Democratic Citizenship Education in the Information Age: A Comparative Study of South Korea and Australia

Young-Ran Roh
Gwangju National University of Education
Korea

Democratic citizenship education in the information age must concern itself with the goal of nurturing future generations with the capacity to make appropriate use of the changes driven by the advances of ICTs so as to activate political and social democracy. Using Australia and South Korea as case studies, this paper discusses the role that citizenship education can and/or should play in producing democratic citizens in the information age. This paper analyses and compares the recent curricula and educational policy developments in citizenship education in Australian and South Korea. More specifically, the paper attempts to identify what implications the advances of ICTs have and what future tasks they impose for the field of democratic citizenship education.

Key Words: democratic citizenship education, information age, ICTs, South Korea, Australia, school curriculum, educational policy

In recent years a surge of interest in democratic citizenship education has been witnessed in many countries including those of the Asia-Pacific region. This phenomenon is closely related to the worldwide change in which most civilized countries have come to accept democracy as a universal value and/or have had a system of democracy during the latter half of the 20th century. That is, many countries have been very concerned with how democracy can be realized and activated in their societies and have therefore regarded education for democratic citizens as an important national task. In addition to the worldwide spread of democratic systems, the contemporary advances of information and communication technologies (hereafter, ICTs) are also accelerating this surge of interest in democratic citizenship education. Democratic citizenship education in the information age is expected to nurture future generations with the capacity to deal with and make provisions for a great number of social, economic and political changes driven by

ICTs so as to activate political and social democracy. Thus, this paper, using Australia and South Korea as case studies, attempts to identify what implications the advances of ICTs have and what future tasks they impose for the field of democratic citizenship education.

Characteristics of Democratic Citizenship Emphasized in the Information Age

ICTs present both positive and negative elements for realizing and activating democracy. The main positive functions of ICTs are to inform citizens about social and political issues and provide them with a means for engaging more actively in those issues (Hague & Loader, 1999; Negroponte, 1995; Rheingold, 1993). Additionally, ICTs may eliminate many physical, social and economic context cues from interactions and communications and so to reduce constraints created by race, class, gender and so on (Dutton, 1999; Poster, 1996). ICTs, thus, are expected to support "horizontal networks of communication between citizens" (Dutton, 1999, pp.185-186) and to promote "egalitarian and uninhibited behaviors" (Ma, 1996, p.176).

The advance of ICTs reveals negative consequences as well as positive functions and benefits. First of all, there are

Young-Ran Roh, Full-time Instructor, Department of Moral Education, Gwangju National University of Education. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Department of Moral Education, Gwangju National University of Education, 1-1 Punghyang Dong, Buk-Gu, Gwangju, 500-703, South Korea. Electronic mail may be sent to yrroh@gnue.ac.kr.

concerns regarding many new social and moral problems raised by the advances of ICTs such as excessive individualism and increasing isolation in human relationships, confused self-identity, hacking, infringements of privacy or intellectual property, uncontrolled access to obscene or pornographic material, and the so-called digital divide (e.g., Severson, 1997; Spinello, 2000). Secondly, ICT networks are confronted by the absence of some shared social practices and norms surrounding interpersonal communication. This is due to the novelty of current ICTs (Dutton, 1999), the deregulation and privatization of ICT networks (Ryu & Bae, 2000), the expanding population of their users, and so on. Thirdly, people have regarded the commercializing tendency of ICTs' as a negative phenomenon which gives rise to a great many problems (Hamelink, 2000). This tendency may threaten access to public information, let alone valuable public information, and accelerate the decline in serious public discourse on political and social issues into a vulgar form of entertainment (Whittle, 1997). What is more, it is largely committed to minimizing public intervention. Thus, people in ICT networks are increasingly seen as 'consumers' for whom ICTs provide commercial services and not as 'citizens' for whom ICTs offer the opportunities of social and political communication and interaction.

Those positive and negative characteristics of ICTs present both new possibilities and challenges for democratic citizenship education. Democratic citizenship education in the information age must assist citizens in becoming equipped with the capacities to resolve the negative aspects of ICTs and to appropriately apply their positive functions to social and political structures and processes. Until now, many who work in the field of citizenship education have devoted much thought and discussion to the kinds of attributes that democratic citizens need to acquire as well as considering the essential elements which underpin effective education for citizenship (e. g., Heater, 1990; Sehr, 1997; The Citizenship Advisory Group, 1998; Torres, 1998). Additionally, there have been a number of discussions on the relationship between the advance of ICTs and citizenship and/or citizenship education (Chu, 2001; Ichilov, 1998; Kim, 1996; Roh, 2002). However, studies focusing on which specific capacities need to be taught to democratic citizens in the information age are somewhat scarce.

