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1. Introduction
1.1 Topic: the globalization of Citizenship Education
As the world globalizes, it would seem logical for education to be shaped by shared standards and molded into a standardized model. However, there are in fact differentiations and diverse factors that run counter to these expectations. Citizenship Education is a particular case in point.

Citizenship Education is essential to the world’s many countries and regions which aim to bring up their young people as democratic citizens. However, given the varying circumstances and needs of each nation or society, this necessity is not met in a uniform way.

This paper will review and examine the factors that explain why Citizenship Education methodology differs throughout the United States, Europe and Asia. These factors have been previously recognized and discussed by many scholars (Kennedy 1997; Cogan and Dericott 1998; Arthur, Davies and Hahn 2008). They include social imperatives, historical environment and development, religious and cultural background, the importance of morality and ethics, and the degree to which Citizenship Education is already in place.

Regarding the latter, for example, ‘citizenship’ has been an independent subject in England since 2002, and Citizenship Education appears as part of the school curriculum. Instead of rearing their young people in a social vacuum, British society wants new educational policies for the purpose of democracy and good citizenship. Many countries and regions share the same social conditions as England, including the rest of the UK, but it is only there that citizenship is treated as an independent academic subject. Elsewhere, Citizenship Education is taught as part of education as a whole or within other subjects such as Social Studies, Social Sciences, Geography, and History.
There are a number of reasons why an independent curriculum area should spring up in England. The country’s social imperatives seek to attain inclusiveness and integration as a whole nation; its religious and cultural background allows people with different faiths, cultures and ideologies to create a single multifaceted society; and, despite the social importance of morality and ethics, there is no single set of values shared in common by its young people. In addition, it has a long history of including citizenship within its educational parameters.

1.2. Research Objectives
Citizenship Education responds to globalizing standards and its essential aims are the same throughout the world. However, looking at how it is conducted in various countries and regions reveals many differing features. It seems that world globalization will not necessarily bring about, uniformity in Citizenship Education; rather, that the attempt at standardization will actually accentuate its diversity as respective countries and regions conduct Citizenship Education in different ways. The object of this paper is to answer the corresponding question ‘Why?’ We can see it in this way: the fundamental aims are the same everywhere, but ways of achieving them will differ because of the individual conditions of each nation and society.

1.3. Research Methods
A kind of Citizenship Education occurs in each country and region of the world. The vehicle for it is not just school, but society as well. Its diverse forms have their origin in a state or nation’s educational policy: its curriculum, its views about formal education, instruction and learning, and teacher training. These make up a major part of the current social and cultural context of each country and region.

This paper will a) make a distinction between Western and Asian spheres; b) propose an analysis of the characteristics of respective systems of Citizenship Education; c) look at the nature of these characteristics; d) conduct a comparative study of five factors: social imperatives, historical environment and development, religious and cultural background, the intra-societal importance of morals and ethics, and the academic advance of Citizenship Education; and e) clarify the reasons why each country and region has its own type of Citizenship Education.

Using a comparative approach to research, we have examined the characteristics of several systems of Citizenship Education through summaries of representative texts from different countries (Cogan and Dericott 1998;
Arthur, Davies and Hahn 2008). In our hypothesis, the Western sphere consists of the US, the UK and Australia, and the Asian sphere of South Korea, Singapore, China and Hong Kong, and Japan.

2. Hypothesis
Using this comparative approach, the departure point of our examination is Green’s 1997 hypothesis on education and nation building. Green’s hypothesis appears in a discussion of Europe and Asia:

The hypothesis here is that education has played a particularly important role in the so-called ‘developmental’ states and that its rapid growth in certain periods has been closely linked with the intensive process of state formation engendered by the developmental ambitions of the state. Rapid educational advance is both a product of the developmental state and an important vehicle for its work. The argument so stated might seem unexceptional, as merely a restatement of a human capital theory of developmental given a dirigiste twist. However, what is suggested here is somewhat more controversial since it specifically relates economic development with the broader aspects of state formation which concern the cultivation of social cohesion and national identity. (Green 1997, 10)

Green sees the relationship between education and nation building from the viewpoint of economic development. This paper modifies his hypothesis in three ways. We refine it by focusing on Citizenship Education instead of general education, expand it by using the concept of state and society building instead of nation building, and augment it by substituting political, social, cultural and other considerations for Green’s economic viewpoint. By doing so, we are able to formulate the following new hypothesis on Citizenship Education:

1. Citizenship Education in a country or region is implemented in response to its level of state and social development, according to the extent to which it is necessary.
2. Citizenship Education has always played a particularly important role in the formation of state and society and continues to do so.
3. At certain times, the rapid growth of Citizenship Education is closely linked to a phase of intensive formation of state and society and is a product of the desire for development and progress.
4. The rapid growth of Citizenship Education is the product of state and
social development as well as an important vehicle for the advancement of this type of development.

