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Abstract

China is in a period of rapid social and cultural change, which bears important implications for civic and moral education. Tensions exist around what may be regarded as appropriate pathways of civic participation, institutional climate, pedagogical practices, and beliefs about the relationship between the individual, the community, and the state. While past research has examined China’s citizenship education broadly, few has investigated how teachers, as the gatekeepers of the state curriculum, interpret their roles and responsibilities in the context of civic action for encouraging or discouraging students’ active civic engagement, particularly through demonstrations. This paper draws on teachers’ responses to the account of a real-life protest in China in 2007 about the building of a chemical plant. Using both thematic analysis and Foucauldian discourse analysis, I examine how their responses define the boundaries, priorities and expectations of their orientations and responsibilities in the moral and political sphere of schools, and reveal what larger discourses are made available to them through their choices of responses.
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Students must serve his teacher like he serves his father. One must learn his teacher’s cultural knowledge, moral standards and ethical principles. In addition, one must also learn the way his teacher speaks... Even if someone was only your teacher for one day, you must respect and value him as if he was your father.

— Chinese Proverb

Introduction

Throughout the many years of history influenced by Confucian thinking, China has no shortage of proverbs that extol education and the profession of teaching. Youngsters are expected to respect the elders and obey the teachers. On one hand, features of traditional Chinese education are heavily focused on creating a hierarchical yet harmonious relationship between the teachers and their students, like the Emperor and his officials. On the other hand, as China emerged as a powerful economic and political force since the 1980s, and the story of Chinese education is also rapidly changing.

Globally, topics in youth civic engagement have experienced a surge in interest among scholars (Carretero, Haste, & Bermudez, 2016; Sherrod, Flanagan, & Torney-Purta, 2011). Yet, scholarship on civic engagement has mostly centered on phenomena amongst youth in Western countries, and we know little about the roles that teachers play in this process and how teachers make meaning of youth participation as an expression of civic engagement, particularly in Mainland China. Indeed, as a country that has resisted openly the trend of democratization and maintained a one-party State, China faces new challenges that problematizes
the state’s legitimacy that has traditionally been front and center in citizenship education (Kennedy, 2014; Law, 2006).

Schools are the formal institution in which young people spend the most time outside of home. Scholars—both in the East and the West—look to schools as a site of social and political becoming, and adults and institutions for providing opportunities for practicing and enhancing civic skills of young people as agentic citizens (Law et. al., 2006; Levinson, 2012; Schoeman, 2013; Tu et al., 2011). In the context of China, however, despite series of educational reforms, the Political Education curriculum continues to stress patriotism and loyalty to the Communist Party (Zhao & Haste, 2012). Reflected in civic education in schools is the continued emphasis on teachers in preparing students to live and function “harmoniously” under the paternalistic state.

Yet teachers have the unique opportunity to engage students in the complex civic skills and expressions for the communities within which they reside. As they occupy the role as the non-familial adults invested with educational authority and oversight of young people, Chinese teachers serve not just as the gatekeepers of the curriculums, but also are important agents in the moral and civic development of students. At the same time, they manage myriad competing educational, cultural, and political goals of schooling. Given this reality, by listening carefully to the narratives of the teachers, I contribute to the existing literature on the role of civic engagement in China by acknowledging the unique experiences and
perspectives of these teachers and investigating how they, as agents of the state\(^1\), manage the goal of civic education under an authoritarian regime. Additionally, I explore how their responses define the boundaries, priorities and expectations of their orientations and responsibilities in the moral and political sphere of schools, and reveal what larger discourses are made available to them through their choices of responses.

**Conceptual Framework**

**Citizenship and citizenship education**

Along with the economic development and globalization, citizenship—a concept many see as originating from the Ancient Greece—understood generally as a “membership of people” who resides within the political boundaries with commonly agreed upon rights and obligations that determine the extent of citizen’s participation civically, politically, socially, and economically—is beginning to grasp hold and develop a local “Chinese” meaning (Giddens, 1993; Jary 1999, as cited in Law, 2007; Shao, 2008; Zhu, 2013).

In the west, citizenship is referred generally to the individual’s relationship to the nation, and it is assumed that a citizen possesses a “natural affinity to the nation state” (Osler, 2011). Such a notion places emphasis on rights and responsibilities that citizens bear in their sociopolitical community (Li, 2009).

Under this conception of citizenship, the school setting is expected to recognize

---

\(^1\) I ascribe all teachers as agents of the state in the sense that they teach national curriculum, and Chinese teachers, though not formally recognized as civil servants by the state, are under the direct supervision of the Communist Party.
such rights, and equip students with the necessary knowledge, skills and values that are deemed important for participating in a given polity (Law et al., 2006).

Contrary to the belief that the Western and Eastern beliefs about citizenship are simply incompatible due to their respective individualistic and collectivist tendencies, China scholars such as Li (2009) and Tu (2005) argue the ancient teachings of Confucianism actually contribute to a broader notion of “citizenship”. Under this broad concept of citizenship, citizens “participate in political life through education in various forms, particularly through individual learning, personal self-cultivation and public engagement” (Li et al., p.383). Schools, then, are expected to promote self-learning and regulate individual behaviors that stresses self-fulfillment rather than directing much attention to systematic structure of the state that promotes or hinders participation. Indeed, rooted in virtues and historical teaching, citizenship is being re-appropriated in the Chinese context as something that is in dynamic tuck-and-pull between gradual recognition of individual agency—manifested in various forms from self-cultivation to participation in grassroots movements, and those civic values and spirits that are collective in nature for the purpose of social order—recognized and appraised by the government through national curriculum (Zhu et al., 2013).

In current Communist China, values and virtues that are aligned with the Party ideology continue to serve as guidelines for school curriculums. Students must take a Thought and Politics class from 7th to 12th grade that centers on law, understanding the functions of government, and some knowledge of Maoist and
Marxist theory. While the recent curriculum reforms have shifted the content of the textbook from abstract theories towards contextualized daily experiences, Li et al. (2009) argues that teachers, even when given autonomy to develop broad citizenship education curricula, place preference on the teaching of political correctness, which is doing what is deemed correct by the regime. For example, taking up one-forth of the course curriculum, lessons on “political life” covered China’s basic political system and its relations with the rest of the world and sought to convince students that “they are all active participants in political life” (Hansen, 2014, p.85). A standardized teaching manual provided teachers with detailed instructions and “correct” interpretations to answer students’ questions. This manual gave many concrete examples to enrich the teacher’s repertoire and to help students learn by repetition that their role as citizen is to abide by the law and that careless actions or speech may be interpreted as incitement that could endanger national security or stability. This sort of education forms an ideal and multifaceted “Chinese individual” who exerts a high degree of self-control and self-discipline, who accepts the successes and failures as a result of individual actions, and who has knowledge of their rights and obligations within the boundaries of law, as interpreted by the state (Hansen et al., 2014). However, it is still somewhat questionable how much longer such type of citizenship education can keep its regime-centric focus, as liberalization, and globalization impact Chinese society and as the country develops at a pace beyond the One-Party-System’s capacity for monitoring and control (Kennedy et al., 2014; Pan, 2013).
Youth Civic engagement

To understand youth civic participation in the context of China, I draw upon the psychological literature on citizenship education broadly. Civic engagement is a multifaceted concept related to both individual and collective behaviors in issues of public concerns, but traditionally believed to electoral politics, measured by indicators such as voting behavior, party membership, individual voluntarism, and organizational participation (Cheng, 2015; Levinson, 2010). Yet by positioning civic engagement in such aforementioned actions yields a belief about political influence from a top down view of what counts for participation, thus ignoring what is accessible and salient to the political development of participants themselves (Haste et al., 2004). As such, scholars are now noting the transition of civic education from a more traditional model of civic education that draws from this top-down perspective that demands merely the acquisition of knowledge to new perspectives in developmental psychology (Carretero et al., 2016). The cognitive model view individuals as active agents in “learning, selecting, organizing, and making meaning of experience and information” according to their cultural contexts (Carretero et al., 2016 p. 295). Cultural models of development emphasize how the individual is exposed to, and actively shaped by “sociocultural settings, interactions, and experiences that promote or inhibit effective and relevant learning”, and in this way, learning comes not only from formal acquisition of knowledge, but also individuals’
interactions, dialogues, and actions within their sociocultural and historical context (Carretero et al, 2016, p. 295).

In the context of China, how youths are supported in their civic engagement is less clear than most liberal democracies. The moral argument for evoking social responsibility is strong (Qiu, 2013), and the paternalistic theory of governance prioritizes social responsibility as its primary objective (Fairbrother, 2014). As such, civic engagement have been typically downplayed due to the ambiguous fear of disruption to social stability. But Chinese youths are not necessarily apathetic or disengaged. Zhao and colleagues (2014) have documented that youths in two Chinese cities keenly identified social issues that they directly experienced in daily lives, such as food safety, environmental pollution, and social inequity, as well as problems widely publicized in the media, such as government corruption, job competition, increasing cost of living, and concern for declining morality in the society. Surely, these concerns do not exist in a vacuum, and identifying discourses and narratives that contribute to students’ concern of social issues is only the beginning. How can schools and trusted adults respond to such concerns? How can teachers explain the roots and causes of the social issues to students? How do the narratives of adults position themselves in relation to the broader government structure? Addressing such questions is critical for understanding the social, cultural, and political processes of change in a transitioning China, the impacts of such transformation on students, and the ways that adults can support youths in these processes (Zhao et al, 2014.).
The research on civic engagement points out that central to effective citizenship is the element of efficacy and agency, which constitutes the active model of the individual engages in with others with an assumption of agency, knowledge seeking, narrative, interpretation, and engagement in argumentation (Haste et al., 2004; Zhao et al., 2012). In addition, research on civic engagement and school experiences seems to suggest that personal agency, motivation, and commitment derive from engaging positively and effectively in civic activities in a democratic school environment (LaRusso & Selman, 2008). For example, when youths are presented with the opportunity to use their knowledge and skills to address social problems, they experience a sense of agency for themselves, and a sense of responsibility for others and the society at large; when their participations are encouraged and supported by trusted adults (i.e. family members, teachers), youths are more likely reflect on the moral and political discourses that they draw upon to view the society, and to sustain in continued civic engagement efforts (Yates & Youniss, 1998). Of central issue is how students are deeply embedded in social relationships and sociocultural contexts, and it is within such frame that civic values and responsibilities are defined and negotiated in accordance with one’s own expectations and goals (Thapan, 2014).

