University of Alberta

Constructions of Global Citizenship: An Albertan Case Study

by

Alexis Kearney Hillyard

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

in

Theoretical, Cultural and International Studies in Education

Educational Policy Studies

Fall 2011
Edmonton, Alberta

Abstract

Global citizenship education in Alberta represents multiple, conflicting frameworks. Thus, there is a great need to understand how global citizenship is constructed in real school contexts in order to attend to how global citizenship might work towards socially just aims versus promote colonially-tainted, Eurocentric understandings of the world.

This qualitative case study centered on students and teachers from The Relations Program, a global citizenship initiative housed in a large urban high school in Alberta. A social justice theoretical lens was used to highlight the relational and constructed nature of global citizenship and to shed light on furthering socially just global citizenship.

The findings suggest discourses present within the global citizenship initiative represent a condition of 'binariality' in which Western-centric knowledge is promoted. Also, they suggest students' and teachers' agency is impacted by their reified understandings of globalization and global structures. Based on the case study findings, interpreted through the lens of social justice theory, it is suggested that an Outward In model be considered for global citizenship education, which includes an understanding of the local and the global as dialectically intertwined as opposed to separate. An interrogation of worldview, along with the realization of political responsibility, is suggested to enhance socially just global citizenship education.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the students and teachers who graciously and courageously invited me into their world and shared their thoughts and reflections about global citizenship. It was an honour and a privilege to listen and learn from all of you.

To my supervisor, Dr. Lynette Shultz: You encouraged my passion for social justice while offering kind and patient guidance throughout the entire process. Thank you for always being exactly what I needed.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank the members of my committee, Dr. Ali Abdi and Dr. Ingrid Johnston, for their critical and insightful input and guidance.

Dr. Joe da Costa: Thank you for encouraging me to write a thesis and for believing in my work.

To my Mother: Thank you for being my cheerleader, my listener, and my critical friend. You have taught me so wonderfully about patience, personal strength, and perseverance.

To my Father: Thank you for your endless encouragement and amazing inspiration.

Jill and Ayesha: Thank you for keeping me sane and for being two of my most amazing and inspiring friends. You are the best office mates I could have asked for.

To my Sister, Ainsley: Well… that happened.

Lastly, thank you Shantel for your constant support and unwavering faith. Now I truly know what is feels like to be a Donkey.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Current global citizenship education initiatives in North America typically aim to promote intercultural understanding, address global issues and promote social change. Unfortunately, it is becoming apparent that conflicting understandings of globalization and global citizenship can result in initiatives that do not engage the systemic and socially constructed nature of global injustice. As a result, these initiatives may offer surface level analyses and proposed solutions for global issues and in fact may reinforce negative stereotypes and Eurocentric assumptions. To address these issues we need to ask how global citizenship education can inculcate, in students and teachers, socially just ways of being in the world that reflect the relational nature of global social structures and the historicized positions that we take up within them. In a world filled with competing discourses about what it means to be a global citizen, it is increasingly important that we recognize how global citizenship education might provide critical spaces of engagement wherein students and teachers can interrogate and transform unjust social relations.

The current case study of a global citizenship education initiative in Alberta makes use of a social justice theoretical framework to study the relationship between teachers' and students' constructions of global citizenship, their understandings of the world, and how these understandings impact their agency. In addition, the results will contribute to an understanding of the relationship between social justice and global citizenship by analyzing the qualities of the particular discourses that participants produce and engage with. The study was conducted at Amber Rock, a diverse, urban high school in Alberta and home to The Relations Program. The Relations Program brings together people from approximately 16 different countries throughout the school year through the medium of videoconference style engagements with the aim of critically assessing, dialoguing about, and proposing solutions for the world's most imminent challenges. The Program utilizes a range of multimedia and communications technologies in order to facilitate long distance, live connections orientated towards enhancing global citizenship.

Study participants included 5 students and 2 teachers, all highly involved in The Relations Program.

Origin of Study and Researcher Reflexivity

I am aware that as the researcher my own biases and beliefs impact my interpretations of the participants' dialogue since, as Lincoln and Guba (1985) state, "no one enters a site in a mindless fashion; there are always prior formulations" that the researcher brings with them to the study (p. 302). Mindful of the fact that my own biases and assumptions would indeed have some bearing on the knowledge creation and meaning making processes of this study (Berg, 2009), I engaged in what Wright (2009) calls "preparatory self-reflection," with the knowledge that it is virtually impossible to truly set aside these deep-seated ways of knowing. In my case it is also clear that my experiences in Africa led me to seek out and embrace a particular area of scholarship and practise, and this must be declared at the outset as a compelling frame for my current biases and assumptions.

Thus, this section addresses how I came to be interested in the area of global citizenship and social justice and expounds the biases and beliefs that I bring to this research. Through two narrative reflections I hope to locate myself within the study: an essential component within interpretive, qualitative research. The first reflection deals with my educational experiences within the Alberta public education system as I look back and reflect on several experiences, now with increased knowledge and experience. The second piece touches on the internal dialogue I had with myself after returning home from a year teaching in Namibia. These reflections assist me in illuminating parts of my social location, along with some of my thoughts and feelings about education in general. By reflecting on my own educational experiences I hope to elucidate from my vantage point not only what is possible, but also what should be questioned within global citizenship education. By critiquing and reflecting on my experiences I wish to identify the transformative aspects of my past that have helped to inform my present research path.

Narrative 1.

This is what fall looks like…

Fall. Red and gold paper leaves lined the door of my kindergarten classroom. Everyone followed the teacher outside onto the frost-kissed grass of the schoolyard. We listened to the *crunch* of the leaves beneath our feet. We rolled the fallen leaves between our fingers, pushed them up against our noses, and inhaled. "This is what fall smells like," our teacher said. This is what fall feels like, and looks like – this *is* fall. I participated in the construction of a season that became, in my mind, the universal for children everywhere. Following fall comes winter, which is not winter without snow, and then spring, with its April showers, summer, and ice cream trucks, and back again to fall. My kindergarten class successfully and naively universalized the world's four seasons. Unfortunately, this innocent act may have laid the groundwork for many years of universalizing, essentializing, and constructing difference that served to naturalize discourses of oppression and othering within our educational experiences. We were not asked to critique the notion of universalism or essentialism, the binaristic "Western" conceptual schemata that justified our assumptions, or the reified concepts of self we were inheriting (Orr, 2002). We were not asked to consider what *fall* might mean for a child on the flip side of the globe.