There may be no fundament difference between the capacities for democratic citizenship in the information age and those in the pre-information age. Nevertheless, the changes and challenges in the information age make some capacities more demanding. In the following, I present five key capacities which need to be emphasized for democratic citizens in the information age among civic knowledge, civic values/attitudes and civic skills for democratic citizenship.[1]

Tolerance and Respect

Tolerance has been generally considered as a most important value/attitude for democratic citizens (e. g., Galston, 1991; Nie, Junn, & Stehlik-Barry, 1996; Print, 2001; Torres, 1998). Tolerance does not rest on "the relativistic belief that every personal choice, every life plan, is equally good, hence beyond rational scrutiny and criticism" but "the conviction that the pursuit of the better course should be (and in many cases has to be) a consequence of education or persuasion rather than of coercion" (Galston, 1991, p. 222). People need to learn to be tolerant of views and positions divergent from their own so that they can cooperate and live together with others in pluralized societies. The ongoing advances in ICTs provide citizens with opportunities to access an ever increasing variety of information and means of expressing opinions and sentiments. Equally, the greater degree of pluralism and a corresponding lack of agreed norms and practices develop in such advances. In a situation like this, if people stick to their own perspectives and are not tolerant of other people's, social conflicts and splits could be deepened. In brief, tolerance can play an important role in maintaining social diversity while seeking social cooperation and cohesion, which tend to be attenuated in the information age.

Respect, like tolerance, is an important value/attitude for democratic citizens (e. g., Heater, 1990; Torres, 1998). People should be able to respect the rights of fellow citizens equally. Respect for others becomes more crucial in an information society since it is becoming much easier to infringe others' rights due to the advances of ICTs. For instance, Severson (1997) includes respect for intellectual property and respect for privacy in the four basic principles of information ethics. Tolerance and respect are the values/attitudes which need to be especially highlighted in the information age.

Responsibility

Citizenship is increasingly seen to involve not merely rights but also civic virtues; therefore civic responsibility has been emphasized as an important virtue for democratic citizens to hold (e. g., Kymlicka, 1995; Print, 2001; Sehr, 1997; The Citizenship Advisory Group, 1998). In the contemporary conceptions of citizenship, citizens are expected to live as responsible members of the community so that they

can be actively involved in social issues which impact upon their communities. In the information age, responsibility is more important in another sense. Responsibility counts as an essential value in contemporary social ethics since science-technology, which has expanded human capacities beyond imagination, can be used to thwart desirable human ends as well as to achieve them (Bulger, Heitman & Reiser, 1993; Jonas, 1979, 1984; Mieth & Pohier, 1989; Whitebeck, 1998). ICTs, too, are true of this. Information's very availability creates the temptation to use it, and this use may very well do harm to some people while at the same time helping others (Mason, Mason, & Culnan, 1995). To make things worse, the advance of ICTs reveals some features which may make decision-makers in ICT networks less responsible. Firstly, due to the public nature of its accessibility, they are increasingly becoming foci of power-however they are neither elected nor held accountable. Secondly, anonymity in ICT networks makes it easier to make decisions on issues of social importance without taking full account of the impact upon society seriously. In addition, decisions are often distorted or restricted by commercial considerations and manipulations. Therefore, citizenship education in the information age must be more concerned with nurturing responsible citizens.

The Sense of Community

According to Butts, the role of civic education is twofold: "it rests upon free inquiry as to rights and responsibilities, but it also seeks to promote commitment to put personal obligation for the public good of a free society above purely personal interests" (1980, p. 153). In fact, many people have put an emphasis upon the importance of the public good or community involvement although they have done it to different degrees and also from different perspectives (Butts, 1980; Dagger, 1997; Galston, 1991; Sandel, 1982; Sehr, 1997). This value/attitude is increasingly needed in the information society since the advance of ICTs is deepening individualistic and isolated human relationships and also it tends to cause people to ignore the public nature of certain personal problems or to exhibit a lack of interest or concern with social or political issues.

Emphasizing the sense of community, however, is not to be necessarily equated with fostering a strong sense of community such as Sandel's constitutive conception of community which understands community to be a constituent of their identity. To emphasize the sense of community does not undermine liberalism, as Galston argues that the concern for community and virtue is not only not antithetical to

liberalism but also perfectly consistent with liberalism rightly understood (1991, p. 43). Democratic citizenship education in the information age needs to emphasize a sense of community that is compatible with liberalism.

Critical Thinking Skills

Critical thinking skills have been one of the important themes in the programs of democratic citizenship education (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Heater, 1990; The Citizenship Advisory Group, 1998). For instance, Heater suggests that the citizen needs to have been educated to an attitude of mind which embraces a willingness to be critical and a capacity to question information, policies and views, while at the same time being ready to advance reasons for his own views and to change them in the light of weighty contrary evidence or argument (1990, p. 338). Additionally, Niemi and Junn (1998, p. 157) insist that democratic citizenship education "should be structured to put less emphasis on rote learning and more on analytical and critical understanding of problems of democracy".

This kind of message is receiving more credence due to the ongoing influx of information and the consequent access to information. As such, the key issue here is not information access, rather what matters is how to integrate and understand this information and how to use this information selectively. In the face of this deluge of information, citizens with critical thinking skills can analyze information independently and investigate their own beliefs and assumptions as well as other people's so that they can develop their own ideas and respond to a diversity of views in appropriate ways.

Active Participation Skills

Active participation skills are very important skills for democratic citizenship (Butts, 1980; Print, 2001; Sehr, 1997). There have been a variety of debates on the influence that ICTs have on the development of political democracy (e.g., Dutton, 1999; Kim, 1993; Kim, Son, & Lee, 1999). ICTs are generally expected to expand the ways and opportunities of civic participation. Along with this, interactive communication in ICT networks makes it possible and easier for persons with some common interests but no private relations to share information and then try together to search for diverse ways that their common interests can be realized.