For a fuller picture of how beliefs and values of citizenship and civic participation function in the school context for the students, it is essential to examine what key stakeholders of students’ civic development – such as teachers – are drawing from to justify and explain the citizen and the nation, and the roles
and capacity of students in different forms of civic engagement. As the Chinese society transitions towards more entrepreneurial and individually-oriented values, which valorize competition, strong orientation to community responsibility continues to be evident. Because teachers see moral education largely in terms of personal relationships and private respect, including to whom one has obligations, and civic education as including social and community responsibility and virtues such as honesty, leadership and integrity, it is not difficult to see the messages they wish to convey to students reflect the interaction of Confucian thought with modern collectivist principles, and their roles as moral agents can clash with other roles that they occupy, such as agents of the state.

**Protests in contemporary China**

Along with China’s economic development comes globalization, which challenges “the classical concepts of citizenship and citizenship education that center on the nation state’s legitimacy and territorial borders”, and undermines the state, values, and identities (Law et al., 2006 p. 598). Further, the socioeconomic polarization leads to an array of social issues as inequality increase in volume. Local resistance movements that “target local authorities and commercial organizations, focusing on particular economic and social problems, as opposed to macro sociopolitical issues” have been gaining grounds and exert considerable power on local politics as more and more middle class citizens beginning to take action and lead change (Shi, 2006, p. 235). Further, studies in China have documented the civic engagement opportunities that come with the new media.
Such online opportunities can be forums for public discussion, information exchange channels between government officials and citizens, and other forms of collective information seeking and decision-making (Tong, 2006; Wu, 2014). It is yet unknown whether such impact will have an immediate impact on the macro sociopolitical system.

While different degrees of engagement, both online and offline have contributed to efforts to address such issues, collective actions are overall rather limited, and small-scale acts of resistance are met with pre-emption, suppression and repression (Su & He 2010, as cited in Ding & Schuermans, 2012). Instead of viewing protest as a form of civic engagement, it is perceived by the state more or less as a destructive force to social stability. As such, there exists an obvious empirical void on civic protests and their outcomes in China, and while certain forms of protests in certain categories (property, environmental pollution, etc.) surface the news media, seldom are they heard and well documented in the literature (Ding et. al., 2012; Froissart 2009; O’Brian, 2006). It is within this genre and context that this study takes its place.

**Aims**

While there is a growing body of literature that examines citizenship education in contemporary China (Fairbrother, 2006), and students and teachers’ reactions on the national curriculum in merging Political Education\(^2\) to Party

---

\(^2\) There are many names to this, Political Education, Ideological Education, Politics, etc. They include classes on Marxism, and ideological contributions of past Chinese leaders, such as Mao, Deng, and Hu.
patriotism both in Hong Kong and China (Fairbrother, 2008; Yuen & Byram, 2007), little is known about how cultural processes and perspectives are at work in enabling, or constraining, teachers in their constructions of citizenship and civic engagement for their students in an authoritarian form of government. As students emerge into adulthood, their civic and political perspectives and capacities will surely be informed by those most trusted adults in their lives. Yet there is a dearth of studies available on how teachers manage the goals of citizenship education, and how they perceive student participation in civic engagement in China. Much of the literature is available only in Chinese, and focuses primarily on pedagogical choices and tools that foster students’ sense of responsibility to the society (i.e. Wu, 2014). This poses as a stark contrast to the noteworthy status of teachers and their recognized life-long impacts on students in both traditional and contemporary Chinese culture.

Taken together, there is a need for further knowledge-building on the civic and political orientations, interests, and perspectives of Chinese teachers, as how they experience and understand the goals of citizenship education is closely linked with students’ beliefs, attitudes, skills, and capacities in regards to civic engagement. To date, research that provides extensive insight into how different processes and perspectives contribute to cultural reproduction is still emerging, and more scholarship on how teachers manage the goals of moral and civic education in their classrooms is needed.
As such, my goal is to use individual as the unit of analysis, to understand the processes involved in civic and moral education, how teachers negotiate and prioritize tensions between being part of a systematic inculcation of national values of loyalty, and supporting student’s civic participation that may contradict such teaching, as well as how they interpret their roles and responsibilities in the context of civic action for encouraging or discouraging students’ active civic engagement. Using in-depth qualitative approach to allow for texture and nuance in generating understanding of these teachers’ perspectives and their own meaning making, my research questions were: 1) How do Chinese teachers interpret impacts of student participation in protests? And 2) what discourses do they draw upon to define the priorities and beliefs of their civic responsibilities to their students?

Methods

Participants

To answer the aforementioned questions, I conducted secondary data analysis on sixteen teacher interviews as part of a multi-method project conducted in Mainland China in 2011, with the goal of understanding how Chinese youth and teachers understand moral and civic issues, and what they see as the purposes and goals of civic participation. In this project, data were collected from eight schools3.

3 The four schools in Shanghai included a high-achieving urban high school, a middle-achieving urban high school, a high-achieving urban high school, and a low-achieving rural middle school. The four schools in Nantong included a high-achieving urban high school, a low-achieving rural high school, a high-achieving urban middle school, and a low-achieving rural middle school. Typically, the middle and high achieving schools are deemed “key schools”, while low-achieving schools are deemed “non-key schools”.

in the urban and rural areas of the metropolitan Shanghai and a medium sized city of Nantong\textsuperscript{4}. The data set included interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires with 8\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} grade students, and interviews with their teachers. At each school, two teachers participated in one-hour semi-structured interviews.

All interviews were transcribed in Chinese by the graduate students from the partnering university, East China Normal University, and then translated by one of the Primary Investigators and myself, both native of China and bilingual researchers the US. Of particular interests to this paper were the teachers’ responses to a vignette about a successful real life demonstration on an environmental issue where some schools had warned that student participation would lead to serious sanctions (hereafter referred to as “the Xiamen protest”, see details in Appendix A).

Data Analysis

The method of analysis chosen for this paper was a hybrid approach of both thematic analysis and Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). Given that my study was aiming to understand teacher’s perceptions, and little research on my population of interest in this topic exists, I felt that inductive, qualitative analyses were most appropriate for this study in order to generate theory for continued future research. Incorporating the data-driven inductive approach of Boyatzis (1998), thematic analysis is a search for themes that emerge that are important to

\textsuperscript{4} According to the 2012 Chinese census, the population in Shanghai was approximately 23.8 million, and the population in Nantong was approximately 7.2 million.
the description of the phenomenon (Daly, Kellehear, & Gliksman, 1997). It is a way to look for patterns within the data and the emerging themes become the categories for further analysis. To give the themes more texture and nuance, and examine the relationship between discourse and how they feel and what they may do in their contexts, I used FDA as discourses make available certain ways of seeing the world and being in the world, and are strongly implicated in the exercise of power, taking a historical perspective to examine the ways in which discourses change over time and shape historical subjectivities (Willig, 2013). For the purpose of this paper, FDA allowed for an examination of how teachers constructed student engagement using their own terms and frameworks as they functioned in their actual experience and interactions, and gave a fuller recognition of the range of orientations teachers perceived to be appropriate for students to take in protests in contemporary China. Combining both of these approaches helped me examine, in a rigorous way, what priorities and concerns about citizenship and enactments of citizenship were evident in teachers’ answers, and how they defined what they believed their civic and moral choices demanded of them.

In conducting the thematic analysis, I focused on the content of the teacher’s responses rather than an analysis of what they were attempting to achieve rhetorically within their answers. I did this by tracking and clustering emic codes that captured ideas emergent in their responses line by line. I first selected eight interviews by randomly selecting one interview from each school to develop
codes, following a data-driven inductive approach. To capture the full cultural and linguistic nuances in the data, I initially conducted the analysis in the original Chinese transcripts, and reviewed them in English to check the codes, and used different excerpts to test the codes. Through this labor intensive first-pass, I gained a grounded sense of the full landscape of the interview, and where the interview questions took the teachers in their responses. With the subsequent interviews, I read each interview transcript multiple times, flagging parts that are particularly germane to addressing my research questions. In this process, I applied the codes to the text with the intent of identifying meaningful units of texts and examining the emerging themes, careful to interpret different cultural perspectives and linguistic issues between Chinese and English. I then composed memos comprised of notes from the coding process, noting comparisons with the other interviews and areas where I felt particularly salient to my research questions, or where I felt that I needed more information (see Appendix E). Lastly, I examined the codes and began to raise codes to concepts by identifying connections between codes, and created themes under which I subsumed codes that captured nuanced details descriptively. These categories provided direct answers to the research questions (see Appendix B).

Drawing from the themes identified from the thematic analysis, I then used FDA to further my inquiry. While there were many procedural guidelines to perform FDA, such as Parker (1992)’s 20 steps in the analysis of discourse dynamics to examine how discourses that structure the texts reproduce power
relations. However, I chose Willig et al. (2013)’s interpretation of FDA, because I believe the steps are sufficient for the aims of this study. It focused on connecting the discursive constructions to individual subjectivity, while also paying attention to exploring the wider social and historical implications for practices and positioning. Using Willig et al. (2013)’s six steps as a roadmap, I conducted a line-by-line analysis of each selected transcript to identify all statements in which teachers alluded to a possible and appropriate civic engagement action for students (i.e. protest, petitioning the government, communicating a grievance to a government department, internet-based action). I examined how these statements functioned as a constellation of inter-related ideas that formed emergent discourse(s), followed by an examination of how teachers positioned themselves and their students drawing on these discourses. Further, in this process, I made detailed notes relating to each of the six steps: discursive constructions, discourses, action orientation, positioning, practice, and subjectivity. Through such constructing, viewing and being in the world, I was able to understand the practical implications, such as the possibilities and limitations for action, what were omitted to be said or done for these teachers. This process helped me identify, for example, discourses that teachers invoked to make themselves intelligible as they discussed their beliefs, values, behaviors, and choices.