Diversity Day. The assorted plates of aromatic food lined the classroom. Reflecting back through my different lenses, one can suggest these aromas masked the fact that this well-intentioned day was in fact a tokenistic reinforcement of "the school's role as a colonizing agent by emphasizing the 'otherness' of [non-white] culture" (Robertson, 2003, p. 552). My reflections would suggest the superiority of the Eurocentric culture was inherent in this act of celebration, and could be found in the raised eyebrows of students and teachers as they privately derided the 'foreign' dishes. We also learned that Chinese culture meant spring rolls, and that Ukrainian culture could be summed up in holubtsi. This hollow act of *mis*recognition, reduced to a single half day per year, in my opinion begs that the issue of inclusion be interrogated more closely.

Bright. In grade four my teacher introduced us to our new classmate, Bright. He was from

Ghana. Bright became a representative of his country at the same time that we enforced our authority over the construction of his *difference* (Smith, 1999). He was made fun of for his name. He was asked if there were roads in Africa, or if there were hockey rinks. The Enlightenment epistemology that Western dominant culture is based on reflects logic based on the dualisms of light/dark, modern/traditional, rational/irrational and so on. His name, ironically so, represents the metaphor of truth and light of the Enlightenment, a "metaphysics that has informed European philosophy" in Enlightenment thinking (Bolt, 2000, p. 203). This *light,* which became "one of the technologies complicit in the colonization of countries, peoples, and bodies," (p. 202) contrasts with the *dark* of the unknown other. *We* used this light to illuminate the construction of Bright's country, history, and 'otherness' with an unearned and unquestioned authority. We learned the facts and figures relating to Ghana while our teacher simultaneously talked about, to, and for Bright's experience. She did not talk *with* him. Like our units on Brazil and Japan, it was as if by reading and memorizing these out of date texts we had 'mastered' each country. I now look back often and question whether 'inclusion' worked for Bright that year.

Snow White. The sun's light illuminates the copper dunes. I went to Namibia in December 2006. Winter in Alberta was cold that year, seizing my lungs as I walked onto the plane. I stepped into my first Namibian winter immediately 'othering' its basic geographical properties. There was no snow. I constructed winter in kindergarten, and this was not winter. My skin, as white as snow, burned under the Namibian sun. I stood under a tattered sign over the door of a run down bar that said *Whites Only*. My white skin crawled as if sensing my soul's yearning to jump out of it. My skin, as white as snow, furnished me with unearned privileges in this 'post' Apartheid nation. I was seen as powerful, expert, and *developed*. I was never once asked to interrogate these privileges during any part of my educational experience.

Narrative 2.

I went to Africa to teach…

I went to Africa to teach.

Pause.

This sentence will forever haunt me in my role as an emerging educator. I cringe when I hear myself speak it. I cringe when I hear my friends and family say it.

Pause.

They think I am a hero. But all I feel is unclean.

Pause

No, I don't want you to tell me I did something good. I don't want to hear how amazing I am. I don't want you to tell me that you could never do that. You could do that. Anyone could do that. In fact, anyone *does* it! Everybody that wants to does it. No one has to earn it, they just go.

Who goes?

I went. North Americans go, Australians go, and Europeans. No, not because they should go, not because what they have to give is invaluable. But because that's what they think they ought to do. It's programmed in: Give back - we are so lucky and have so much that we can give them. We owe it to *ourselves* to give back.

Pause: What is this badge of honour that I wear?

Pause. Why don't we ever take pause?

Pause. Why did I go?

Pause. Why did I think they needed me?

Pause. Why did I think I could make a difference?

Pause. What did I do?

Narrative 1, looking back at my own school experiences, along with the questions I struggled with in Narative 2, have helped me to take pause and consider where, how, and in what ways my educational experiences have impacted me. Interestingly, and quite unfortunately, I was never given the opportunity nor did I ever feel an urgent need to reflect upon my experiences within an educational system that so many of us take for granted. One of the aims of this research

project is to give pause and explore the nature of global citizenship within a specific school context.

Narrative 1 deals with four different yet inextricably linked themes. The first is the notion of universalizing from the sole position of self, and an inability to recognize the limits and partiality of this flawed perspective. The second has to do with what Andreotti (in press) calls ticking the box of Eurocentric tolerance through attempts at domesticating difference as opposed to actually engaging with difference on its own terms. The next theme deals with the colonial obsession with the construction of Others and Otherness. These discourses of Otherness, according to Said (1978), are based on colonialist constructions that serve to situate, construct, and name the non-West, whilst reinstating the notion of Western superiority. The last theme deals with the different spaces of privilege that social actors inhabit, and the lack of interrogation these discursive spaces receive. These four themes are representative of the critical lens through which I view global citizenship initiatives and reflect the personal biases that I bring to this research project.

Narrative 2 deals with the rage I experience(d) after I returned from a year long teaching assignment in Namibia, Africa. It touches on my frustration with the common, crystallized *mis*conceptions about people and education in Africa as deficient, as well as with the problematic belief that it is a 'good thing' for people to go teach there. It was as if every conversation I had about my time in Namibia served to valorise me. But did I enrich the educational experiences of the youth I worked with there? Or did I teach from an ethnocentric, Eurocentric frame that had little, if any, relevance to their lives? The truth is, I sometimes wonder if I did any good at all. This narrative, while highlighting my biases, also reflects my personal critique of the notion of 'helping' that can oftentimes become embedded within the discourses of global citizenship initiatives.

After I came home from Namibia I needed to find a space to address the questions I had regarding the relationship between education and social justice. At the time, I did not know what

'social justice' was; I just had a gnawing inside my stomach based on the issues outlined above that I could not ignore. I decided to go back to school to pursue a master's degree in Education with a focus on global citizenship. I turned to global citizenship education for its potential as a generative project of social justice (Shultz, 2011) and the opportunities for action it seemed to provide. I needed to find a space where I could make sense of global injustice and inequity and simultaneously engage with my personal relationship with privilege and complicity; global citizenship education and social justice offered me that space.

