Little Islands, Big Trouble: Mapping The South China Seas’ Maritime Disputes.

An analysis of curriculum making, and the justification and evaluation of a curriculum artefact and lesson activity.

Abstract

Geography teachers have a vital role to play in interpreting the subjects’ centralised curriculum. The Geographical Association’s concept of ‘Curriculum making’ promotes the design and use of carefully selected curriculum artefacts. This paper examines the ability of curriculum artefacts to act as ‘a launch pad into a sequence of thought’ (Lambert 2014) and the ability of the artefact to facilitate geographical thinking in line with the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme Geography Course. It evaluates in-class simulations as a vehicle for geographical thinking through the introduction of a core artefact, this being a map of the South China Sea maritime dispute, which forms the basis of a series of IB diploma geography lessons.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to describe and justify a specifically designed geography teaching and learning artefact, and evaluate its effectiveness based upon contemporary thinking within the field of geography education. From a curriculum stand point the focus is from both the national curriculum from England and the International Baccalaureate diploma programme. To begin with the paper will focus upon changes to the geography curriculum and attempt to distinguish between curriculum design, planning and curriculum making. It will go on to examine how the core artefact and supporting resources allow geographical thinking through simulation. And how simulation and role-play are effective means of teaching and learning about the issue in question, as well as the subject of geography as a whole.
The geography curriculum

“A high-quality geography education should inspire in pupils a curiosity and fascination about the world and its people that will remain with them for the rest of their lives.” (National Curriculum in England: geography programmes of study 2013)

This ‘purpose of study’ published by the Department for Education forms the opening statement for the National Curriculum in England’s geography programme of study. The prospect of this vision of a ‘high quality geography education’ becoming a reality is dependent upon numerous interconnected factors. These include the type of pedagogic practice, the employment of subject specialist practitioners and the degree of student’s personal geographies and pre-existing skills. The introduction of the National curriculum in England in 1991 witnessed the demise of the teachers’ ability to decide what is taught in schools. Greater central control of the curriculum pushed teaching professionals to the periphery of curriculum decision-making and confined them to the role of curriculum conveyor.

“The introduction of the national curriculum in the 1990s alienated many geography teachers and pupils. Teachers lost control of their work and the curriculum, and pupils failed to discover answers through geographical enquiry to pressing questions raised by their everyday lives”. (Huckle, 2002, p. 86)

The Children, Schools and Families Committee (2009) reported that central prescription and direction through the National Curriculum had de-skilled teachers. The same committee likened schooling to a franchise operation, dependent on a recipe handed-down by Government rather than the exercise of professional expertise by teachers. By removing the classroom teacher from the curriculum design process the most vital connection between the policy makers and the student had been severed. The impacts of which lead to professional dissatisfaction and run the risk of teachers becoming what David Lambert (2010) refers to as ‘delivery technicians’.

Central coordination and planning in education is essential in order to ensure high standards are established and that students of all backgrounds are afforded the
same standard of education and the opportunities that come with a quality education. A fundamental reason for supporting a national curriculum is that it has, and does safeguard geography’s place in the classroom, without this ‘protection’ geography could find itself relegated in importance or removed from the classroom all together as commonly seen in the U.S. education system. At my current school, which implements the I.B. Middle Years Programme (MYP) there is a distinct lack of geography specific units in the syllabus due to the freedom of choice over content and concepts the MYP permits. A long-term absence of geography subject specialists contributing to curriculum making has resulted in history dominating the humanities syllabus. The consistency offered by the national curriculum affords teachers a greater opportunity to collaborate on and share teaching resources, therefore helping to reduce the increasing workload in the profession. However, Lambert (in White, 2004:75) warns that this standardised approach can lead to curriculum planning being relinquished to textbook authors. The national curriculum is valuable in providing a balance in the subject. Marsden (1997) argues that the curriculum should contain a balance of all three critical components –