This procedure revealed that teachers drew upon certain resources when talking about protests and their opinions of student participation within it. Drawing upon these discursive resources, they constructed multiple identities, each serving
a different purpose and positioned the teachers themselves in different ways in regards to civic actions. These identity constructions were essentially linked to the subject positions offered within the discourses. In what follows, I selected excerpts to unpack each of the discourses and explain how they were constructed and upheld in the Chinese cultural and political context. In the following sections, I first present the key overarching concepts and themes identified through the thematic analysis; then I discuss the discourses that were identified through FDA, and how multiple identities were constructed to offer different opportunities for action and positioning for the teachers.

Findings

Three themes on teachers’ perspectives on students’ participation in protests emerged from the interviews with teachers: wasteful, wary, and wishful. These three themes should not be seen as static, existing independently from one another, for the examples may be interpreted as more fluid or fit in other themes. Below, I present thematic findings first, followed by a Foucauldian discourse analysis that demonstrates how ideologies are expressed and reproduced in political and cultural contexts.

Thematic Analysis

I. Wasteful: civic participation is not a priority and efforts are likely to be spent in vain.

This theme portrays regulations as subjective, and institutions of government as unresponsive. Teachers in this theme believed individual Actions
had no impact on governmental policy and students should not be wasting their time. Their narratives focused on students’ developmental trajectory, and responses to protests were for students to redirect their attentions to prioritize their studies through self-regulation and continued obedience to rules. Historical large-scale protests were referenced to describe the inability to enact changes on the government. Students were portrayed as young, and immature, not being able to discern what’s right or wrong, making mistakes on the way to their maturity.

For example, a teacher thought the Xiamen protest was simply commonplace: “There are too many things like that. Many are worse than this. I have stopped thinking too much of it.” Another teacher drew from historical events and expressed preferences for students to prioritize their studies:

“…Students are… historically things like this have also happened, like in 1989, when students have not fully formed their perspectives on the world, life, and values. I won’t encourage them, and they must prioritize their studies. Perhaps they can get some basic idea of society through such events, but they are just too young.”

This sense of wasting time and energy is also prominent in this other excerpt:

“First, I don’t recommend for students to participate in such a protest directly, they need to see other ways… As a student, no matter now impulsive or passionate you are, you can’t solve the problem.”

Here, the teachers spoke with much certainty that youth civic participation would lead nowhere, and protests were perceived as illegitimate forms of civic participation. Interestingly, this theme prevailed among many Shanghai teachers,
and less prominent among Nantong teachers, though no generalizations of area differences may be made in the scope of this study.

II. Wary: Focus on political consequences in fear of retaliation or persecution

This theme portrayed government as alert and punitive, and historical parallels of protests were also drawn to highlight the consequences for students in particular. Teachers in this theme stressed the possibility of consequences, and alerted the students to avoid potential danger or acts of retaliation.

In the following excerpt, this teacher responded to a question regarding if and how he/she would talk about protests with students:

“As long as it is not sensitive, I would talk about it. But some students misunderstand or get confused. Some students may become disorderly, insubordinate, and lack of discipline, he may grow to have those behaviors Anarchists have. They may have good intentions, participating in this activity, but then they will gradually participate in other events in a similar way in the future, no matter for what purpose, and I don’t think it is appropriate. I think we should be cautious when we talk about this issue. If we were to discuss this with students, and once when students enter the society, they will take actions similar to this one whenever they come across something. Sometimes, even if it’s an inappropriate request, they will act like this, so they will raise banners and say things whenever something happens, to reform violently. I think this is what I worry about.

The government was narrated as an invisible yet active force that punished those contradicted or went against the state’s policies or decisions. Here is the response a teacher gave:

“I know about it. There is an XP project in Dalian, a big chemical factory. The [famous] anchor, Bai Yansong, tried to report the truth, and there was a lot of discussion on the internet. Later Bai had to take a break from work. Xiamen was just one case, there are many other cases.”
This teacher was concerned with the fact that if someone famous like Bai were penalized, then the common citizens would suffer the same or worse consequences. In the later discussion, this teacher revealed his personal emotion on similar events: “The government simply didn’t take seriously people’s request. I am angry about it.”

Though these teachers recognized protests as a legal action, related to this theme were fears of students to be lead astray, and while they did not necessarily consider student participation in protests to be a waste, their first priority was safety itself. As such, their response was to try and socialize students in particular sets of civic values at affective levels instead.

III. Wishful: Desire for influence and change over government.

Unlike the wasteful and wary themes that focused on drawing on unfortunate past or present observations to not act, teachers the wishful theme considered protest to be effective in affecting social change and students will learn civic skills in participation. Here the teacher talked about presenting protests to students.

“Students can have their own views of it when they grow up. I don’t stand out doesn’t mean I don’t allow my students to stand out. I think they need to know that is right and wrong. Some of them may be like me in the future, living their lives cautiously; but others…the world needs some people who can break out to change it.”

Recognizing his/her own reservations, this teacher expressed admiration to those who “stand up”, and saw students as capable beings who are in control to
actively demand change. Similarly, this other teacher stated, though a bit more subtly:

“We have to make sure students pay attention to social events, they cannot just sit in the classrooms and be separated from the society. They have to understand their realities, and think about issues like this. I think I should affirm students’ thoughts on paying attention to social events, this means they are not just sitting in their classes and do nothing but reading.”

One particular teacher was the only one that stated directly that, “students are also citizens”, affirming his/her support for students to freely express themselves, and to participate civically:

“To prohibit… I think this is already a violation of citizens’ rights. Students are also citizens, it should be OK for them to express themselves.”

These teachers recognized students as full citizens rather than feeble children who were not capable of making rational decisions themselves. They understood that the success of democracy lied in the fact that all citizens have and should be able to exercise their voices, and believed in the potential of collective efforts by all citizens to influence governance decision making. Instead of focusing on the negative consequences of touching on the “sensitive issues”, teachers saw the potential of students to be agents of change.

**Foucauldian Discourse Analysis**

The three teachers whose interviews I drew upon represent the three broad themes presented earlier in this paper, at times supporting and then other times resisting conflicting constructions of protests. These contradictions are representative of the dilemmatic nature of social thinking (Billig et al., 1988), and
contradictory tension of everyday speech and decision-making, which result in different ideologies that exist in the society at large.

Following Willig (2013)’s 6-step-analysis, I offered analysis and interpretations according to my own interests, motivations, and experiences. Because individuals cannot be separated from the wider social and institutional structures that they are embedded, in approaching teachers’ narratives, I tried to avoid the tendency to attribute intentions to individual teachers. I recognize, in this way, that discourse is complex and dynamic in nature, an individual may both utilize and resist discourses, and by doing so take up or refuse to take up subsequent discursive positions, and the effects are far reaching beyond individual intentions.

In the following excerpts, I focused on “the protest” as my discursive object, given this section of the interview was concerned with how teachers described and constructed “appropriateness” of student participation in protest.
I. The Wasteful: History teacher, Key School, Shanghai

I: How do you see Xiamen residents’ protest?
T: Because this protest happened in China, so it’s necessary to talk about it. If not in China...actually, in many other countries, if they want to express some opinions on certain issues, protest is a collective activity actually allowed by the government. But because it happened in China, it seems that we have a reason to discuss it. Yet in fact, it’s just a way for people to voice their concerns. It’s a way for people to put forth their complaints.

I: Why is that?
T: I teach history... Because China has been ruled by people [in power]. Because we have had so many years of centralized control, the power is still controlled by the centralized government. Even though we say the power comes from people, but there are few people that really participate in the management of society, or political issues. Firstly this type of awareness is not strong. Second, there’s not a context or social environment.

I: How do you view schools’ decisions to ban students from participating?
T: From the school’s perspective, it would definitely handle this situation in this way, or how else? This is the so-called “stability for development”, and you must prioritize stability. Even when everyone knows that during such activity, you can express [your opinion] democratically, but because this happened in this type of social context, it’s best to... because I cannot think of other ways for schools to handle it, they definitely would not support such a behavior. I can only say that it fits the realities of China.

I: Suppose you had a friend at one of the schools that banned students from participating, how would you advice your friend?
T: ... (hesitates) Perhaps as a teacher, he has to follow the schools’ steps. It’s not that I’d give him any advice, it’s that he has to do it this way. Because now in schools, if the teachers participated as well, it would be connected to all evaluations of the teacher. So there are times that you want to participate in democracy, but you just do not have the ability to. It’s up to him... I think this advice [pauses] it depends, if he’s a history teacher like me... [pauses], or if he didn’t have... [pauses], then I’m supportive of him to participate and demand democracy.

I: Do you think teachers should talk to students about this?
T: They may discuss. But for the students that I currently teach, I would not advise such a thing, because they are still too young. I currently teach 7th grade. They have not fully formed their perspective of values, so they may not be guided well...I feel like it’s not suitable for their age group to be discussing this. Perhaps students in higher grades can. Because they are relatively more developed in their ability to judge and have a better theoretical background. But the children today are not there yet, I think.
I: For middle school students?
T: It’s better in high school, because it’s about the national system, and junior high students have not really fully been in touch. One is that we just have the opportunity to teach this, and two is that it’s really not appropriate to teach this at this phase. Because it’s even hard for us to fully comprehend, let alone them.
I: How can they engage in discussion?
Just have a debate among classmates, nothing right or wrong.
I: Would you talk about Xiamen citizens’ protest in class?
T: I wouldn’t. Because students are… historically things like this have also happened, like in 1989, when students have not fully formed their perspectives on the world, life, and values. I don’t encourage them, and they must prioritize their studies. Perhaps they may get a basic idea of society through such events, but my students are too young.
I: You mentioned that high school students are different, is it in this aspect?
T: I still would not encourage them, because similar things have happened in history, and they may just be taken advantage of by certain organizations. Overall, I just would not encourage students to participate.
Step 1: Discursive constructions

Despite the fact that protest is, in theory, a recognized legal activity as a form of civic expression, and that there are many protests – at different scale – that take place everyday in today’s China, it is still a highly contested act. Teachers, as agent of state, are in precarious social position as they perceive, negotiate, construct and speak to the students about appropriate level of engagement with such act. Here I examined the ways in which “the protest” was constructed through language. In this extract, “the protest” was referred to as something that was **universal** (line 3), as something that was a collective activity **legitimized** by the Chinese government (line 4), as something that was a channel of **expression** for concerns or complaints (line 6, line 16), as something that manifested people’s power to **manage** their society” (line 11), as something that was **conditional** (line 12, line 32, line 45-46), as something that could be **manipulated** for political agendas (line 50).