Research Questions

A broad goal of this study is to contribute meaningfully to our understanding of the relationship between global citizenship education and social justice. In order to examine the complexity of global citizenship within a particular school case I have used the following questions to guide my research and to reflect upon the findings from this particular source:

I. What is the relationship between global citizenship education and social justice?
II. How do teachers' and students' understandings of the world and globalization interact with their constructions of global citizenship?
III. How might global citizenship education discourses either perpetuate unjust social relations or offer spaces of possibility for social justice?

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations. Due to the socially constructed nature of experience and understanding, I, as the researcher, recognize that the participants' responses were subjected to my interpretations of them, and that I can never fully understand or reconstruct them (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 10). Thus, my engagement with the data was affected by my own understandings and interpretations of global citizenship education and social justice, though self-reflexivity helped me to recognize my biases (Wright, 2009). The practical limitations of this study included a focus on a single school and one particular initiative, and not including students and teachers from a wide range of cultures and worldviews.

Delimitations. Due to time and transportation constraints, this study was delimited to participants from one Westernized, urban locale. Much richness could be added to a study like this as different perspectives about what global citizenship means to students in different locations are incorporated. Another delimitation was that I chose not to engage in data triangulation by observing my respondents teach. This choice was made due to the fact that observation can be intrusive for both teachers and students, and may lead to insincere engagements that are less representative of the typical teaching context.

This study was also delimited by my choice to include one global citizenship initiative in one school setting as opposed to multiple initiatives across a diverse range of school sites. Yet, opposed to a wide quantitative study with the aim of generalizing findings, this study aims to gain deep insights into a particular case. One of the aims of this research is to address a gap in the global citizenship education literature, namely the lack of empirical analysis that addresses what is happening in actual school contexts. Therefore, this study is delimited to a single school case in order to provide rich, descriptive interpretations of the participants' experiences (Mertens, 2005; Stake, 1994).

Significance of the Study

According to Pike (2008), the time is right for research in the area of global citizenship as "academics debate the meaning of citizenship in the age of globalization and classroom teachers strive to determine the most effective approach to engaging young people in the world around them" (p. 223). Yet the field of global citizenship education is complex, and there remains little systematic research geared towards addressing these complexities (Davies, Harber, & Yamashita, 2004; Johnston & Ochoa, 1993). While there is much theoretical literature dealing with global education and global citizenship education, there remains a gap in empirical research regarding how global citizenship is constructed within school sites. Abdi (2008) contends that although, at the theoretical level, education for global citizenship is explored and critiqued, "one needs to seek the real pragmatics of learning possibilities" (p. 74) that produce meaningful understandings in

school contexts. Indeed, research that touches solely on the levels of theory and policy tends to miss out on the rich "experiences of teachers and students engaging in global citizenship education" (Lapayese, 2003, p. 496). This research aims to address this gap by focusing attention on the practice of global citizenship in a school context (Andreotti, 2011, in press; Davies, 2006; Pike, 2000) and illuminating the relationship between participants' constructions of the world, global citizenship and their actions. Thus, this research is timely and will add to this growing body of knowledge by engaging with a global citizenship initiative in a real school context.

Also, students' perspectives are underrepresented in global citizenship research: the role they play in shaping global citizenship practices has received little attention (Lapayese, 2003; Mitchell & Parker, 2008). The inclusion of students' perspectives is important, according to Myers (2010), because global citizenship "is a fundamentally contested topic that has implications for how they will exercise citizenship in the future" (p. 484). Indeed, student perspectives can "help to align [global] citizenship education programs with current transformations in the world" (Myers, 2010, p. 499). This research aims to address this gap by including the perspectives of student participants.

Lastly, Daniel (2007) discusses the despair that often accompanies discussions of the negative effects of globalization and suggests the key to enacting new possibilities is furthering a social justice agenda in education. A feeling of powerlessness in the face of the sheer magnitude and power of globalization and dominant interests fuel this despair. Yet global citizenship education, "through both its social justice content and pedagogy … has the potential to provide a space for students and teachers to tackle issues of equity and justice in increasingly plural and fast-changing societies" (Lapayese, 2003, p. 499). Global citizenship education has the potential to create the critical spaces needed so that actors may "challenge the prevailing paradigms and interests of dominant groups" (Lapayese, 2003, p. 500) as opposed to reinforce them. Social justice is crucial, therefore, for global citizenship education in a world characterized by international treaties, global structural injustice, and transnational relations. Thus, it is imperative

that learners be provided the opportunity to engage with these themes so that they may thrive in a world characterized by multiple trans-border relations, issues and structures. This research aims to contribute to understanding this important relationship between social justice and global citizenship for the 21st century.

Chapter 2: A Review of the Literature

The overall aim of this study was to gain insight into the relationship between global citizenship and social justice by engaging with participants' understandings of globalization and global citizenship in a specific school context. By examining how students and teachers navigate through personal constructions of global citizenship, and by further exploring how their understandings impact their actions as global citizens, the study provides a window into global citizenship, per se, and the potential impact of global citizenship education programs, which are becoming frequent components within North American educational systems.

In recognition of the complexity of the definitions and issues related to both global citizenship and social justice, and to accommodate this complexity, the analysis of student and teacher input was undertaken within a specific theoretical framework. To extend our understanding of how global citizenship education can have impact on teachers and learners in meaningful ways and in the context of the world that is essentially "unjust," a social justice theoretical approach was chosen to guide the analyses within the study. This framework engages directly with the phenomenon of global injustice, and thus offers the potential to inform global citizen action in the world in helpful and respectful ways.

Within the initial section of the Literature Review the discussion of the concepts of global citizenship and global citizenship education are expanded by highlighting how global citizenship has been conceptualized in the literature, and how global citizenship theorizing is evolving to reflect its enacted, socially constructed nature. In addition some of the tensions and critiques that exist regarding the practice of global citizenship education are presented.

The section on social justice elaborates on the nature of structural injustice in the context of globalization and explicates how social justice theory can inform global citizenship education practices in relation to these structural injustices. The relationship between historical colonialism and current forms of structural injustice is examined, including comment as to how neoliberalism contributes to perpetuating discourses that serve to disadvantage particular people. Reified

understandings of globalization that condone passive attitudes towards global issues and concomitant structural injustice are problematized, and the implications of both neoliberal discourse and reified conceptualizations of globalization for global citizenship education are addressed.

Global Citizenship Education

Global [Citizenship] Education: What's in a name? The terms 'global education' and 'global citizenship education' are used in a variety of different ways throughout the literature. Some authors use the terms interchangeably (e.g., Merryfield, 2001, 2002; Shultz, 2007; Schweisfurth, 2006), some use only 'global education' (e.g., Becker, 1982; Case, 1993; Pike, 2008; Tye, 2003), and some only 'global citizenship education' (e.g., Andreotti, 2006; Begler, 1993; Lapayese, 2003). Pike (2008) talks about "global education" as a way to nurture global citizens, and uses this term since, according to him, "global education [is] the term most widely understood in Canada" (p. 224). Others problematize the interchangeability of the terms, and call for contextual distinctions to be made (e.g., Davies, 2006). According to Davies (2006), "global citizenship education is a relatively new concept. The insertion of 'citizenship' into global education implies something more than – or different to – previous conceptions" (p. 6). Shultz (2011) echoes this notion, stating, "[w]hile what might have been seen as 'global education' in the 1990s and early 2000's, where there was a focus on learning about 'others' and the issues that connected people, there is currently a shift in the inclusion of concepts of citizenship into this global/globalized learning project" (p. 13). Davies (2006) offers an important distinction between global education and global citizenship education. She states:

> What seems to happen with global citizenship education is a confirmation of the direct concern with social justice and not just the more minimalist interpretations of global education which are about 'international awareness' or being a more rounded person. Citizenship clearly has implications both of rights and responsibilities, of duties and entitlements, concepts which are not necessarily explicit in global education. One can

have the emotions and identities without having to do much about them. Citizenship implies a more active role. (p. 6)

Pike (2008) reiterates this idea, stating that global citizenship education can be defined as the marriage between global education, student agency, and civic and global engagement.

More specifically, global citizenship education as it is addressed in the literature seems to contain two equally important factors: worldview and agency. In essence, worldview refers to how we understand the world and our position in it, and agency refers to how we use these understandings to act within the world. Within global citizenship education, critically engaging with worldview involves an engagement with the socio-historical positions, perspectives and standpoints of social actors, and addresses notions of responsibility and power. As Giroux (1992) contends, meaningfully engaging with our worldviews allows us to analyze the socially constructed socio-historical processes that "frame our discourses and social relations" (p. 28) and understand our positions within social structures in relation to others. Engaging with our worldview undoubtedly informs our agency, and therefore shapes our actions in the world. In regards to global citizenship education, agency refers to fostering the will and opportunity for informed action towards the benefit of all people. According to Shultz (2011) agency is vital for realizing social justice since "it is not enough to just humanize the structures and institutions of globalization but in fact, it is necessary to transform the structures" (p. 22). Lapayese (2003) summarizes these two important elements in her description of global citizenship, contending global citizenship education must challenge dominant ideologies while encouraging informed action against all forms of social and political oppression. Thus, global citizenship education as I have conceptualized it for this study implies an active, informed global citizen concerned with socially just aims.

Global citizenship education: Differing perspectives. Shultz (2011) reiterates that the underlying ideologies and foundational ideas of educating for global citizenship are "diverse and certainly in tension" (p. 13). Many authors contend that the multiple agendas and theoretical

frameworks that inform global citizenship practices contribute to divergent and, in some cases, problematic implementations of global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2011; Case, 1993; Davies, 2006; Pike, 2000; Shultz, 2007). This section discusses different perspectives from the literature regarding the multiple understandings and definitions of global education and global citizenship education.

In relation to pedagogical practice, Couture (2009) states that "educators, researchers, and school communities [are] divided on the philosophical principles and assumptions related to what [global] citizenship education means" (p. 5). Yet there is little consensus in the literature regarding the desirability of a universal, shared description of global citizenship education. For instance, LeRoux (as cited in Lyons, 2006) points to the ambiguity of the notion, stating, "the lack of consensus on a worldwide acceptable definition of global education has been criticized and applauded" (p. 73). Although the non-articulation of a singular philosophy of global citizenship education has created barriers for the field, K. Tye (1990) maintains, "the lack of a fixed definition [of global education] is one of the major strengths of the field" (p. 163). Case (1993) agrees, maintaining a loose definition allows space for the inclusion of disparate, yet similarly oriented, factions (e.g., Peace Education, Environmental Education). Shultz (2007) and Lamy (1990), on the other hand, caution against vague descriptions of global education and global citizenship education, stating vastly different understandings have contributed to a lack of effective initiatives and attacks from the "conservative right" respectively. Indeed, Shultz (2007) maintains that currently, the "reduction in effective … education for global citizenship education is a result of vastly different understandings of what global citizenship entails" (p. 249).

Although there is a lack of clarity of the particular purpose(s) and rationale(s) of global education and global citizenship education, this does not negate the importance of interrogating and analyzing its place within the education system. In fact, these discrepancies call attention to an important need to analyze how global citizenship is taken up within school and classroom contexts. For instance, little has been documented about efforts to analyze and critique classroom

practices relating to global education (Anderson, 1982; Becker, 1982; Merryfield, 2001; Pike, 1996). Begler (1993) and Pike (1996) attend to the ways teacher understandings affect global citizenship education, for instance. According to Begler (1993), an educator's "conceptualization of global education has a significant impact" (p. 14) on how it unfolds in the classroom and the underlying assumptions and values are portrayed. In terms of specific definitions and rationales of global education, Pike (1996) maintains they are "often highly revealing of the nature and scope of the thinking that lies behind them" (p. 8). Similarly, students' understandings of citizenship along with the multiple locations and identities that they bring with them into the classroom impact how global citizenship is constructed within schools.

Important to this discussion is what Pike (2000) calls "the problem of meaning" (p. 64). Pike (2000) maintains, "the search for meaning is a recurrent theme in global education research and writing" (p. 64). There is great debate in the literature between defining what global citizenship is, on one hand, and what global citizenship produces on the other. For instance, Pike asserts "the meaning of global education is derived in part from its practice, not just from theoretical understanding alone" (p. 64), therefore critical attention must be paid to the ways global citizenship education takes shape within the classroom. Since meaning shapes practice (Pike, 2000), an interrogation of the underlying beliefs of global citizenship education in concert with an analysis of the ways these beliefs impact students and teachers global citizenship constructions is necessary. On the topic of meaning, Myers (2010) has characterized global citizenship as a personal, moral affiliation. Thus, an understanding of global citizenship as constructed might enrich our understandings in this globalized and globalizing era by highlighting the importance for educators and students to create their own definitions and conceptualizations of global citizenship education: conceptualizations that meet their own localized needs that are not dictated by a 'cookie cutter' approach.

The evolving discussions of the diverse definition(s) and conceptual framework(s) for global citizenship education are further impacted by the notion that the construct itself can be

seen as 'virtual,' as described in the following section.

Global citizenship: Virtual reality? A common critique in the literature regarding global citizenship is that the construct itself is too 'virtual.' Pike (2008) states national citizenship, though imperfect, persists due to the formal civil structures that are in place to maintain it, as opposed to global citizenship whose "essence depends upon the collective participation of citizens worldwide to give substance to an otherwise unrealizable goal" (p. 232). Similarly, Pike (2008) says people may not be culturally ready to think and act authentically as global citizens if we do not "feel the realities of our [global] interdependence" (p. 227). Mitchell and Parker (2008) echo this critique, stating, "local, thick, warm commitments [of national citizenship] naturally and inevitably trump the thin, cool idealism of a far-away utopian ideal [of global citizenship]" (p. 783). Myers (2010) contends that although global citizenship is theoretically supported in the literature and scholarship, it has been labelled a weak affiliation at best. According to critics, the lack of formal status for global citizenship in the political community trumps the moral, ethical affiliations granted to it by individual social actors, and thus it lacks a solid foundation (Myers, 2010, p. 487).

Yet in many ways people are acting as self-proclaimed global citizens in the world and, according to Myers (2010), people are attracted to the constructed, 'virtual' nature of global citizenship. Globalization has indeed complicated what it means to be and act as a citizen in the world (Richardson & Abbott, 2009) and social actors are mirroring this shift. According to Myers (2010) citizenship and citizenship roles have been transforming due to globalization in a number of ways, including "the emergence of a broader range of affiliations and practices, which are primarily moral in character rather than tied to legal status" (p. 485). Similarly, the multiple processes of globalization have contributed to understandings of citizenship as flexible and multiple, accounting for the fact that citizenship(s) are "exercised in a transnational political community" (p. 485).

The role of the nation-state as the sole arena for citizenship granting and enactment is

also diminishing. Conway (2004) maintains that the expansion of citizenship beyond the traditional bounds of the nation-state is due, in part, to "intensifying transnational economic and cultural flows and the expanding reach of international human rights norms" (p. 368). Sassen (as cited in Myers & Zaman, 2009) contends:

> Globalization makes legible the extent to which citizenship, which we experience as some sort of unitary condition, is actually made up of a bundle of conditions. Some of them are far less connected to the national state than the formal bundle of rights at the heart of the institution of citizenship. There are citizenship practices, citizenship identities, and locations for citizenship that are not as inevitably articulated with the national state as is the formal bundle of rights. (p. 2591)

Indeed, the fact that "global citizenship transcends the artificiality of national boundaries" (Davies, 2006, p. 7) and offers spaces for possibility in a world characterized by transnational issues is particularly important for a globalizing world. Consider for instance the important impacts that globalization has on identity. Local, regional, and global processes and influences continually shape our identities in this globalized era (Daniel, 2007). According to Pike (2000), "a person's identity and citizenship is no longer framed within the boundaries of one nation but shaped within a plethora of influences that emanate from multiple points in the global system (p. 71). Similarly, Mitchell and Parker (2008) maintain the movement of globalization has contributed to "a pluralization of orientations and a multiplication of subject positions" (p. 779). They state, "contemporary subjects are constituted and transformed *though* these flexible, often contradictory positions and relations and must negotiate conflicting calls to allegiance on a frequent basis" (p. 779). For Mitchell and Parker, "these processes have led … to an increased spatial and temporal flexibility of multiple allegiances rather than an essentially static … affinity" (p. 779). Thus, one danger of static conceptualizations of identity and citizenship is that they are dislocated from actual existing realities of people in a globalizing world, and they threaten to disregard important contextual variables that may lead to essentialism, misrepresentation or

misrecognition.

In their research on youth and citizenship, Mitchell and Parker (2008) found that youth "are especially open to movement across and between the direct, immediate, and embodied to the abstract and distant; [they] already imagine and produce the spaces of the world at multiple, flexible, and often interchangeable scales" (p. 780). Davies (2006) found that youth are "more drawn to global citizenship than are adults" (p. 14). She quotes the Times Educational Supplement, which states, "perhaps the younger generation know instinctively what to choose to be a global citizen, because that is what they are" (p. 14). According to Myers (2010), adolescents hold multiple affiliations and understand citizenship as "extending beyond the traditional national narrative of legal status and exclusive membership" (p. 487). Thus, youth construct global citizenship through moral understandings that give it meaning, as opposed to through a granted legal status (Myers, 2010).

Global citizenship: Constructed. Because global citizenship as a construct has been characterized as a broad, moral, and ethical affiliation (Myers, 2010; Mitchell & Parker, 2008) that is realized through the agency of individual actors, the constructed nature of citizenship(s) is particularly notable in a globalized milieu (Myers, 2010, p. 485). The evolving nature of citizenship(s) outlined in the literature, along with the view that youth are 'inherently global' in outlook, has particular salience for the area of global citizenship education. Thus, the notion of citizenship as a constructed and social process is a recent trend that moves conceptualizations of citizenship beyond the static (Conway, 2004; Myers, 2010). Indeed, the process of citizenship construction, according to Conway (2004), is "constituted by discourses and practices through which people and groups become political subjects" (p. 369). Within the realm of empirical research, Myers (2010) maintains a "key shift in citizenship studies has been toward the recognition of citizenship as a personal and flexible construction" (p. 484). Conway (2004) echoes this, stating, "many theorists argue for a shift in focus from legal-institutional to cultural practices in order to perceive how citizenship is being transformed" (p. 369). The notion of

'constructed citizenship(s)' is especially important for global citizenship, "which in lacking an institutional status does not have a master narrative or 'scripted' definition that would give it shape and meaning" (Myers, 2010, p. 484). By paying attention to the constructed nature of citizenship, space is opened up for exploring the dialectical relationship between global citizenship, agency, and globalization within global citizenship education. For instance, Shultz (2011) maintains the many locations and discourses global citizenship represents is "an indication of an authentic and extensive engagement within the public sphere that results in multiple theoretical and practical extensions" (p. 14). Thus, the notion of constructed global citizenship opens up the possibility for global citizenship education to inculcate new forms of anti-hegemonic citizenship "where citizenship claims and exchanges are moved outside the exclusive enclaves of the elite" (p. 14) and socially just aims might be promoted.

Eduscape. Particularly fruitful to this discussion around global citizenship is the concept of 'eduscape' as offered by Abdi and Naseem (2008), Beck, Ilieva, Scholefield, & Waterstone (2007), and Kynaslahti (1998). The concept of eduscape stems from Appadurai's (1996) conceptualization of 'scapes,' which offer "a radical new framework for examining cultural dimensions of globalization" (Oonk, 2000, p. 158). According to Appadurai, "the suffix *–scape* allows us to point to the fluid, irregular shapes of [global cultural] landscapes … [and] also indicate[s] that these are not objectively given relations … but, rather, that they are deeply perspectival constructs inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors" (p. 33). Indeed, global scapes represent unbound spaces free of the confines of geography and physical reality and offer "a fruitful perspective to investigate a variety of phenomena which link people from different localities, cultures and nations together" (Kynaslahti, 1998, p. 154).

Eduscapes, according to Abdi and Naseem (2008), are spaces that "can ascertain the global as well as local realities" (p. 102) as they are not characterized by physicality or geography, but by a matrix of social linkages and flows between people. Thus, eduscapes are a

product of a multitude of global-local linkages that create a deterritorialized educational condition. Deterritorialization, according to Tomlinson (1999), points to a "complex and ambivalent cultural condition" (p. 108) and describes a "life which, as a result of the various forces of global modernity, is 'lifted off' its connection with locality" (p. 137). Eduscapes, therefore, have the potential to transform traditional territorialized learning processes "that are located within the boundaries of the nation-state society to a situation that is less compact and basically translocal" (Abdi & Naseem, 2008, p. 102). Abdi & Naseem define the "glocalized eduscape as complex relations of knowledge production and consumption that are complementary and contradictory at the same time" (p. 103). This conceptualization compliments the constructed, multi-dimensional and fluid nature of citizenship in our globalized milieu; the notion of eduscape may accommodate more multidimensional, complex, and nuanced understandings of global citizenship and global citizenship actions that complicate the local/global and national/global binaries.

What is active global citizenship in a global age? If global citizenship is indeed constructed, and since global citizenship education calls for active and engaged citizens (Couture, 2009; Pike, 2000; Shultz, 2007), what do these active global citizen constructions look like? Myers (2010) asserts, "in an era of globalization, the meanings of [active] citizenship … have increasingly come under scrutiny" (p. 483). Similarly, Pike (2000) maintains there has been an increase "in teacher and school-based initiatives to increase students' understanding of, and participation in, … systems [of globalization]," (p. 70) yet stresses that these initiatives are greatly shaped by educators' own perceptions of the impacts and scope of globalization itself. Directly stemming from this notion, Andreotti (2011) maintains that "different agendas and theoretical frameworks … construct different meanings to the phrase 'global citizenship education'" (p. 140) and therefore global citizenship initiatives manifest differently as a direct result of these different agendas. Importantly, Shultz (2011) maintains "the multiple discourses that lay claim to the label of "global citizenship" reflect particular orientations to issues of power,

justice, difference and diversity, international and intercultural relations, as well as suggesting what would be considered good citizenship in a globalized context" (p. 20). These multiple discourses ultimately affect individual constructions of global citizenship.

In addition, schools are presented "with a real … responsibility to exploit students' interests and concerns and to channel their enthusiasms into practical action projects that can be seen to make a difference" (Pike, 2008, p. 232). Yet Pike warns that many times "schools' attempts at encouraging active participation among students, and thereby refining the necessary skills of global citizenship, are often more tokenistic than meaningful" (p. 233). Indeed, Davies (2006) cautions about this, stating:

> Active local and global citizenship is a vexed structural issue for schools, when so little economy is allowed in learning. It is possible that the charitable, welfare side of active citizenship, the fundraising for poor countries, does reach more people than representative democracy in the school. (p. 17)

Similarly, global citizenship 'action projects' are often viewed as peripheral add-ons to the curriculum and therefore do not receive wide implementation support. Unfortunately, Pike (2008) maintains, these projects are where real learning takes place for many students, "where their interests and skills come together in a way that provides a meaningful and lasting experience" (p. 233). Global citizenship education aligned with socially just aims is crucial for minimizing such tokenistic and surface-level engagements. The following sections address some of the significant barriers to socially just global citizenship as they are outlined in the literature.

Binaric thinking and binariality. Pike (2008) maintains there is a great tension between the 'prevailing legend' currently shaping dominant ideology, which is characterized by a history of colonialism and free market capitalism, and the aims of education for global citizenship (p. 226). This legend, according to Pike, denies the realities of poverty and omits the responsibility of the global North in global issues. Yet, any revisions to this legend may serve to disrupt the comfortable positions of privilege and power of the dominant classes, and are

therefore met with opposition in the form of indifference, apathy, and denial. Crucial to the maintenance of this prevailing legend are deeply embedded binaric categories, stemming from historical colonialism. Abdi (2008) maintains that one of the barriers to creating liberating global citizenship education programs is "their continuing adherence to the philosophical, ideological, and understandings of Western global division" (p. 75). For instance, the most problematic and prevalent ideological construction that has sprung from the Western tradition is the binaric thinking that permeates Eurocentric culture, characterized by an 'Us and Them' mentality. Willinsky (1998) addresses the constructed nature of the West's 'superior' positioning within this West and the Rest binary stating, "the globalization of Western understanding was always about a relative positioning of the West by a set of coordinates defined by race, culture, and nation" (p. 253). Indeed, Abdi (2008) maintains that the logic of binaric thinking affirms and maintains "the continuing subjugation of billions of people who may be catagorized as lesser beings than those in the more endowed zones of the globe" (p. 75). These issues contribute to a condition of binariality (i.e., a reality that is dictated by an unquestioned set of binary oppositions) that permeates and influences the way in which people think and act.

Binary oppositions are relations imbued with meaning and power and represent one way in which neo-colonial relations of dominance are reinforced. As Giroux (1992) contests, binary relations typically erase issues of complexity and difference (p. 23). Binary oppositions and their discreet bounded nature obscure an understanding of "the Other as multiple complex subjects who both reproduce and refuse the systems of domination" (p. 24). They do not "acknowledge the multiple rather than monolithic forms of power exercised through various institutions and diverse forms of representation" (p. 24). Spivak (as cited in Giroux, 1992) also warns, "there are few attempts to call into question the binary opposition of colonizer/colonized (in its many expressions) in order to examine the heterogeneity of 'colonized power' and to disclose the complicity of the two poles of that opposition as it constitutes the disciplinary enclave of the critique of imperialism" (p. 24). Giroux critiques the logic of binary oppositions within the realm

of global citizenship education. He offers caution to global citizenship education initiatives stating:

> [They may fall] into the trap of simply reversing the old colonial legacy and problematic of oppressed vs. oppressor. In doing so, they [may] unwittingly imitat[e] the colonial model of erasing the complexity, complicity, diverse agents, and multiple situations that constitute the enclaves of colonial/hegemonic discourse and practice. (p. 20)

Binary oppositions considered in this broad context become relevant considerations when examining global citizenship education.

Popkewitz (1980) offers an example of how global education might perpetuate relations of dominance based on binary oppositions and contribute to a condition of binariality. The common discourse of manifest destiny, defined as "the belief that the cultural and economic developments in the United States and Europe are naturally superior and provide the norm by which other societies are judged as being 'developed,'" (p. 309) may problematically reinforce essentialized dichotomies and binaries. Embedded within the discourse of manifest destiny is the binary opposition of developed/developing, and it is through a number of distinctions and classifications that differences might be "categorized to impute moral, political, and economic superiority" and inferiority (p. 309). For instance, global citizenship education has the potential to perpetuate binary relations of superiority by classifying nations as either democratic or totalitarian, economic systems as either modern or traditional, or people as developed or undeveloped based on a Western scale of progress. These simplistic and over-generalized "dichotomies direct one to think about differences as we/them, and good/poor" (p. 309) therefore reinforcing problematic colonial relations.

Eurocentric global citizenship. Andreotti (2011) offers the following critiques of global citizenship initiatives based on her research involving three separate case studies. She found:

> [Although] north-south school partnerships … have the potential to provide an exciting and highly motivating opportunity to enable learners to engage productively with

> complex and interdependent processes that shape global/local contexts, identities and struggles for justice … they can also reinforce stereotypes, promote a patronizing attitude towards the South and alienate students further in relation to global issues and perspectives. (p. 145-146)

Andreotti continues, stating, "many … educational practices inadvertently result in uncritical approaches to global citizenship education where essentialistic, ethnocentric, Eurocentric and imperialistic assumptions are reproduced and not problematized" (p. 140). These uncritical approaches are fuelled in part by imperialist and neoliberal discourses that serve to reify the nation and commodify difference respectively, and by the constructed condition of binariality suggested above. For instance, Richardson and Abbott (2009) maintain that global citizenship education has encouraged students to "separate … West from non-West" (p. 381); it has "reinforce[d] the inherent 'rightness' and superiority of the democratic, capitalist system" (p. 382); it has "erase[d] cultural difference, devalue[d] non-Western cultures, [and] privilege[d] Western ways of knowing" (p. 384). Global citizenship education has also been charged with evolving "from an overwhelmingly Western point of view that privilege[s] reason, transparency and universalism" (p. 385). These imperialistic assumptions are reinforced by uncritical understandings of globalization and global relations. For instance, Roman (2003) critiques discourses of global citizenship education since they "[do] not attend to… the powerful economic inequalities and political and cultural differences that structure and form the conditions, processes, and effects of globalization" (p. 279). Therefore, according to Andreotti (2011) "a more critical and ethical approach to global citizenship education [that starts] from an engagement with the social-historical construction of inequalities in both material and discursive terms and, most importantly, one's own locus of enunciation" (p. 154) is needed.

Reification of the nation. Tensions lie between the discourses of national citizenship and global citizenship in education and particularly within global citizenship education (Richardson & Abbott, 2009; Pike, 2000). Richardson and Abbott maintain that although global citizenship

initiatives "expand the confines of citizenship … [and] better prepare students to understand and address the challenges and possibilities of globalization, … significant ideological tensions exist between global citizenship and national citizenship" within educational discourses (p. 377). First of all, according to Myers (2010), "national citizenship is at the top of an unwritten hierarchy of citizenship. Global citizenship affiliation is considered to be less significant for education because it is not part of the dominant view that equates citizenship with legal status" (p. 486). According to Richardson and Abbott (2009), "global citizenship education has always been a part of social studies in Canada, but for much of the 20th century learning about the world and Canada's civic role in global affairs was primarily a function of the development of nationalism and national pride" (p. 381).

Although the nation is itself a socially constructed category, over time the nation and national citizenship have become reified or concretized social identities wherein the constructed relationship between people and their citizenship have become social facts that describe 'inherent traits' of the individual. Thus, through the reification of the nation, Richardson and Abbott (2009) assert that although "global citizenship education has become less overtly Eurocentric and racist over time," (p. 379) it can retain imperial undertones. For instance, as Richardson and Abbott note, within global citizenship education students often enact their citizenship responsibilities and roles as citizens of Canada as opposed to citizens of the globe. This legitimates the role of the nation-state as a mediating structure in resolving transnational global issues such as "international conflict, environmental degradation or the protection of human rights" (p. 288). Yet the nation-state has been a vehicle of injustice in the past, and continually works to disenfranchise certain groups in different contexts. Indeed, according to Fraser (2009), as global issues continue to traverse borders and boundaries, the frame of the nation state as a vehicle for addressing these issues needs to be reconsidered.

Voyeurism. Roman (2003) argues that globalization and global citizenship education has promoted forms of "intellectual tourism" in the classroom that involve "virtual encounters in

cyberspace … with unfamiliar people, places and cultures" (p. 272). The rhetoric surrounding these encounters is "based on providing 21st-century students with the knowledge seen as necessary to deal with today's complex and increasingly communicative presumed 'global village'" (p. 272). Andreotti (2011) critiques the notion of intellectual voyeurism, stating people in 'other' places are morphed into "additional content in the school curriculum" (p. 145) and used to provide learners in the global North with rich learning experiences. Roman (2003) warns that this consumer-model obscures notions of difference, commoditizing it in the name of the 21st century knowledge economy. In addition, the learning that takes place in these situations is often unilateral, wherein foreign issues or practice are taken up without a critical analysis of issues and practices within students' own local contexts (Roman, 2003). Without critiquing Western issues, "such experiences confirm the sense of cultural (and geographical) difference between the local defined as the Western self and the global constructed as the non-Western global 'other'" (p. 274). Similarly, notions of Western superiority may be reinforced.

The following section addresses the important and inextricable relationship between global citizenship education and social justice and offers meaningful contributions from the social justice literature that address some of the abovementioned issues.

Social Justice and Global Citizenship

According to Snart (2010), social justice is a vital component for "distinguishing global citizenship from cross-cultural engagement, per se," (p. 143) and for addressing the power imbalances and ideological tensions that lead to exclusions and omissions in global citizenship education. Thus, global citizenship education for a globalizing world may be constructively conceptualized around principles of social justice (Shultz, 2011; Abdi & Shultz, 2008; Andreotti, 2011). A social justice theoretical approach offers insights into to how global citizenship education in a globalizing world is constructing practices, ideas, and actions that are not merely *global*, but *socially just*. Young (2011) and Fraser (2009) offer constructive suggestions for how

we might critically engage with our socio-historical locations, and suggest avenues for agency geared towards transforming the socially unjust nature of many of our social structures.

Structural injustice. Young (2011) contends we must acknowledge the inextricable relationship between present conditions of injustice and past injustice in order to fully understand their complexity and acknowledge their socially constructed nature. Indeed, injustices that are temporally *past* may reformulate into seemingly de-historicized relations and structures, creating a social sense of ambivalence towards these present injustices. Yet by interrogating these relationships to past injustices, such as historical colonialism, impetus is given to remedying such injustices (Young, 2011). The understanding that our positionalities and roles in social processes are in fact historical, and that the present privileges and disadvantages we experience are linked to past injustice and changeable, might fuel this impetus.

Before discussing the impact of colonialism on present systemic structural injustice, one should expand upon the concept of structural injustice itself. Social structures, according to Young (2011), are created as a result of the multiple, often uncoordinated, accumulated actions of individuals going about their daily pursuits. Social structures often appear objective and somewhat constraining since their existence cannot be traced back to any one individuals' or groups' actions. Thus, social "structures describe a set of socially caused conditions that position a large number of people in similar ways" (p. 18-19). Structural injustice, she states:

> Exists when social processes put large groups of persons under systematic threat of domination or deprivation of the means to develop and exercise their capacities, at the same time that these processes enable others to dominate or to have a wide range of opportunities for developing and exercising capacities available to them. (p. 52)

Thus, by minding their own business and following individual pursuits, people's actions "contribute to injustice … indirectly, collectively, and cumulatively through the production of structural constraints on the actions of many and privileged opportunities for some" (p. 96). Importantly, in our globalized milieu, multiple trans-border structural social processes produce

structural injustice that is sustained all over the world (p. 168). To reiterate, by concerning ourselves with historic injustice, such as colonialism, Young contends this will generate understandings of present injustice as structural (i.e., socially constructed) as opposed to static social facts. (p. 185). These understandings greatly inform our worldview, and thus inform how we engage in meaningful actions to make a difference in the world. Indeed, colonialism is an historical process and past injustice that contributes to present structural injustice by the way of neo-colonial and neoliberal discourses, and contributes to the condition of binariality mentioned above.

Imperial colonialism. Willinsky (1998) defines imperialism as "a loosely conceived historical phenomenon that covers a myriad of adventures directed at extending the domination of Europe around the globe" (p. 10). In addition:

> Imperialism afforded lessons in how to divide the world. It taught people to read the exotic, primitive, and timeless identity of the other, whether in skin color, hair texture, or the inflections of taste and tongue. Its themes of conquering, civilizing, converting, collecting, and classifying inspired educational metaphors equally concerned with taking possession of the world. (p. 13)

Thus, imperial colonialism at its height was based on an ideological trajectory of Western superiority that has served to disenfranchise populations across the globe (Abdi, 2008). Yet these historical colonial relations have not ceased; they have merely changed form. Indeed, Tikly (2004) has described our current condition as the "new imperialism," which is characterized by the spread of Western capitalism and culture, increasing economic and social inequalities between and within countries, and a shift to more subtle forms of domination through neocolonial and neoliberal discourses. Rooted in colonial relations, the current relations of globalization are hegemonic structures that perpetuate Western dominance at the expense of the populations the relations serve to disenfranchise.

Of importance is the need to recognize that the systems of globalization, and the current

global economic system in particular, are historically contingent, colonially rooted, and socially constructed structures. