Front. Educ China 2010, 5(1): 104–129
DOI 10.1007/s11516-010-0008-z

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Limin Bai

Human Capital or Humane Talent? Rethinking the Nature of Education in China from a Comparative Historical Perspective

Abstract In order to analyze the impact of human capital theory on contemporary Chinese education, this paper first draws a conceptual outline of how this theory was introduced and interpreted to suit the Chinese quest for modernization. The study then adopts a comparative historical approach to the points of similarity between Neo-Confucian educational ideas and those of British humanism in an earlier transitional period that has some parallels. The aim of this comparison is to connect the ideas of Neo-Confucians and humanist educators to Ronald Dore's concept of the role of education and his insights on the diploma disease. Within this core framework, this paper exposes the problems that have come from a melding of the examination tradition and the notion of human capital. It suggests that a revival of another aspect of Chinese tradition—education for fostering one's humanity—may help balance contemporary Chinese education and restore it to health.

Keywords human capital theory, human talent, examination system, Neo-Confucianism, diploma disease, nature of education, British humanism

Since 1978 human capital theory and the instrumentalist view of education for economic development have permeated China. The revival of the formal education system and the university entrance examinations after the end of the Cultural Revolution helped shape the Chinese perception and interpretation of human capital theory. However, seeking a connection between education and China's development is not entirely new, and it can be traced back to the nineteenth century when China faced intrusion by Western powers. Modern

Received October 3, 2009

Limin Bai (✉)
School of Languages and Cultures, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand
E-mail: limin.bai@vuw.ac.nz

scholars have pondered such questions as whether there was a causal link between education and industrialization, or the scientific revolution, and their research findings may shed some light on our discussion of human capital theory with its emphasis on the role of education for economic productivity.

In order to analyze the impact of human capital theory on contemporary Chinese education, this paper first draws a conceptual outline of how this theory was introduced and interpreted to suit the Chinese quest for modernization. The study then adopts a comparative historical approach to the points of similarity between Neo-Confucian educational ideas and those of British humanism in an earlier transitional period that has some parallels. The aim of this comparison is to connect the ideas of Neo-Confucians and humanist educators to Ronald Dore's concept of the role of education and his insights on the diploma disease. Within this core framework, the final part of this paper exposes the problems that have come from a melding of the examination tradition that was so powerful in China, and the notion of human capital which is so central to neo-liberal ideology. It argues that the present dilemma of unemployed graduates is a reflection of an obsession with a kind of education that is upheld because of its supposed support of "human capital" but actually is dysfunctional. It is from this perspective that the study calls for the rethinking of the nature of education in the contemporary Chinese context.

China's Perception of Human Capital Theory

The origin of the concept of human capital can be traced back to Adam Smith's *An Inquiry into the Nature And Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), but it was developed into an influential educational idea by American economists Gary Becker (1930–) and Theodore Schultz (1902–1998). The basic idea is that education and training are costly and should be considered an investment as they relate closely to personal income differentials. In 1961 Schultz formalized the theory of human capital which brought about great enthusiasm for education and its positive impact on economic growth in the Western world. Within the framework of this theory, economists tend to view education as "both consumer and capital good"; and as "a capital good, education can be used to develop the human resources necessary for economic and social development" (Olaniyan & Okemakinde, 2008, p. 157). Along with this definition of the relationship between economic growth and education, the individual pursuit of financial rewards for an investment in education is naturally logical.

The concept of human capital was introduced into China in the late 1970s after the end of the disastrous 10-year Cultural Revolution. At the end of the 1970s and in the early 1980s, China, under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping, decided to

shift the priority of political movements to economic development, and education and science were emphasized as the key elements in China's new modernization initiatives. The formal education system was revived in order to train a highly educated work force and to improve the quality of the Chinese population. It was this socio-political context that laid the foundation for the warm reception of the theory of human capital in China.

The introduction of human capital theory to the field of Chinese education was initially legitimized through the study of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*. One of the key figures, who laid the theoretical foundation for Chinese perceptions of human capital theory in the development of educational theory, is Professor Gu Mingyuan of Beijing Normal University. Based on his knowledge of and research into the educational experience of Europe and Japan, he argued that there was a close link between education and economic development. In order to prepare a modern workforce in response to the rapid development of science and technology, education had to be designed to foster people with knowledge and understanding of the scientific foundations of modern production. Here Gu actually touched upon the theory of human capital, but did not quote from Schultz or Becker, nor did he even mention their names. Instead, Gu quoted extensively from the original texts of Marx and Engels, which legitimised the revolutionary concept that the integration of education and production was a law of education applying to both capitalist and socialist societies (Gu, 1981, pp. 1–8; 2001, pp. 34–35).

Apparently, Gu's advocacy was influenced by his experience of study in the Soviet Union, where the concept that educated and trained labor is itself a capital investment was developed in the 1930s, when the "communist regime embarked on an educational program which would prepare youth for the transformation of the nation into an industrial and technological territory" (Brickman & Zepper, 1992, pp. 54–55). Soviet labor-oriented education in fact contained elements of human capital theory, as education was regarded as a "capital good," albeit in a different disguise. This Soviet approach to education coincided with Mao Zedong's emphasis on the need to combine education with productive labour. In this sense, Gu's call for investment in education and his emphasis on a close link between education and modern production advocated this aspect of "human capital" theory, which was actually operative in China from the early 1950s and throughout the Maoist era. Nevertheless, Gu's call for investment in education and for strengthening scientific education was not merely a revisiting of this old concept. Rather, it was a correction to the focus of education on politics and class-struggle that existed during the Cultural Revolution. From this perspective, we may contend that Gu made a significant contribution to China's education reform, as his essay "stimulated the Chinese leadership to launch a series of reforms in education that focused on the human development needed for the

achievement of modernization in agriculture, industry, science and technology" (Hayhoe, 2006, p. 285).

Gu first published his theory in China's official journal *Red Flag* (Hong Qi) in 1980, and this essay, entitled "Modern education and modern production," was subsequently published in various other journals, and presented on 40 different occasions (Hayhoe, 2006, p. 284, note 41). However, the concept of education as a "consumer good," the aspect emphasized by Becker (1993) and Schultz (1971), did not appear in Gu's article. Schultz visited China in 1980, which helped fuel the Chinese fervor for the theory of human capital, especially among scholars and policy makers (Li & Lin, 2008, p. 280).

In the 1980s, the discourse around human capital theory in the West shifted to an emphasis on the impact of technology, combined with knowledge and skill, on economic growth and substantiality. This new focus in the concept of human capital served Chinese needs in a very timely way. Furthermore, this reception of human capital theory, along with the revival of the university entrance examination system, to a certain extent, shaped the Chinese perception of the value of education. The restoration of the university entrance examination nationwide signaled the end of the Cultural Revolution and the beginning of a new era where education became significant to both the nation and individuals. While the national pursuit of the benefits of education focused on its impact on economic growth, for individuals it has been perceived as having a close link to personal income and social status. This close connection between education and financial rewards appears to have a powerful influence on people's appreciation of the nature and value of education.

Historically, the power of the traditional examination system came from its association with fame and gain. This is reflected in the old Chinese saying that "there is gold in books and there are beautiful women in books" (*Shuzhong ziyou huangjinwu, shuzhong ziyou yanruyu*). In modern terms, books represent knowledge, gold represents wealth, and beautiful women symbolize social status. From this perspective, the Chinese examination system served not just to test one's academic ability but also as a significant mechanism to regulate social mobility. The significance of this system can be seen in two spheres: in the public sphere this was the only means for the government to make official appointments; in the private sphere, this was the only channel for people to move upwards socially and to have a better income and a better life. This system was an integral part of Chinese society, no matter how the political systems and constitutions changed over the centuries. Schooling and examination, examination and better emoluments, could never be separated, and thus the key elements in "examination-oriented" education model have never disappeared.