As an example of an explicit way that it was constructed, this teacher gave a book definition of protest: “In fact, it is just a way for people to voice their concerns, it’s a way for people to put forth their complaints.” Here civic protest was constructed as something that citizens naturally **can** do collectively to express concerns and complaints without any consequences. More implicitly, on the other hand, civic protest in China was being compared to that of other democratic nations. Everything that civic protest was in these democratic nations as believed to be the same, in principle, in the authoritarian China. Yet when the teacher
described protest as an expression of “opinions on certain issues” in other countries, these expressions were perceived to be silent in China. Protest was constructed as something associated with a mysterious act. S/he teacher said, “but because it happened in China, it seems that we need to discuss it”, which I interpreted as resisting the outside perspective that protests in China was nonexistent, curbed, prohibited, but also constructing civic protest as something that needed to be discussed, explained, and unpacked to students, as opposed to something that was naturally open and exercised commonly. At the same time, recognizing that protests in China embraced the same principle as other democratic nations, yet silenced in practice, this teacher constructed civic protest in China to be desirable, and context-specific (“everyone knows that during such activity, you can express [your opinion] democratically, but because this happened in this type of social context, it’s best to […]”, line 17-18).

All these references constructed “the protest” as a civic contract between all government and its citizens, one that offered legitimacy in response to citizens’ care and concern of their society. Additionally, “the protest” was constructed as a desirable act—yet one that can only be done right when all necessary conditions were met.

The absence of direct reference to the discursive object also indicated the ways in which the object was constructed. For example, this teacher used “it”, “activity”, “situation” and “behavior” to construct the discursive object as something that was silenced and perhaps unspeakable for various political reasons.
Step 2: Discourses

In this excerpt, civic protest was constructed in at least two different ways: what it *should* be ideally (a romanticized expression of democracy), and what it *is* in reality (a controlled orchestra). On one hand, our discursive object was constructed as a normal practice or expression in an ideal democracy, such as the case in “many other countries” (line 3). Such practices were consensually agreed upon by “everyone” as an organic form of participating in democracy (“… everyone knows that during such activity, you can express [your opinion] democratically, line 17-18). But on the other hand, civic protest was constructed as an orchestra conducted by centralized, higher political power. Ordinary people can only be in the audience’ seats, or even be in the performers’ seats, but everyone must follow the conductor’s direction (‘This is the so-called ‘stability for development’, and you must prioritize stability’, line 16-17). Schools conformed to this higher political power because they had no choice (“or how else?”). Within the political hierarchy, teachers must “follow the school’s steps” or everything else about being a teacher may be compromised (“it would be connected to all evaluations of the teacher”).

These two constructions of discursive object (as “expression of democracy” and as “controlled orchestra”), civic protest, were then located within wider discourses surrounding civic participation, and attention was paid to how they were conversed in relationship to the institution (“school”) and the state (“centralized government”). The construction of civic protest as an expression of
democracy resonated with the *discourse of global standards*. Demands to act in accordance with international standards, particularly around human rights, had been placed on China to give voices and power back to its people. Under the pressure from the international community and China’s agenda to grow into an influential world power, the government put forth laws and regulations around protests and demonstrations after the Tian’an Men massacre in 1989, stating that such activities were allowed and protected by the government, though not without its conditions. The political education curriculum in all Chinese schools articulated people’s right to protest is permitted by law.

The construction of civic protest as a “controlled orchestra” was associated with the discourse of *economic development*. Notions of investment in return for long-term security and the expectation that social actors (people and the government) exchange information and services with one another are prominent in contemporary talk about the economy. Here the civic protest was subsided to make way for a greater collective purpose in exchange for security and stability – precursor for economic development as guaranteed by the government. By an investment of controlled engagement or non-engagement, citizens were provided in return the ease and comfort of economic advancement and social stability. This economic discourse was frequently recycled as the evidence to ensure Chinese people that China was making progress, and economic development continued to remain one of our top priorities. In other words, it was not that civic protest was not important, but only when the Chinese economy was further advanced can the
people begin to concern themselves with social issues. Such discourse was readily available in state-owned media outlets and publications.

Step 3: Action Orientation

In this stage of the analysis, I examined the action orientation of civic protest and what functions the deployment of the two different discourses might reveal about the discursive object, or what Willig called the “implications for the speaker’s interactional concerns”. The part that constructed civic protest as an “expression of democracy” as in response to a question about how s/he saw Xiamen residents’ protest. This question invoked a comparison with other countries’ civic realities and an account of how power had been distributed in history. S/he tried to normalize the discursive object, absent of expressions and actions deemed appropriate and legal in other countries, was “just a way for people to voice their concerns”, and “for people to put forth their complaints”. This construction can be seen, in this context, as a way of diluting his/her actual view of the symbolic meaning of protest in establishing democracy. By normalizing protest as a common act, expressive in nature and collectively done, this teacher was able to mobilize his/her critique for the absence of this reality. Using a disclaimer, this teacher expressed his/her disappointment in the social environment that conformed its people, within whom power should have been presided, were manipulated and marginalized.

The portion of text that constructed the civic protest as a “controlled orchestra” followed a question about how s/he viewed schools’ decisions to ban
students from participating in protest. The use of *discourse of economic development* allowed the teacher to amend the critiques to the political system. From within an economic discourse, exchanges were expected to be relatively equal. In this sense, this discourse asserted the basic needs of stability through economic development, and contended that without such basis, it was insensible of citizens to participate and make intellectual demands. By deploying this discourse, the teacher could then be free of blame for not giving the benefit of the doubt to the government who gave priority to economic development in accordance with the reality of Chinese society.

Step 4: Positionings

Willig et. al. (2013) states that discourses construct *subjects* to make available “positions within networks of meaning that speakers can take up” (p. 387). The economic construction of “controlled orchestra” bore the implications that there was one entity with power (one that exerts control), and another that is powerless (those controlled). Government – and government entities by extension – was positioned as the empowered body, whereas the individual citizens was subordinated by the acceptance of such authority – though the government was not being positioned as dictatorship per se.

The subjective position offered by this discourse was that teachers must follow the hierarchical political power that’s suspended above them (“he has to follow the schools’ steps”, “I couldn’t think of other ways for schools to handle it”). On the contrary, the government’s subject position offered in the discourse
saw the government as an irreplaceable fixture (“for so long, it has been ruled by people [in power]”), and one that had to make hard decisions that individuals could not understand (“you must prioritize stability”).

Step 5: Practice

This stage of analysis was concerned with the relationship between discourse and practice. The discourse of international standards was bound up with the practice of having the freedom to express freely, and participate in civic protest without being penalized by the government. This stage of analysis mapped the possibility for citizens with “strong awareness” in a more advanced, open, and internalized to enact social change through recognized legal channels, protest included.

In practice, however, there was a clear hierarchy and the practices made possible reflect such hierarchy. Being part of a society that prioritized stability for its economic development meant that the government would demand of things that it seemed fit or correct, and constantly evaluated and punished those that may participate to reverse this power dynamic. While perhaps the government can be engaged legally through protest when time was right, or when the “social context” was stable, there was no guarantee from the government to facility those who “have the ability to” and “want to participate in democracy”.

Step 6: Subjectivity

Willig et al. (2013) calls this final stage to be “most speculative” for the attempt to make claim between the discursive constructions and their implications
for subjective experience, such as how s/he might feel, think, and experience from within various subject positions (p. 136). Through positioning him/herself as perhaps an expert teacher of history (“I teach history”) and observer of international norms in “many other countries”, this teacher managed to speak in a somewhat detached way in expressing what should be and what was the civic reality of China. It could also be argued that feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction are available to those positioned within the economic construction of civic protest (“…you must prioritize stability. Even when everyone knows that, during such activity you can express [your opinions] democratically, but… because this happened in this type of social context, it’s best to…”).

II. The Wary: History teacher, Nonkey, Nantong

I: How do you see Xiamen residents’ protest?

T: I think it is OK if such protest comes out of individual’s concern for his own residential environments, and that we must make sure if this chemical plant does indeed validate such a concern of pollution. Of course, this protest caught the attention of relevant governmental offices, and so with certain investigation and by taking certain measures, this problem can be solved. If indeed the pollution is severe, then it is right that this project should be suspended.

I: how do you view those schools that prohibited students from participating?

T: I don’t think that it is a good way to just send banning notice. [I think schools] should talk to students and explain explicitly what is really going on. We can also ask certain governmental offices to investigate, and that if the pollution is indeed alarming, yet the government is ignoring the situation, the people may protest. School should explain to students, and let them know of any relevant information… because students are still within the walls of their school, they may not know enough. They may go back home and learn this from their parents, and they may get riled up without knowing what is going on. So schools should prepare and precaution [this],
to let the students know [the truth]. We teach so that the students can decide
whether or not they want to participate.

I: If you had friends who’s a teacher at one of those schools that sent the
banning notice, what suggestions would you give your friend as to how to
handle this situation?

T: My suggestion is that s/he must explain clearly what the situation is.
S/he must explain to the students what measures one can take, and under
what circumstances. For example, you may protest if this particular event
pose large national threats to citizens and students, like what happened
during the May 4th Patriotic Movement. Of course, this event is not about a
national threat, but this is relevant to their daily lives, something that should
be stopped. I think it’s OK to protest.