However, it cannot be said that ICTs necessarily elevate the degree of political participation. For example, GVU's WWW User Survey of 1997 showed typical behavioral

characteristics of ICT network users. 44.0% of respondents in this survey reported being more involved with political issues since coming online and 46.5% reported being equally involved. Additionally, the survey showed that netizens tend to participate in political activities through language and are reluctant to engage in behavior-oriented political participation. Although the advances of ICTs do not necessarily elevate the degree of political participation, it is true at least that they have the potential to do so, though it is not fully realized yet. Thus, if used appropriately, ICTs can lead members of the global community to become more active citizens. In this sense, active participation skills are crucial in nurturing democratic citizens in the information age.

Having outlined the theoretical underpinnings of this paper, I will situate such arguments in the context of current curriculum and policy developments in South Korea and Australia.

Education for Democratic Citizens in South Korea

According to the current 7th national curriculum reform (1997-present), moral education is to be implemented by two compulsory subjects and three elective subjects. Among them, the subject 'morals' is compulsorily taught in elementary, middle and high school from the 3rd to the 10th grade and it also clarifies democratic citizenship education as one of its four key sub-areas (Ministry of Education, 1999). In this sense, the subject 'morals' is a major vehicle through which democratic citizenship is taught in Korea's school system. Given its importance, to analyze the subject 'morals' is essential for any examination of democratic citizenship education in Korean schools.

There are four basic features by which the subject matter of 'morals' was designed in the 7th National Curriculum. Firstly, it adopts as a main theoretical foundation an approach to integrate the virtue ethics approach and the cognitive approach. This integrated approach influences all the areas of curriculum, that is, its goals and objectives, content, teaching and learning methods, and evaluation. Secondly, the content of the 7th 'Morals' Curriculum, following the principle of 'expanding communities', consists of 4 life areas: Personal Life, Life in the Family, Neighborhood and School, Social Life, and National and Ethnic Life.[2] Thirdly, the content of the 7th 'Morals' Curriculum attempts to harmonize Korean moral norms and universal values but it places greater emphasis on the former. Thus it adopts as its goals the nurturing of a desirable Korean citizen rather than a desirable human being.

Lastly, the 7th 'Morals' Curriculum specifies basic core values/virtues as its teaching elements, which has never been done until the 6th Curriculum. It selects 20 core values/virtues which are considered to be necessary for leading the four dimensions of life (5 core values/virtues respectively for the 4 life areas) and new textbooks are built around units designed to convey those core values/virtues. The 20 core values/virtues are as follows: (1) Personal Life - respect for life, sincerity, honesty, independence, temperance; (2) Life in Family Neighborhood and School - piety, filial duty, etiquette, cooperation, love for school and hometown; (3) Social Life – being law-abiding, caring for others, environmental protection, justice, maintaining a sense of community; and (4) National, Ethnic Life - love for the state, love of the nation, security consciousness, peaceful reunification, love for humankind.

How does the 7th 'Morals' Curriculum treat the above-mentioned five values/attitudes and skills that need to be emphasized for democratic citizenship in the information age? In the first place, respect for others' equal rights and tolerance are not included in the 20 core values/virtues while they are connected with several other core values. Two core values/virtues, 'being law-abiding' and 'justice' are related to 'respect for others' equal rights', and those core values/virtues are taught in such units of the school textbooks as 'Etiquette and Discipline in Public Areas' 'Attitudes of Living Fairly' 'Respect for Others' Rights and Interests' and 'Observing Laws and Rules.' Tolerance, too, does not appear in the 20 core values/virtues, but it is directly taught in the unit of 'Attitudes for Love and Tolerance.' Additionally, it is related to the core value of 'caring for others' in Social Life and is supported by the unit of 'Care and Service for Others.' It seems that tolerance itself is not treated importantly since Korea is a relatively less pluralistic society.

The sense of community is one of the most emphasized values in the 7th 'Morals' Curriculum. According to the 7th Curriculum, 'Morals' is civic/community education which supports the basic order of liberal democracy and also values many of the attitudes for ethnic communities which contribute to national, ethnic development (The Textbook Compilation Committee, 2001). Therefore, the sense of community is not only one of 5 core values/virtues in Social Life but also has some related core values/virtues such as 'love for school and hometown,' 'love for state' and 'love for nation'. In comparison to the 6th Curriculum, the 7th curriculum has two sub-units directly assigned to the sense of community, that is, 'The Sense of Community and Environmental Problems' and 'Building a Moral Community and Seeking the Common

Good.' It can be said that the emphasis on the sense of community is made as part of that on traditional ethics. The 7th 'Morals' curriculum places more stress on traditional ethics including the sense of community according to the idea that the young generations have been steeped in inordinate and irresponsible individualism in the process of modernization and westernization.

Compared to the sense of community, responsibility is neglected in the 7th Curriculum. It is not included in the 20 core values/virtues. Instead, it is directly taught in relation to the core value, 'sincerity' in Personal Life and indirectly conferred as part of democratic living attitudes in Social Life. In brief, responsibility is somewhat neglected in the 7th Curriculum although it is too important to be taught either in relation to other core values/virtues or in a part of one sub-unit.