Compared with the highly politicized methods and criteria used in selecting talented personnel in the Cultural Revolution, the revival of the university

entrance examination system in 1977 was welcomed and regarded as the only fair means to judge and select talented personnel. No longer did one's political background or social class play a significant role in the selection process, and everyone was supposed to be equal before marks and grades.

However, this seemingly fair system does not resolve a key issue in the format and content of the Chinese examinations. In traditional Chinese education, the focus of the examinations was the mastery of the Confucian classics and the eight-legged essay (*baguwen*) writing skills. Under the modern school system, the examinations by and large still seem to place the emphasis on memorizing what is in the textbooks, and testing the skills and techniques of answering questions in subjects such as mathematics and physics. More importantly, the examination system has been metamorphosed into a system encouraging students, parents and teachers to pursue high marks, which have become not only the purpose of schooling but also the crucial factor determining students' future. The critics of this examination system have almost all agreed that many students who perform well under this system do not necessarily turn into *rencai*, or human talent.

In Chinese, the term *ren* stands for people (*Ciyuan*, 1988, p. 85); *cai* for talent or endowment (*Ciyuan*, 1988, p. 652). However, the interpretation of the term *ren* in traditional Chinese philosophy and educational thought was often combined with a core concept in Confucianism: benevolence or humaneness (*ren*). The two characters share the same pronunciation, and the structure of the character for benevolence is formed with the character for people as its radical. In Confucianism benevolence (*ren*) was a key term, referring to the virtues of goodness, humanity and love. It was impossible to become a superior man (*junzi*) without the virtue of benevolence (Tu, 1968, pp. 29–39; 1979, pp. 17–34). Therefore, the term for people in Chinese has the full sense of a rich humanity. The origin of Chinese education was designed to foster children's humanity. There might be a parallel here with the connection between the English words human and humane.

The civil service examination system was well established in the Tang, and since then formal education was gradually constructed around this examination system, which consolidated the connection between wealth and power and the mastery of Confucian classics and literary forms. Entering officialdom through education became the motivation for motivated literati to devote their lives to participation in such examinations. In the entire period of late imperial China the civil service examination system by and large was the driving force that determined the aim and content of formal education.[1]

[1] See Elman (2000) for a cultural history of Chinese civil service examination system and its impact on late imperial Chinese society.

In the late nineteenth century China was in crisis and the reform of education was regarded as one of the most urgent issues for national survival. Many influential intellectual-reformers, such as Liang Qichao (1873–1929), charged the traditional Chinese education system with ruining China's future, as it blocked young people's intellectual development (Bai, 2001, pp. 124–155). In 1905 the civil service examination system was officially abolished and in its place emerged a modern school system based on the Western model. Nevertheless, the complex of examination-oriented education, including teaching methods and academic assessment, did not completely disappear. The examination system is still the mechanism to test and select talent, and it exerts a powerful impact on today's school curriculum.

When this powerful educational tradition combined with the newly introduced concept of human capital, it stimulated the entire nation's enthusiasm for education with a firm belief that education would make China strong and wealthy while providing individuals better career pathways and income. "Schooling-modernity-economic growth," as the core formula in the Chinese concept of human capital, was well accepted on both national and individual levels. On the national level, this concept was elaborated in the policy of *keji xingguo*, meaning employing science and technology to make the country prosperous. Science and technology require education, so education was at the forefront of a new campaign to strengthen China. On the individual level, the formula that emerged was "schooling → examination → higher degree = good job + good income + higher social status."

Faith in education and its positive impact on economic growth is at the core of the Chinese favourable reception of human capital theory. This is consistent with what was first proposed by human capital theory in the early 1960s. However, in the 1970s unemployment became widespread among school graduates in many parts of the world, and it hit the developing nations particularly hard, as these nations expanded their education under the influence of human capital theory. Doubts about the positive impact of education on economic growth therefore arose. Ronald Dore (1976, ix) critically described the escalation of academic diplomas as the "diploma disease," arguing that "not all schooling is education. Much of it is mere qualification-earning." He distinguished education from schooling, saying that education is "a process of learning" for pleasure and with the mastery in a particular area of learning as its object, whereas schooling is only "a process of certificating" with job attainment or career advancement as its primary goal (Dore, 1976, p. 8). In his view, modern education systems in the mid-1970s constituted schooling without education as they merely focused on job attainment. This type of schooling served to fuel the spread of the diploma disease.

At the time China was still closed to the rest of the world, and the Chinese

were not aware of Dore's cautions against the inflation of academic qualifications. When China began to open its door to the outside world, human capital theory was introduced into China with pragmatic urgency. China badly needed education to serve its economic development in order to make up for the time wasted during the Cultural Revolution, and to catch up with developed countries. It was under these circumstances that China missed the critical debates over human capital theory in the earlier periods, and the cautions against graduate unemployment issues.

Historically, the search for the connection between education and China's modernization can be traced back to the late nineteenth century. In the discourse of education and its impact on China's transition to modernity, the Confucian tradition in education was often criticized as being a barrier to modernization. As mentioned above, Liang Qichao accused traditional Chinese education of being *zhinao*, meaning blocking the development of the brain. Liang's view represented the prevailing criticism of traditional Chinese education at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century.

In modern scholarship, especially in the field of China studies, the discourse on the question of "why the scientific revolution did not take place in China" (Sivin, 1982) naturally extended the debates to the relationship between education and China's modernization course. The discussions provide us with some insights into certain aspects of Confucian education and its links with modern development. For instance, in his theory of "politically empowering literacy," Alexander Woodside (1992) divides literacy in Qing China into "an elite literacy" and "popular literacy." The former referred to officialdom whilst the latter operated as a mechanism for social and cultural control more than for economic change or for the "transition to modernity." The study of the varieties of Chinese educational theories and practices in different regions and across time appears to support Woodside's theory.[2] Woodside (1992) doubted the correlation between literacy and China's modernization because, he argued, the literacy campaign in the late imperial period was not inspired by economic demands.

In the discussions of education and its impact on China's modernization, such late Qing reformers as Liang Qichao and modern scholars have used cases in the West as a reference point. Indeed, the case of China in isolation is insufficient to assess such questions regarding education, and its possible contributions to China's modern development, since there are too many variables. While modern scholars use the comparative approach as a significant research method, Chinese reformers in the late nineteenth century used a similar approach but they were inspired by the sharp contrasts between a weak and sick China and

[2] This has been demonstrated in Woodside's earlier article (1983, pp. 3–35). Sally Borthwick holds the same opinion in her work (1983, p. 4).

the powerful and wealthy West, especially England. The Chinese searched for answers as to why England was the first nation in the world to embark on the process of industrialisation, but China began at least a century later.[3] This puzzle, like the Scientific Revolution issue, is also a focal point in modern scholarly debates on the possible contribution of traditional education to China's transition to modernity.

In his discussion of the relationship between education and economic growth, Dore (1976, p.15) clearly points out that "there was no spurt in educational provision preceding or accompanying the acceleration of economic growth known as the industrial revolution." Following Dore's point, this paper extends the discussion to a comparison between educational ideas of Song Neo-Confucian educators and English humanists, since both initiated a secular approach to educational problems and had profound influence on the theories and practices of education in the pre-industrial period.