5. It is common in developing states and societies that their developmental ambitions are closely linked to the rapid growth of Citizenship Education, since Citizenship Education encourages social cohesion and the formation of a national identity.

6. Economically and politically developed states and societies create and continue to create new and more advanced models of themselves, and expect their people to attain new and more advanced stages of citizenship. These are linked to the advance of Citizenship Education. Citizenship Education is concerned with cultivating diverse social integration alongside local, national and global identities.

3. Characteristics of Citizenship Education in the Western sphere

We examined the US, Australia and the UK as examples of economically and politically developed Western society, and analyzed the characteristics of Citizenship Education using representative works on the subject.

3.1 The diversity of public education based on freedom of education: the USA

We will use Citizenship Education in the US as our landmark. One could say that the US is the most fertile ground for the growth of Citizenship Education, the hallmark of which in the US is the fact that it is not conducted as a separate subject but instead incorporated throughout the curriculum and in Social Studies classes.

Hahn reviews academic research on Citizenship Education in the US and makes the following comments about its distinguishing features:

In exploring the topic of education for citizenship and democracy in the US, several contextual factors should be kept in mind. First, there is little agreement about the most appropriate definition of citizenship education. ........ A second contextual factor to keep in mind is that citizenship education has a long history in the US. ........ A third factor to consider in examining citizenship education in the US is that the educational system is decentralized; policies and practices are not uniform across the 50 states and 15,000 school districts. (Hahn 2008, 263-264)

The progress of Citizenship Education in the US goes hand in hand with the social imperatives that each state places on each of its members at any particular time. It is fair to say that the development of US education as a
whole is the history of Citizenship Education. Americans are taught citizenship as they progress through the school system. Hahn discusses three important contextual factors that have shaped US Citizenship Education. These are its long history, the fact that it is not precisely defined, and the decentralized nature of the US education system.

Walter Parker offers these conclusions about Citizenship Education in the US:

Many educators in the United States, probably most in the Social Studies community, uphold the citizenship mission of the schools, but many criticize its implementation as being too weak to amount to anything. Free public schooling for all children has, in fact, been the primary citizenship education achievement; stronger forms of citizenship education have been developed but not widely implemented. In other words, as a curriculum innovation, democratic citizenship education is an idea that really has not been tried vigorously on a wide scale. (Parker 1998, 72)

Parker writes that US Citizenship Education is conducted within the framework of the Social Studies curriculum and is characterized by the free educational system. He states that its primary purpose is Citizenship Education, but that this is not fully functional and curriculum reform is needed. Parker selects both internal and contextual factors as the grounds for US Citizenship Education.

By their selection of the characteristics of citizenship, Hahn and Parker exemplify thinking on the subject in advanced countries and regions. Freedom within the educational system is the external driving factor of Citizenship Education and within that framework much diversity is possible. Further, Citizenship Education functions in a variety of formats but the degree of implementation and its content are insufficient. Both scholars share the opinion that reform is necessary in order to recreate Citizenship Education.

The American example demonstrates that while Citizenship Education operates within the contextual factors of educational history and the school system, there is a drive toward diverse realizations: while fulfilling America’s educational mission, Citizenship Education either conforms to the development of state and society or, in Parker’s words, exists in “stronger forms...... not widely implemented.” Along with the extensive history of US education, there is a history and body of research on Citizenship Education, but no limitations on its aims. A superior product is always the goal; growth and progress have been achieved but there is always more to attain; and it is America’s special
characteristic that this is still the objective of Citizenship Education.

Citizenship Education in the US is strongly influenced by two factors - the historical development of citizenship in America and the academic development of research into it - and prompted by the social imperatives of societal growth, which is natural in a democracy. In her review Hahn points out two frameworks of the historiography of Social Studies and citizenship education in the US of the 20th century: "the Progressive Era origins of social studies and civic education and a continuing struggle between the subjects of history and social studies" (Hahn 2008, 264). These frameworks were found by academic research and continue to have considerable influence on Citizenship Education in the US.