For many years, democratic citizenship education in Korean schools has been criticized for failing to teach democratic behavior and practices, and concentrating on delivering knowledge or promoting understanding (Bae, 2000). Thus, one of the purposes of the Morals subject in the 7th Curriculum is to foster the skills of moral thinking and moral judgment, or the skills necessary for desirably and rationally resolving moral problems in daily life (Ministry of Education, 1999). Therefore, the 7th Curriculum encourages teachers to actively introduce student-centered investigation and discussion methods in their classroom practices (Ministry of Education, 1999). It employs some new measures for this purpose, that is, the principle of the spiral curriculum, a new item entitled 'Doing Things Together' in textbooks, the partial introduction of the subject-centered approach, and a new evaluation method called 'Performance Assessment'. These newly introduced measures are expected to help students learn critical thinking skills by means of the 'Morals' lessons.

Despite these measures, the 7th Curriculum is confronted with one fundamental problem with regard to the learning of critical thinking skills. Generally speaking, it takes an integrated approach to moral education and emphasizes all of the three cognitive, emotional, and behavioral domains. However, the basic framework in the constitution of its content strongly reveals the influence of character education in that 20 core values/virtues were selected as values to be learned in the classroom. That means that 'Morals' intends to instill particular values in students rather than provide students with opportunities to discover those values for themselves. The influence of character education on the 7th Curriculum is disclosed at the level of particular units, let alone at the level of the basic framework. Compared to the 6th Curriculum, the 7th Curriculum has diminished the sub-units

pertinent to the learning of thinking skills.[3]

In the new curriculum, active participation skills are delivered as attitudes for democratic life. The sub-unit 'Attitudes for Democratic Life' in Social Life of the 8th grade is composed of 'Respect for Human Beings in a Democratic Society', 'Voluntarily Participatory Service and Responsibility', 'Orderliness Consciousness and the Law-abiding Spirit', and 'Fair Procedure and Right Decision-Making'. However, participation skills, like responsibility, are not given much weight in the Morals subject. This is true of the level of its learning/teaching methods as well as the level of its content. The classroom practice of 'Morals' as a separate subject has some limits to training in participation skills; it is apt to provide students with a knowledge-centered lesson. Today, single issue social movements in Korea -for example, social movements related to education or the environment- have to some extent been active, but daily participation has still not been established. Overall, democratic citizenship education in Korea does not succeed in teaching the skills for participatory civic culture.

Education for Democratic Citizens in Australia

Citizenship education, by and large, has not been an explicitly identifiable component of the school curriculum in Australia for over three decades. However, it has been revitalized during the 1990s. In particular, since the Federal Government established the Civics Expert Group (CEG) and released its report in 1994, citizenship education has been a prominent feature in Australian education policy making. The CEG report recommended that comprehensive, engaging curriculum materials for citizenship education be nationally produced and that citizenship education be integrated within the compulsory years of schooling.

In 1997, the Federal Government released the new Civics policy statement, entitled 'Discovering Democracy' which was founded on "a belief that civics and citizenship education is central to Australian education overall, and to the maintenance of a strong and vital Australian citizenship" (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p. 1). The Federal Government then developed two sets of comprehensive citizenship curriculum materials in accordance with the 'Discovering Democracy' program and distributed them to all 10,000 Australian schools in 1997 and 1998. Although the 'Discovering Democracy' program was largely consistent with the recommendations set forth by the CEG, it had some features which significantly differentiated itself from other earlier forms of policies including the CEG report (Print,

2000b). The most remarkable feature in relation to democratic citizenship education is that it deliberately supports a set of values which was reduced into a cluster of democratic values.[4]

Let us now examine how the values/attitudes and skills that need to be emphasized for democratic citizenship in the information age are treated in the 'Discovering Democracy' program and its subsequent curriculum materials. First of all, respect for others' equal rights and tolerance are included in the values most emphasized in Australia's citizenship education. The program states clearly that "its materials support the development of important core values such as tolerance, the acceptance of cultural diversity, respect for others, and freedom of speech, religion and association" (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p. 10).

There are two main reasons why respect for others' equal rights and tolerance are currently highlighted in Australia's citizenship education. First, Australia is now regarding the reconciliation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians as an important task of citizenship education, compared to two-thirds of the last century (Chesterman & Galligan, 1999). Also, multiculturalism is being recognized to be a main component for proper articulation and appreciation of Australian citizenship as Australia has reflected the increasing multicultural nature of its society due to migration.

In Australia, responsible citizens are people who "understand the relevance of our political and legal systems to everyday life and participate as informed, reflective and active individuals in community life" (Murrary, 2000, p. 233). This means that responsibility is emphasized and taught as one of the main components for civic participation. One of the four organizing themes of 'Discovering Democracy' program, 'Who Rules?' examines and tries to develop the responsibilities of citizens.

Unlike responsibility, the sense of community is not directly taught in citizenship education. This seems to be due to the fact that democracy in Australia is understood on the basis of liberalism and individualism. That is, the sense of community in Australia seems to be considered too communitarian to be a democratic value while respect for individual rights and responsibilities are adopted as democratic values.