The objectives of this comparison are threefold. First, it aims to show whether there was a causal relationship between education and the industrial revolution in both pre-industrial societies. Second, both Song Neo-Confucian educators and English humanists called for the rethinking of the nature and role of education in a period when the societies were in transition. This may inspire us to do the same, as contemporary China has been experiencing rapid changes, and there is the unprecedentedly strong demand for the further reform of education. Thirdly, the idea of education for self-fulfilment is not only the essence of Song Neo-Confucian educational theory and English humanist ideas, but may serve as a remedy to correct the narrow interpretation of human capital theory.

Education for Moulding "the Complete Man"

The educational ideas of Song Neo-Confucian educators and English humanists took form and developed in a period when both societies were in transition. As Elias (1978, 1982) says, the changes to the structure of civilised behaviour were closely interrelated with changes to the standards and the structure of societies.

In the Song (960–1279 A.D.), a new scholar-official elite emerged through the civil service examination and replaced the old aristocracy. In fact, the society started regrouping toward the end of the Tang (618–907 A.D.), accompanying institutional and political developments. The examination system made it possible for people who were not from provincial aristocratic families or the pre-eminent clans to attain the very highest positions in the government (Twitchett, 1979, pp. 8–22). Further changes in the Song, such as intensive

[3] For a most recent discussion on this topic, see Clark (2007, Part III).

economic growth (Jones, 1988), "revolution" in the fields of science and technology (Elvin, 1973), the formation of a civilian absolutist court and the spread of schooling (Liu, 1973, p. 484), accelerated the need to redefine the concepts of nobility and gentility. In the criteria for inclusion in a ruling class, moral and intellectual qualities became more important than good birth. With these changes, the school of Neo-Confucianism began to establish itself. Some thinkers of this school who had a new intellectual awareness advanced the revival of original Confucian learning, and education was chosen as an accessible instrument to help promote Confucian ethical values throughout society. Therefore, the basic concept of education in Song Neo-Confucianism focused on individual commitment to moral transformation. Neo-Confucian scholars emphasised "learning for the sake of the self" rather than learning for status or profit, and self-cultivation became the basis of a good government and of a harmonious society. In this sense, classical knowledge assumed a new importance. The "distinction" among people, in theory, was determined less by social strata than by manners, which were embodied in one's behaviour in such areas as greeting, speaking and walking (Bai, 2005, pp. 33–45).

Similarly, in Renaissance England the old aristocracy declined along with a fall in incomes from land values and cultivation, and a new and rising social group of merchants, lesser landowners and officials appeared. The old aristocracy attempted to distinguish itself from other "inferior" social groups by its way of living, elaborate rituals and manners. The newly risen social groups, as rivals of the old aristocracy, thus required a redefinition of nobility and gentility on the basis of people's own virtue and wisdom, not of hierarchy (Charlton, 1965, pp. 74–85). Under the Tudors, there was a shift from military to civil service, and hence the terms "gentility" and "civility" tended to replace the term "nobility." This was not purely an exercise in terminology. At that time, "feudal knights' nobility was still in decline, while the new aristocracy of the absolutist courts was still in the process of formation" (Elias, 1978, p. 73). Humanists tried to reconcile the knightly with the civic and scholarly, and then constructed an ideal personality which could represent their concept of the complete human person in modern society.

The concept of "civility" originated from the Latin work *De civilitate Morum Puerilium*, a treatise on civilised behaviour in the Renaissance. The work, written by Desiderius Erasmus (1466–1536) in 1526 and translated into English[4] in 1532, focused on the behaviour of people in society, including bodily carriage, gestures, dress and facial expressions. On the one hand, the book remained true to medieval

[4] The edition of Whittington's translation published by Wynkyn de Worde is under this title: "A Lytil Booke of Good Maners for Chyldren, nowe lately compyled and put forth by Robert Whittyngton laureate poete." The new edition translated and annotated by Brian Mcgregor has a different title: "On Good Manners for Boys," in Sowards 1985, vol. 25.

tradition in many respects; on the other, it presented "a particular social code, a particular standard of manners" (Elias, 1978, p. 71), which met the new social demands and became the model for behaviour. This short treatise was published in catechism form in 1534 and was introduced into schools to educate boys. "Civility" thus became an established and commonplace word, and corresponding terms were adopted in other European languages (Elias, 1978, pp. 53–55).

In China, *li* in the classics embraced all traditional rules which regulated matters of daily life. Basically, *li* was regarded as decorum, which provided an objective standard of conduct and governed social deportment and domestic relationships. Secondly, *li* referred to religious and social ceremony such as ancestor worship. Thirdly, *li* was considered a means to maintain social stability, and was sometimes used as a counterpart or complement to the statutes and ordinances of the empire.[5] Song Neo-Confucianists classified *li* into two main parts: reutilization of the body and performance of classical ceremonies. They emphasised the first part of *li* and believed that individual commitment to moral transformation could be fulfilled through everyday actions, such as walking, speaking and greeting. Although the classical ceremonials were still an essential part of ethical observations in Song Neo-Confucianism, the rules for ritualising these everyday activities were established as social norms and everyone was supposed to reach a high level of morality through the practice of these rules. In the late Ming and early Qing periods, some Confucian scholars supported the idea of transferring Confucian *li* from the status of scholarly classics to that of conventional beliefs. *Li* was thus accessible to all ordinary people, for the first time. All were to be persuaded that they could achieve personal fulfilment regardless of economic circumstances and social status. In this new interpretation, *li* resembled "civility" in the context of 16th century English humanism.

Both humanists and Neo-Confucianists regarded the rediscovery of ancient learning "as embodying perennial human values or models" (de Bary & Bloom, 1979, p. 5), and education in both Renaissance thought and Neo-Confucianism was seen as a significant instrument for creating a new type of human person.

Institutionally, basic schooling was extended to a broader range of people in both late imperial China and Renaissance England. In China, schools for children were usually run by individuals. Some of them were *jiashu* (family schools) or *sishu* (private schools), where a teacher had a few students at his home; or a teacher was invited to instruct children of a well-to-do family, or of a clan. Others were *shexue* (community schools) or *yishu* (charity schools), which were usually supported by the donations of local people and served the requirements of poor children's schooling. In brief, private tutoring was a popular means for

[5] For discussions of these three phases of *li*, see (de Bary et al., 1966, p. 30); Twitchett & Loewe, 1987, pp. 706–707).

providing children with a basic education. As for adult education organisations, most of them were official schools, such as the Imperial School and schools financially supported by provincial or county governments. The curriculum of such schools was structured to prepare students for the civil service examinations (Lee, 1977, pp. 45–60). In contrast, *shuyuan* (academies), which flourished during the Song Dynasty, were places for the study of real learning, but largely degenerated into institutions playing the same roles as the official schools in the Qing period.[6]

In England, basic education was a matter of individual enterprise or dependence upon charity. In the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, the schools were no longer only nurseries for the priesthood, and the demand for education of the underprivileged grew. The sons of doctors, lawyers and merchants filled the grammar schools, while the sons of the nobility were mostly taught by private tutors. Different groups during this period contributed to the establishment of schools. Some schools were operated by chantry priests or by local clerics. The cathedral or monastic schools of the time also provided instruction for children, while a few grammar schools were set up by merchants.[7]

The growing demand for education on the part of all social groups, except the very poor, was due to social, economic and religious factors. Alexander (1990, pp. 89–112) points out that the lower price of books and the availability of an English-language Bible contributed to the spread of literacy education. The opinions of the elite and religious or ideological concerns also influenced the promotion of literacy. Besides these "external" or "push" factors, the demand for, and the use of literacy, as Cressy argues, were "internal" or "pull" factors and played an even more important part in the spread of literacy education.[8] Cressy (1980, p. 186) states, "In a society with a complex and developing economy and a rich and variegated culture there might well develop a strong taste for literacy" which owed more to "pull" factors than anything else. For the humanists, basic training in literacy skills was not merely an essential step for entrance into a grammar school or a component in religious education; more importantly, it was part of the movement aimed at promoting the English language as a medium for teaching and literary expression.