- subject content,
- educational processes,
- social purpose,

but it was, according to him, best balanced during the 1970’s prior to the implementation of a national curriculum. Geography finds itself on the ideological “merry-go-round”. Rawling (2001) notes the increasing centralization of curriculum policy making during the 1980’s and 90’s and the impact this has on the politicisation of the subject. Marsden (1989) supports this and refers to the promotion of geography during the interwar years as an ‘Empire’ subject used for socio-political purpose. An observation that cannot be ignored is that since the first geography national curriculum was implemented as a result of the 1988 Education Act, student numbers sitting GCSE and A-Level exams in geography had declined year on year. According to Rawling’s (2001:148) table of geography curriculum development, the 1970’s and 80’s, prior to any geography national curriculum, was the most positive period for the subject. The most negative period was identified as the 1987-93 period
of strong centralized control and the launching of the inaugural national curriculum. The situation, according to Rawling, improved going into the Millennium but declining student numbers continued. There is now evidence of a revival in the subjects’ fortunes, according to the Royal Geographical Society (2014) the subject is becoming increasingly popular at GCSE: over 225,000 pupils took an exam in 2014 placing it as the eighth most popular subject taken. In 2014 the numbers taking A and AS level geography increased by 0.4% and 17% on 2013.

What is curriculum making?

In order to evaluate an example of curriculum making it is important to first discuss the process of curriculum making and identify how it is different from curriculum design. The Geographical Association (2013) states that curriculum making is about bringing a scheme of work or syllabus alive. It is about enacting geography and giving it purpose. The GA is also keen to stress the importance of the subject specialist in the curriculum making process as well as the need to create interesting, engaging and challenging educational encounters for students, which draw upon teacher knowledge and skills, the experiences of students and the valuable subject resources of geography.

Curriculum making should not be confused with curriculum planning. This is the continuous strategic and purposeful implementation of the curriculum. Hoyle (1969, cited by Kelly) refers to earlier changes to the curriculum as ‘unplanned drift’. In order for education to meet the needs of a changing society and the developments brought about by technological innovation then curriculum planning is essential. The strategic aspect is a reference to the involvement of policy makers (politicians) in curriculum decision-making. The notion that curriculum planning should be continuous is essential in order to ensure what Kelly (2004) refers to as “Evolution not revolution” of the curriculum. Curriculum planning is holistic and ensures that a ‘piecemeal approach to curriculum making by subjects is avoided.

“The curriculum offered by a school, and the curriculum received by individual pupils, should not be simply a collection of separate subjects” (DES, 1981:12).
At the very least, the total curriculum must be “accorded” Kelly (2004)

“Teachers are the filters through which the mandated curriculum passes. Their understanding of it, and their enthusiasm, or boredom, with various aspects of it, colours its nature. Hence, the curriculum enacted in classrooms differs from the one mandated by administrators or developed by experts” McCutcheon (1988:198).

This statement echoes the paramount importance that teachers are involved in the curriculum planning process and that it needs to take a bottom up approach. Teachers deliver the curriculum and need to be invested in it. Planning of the curriculum is a costly, time consuming process. The true test of its success is in the classroom.

The Geographical Association (no date) believes that geography has a distinctive part to play in the school curriculum. Covering the syllabus is just the mechanics of teaching and is not the same as making the curriculum. Butt (2008) believes that geography should also help young people understand the world around them, make informed decisions about issues that affect them at a variety of special scales.

Who should design and make the curriculum?

Involving Young People in the curriculum making process would allow improved engagement and focus in the learning process due to students becoming ‘stakeholders’ in the curriculum. The drive to personalise student learning would appear to be an ideal opportunity to empower them as curriculum makers. Personalised learning is more than a greater choice for learners. Personalised learning equips children to become more active, engaged learners, able to reflect on how they learn, what they learn, and how they are assessed.

“Our education system’s biggest untapped resource is the children themselves”.

Leadbeater (2005)

By including them in the curriculum making process we are ensuring that there is an up-to-date, relevant and appealing context in which geography learning can take place. Students need not necessarily make the curriculum directly, although they may, through interactions with their teacher they may influence curriculum making.
Teachers regularly learn from their students through questions raised in class (which teachers may have to undertake research to answer), differing cultural backgrounds, or after relocating to a new region.

Naturally, teachers are qualified professionals who should be trusted to deliver balanced and meaningful lessons. They are in the best position to do so as they (I would hope) understand the subject (content knowledge), the students, and the setting (the area in which the school is located). It is also important that teachers are confident in what they are expected to teach, i.e. they should be free to choose relevant case study examples, fieldwork exercises, and utilise their strengths based upon travel, living overseas, in different parts of the country, different career paths, university degrees (Physical or human geographer). You could look at this as teachers integrating their own experiences into the classroom, a practice that should be encouraged.

Most involved in secondary education would agree that curriculum design should not be at the mercy of politicians. David Laws (2014), the former minister for schools argues that the school curriculum should not be set by the “whims of here-today, gone-tomorrow politicians”. Writing for the Spectator Fraser Nelson (2014) points out that;

“Labour’s first postwar Education Secretary, George Tomlinson, famously declared that ‘the minister knows nowt about curriculum’. It was a Conservative minister, David Eccles, who started to interfere – believing (not without reason) that the education establishment didn’t pay enough attention to the three Rs”. Spectator (2014)

Selecting my curriculum artefact:

As educators today we are spoilt for choice when it comes to the volume and variety of teaching resources made available by technological innovations such as the Internet and new media. The success of the subject in schools is dependent upon teachers embracing these technological changes and utilising the range of learning materials at their disposal. Walford (2001) observes that another vital strategy for survival (or for the justification of survival) is for geography teachers to teach well. Given the wealth and range of lively material available to geography teachers and the
richness of life in the real world, it ought to be rare for a geography teacher not to be able to interest or stimulate students in some part of the subject on its own merits.

My initial reaction to the artefact selection process was to ensure that it related to a personal interest, thus enabling me to utilise my strengths and personal experiences. This resonates with McCutcheon (1988) who talks about the ‘hidden curriculum’. She argues that hidden curriculum is when teachers implement the overt, or established curriculum. Teachers will interpret the curriculum themselves in a different way thus impacting the hidden curriculum of the classroom. Secondly, I my thoughts turned to pedagogical practice – what student centred learning activities do I want the artefact to facilitate? What theme will the artefact sit in? How will it interact with other resources?

Tentatively, I selected an animated video that addressed the subject of the Tohoku earthquake and subsequent Fukushima evacuation. This had a spatial context, addressed a contemporary issue and could be supported by a number of additional resources. After deliberation it was deemed to be unsuitable. The problem with the resource was that the spatial context was too vague and therefore could not fully lend itself to geographical thinking. Subsequently, I opted to use a tried and tested artefact, what the Geographical Association (no date) refer to as a “standard tools of the trade”, a map.

"So important is the use of maps in geographic work that ... it seems fair to suggest to the geographer if the problem cannot be studied fundamentally by maps ... then it is questionable whether or not it is within the field of Geography." Hartshorne (1939)

The map that is my core artefact is centred on the South China Sea region (see figure 1) and focuses upon local maritime disputes. The purpose of the artefact is multifaceted. The primary purpose is to allow students to examine the geography of conflict in the region and develop an understanding of how nations exercise sovereignty rights beyond their coastlines. I also want students to gain an appreciation for the value of maritime resources and to the extent nations will go to project their territorial claims in order to harness the wealth of the resources. The original version of the map is digital and provided by the Council on Foreign relations.
Fig. 1 Core artefact: Map of maritime disputes in the South China Sea (Screenshot).

The digital nature of the map enables it to be interactive so that the different nation’s maritime claims can be selected or deselected to produce a clearer picture of where national claims are made and where disputed claims occur. It also identifies the disputed islands and shoals and provides a brief synopsis. It can be projected on an interactive whiteboard, viewed on a laptop screen or preferably printed out so that students can add value to it in the form of labels and annotations. In essence it is a visual stimulant with the key function of facilitating enquiry. The aim of this artefact is to allow students to "think through maps," (Liben 2001: 76). However, geography students must be critical consumers of maps and other spatial representations. "Maps cannot be seen as separate from the contexts in which they are produced and used" (Morgan and Lambert 2004:109). Therefore, in addition to the core artefact I have included supporting resources in the form of a series of images in order to bring the map and the maritime disputes to life. The images are all relate to the disputed region on the map and are taken from a variety of news articles published on the dispute.
The images include;

Fig 2. Haiyang Shiyou 981 exploration rig.

Fig 3: Satellite image of Scarborough Shoal

Fig 4. The Sierra Madre. A shipwrecked Filipino naval vessel.

Fig 5. Chinese flag being hoisted on Scarborough Shoal.

Fig 6. The Liaoning. A recently acquired Chinese aircraft carrier.

Fig 7. Chinese Island expansion.
The purpose of the images is to stimulate enquiry, which is regarded as the “heart of curriculum making in geography” Geographical Association (No date). Whilst the principal aim of the core artefact is to stimulate curiosity and identify an issue, the supplementary resources, in the form of the images, acts as a bridge between what Roberts (2003) refers to as stage 1: Create a need to know and stage 3: making sense of the data through description, explanation, analysis and interpretation.

**Thinking Geographically**

The effectiveness of the core artefact and supporting images selected for this curriculum making process depends in part on the ability to get students to Think Geographically.

‘Thinking geographically is not everyday thinking. If we thought these were the same, there would be little point in having geography lessons, or specialist geography teachers who are grounded in the discipline’ Geographical Association (2012).

The Geographical Association (2012) focuses upon three key concepts, those of place, space and environment. Using these key concepts as a means to develop an understanding of the world around them students must view the artefact through a ‘geographical lense’. The map and the images allow students to think geographically as they provide a clear opportunity for students to address the concept of place, space and environment. In it’s manifesto (2009), The Geographical Association likened learning geography to learning a ‘language’. Lambert (2011) sees factual knowledge, such as the countries involved in the dispute, the names of the islands and bodies of water as the ‘vocabulary’ of geography. In relation the ‘grammar’ of geography would be the more complex concepts such as the causes and social, economic, environmental, and political impacts the conflict has both locally and globally. In its ‘raw’ form the map offers a number of opportunities for discussion however it is only when the map is annotated with the ‘vocabulary’ of geography, islets, shoals and reefs, shipping routes, hydrocarbon deposits, and other potential resources that make the artefact ultimately a valuable learning tool. Students are able to view the ‘bigger picture’ and develop a sense of why these ‘small islands’ lead to ‘big troubles’.
Learning to think geographically is learning to think spatially - to consider objects in terms of their location in space, to question why objects such as rocky islets or rusting naval hulks are located where they are, and to visualize relationships between and among these objects. Why are the territorial claims shaped like they are? How did the islands and reefs form in these locations? Why is China constructing artificial islands?

If young people are to explore global issues then we cannot expect them to gain certain knowledge of distant places through their own day-to-day experience. Young (2013) during a presentation at the Institute of Education, questions whether there is better knowledge and argues that if there is then access to this knowledge should be an entitlement. It is this differentiation from everyday life that makes this knowledge ‘powerful’. On the contrary to Young, Margaret Roberts makes the case for the need to develop the link between young people’s experiences and the geography curriculum. Roberts (2013), presenting at the same time as Young, highlighted the need to develop the relationship between ‘spontaneous concepts’ and ‘scientific concepts’ the latter being beyond personal experience. Roberts talks about young people being ‘saturated with experience’ and having the ability to develop ‘personal geography’. If this ‘personal geography’ is not made an object of study then it will be otherwise neglected. I would argue that young people are not a homogeneous group. The geographic interests of each young person is shaped by their location, day-to-day experiences, travel opportunities, as well as interests outside of geography, such as music or sport. What Margaret Roberts refers to as a ‘personal geography’. Young people living by the coast are more likely to develop an interest in its processes and actions, just like someone with connections to another country (through family or travel) may feel a stronger bond and ability to relate to that place. The development of technology and the growth of social media means that students can now interact with and gain knowledge of far-flung places like never before. They are able to follow the events with live updates, view aerial and satellite images of the conflict in question. However, it can be argued that this sedentary lifestyle has ultimately led to a reduction in their ‘real world’ experiences such as playing out in parks, climbing trees, taking the bus into town or to neighbouring towns. The opportunities to go out and explore have been diminished. For many young people the world is seen through
the lens of the computer screen. Students’ experiences of places visited, previous homes, and their undertakings outside of the classroom or ‘personal geography’ can prove to be a valuable teaching and learning resources. The failure to utilise the student as a teaching and learning resource would be detrimental. However, as Michael Young argues, teachers must be careful not to neglect the ‘powerful knowledge’ that often ‘personal geography’ cannot bring to the classroom. The teacher must use their professional judgement to determine the correct balance between the two.

**Artefacts relationship with the curriculum.**

The artefact and associated sequence of lessons is specifically designed to provide a scheme of work aimed at addressing the IB diploma geography course. In particular the following learning objectives taken from Optional Theme B: Oceans and their coastal margin.

**Fig 8. IB Geography Course – Learning Objectives.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Geopolitics of oceans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sovereignty rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the sovereignty rights of nations in relation to territorial limits and exclusive economic zones (EEZ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine a geopolitical conflict in relation to an oceanic resource, other than fishing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning objectives outlined by the IB diploma course are not heavily prescriptive and allow the teacher to become the curriculum maker. The flexibility to choose any appropriate case study can be seen in figure 8.

**Context of the core artefact within the series of lessons**

The scheme of work (see appendix) is comprised of 5 possible lessons. I have refrained from making any reference to time allocation as lesson duration can differ significantly from one school to the next. The learning objectives and key questions are what define the individual lessons.
Lesson one begins with the introduction of the map to the students. With this they are exposed to the ‘geography vocabulary’ as they examine the different countries and bodies of water. Initially, the maritime territorial claims are not revealed. Instead students are asked to think about who owns the sea and are instructed to draw and label the extent of where they believe the countries territorial waters should be, they are required to justify their decision. Already, the artefact is taking on new form, as each stage of each lesson progresses the artefact will transform through the addition of student generated information, which begins to develop the ‘grammar’ of geography. Lesson two addresses the potential causes of the conflict by identifying resources in the disputed seas and what importance might the countries in question place upon such resources. Lesson three identifies the framework for maritime claims and how and why maritime disputes may come about and potentially be resolved. Lesson four is a key lesson that provides an opportunity to undertake a key aspect of curriculum making, that of bringing a scheme of work alive. The lesson involves learning through simulation in the form of a regional forum role-play.

**Learning through simulation.**

“*Role-play and simulations are forms of experiential learning*" Russell & Shepherd (2010)

Through a regional forum simulation, learners have the opportunity to take on different roles, and are encouraged to assume the personality of a political leader representing one of the nations involved in the dispute. Simulation provides opportunities for interaction and participation in a complex learning environment. Undertaking this simulation provides an ideal situation for group interaction as students plan, research and deliver their arguments as a team. This activity shifts the teacher to a facilitator of learning and puts students at the centre of the lesson.
**Benefits and challenges of learning through simulation**

Russell & Shepherd (2010) point to widespread evidence that suggests educators and students experience satisfaction with assessment-as-learning through role-play, games and simulation. Learning by simulation provides a safe and supportive learning environment where students can develop their communication, critical thinking, and analytical skills. Simulations can be unpredictable, with the learning outcome determined by the ability of the students, their level of preparedness, communication skills, and the teachers’ management of the activity. Walford (1987:83 from Balderstone, 2000) suggest that it is a mistake to see simulations as a replica of reality. He points out that they can never be regarded as such. Rather it is better seen as a vehicle for teaching about reality and an aid in bringing pupils into an empathetic frame of mind in order to better understand it.

**Student Voice:**

The series of lessons based on the core artefact were delivered to a grade 11 IB diploma class in April 2015. The class was comprised of international students from a wide range of countries. Feedback from the group was predominantly positive.

**Summary of strengths:**
The majority of students enjoyed the sequence of lessons and were heavily engaged throughout. They appreciated a fresh topic that had relevance to current events and allowed them to examine a part of the world many admittedly knew little about. A particularly powerful lesson was when students were asked to delineate the maritime zones between neighbouring countries. The consensus was that proximity to a country was a fair means of division. When the Chinese claims, based upon the nine-dashed line premise were revealed students were shocked that such a claim could be justified, this kick started the enquiry processes as students were increasingly keen to understand how and why such a claim could be taken seriously.