The 'Discovering Democracy' materials apparently take great pains in nurturing attitudes and skills as well as knowledge and understanding. As a major part of such an effort, these materials put the overriding emphasis on student activities (Bereson & McDonald, 1997; Ditchburn & Halasa, 1998; Stamoulis, Ditchburn, & Halasa, 1999).[5] Through a lot of 'hangs on' activities, students are expected to appreciate what they learn and furthermore, to actively involve themselves and participate in their community.

Among the attitudes and skills for effective citizenship, critical thinking skills are prominent, since these skills, along with responsibility, are major components for civic participation. Therefore, citizenship education in Australia is concerned with nurturing students as "citizens who can explain why things are the way they are and assess the reasons for their being that way, who can distinguish between fact and opinion, and who can articulate logical and reasoned argument on key civic issues" (Stamoulis et al., 1999, p. v). With this goal in mind, the 'Discovering Democracy' materials suggest ways to approach controversial issues or contested issues by "ensuring an even-handed approach, insisting that all points of view be heard, and encouraging students to formulate defensible stances" (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p. 10).

Active participatory skills, too, are very strongly accentuated in Australia's citizenship education. They seem to count as final goals for democratic citizenship in Australia. The emphasis of participation is well brought out in the theme 'Citizens and Public Life' of the 'Discovering Democracy' program, which deals with the ways people participate in Australia's civil community, including the contribution of particular groups and people operating within and outside formal political processes (Curriculum Corporation, 2001). In addition, the 'Discovering Democracy' materials encourage students to be practically engaged in appropriate organizations such as student representative councils in schools and voluntary associations in their wider community.

As we have seen up to now, the content of the 'Discovering Democracy' program appropriately reflects the values and skills that are needed in the information age although it does not directly refer to the information age.[6] Additionally, most States in Australia have adjusted or revised their existing school curricula in accordance with the values advocated in the national initiatives and what is more, the units in the 'Discovering Democracy' program have been included in SOSE, History, and Geography syllabus. The units have sometimes been linked to extra-curricula activities as well.

Nevertheless, the application of the national civics initiative to classroom practice is seen to be problematic. There are several explanations for this. Teachers may well have a more crucial role in the case that citizenship education is integrated within existing school subjects than in the case that it is taught as form of a separate school subject. If teachers are not more positive towards citizenship education in the former case, they are unlikely to implement citizenship

education materials. In Australia, the results of recent research prove the low level of teacher awareness of citizenship education, a lack of teacher preparation and a lack of a self-concept as a civics teacher (Print & Craven, 1998). In addition, many teachers in Australian schools feel uncomfortable addressing values in an explicit manner and wish to avoid anything that may appear as indoctrination (Print, 2000b). These factors lead teachers to carry out citizenship education at the minimum level required. According to another explanation, an overcrowded curriculum makes it problematic for teachers to find quality time for Citizenship Education in the context that citizenship education is implemented as largely a part of other subjects (Print & Craven, 1998). It is seen that the gap between the 'Discovering Democracy' program and social and political realities also makes citizenship education less successful (Davidson, 2000). In particular, Australian citizenship at present may heighten the insecurity of immigrants and Aboriginal Australians as it remains contradictory and incomplete in many respects, both as a legal framework and as a form of social membership: the

current situation is marked by oscillation between conservative models based on nostalgia for a bygone age of British hegemony and neo-liberal models based on the perceived needs of Australian business as part of globalized capital (Zappala & Castles, 2000).

A Comparative Analysis and Some Findings

We have examined the latest curricula and educational policies for democratic citizenship education in South Korea and Australia respectively while keeping in mind the democratic values/attitudes and skills that need to be especially highlighted by the development of ICTs. If we review this examination from a comparative perspective, juxtapositions between some points of those curricula and policies in the two countries can be tabulated (see Table 1). From this comparative perspective we can get some helpful findings or suggestions as to democratic citizenship education in the information epoch.

First, it turns out that those five kinds of values/attitudes

Table 1. *A Comparison of Democratic Citizenship Education in South Korea and Australia*

Latest Reform at the National Level	South Korea	Australia
	7th National Curriculum in 1997	'Discovering Democracy' program in 1997
System	Two compulsory subjects, 'Proper Life'(1st and 2nd grade) and 'Morals' for 3rd – 10th, and three elective subjects, 'Civic Ethics' 'Ethics and Thought' and 'Traditional Ethics' (11th and 12th grade)	-No separate subject Integrated into such learning areas as Studies of Society and Environment, Health and Physical Education, and Science (from middle primary to the end of their compulsory years at school) -Emphasis upon the History subject as the main vehicle for citizenship education
Aims	A desirable Korean, and furthermore desirable global citizen	A responsible, thinking (or informed) and active citizen
Contents /themes	Four life-areas and 20 core values/virtues: (a) Personal life (b) Life in Family, Neighborhood, and School (c) Social Life (d) National, Ethnic Life	Four organizing themes: (a) Who Rules? (b) Law and Rights (c) The Australian Nation (d) Citizens and Public Life
Characteristics	-National identities in the global context -Emphasis on Korean traditional ethics, but the pursuit of its harmonization with the universality of global ethics -One of 4 sub-areas in moral education -Centralized system of curriculum dissemination -Communitarian approach as well as liberalistic approach to democratic citizenship	-Multicultural identities -Emphasis upon a cluster of democratic values, in particular active participation -Basically democratic citizenship education -Localized system of curriculum dissemination -Liberalistic approach to democratic citizenship

and skills in question lead toward responsible and reflective participation. As far as this is concerned, Australia's citizenship program itself is better than that of South Korea. It was said that civics in Asian countries was usually understood by the conception of civics education that stresses commitment to the state and a preconceived set of 'good' citizen values rather than one which stresses active participation in civic action, democratic rights and social enhancement (Print, 2000a). This is typically true of South Korea. Although the 7th National Curriculum is getting better than the previous ones along with the political development of South Korea, it needs to put more stress on responsible civic participation if it is to enable the young generations to prepare for the information age.