---

[6] T. Grimm (1977, pp. 475–498) concentrates his research on Guangdong academies against the social and economic background of the Qing period. He mentions the types of educational institutions, such as *yixue*, and *shexue*, and discusses the functions of these institutions. He contends that those best of *yixue* "were functionally quite close to the less exalted of the shuyuan"(p. 480), and *shexue* "served as feeder schools for more advanced" *yixue* and *shuyuan* (p. 488). For a discussion of the Ming *shuyuan*, see Meskill (1982).

[7] The information for this paragraph comes from (Alexander, 1990, pp. 43–66, pp. 185–186; Charlton, 1965, pp. 93–99).

[8] In his discussion of how the promotion of literacy could be effective, D. Cressy (1980, pp.186–188) describes an ideologically inspired pressure for literacy as a "push" factor, and the social and economic environment as "pull" factors.

Above all, both English humanists and Song Neo-Confucian educators' emphasis on elementary education was mainly motivated by their intention to foster "the complete man."

In pre-modern China, education for children was also called *mengxue*. *Meng* alone meant ignorant and illiterate, and education was to nourish youths and lead them back to "correctness," which was the way of the sages (Zhouyi, SSJZS, I, p. 20). The term *jiaoyu* (education) in classical times referred to the enlightenment of people. *Jiao* alone meant to teach, to awaken, to make aware. We can find this meaning of *jiao* in the *The Book of History* (SSJIZS, I, p.169). In relation to *jiao*, the meaning of *yu* was to nourish. The *Book of Changes* states that "The Superior man (*junzi*) strives to be resolute in his conduct and nourishes his virtue" (SSJZS, I, p. 20). These two quotations taken from the Confucian classics suggest that the concept of elementary education in ancient China was to mould a person's character, not just acquire skills or knowledge. Song Neo-Confucians prescribed certain modes of behavior and believed that the practice of such ritualizing behavior was to nourish virtue and correctness.

The aim of Humanist teachers was to mould "the complete man" or "the complete citizen," whose "nobility" was conferred by virtue and learning. With "Hellenistic origins, a mixed content and a Christian purpose" (Charlton, 1965, p. 6) liberal education involved exercises, manners and studies which stressed such subjects as morals, history, law, modern and ancient languages, mathematics and astronomy. In brief, virtue, education and civic action were closely linked to the humanist concept of education (Charlton, 1965, pp. 22–29, pp. 82–85; Alexander, 1990, pp. 43–44).

In Neo-Confucianism, Confucian virtues were embodied in the practice of ritualized behavior, which was regarded as the basis of self-cultivation and as the way to sagehood. Song Neo-Confucianists established rules for morality and social manners. These rules became the norms—what should be done, what should not be done—which prescribed people's social behavior for centuries. Zhu Xi's *Tongmeng xuzhi* (What Children Should Know) and Chen Chun's *Xiaoxue shili* (Poetic Rituals for Youths) were representative of Neo-Confucian treatises on good manners and were used as textbooks during the late imperial period.

In England, learning also embraced religion and good manners. Richard Mulcaster (1532? –1611)[9] stated that "the goodness and vertew of matter is most

[9] Mulcaster was the first headmaster of Merchant Taylors School in London in 1561; in 1596 he became the High Master of St Paul's School. At Merchant Taylors School he established a rigorous curriculum with the particular strength in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. His two treatises on education, *Positions* (1581) and *Elementarie* (1582), remain important in the study of humanist education and sixteenth-century England.

fit for the young childe in the first seasoning of his tender minde" (1582, p. 55). Knowledge was classified into two branches: "religion towards God, and right opinion in faith" and "civilitie towards men and right judgment in behavior" (ibid). Here, "civility" corresponds to good manners.

Manuals on "civilities" largely originated from the treatises of courtesy or etiquette, and the late Latin adages. In the Renaissance period, education in England was mainly mostly confined to the nobles' houses, and the content of education centered on manly exercises, manners and courtesy. *The Babees' Book*, edited by F. J. Furnivall (1825–1910), collected many treatises on etiquette, courtesy and the details of manners and morals in the periods from the fifteenth century to the seventeenth century.[10] Here, the term "babees" refers to young men of good families or of noble houses, much older than the term suggests today (Rickert, 1908? p.179, note 2). These treatises mainly taught etiquette, how to behave properly in noble houses and in society, i.e., how to speak correctly and politely, how to greet people, how to answer questions, how to serve at table and the like. In brief, "domestic service was confused with apprenticeship as a very general form of education" (Aries, 1973, p. 364) of the time. From the fourteenth century on, however, grammar schools were set up, and education became increasingly a matter for school.

However, medieval courtesy and etiquette were not suitable for children's practice. Accordingly, those complex medieval treatises on courtesy, etiquette and rules of morality were simplified and became the "civilities," from which the books for the instruction of appropriate manners, including propriety in body, gesture and clothing, were produced. The first of such books intended for schoolboys was Erasmus's *De Civilitate Morum Puerilium*. This book was the foundation for the later manuals which, in many respects were inspired by it and copied it. These manuals served more strictly educational needs, in a modern sense, than those earlier treatises.

In Song China, similarly, the teaching of Confucianism required youths to be filial and fraternal, earnest and truthful, overflowing in love to all and cultivating the friendship of good people. However, youths were not able to practice these principles without any instruction in detail. Hence, Zhu Xi said: "The beginning of elementary schooling is to let children know how to dress properly; then how to talk and walk in accordance with the rules; then how to sweep the floor, and tidy their books and stationery; then how to read and write. All children should know the rules of these issues as mentioned above and other affairs which they can and must do" (Zhu Xi, 1962, 1.6a).

[10] There are three books from the 1430's, two each from the 1460's and 1500, and one each from 1446, 1475, 1480, 1551, 1557, and 1619. So, most of these texts were produced in the Renaissance period.

In brief, with the changes in social structure and the demand for redefinition of nobility and gentility, manners took on a new importance in both humanism and Neo-Confucianism. In England, "civility," which originated in medieval treatises on knightly etiquette and courtesy, was modified by humanists and extended to the newly rising social groups such as the bourgeoisie. In China, *li*, which was at first reinterpreted as rules for ritualizing the body and then was transformed from the scholarly classics to conventional belief, was for the first time not limited only to the elite minority but made accessible to ordinary people.

More importantly, virtues, learning and civilized behavior were integral qualities of the humanist concept of "a complete man" and the Neo-Confucian ideal of "the true self." The significance of "civility" and *li* lay in the belief that virtues were embodied in behavior and that the high level of morality could be reached through the practice of "civility" and *li*.

Furthermore, both humanists and Neo-Confucianists believed that to nourish and mould children's personality in their early years became the main aim of elementary education and an essential part of training "a complete man." For this purpose, elementary education was not simply a stage in teaching the rudiments of literacy skills. Rather, it was in essence a religious and moral education. "Civility" and *li* in school textbooks were transformed into rules for guiding children's manners and integrated with religious and moral instruction.