3.2 Citizenship Education as the vehicle for democratization: Australia

Australia has developed Citizenship Education because of the influence of such factors as educational conditions, policy and research in the US, England and elsewhere. Citizenship Education in Australia is not an independent subject and is included in Geography, History, Social Studies and related subjects. Print provides the following interpretation of "education for democratic citizenship (EDC)" in Australia:

That this situation exists after a decade of education for democratic citizenship (EDC) through the vehicle of Discovering Democracy, a promising programme designed specially to develop student understanding of Australian democracy, is all the more confounding. In 1997 the federal government introduced Discovering Democracy after an earlier national inquiry concluded a civic deficit existed in Australia schools. The outcome was a major curriculum initiative, designed to meet a widely held view, particularly by the government of the day, that young Australians knew little, and understand less, about their system of democratic government. (Print 2008, 95)

Several factors may account for this situation with lessons for future innovations. The lack of curriculum consolidation in schools has meant that many students have simply not studied EDC or have done so minimally. Second, the lack of a high profile for EDC has meant it is too often not taken seriously by teachers. Third, widespread teacher engagement is lacking largely because EDC is not represented as a full academic subject or a substantial subject presence in the school curriculum. Fourth, schools display a lack of consolidation of the informal curriculum components of EDC, (such as school elections, student councils and student volunteering) with the formal curriculum so as to provide a comprehensive approach to learning about and participating in education for democratic citizenship. Until these issues are
addressed seriously the future for democratic citizenship in Australian schools will remain problematic. (Print 2008, 106)

Citizenship Education is offered as ‘EDC’ in Australia. Australian citizens and residents are seen to have gaps in their awareness and functioning as a democratic public because of insufficient knowledge, understanding, competency, skill and perception; and these must be compensated for and overcome. Four areas must be examined to provide new innovations. These are: rethinking of the curriculum, recognition and status of citizenship within it, deeper involvement on the part of teachers, and the study and consolidation of informal curriculum components.

Print’s study offers recommendations for the smooth functioning of EDC and the achievement of results. Its aim is to prepare for a more democratic society. It is a vehicle that shapes state and society. In Australia as well as among other advanced nations, Citizenship Education exists not just to maintain state and society as it is, but as a positive factor and a driving force for growth and evolution. One could say that the need in Australia is for curriculum conditions that will enable this to happen.

3.3 The hidden perspective of religion and universalism: the case of Citizenship Education as an independent subject in England

In contrast, Citizenship Education in England is an independent subject in the secondary school. This original subject had three strands: social and moral responsibility, community involvement, and political literacy; and three interrelated elements: knowledge and understanding about becoming an informed citizen, skills of enquiry and approach, and skills of participation and responsible action (Kerr, Smith and Twine, 2008, 253-255). Formerly, most research into Citizenship Education focused on state and society. But “citizenship is built upon understandings of individuals and society.” (Arthur, Davies and Hahn 2008, 4)

In his recent book, Arthur demonstrates new perspectives on Citizenship Education, arguing that:

In Britain there is little attention given in modern educational discourse to religion and its role in shaping meanings of citizenship. In part this is due to the fact that many of the organizations that seek to promote a discourse on citizenship education are secular bodies that present issues of religious identity and faith in the language of community, equality, diversity and values. ...... Consequently, accounts of citizenship in educational studies generally omit positive references to religion. (Arthur 2008, 305)
Arthur offers the religious perspective as a new approach to Citizenship Education and examines the relationship between the subject area and Christianity. In particular, he emphasizes the importance of secular beliefs versus religious beliefs in personal and social life, and states that Christian beliefs are present within Citizenship Education. He would probably say that Christian beliefs are the primary characteristic of Citizenship Education in the Western sphere. This is an important point that is new to research on this subject.

Arthur’s assertion that Christian beliefs inform Citizenship Education does not mean that the virtues of tolerance and brotherly love - which are moral and spiritual values - are critical or will become critical to it, but within Citizenship Education children can think, debate and act, and at such times they are pursuing absolute universalism, which is grounded in Christian core values such as community, equality and diversity.