At this point we need to deliberate on the current trend that Asian traditional values are encouraged by the school education systems of some Asian countries. For instance, the 7th Morals Curriculum in South Korea accepted positively traditional Asian values since it wanted to remove some of the negative influences of modernization, globalization and the advances of ICTs by means of a national identity based on traditional Asian values. This may raise some problems, however, in that Asian traditional values may have contradictory implications when confronted by the realities of the information age. As we have mentioned in the preceding sections, the sense of community as part of traditional values can serve to cultivate citizens who positively take into consideration public implications and consequences of the issues at stake. However, some other traditional values may throw obstacles in the way of cultivating critical thinking skills, which have become crucial in the contemporary world deluged as it is by huge amounts of information. For instance, such Asian values as social cohesion and deference to elders and teachers are considered to be obstacles to the full realization of critical thinking skills in students (Hongladarom, 1999). It is true that western, liberal and individualistic values have their own problems in realizing a democracy in the information age as the Australian citizenship education programs show. Additionally, it seems doubtful that traditional Asian values themselves can actually work well in the 21st century without any adjustment. If democratic citizenship education contains traditional values in its contents, it must be more concerned with reflecting upon which traditional values are appropriate for the present society or how they should be modified.

Another point to make with regard to citizenship education in South Korea and Australia is that the success of democratic citizenship education, compared to any other kind of education, is very much dependent upon educational, social and political circumstances and practices. No matter how excellent the programs and materials for citizenship education are, citizenship education cannot be successful unless it is supported by those circumstances and practices. According to a research work on democratic citizenship education in Korean schools, an overwhelming majority of respondents (87% of teachers, 77% of students, and 65% of parents) claimed that democratic citizenship education is not presented well in Korean schools (Kwak, 1999). Some of the reasons for this were highlighted as an examination-orientated school curriculum, academically pressurized and undemocratic school systems and an irrelevant citizenship curriculum (Kwak, 1999). In the case of Australia, a lack of teacher awareness and preparation and an overcrowded curriculum, as mentioned above, are identified as its problems.

Democratic citizenship education in schools can be successful when basic democratic concepts and principles reside at the core of all school programs and school systems themselves are made democratic so that students have opportunities to learn through direct participation in decision-making on matters related to their own concerns and interests as well as through classroom lessons. Additionally, if democratic citizenship education is implemented independently of or opposite to the reality of a political and social system, it is not likely to reach its goal; in fact it needs to be supported by the real world. If the civic values that are taught in the school curriculum coincide with political and social realities, they will be internalized easily and affirmatively. With respect to this, both of South Korea and Australia still have a great deal of room to improve and reform.

Third, the cases of the two countries show how important it is to develop relevant teaching/learning approaches or strategies as well as goals and content of citizenship education. If citizenship education, such as in the case of Australia, is implemented as being integrated into related subject matters, it is liable to be treated less importantly or sidelined by teachers and pupils regardless of national concerns and support. If citizenship education is implemented as a separate subject as in South Korea, it has a relatively low chance of being neglected. However, it tends to be based on a knowledge-oriented curriculum and so comes to convey knowledge and understanding alone. The subject 'Morals' in South Korea has suffered from such a criticism that it has provided moral knowledge for students but it has barely affected their moral practices (Ministry of Education, 1999). It is not easy to decide which is better, the Australian approach

or the Korean approach, since the two kinds of approach have their own strength and weakness. The best thing here is to try to contextualize approaches to citizenship education in each country so that classroom practices of citizenship education can be taken effectively under each country's own individual educational circumstances. In addition, various extra-curricular programs should be developed in order to provide students with the learning experiences that will link the theoretical with the experiential or learn from real experiences and activities.

Conclusion

As Australia, as a multi-cultural society, recommends that democratic values become fundamental social norms and principles, it is directly implementing education for democratic citizens with concern and full support at the national level. South Korea has had democratic citizenship education mainly integrated into moral education. It now appears that the implications and tasks imposed by the advances of ICTs are not sufficiently being reflected in current democratic citizenship education in both South Korea and Australia. This implies that the two countries should pay more attention to the advances of ICTs and strive to play a more positive role in applying ICTs to the development of social and political democracy.

The advances of ICTs enable us to implement citizenship education in various forms as well as in schooling. In this sense, citizenship education in the information age may be said to be less dependent upon school education. However, paradoxically, citizenship education in public education systems becomes increasingly more important because various other forms of citizenship education might be distorted and misused by the commercialized or privatized ICTs. This means that school education may and should play a crucial role in nurturing democratic citizens in the information age.