From Education for "the Complete Man" to Education for Self-Fulfilment

It has been evidenced that the educational treatises of English humanists and Song Neo-Confucianists have some common characteristics, especially in the definition of the nature and function of education.

In the view of humanists, a complete person was educated for participation in social life. For the ruling class, it was considered essential to be well versed in classics and equipped with virtues, in order to become good "governors," who were supposed to aid the rule of Kings (Elyot, 1967). For all people, God in Humanism and secularism was to represent "all goodnes, all charite, all loue, which holy be comprehended in the saide worde beneuolence"; for "without beneuolence may be no God" (Elyot, 1967, p. 93). Similarly, *ren* (benevolence, humanity) in Confucianism, as mentioned earlier, was an inner virtue of people, an essential quality of human beings. As a good Christian, one had to behave well to response to social requirements; and good manners could embody one's virtues. So it was for a good Confucianist. For example, a good Confucianist had to conduct himself with reverence in any circumstance in practice of the virtue of

benevolence.

The relationship between individuals and state and society is further elaborated in the *Great Learning* that provides eight items and combines self-cultivation with keeping good order at home and dealing with the affairs of state as a whole principle. It was believed that a person who was not morally cultivated would not be able to keep his family in good order. If his family was in chaos, he could not be expected to manage state affairs well.

Later, Neo-Confucianism, especially the Cheng-Zhu school, laid even stronger stress on morality. For Neo-Confucianists, the goal of pursuing learning was to achieve moral transcendence. The term "the investigation of things and the extension of knowledge" (*gewu zhizhi*) stood for intellectual and moral cultivation. To a certain extent, this resembled the humanist concept of a complete man. To young children, self-cultivation was firstly embodied in the activities of daily life, such as greeting people and undertaking light housework.

What might these similarities say to us? Is there any value here that may help us in for rethinking the nature of education today?

In his discussion of the escalation of academic qualifications, Dore proposed an educational model with a focus on "productive self-fulfilment." This model relates to his differentiation between education and schooling. As discussed in the first section of this essay, in Dore's view (1976, p. 8), education is "mastery of the knowledge" and "knowledge may be sought for its own sake, for the sheer play delight of using the mind." Schooling, by contrast, is a process of qualification earning, and in this process students are "concerned not with mastery, but with being certified as having mastered." The knowledge students have gained is then "for the once-and-for-all purpose of reproducing it in an examination." Based on these differences between schooling and education, Dore suggests that there are two different sets of intelligence-linked qualities: "qualities expressed in self-fulfilling activities" include curiosity, creativeness, productiveness and craftsmanship (Dore, 1976, p.177), while "cunning and the ability to manipulate things and other people in order to acquire for oneself wealth or power or prestige" are termed by Dore as "acquisitive achievement" (pp.177–178). Dore further elaborates his ideas by saying that schooling is catering for people who, with a strong achievement motivation, study hard to earn qualifications which may lead them to wealth, power and prestige. By contrast, a genuine education is not "a competitive exercise in qualification hurdle-jumping" (p.184); it fosters in students not only the qualities linked with intelligence but also "the qualities of compassion" (p.184), with which people do not work only for extrinsic rewards but for a better society.

We can see some similarities among Dore's "productive self-fulfilment," Song Neo-Confucian idea of "Learning for the sake of oneself" and the English

humanist concept of "the complete man." In England, the humanist emphasis on good manners was based on central themes of Renaissance thought such as the dignity of man and the immortality of the soul. In China, the ritualization of the body was the basis of self-cultivation, which was regarded as "an experience of the realization of the true self" (de Bary, 1979, p.11) as well as a way to the attainment of sagehood. Furthermore, civilized behavior in both humanist and Neo-Confucian treatises can be seen as the most distinctive sign of people's human aspect and a complex integration of moral, intellectual and religious concerns. These ideas in the expression of Dore are "the qualities of compassion."

The similarities drawn here are not intended to imply or advocate a "return to antiquity," because the kinds of etiquette taught in the writings of Neo-Confucian educators or in those of Humanist texts may not be relevant to today's society. Any proposal to promote the reading of Confucian Classics in school may miss the point, which is that education should develop both mind and character. However, schooling has become a mere process of qualification-earning in the present time, which, in the words of Dore (1976, ix), is "destructive of curiosity and imagination; in short, anti-educational." Dore argues that the consequence of this "anti-educational" schooling for developing countries is more disastrous than what has happened in developed countries, since schooling without education does not produce manpower with critical and creative minds but merely individuals pursuing good jobs, personal wealth and prestige. There are two possible outcomes for these graduates: they may find the ideal jobs they sought after, and feel that they are deserving of the benefits these confer; or their failure to attain an ideal job may result in anger at "being wronged," as the promised reward from their investment in education is not realized. Either way, this kind of schooling does not contribute to the social good: the former group would focus on pursuing individual material interests and enjoying their privileges "at the expense of the community without much trouble from their consciences" (p.186); and the latter would result in a large number of frustrated unemployed graduates who are likely to cause social unrest. It is from this perspective that the definition of education in Song Neo-Confucianism and English humanism becomes meaningful for us as a stimulus and avenue for rethinking education in contemporary China.

When Dore wrote *The Diploma Disease*, China was close to the end of the Cultural Revolution. Dore had thought that China's radical decision to abandon the examination system as the main means of selecting students for higher education and appointment to cadre positions in the socialist system might exemplify a solution to the problem of continuously escalating academic qualifications. Ironically, soon after the publication of Dore's book, China ended the Cultural Revolution and the revival of the university entrance examination

system was one of the most important policies for restoring order to the system. As mentioned earlier in this paper, the policy was overwhelmingly welcomed by people throughout the country, and it satisfied a national urge to restore law and order after the lawlessness of the Cultural Revolution, to quickly develop the country's economy, and, most of all, to realize the long cherished Chinese dream of building a strong and wealthy nation. Deng Xiaoping laid down the "absolute principle" that established the development of China's economy as the top priority, and China's open-door policy and economic reforms have all been structured around this principle. It is in this context that human capital theory was introduced into China and no one in China at that time either noticed or heeded Dore's warning about the diploma disease.

The combination of the old Chinese examination system with the newly discovered theory from the West appeared at first to work well for China. However, educational reform commenced with China's move to a market-oriented socialist economy. In 1985 the central government embarked upon a decentralization process which gave local governments and higher education institutions more autonomy. In 1993 a "user-pay" system was implemented for higher education, along with fundamental changes in the job assignment system. Since then Chinese higher education has been transformed from an elite privilege to a commodity with a price in the course of economic development. University students are now charged as consumers, in the sense that their fees make up about 30% of the budget of public universities, much more for the ten percent of students in private universities. With the introduction of student fees and the freedom to choose their occupations, the majority of university students have discarded the old teaching that they should put "the needs of the country first," and now prefer to look after their individual well-being first (Bai, 1998, pp. 525–540). Under these circumstances, human capital theory in relation to the individual investment in education is translated into a desire for greater capital gain. Extrinsic factors tend to dominate individuals' motivation to pursue higher education, and the formula "university degree = good jobs = better income = social prestige" appears to have provided common people with a clear understanding as to why they need to invest in education. In short, monetary reward as the main aspiration for education fuels the Chinese enthusiasm for education, and so every year millions of students cram for the university entrance examinations.