I: Do you think teachers should discuss this with their students?

T: We should figure out clearly the cause and effect of the events if we
were to discuss. As students, they can discuss what to do when faced with
the situation. This is a form of education for our students, not to jump on it
without really knowing, or to congregate once they hear the slightest trail of
things. The students now, especially high school students, should take
responsibilities for their action. Of course, compared to us, they are still not
mature enough, so we must educate them through discussions, and teach
them what would be the appropriate course of action to take when they are
in this situation.

I: So, you are saying the teachers should still talk to students about this, and
let them know more in order to make their own decisions [whether or not to
act]?

T: Yes, perhaps in learning about ways to deal with [such] things.

I: What are the usual ways of discussion?

T: Students should still learn more about the situation, so they first need to
learn the facts, and then you may express your opinion. Perhaps they may
have their [different] opinions, and such opinions do not really match the
“citizen standards” or “moral standards” [of our country]— s/he is only
concerned about her/himself. As a teacher, we should correct those areas
where they did not think through.

I: So how do you see students participating in activities such as protest?

T: I think that even though students’ priorities are to study, when it comes
to situations that thwart the human development, they should participate.
Not that they participate in anything. You have to figure out whether or not
you should participate, in what ways is this situation problematic, and you also need to figure out how you may participate.

Step 1: Discursive constructions

Protest within this theme was seen as a concern for any indications for potential risk and danger. In this theme, protest was referred to as a channel for people to make visible concerns (line 2), a patriotic response to a collective threat (line 12-13), a way to draw the governmental attention to the issue(s) at stake (line 6). Yet this was an action that should only be used as “a last resort” if there was a lack of responses from the state (line 11-12). The active actor to respond to threat or concern was the government (line 4-6), with official interpretations provided by schools (line 14-16) which meant that protest must be approached with caution, that it should be a controlled and passive act (“This is a form of education for our students, not to jump on it without really knowing, and to congregate once they hear the slightest trail of things”), as it had consequences (line 31). Participating in protest was not for everyone (line 32-35), but for those with more maturity (thus it is off-limit for the students, who were developmentally immature). Further, participation in protests should be selective, as not all protests were the same (line 44-48).

Even when protest was perceived to be a recognized legal response to issues of concern, this teacher understood the consequences that participation in protests could have. When linked to consequences in this way, protest was an indicator for risk and as such, should be taken seriously and cautiously. Teachers
should, then, offer to “correct those areas where they (students) did not think through”. In this sense, teachers stood as the first guard of defense to calm the angry students, and assume the role of the interpreter to make justifiable events and perspectives that may incite protests. Implicit here was that such correctness was not really debatable, as the Party had the final say in its interpretation.

Step 2: Discourses

In the excerpt, realizing that civic protest can be a challenge to the existing social order, this teacher constructed civic protest as a testing ground for government accountability. Here, protest was a recognized form of civic engagement, but also one with the utility to assess the receptivity of the government accountability. While civic protest was constructed as a potential to challenge and disrupt the existing norm, such as when faced with “national threat” (“you may protest if this particular event pose large threats to citizens and students, like what happened during the May 4th Patriotic Movement”, line 22-23), both of the social actors (citizens and government) worked under an agreed upon consensus to preserve the status quo. The priority here, then, was to make necessary adjustments (“with certain investigation and by taking certain measures, this problem can be solved”, line 5-6), and prescribe sufficient guidance to students (“correct those areas where they did not think through”, line 41-42), so that the existing social order was sustained for the benefits of all citizens.

Such construction of civic protest as a testing ground resonated with the medical discourse. Here, protest was conceptualized as a manifestation of existing
problems that needed to be addressed and dealt with. There was no need to account for why the problems existed in the first place, but rather a call for diagnosis and treatment of illnesses from a professional entity (schools, teachers, and the government). By locating the protest in a medical discourse, the teacher constructed the protest as the outbreak of an illness, which warranted genuine concerns, and discredited students’ participations in protest for they are immature, reactive, ill informed, and unable to make right decisions (“because students are still within the walls of their school, and they may not know enough. They may go back home and learn this from their parents, and they may get riled up without knowing what is going online”, lines 13-16), and gave power to the authorities who had the expertise to prescribe the right type of treatment to eradicate the illness. With carefully prescribed transcripts to protect students’ wellbeing, teachers and schools were positioned to guide and contain students’ flight responses through discussions:

“As students, they can discuss what to do when faced with the situation. This is a form of education for our students, not to jump on it without really knowing, or to congregate once they hear the slightest trail of things. The students now, especially high school students, should take responsibilities for their action. Of course, compared to us, they are still not mature enough, so we must educate them through discussions, and teach them what would be the appropriate course of action to take when they are in this situation.”

Step 3: Action orientation

This stage of analysis involved a careful examination of “the discursive contexts within which the different constructions of the object are being deployed”
(Willig, p.132). Using the medical discourse, this teacher’s use of a discursive construction of the civic protest as a “testing ground” could be seen, within this context, as a way of emphasizing his/her sense of responsibility for her students’ wellbeing. The talk about the need to warrant the validity of concern – whether there was indeed any damage of the chemical plant on residential environments – created an impression that this issue, alarming and potentially harmful, was out of reach for ordinary citizens, but rather reserved for those in authority and with professional knowledge. To respond to such an impression, a construction of the civic protest as a “testing ground” drew attention to its diagnostic nature and this teachers’ awareness of the potential consequences that students may encounter, and his/her trust in the ability of the authority to handle such a situation. This teacher attributed the diagnosis and treatment of the problems to the professionals and authorities; in this way, students were well taken care of. From within a medical discourse, the teacher was not then held accountable for refraining from discussing the root cause and various ways the students can participate in protests, and positions him/herself as one who was making responsible choices of protecting students from the harm and letting the professional handle the tricky situation.

Step 4: Positionings

The medical construction of civic protest as “the testing ground” gave unequal power to the government and its citizens. Testing ground was typically a space where experimentations were run and technical issues debugged by those
with authority and professional expertise. It provided the opportunity to observe what would happen when the tested subject was pushed to extreme, and to adjust when the results contradicts with the original hypothesis. In this sense, while the participants of such “social experiments” (citizens) were given limited degrees of agency, when their performances was off track from an hypothesized outcome, agents (teachers, schools) shall be injected by authority (government) to adjust or even reverse such courses.

The subjective position offered by this discourse was that teachers should watch closely and be wary of the pitfall of the social experiments of government control. Using the sanctioned transcript deemed appropriate by the authority, teachers should help adjust or even deter the students’ decision making to prioritize authority over individuals (“they are still not mature enough, so we must educate them through discussions, and teach them what would be the appropriate action to take when they are in this situation”). Students are, in this sense, excused for their immaturity and ease of being deceived (“they are still not mature enough, so we must educate them through discussions, and teach them what would be the appropriate action to take when they are in this situation”). The government’s subject position offered in this discourse was that it was benevolent and responsive (“this protest caught the attention of relevant governmental offices, and so with certain investigation and by taking certain measures, this problem can be solved”), and was the only trusted entity that had the capacity to address alarming issues that may pose a threat to the citizens, such as the PX project pollutions.
Step 5: Practice

In this stage, I examined the possibilities for action mapped by the discursive constructions of protests, and what can be said and done by the subjects positioned within (Willig, et. al., p.136). In this section of text that constructed protests as a “testing ground” required a vigilant preoccupation with the participants’ action taking. This teacher talked about the importance of fact checking and the criteria by which to assess the need to take actions. The subject position of a watchful agent who reserved the right to intervene at any time when the political discourse was disrupted involves a focus to balance both the wellbeing of the participants (students) and the interests of authority. This agent, then, carried the care for the students, and at the same time was required to make the right choices and appropriate decisions. This meant that the subject position of the watchful agent was associated with political awareness, careful deliberation and a consideration of the effects of potential decisions and outcomes upon the wellbeing of participants. This was demonstrated in lines 20-25, 27-33.

In practice, the power distributed to the government and the citizens by this teacher was unequal. Being part of a protest may help highlight the social issue at stake, citizens themselves did not hold much capacity to understand or address it. Rather, they served to highlight the “performance glitches” that had gone wrong in the governance machine, by taking appropriate actions, and a responsive government would take such information to understand what works and what can be managed, to then dedicate its resources to address such glitches.
Step 6: Subjectivity

This stage of the analysis helped make links between the discursive constructions used by teachers and their implications for subjective experience, what can be felt by this teacher from within his/her subject position.

By positioning him/herself as a mature, unbiased, and protective educator, this teacher spoke in compassionate tone in identifying the students’ place in protests, and in expressing the power of civic actions in changing the governance landscape in China. Feelings of guilt and unease were available to those positioning themselves within the construction of protest as a testing ground, as this teacher tried to prioritize protests of different natures (“I think that even though students’ priorities are to study, when it comes to situations that thwart the human development, they should participate. Not that they participate in anything.”) that demanded different responses that were well-thought out and appropriate. The focus here, then, involved a sense of urgency in guiding students to take rightful path of action to arrive at goals that were aligned with that of the national standards deemed correct by the government.