**Summary of limitations:** The initial lack of specific regional knowledge was a barrier. Although all students could locate China, many could not name Vietnam or The Philippines. No one in the group had heard of Scarborough Shoal, the Spratly Islands
or the Paracel Islands. Some were aware that conflict was present. However, the lack of knowledge did not serve to deter the students, in fact touching on Michael Young's notion of 'powerful knowledge', it raised some interesting conversations about how many of them have little understanding of places outside of their personal realm, and that they expect to get this from their geography lessons.

Conclusion:

Curriculum making is about providing the teacher the opportunity to tap into their personal expertise in order to provide a captivating and challenging learner experience. Students should play an integral role in the curriculum making process and it is the duty of the teacher to ensure that they do so. By affording the teacher the opportunity to become curriculum makers they are able to balance the views of Young and Roberts and permit access to ‘powerful knowledge’, whilst ensuring that links between student's personal geographies and the classroom are strong. Curriculum making can be seen as a form of professional development. It keeps teachers actively engaged in the curriculum, develops their skills and maintains their interests in the subject, more importantly it can help prevent them from becoming what Lambert calls ‘delivery technicians’.

The importance of a well-chosen artefact cannot be overlooked. Whether it acts as a ‘springboard’ into something deeper or remains central throughout a series of lessons or scheme of work. Artefacts can be found in a variety of forms from a digital medium such as a video, song or image to more traditional formats such as maps, quotes, or facts. In their raw form they may be simply regarded as a teaching resource, their true value as an artefact is only apparent when you begin to understand the way that they are applied in order to facilitate geographical thinking. When a well chosen artefact provides the opportunity for active and deep geographical learning to take place this is the moment that curriculum making truly happens. Role-play and simulated learning activities bring out the best in our students and bear the hallmark of the IB learner profile traits - risk-taker, communicator, and thinker. An active learning approach affords both teachers and students opportunities to personalize the learning environment by providing a range of roles that place learners both inside and outside their comfort zones.
Appendix 1: Scheme of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conflicting claims: Who, what, where?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        | Learning Objective:  
|        | Examine conflicting maritime claims in the South China Sea.  
|        | Summary:  
|        | Students are introduced to the map with all maritime claims removed. They are asked to consider;  
|        | Key Question: Whom does the sea belong to? (Followed up specifically with the South China Sea).  
|        | On the board or on printed blank maps students should decide how they think the sea should be divided up amongst the countries in the region (or not). They should plot the demarcations and label their maps accordingly.  
|        | The following territories are plotted on the map.  
|        | 1. Spratly Islands.  
|        | 2. Paracel Islands.  
|        | Comparisons are made between the student’s maps and the actual claims made by the countries in the region.  
|        | How might the countries justify their claims? |
| 2.     | The value of the ocean. |
|        | Learning Objective:  
|        | Identify the biotic and abiotic resources of continental shelves, oceans, and ocean floor deposits.  
|        | Key question: What is the most valuable resource in the ocean?  
|        | Lesson Summary:  
|        | Student’s brainstorm oceanic resources and categories them into biotic and abiotic. For an assigned resource, students identify the resource location, socio-economic and environmental values, and a present day use for the resource. Resources are categories in terms of importance. |
|        | Learning objective: Discuss the sovereignty rights of nations in relation to territorial limits and exclusive economic zones (EEZ).  
|        | Key Question: How are maritime waters assigned? |

   Student groups are assigned to represent a country involved in the disputes. 1. China, 2. Vietnam, 3. The Philippines, 4. Taiwan, 5. Malaysia.

   Learning objectives: Discuss the conflicting maritime claims within the South China Sea region.

   Key Question: Can the maritime conflict of the South China Sea be resolved?

   After sufficient opportunity to research and prepare, student groups represent their assigned country at either a forum or tribunal in order to press their claims of sovereignty over the disputed territory.

5. Theory of knowledge.

   Additional follow up lesson discussion questions.

   Who determines the names of geographical places and features?

   Why aren’t maritime borders shown on conventional maps?

   Who owns the oceans and their resources outside of maritime claims?
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