Because of the close link between degree attainment and personal income and social status, most primary and secondary schools construct their curriculum around exams and tests, and the purpose of education is to pass the exams in order to advance to the next level (*shengxue jiaoyu*). This phenomenon has come to be described as *yingshi jiaoyu* (examination-oriented education), a phrase which depicts the nature of the phenomenon quite well. In

order to correct this obsession with examinations in the education sector, and to achieve the goal of improving the quality of the Chinese population through education, the concept "*suzhi jiaoyu*" (Quality Education, or Education for Quality) has emerged to uphold a new ideal in the face of examination-oriented education.

What is *suzhi*? There is no equivalent term in English that can convey the meaning of this Chinese concept. In a simplistic translation, it is the term for quality. However, as Kipnis (2007, p. 397) points out, in English "while one may speak of human 'qualities' (in the plural), it is de-humanizing to use the singular form to discuss 'the quality' of an individual or group of human beings. Though one may refer to the moral qualities of a person with the term 'character,' the mental qualities with the term 'intelligence,' and the physical qualities with the term 'strength,' there is no term like *suzhi* that can refer to all of these things at once." In China there has been a lively debate over this term and the so-called *suzhi education*, which has been translated as "education for quality" (Kipnis, 2006, p. 301) since it aims to raise the quality of the population. In this sense, *suzhi* is the capital Q—Quality.[11]

Officially, the Chinese attributed the origin of this concept to Deng Xiaoping who said in 1985 that China's development and future was determined by the quality of the working force, as well as both the quantity and quality of educated people (Deng, 1993, Vol. 3, pp.120–121). This was echoed in the decision of the Third Plenum of the 11th Party Congress that announced education reform: "The aim of education system reform is to raise the quality of the nation's people" (The State Education Commission, 1992, p.182). It was not until April, 1987, that the term *suzhi jiaoyu* emerged at a national meeting on the composition of textbooks for compulsory education. Then in July at the third national conference on Chinese Education, Liu Bing, as a representative of the then State Education Committee, made a speech in which he emphasized that *suzhi jiaoyu* should become the key task of basic education. Since then the discourses on *suzhi* and *suzhi jiaoyu* have unfolded (Sun & Hong, 2009). In 1993 the State Education Committee issued the document entitled *Outline of Chinese Education Reform and Development* (Zhongguo jiaoyu gaige he fazhan gangyao) that marked the official launch of *suzhi jiaoyu*.

Theoretically, these two types of education have entirely different purposes. Examination-oriented education focuses on achieving high marks in order to advance to the next level, and therefore the process of learning and teaching

[11] There are discourses on *suzhi* and *suzhi jiaoyu* in English literature. For a thorough discussion and criticism of the word in its origin and evolution, see Kipnis (2006, 2007); for the critiques of political and social meanings and applications of the term, see (Anagnost, 2004; Yan, 2003).

becomes a process of selecting students based on their grades. By contrast, *suzhi jiaoyu* aims to improve the quality of people, so it pursues the all-around development of students. This fundamental difference in educational practice is reflected in different approaches to students. Under examination-oriented education teachers focus only on students who are likely to obtain high marks, while neglecting the majority of students, especially those with lower marks; but *suzhi jiaoyu* aims to provide everybody an equal opportunity to develop their potential, and caters for different educational needs. Reflected in the content of education, under examination-oriented education the curriculum is structured around the content of examinations and tests, and does not provide a holistic education, ignoring anything that is not relevant to the examinations; but *suzhi jiaoyu* pursues students' full development, and the curriculum provides a comprehensive knowledge balanced across a wide range of subjects. Reflected in pedagogies, under examination-oriented education teachers often adopt the strategy of "throwing students into the sea of exercise problems and examination questions" (*tihai*), using the "duck-feeding" method to encourage rote learning; but *suzhi jiaoyu* tends to use the heuristic method of teaching and encourage students to discover solutions or resolve problems themselves. Reflected in appraisal criteria, under examination-oriented education, grades become the only criterion for measuring the performance of students, teachers and schools; while *suzhi jiaoyu* pays a lot of attention to students' all-around development and measures their performance from various perspectives. Reflected in educational results, under examination-oriented education, only a small portion of students with high marks are catered for, while most students are neglected and discouraged from study and further intellectual development; but *suzhi jiaoyu* provides a well-rounded education where the broad content of education expands students' future options professionally, socially, and personally.[12]

The above differences between the two types of education sound obvious and show the superiority of *suzhi jiaoyu*. However, in reality *suzhi jiaoyu* is merely a slogan, and examination-oriented education by and large still dominates teaching and learning in China's schools, as well as the lives of children and their parents.[13]

The failure of *suzhi jiaoyu* has been noticed by many education practitioners. For instance, Ye Lan, one of Chinese influential educators and the founder of the "New Basic Education" project (Hayhoe, 2006, pp. 342–358), has summarized

[12] There are numerous research articles on *suzhi jiaoyu* in Chinese. For a comprehensive survey on the research on this topic, see Sun Kongyi (2007, pp.1–10).

[13] This fact was acknowledged officially, for example, in the second section of the Ministry of Education's report on *suzhi jiaoyu*. See *Zhongguo jiaoyubao* (China Education Daily), 7–10 November, 2006.

the differences and similarities between "New Basic Education" and *suzhi jiaoyu*. She says, both pursue "all-round development of individuals" and aim to improve "the quality of the whole nation"; but *suzhi jiaoyu* was implemented in schools by the government in 1994, while "New Basic Education" was proposed through research and experiments in targeted schools. From this perspective, Ye contends that her project and *suzhi jiaoyu* "are different in scope, development approach and developing force" (Ye, 2009, p. 369). And most importantly, Ye continues, *suzhi jiaoyu* has become "more of a slogan or posture rather than a serious practice" (ibid, p. 370).

Furthermore, the problems in the existing education system have their roots in China's wider social and political systems. For instance, one's income and social status are closely linked with one's education diploma, which is by and large determined by one's success or failure in the highly competitive university entrance examinations. This is reflected in the prevalent Chinese saying that "one examination determines one's whole life" (*yi kao ding zhongsheng*). As long as this university entrance examination system is still in operation, it will remain the main focus of teaching and learning. The abolition of this entrance examination system, however, seems impractical, as most Chinese people today still regard it as the fairest means and mechanism for selecting *rencai* or people of talent, because of the negative experiences of the Cultural Revolution and the corruption that exists within Chinese society.

In 1999 China initiated the expansion of the higher education section, and one of its goals was to reduce the intense pressure students suffered from in the university entrance examinations, and promote *suzhi jiaoyu* in schools. But this move to mass higher education has not resolved the existing problems in China's "examination oriented" education, and the promotion of *suzhi jiaoyu* has so far proven futile. Meanwhile, thanks to this move, a much larger number of university graduates have now been produced through the Chinese university system, but China's industries cannot "digest" these numbers, and many graduates are now at risk of becoming surplus over-educated *rencai* (Bai, 2006, pp.128–144). The existence of such a surplus does not necessarily signify an improvement in the quality of the Chinese population; rather it may simply reflect the escalation of academic qualifications.

It appears that over thirty years after Dore's criticism of the "diploma disease," Chinese education has gradually moved further and further away from what Dore termed the "productive self-fulfillment" model, and schooling for self-enrichment has become the vogue, along with the market-oriented economic reform and the rise of materialism. Such changes have grown along with the examination system and resulted in intensified pressure on schools, parents and students at all levels, even the kindergarten level. At the same time, the graduate

unemployment crisis has continued to worsen.[14] China now faces the social consequences of this crisis, just as Dore anticipated in the 1970s. One report (Tong, 2009) finds that university students regarded the corruption of government officials as an even more serious problem than the financial crisis and unemployment issues. This coincides with the findings of surveys conducted from 2006 to 2008. It signals an important warning that schooling without education will not produce quality government servants, and work for self enrichment will not contribute positively to the construction of a better society.