III. The Wishful: Chinese Language and Literacy teacher, key school, Nantong.

1 I: How do you see Xiamen residents’ protest?
2 T: What do I think? I think it is necessary. I can tell from the materials you showed me that they did follow legal procedures, and did not cause any chaos or disorder for the society and the government. Because our government doesn’t provide people with ways to express their concerns... I think alternatives such as protesting online, holding public hearings and street rallies are the only means that people can think of that are legal ways to protest. Yet the government sent “notices”…

10 I: What do you think about the decision of some of the schools and
colleges?
T: Prohibiting students from participating...(sighs), I have conflicting feelings about this, because I am a teacher. From the students’ perspectives, how much can students’ participation make real impacts? I have conflicting thoughts. What is the use of it for them to protest when they are so young? Protests should be done by adults who are better informed and more rational. It is not meaningful for kids to participate. But again they are citizens; they have the right to participate. So I have conflicting thoughts about students’ participation. I also feel like, [we] can let students participate, but when they participate without understanding what is going on, they will make a chaotic and ridiculous scene. And for the schools that claimed that they would punish the students who break the rule, I despise them. And what they were saying about not allowing the students to join the Party…I feel like the Chinese Party…I shouldn’t say blindly anymore... I will not say anymore. Anyways, I despise them.
I: Suppose you had a friend who was a teacher in one of the schools, what would you advise him or her to do?
T: Personally, and I have been emphasizing for sometime now that I am a good law-abiding citizen. Usually I admire those who are brave enough to stand out for the development of country and society. I really admire them. But in reality, I am embarrassed to admit that I don’t necessarily have the courage to stand up. Of course in my mind I would have the awareness of whether or not I admire (such act), but in fact, I doubt that I will be the first one to bravely stand out. And I have learned to live my life cautiously (avoiding troubles) in the society, just hoping I can be safe, and live on without having any big ambitions. I just want to keep going. So if there is a friend in that school, I won’t give make any noise, I won’t talk too much.
I: How do you think teachers should present issues like the Xiamen incident to school students? Is this a good example of a contemporary issue for class discussion?
T: Of course, I think we can discuss it. Because after discussions, when they grow up they can have their own views. I don’t stand out doesn’t mean I won’t hope for my students to stand out. Additionally, I hope that they have an idea of what is right and what is wrong. This I think is necessary. Some of the children may be like me in the future, living their lives cautiously; but others [won’t]...this society needs some people who can rush out to change it. So I will talk about this event in an objective way without telling them what they should do. This I feel like, when things happen, different people will have different ways of responding to it.
Step 1: Discursive constructions

Protest within this theme was seen as a channel for citizens to “express concerns” (line 5), one that can creatively manifest in different forms (line 5-6), as a way to stand in solidarity with those who shared the same cause (line 6), as something that required informed and rational decision making (line 13, line 16-17), as something that all citizens rightfully and legally can participate in (line 7, line 14), as something that took courage and even sacrifice (line 25-25), and as something that can have positive impacts in the world (line 38-39).

While protest was seen by the previous two teachers as a reactive response to an absence of possibilities, in this selection of excerpts, this teacher identified protest as a versatile and proactive opportunity of voicing concerns in a civil society, a recognized legal right of all citizens that was governed by informed and rational decision making, an expression of solidarity that took tremendous courage (for it can come at great personal loss), and one that promised positive changes in the world. These aforementioned seven references constructed protests as a catalytic force for the possibility for change, promising uncertainty and disruption to the status quo, but giving rise to hope. Teachers should, then, offer to help students form “their own views” through discussions, and not discourage them from exercising their civic right in creative ways.

Step 2: Discourses
This teacher constructed protests as a catalytic force charged by those who invested personal resources (time, courage, security) in exchange for solidarity from the mass, with the potential to finally “change the world” (line 24-25, line 38-39). When located within wider discourses surrounding civic participations, construction of protest as such resonated with the evolutionary discourse. Here, protest was conceptualized as one of the ways of moving towards a superior, more democratic form of governance. Notions of diversification, mutation, and selection in response to changes in the environment and the expectations that changes take place over time accordingly are prominent ways in contemporary talk about development. By constructing the protest through discursive resources derived from evolutionary discourse, I then investigated how protests contained assumptions, expectations, and practices that gave rise to a particular version of protests, which was mobilized in the construction of protests as a transformative force towards progress.

Step 3: Action Orientation

This teacher’s use of a discursive construction of the protest as a catalytic force can be seen, within this context, as a way of emphasizing the inevitability of development and change that differed from the current ways the government was run and how protest as a practice was handled. The use of evolutionary discourse could be seen, within this context, as a way of emphasizing the inevitable course of change and this teacher’s sense of responsibility for his/her students’ capacity building for civic participation. Talk about his/her own behavior of keeping a low
profile, not having the “courage to stand up” and just want to “be safe, and live on without having any big ambitious” may have created the impression that he/she, was the victim of turbulent and uncertain governance. To reverse such an impression, a construction of the protest as a “catalytic force” drew attention to its immediate and transformative nature, its promise for hope, and the teacher’s awareness of the political significance of protest.

Step 4: Positionings

By linking individual’s active agency and protest, the positioning of citizens as those capable to make reasonable and rational decisions for their own best interests was strengthened. While the other two teachers discussed the Party and the Country as if they were the same, this teacher did not equate one as the other. Those citizens with more agency were positioned as ready for change, even when such change came at the cost of their own wellbeing; those with less agency were positioned as conflicted, unable to act without assurance of their safety (“When things happen, different people have different ways of responding to it”).

While both types of people may be “dormant” at the surface level, the introduction of a catalyst (protest) can lead to drastically different outcomes, one that was ever more cautious, while the other one embraced the inevitable progress for change.

The effect of a catalyst (protest) may vary due to the presence of other substances (students) such as inhibitors – which reduced the catalytic activity, or promoters – which increased the activity. Typically with a catalyst, a chemical reaction occurs faster, and without being consumed in the catalyzed reaction, catalysts can
continue to act repeatedly. From this teacher’s perspective, a teacher’s duty subsequently became more of a facilitator, one with authority and responsibility to provide scaffolding to students who participate through quick, transformative reactions. Teachers were positioned here as the empowered, who were able to make reasonable judgments as rational adults in regards to change. While they may not necessarily act due to their own personal limitations, they had an ethical obligation to give students who – while less mature and experienced compared to teachers – the space, resources, and tools to find their voice and be their own agents of change:

...After discussions, when they grow up they can have their own views. I don’t stand out doesn’t mean I won’t hope for my students to stand out... some children may be like me in the future, living their lives cautiously; but others [won’t]... this society needs some people who can rush out to change it.

Step 5: Practice

In this section of text, constructions of protests as a catalytic force and teacher’s subject positions of empowered facilitator required those positioned within it to act with an open attitude and welcoming mindset for change. Being part of a chemical reaction (in this case, democracy) meant that the roles that substances (students) took up – be it inhibitors or promoters, contributed to whether the catalyst (protest) promised a fast, reactive, and transformative outcome. This section of the text that constructed the protest as a catalyst did not make clear a judgment as to how the participants should react (“different people will have different ways of responding to it”), but recognizing the power potential
of citizens and taking responsibility for the education of these participating
citizens (students) supported the construction of protests as catalytic forces. The
subject position of a hopeful agent who facilitated the process of decision-making
and acts of participation in a protest involved a focus upon the students, their civic
interests, and the advancement of the society. Here, a protest not only highlighted
citizen concerns, but it also gave citizens an active voice and role of participation
in governance, who held the potential to make evolutionary impacts in the existing
political arena.
Step 6: Subjectivity

The relationship between discourse and subjectivity made available ways of
being in the world and seeing the world. Further, it offered a perspective into what
could be felt, thought, and experienced by this teacher from within his/her subject
position.

Feelings of hope and empowerment can be felt by the psychological reality
constructed by an evolutionary discourse that positions subjects as wishful agents
in presence of protest. By positioning him/her within this discourse allowed
him/her to not only forgive those who chose not to participate, but also to feel safe
in publicly expressing admiration for those who participated in protests (“Usually
I admire those who are brave enough to stand out for the development of country
and society. I really admire them”, lines 24-25). In this way, it can be argued that
he/she was able to feel less guilty about not participating personally, but can be
comforted and empowered by those who did participate, as they contributed to the
inevitable advancement of collective ("when they grow up, they can have their own views. … I hope that they have an idea of what is right and what is wrong...

Some of the children may be like me in the future, living their lives cautiously; but others [won’t]…this society needs some people who can rush out to change it”, lines 34-39).

**Discussions and Implications**

Teachers teach to the identity of the students, and what teachers teach carry a message. Students encounter these multiple narratives that constantly shape their civic identities as the citizens of the future. By examining the perspectives of teachers, and thinking about the obligation of the teaching profession to encourage students to try and change the system and the world, this paper bears important implications for reforming civic curriculums, teacher’s professional development, youth civic engagement, and adaptations of policies in meeting citizens’ demands to increase governing resilience towards a democratic society.

By 2017, China is expected to surpass U.S. to be the world’s largest economy. Today, along with the large population and rapid growth, the rest of the world keenly watches as the awakened “Oriental dragon” exerts its economical, social, and political power. Despite the economic and political advancement, political safety and correctness is still a big factor that hinders teachers from encouraging students to participate in critical civic engagement broadly. However, it also shows that, even within a relatively rigid authoritarian political system,
some teachers begin to see potentials for students to build their civic capacity to affect social change through civic protests.

In this paper, I examined the questions of how Chinese teachers interpret impacts of student participation in protests, and what discourses do they draw upon to define the priorities and beliefs of their civic responsibilities to their students. I sought to understand how Chinese teachers negotiated and prioritized tensions between being part of a systematic inculcation of national values and supporting students’ civic participation that may contradict such values, as well as how they interpreted their roles and responsibilities for encouraging or discouraging students’ active civic engagement in an authoritarian form of government. Existing research on teachers’ perceptions on students’ civic participation draw largely from liberal democracies, and few research exist that examined how teachers managed the goals of citizenship education, particularly in China. Much of the research is only available in Chinese, largely situated in the philosophical and moral tradition, or on pedagogical choices and tools that promoted individuals’ senses of self-improvement as a responsibility to the society.