Knowledge, skill, and understanding are tested in British Citizenship Education, by the standard questions ‘What is right? What is wrong?’ before each course unit proceeds to the next. This differs greatly from the Citizenship Education based on Confucian philosophy in Japan and most nations in the Asian sphere, where Citizenship Education is grounded in relative universalism. Rather than ‘Which is correct?’ the issue is to determine ‘Which is more correct?’

Along with its long history of educational research into Citizenship Education, England has responded to social imperatives and the demands of its religious and cultural background by formulating and implementing the subject as a discrete curriculum area. In this context, as Arthur points out, the distinguishing feature is that the social necessity for morality and ethics which underlies the Christian religion has become its framework.

3.4 Characteristics of Citizenship Education in the Western sphere
The developed nations and regions of the United States, Australia, and the UK have implemented Citizenship Education as part of the academic curriculum, in the form of EDC, as an independent subject, or as Social Studies. It appears in very diverse formats. In addition to this characteristic diversity, three other aspects should be emphasized.

First, Citizenship Education has been instituted in many types of school curricula and is firmly established. It has always been the main mission in America’s long history of education, Australia has EDC as an educational concept and England teaches Citizenship Education as an independent subject.
Secondly, it is linked to the formation of state and society. Given the evolution of American society, there have been proposals to reform Citizenship Education in the US. Australia’s EDC was originally seen as a way to democratize Australian society. England’s Citizenship Education classes are directed toward the democratic social cohesion of UK society.

Third, Citizenship Education embodies Christian absolute universalism as a hidden standard. In the Western sphere people tend to make judgments according to personal beliefs founded in Christianity. One of the characteristics of Christianity is absolute universalism, expressed by ‘God is always right.’ Absolute universalism is an important standard for judgment, as it is used to determine societal rights and wrongs, and judgments and decisions about conduct. This becomes a second dimension of a moral education that examines and makes decisions about social virtues and evils. In Western countries and regions, religious education is a school subject but moral education is not. One could say that Citizenship Education is a substitute for the work of moral education.

4. Characteristics of Citizenship Education in the Asian sphere
We examined South Korea, Singapore, China, Hong Kong and Japan within the developing Asian sphere and, as with the developed West, we analyzed the characteristics of Citizenship Education using representative works on the topic. These countries and regions share the fact that they are influenced by the West instead of instituting Asia’s own systems of Citizenship Education. They have adopted a Western model and within it tried to create systems appropriate to their own circumstances.

4.1 Citizenship Education linked to national history and ideology: South Korea
South Korean Citizenship Education is linked to Social Studies. The Korean educational scholar Jho discusses the characteristics of Korean Social Studies and Citizenship Education:

The discourse of Korean social studies curriculum in the second half of the 20th century was not free from ideological constraints, but severely distorted by authoritarian dictatorship. The state government in Korea was in strong command of social studies curriculum and textbooks at the national level until very recently. Authoritarian military leaders capitalized on the national social studies curriculum so as to legitimate their cold-war ideology and to prolong their political life. (Jho 2006, 26)
Jho proposes that Social Studies/Citizenship Education in South Korea is a creation of its social and cultural history and is tied to an ideological context. Like South Korea, many Asian countries make Social Studies, Geography and History the center of their designated curriculum and implement Citizenship Education by connecting it to their own society, culture and history. Consequently, they have moved to a values-centered orientation. For South Korea, Citizenship Education, and Social Studies in particular, is taught against the backdrop of world affairs and its own situation in the North-South confrontation that followed World War II and the Korean War. Political and military relationships are strongly reflected in Social Studies/Citizenship Education. The content of these courses is always defensive of the homeland and strongly nurtures national loyalty. Disregarding the question of whether or not this is ‘ideology,’ South Korea’s characteristic is that it places the nation in the foreground.

South Korean Citizenship Education is strongly influenced by the nation’s international standing, and, in particular, by a historical environment and conditions that are inseparable from the political and economic context. The environment and conditions have created social imperatives that frame the contents of Citizenship Education.

4.2 Citizenship Education as National Education: Singapore
In the aftermath of World War II, Singapore has exhibited the most striking growth in Asia. Singapore is characterized by its status as a city-state and by its aggregation of diverse ethnicities.