References

Bae, H. (2000). Jungdeunghakgyo minjusimingyouykui hyoulhwalul wihan restui dodukbaldallonjeok jeobgeun [An Approach of J. R. Rest's moral development theory for effective democratic citizenship education in the secondary school]. *Morals and Ethics Education*, *12*, 153-175.

Bereson, I., & McDonald, D. (1997). *Civics and citizenship in Australia*. Melbourne: An International Thomson Publishing Company.

Bulger, R. E., Heitman, E., & Reiser, S. J. (1993). *The Ethical dimensions of the biological sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butts, R. F. (1980). *The Revival of civic learning*. A Publication of the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Chesterman, J., & Galligan, B. (1999). *Destining Australian citizenship: Selected documents*. Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Chu, B. (2001). *Jeongboyoulli gyoyuklon* [Education for Information Ethics]. Seoul: Ulyeok.

Chung, S. (2000). Chojungdeung dodeok yulligwa gyouk bansegiui hoegomich banseonggwa 21segichoui gwaje [The Reflections on morals and ethics education of the last half century in the elementary, middle and high school and its tasks in the 21th century]. *Morals and Ethics Education*, *12*, 19-39.

Commonwealth of Australia (1998). *Discovering democracy: Using the primary kit*. Carlton South Vic.: Curriculum Corporation.

Curriculum Corporation (2001). *Discovering democracy*. Retrieved May, 11, 2002, from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/democracy/

Dagger, R. (1997). *Civic virtues*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davidson, A. (2000). Democracy and citizenship. In W. Hudson, & J. Kane (Eds.), *Rethinking Australian citizenship* (pp. 45-55). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dertrouzos, M. L. (1997). *What will be*. New York: Harper Edge.

Ditchburn, G., & Halasa, K. (1998). *Citizenship, civics and you: Book 1*. South Melbourne: Longman.

Dizard , W., Jr. (1997). *Meganet*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Dutton, W. H. (1999). *Society on the line: Information politics in the digital age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Engle, S. H., & Ochoa, A. S. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship*. N.Y.: Teacher's College Press, Columbia University.

Galston, W. A. (1991). *Liberal purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GVU's seventh WWW user survey (n. d.). Retrieved September, 14, 2001, from http://www.gvu.gatech.edu/user_surveys/survey-1997-04/graphs/

Hague, B. N., & Loader, B. D. (1999). Digital democracy: an Introduction. In B. N. Hague, & B. D. Loader (Eds.),

Digital democracy: discourse and decision making in the information age (pp. 3-12). London & New York: Routledge.

Hamelink, L. J. (2000). *The Ethics of cyberspace*. London: SAGE Publications.

Heater, D. (1990). *Citizenship: the civic ideal in world history*. Politics and Education, London and New York: Longman.

Hongladarom, S. (1999). Asian philosophy and critical thinking: Divergence or convergence? In P. Cam, I. Cha, M. Tamthai, & R. Reyes (Eds.), *Philosophy, culture, and education: Asian societies in transition* (pp. 83-97). Seoul: Korean National Commission for UNESCO.

Ichilov, O. (1998). Patterns of citizenship in a changing world. In O. Ichilov (Ed.), *Citizenship and citizenship education in a changing world* (pp. 11-27). London: The Woburn Press.

Jonas, H. (1984). *The Imperative of responsibility: In search of an ethics for the technological age*. (Hans Jonas, trans., with the collaboration of David Herr), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Original work published 1979.

Kim, B. J.(1993). *Jeongbosahoewa jeongchigwajeong* [Information society and political process]. Seoul: Bee-bong Publishers.

Kim, H., Son, J., & Lee, Y. (1999). *Jeongbosahoilon* [A Theory of information society]. Seoul: Se-Chang Publisher.

Kim, J. H. (1996). Jeongbotongsinui baldaleun chaekimissgo chamyeojeokin minjusahoeleul mandeulsuissnuinga? [Can the advance of information technology establish a responsible, participatory and democratic society?] In *Information society and social ethics: The 7th symposium on social ethics* (pp.30-39). Seoul: A-San Foundation of Social Welfare.

Kwak, B. S. (1999). Curriculum and materials development for civics in formal education. In M. Print, J. Ellickson-Brown, & A. R. Baginda (Eds.), *Civic education for civil society* (pp. 99-116). London: Asean Academic Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: a liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1995). Return of the citizen: A Survey of recent work on citizenship theory. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Theorizing citizenship* (pp. 283-322). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ma, R. (1996). Computer-mediated conversations as a new dimension of intercultural communication between East Asian and North American college students. In S. C. Herring (Ed.), *Computer-mediated communication* (pp. 173-185). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Publishing Company.

Mason, R. O., Mason, F. M., & Culnan, M. J. (1995). *Ethics of information management*. Thousand Oaks, London, & New Delhi; SAGE Publications.

Mieth, D., & Pohier, J. (1989). *Ethics in the natural science*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark LTD.

Ministry of Education (1999). *A Handbook of the middle school (II): Korean, morals, social studies*. Seoul: Korea Textbook Corporation.

Murrary, S. (2000). *Investigating Australian geography and citizenship*. South Melbourne: Nelson Thomson Learning.