Although not a longitudinal study, through a careful and systematic analysis of interviews with teachers, themes of their perceptions of student participation and construction of how the protest—as a form of civic participation—were identified. Teachers varied in perceiving the utility of student participation; some believed participation was a simply a waste of time and energy, some
expressed their concerns for student safety, while some other believed firmly in the principal of democracy in having a voice. A teacher who primarily was situated in the “wasteful” theme constructed the protest may say that protest should be universal, yet is conditional and controlled in the context of China, and assigned authorities with absolute power of surveillance and decision making. By constructing the protest as conditional with possibility to be manipulated, teachers were positioned as accountable for ensuring students’ values are aligned with those supplied by the patriarchal authority, for the purpose of protecting and maintaining social and economic progress. A teacher in the “wary” theme constructed the protest as risk and danger, and therefore an act to be taken seriously by authorities, which were positioned as responsible for providing solution, surveillance, and containment. A medical discourse constructs protest in ways that mean the teacher is genuinely frightened for the welfare of the student and for his or her own safety. By not encouraging student participation in protests, teachers may be positioned as caring yet watchful agents who reserve the right to intervene on behalf of the authority, and to balance both the wellbeing of the students and the interests of the authority in preserving social stability. Contrary to both teachers in “wasteful” and “wary” themes, the teacher in the “wishful” theme constructed the protest as a proactive opportunity to engage with the society and decision making, despite the challenges and potential danger. Students who participate in protests were positioned within this construction of protest to be capable to make rational decisions for their own best interests.
This analysis highlights the personal, conceptual, and institutional, and complexities involved in the discursive processes through which constructions were both utilized and resisted. Personally, teachers have to make different choices to prioritize social order, personal wellbeing, or collective agency, and social order. At the level of practice, teachers have to grapple with priorities emphasized by their immediate communities and the culture of the social institutions within which they are embedded in.

Conceptually, teachers face the challenge of receiving, interpreting, and modifying the ideas of civic engagement and individualism in the context of their experiences and daily lives, and during this process, they draw upon values and discourses in their own cultural tradition and social standing to make meaning of the values to themselves and their students. At the level of the concept, there is no inherent incompatibility between protests as a form of civic participation and that of the law; from the perspective of practice, however, teachers are more hesitant towards this form of participation, and express varying levels of concern about the resistances that participants would face.

Institutionally, the discourses that teachers draw upon are shaped by the wider socio-political context and the power structure between the state and the individuals. Our analysis shows that much of the knowledge about civic participation and their outcomes are limited to what had been made salient by the dominant discourses about safety, priority, and progress. On the other hand, some
teachers begin to see opportunities in instilling and practicing the skills and opportunities for civic participation at the individual level to enact change.

The constructions identified here by teachers have largely disempowering implications for citizens who participate in the protest. However, some teachers resisted the damaging aspects of participating in a protest, and constructed a hopeful urge to facilitate, support, and empower their students in their participation in an emerging democracy. In this way, they positioned themselves within it to have greater control and less fear. By resisting constructions of the protest as damaging or risky, teachers face being positioned as unprofessional or unruly, having certain political and professional obligations within their duties as agents of the state, which require them to react to myriad forms of resistance or disruption to social stability and safety. An evolutionary discourse constructs the protest as one of the ways of moving from an authoritarian form to a more democratic and advanced form of governance, and emphasized the inevitable, yet transformative course of change that evokes the teachers’ sense of responsibility for the students’ capacity building.

I hope to have presented these complexities to open up possibilities for social research and actions. While this study suggests potential challenges in encouraging student participation in civic actions for teachers, distinguishing particular types of civic engagement that are appropriate warrants further consideration. Using this information, scholars and activists may seek to develop curriculums or professional development materials for teachers to identify and
teach the necessary skills to participate meaningfully in the society within reasonable bounds. Further, it may be helpful to ask, what cultural and structural resources can we draw upon to encourage changes making within the local community to help promote skill capacity building.

Setting these teacher’s experiences in the frame of developmental psychology provides useful clues for understanding the different kinds of value system that teachers subscribe to and by doing so, distinguish their perspectives towards student roles in protests and reveal their senses of responsibilities to students’ civic engagement and development. While most constructions resulted in the production of largely disempowering positions, some offered promise of promising positions, both with important consequences for action and subjectivity. By analyzing the inherent tensions within available discourses embedded within the society, at the individual level, I expose their instabilities and begin to investigate, and identify promises of possibilities for change. Only through focusing on individual positioning and practice and being aware of the impact of language on possibilities for action and complex power relations within the wider social and political practices can we begin to bring about small, even sometimes seemingly wishful, changes. In this sense, we disrupt what is commonly held to be true, and offer freedom to those in positions oppressed by the existing structure. Through this process, I was able to ask new questions that highlighted the existing discourses that were held to be true or commonplace, in order to destabilize and challenge current practices that disempowers citizen from participations, and hope
to emancipate them—starting from teachers— to apply and use information as never before.
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Appendix A: Details of the Vignette

In 2006, a Taiwanese businessman applied to build a large chemical plant in Xiamen. The National Development and Reform Commission approved of this project, and so did the city government of Xiamen, as it promised an increase in Xiamen’s GDP. Citizens of Xiamen were concerned that such a chemical plant would damage the air quality in the city severely and pose negative impacts on residents in surrounding cities. They began organizing resistance movement on the Internet. In May of 2007, Xiamen residents used cellular text to organize protests online, public hearings, and finally staged a street demonstration by marching the streets. Under such pressure from the public, the city government of Xiamen suspended this project, which was then moved to Zhangzhou, a nearby city in the same Province. During the period of protests, a few schools sent warnings, prohibiting students from participating in the protests, stating that whoever that did not follow such a rule would be penalized, and face consequences such as loss of nomination to join the Communist Party.
Appendix B: Details of Data Analytic Process

Given that my study was aiming to understand teacher’s perceptions, and little research on my population of interest in this topic exists, I felt that inductive, qualitative analyses were most appropriate for this study in order to generate theory for continued future research. In the first phase of the analysis, I used thematic analysis to identify perceptions of salient civic and moral qualities of students, as well as their perceived roles in protests that are observed in teacher’s responses. In the second phase, I use Foucauldian discourse analysis to understand how teacher’s responses construct their orientations and responsibilities as agents of the state in their schools.

Combining both of these approaches help me examine what priorities and concerns about citizenship and enactments of citizenship are evident in teachers’ answers, and how they define what they believe their civic and moral choices demand of them. In thematic analysis, I focus on the content of the teacher’s responses rather than an analysis of what they are attempting to achieve rhetorically within their answers. I do this by tracking and clustering emic codes that captured ideas emergent in the teachers’ responses. In discourses analysis, my goal is to describe how teachers’ responses define the boundaries, priorities and expectations of their orientations and responsibilities in the moral and political sphere of schools, and revealing what larger discourses that are made available to them through their choices of responses.

Because I was working with transcripts in Mandarin Chinese, the first step in approaching these interviews was through translations. Using four translated transcripts translated by our research officer, Xu Zhao, as templates, I translated the remaining interviews into English. For both Xu and I, Mandarin is our first language and we both received our academic training at the graduate level in the US. As such, we can understand and appreciate nuances in language and culture both in the US and China, and to be able to reflect such nuances in our translations. This was important because as cultural straddles, we can read “between the lines”, comprehend the gaps and pauses as perceived through the transcripts, and be able to interpret such nuances.

The first cycle of coding was largely descriptive. Here, the goal of coding is not to count things, but to rearrange the data into categories that facilitate comparison between things in the same category and that aid in the development of theoretical concepts, or categorize data into broader themes and issues (Maxwell, 2005). My adviser and I read through all the 16 interview transcripts in English, getting a general sense of the interviews. Then, focusing on the part of the interview on responses on qualities makes a good person versus that of a citizen, as well as a vignette on “Xiamen protests”, we extracted four random transcripts, and did line by line coding, trying to find the nuances of text at the sentence level. At this time, I began to compare the English transcripts to the original interview transcripts in Chinese, zooming in on both the culture and textual elements of the responses of our participants.
In this cycle, we each read through all of the 16 interview transcripts in English to get a general sense of the interviews. Then, focusing on the part of the interviews on the “Xiamen Vignette”, which is what prompted me to be interested in this dataset in the first place, knowing that this will be a space that’s packed with conflicts, micro and macro, personal and societal, national and patriotic, etc. We then extracted 8 random transcripts, one from each school, and did line by line coding emically, with an eye to find the nuances of the text at the sentence level. At this time, I began to compare the English transcripts to the original transcripts in Chinese, focusing on, and comparing actively to both the cultural and textual elements of the responses to our questions.

We then used different excerpts to test our codes resolved our differences as a way to address issues of reliability. To do so, we summarized transcripts separately and then together outlined the key points or takeaways from each teacher and compared notes. Lastly, we applied the codes to the rest of the transcripts with the intent of identifying meaningful units of text. We each read the data several times to examine the emerging themes. We then were able to consolidate on our disagreements about categorizing and interpretation for different cultural perspectives and linguistic issues between Chinese and English.

[memos]

puzzled over the “safety” vs “citizen rights (to protest)”

When we code, we coded for both for semantic and latent meanings. Here are two examples in which were many codes going on between these teachers: legitimacy of reactions to injustice, including protests; individuals share responsibility to society:

“As a citizen, [students] have the right to participate in protests… I think [in classrooms] we should talk about it…. ” This excerpt was coded for semantic: teachers teach to context of injustice, legitimacy of protest, goal of civic education.

“We should teach students to care about society – you cannot simply sit in the classrooms to [show that you] care, students must learn the realities [of injustice] and different approaches to solve them. ” This was coded for latent: student/individual agency, responsibility to society

Following that, we entered the next stage of reducing data even further and came up with emerging themes. Here are two examples of how themes were
constructed, and I extracted key words from identified codes and organized them under different themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotes</th>
<th>key words</th>
<th>theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Students are students and, after all, immature, it’s OK for college students, but not for those in middle school, they are too emotional and less rationale, they haven’t established their perspectives of the world, and they are still developing their perspectives” – T12</td>
<td>immature, irrational, emotional, developing, young,</td>
<td>immaturity of students in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“They shouldn’t participate, they are too young, they can’t tell (right from wrong)…” – T15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’m conflicted about this, because as citizens, students have the right to participate (in protests)” – T2</td>
<td>law, citizens, participation, rights</td>
<td>Agency of students Civil rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“this is a law-given right of a citizen, he should be able to participate according to law ”-T3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“this is their own community, of course they have the right to protest” – T8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We then moved from thematic analysis to move towards noticing, how these broad themes led us to thinking about how issues around power might be implicated in these interviews about civic protest. FDA is a method that is particularly concerned with power. Moreover, there is a contextual relevance here. In post-Republican Communist China, civic protest is highly controlled by the state, and FDA treats discourses as bound up with institutional practices, so we were also interested in looking at how civic protest was constructed in terms of the relation to the institution of the state. Finally, because civic protest is a contested act across many societies, we thought it was particularly relevant to look at the possible ways of being that are constructed through discourse.
Appendix C: Personal background and connection to the data

I was born into the post-cultural revolution era in China. Economic reform had started to show positive impacts, and the execution of one-child policy was tighter than ever before. With my father a loyal Mao’s Communist party official, and my mother a descendent of Marine chief of Chiang Kai Shek’s Nationalist party, there was surprisingly very little debate on the difference of opinions that dominated these competing ideologies that my parents each represented. Perhaps, the aftermath of the Cultural Revolution was still haunting, so much that people dared not to speak of contrasting views. Perhaps, people were far too satisfied with their hard-fought material well-being after the horrendous times of war and famine. Perhaps, it was also such silence that afforded me the opportunity to remain curious, and thereafter the space to alter the problematic realities that I see myself in.