Sim explains Citizenship Education and Social Studies in Singapore as follows:

Citizenship education involves the preparation of young people to become informed, responsible and participative citizens. In Singapore, social studies is a key vehicle for citizenship education in the context of National Education, the Government’s initiative to drive the future. The introduction of social studies as a compulsory, examinable subject in Singapore secondary schools at the upper secondary level reflects the government’s continuous single-minded pursuit of citizenship education to meet national needs. (Sim and Print, 2005, 70)

Singapore also incorporates Citizenship Education into Social Studies. As Sim states, Singapore is characterized by its teaching of National Education, in which the government takes the lead and instills awareness and understanding
of the state. The city-state of Singapore uses Citizenship Education to meet national needs as it strives to unify the public. Because of this, Social Studies is a required subject even in high school. Citizenship Education in Singapore is shaped by national imperatives and needs rather than by social or moral imperatives. It is best expressed by the word ‘single-mindedness’: the union of individual minds into one.

4.3 Citizenship Education that departs from Western reason: China and Hong Kong

Citizenship Education in Hong Kong operates under different circumstances from those in mainland China. As in other developing Asian countries and regions, there is an agreement with the way in which Western Citizenship Education is conducted.

Paul Morris provides us with an account of civic education in Hong Kong:

Hong Kong schools have provided pupils with a moral code of behavior, especially through the hidden and informal curriculum. However, loyalty to the state or the promotion of a sense of national identity have not been key goals of schooling, as is the case both in China and other East Asian societies such as Japan, South Korea and Taiwan. Evidence does suggest that this is in the social psyche of Hong Kong citizens which, as noted earlier, has also been described as:

defiant to both the governments of Hong Kong and China, lacking a sense of community and individualistic and lacking a clear cultural identity. (Morris 1997, 125)

Morris informs us that civic education and Citizenship Education in the nations of East Asia is similar to that mentioned in our previous discussion of South Korea: it is conducted in a political, economic and social context. Further he points out this subject area in East Asia provides “a moral code of behavior,” and is connected with moral education.

Morris’s explanation stands in contrast to Arthur’s previously quoted discussion of religion in economically and politically developed nations matured in democracy. Special attention must be given to the link with Asian morality and, in particular, to extracurricular education, school functions that are conducted as a hidden curriculum, and special activities. Such activities are very conspicuous.

Morality can also be explained in terms of Confucianism, which has
spread widely throughout Asia. Confucian philosophy values the community over the individual. The state takes precedence over the individual and private thoughts must give way to group consensus. Decisions are made according to the dominant view within the group, in obedience to ‘single-mindedness.’

Outwardly, this principle bears a strong resemblance to the Western-style process of respect for individual opinions, emphasis on deliberation, and decision by majority rule. However, it is merely a surface resemblance. In Asia, the true focus is on group dominance and aggregate decisions, the core values behind it being hierarchical and historical; for example, the precedence of the old over the young and the dominance of the state.

Citizenship Education as practiced by China, Hong Kong and the other Asian nations is based on a background of historical environment and development, religion and culture. It is characteristically rooted in Confucian morality. As Morris has also noted, rather than creating a democratic society that rests on the formation of an awareness of individual and community in the Western sense, these countries have created a society that is dependent on a pre-existing awareness of the state.

4.4 Citizenship Education verified by ‘naturalness’: Japan

Japanese Citizenship Education is centered principally on the subject of Social Studies.

Parmenter discusses the ‘naturalness’ of Citizenship Education in Japan:

As in most other countries, citizenship education in Japan is a deeply built structure of many years of history, many aspects of culture and many institutions’ and individuals’ efforts. The result is a solid foundation which, to the eyes of the most of those standing on it, is ‘just natural’. Herein lie both the power and danger of citizenship education. As a ‘natural foundation’, citizenship education is a powerful force in developing individuals’ values, ways of acting, ways of thinking and ways of being. At the same, this naturalness is potentially dangerous as it encourages an unquestioned, taken-for-granted acceptance of the values and ways of thinking being promoted by the state. (Parmenter, 2004, 94)

As Parmenter states, Citizenship Education in Japan is based, in its own fashion, on Japan’s long history, its culture and institutions, and human endeavor. These form the foundations of Citizenship Education. The foundations are very stable and the public regards it as ‘natural’.
‘Natural’ refers to the unchangingness of historical tradition, in terms not of (transient) society but the (intransient) state. As Parmenter points out, despite attempts at change, nothing changes. In Japan, Korea, China, Hong Kong and most other Asian countries and regions, the state forms a constant and continuous part of Citizenship Education.