Concluding Remarks

As discussed earlier, the educational ideas of Song Neo-Confucian educators and English humanists took form and developed in a period of societal transition. The

[14] According to the most recent research work by Yang and Chi (2008, pp. 275–282), before 2000 the graduate first-employment rate averaged 90%; since then it has changed to the average around 65%. Since 2007 the graduate unemployment crisis has escalated because of the continuing increase in enrolments, and the unemployed graduates by July each year consistently numbered almost 2 million, although the percentage employed was similar (see table below).The different methods used in the surveys, and different definitions of the term "employment," however, may result in significant differences in findings. For instance, a survey conducted by MyCOS reported that by July 2009, only 49.5% of graduates for that year were employed. This figure is about 18% lower than the 68% figure published by the Ministry of Education. The MyCOS survey was conducted independently, and its definition of "employment" strictly refers to graduates who are in full-time employment six months after graduation. It excludes those who have gone overseas, joined the army, or become postgraduate students. The figure is consistent with its survey findings for 2008 (52%) and 2007 (55.8%). For further information, see Geng Yanbing (2009).

The number of tertiary graduates and the first employment rate, 2000–2009

Year	Number of graduates	First employment rate (%)	Unemployed graduates numbers
2000	1 070 000	65	374 500 (July)
2001	1 150 000	70	345 000 (July)
2002	1 145 000	65	400 750 (July)
2003	2 122 000	70	636 600 (September)
2004	2 800 000	73	756 000 (September)
2005	3 350 000	72.6	917 900 (September)
2006	4 130 000	62	1 569 400 (September)
2007	4 950 000	60	1 980 000 (July)
2008	5 500 000	65	1 925 000 (July)
2009	6 110 000	68	1 955 200 (July)

Sources: The figures for 2000–2008 come from Yang & Chi (2008, pp. 275–282); the data for 2009 is from the Ministry of Education (Yuan, 2009).

rise of Song Neo-Confucianism was partly attributed to the emergence of a new scholar-official elite through the civil service examinations. In other words, the establishment of the civil service examination system and the spread of schooling contributed positively to social re-grouping and the replacement of the old aristocracy. However, side-effects of the civil service examination system were also apparent, and education under the system became a key means for the pursuit of personal gain and prestige. It was under these circumstances that Song Neo-Confucianism raised a call for the rethinking of education and advocated "learning for the sake of the self" rather than for personal enrichment. Their redefinition of education shared the same spirit as the ideas of English humanists who promoted education for fostering "the complete man." In his differentiation between education and schooling, Dore incorporated these ideas, proposing that the development of one's character should be as important as one's intellectual development, and the "qualities of compassion" are the foundation for a better society. Wm. Theodore de Bary, a renowned scholar and educator, has also held unrelentingly to the Neo-Confucian vision of an ideal social order throughout his long career, promoting the inclusion of core Asian values in general education around the world today (De Bary, 2004, 2007).

In the contemporary Chinese context, the socio-political conditions have changed rapidly since 1978, and schooling and higher education have become more accessible. The revitalization of the examination system after the Cultural Revolution initially worked hand-in-hand with Deng Xiaoping's modernization approach and the introduction of human capital theory into China. One can easily see the influence of neoliberalism on China's economic and education reforms in the past thirty years. On the other hand, however, China's recently erupting "diploma disease" and graduate unemployment issue are a bitter consequence of this approach.

It is true that the Chinese government has made the effort to implement *suzhi jiaoyu* in order to address the current obsession with tests and examinations in education and for *rencai* selection, but this effort has proven futile. There are various factors contributing to the ineffectiveness of the *suzhi jiaoyu* movement. One of the most fundamental factors is that it appears to contradict the prevalent concept of investment in education, and the influence of market-oriented reform in the education sector, where human capital theory seems to have been applied to all of the reform measures implanted so far. This dilemma is reflected in the difficulty in finding a clear definition of *suzhi*, and has caused confusion between the rules for the market-oriented economy and that for education.

Lu Jie, an eminent contemporary educator (Hayhoe, 2006, pp. 292–323), points out that China should not simply apply the principles of a "market-oriented" economy in educational reform; instead, education should "transcend " (*chaoyue*) the market rules and profit making (Lu, 2005, p.259). In

her definition of this "transcendence" in education, she points out that education is a process of "human transformation," and through education human beings can transform the world "through the ongoing 'production of the self.'" She goes on to say that a "learning society" does not merely mean to learn modern technology, rather it also refers to the "interaction between the role of the subjective self and the objective external world," and to "the development of the self" (Hayhoe, 2006, p. 317; Lu, 1998, pp. 13–18).

Lu Jie's argument does not deny the connection between education and economic growth which, in the Chinese case, was a critically important move away from the focus of education on political movements and class struggle. However, the simplistic use or even abuse of human capital theory by employing market rules exclusively to regulate and govern education is a practice that could ruin education. This narrow interpretation of human capital theory may also lead to dire consequences when graduates are faced with the unemployment crisis, and their parents cannot capitalize on the investment they have made in their children's education. The surplus of over-educated graduates is certainly a matter of grave concern for government and for the whole of Chinese society. From this perspective, we may say that now it is the time for the government, educators and the whole of society to begin to reflect on the limitations and shortcomings of the existing education system. The educational theories of Song Neo-Confucians and humanist educators in Renaissance England may provide us with rich sources for the redefinition of the nature and task of education in today's Chinese society. Lu Jie's concept of education for the "production of human self" and the pursuit of transcendence in education and through education, as well as Ye Lan's promotion of her "New Basic Education," evoke Dore's call for a well-balanced education to replace certificate-attainment schooling. This in turn suggests a rising demand for a revival of another aspect of Chinese tradition—education for fostering one's humanity—which may help balance contemporary Chinese education and restore it to health.

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Professor Ruth Hayhoe for her guidance on earlier drafts of this article. Thanks also go to two anonymous referees for their helpful comments. Funding for this research was provided by an Internal Research Grant of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Victoria University of Wellington.

References

Alexander, M. C. (1990). *The growth of English education 1348–1648: A social and cultural history*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Anagnost, A. (2004). The corporeal politics of quality (*Suzhi*). *Public Culture, 16*(2), 189–208.

Aries, P. (1962). *Centuries of childhood*. (R. Baldick trans.). London: Cape. (The original