Negroponte, N. (1995). *Being digital*. New York: Knopf.

Nie, N. H., Junn, J., & Stehlik-Barry, K. (1996). *Education and democratic citizenship in America.* Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Niemi, R. G., & Junn, J (1998). *Civic education: what makes students learn*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Park, H. (1996). Jeongbosahueeseo sahoejeok bulpyeongdeungui mechanism [The Mechanism of social inequality in the information society]. In *Information society and social ethics: The 7th symposium on social ethics* (pp.351-366). Seoul: A-San Foundation of Social Welfare.

Poster, M. (1996). Cyberdemocracy: Internet and the public sphere. In D. Porter (Ed.), *Internet culture* (pp. 201-217). New York & London: Routledge.

Print, M., & Craven, R. (1998). *Final report for Civics education for the 21st century: Academics consortium project in civics education*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Print, M. (2000a). Civics and values in the Asia-Pacific Region. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 20*(1), 7-20.

Print, M. (2000b). Curriculum policy, values and changes in civics education in Australia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 20*(1), 21-35.

Print, M. (2001). Education for democratic citizenship in the twenty-first century. Presented at The International forum on democratic citizenship education in the Asia-pacific region, Korean Educational Development Institute, Seoul, South Korea.

Rheingold, H. (1993). *The Virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.

Roh, Y. R. (2002). Chodeung dodeokgwaui jeongboyulligyoyuk [Information Ethics in the Elementary 'Morals' Subject]. *The Journal of Elementary Education*, *15*(2), 105-124.

Ryu, K., & Bae, D. (2000). *Jeongbohwasidaui minjoojooui* [Democracy in the information age]. Seoul: Nano Media.

Sandel, M. J.(1982). *Liberalism and the limits of justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sehr, D. T. (1997). *Education for public democracy*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Severson, R. J. (1997). *The Principles of information ethics*. M.E. Sharpe.

Spinello, R. A. (2000). *Cyberethics: Morality and law in cyberspace*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Inc.

Stamoulis, D. C., Ditchburn, G., & Halasa, K. (1999). *Citizenship, civics and you: Book 2*. South Melbourne: Longman.

The Adelaide declaration on national goals for schooling in the twenty-first century (1999). Retrieved September 05, 2001, from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/mceetya/nationalgoals/

The Citizenship Advisory Group (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools: Final report of the advisory group on citizenship*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Retrieved February 14, 2001, from http://www.qca.org.uk/ca/subjects/citizenship/crick_report_1998.pdf

The Textbook Compilation Committee (2001). *Gyosayong jeedoseo: joonghakgyo doduk ilhaknyeon* [A Guidebook for teacher: Morals for 1st grade in the secondary school]. Seoul: Korea Textbook Corporation.

Torres, C. A. (1998). *Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: dilemmas of citizenship in a global world*. New York & Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Whitebeck, C. (1998). *Ethics in engineering practice and research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whittle, D. B. (1997). *Cyberspace: The Human dimension*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Zappala, G., & Castles, S. (2000). Citizenship and immigration in Australia. In T. A. T. Aleinikoff, & D. Klusmeyer (Eds.), *From Migrants to citizens: membership in a changing world* (pp. 32-77). Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Notes

1. In selecting the five capacities, I am less focused on civic knowledge since civic knowledge, compared to other capacities, tends to be satisfied relatively well in schooling and also "knowledge about citizenship is only partially useful if it does not lead on to the formation of attitudes and the acquisition of skills" (Heater, 1990, p.336).

2. In fact, the 'Expanding Communities' principle is not entirely appropriate for the information age any more. It is true that this principle was admittedly persuasive in the past when transportation and communication systems were limited. That, however, cannot be accepted to be reasonable in the global and information age that the world is shrinking into an instantly accessible global society since the principle makes it difficult to deal with civic values/virtues while linking world, nation-states, and local communities together (Chung, 2000).

3. The 6th Curriculum was basically grounded on the cognitive approach to moral education.

4. Supported democratic values and principles are as follows: democratic decision-making and sovereignty; government accountability; civility, truthfulness and respect for the law; the value of individual and collective initiative and effort; concern for the welfare, rights and dignity of all people (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998). On the other hand, the CEG report characterised values for civics education in terms of the three general terms, social justice, ecological sustainability, and democracy.

5. This is the most prominent feature of those materials. For example, *Civics and Citizenship in Australia* (Bereson & McDonald, 1997) is designed to provide a wide variety of activities covering the learning processes of investigation, communication and participation. *Citizenship, Civics and You: Book 1* (Ditchburn & Halasa, 1998) includes a wide variety of student activities which cover the gamut of research skills. In *Citizenship, Civics, and You: Book 2* (Stamoulis et al., 1999), student activities are divided into 'Knowledge Review Questions' and 'Extension Tasks.' The tasks also require that students use interpersonal (working with others), intrapersonal (developing individual thinking processes and research), bodily kinesthetic (role-playing) and spatial (visualizing things and thinking in images and pictures) intelligences; in addition, there are opportunities for students to discuss and to hypothesize, to present work orally or through debate, to complete research or to present work in project form.

6. It is true of the Adelaide Declaration (1999) as well, which released a new set of national goals for schooling in the twenty-first century.