When my fiancé found out that I knew nothing of the 1989 Tian’an Men protest in 2009, when I came to the U.S. for the first time, he was extremely shocked. Subsequently, I began to find a series of discrepancies between what I thought I knew about China and what were written about Chinese histories. I then got into many heated debates with my fiancé, who minored in East Asian Studies in Harvard College, over Taiwan, protests, Falun Gong, and Dalai Lama, etc. I quickly realized the danger of the many “single stories” that are part of the Party’s choice of history and repertoire. This was the budding beginning interest in civic studies.

So when Helen let me know the first time, about this “China lab” she’s running, doing analysis of this set of data, I was overwhelmingly excited as I thought of it as a great opportunity for me to engage in conversation (sort of) with my country on citizenship, and learn more about the opportunities that are being presented to students – explicitly or inexplicitly – about what makes a good citizen, a good person, and what are the boundaries of government.

I knew I had wanted to use FDA for this assignment when I first learned about FDA through Amy in our China lab, who took S522 last year. I was mesmerized by this method’s ability to allow us take deep dives into what appeared to be a very small chunk of text. Throughout the course of this year, due to my multiple overlaps with Helen in different capacities (lab, ECSP, S522, and work towards QP), I find myself fully immersed in the data, and sometimes it seems that everything blends together. So I was appreciative of Assignment 4, when I took the dive to do FDA before I can conduct the analysis on my own for the final assignment.
Appendix D: Sample Memo on Individual Participant

Memo on Individual Participant

Ms. Li teaches History at a key high school in Shanghai. Her interview brings to mind the preference to “controlled” ways of being exercised in the Chinese society. Such control manifest itself in controlled interpretation of texts, expression of opinions, ways of seeking resolutions, etc. Ms. Li began by describing a seemingly changed classroom, one quite different from what I had experienced myself, growing up in China. In Ms. Li’s classroom, there is a lot more interactions between the teacher and the students, and historical events are posed as questions for multiple interpretations. Ms. Li enjoys this free-style way of conducting classes with her students, and at the same time, seems to give the students much more “freedom” in whether or not they should participate or not. For example, recognizing that there may be an important test coming up, Ms. Li would let is slide if a student was cramming for that test, rather than focusing on the class she was teaching. Part of this is a reflection of the persistence of testing culture, but another part, I wonder, if this is the individualist orientation manifest itself in the classrooms – students are recognized as consumers of education, and are at their own will to choose whether to participate or not in the classroom, and teachers can no longer force their participation.

Ms. Li also sees the goal of History as a form of citizenship education, to help educate “the person”, a person who is “thoughtful and well-rounded”. To her, moral education falls into the private sphere, where an individual can and exerts control; on the other hand, civic education falls into the public sphere, where some form of “nudging” or, “guidance” should be provided to map onto the “mainstream value”, especially the value of the “main stream political system”, and an education of the mainstream “political ideology”. And to her, teachers should take on the role to merge moral education, civic education, and political education into one form of education that guide students to internalize and agree with the mainstream value. Interestingly, to Ms. Li, such a mainstream value manifest itself in the basic “moral qualities” that stood the test of time from the Chinese traditional culture, and a sense of responsibility to the society – to advance it, but not to completely eradicate it.

This is so interesting to me, because such a perspective not only confirms and directly taps into the “mainstream” party line, but also the internalization of the interpretation of knowledge that came from outside of China through the process of globalization. In a metropolitan city like Shanghai where academic exchange with non-Chinese scholars happen frequently, it is certainly to be expected that alternative perspectives of citizenship are present. But it is also in such an important trading center like the City of Shanghai where the government exerts lots of propaganda and control. This manifests itself in the tensions that surfaced constantly in this interview. For example, Ms. Li states that to be a good citizen
there are three characters that one must embody: to not be blind, to be proactive, to be socially responsible. She then further states that a good citizen is one who does not follow orders blindly, and such clear judgment should be built on the foundation of knowledge, experience, and thought. This all seems good and benign. On one hand, Ms. Li recognizes, in her interview, that by being a citizen, one should participate in the country’s affair as the mainstream ideology sees fit, and such “participation” is incredibly important in making a citizen. Ms. Li did not use any value adjectives here, but draws from Aristotle that being civic is a “western democratic idea”, and stated it as a fact. It seems that, in this context, instead of being “proactive”, by being “civic”, one is seemingly rendering control to a superior entity that dictates what one’s values should be, and that value oftentimes blurs into individual value systems and permeates the ways that individuals conduct ways of being.

This “controlled ways of living”, seems to exist in a hierarchy of involvement that dictates who can be involved at what stage/status of his/her life, and how to act. Taking this in an extreme form, how does the concept of good citizenship change as the regime changes? Is there anything that can be held constant?
Appendix E: Sample Analytic Memo

The purpose of this memo is to document my current thinking in response to your comments on constructing matrix(s) that may surface the nuances in how teachers construct the 3Ws that unearth the dominant discourses they are drawing upon.

One of the challenges that I have in presenting the 3Ws is to convey the multilayered discourses that are at play in a way that is respectful of the teachers, without over-simplifying, or misrepresenting the intentions of teachers in their authentic ways of caring for their students in the unique context of China. I am particularly cautious, as I join the many China scholars in the West in unpacking and attempting the interpretation of a unique “China model” that responds to market demands/neoliberalism forces within the parameters of a socialist country. And one of the many assumptions about the East and the West, in this particular context of China, has been the tuck and pull between the between perspectives of the “Confucian” collectivist and the “Western” individual. The question of whether or not the leadership, in this rapidly developing country, will allow opportunities for the millennials by having access to expressions of individualism by way of a westernized/popularized version of democracy, or constrain opportunities by tightening ideological control to exert dominance of the party state, is continually debated. As an emerging scholar from China who received the majority of academic training in the US, and one who only begins to examine such tension academically, I enter my analysis of the teacher data aware of, and reflective of my assumptions and biases.

In approaching the teacher data, a question that’s constant on my mind is how teachers’ perception of a Chinese citizenship is constructed, both horizontally and vertically. By horizontally I mean the terrain of public discourses available on the many ideas of citizenship, domestic and foreign, familiar and imagined. By vertically I mean the span of temporal shift through thousands of years of cultural sediment, cultural processes made and molded by the change of time. It is within such a vertical and horizontal space that teachers drew on their perceptions of student roles in protest, and the possible ways of being that they construct of the students through such discourses.

In contemporary China, while there are myriad of protests every year, all protests are highly controlled by the state. Within my broader themes that emerged through the codes are the various dimensions of results of protest (both good and bad) that are thought to contribute to the decisions that these teachers make to discuss (or not) protest with students: school policies, student priorities, sanctions, supports, power and politics, as well as other dimensions that arose from the data, such as collegial relationships, moral gain/loss, and (individual) agency, etc. To avoid an over-simplification of the 3 typologies of teachers, I look within the dominant discourses that the teachers have access to, and then across them to reveal their connections within and across these typologies. I condensed the data into a matrix that captures the following discourses – or something that I am
wondering if may be simply termed “criteria” that teachers are using to calculate the usefulness of protests: developmental stages, goal, perceived role of power and system, cost, individual agency, collectivist responsibility (to society).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Wasteful: Individual Actions have no impact on governmental policy and students should not be wasting their time</th>
<th>Wary: Possibility of consequences, and avoid potential danger (in response to action)</th>
<th>Wishful: Protest can be effective in affecting social change and students will learn civic skills in participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>Be safe</td>
<td>Participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental stages</td>
<td>Students are: Immature, irrational,</td>
<td>Students can be misguided, manipulated, something that college students (and beyond) can do</td>
<td>Students can learn “right from wrong”, student are adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or: capacity?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning process...by participating...they are actually developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/negative</td>
<td>Useless waste of energy, time, there are others who are doing it (both)</td>
<td>Distracts students from studying; may impair future opportunities; may be dangerous (explain) limited resources, elaborate cost/benefits</td>
<td>Won’t change the status quo (?) what is the cost to the wishful discourse? Is it worth the investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and system</td>
<td>Political consequences; surplus of protests; chaos</td>
<td>Absence of institutional change; anarchy; we should be protecting the system</td>
<td>Caring for one’s own community, learn to change the world; potential skills, motivations in the long run;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual agency</th>
<th>Don’t participate</th>
<th>Be more “rounded”, Live cautiously</th>
<th>Exercise legal rights to change the status quo, or to respond to injustice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective responsibility</td>
<td>Protest disrupts social order, must prioritize the consistent goal of nation</td>
<td>Maintain stability; must be well organized; trust the leadership; learn more before you act; be objective</td>
<td>Be well organized; demand citizen rights;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is evident here, I am still trying to capture the nuances that are reflected in each discourse, encompassing the discourses, or criteria that the teachers are using to make references to and talk about students’ participation in protests. This is certainly not exhaustive, and I am thinking about ways to make more attentive and explicit in capturing teachers’ unique ways of thinking.