4.5 Characteristics of Citizenship Education in the Asian sphere
Most of developing Asia conducts Citizenship Education as Social Studies, but with varying content. However, they share three points in common.

First, Citizenship Education is incorporated into the school curriculum as Social Studies. It is firmly established but ambiguous at the same time. This is because Social Studies is the primary responsibility and Citizenship Education is only secondary. It would be unusual to find instances where citizenship is seen or taught as the aim of education itself, as it is in the US.

Secondly, Citizenship Education is linked to the state. There is little sense of societal growth and evolution. Instead, all of these countries and regions depend on Citizenship Education as the basis for nation building and growth. Consequently, Citizenship Education is taught as national education instead of civic education.

Thirdly, Citizenship Education takes ‘naturalness’ as its point of reference, and relies on history, politics, economics and culture in their own right. Relative universalism, which changes according to circumstance and is based on precedent, is used to determine right and wrong and to make judgments and decisions about conduct in state and society. In general, Confucianism operates as the main standard for these judgments. One could say that it is easy for Citizenship Education to work in tandem with moral instruction in the Asian sphere, not with the aim of nurturing citizenship in a democratic society, but in order to shape a nation in accordance with ‘naturalness’.

5. Summary and discussion
Let us summarize the results of this study and discuss our previously created hypothesis.

As nations respond to their respective national and social imperatives, Citizenship Education has come to be seen as critical. This movement is occurring throughout the world and can be seen as an effect of globalization.

However, this is not to say that Citizenship Education in each country and region is uniform. If we divide the world into the two major spheres of the West and Asia and look at their approaches to Citizenship Education, we discover their respective differences as well as commonalities. There is
differentiation and diversity. Each country and region has its own operating factors.

This paper compares the characteristics of Citizenship Education in Asia and the West. The democratic and economically and politically developed United States, United Kingdom and Australia all deliver Citizenship Education, but in very diverse forms. South Korea, China, Hong Kong, Japan and most of developing Asia teach Citizenship Education as Social Studies, but in each case the content is different. However, in the approach to the subject in both spheres there is some commonality. Here are our points of comparison.

First, Citizenship Education in the West and in Asia has been instituted in many types of school curricula and is firmly established. It has always been the educational goal throughout America’s long history of education. Australia has EDC and England teaches Citizenship Education as an independent subject.

Secondly, Citizenship Education is linked to the formation of state and society. In the West, the subject is more connected with society; in Asia, with the state. As Western Citizenship Education is linked to the larger growth and evolution of society, there are frequent proposals for its reformation. In Asia, on the other hand, there is little sense of societal growth and evolution and Citizenship Education is seen as a sure and dependable basis for nation building and growth.

Thirdly, Citizenship Education in the West is founded on Christian absolute universalism. It is used to determine right and wrong, and to make judgments and decisions about conduct in state and society. In the West, religious education is a subject but moral education usually is not. One could say that Citizenship Education is a substitute for moral education. In Asia, it is related to ‘naturalness’ as a standard and is drawn from history, politics, economics and culture in their own right. Confucianism frequently provides the standard for making judgments. It is easy for Citizenship Education to operate in tandem with moral instruction in the Asian sphere.

6. Conclusions
Earlier we set out our new hypothesis. Now the following conclusions can be made on the basis of the above study.

A: Citizenship Education, both in economically and politically developed Western democracies and in developing states and societies in Asia, has much in common such as the stress on political literacy; participation and responsibility in meeting objectives; local, national and global dimensions; and activity-based learning.
B: Citizenship Education has different variables such as religious and secular morals, universality and relativity, decentralization and centralization, authority and freedom, and diversity and unity.

C: Citizenship Education in developing states and societies in Asia centers on national education, which is funded by each individual state.

D: The rapid growth of Citizenship Education in each country is dependent on developmental factors such as its historical, political, economic, cultural, social/societal, religious, and ideological background.

E: Citizenship Education in each country has deep-rooted foundations that are solid and unquestioned, based on 'naturalness' in Asia and Christianity in the West. Further research is needed in order to explore in more depth the connection between Citizenship Education and its foundations in underlying beliefs and philosophies. Such investigation can only contribute to the improvement of Citizenship Education throughout the world.
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