their applicability to the Chinese culture. China’s first White Papers on Human Rights were published in 1991, and within them they addressed the right to subsistence and the right to development. Along with the concept of cultural relativism, these documents helped lay the foundation for China’s Human Rights efforts (Kent, 2001). Since then, several White Papers addressing the topic of Human Rights in China have been released. This includes several papers on the progress of Human Rights in China, one on the past 50 years of Human Rights in China, and the National Human Rights Action Plan for China (2012-2015) (NHRAPC), which directly addresses the topic of HRE (Information Office, 2014). Despite these efforts, there is still backlash from various sectors criticizing China’s efforts as they do not conform to western ideals (Amnesty International, 2013; Human Rights Watch, 2014; U.S. Department of State, 2014).

Although there are criticisms of China, there is limited research investigating China’s national curriculum with a Human Rights perspective. This study seeks to fill this gap by examining how Human Rights values are incorporated within China’s national curriculum policies. To answer how and in what ways the definitions and teaching methods of these rights differ from western ideologies, this study explores the concepts and values embedded within Chinese moral and patriotic education, specifically; responsibility, respect, the concepts of self and community, citizenship, and morality, then, the study examines and compares the moral
training curriculum in China with western methodology framework for HRE, that was developed directly from the UN document, *Guidelines for National Plans of Action for Human Rights Education*, by Flowers (1998) and recommended by Tibbitts (2008). This framework outlines at which grade levels students should be learning about specific Human Rights and what the core goals and concepts are for that human right. This study will map China’s national curriculum policies with this HRE model in correspondence congruencies and overlaps. Findings from this study will provide a valuable case for HRE in a context where western models of HRE have not been adopted and have been contested.

This study seeks to answer two specific questions. First, to fill the gap of limited research investigating China’s national curriculum policies with a Human Rights perspective, it asks 1) How are Human Rights values incorporated within China’s national curriculum policies for moral and patriotic education, and then 2) How and in what ways do these definitions and teaching methods of these rights differ from western ideologies? Chapter one will outline the theoretical perspectives of HRE and Amartya Sen’s Capabilities theory. Chapter two presents the conceptual framework of the cultural and historical context of moral and patriotic education in China, HRE, as well as China’s engagement with Human Rights. Chapter three discusses the sample and methodologies of the study. To conclude, the final chapter summarizes and discusses major findings then discusses implications of HRE in China and other cultural contexts.
Chapter 1: Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

While this study maps the Chinese National curriculum for moral and patriotic education with Flowers’ (1998) HRE methodologies, it also employs Amartya Sen’s Capabilities theory. This theory moves away from material perceptions of development, i.e. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Gross National Product (GNP), and looks at individual perceptions of fulfillment. Sen (1999) discredits GDP and GNP as indicators of development through comparing them to a country’s public investment in citizens. According to research done by the World Bank, countries that have higher rates of GNP, but do not invest in the health and education of their citizens will have lower life expectancy than countries with lower GNP and higher investment in their health care and education institutions (pp. 46-47). The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) utilized Sen’s theory in the creation of the Human Development Index. Three of the key capabilities measured by the index include “access to health, education, and goods” (Stanton, 2007, p. 3). Moving away from measuring economic growth, the UNDP now sees these three components as specific indicators to human development, making Sen’s framework applicable on global scale.

The foundation of Sen’s (1999) theory is that freedom is also the means to development, not just the end. According to Sen (1999), “[o]ne’s freedom depends on one’s ‘capabilities.’ A person’s capability is advanced through their freedoms. He defines “functionings” as “reflect[ing] the various things a person may value doing or being” (p.75) and “capability” as “the alternative combinations of functionings that are feasible for [him or] her to achieve” (p.75). Human Rights are very general statements, and there existence is not up for debate. However, the means of implementation can and should be contextual. If an individual or culture is taught to value the
morals of equality behind the universal Human Rights, their capability then becomes the assurance of that human right for themselves and for others. For example, if it is institutionalized that the sexes are equal, which is Article 2 of the UDHR, individuals will make the choice to carry out this belief for themselves and for others. This is their function, and it would depend on the scope of what each sex finds fulfilling. In the western feminist context, fulfilment comes from full engagement in the market and paid work as well as autonomy within intimate partner relationships. These examples create satisfaction amongst western women and the feeling of independence (Kelly, 2012). Capability would be the realization of the choices to ensure the absence of unfair treatment (Sen, 1999; United Nations, 2013). Therefore, “[c]apabilities and public policy are directly related. Each is enhanced by the presence of the other” (p. 18). Public policy will develop as citizens are given the capabilities that help them to achieve fulfilment in life through that in which they value. These capabilities can be measured based on the subjective opinions of well-being, but first it must be determined which functionings matter most to each culture or country (Sen, 1997, 1999).

If we are to view Human Rights as functionings and a means to development, we must first accept the argument that Human Rights, as they are written and measured by western entities, are not universal (Kent, 2001). In his examination of the Universalism of Human Rights, Perry (1997) concludes that, “particularities of context, especially, cultural particularities do and should play a role in determining the specific shape—for example, the specific institutional
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1 An important point to note is that Sen himself does not agree with the concept of “Asian Values” as Asia is too diverse to fall into just one category, and he believes democratic principles are the better means of ensuring Human Rights.
embodiment—one or another culture gives to a value (e.g., freedom of press) represented by a Human Rights provision” (p. 509). Not only should the value Human Rights be manifested differently within cultural contexts, they should also be institutionalized and measured accordingly.

During the UN Decade for HRE and based on the UN document, *Guidelines for National Plans of Action for Human Rights Education*, Flowers (1998) created a methodological framework that is commonly referenced throughout this field. It was developed to act as a resource for developers of HRE programs. The framework recommends age levels at which students should be learning about particular Human Rights and methods on applying them (Appendix A). The framework touches on several thematic elements relative to Human Rights. The methodologies addresses specific UN endeavors and conventions, it features explicit rights-based terminology, it addresses individual qualities and characteristics, as well as external factors that individuals should be aware of. Specific to the UN, the methodologies features terms including UDHR, History of Human Rights, Convention on the Rights of a Child, Knowledge of Specific Human Rights, etc. The explicit rights-based terminology includes racism, sexism, discrimination, genocide, torture, etc. The methodologies lay out several individual qualities and characteristics such as respect, responsibility, equality, moral inclusion/exclusion, etc. In reference to awareness of external factors, the terms include world peace, world development, economic globalization, injustice, etc. This framework highlights the intrinsic goals and values of Human Rights and will assist this research as it is looking for congruencies and overlaps in concepts, goals, and values (Flowers, 1998).
If we know that “Asian cultures developed completely independent of [the philosophy of individual liberty, we can] know if similar features exist within a non-western culture [by looking] for parts or components rather than the whole identical mind-set” (Sen, 1997, pp.15-16). According to Sen (1997), “[t]he real issue is not whether these non-freedom perspectives are present in Asian traditions, but whether the freedom oriented perspectives are absent there” (p. 17). This research will then look at the values taught within the Chinese education system to determine which values are present and the congruencies these values have with Human Rights.

**Chapter 2: Historical and Cultural Context of Moral and Patriotic Education**

Beginning with ancient China to modern day, this section provides a brief historical and cultural discussion of the Chinese education system, including moral and patriotic education courses, in order to situate the rationale for how children have been and are being taught responsibility, respect, the concepts of self and community, citizenship, and morality. The first section discusses characteristics and reforms of the education system before the Cultural Revolution, including the roots of moral education and the examination system. The second section focuses specifically on the efforts of Mao Zedong during the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution that lasted from the 1950s through 1970s. The final section discusses the changes that took place within the education system after the Cultural Revolution, during China’s reform and opening up, until today.
Pre-Cultural Revolution

Even though it was informal, moral education can be traced all the way back to ancient China (Xu, 2013). As early as 771 BC, elected officials were chosen because of their moral qualities, and “personal virtue” was regarded with the utmost importance (Maosen, 1990). Throughout most of ancient China, there was much hope of enhancing the scope of morality, improving society, and fostering respect for law (Xu, 2013). The culture in China today, is deeply rooted in tradition. Despite many of the political efforts to break away from tradition, Chinese culture still relies heavily on the values and beliefs of their ancestors. Confucian concepts of proper conduct, relationships, respect, and character are still prevalent within the education system because his belief was that the education system alone could bring about the ideal social order (Reagan, 2004). Until the revolution of 1911, education was mostly seen as the means to becoming a civil servant. The curriculum was only focused on Chinese characters and “Confucian concepts of morality, filial piety, and correct conduct in interpersonal relationships, as well as information about China’s past” (Pepper, 2000, p. 53).

In the 20th century, China continuously struggled to organize and legitimize the education system. The revolution of 1911, which ended utilitarian rule, marked an end to the examination system that kept social classes completely separate. Before this time, quality education meant you could pass the Civil Service Examination and work for the government. The lower quality education, typically found in the countryside, meant a continued life of peasantry. Even though the Civil Service Examination system was eliminated in 1911, the utilization of examinations
and the Confucian ideology of faithfulness to a paternalistic culture remained within the education system. There have been multiple reform efforts over the past century, yet the dilemma of equal access to education has never been fully eradicated (Dore, 1976; Fairbrother, 2013; Pepper, 2000).