work *L'Enfant et la Vie Familiale sous l'Ancien Régime* published in 1960 in France).
Bai, L. (1998). Monetary reward versus the national ideological agenda: career choice among Chinese university students. *Journal of Moral Education, 27*(4), 525–540.
Bai, L. (2001). Children and the survival of China: Liang Qichao on education before the 1898 Reform. *Late Imperial China, 22*(2), 124–155.
Bai, L. (2005). *Shaping the ideal child: Children and their primers in late Imperial China*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
Bai, L. (2006). Graduate unemployment: Dilemmas and challenges in China's move to mass higher education. *China Quarterly, 185*, 128–144.
de Bary, Wm.T., Chan Wing-tsit, & Burton Watson (Eds.). (1966). *Sources of Chinese tradition*. Berkely: University of California Press.
de Bary, Wm.T., Chan Wing-tsit, Burton Watson, & Irene Bloom (Eds.). (1979). *Principle and practicality*. New York: Columbia University Press.
de Bary, Wm.T., Chan Wing-tsit, Burton Watson, & Irene Bloom (2004). Nobility *and civility: Asian ideals of leadership and the common good*. Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
de Bary, Wm.T., Chan Wing-tsit, Burton Watson, & Irene Bloom (2007). *Confucian Tradition and global Education.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Becker, Gary S. (1993). *Human Capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Brickman, William W., & Zepper, John T. (1992). *Russian and Soviet education, 1731–1989: A multilingual annotated bibliography* (Garland Reference Library of Social Science; Vol. 200; Reference books in international education; Vol. 9). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
Borthwick, S. (1983). *Education and social change in China: The beginnings of the modern era*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University.
Charlton, K. (1965). *Education in Renaissance England*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul & Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Clark, G. (2007). *A farewell to alms: A brief economic history of the world*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Ciyuan 辞源 (1988). Beijing: Commercial Press.
Cressy, D. (1980). *Literacy and the social order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Deng, X. P. (1993). 邓小平文选 [*Selected works of Deng Xiaoping*], (Vols 1–3). Beijing: People's Publishing House.
Dore, R. (1976). *The diploma disease, education, qualification and development*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Elias, N. (1978). *The civilizing process*, (Vol. I), *The history of manners*. (Edmund Jephcott trans.). New York: Urizen Books.
Elias, N. (1982). *The civilizing process*, (Vol. II), *State formation and civilization*. (Edmund Jephcott trans.) Oxford: Blackwell.
Elman, B. (2000). *A cultural history of civil examinations in late Imperial China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Elvin, M. (1973). *The pattern of the Chinese past.* London: Eyre Methuen.
Elyot, T.(Ed.). (1967). *The book named the governor*, Henry Herbert Stephen Croft. Reprint. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.
Erasmus, D. (1985). *Collected works of Erasmus*. Vo (J. K. Sowards, ed.). Toronto, Bufflo and London: University of Toronto Press, Vol. 25.
Furnivall, F. J. (Ed.). (1868). *The Babees' book*. Reprint. New York: Greenwood Press.

Grimm, T. (1977). Academies and urban systems in Kwangtung. In G. W. Skinner, (Ed.), *The city in late Imperial China*, (pp. 475–498). Stanford: Standford University Press.

Gu, M. Y. (2001). *Education in China and abroad: Perspectives from a lifetime in comparative education*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.

Gu, M. Y. (1981). 现代生产与现代教育 [Modern production and modern education]. 比较教育研究 [*Comparative Education Review*], (1), 1–8.

The State Education Commission. (Eds.). (1992). 十一届三中全会以来重要教育文献 [*Important documents since the third Plenum of the 11th Party Congress*]. Beijing: Educational Publishing House.

Hayhoe, R. (2006). *Portraits of influential Chinese educators*, CERE Studies in Comparative Education 17. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong and Springer.

Jones, E. L. (1988). *Growth recurring:Economic change in world history*. Oxford: Clarendon Press & New York: Oxford University Press.

Kipnis, A. (2006). Suzhi: A keyword approach. *China Quarterly*, *186*(2), 295–313.

Kipnis, A. (2007). Neoliberalism reified: suzhi discourse and tropes of neoliberalism in the People's Republic of China. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N. S.), *13*, 383–400.

Lee, T. H. C. (1977). Life in the schools of Sung China. *Journal of Asian Studies*, *37*(1), 45–60.

Li, J., & Lin, J. (2008). China's move to mass higher education: an analysis of policy making from a rational framework. In P. David Baker, & A. W. Wiseman, (Eds.), *The world transformation of higher education* (International Perspectives on Education & Society, Vol. 9) (pp. 269–295). Bingley, UK: JAI Press Inc.

Liu, J. T. (1973). How did a Neo-Confucian school become the state orthodoxy? *Philosophy East and West*, *23*(4), 483–505.

Lu, J. (1998). 教育：人之自我建构的实践活动 [Education: The activities of practice involved in the construction of the human self]. 教育研究 [*Educational Research*], (9), 13–18.

Lu, J. (2005). 道德教育的当代论域 [*On moral education in contemporary society*]. Beijing: People's Publishing House.

Meskill, J. (1982). *Academies in Ming China: A historical essay*. Tueson: The University of Arizona Press.

Mulcaster, R. (1582/1970). *Elementarie*, Reprint. England: Menston.

Olaniyan, D. A., & Okemakinde, T. (2008). Human capital theory: implications for educational development. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, *24*(2): 157–162.

Rickert, E. (1908/1966). *The Babees' book, medieval manners for the young: Done into modern English from Dr. Furnivall's texts*. New York.

Sivin, N. (1982). Why the Scientific Revolution did not take place in China? Or Didn't it? *Chinese Science*, *5*, 45–66.

Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review*, *51*, 1–17.

Schultz, T. W. (1971). *Investment in human capital: The role of education and of research*. New York, Free Press.

Shisanjing zhushu 十三经注疏 (SSJZS) (The Thirteen Classics with Commentaries). (1980). (Vols 1–2) Compiled by Yuan Ruan. Reprinted. Beijing: Zhonghua Company.

Sun, K. Y. (2007). 素质教育研究之研究 [On the research on *suzhi jiaoyu*]. 江苏教育学院学报(社会科学版) [*Journal of Jiangsu Institute of Education (Social Science)*], *23*(1): 1–10.

Sun, Y. X., & Hong, M. (2009). 挑战与回应：访原国家教委副主任柳斌 [Challenges and responses: Interview with Liu Bin, the former deputy director of the State Education Committee]. 少年儿童研究 [*Children's Studies*], 10

Tu, W. (1968). The creative tension between *ren* and *li*. *Philosophy East and West*, *18*(1–2) (January–April), 29–39.

Tu, W. (1979). *Humanity and self-cultivation*: *Essays in Confucian thought*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.

Twitchett, D. (Ed.). (1979). *The Cambridge history of China* (Vol. 3). Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press.

Twitchett, D., & Michael L. (Eds.). (1987). *The cambridge history of China* (Vol. I). Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press.

Woodside, A. (1983). Some mid-Qing theorists of popular schools: their innovations, inhibitions, and attitudes toward the poor. *Modern China*, *9*(1), 3–35.

Woodside, A. (1992). Real and imagined continuities in the Chinese struggle for Literacy. In R. Hayhoe (Ed.), *Education and modernization, The Chinese experience* (pp. 23–46). Pergamon Press & Oise Press.

Yan, H. (2003). Neoliberal governmentality and Neohumanism: organizing suzhi/value flow through labor recruitment networks. *Cultural Anthropology*, *18*(4): 493–523.

Ye, L. (2009). "'New Basic Education' and me—notes from the past ten years of research. *Frontiers of Education in China*, *4*(4): 343–364.

Yang, Y. Y., & Chi, Z. H. (2008). 2009 年中国就业形势及对策建议 [China's employment situation, 2009: responses and suggestions]. In J. G. Chen (Ed.), 2009 年中国经济形势分析与预测 [*China's economic situation, 2009: Analysis and forecast*] (pp. 275–282). Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press.

Yuan, C. L. (2009). 麦可斯报告称 49.5% 应届毕业生就业比政府数据少逾 18% [The MyCOS report reveals that only 49.5% of graduates of 2009 are employed, which are more than 18% less than the government figure]. 二十一世纪经济报道 [*21st Century Business Herald*], August 4, 2009.

Zhu, Xi (1962). Tongmeng xuzhi 童蒙须知 [Children should know]. Collected in Yangzheng yigui 养正遗规, one of Wuzhong yigui 五种遗规 [*Five regulation series*]. Reprint. Taipei: Zhonghua shuju.