In 1912, the new government wanted to “create an education system more in tune with prevailing world trends” (Pepper, 2000, p. 61). There was constant disagreement with which path to take, and for a while, were more concerned with keeping up with international trends, rather than developing from within. There began a period of reactionary borrowing and attempted institutionalization of foreign education system features and policies that were not completely compatible with China’s system, Chinese educational ideals, and cultural context. For most of the new components, China was unable to meet financial and foundational requirements, which also caused the new policies and practices to fail. In 1914, Kuo Bingwen, the first Chinese student to earn a doctorate from Columbia University Teachers College, published a dissertation highlighting what he considered were “all” of the current issues currently impeding the education system: too much missionary influence which produced students with foreign ideals, inclusion of moral education, disciplining students to value community advancement over individual desires, adequate funding sources, mass education, transferring knowledge from the classroom to real life, elimination of the idea that education is the path to government service, lack of teacher training, and finding the right levels of centralization and decentralization. This helped policymakers foster a discourse around the flaws within the education system and goals to work towards (Kuo, 1915; Pepper, 2000).
In the 1920s, as students began to return from their studies abroad and demand more of their own education system, they put their pressure on Chinese officials. This policy borrowing continued into the 1930s, and had the most effect in secondary school where a division of paths between vocational training and higher education were developed. Policies and procedures of the French and German systems were borrowed, and later, parts of the U.S. system were integrated. For example, from Germany, the middle school was divided into students who studied industry and students who studied the arts, a design that still remains in place today. Europe was heavily critical of the policy borrowing, expressing that these models did not fit the culture or economy and China should focus more on meeting the people’s needs (Pepper, 2000). Prevalent issues within the system became part of the common discourse between academics and policymakers. This time period also marks the beginning of the continuous focus on quantity over quality and universal education. Pepper (2000) offers a summary of the failures of the early 20th century:

Gradually, national leadership of education passed on to those educated in Japan and the West, who sought to apply the ideals and models they had learned overseas…[M]any of these leaders would conclude that their new education system was more dependent than independent; more the product of a partially traditional, partially modern society than a positive force for change itself; and that, as leaders they bore a certain measure of responsibility for many of the system’s failures. (p. 76)

The combined dependence on foreign systems and rooted cultural nationalism began to foster resentment and insecurities from the Chinese and Chinese officials. Nothing had worked as expected and still, in 1931, only about 21% of elementary-age students were attending school (Pepper, 2000). Then, amongst all of the mixing of ideas and forms, there developed an idea “for an education system that would be...China centered and mass based” (Pepper, p. 117).
Civic education began to be incorporated into the national curriculum in the 1920s and 30s. There was an adoption of this topic brought on by scholars like, Yan Fu and Liang Qichao, which led to a quick spike in its popularity and implementation. Over time, it completely replaced moral education, which originated in ancient China (Xu, 2013). According to Qin (2013), “[f]rom the very beginning, civic education in China has been focused on practical issues in the country with a view to promoting social progress, serving social development, solving practical problems in the social development of China, and guiding cultural development” (p. 64). “Yan Fu also pushed for the replacement of “the traditional Chinese patriarchal hierarchy with the western enlightenment concepts of freedom, equality, and fraternity, so as to reshape the personality of people and reform national character, and in turn, save the nation from peril and destruction” (Xu, 2013, p. 28) through his “three-pronged education—strengthening the physique of people, developing the intelligence of people, and developing new ethics of people” (Xu, 2013, p. 28). Yan Fu’s reform efforts and the prevalence of civic education eventually faded out in the 1940’s with the change in ideological control (Xu, 2013).

**Cultural Revolution**

The first signs of a larger national ideological reconstruction began in 1920 with a movement to the left and the emersion of Marxist thinkers, including Mao Zedong. From this group came a push for educating the peasant class as well as discontentment towards the elite for not doing their share of the labor. Within education, the issue of unequal access was seen as a result of class struggle. In the 1940’s, after Mao had risen to power, he introduced education reforms across the board, all based on uniformity, which were very well received as the political
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2 Equality is perceived in China as everyone having the same social status and receiving the same treatment in society, economics, and laws. More political definitions of equality in China state equality in nature and distribution of wealth, social opportunities, and political power (Hu, 2008).
authorities in rural areas also backed the idea of reform (Pepper, 2000). “According to Mao, education was entrusted with the task of producing a generation of "red and expert" intellectuals committed to the welfare of the working class and who would identify with the proletariat, not a separate or elite intelligentsia” (Kwong, 1979, p. 444). Elementary schools became minban schools, or “schools run by the people,” and mostly they were controlled by the people of that community while still being subject to several government mandates, including textbook selection. Secondary schools became a place to train students to fulfill local needs (Pepper, 2000).

In regards to moral and patriotic education during this time period, there were “very frequent changes in school textbooks after 1949, [while] the goals…remain[ed] stable and clear” (Wang & Tang, 2013, p. 196). Elementary school curriculum remained focused on character and moral development, while middle school curriculum focused more on politics and citizenship (Wang & Tang, 2013).

In the 1950s, there was a direct shift from relying on the West for education policy towards relying on the Soviet Union. During this time, the Soviets rigorously helped reconstruct the structure of higher education in China. There was an emphasis on a political and social brainwashing of the intellectuals to align more with communist ideals, of everyone working to their full ability and everyone having enough, as well as specialization-specific universities that were all seen as prestigiously equal. The gaokao, the universal college entrance exam, was put in place alongside state-mandated job placements so that the number of first year university students in a specific specialty matched the expected employer needs. After a few years, these new efforts were very well received as the education system was finally adapting to fit the culture and the need (Maosen, 1990; Pepper, 2000). The Soviets also assisted in the reconstruction of elementary and secondary schools. In elementary schools, there started to be
movement away from the minban community model, towards a more national model and emphasis on enforcing enrollment policy, allowing the number of students to increase 135% during this decade. However, the overall quality was sacrificed, and in the temperamental times it would have been too controversial to risk directly addressing the issue with government officials. During the transition to incorporate Soviet influence, secondary schools also became more tailored for college-preparation, yet, like many of the policy borrowing initiatives, the incorporation of new policies did not go as planned and Chinese nationalistic ideals resurfaced along with the desire to create their own systems, including the education system, and they became less reliant on the Soviet Union (Pepper, 2000). Moral education, at this time, became very political in nature as it was a tool for the Communist Party. According to Kai and Xu (2013), “[p]rior to the reform and opening up, communist and collective moral education focused on developing communist ideals and beliefs, social responsibility, the spirit of self-sacrifice, the spirit of unity and mutual help, and the spirit of hard work and plain living, etc.” (p. 74). There was a particular emphasis on the sacrifice by individuals for the collective, and ‘ego’ was to be ignored for the sake of the country (Kai & Xu, 2013). At this point in time, according to Maosen (1990), primary and secondary schools served the purpose of developing youth into individuals who were moral, intelligent, physically well, and “aesthetic[ly] understanding, so as to make them conscious and active members of a new-democratic society” (p. 164). Directly following the determination of this focus, Moral Education was given the tasks of shaping character, fostering filial piety, and creating the values of collectivism, bravery, conscientiousness, and discipline (Maosen, 1990).
The Great Leap Forward, Mao’s push to promptly mold China into a Socialist country through ideological shifts and economic expansion in 1958, marked a temporary end “of mechanical copying… [and] direct Soviet influence,” (p. 259) as China moved towards developing independently. During this time, the minban concept of community-run schools was embraced again and pushed to secondary and tertiary levels. Schools were now forced to focus on bringing in new students rather than quality of education being taught, whether local authorities agreed or not (Pepper, 2000). According to Kwong (1979), “When the Communist party took political control of mainland China in 1949, only 20 percent of the population had completed some level of education” (p. 443) and estimates claimed 85 percent of elementary-aged students to be in school after this push in 1958. The Great Leap Forward was also successful in connecting education with labor through efforts such as practices of clean dormitories and campuses as well as the opening up of over 9,000 agricultural middle schools. During this time, great emphasis was placed on Political education and the ability to analyze national and international situations through a Marxist-Leninist lens, but this was difficult to achieve and ultimately failed because of the emphasis on rote memorization over critical discussion in the classroom. The drawbacks of this time period were an enhanced example of typical issues in Chinese policy reform in that there are attempts to produce immediate results with little consideration of needs and available resources. The new efforts of the Great Leap Forward were not well received and lasted briefly because of the devastating effects it had on the country, including the famine that killed over 10 million people (Kwong, 1979).
During the Cultural Revolution, which lasted from 1966 to 1976, Mao used education as a starting-point for overall reform. In schools, students were recruited to be Red Guards, to enforce literal translations of communist ideals amongst the other Chinese citizens. Everything considered “old” and “traditional” or classist was to be eradicated. The education system itself was being criticized by Mao for being too bourgeois. The working class was therefore sent into schools to maintain proletariat control. Labor was held at a higher value than education, intellectuals were to be “re-educated,” and universal schooling was the ideal (Pepper, 2000). Moral and patriotic education were merely instruments to assist the class struggle (Kai & Xu, 2013). According to Kai and Xu (2013), “Education on moral personality virtually disappeared. Even though [moral education existed], it only focused on developing communist ethics and collective ethics, and fundamental morality was lost in [this]” (p. 74). While little was said during the revolution on the reforms, afterwards, China saw the Cultural Revolution, overall, as more destructive than beneficial for the education system (Pepper, 2000). Within both the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution, there was total system reform as well as ideal reform. The ideal was that students should both work hard and study hard while schools began to foster a socialist and communal culture over an individualistic capitalistic one. Labor and hard work were of much higher value than education. Today, in many areas of China, this is still the case. Within this time period, the compulsory Marxism education and society classes also began in schools, and they are still in existence today (Pepper, 2000).
Post-Cultural Revolution Reform and Opening Up

In 1975, the Education Ministry was reestablished, and in 1978, under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping, education reforms from the 1950s were put back in place. At this time:

Zhou Enlai,…outlined a program of what has come to be known as the “four modernizations,” the core of a development strategy aimed at turning the country into a relatively advanced industrialized nation by the year 2000. The modernizations are those of agriculture, industry, science and technology, and national defense. Under Deng's direction, three major policy documents--on science and technology, industry, and foreign trade--were drafted. Intended to promote economic growth, they called for rehabilititating scientists and experts, reemploying strict academic standards in education, and importing foreign technology. The concept was later adopted as the official party policy at the Third Plenum of the Eleventh Central Committee [in December of 1978] and became the framework for the post-Mao period. (Oden, 2004, p. 2)

Deng truly believed that the foundation for these modernizations was education (Oden, 2004, p. 2). With Deng’s speech in 1978 that officially opened up China to the rest of the world, capitalist ideals were brought back and complete restoration was finally realized, reversing the damage caused by the Cultural Revolution. In his speech he addresses China’s lagging behind in the advancement of technology and the suffering of their economy as a result of their closed door. While reassuring his citizens that they will continue to protect their socialist system, he simultaneously discusses the need to rely on developed countries to catch them up (Deng, 1984).

It was during this time period that “Moral Education” became the umbrella term for the ideological-political branch of education (Maosen, 1990).

Quality was no longer sacrificed for quantity and many schools were closed down if they were not meeting standards of learning. The Cultural Revolution left China with a weakened economy and severe political issues. Because academics were relocated to the countryside to be “re-educated,” education research had come to a standstill. A push started for modernization to continue within the education system as a “new culture oriented toward economic development” (Lewin & Hui, 1989, P. 9). Until 1985, the Chinese education system was controlled by the
Ministry of Education. At this point, control was handed over to the State Education Commission, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) proposed five major reforms including the 1986 Compulsory Education Law: (1) *a universal nine year cycle of schooling*, (2) *an introduction of vocational and technical schools at the secondary-school level*, (3) *greater autonomy for higher education institutions in planning enrollments*, (4) *convert the job allocation system from assignments to a job market system*, and (5) *update curriculum and pedagogy*. However, these reforms are criticized by academics for having decentralized both the governance and funding of the education system (Lewin & Hui, 1989; Maosen, 1990). These reforms have had tremendous effect on what the education system looks like today. Elementary education is estimated to be nearly universal, while higher education is very competitive. Entrance into a quality university is usually contingent on a parent’s wealth and connections. Unequal access was, and is still, severe and social mobility very difficult. Students are now pressured to work hard around the clock to compete for the highest exam scores (Dello-Iacovo, 2009).

In the 1990s, there became a very apparent shift in the discourse surrounding criticisms in education to include the notion of “quality education” which includes competence, quality, and character. In the early 2000s, new curriculum and education reforms began taking place to address the growing concerns of quality and a competitive global economy. As part of these reforms, new textbooks were distributed and new initiatives included critical thinking, student-focused lessons, individual thinking practices, and citizenship education, both moral and citizenship development, were pushed. However, it is believed that teacher training has been ineffective and the competitive examination process does not allow for time within the classroom to explore these new efforts (Dello-Iacovo, 2009). Even though there is resistance to recent
educational changes, it is the first time education policymakers are putting a serious effort into quality education practices over enrollment quotas. The more recent efforts at developing the quality of the education system are still heavily integrated with ancient Chinese tradition as well as socialist ideals. In the new curriculum that focuses on the development of a quality individual, the real concern is with the development of the nation as a result of the strong filial piety within the culture (Dello-Iacovo, 2009).

Today’s moral education class is still framed heavily by Marxist theory, associating it with the economy and politics. In 1993, the moral education curriculum was restructured by CPC to also be inclusive of both socialist or collectivist ideals, and moral integrity. The recent trends are creating a shift from ideological training to citizenship training. Communist ideals are still the basis of the class and “citizenship’ applies to everyone, whereas, before, those who could live out socialist ideals were accorded privileged moral status” (Ping, Minghua, Bin, & Hongjuan, 2004, pg. 459). There is new emphasis on “honesty and respect for others” (Ping et al., 2004, pg. 459), and the concepts of self, community, and respect as noted in several of the recent education policy documents that have been published (Action, 2006; Outline; 2006; Regulations, 2006). These are the same core goals and concepts found within current HRE methodologies. Each level of the education system has a different focus for Moral Education (Maosen, 1990). According to Maosen (1990), “primary schools have ideology-morality lessons; secondary schools have ideological-political courses, and colleges have courses of Marxist theory and Communist morality” (p. 168).
Chapter 3: Intersections of Chinese Culture, Education, and Human Rights

Human Rights Education

After the creation of the UN and the UDHR, it wasn’t until 1974, that the (United Nations Education, Social and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) document *Recommendation Concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace, and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* suggested Human Rights be incorporated into all national curricula (UNESCO, 1974). Between the early 1980’s and 2000, the amount of yearly HRE publications rose from 10 to over 180, indicating international interest and distinguishability of the topic (Suarez, 2007). The current UN definition of HRE says it should focus on building a culture of Human Rights. HRE will teach knowledge about Human Rights, the willingness to uphold Human Rights and the skills to protect them (United Nations; 2006). It is not just about knowledge of the UDHR but how to support and protect the rights it prescribes for all members of society.

Despite the rapid expansion of HRE, there are still many challenges to overcome. Competition-oriented education systems encourage students to seek fulfillment through attaining knowledge, rather than personal development. In a system without democracy, economic progress often ranks higher than pursuit of Human Rights (Plantilla, 2009). Suarez (2007) also notes that there is a lack of Human Rights knowledge among teachers and students, meaning that it is not part of common classroom discourse. It is also believed that, “the effectiveness of global consciousness and pressure on states, paramilitaries, and insurgents responsible for long-standing Human Rights violations varies tremendously” (Brysk, 2002). This means that international pressures to ensure Human Rights are not being applied consistently amongst nation-states, and
those with the highest level of Human Rights violations may be least able to protect themselves
and are still not getting the help they need (Brysk, 2002).

From 1995-2004 the UN held the first Decade for HRE and:

The Plan of Action[, for this decade had] five objectives: the assessment of needs and
formulation of strategies; building and strengthening Human Rights education
programmes; developing educational material; strengthening the mass media; and the
global dissemination of the UDHR. The Plan focuses on stimulating and supporting
national and local activities and initiatives and is built upon the idea of a partnership
between Governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations,
professional associations, individuals and large segments of civil society. (United Nations
General Assembly, 1996, p.4)

From this Plan of Action, came the creation of several definitions, methodologies, research
initiatives, and implication efforts towards the expansion of HRE, including the methodology
used in this research by Flowers (1998). The definitions vary as different entities have different
uses for HRE. While this is beneficial, allowing many to work within the context, it also causes
a lack of cohesion. Governmental bodies usually highlight democracy and social order in their
definitions while NGOs emphasize social change and specific Human Rights violations. In
contrast, academics focus more on “ethical framework for universal application” (Flowers, 2002).
Researchers in the field have focused specifically on the global definitions, ideologies, models,
and the discourse of HRE. To support this research, I have selected, and made minor
grammatical edits to, an academic definition, created, even before the UN Decade for HRE, by
the Centro de Recursos Educativos in Costa Rica. They believe that, “[t]o educate for and about
Human Rights is without a doubt to educate for values. It is precisely within the universality of
Human Rights that we can confirm an education in values that leads to the realization of these
values and does not lead to a cultural and local decontextualization” (Centro de Recursos
Educativos, 1992). This definition challenges the notion that Human Rights can only be ensured
through specific demand, and it highlights the dynamic lenses through which Human Rights can
been seen. It pushes past the legal framework and allows for multiple paths to a similar end. Instead of looking to measure specific Human Rights, the values and goals that support them can be sought out, better understood, and contextualized to allow for reach to cultures and countries in which Western Human Rights monitoring and operationalization conflicts with cultural norms. Additionally, it situates well within Sen’s Capabilities theory. The means of Human Rights implementation can and should be contextual. If the morals and values behind Human Rights are taught, the individual or community becomes capable of ensuring them (Sen, 1999). The definition provided by the Centro de Recursos Educativos in Costa Rica and Flowers’ (1998) methodological framework complement each other as they both highlight the intrinsic goals and values of Human Rights. They will also assist this research as it is looking for congruencies and overlaps in concepts, goals, and values (United Nations General Assembly, 1995; Tibbitts, 2008).

**China and Human Rights**

As China is one of the five permanent members of the United Nation’s Security Council, they play a large role in the decision-making process and the adoption of UN resolutions (United Nations, 2012). China has ratified a majority of the UN’s International Human Rights Treaties, including the CESCR – International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Only one of them, the CCPR – International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, have they signed but not yet ratified (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2014). Additionally, as a member of the Human Rights Council, they have declared that “[t]he Chinese Government respects the principle of the universality of Human Rights and has made unremitting efforts for
the promotion and protection of the Human Rights and fundamental freedoms of the Chinese people” (UNGA, 2013, p. 1). Also within the same document of this statement is the affirmation to the creation and implementation of China’s first Human Rights Action Plan from 2009-2010 (UNGA, 2013).

In Asian cultures, especially China, discipline, loyalty, relationships, connection, and community advancement are highly valued (Nisbett, 2004; Reagan, 2004). In Richard Nisbett’s (2004) book, Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently…and Why, his comparative research on the cultural psychology of westerners and Asians helps reveal the deep-rooted differences in the cognitive processes of the cultures and can offer one supportive explanation of this perspective. It can provide additional rationale for why western concepts of Human Rights cannot be directly applied to the Chinese education system, and what the manifestation of Human Rights values might look like in China. Nisbett (2004) explains the vast differences in thought processes and social orders to have started because of the given variety in ecology between China and the West and how the groups interacted with that ecology. The initial interactions with their environments caused the Greeks and the Chinese to interact with their peers in respective manners. While the Chinese looked outward, the Greeks looked inward. The Chinese need to attend to their social relationships was a reflection of the need to attend to their relationships of all types (Nisbett, 2004). According to Nisbett (2004) “[t]he sense that the self was linked in a network of relationships and social obligations might have made it natural to view the world in general as continuous and composed of substances rather than discrete and consisting of distinct objects” (pp. 35-36). The Greeks, on the other hand, related to objects and people with more personal goals in mind. Objects were categorized based on attributes so that they could be controlled and actions predicted. This, in turn led the Greeks towards more of a
sense of permanency and stability while the Chinese viewed all objects as connected and changeable (Nisbett, 2004). This disparity in worldviews is then reflective in the Chinese reaction to Human Rights and HRE policies and practices, as well as western lack of empathy to Chinese insistence on the need for cultural relativity. Human Rights, by nature are for the safety and security of the individual, but China views the collective as more important. Through their ecology, Greeks developed a very strong sense of personal agency. They believed that “they were in charge of their own lives and free to act as they choose” (Nisbett, 2004, p. 2). The Chinese, on the other hand, viewed themselves as part of a collective, or several collectives. Their counterpart to the agency of the Greeks was harmony. Nisbett (2004) notes that, “Chinese social harmony should not be confused with conformity. On the contrary, Confucius praised the desire of the gentleman to harmonize and distinguish it from the petty person’s need for conformity” (p. 7). The values of traits and harmony assisted in constructing two completely different worldviews. The Greeks, or westerners, valued freedom, individuality, curiosity, debate, independence, truth, categories, stability, and correctness, while the Chinese valued nature, yin-yang, rural life, interdependence, connection, contradictions, changes, viewing things as a whole, relationships, and a common ground or middle way (Nisbett, 2004).

Although China has a history of policy borrowing from the West, there is consciousness around blind borrowing as has often resulted in serious conflicts with Chinese traditions and culture. For example, the relationship values within filial piety and desire to grow from within are at odds with individualized Human Rights (Dello-Iacovo, 2009). Despite the continuous criticisms that China receives from entities such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, China is making efforts at improving the insurance of Human Rights for its citizens, particularly through their compulsory moral education classes and efforts at “quality education”
Regard for patriotic and moral education classes were destroyed after the Cultural Revolution because they were seen as extreme and hollow. In the 1990s, credibility in the courses was restored as there was a shift to teaching about “traditional Chinese values” and the more recent focus on “citizenship” (Maosen, Taylor, & Shaogang, 2004). “Moral education today stresses unity, harmony, stability and peaceful evolution, an integration of Confucian thinking with an authoritarian political system,” (Maosen, Taylor, & Shaogang, 2004) similar to the goals of the UN and the UDHR. These changes are expected to take time however, as previous radical reforms in China have been very detrimental to the development of the country (Maosen et al., 2004; Oud, 2006). China has also declared that it will respect UN decisions as they continue to develop as a country as long as the “Human Rights Council [respects] the historical, cultural and religious backgrounds of different countries and regions” (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2013, p. 10). This does not mean that the values of Human Rights education cannot be taught or are not being taught in the classroom, they are just not taught in way that is ideal for westerners. The years of failed policy borrowing have only cultivated the Chinese government’s desire to grow from within. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise when western transformative Human Rights policies are rejected (Pepper, 2000).

According to Kent (2001), typically, “Non-western states use the banner of cultural difference to attempt to restore a greater degree of operational equity to the Human Rights monitoring process, not in favor of their own particular civilization but in the interests of the non-western world generally, by emphasizing collective and developmental rights. They are also defending their legitimate right to interpret, in the process of domestic implementation, the meaning of the abstract norms incorporated into international treaties” (p. 24). Even though
Human Rights are technically universal entities, their implementation has only been through monitoring, which creates a western bias in operationalization. As cited in Kent (2001), at the 1992 Human Rights Commissions session, China brought to light the “traditional limitations of the Commission” (p. 64). Cultural relativism, as articulated by the Chinese Ambassador, Fan Guoxiang, stated that “measures aimed at protecting Human Rights should be decided by each individual country in the light of history, tradition and level of economic development” (p. 64). The emphasis in China is more about constructing a “theory of Human Rights with Chinese characteristics” (Kent, 2001, p. 193), and according to Sen (1999), if the same moral or values within Human Rights are being taught, then there is the capability to assure Human Rights for themselves and others. Even though China supports universal concepts of Human Rights at the international level, cultural and historical relativism are necessary elements to operationalization, especially if Human Rights concepts are to be implemented within China (Kent, 2001).

In China, the political discussions on Human Rights are shifting. Until recently, documents opposed the western context of specific Human Rights and their applicability within Chinese culture. Western pressures in the monitoring process of Human Rights are demanding reaction. In 1991, the Information Office of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China published the first White Paper contextualizing Human Rights to Chinese culture entitled, *Human Rights in China*. This document discuss the Right of Subsistence as citizens have faced centuries of devastating imperialist rule, and they emphasize the rights of economic and social development as both sectors are rapidly growing. The document also highlights the right to work and the right to have a sustainable family, as they are both important to Chinese social norms (Information Office, 1991). According to Kent (2001):
[Subsistence], together with the right to development and the claims of cultural relativism, were to be given priority in China’s Human Rights policy. At [the Human Rights] commission, China’s delegates took a positive position of emphasizing China’s support for the reoperationalization of Human Rights norms, specifically by placing a priority on economic, social and cultural rights and the right to development. (p. 66)

At the 1992 United Nations commission on Human Rights annual meeting in Geneva, the Chinese diplomat, Zhan Daode, brought attention to the current lack of cultural relativity. He said that the “practice of distorting Human Rights standards, exerting political pressure through the abuse of monitoring mechanisms, engaging in selectivity and applying double standards…[is] infringing the sovereignty and offending the dignity of many developing countries” (Kent, 2001, p. 66). So now, instead of complete refusal to comply with Human Rights standards, there is a shift within China to defend themselves and their culture against western hegemony.

More recent policy documents mark a shift as the government is now focusing on specific Human Rights, rather than those that are culturally contextual. In 2000, China examined the past 50 years in regards to progress of Human Rights. Within the documents, they explicitly compare Old China to New China and discuss the increase in GDP and GNP, the increase in average incomes, an improvement in worker rights, increased allocations of money to relief funds, a new social security system, greater access to education, improved health services, etc. all under the umbrella of the right to subsistence (Information Office, 2000). In November 2012, at the CPC 18th National Conference, the goal of “respect for and protection of Human Rights” was set, and the NHRAPC was created. Focus was placed on safety, standards of living, participation and awareness of citizens in political decisions, protecting and enhancing cultural rights, social assistance, health, education, the environment, and participation in international Human Rights discourse (Information Office, 2013). The NHRAPC itself addresses HRE with regards to the training of civil servants as well as the integration of key concepts into primary
and middle school curricula. It also anticipates the opening of HRE training bases throughout the country by 2015 (Information Office, 2012). With the existence of these documents and this action plan, there is a clear movement from the discussion of the cultural context of Human Rights to the implementation of new Human Rights norms within China.

Chapter 4: Data and Methodology

Research Questions

This study answers two questions. First, it fills the gap of limited research investigating China’s national curriculum policies with a Human Rights perspective, by investigating 1) How Human Rights values are incorporated within China’s national policy for moral and patriotic education, then, determining 2) How and in what ways do these definitions and teaching methods of these rights differ from western ideologies? This study examines and compares the moral and patriotic education policy in China with western guidelines for HRE, while looking for overlaps and congruencies.

Sample

The sample is composed of eight policy documents that were published between 1994 and 2004, from various “organs of the government on the ideologies guiding citizenship education efforts as well as emerging issues related to implementation” (Fairbrother, 2006, p. 3). All having been translated to English, by Gregory Fairbrother and Ming Qiang (2006), they were then published together in 2006 in volume 39, Number 2, of the Chinese Education and Society
Journal. In addition to providing access to the researcher, because of limitations to the English language, these specific documents provide insight into the progress of the new education laws, including the Compulsory Education Law that came into existence, just a decade earlier, in 1986 (Lewin & Hui, 1989). In additional significance, they were all written during the UN’s Decade for HRE, which ran from 1995 to 2004, and pushed nation-states to incorporate Human Rights into their national curricula, which may have significance in the inclusion of terms related to Human Rights (United Nations General Assembly, 1995). According to Fairbrother (2006), “Some of the documents in this issue deal with citizenship education broadly conceived in the form of ideological and moral education. Others are more specific, addressing, for example, patriotic education (p. 3). In addition to their relevant time period, these documents are well suited to answer the research questions because “[all] of them, [to some extent,] address the role of society in carrying out citizenship education” (Fairbrother, 2006, p. 3). Fairbrother (2006) states that, “[t]hese documents address a variety of items; the role of schools specifically, the role of patriotic education and the functioning of the models, central guidance and local contextualization, expected content of moral education, covering education in patriotism, collectivism, socialism, ideals, morality, labor, socialist democracy, the law, and individual psychological quality” (p. 4), evaluation, the roles of management for the levels of the education bureaucracy, the issues within society, education, and youth that need to be addressed throughout the mobilization of moral education, as well as the meaning of the term “civic morality” (Fairbrother, 2006). This research explores a context that has begun to shape the way China identifies itself in comparison to western and international entities. This being the first research to examine the scope of HRE in China, moral and patriotic education policy documents are a sufficient starting point for data analysis within this research. Through summative content
analysis of these documents, this study will identify major patterns and saturation points of values and concepts that are inherent of Human Rights, and the findings will then be compared to Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies: Development and Conceptual Framework for HRE to identify overlaps and congruencies (Hsieh, 2005).

**Methodology**

According to Hsieh (2005), in the process of summative content analysis, words and content are first quantified to determine use and contextual understanding. With this method, meaning and usage of specific terms/phrases can be explored and understood. Instances of terms, phrases, or ideas are counted by hand then examined individually with accompanying words or phrases. From the policy analysis of this study, terms and concepts were quantified and contextualized based on their reoccurring themes and then on their relationships and parallels to Human Rights through the terms from Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies. Next, the content was analyzed and interpreted in order to understand underlying meanings through determination of points of saturation, where no further examination of the concepts yielded anything new. In this study, concepts that are heavily emphasized through saturation points, within moral and patriotic education texts were carefully examined and understood from their socio-cultural context. Finally, the data was conceptualized to create a larger picture of the concepts being emphasized within moral and patriotic education curriculum (Hsieh, 2005; Krippendorff, 2012). A recent study with similar methodologies was done in the field of HRE by Bajaj (2012). The article, “From ‘time pass’ to transformative force: School-based Human Rights education in Tamil Nadu, India,” quantifies the emerging categories from the data, which are based around the ability of the students to incorporate Human Rights practices into their daily life. The researcher discusses
the use and meaning of the quantified variables with examples based on their ability by location, i.e. home, school, community. The research has the ability to take the analysis a step further than this research by providing additional categories to the saturation points because the sample provides these categories and also supplement the findings (Bajaj, 2012).

There were six steps of this policy analysis. The sample was selected in the first two steps. Initially, appropriate sections of each document’s content relevant to this research were identified, and then, of the sections selected, relevant key terms/phrases were identified based on their containment and reflection of the goals/values, of moral and patriotic education. The analysis began with the categorization of the key terms/phrases based on emerging themes to correspond with Chinese characteristics. Next, terms from Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies were consistently assigned to the previously selected terms/phrases. The reoccurrence of Chinese characteristics and the reoccurrence of the terms from Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies were then measured and compared. In the final step, saturation points of goals/values were identified from the selected key terms/phrases, allowing for deeper reflection and understanding.

The first step of the analysis was to identify which section of each document’s content was relevant to this research and allowed for the elimination of text that was irrelevant to the focus. Of the 66 sections within the eight documents, 22 were retained for analysis while 44 were eliminated. Sections that discussed explicit goals/values that policymakers strive to be the characterizations of moral and patriotic education were retained, while sections that discussed the management of moral and patriotic education were eliminated. For example, the section entitled, “The Essential Principles of Patriotic Education” in document 1, the Action Plan for Patriotic Education (2006), was retained as it contained statements such as:
Patriotic education must be guided by Deng Xiaoping’s theory of developing socialism with Chinese characteristics and the Party’s basic line and be beneficial for promoting socialist modernization; promoting reform and openness; upholding the reputation, dignity, unity, and interests of the nation and nationality and promoting the cause of the unification of the motherland. (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006, p. 7)

There are many things happening within this one phrase that will all be discussed throughout this analysis. There is discussion of “socialism,” “nationalism,” and “unity,” as well as “Reform and openness” which suggests “international awareness.” The sections of the documents focusing their attention on laws, curriculum implementation methods, logistics, expectations of teachers, community members, and government officials, summaries, evaluation, classroom materials, etc. were eliminated. The second document, Notice on the Formal Promulgation of the “Outline on Secondary School Moral Education” (2006), was eliminated completely as it is a summary of the third document, the Outline on Secondary School Moral Education (2006), and it exclusively discusses how the outline should be implemented, not the goals/values it contains (Outline, 2006; State Education, 2006).

The second step focused on identifying which key terms/phrases of the previously selected sections are relevant by containing reflections of the goals/values of moral and patriotic education. This further eliminated text that was irrelevant to the focus of the research. This step’s focus was to select the specific terms/phrases that would be used in the analysis. Through the use of Microsoft Excel database software, terms/phrases were isolated from text that was superfluous. The majority of the text was retained, but fragments and phrases that discussed laws, curriculum implementation methods, logistics, expectations of teachers, community members, and government officials, summaries, evaluation, classroom materials, etc. were eliminated. Examples of eliminated phrases include; “These regulations were made to strengthen primary and secondary school moral education work in accordance with the Education Law of the
People’s Republic of China and related provisions” (Regulations, 2006, p. 37), as this is a
discussion of the law, and “The process of developing civic morality is one in which education is
integrated with practice” (Action Plan for the Development, 2006, p. 63), as this is a logistic.

Next, in the third step, the isolated terms/phrases were categorized to correspond with
Chinese characteristics. The categories were derived from Nisbett’s (2004) descriptors of Asian
cultures, themes within descriptors of Chinese values from the literature, as well as
reoccurrences of themes within the documents themselves. The categories that surfaced were;
“harmony,” “inclusion,” “international awareness,” “nationalism,” “relationships,” “social
responsibility,” “socialism,” “tradition,” and “unity” (Maosen, 1990; Pepper, 2000; Reagan,
2004). These categories were not exhaustive and some were more frequently noted than others.
Many of the terms/phrases fit into several categories. They were not mutually exclusive. For
example, when the term or phrase identified with the “socialism” category, the term or phrase
usually identified with the “nationalism” category as well. However, whenever the “nationalism”
category appeared, it did not always coincide with the “socialism” category. The phrase
“Socialism with Chinese characteristics” appears several times throughout the documents and
represents both “socialism” and “nationalism” with the emphasis on the Chinese perspective. A
phrase such as “national pride and dignity” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006, p. 8) would warrant
the “nationalism” category, but not “socialism.”

Step four of the analysis was to consistently assign terms from Flowers’ (1998)
Methodologies to the previously selected terms/phrases. The terms/phrases were again examined
independently of one another then associated with terms from Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies.
Again, many of the terms/phrases from the policy documents fit into several categories, and they
were not mutually exclusive. Very rarely did a term/phrase arise that was unable to be associated
with a term from Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies. All terms from each of Flowers’ (1998) categories, Goals, Key Concepts, Specific Human Rights Problems, and Education Standards and Instruments, were considered so that as many overlaps could be identified as possible. The grade level at which each Goal, Key Concept, Specific Human Rights Problem, and Education Standard and Instrument that Flowers (1998) specifies is disregarded because the research examines policy, not curriculum. They are also irrelevant for this research because it examines the education system as a whole, not specific grade levels.

To ensure the accuracy of steps three and four, several measures were taken. First, a small percentage of the data was coded and reviewed with the research advisor, to guard against researcher bias and to ensure the correct processes and correlations were being made. During initial coding, certain codes were openly discussed with others to ensure that they were accurate, they were consistent, and the categories were not being forced together. After step three and four were completed, the categorizations were reviewed several times until no further changes were made. This was also to ensure that throughout the policy document terms/phrases, the categories were applied accurately, consistently, and that they were not being forced together with the terms/phrases. There was an initial coding, followed by a secondary review of the coding where various changes were made. In the third review of the coding, no additional changes were made. To additionally ensure that pairings were accurate and not being forced, the researcher, throughout the processes of steps three and four, erred on the side of not matching terms/phrases with Chinese Characteristics or Flowers (1998) terms if they did not seem to sufficiently parallel one another.
Step five measured the reoccurrence of Chinese characteristics and the reoccurrence of the terms from Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies. The reoccurrence of the Chinese characteristics reveals how strongly one characteristic is emphasized over the others. The reoccurrence of the terms from Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies reveals which concepts are present within Chinese moral and patriotic education classes and to what degree. This step also revealed the categories that do not exist within both the Chinese characteristics and within Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies. This is particularly important as it gives insight into the concepts of Human Rights prescribed by international entities that are missing from Chinese education.

In the final step of the research, step six, saturation points of the goals/values of the selected key terms/phrases, were identified and addressed to allow for deeper reflection and understanding of the content and its relativity to HRE. This revealed what is specifically being conveyed and how. This step answers the questions of how these documents overlap and are congruent with western HRE methodology. Also examined within this step was the contextualization of terms/phrases that specifically addressed important components of HRE prescribed by international entities such as rights, multinationalism, international participation, rights, and democracy. Around 40% of the document’s selected terms/phrases were not included in this step because of their lack of contribution to the saturation points.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that merit attention. First and foremost, the researcher is limited by the English language. While familiar with Chinese culture and language, fluency is not present. This limits the research in terms of access to text and sample size. Even though these specific documents highlight the significant time period from 1994 and 2004, where
radical changes in the education system have begun to settle in, the research is also limited to this specific time period. Other texts that could potentially undergo this analysis include more recent policy documents released on the topic of moral and patriotic education that have not yet been translated into English, classroom textbooks from moral and patriotic education courses, teacher lesson plans from moral and patriotic education courses. Despite the limitation of the time period, the selected policy documents provide adequate information for this analysis because their initial collection was based on their specific foci on citizenship education. As Human Rights is still a sensitive topic in China, interviews or surveys may be too controversial and could make participants uncomfortable. Another limitation of this research is researcher bias. Although several measures were taken to ensure objective coding, subjectivity is still present. The researcher, though invested in both HRE and Chinese education, may have made assumptions and links that are not completely transparent to all. To reduce research bias, the coding went through several steps of review and analysis.

Chapter 5: Findings, Conclusion, and Implications

Findings

The goal of this study is to examine and compare the moral and patriotic education policy in China with western guidelines for HRE, while looking for overlaps and congruencies. This section will provide a summary of the relevant points and interesting discoveries that came from the analysis of the text. First, the findings from the matching of terms/phrase with Chinese
characteristics and Flowers (1998) Methodologies will be discussed, followed by the examination of each of the saturation points. Finally the research will conclude with a summary of the findings and a discussion of the implications of the research.

In the analysis, 328 terms/phrases were selected for analysis. The total count of words analyzed was 9,122. The terms/phrases were first categorized to correspond with Chinese characteristics. This gives specific insight into the Chinese values emphasized within the documents. These categories were derived from Nisbett’s (2004) descriptors of Asian cultures, themes within descriptors of Chinese values from the literature, as well as reoccurring themes within the documents themselves (Maosen, 1990; Pepper, 2000; Reagan, 2004). Table 1: Frequency Table of Chinese Characteristics by theme presents the data associated with this step of the analysis. It first presents the number of appearances of each of the Chinese Characteristics followed by the percentage of terms/phrases that each of the characteristics was present within. Note that many of the terms/phrases exemplified multiple Chinese characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Appearances</th>
<th>Percent of Appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International awareness</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialism</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chinese categories themselves were also often indicators of the Flowers' (1998) terms that would be associated with each term or phrase from the documents. “Social responsibility” was a direct match to the Flowers’ (1998) term of “social responsibility.” The “Harmony” category was not necessarily indicative of “world peace,” but it would commonly signify “community” or “equality.” The category “Nationalism” was typically paired with “citizenship.” “Tradition” did not have a direct correlation and the phrase or term needed be examined more contextually. “Socialism” was always paired with the Flowers’ (1998) terms “community,” “equality,” and “group rights,” as it is a system of common ownership (Badie, Berg-Schlosser, & Morlino, 2011). Lastly, “international awareness,” depending on the context, could indicate Flowers’ (1998) terms such as “international law,” “world peace,” “world development,” “world political economy,” and “world ecology.”

Of the 328 terms/phrases used in this analysis, 182 (roughly 55%) of the terms/phrases, or around 2% of the words emphasized the theme of “nationalism.” Common terms/phrases other than the word “national” that were associated with the characteristic of “nationalism” include; “patriotism,” “national spirit,” and “love for the motherland” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; General, 2006). Just based on the amount of times this these occurred, it is clearly one of the most important values of the Chinese culture. If similar documents from western cultures were examined in the same light, the most common themes would most likely be “freedom,” “independence,” or “rights.” “Nationalism” to the Chinese is the most important thing. It is not just mandated by the government, but dictated by the culture. Not just the nation itself, but being part of the nation is more important in the Chinese culture that the freedom, independence or rights of the individual. On the other end of the spectrum, the theme of “relationships,” a common characteristic of the Chinese culture, dictated by Nisbett (2004) and thematic within the
descriptors of Chinese values from the literature, was only noted in ten instances (Maosen, 1990; Pepper, 2000; Reagan, 2004). The concentration of this term was in document 6, *Action Plan for the Development of Civic Morality* (2006), and focused not only on individual’s relationships to each other, but also their relationships with their society (Action Plan for the Development, 2006). Again, there is a push for the individual to be part of a larger whole. “Socialism” and “harmony” each appeared in roughly 33% and 31% of the terms/phrases respectively, or 1.2% of the total words, also making them characteristics of relatively great importance. The phrase “socialism with Chinese characteristics” was repeated throughout all of the documents and will be discussed in a later stage of the analysis as a saturation point. This characteristic was also noted several other instances, but it was almost always paired with the terms “socialism” or “socialist” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006). “Harmony” was only explicitly written a few times within the documents, and was typically paired with terms/phrases like “civilized,” “collectivism,” “right from wrong,” and “observing the law” (Outline, 2006). While the remaining themes, “inclusion,” international awareness,” “social responsibility,” “tradition,” and “unity” were mentioned in between 11% and 24% of the terms/phrases, they are still deemed important qualities by the creators of these policies because of their presence and repetitive appearance.

In step four of the analysis, the focus was shifted from analyzing the terms/phrases in reference to their representation of Chinese characteristics to associating the terms/phrases with terms from HRE Methodology. Of the 66 terms from Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies, 41 of them arose within the policy documents. The Chinese characteristic of “Nationalism” was typically paired with the Flowers’ (1998) term “citizenship,” because of their relative and
interchangeable meanings which reference an individual’s attachment to and status within their country. “Citizenship” was the most frequently noted of the Flowers’ (1998) terms, and the parallel appeared 217 times, or in 66% of the terms/phrases, or nearly 2.4% of the total words, with the highest concentration in the first document, Action Plan for Patriotic Education (2006). Therefore, like the Chinese characteristic of “nationalism,” “citizenship” was also associated with the terms “patriotism,” “national spirit,” and “love for the motherland.” In addition, it was associated with “unity” and “multinationalism” on a contextually relevant basis (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006). As previously discussed, when the theme of “socialism” appeared within the Chinese characteristics, the term or phrase was immediately associated with three Flowers’ (1998) terms; “community,” “equality,” and” group rights.” As “socialism” was also highly noted within the Chinese characteristics, these three terms also made frequent appearances. Table 2: Frequency Table of Socialism within HRE Framework highlights the instances that Flowers’ (1998) terms are used because of their association with the Chinese characteristic of “Socialism.” The second column shows the number of appearances of each of Flowers’ (1998) terms previous to their appearances included in the concept of “Socialism,” the second column shows their occurrence after the terms are noted with “Socialism,” and the final column shows the percentage of their total occurrences compared to all of the terms/phrases analyzed in the policy documents:
Table 2: Frequency Table  Socialism within HRE Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flowers’ (1998) Term</th>
<th>Number of Appearances before Association with Socialism</th>
<th>Total Number of Appearances including Association with Socialism</th>
<th>Total Percent of Appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>51.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Rights</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Socialism” was noted 110 times, and with additional instances, “community” was noted a total of 170 times, “equality” a total of 129 times, and “group rights” a total of 124 times. A few other moderately repeated terms include “social responsibility,” “ignorance,” “moral inclusion/exclusion,” and “moral responsibility/literacy.” The “social responsibility” characteristic was generally noted explicitly, in reference to enjoyment of occupation, and social participation which differed from “responsibility” as that was only noted 9 times and typically associated with self-consciousness or preservation (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006). “Ignorance” was usually noted in when the term/phrase eluded to awareness of a modern development and was often paired with “apathy” (Outline, 2006). The terms “moral inclusion/exclusion” and “moral responsibility/literacy” were often noted together but did vary occasionally based on the context of the phrase. The term “moral” arose repeatedly, but it was not always associated with “moral inclusion/exclusion” or “moral responsibility/literacy” because it often referred to the Moral Education course itself.
The 25 terms that were completely missing from the policy documents mainly included those that specifically address the UN and HRE endeavors. They also included the terms; “sexism,” “poverty/hunger,” “injustice,” “political repression,” “colonial/imperialism,” “environmental degradation,” “elimination of racism,” “elimination of sexism,” “NGOs,” “genocide,” and “torture.” The Flowers’ (1990) phrase “distinguishing wants from needs from rights” was not used in reference to Human Rights or citizens’ rights, but rather sacrifice for the society and social responsibility (Action Plan for the Development, 2006). Table 3: Frequency Table of HRE Methodology Terms shows the number of appearances for all of the HRE terms that were noted at least once in the first column, and in the second column, the table displays the percentages of the matching with the terms/phrases from the policy documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flowers’ (1998) Term</th>
<th>Number of Appearances</th>
<th>Percent of Appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for self</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for parents and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for others</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfairness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurting people (emotionally, physically)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom rules</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishing wants from needs from rights</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual rights</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group rights</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination/ prejudice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and national legal systems</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Specific Human Rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International law</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World peace</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World political economy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World ecology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal rights</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral rights</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic globalization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Human Rights Standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral inclusion/exclusion</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral responsibility/literacy</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialism = Community, Equality, Group Rights</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interesting notes from the analysis of this step include the specific mentions of democracy and Human Rights. Democracy appeared seven times within the documents and was occasionally used in the phrase “socialist democracy.” The notion of citizens’ rights appears several times within the documents, and Human Rights are specifically noted once. In the third document, *Outline on Secondary School Moral Education* (2006), Human Rights is one of the “Highlights of the Content of Senior Secondary Moral Education” (Outline, 2006, p. 25) in the “Education in Socialist Democracy and Observing Discipline and Law” (Outline, 2006, p. 26) section. The document specifically states “education in respect for the constitution, Human Rights, and upholding social stability” (Outline, 2006, p. 26). Despite the infrequency, the mention of these terms alone indicates progress towards their inclusion and will be discussed in step six of the analysis with the contextualization of saturation points.

Not all of the common terms/phrases from the policy documents fit in with Flowers’ (1998) terminology. There is not a specific matching Flowers’ (1998) term for the Chinese notions of “tradition,” “occupation,” and “self-discipline.” The Flowers’ (1998) term, “citizenship” was typically paired with the characteristic of “tradition,” but not exclusively. It was the context of the term “tradition,” that regularly paired together. For example, the phrase “education in the fine traditional culture of the Chinese nationality” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006, p. 9) can easily be paired with both the Chinese characteristic of “tradition” as well as the Flowers’ (1998) term “citizenship.” Even though the concept of “tradition” is not necessarily indicative of “citizenship,” awareness of “tradition” promotes a sense of belonging. There is not a specific Flowers’ (1998) term that can be paired with the word “tradition” or “culture,” but they clearly hold weight in the development of a quality citizen and help further the ideas of “nationalism” and “citizenship,” especially in China. Similarly, “occupation” and self-discipline”
were also common terms and part of common phrases that did not easily pair with Flowers’ (1998) terms. Within the documents, they appeared often but not enough to warrant their own thematic label. Instead they fell into other categories, particularly, “social responsibility.” The terms, “occupational ideals” and “occupational morality” could be associated with the Chinese characteristic and the Flowers’ (1998) term, “social responsibility,” but the context that “occupation” and self-discipline” are used suggest that these characteristics are not just part of that characteristics an individual should have, but that they are vital to the success of the individual and society. There is no reference to hard work or the importance of one’s occupation to society within HRE terminology. These three terms, “tradition,” “occupation,” and “self-discipline,” will be discussed at length in step six of the analysis, where saturation points are examined (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006).

In the final step of the analysis, step six, saturation points of the goals/values of the selected key terms/phrases are discussed to allow for deeper reflection and understanding of the content of the documents and their relativity to Flowers’ (1998) HRE Methodology. One of the most common concepts pushed within the policy documents was “socialism.” Specifically mentioned several times was, “Deng Xiaoping's theory of developing socialism with Chinese characteristics and the Party's basic line” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006, p. 7). Despite its numerous occurrences, there is no instance where the documents directly define this phrase. As cited in Cheung (2012), this concept was “first introduced by Deng Xiaoping when he announced the building of socialism with Chinese characteristics in his opening speech to the 12th Party Congress in September 1982” (p. 206). This phrase “mark[s] a new era of modernization that depart[s] from the Soviet model of the planned economy” (Cheung, 2012, p.
an and it typically allows for reforms, usually economic reforms, that do not specifically fit with socialism. The phrase provides enough vagueness to allow for market reform while ensuring a socialist ideology. Over the years, it did not remain solely in the economy as it made its way into other sectors of society including education (Cheung, 2012). The documents themselves exemplify this movement as they consistently focus on the development and cultivation of “socialism with Chinese characteristics” and conforming to the CPC through moral and political education courses. In addition to explicit matching, the Chinese characteristic of “socialism” was also associated with terms/phrases such as, “love for the motherland,” “nationalism,” “patriotism,” “modern development,” and the “market economy,” depending on the context. For example, in document five, *Opinions on Further Strengthening and Improving Primary and Secondary School Moral Education Work to Adapt to the New Situation* (2006), “patriotism” is mentioned as a means along with “collectivism” and “socialist ideological consciousness” to communism in the statement, “Moral education should lead students to gradually form a correct worldview, outlook on life, and values and to continuously enhance their patriotism, collectivism, and socialist ideological consciousness, laying a foundation for the excellent among them to eventually become communists” (p. 47). While it is not explicit that “community,” “equality,” and “group rights” are not the definition of “socialism” or “socialism with Chinese characteristics,” they are relevant enough within definitions of socialism, as well as Chinese culture to warrant the association. Their strong presence within the policy documents not only orients the analysis to understand that from Flowers’ (1998) terms the documents already strongly emphasize, but also how HRE can be shaped to fit with existing cultural norms (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006).
Two more points of saturation were the concepts of “Chinese nationality” and “multinationalism.” Within the documents, there is discussion of the development and tradition of Chinese nationality as well as the development of quality and pride for nationality. The concept of “nationality” itself and the phrases that describe and contextualize “nationality,” very overtly tie in with Flowers’ (1998) term, “citizenship.” Examples of phrases include, “The Chinese nationality is a great one” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006), “[w]e should guide people to develop their patriotic spirit and raise their respect for, confidence in, and pride in their nationality so that they take loving the nation and repaying the people as the greatest honor and harming the national interest and dignity of the people as the greatest shame,” (Action Plan for the Development, 2006) and “understand how the Chinese nationality developed, how it made great efforts to strengthen itself, remaining indomitable” (Outline, 2006). The Flowers’ (1998) term, “citizenship” does not specify the meaning of citizenship to one’s own country or global citizenship. Perhaps it is both. The policy documents specify Chinese nationality, not global citizenship. While one of the main Chinese characteristics is “International awareness,” the documents do not specifically mention being a global citizen or having a global nationality. There is no emphasis on this because Chinese identity is perhaps seen as more important than a global identity. Another answer would be that their emphasis is more oriented towards a Chinese identity because this characteristic can help facilitate other important qualities and values such as society and country before self (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006). Linked closely to the concept of “Chinese nationality” is the concept of “multinationalism.” There is strong emphasis on the idea that each nationality has made contributions to the Chinese nationality as a whole and that all should be equally represented.
Specifically in document one, *Action Plan for Patriotic Education* (2006), there is also discussion of unity among nationalities as well as the unity of the mainland with Hong Kong, Macao, and Taiwan. It is within this saturation point that the value of the whole is very apparent, and without the quality individual though, there is no quality whole. What is also important here is the notion that everyone is contributing to the whole and the nation. Citizenship and nationalities is about a group effort and the individual contribution to that effort (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006).

Relative to the concept of “nationalism,” with the focus on the cultivation of the individual to contribute to the whole, is the concept of “patriotism” which also formed a saturation point. Unlike concepts discussed previously, “patriotism was given a specific definition. According to several of the documents, “the basic moral standards of patriotism [are:] respect for the law, courtesy, honesty, unity, friendliness, hard work, frugality, self-improvement, respect for occupation, and dedication” (Action Plan for the Development, 2006, p. 58; Chinese, 2006, p. 69; Central, 2006, p. 80). It was even stated that patriotism should be “[regarded] as a main theme in young students’ ideological and moral development” (Chinese, 2006, p. 71). Other than the specific definitions, the other instances of the term “patriotism” were general and sweeping, such as, “[p]atriotism is the banner that mobilizes and inspires” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006, p. 7) and “the glorious tradition of patriotism” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006, p. 7). The reoccurrence of this term also contributes to the concept of “citizenship,” and the definition of “patriotism” provides a window into the specific characteristics associated with the development of quality citizens.
The next point of discussion is not specifically a saturation point within the documents, but its strong ties with Flowers’ (1998) methodologies, merits the attention. The terms “democracy” and “rights” made several appearances within the documents, and their presence alone signifies strong links to western ideals, international awareness, and the importance of Human Rights. There were nine specific instances of the word “democracy” and two of them were, “socialist democracy.” Never fully endorsing a democratic government, the documents did not discussed “democracy” in terms of the cultivation of democratic values, but rather ensuring democratic rights, legal systems, political system, and market economy (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006). The term “rights” appeared seven times, and as mentioned previously, in document three, the Outline on Secondary School Moral Education (2006), Human Rights was specifically addressed. In the section “Education in Socialist Democracy and Observing Discipline and Law” (Outline, 2006, p. 26), the document encourages the “education in respect for the constitution, Human Rights, and upholding social stability” (Outline, 2006, p.26). This instance alone signifies that there has been some impact from international pressures to incorporate Human Rights into national curriculum. The document that the specific term, “Human Rights” is mentioned in, document 3, the Outline on Secondary School Moral Education (2006), was published in 1995, four years after the White Paper, Human Rights in China, published by the Information Office of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China (1991), that discusses the right to subsistence, or development from within, which insists on the inclusion of cultural relativity within Human Rights (Kent, 2001). The other six instances of the term “rights” do not specifically address Human Rights, but flow through the same vein by addressing the need for educating about and ensuring of basic rights, legal rights, socialist rights,
democratic rights, and civil rights. When these documents were published, China was already embracing and contextualizing Human Rights concepts. While the appearance of the word “Human Rights” is significant, it does not necessarily mean that the specific Human Rights that are in the UDHR will be taught, or that China will now shift and completely comply with international pressures, but rather they will apply Human Rights as they are seen as relevant (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006; United Nations, 2013b). In document six, the Action Plan for the Development of Civic Morality (2006), there is a specific phrase that warns against the attempt of ensuring one’s own individual rights. The phrase reads, “people seek rights while neglecting their duties and harm the public interest to benefit their private interests” (Action Plan for the Development, 2006, p. 57) and is listed among other negative qualities. Again, we see the theme of the whole before the self as well as the belief that Human Rights can be ensured if the individuals take responsibility for one another.

Also heavily discussed within the documents is the concept of “tradition.” The term itself was mentioned 19 times, and it was usually preceded by the word “fine” or “glorious.” It is discussed as something to be respected and something that represents a standard that everyone should be trying to meet. The emphasis on pride in tradition centers the desire to fulfill or live up to one’s past. The awareness of and respect for tradition again connects the individual to something larger than themselves (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006). In this particular quote, “tradition” is understood as a balancing point for involvement with the rapidly developing international world; “education in a correct recognition of the fine ideological and cultural traditions of the Chinese nationality while drawing on the achievements
of the world’s advanced civilizations” (Outline, 2006, p. 25). The value that the Chinese place on tradition allows them to explore the international and developing world while remaining grounded within their own. In the scope of this analysis, the term “tradition” is specific to the Chinese culture. It is not present in Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies except for falling under the umbrella of the term “citizenship.” Tradition is both a culturally contextual characteristic and could be considered a weakness of Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies.

Similar to the term” tradition,” is the saturation point relative to contemporary history and the new or current situation. This specifically speaks to the developments since the Cultural Revolution in the 1960s and 70s, as well as the influence of the international world. The documents discuss how not only should education be about contemporary history and the modern situation, it should keep up with changing times (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006). These phrases range from “education in modern and contemporary history and the great achievements of the new socialist China,” (Outline, 2006, p. 23) to “[w]e should start from the reality of the situation, identify different levels, pay attention to the majority, encourage progressiveness, and make progress step by step” (Action Plan for the Development, 2006, p. 59). Similar to the concept of “tradition,” there is a need for the sense of balance with this point in the documents. While it is important to remember and understand the struggles of the country, it is similarly, not quite equally, important to keep up with modernization. The international world is looked at with caution and criticism to prevent individuals from getting swept up in romanticization.
Tied to the “international” theme is “reform and openness,” which creates another saturation point. The phrases also depict the opportunities within openness to the international world, as well as hesitations and complications. An example that represents many of the statements is from document 8, *Some Opinions on Further Strengthening and Improving the Development of Ideology and Morality Among Minors* (2006):

Our country’s further opening to the world has provided minors with more favorable conditions for understanding the world, increasing their knowledge, and broadening their horizons. At the same time, our struggle with hostile international forces to win over successors has become increasingly intense and complicated. (Central, 2006, p.76)

Again, the policymakers see the opportunities that can come from international relations and participation in a global discourse as they state, “we must also learn from and absorb all the civilized achievements of each of the world's nations, including developed capitalist nations” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006, p. 8) and they hope to be “able to contribute to promoting world peace and world progress” (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006, p. 8), but they also see the importance in protecting their own culture by “upholding national sovereignty, opposing hegemony” (Outline, 2006, p. 25).

In relation to the fear of negative international influence, another point discussed within the documents is the negative qualities to which an individual or group may be susceptible. Individualism is used in several instances as a negative trait and is only used in other instances to describe legal rights or relationship to the collective. Other negative qualities include; immorality, dishonesty, fakery, deception, cheating,….feudal superstition, cults, prostitution, gambling,…drug-taking[,]…money worship, hedonism, and extreme individualism[,] using power for personal gain” (Central, 2006 p. 77), crime, negative decadent ideologies, corruption, degeneration, and subversive behavior (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations,
These are the behaviors that the documents warn to avoid, and the majority of them are fairly universal taboos in most countries and cultures. The specific naming of negative behaviors clearly lays out expectations for personal conduct and creates a space for public shaming.

The final two major saturations point within the documents is the concept of “occupation” and “self-discipline,” as well as the concept of “collectivism.” The phrases that discuss “occupation” and “self-discipline” present interest and investment in them to be part of a person’s moral obligation to society. They are typically found within a list of characteristics prescribed by the policymakers. The motivator is not the self but others. These two concepts, like tradition, are also not found within Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies, offering yet another contextual point and whole in Flowers’ (1998) terms. Similar to “occupation” and self-discipline” is the saturation point of “collectivism” where the group needs are emphasized over the individuals (Action Plan for Patriotic, 2006; Action Plan for the Development, 2006; Central, 2006; Chinese, 2006; General, 2006; Outline, 2006; Regulations, 2006). “Collectivism” is mostly discussed around the notion of education, including:

Education in [c]ollectivism[,]…education in respect and care for others and unity and friendship among members of the collective[,]…education in love for the class and school, service to the collective, and upholding the honor of the collective[,]…education in the correct handling of relations between oneself and others, between the individual and the collective, and between freedom and discipline. (Outline, 2006 p. 23)

and “education in an outlook on life that takes collectivism as a guide” (Outline, 2006, p. 25).

“Collectivism” is about relationships and development of every type of relationship a person can have, particularly the one a person has with society. In document 6, the Action Plan for the Development of Civic Morality (2006), the policymakers also say that, “[t]he spirit of collectivism should penetrate each layer of social production and life, guiding people to correctly recognize and handle the relations among the interests of the nation, the collective, and the
individual and advocating the subordination of individual interests to collective interests, of the part to those of the whole, and of current interests to long-term interests” (Action Plan for the Development, 2006, p. 60) furthering the notion of the group needs before the individual, which was reiterated numerous times through several of the saturation points.

To display some of the findings a little more clearly, this final table, Table Four: Map of Chinese Values/Goals in relations to Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies, lays out the overlaps, congruencies, and additional characteristics or values found within the policy documents:
Table Four: Map of Chinese Values/Goals in relations to Flowers (1998) Methodologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
<th>Specific Human Rights Problems</th>
<th>Education Standards and Instruments</th>
<th>Additional Chinese Characteristics or Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for self (20)</td>
<td>Self (14)</td>
<td>Racism (12)</td>
<td>Classroom rules (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for parents and teachers (1)</td>
<td>Community (170)</td>
<td>Sexism (0)</td>
<td>Family life (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for others (47)</td>
<td>Responsibility (9)</td>
<td>Unfairness (1)</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of a Child (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishing wants from needs from rights (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hurting people (emotionally, physically) (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility (65)</td>
<td>Individual rights (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship (217)</td>
<td>Group rights (124)</td>
<td>Discrimination/prejudice (8)</td>
<td>UDHR (0)</td>
<td>Harmony (104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality (129)</td>
<td>Freedom (1)</td>
<td>Poverty/hunger (0)</td>
<td>History of Human Rights (0)</td>
<td>Inclusion (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice (3)</td>
<td>Injustice (0)</td>
<td>Local and national legal systems (34)</td>
<td>Relationships (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule of law (34)</td>
<td>Ethnocentrism (11)</td>
<td>Local and national history in Human Rights terms (0)</td>
<td>Tradition (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government (38)</td>
<td>Passivity (33)</td>
<td>UNESCO (0)</td>
<td>Unity (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNIFEC (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democracy (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of specific Human Rights (1)</td>
<td>International law (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN Conventions (0)</td>
<td>Socialism with Chinese Characteristics (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World peace (12)</td>
<td>Apathy (47)</td>
<td>Elimination of racism (0)</td>
<td>History (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World development (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elimination of sexism(0)</td>
<td>Occupation/Self-Discipline (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World political economy (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Human Rights conventions (0)</td>
<td>Collectivism (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World ecology (13)</td>
<td>Economic globalization (6)</td>
<td>UNHRC(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal rights (4)</td>
<td>Environmental degradation (0)</td>
<td>NGOs (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral rights (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Human Rights standards (1)</td>
<td>Moral inclusion/exclusion (71)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geneva Conventions (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Human Rights into personal awareness and behaviors (0)</td>
<td>Moral responsibility/literacy (75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specialized conventions (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genocide (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evolving Human Rights standards(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torture (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This table is a copy of Flowers’ (1998) Methodologies with an additional column for additional Chinese Characteristics or values that are representative of both the Chinese characteristic themes and the saturation points. Those themes with the greatest emphasis found throughout the analysis are marked in bold and enlarged. Those themes with notable emphasis are marked in bold. Themes with at least ten to 50 mentions are left in standard font. The themes or terms that have only a few or several mentions are washed out.

**Conclusion**

The results depict that, despite bias and international accusations, concepts found within Human Rights are present within the Chinese education system. It is potential that western influence from the monitoring processes is present, particularly with the use of the terms “democracy” and “rights,” but many of the congruencies and overlaps exist independently of the international influence as they are already relevant to Chinese culture and values. The terms “citizenship,” “community,” “equality,” and “group rights” are particularly well represented within the policy documents, “community,” “equality,” and “group rights” by means of “socialism.” These terms would not have occurred as frequently if they were only mandated by international pressures. They have developed organically through Chinese prioritization and are reflective of the values that the Chinese believe to be most important. It is supportive of what the Chinese government argues, that Human Rights, as they are written and measured by international and western entities, are not universal (Kent, 2001). What is not typically considered by these entities in their criticisms of China’s Human Rights policies is that there is a deep-rooted difference in the cognitive processes of easterners and westerners. The way each
group learns to interact with one another is reflective of deep rooted traditions developed through ecology. The natural landscape of China required individuals to live in well-organized communities, linking themselves to a network, while the natural landscape in Greece allowed for more trade and individuals to live on their own, connecting themselves more to objects. As previously discussed, “harmony” is the counterpart to western agency. The goals of harmony therefore, directly conflict with the notion of speaking out for oneself, providing rationale, not only for China’s resistance to institutionalizing Human Rights, but also for the need for HRE to be contextualized rather than explicit within the national curriculum (Nisbett, 2004). Not only can the implicit goals/values behind Human Rights be manifested differently within cultural contexts, they can and should be institutionalized and measured accordingly.

The research reveals that the documents are supportive of Kent’s (2001) claim that the focus of Chinese moral and political education is on “economic, social, and cultural rights, and the right to development” (p. 66). Economic rights are developed through socialism and social rights through collectivism and socialism. Culture is woven throughout many of the terms/phrases and is particularly present within all nine of the Chinese characteristics: “harmony,” “inclusion,” “international awareness,” “nationalism,” “relationships,” “social responsibility,” “socialism,” “tradition,” and “unity.” Some of the themes that arose from the documents, Nisbett’s (2004) themes from his research, and the saturation points were reflective of the shifts in political education that occurred during the Cultural Revolution, specifically “socialism,” “social responsibility,” “unity,” the notions of hard work and self-discipline as well as the dedication of the individual to the collective, marking their origins (Kai & Xu, 2013).
Additionally, the right to development, of the right to subsistence, has its own place as it arises with the mentions of “Chinese characteristics” (Kent, 2001). It is also reflective of the push away from Soviet influence and is also indicative of the self-development that is occurring and national independence (Pepper, 2000).

Returning to original perspectives and definitions of Human Rights from Sen and the Centro de Recursos Educativos, at HRE core is education for values. The definitions of the Human Rights are not up for interpretation, but how they are taught and their relevance to local and cultural context is important as they are written by western entities (Centro de Recursos Educativos, 1992; Sen, 1999). Through matching each of these Human Rights terms, it could be determined which values and morals align with each of them, and the realization that HRE exists within the Chinese curriculum can be achieved. Sen’s (1999) belief that public policy will develop as citizens are given the capabilities that help them achieve fulfilment in life through that which they value can be realized through understanding the current capabilities within China and the determination of that which is missing. Sen’s (1999) framework emphasizes individual development and fulfilment. While the descriptors of Chinese Characteristics highlight the collective over the individual, the individual is not absent. It is the individual’s cultivation, by both society and themselves, that contributes to the collective.

Implications

Firstly, this research should not be considered exhaustive. There are several steps that can be taken to contribute to its continuation. Following the same analytic procedures to conduct a text analysis of documents and textbooks that are more recent and have not been translated into English or examining the content in regards to grade level or age ranges would both be
expansions that would allow for a wider and more accurate scope of the framing of HRE in China. Additionally, what we still do not know from this research is how well the policies are reaching the classroom, and this is a common issue within the field of HRE. The eliminated sections of the policy documents could be examined for logistics of implementation. They could then be compared to the reality of the situation and the knowledge of the educators and students on the subject matter. This may allow for a better picture of what is truly reaching the student.

Within the Chinese context, the themes of “citizenship,” “nationalism,” and “socialism” are closely intertwined. It is important to develop these things in the individual for the good of the country. It is also important for China to develop these things independent of its neighbors and western influence. The saturation points discussed in the analysis reveal what the policies look like when there is not an emphasis on Human Rights. Categories like “tradition,” “occupation,” and “self-discipline” would not be present within HRE Methodology as they are not representative of individual rights, but rather the needs of the society. They are heavily present within this research as they contribute to the overarching theme of development within and Chinese independence over individual independence. Despite the construct of “relationships,” being an important Chinese characteristic and a large part of Confucian ideology, it made little appearance within the documents. Does this mean that it is taught elsewhere? This also brings to question the other concepts that may be missing. Perhaps the concept of “relationships” is almost exclusive to an individual’s relationship with society and was implied within most of the text, but not strongly enough to warrant categorization. Through the way the other themes are presented, this is a definite possibility.
This research offers several contributions. The first area of contribution is the support of China’s engagement with Human Rights. China provides a valuable case for the context of HRE where no specific western model has been adopted as well as insight into how these interpretations can take place in a non-Western context. There is a stronger platform for Chinese policymakers to support their claims that western definition of Human Rights and the western education models proposed for international standards conflict with the norms of Chinese culture, and that their own framework of HRE is infused in the national curriculum and falls within the spectrum of universal Human Rights. This research additionally contributes to the transformation of the field of HRE so that it can be more relative to eastern cultures. If directly applied to curriculum, HRE will impose western ideals that may not be directly applicable, as we see with the terms “democracy” and “rights.” When these terms are examined outside the box, it may appear that democracy and demand for the ensuring of individual rights may not be the best fit for every county and culture. Now that it is possible to contextualize HRE for non-western cultures there is a foundation for future exploration of the values and morals being taught as well as their relativity to HRE. It not only allows us to see what is weak or missing, but also shows the complexity of the concepts and multiple combinations of them with different meanings. Flowers’ (1998) terms that were not present within the analysis are revealing to what can be improved upon or, more importantly, what may not fit and should not be forced into the culture. The terms that specifically address Human Rights and UN endeavors force the idea of explicit individual rights that could jeopardize the whole. If instead, the same values are present within the curriculum, contextualization can occur. In China’s case, individuals can protect each other’s rights rather than just their own. This will still ensure the presence of Human Rights and perhaps create an even stronger path to their existence than everyone only looking out for themselves.
However, there are still several terms missing from the documents that do not appear to directly conflict with Chinese values and could easily be incorporated. They are: “sexism,” “poverty/hunger,” “injustice,” “political repression,” “colonial/imperialism,” “environmental degradation,” “elimination of racism,” “elimination of sexism,” “NGOs,” “genocide,” and “torture.” The culturally contextual incorporation of these terms into the policy documents is where policymakers should head to better insure compliance with international law as well as education and awareness of their people. It is proof that this type of analysis is beneficial to education policymakers as well as those developing the field of HRE. Not only can it provide the basis for entities to expand HRE practices within their own cultural context, it can also be used to create reflective and important change in the way we view the universal operationalization and monitoring of Human Rights.
### Appendix A

Methodologies: Development and Conceptual Framework for HRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
<th>Specific Human Rights Problems</th>
<th>Education Standards and Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Early Childhood**  
*Preschool and Lower Primary*
| **Later Childhood**  
*Upper Primary*
| **Adolescence**  
*Lower Secondary*
*Ages 12-14* | Knowledge of specific Human Rights | International law, World peace, World development, World political economy, World ecology, Legal rights, Moral rights | Ignorance, Apathy, Cynicism, Political repression, Colonialism/imperialism, Economic globalization, Environmental degradation | UN Conventions, Elimination of racism, Elimination of sexism, Regional Human Rights conventions, UNHRC, NGOs |
| **Older Adolescents and Adults**  
*Upper Secondary*
*Ages 15 and up* | Knowledge of Human Rights standards, Integration of Human Rights into personal awareness and behaviors | Moral inclusion/exclusion, Moral responsibility/literacy | Genocide, Torture | Geneva Conventions, Specialized conventions, Evolving Human Rights standards |
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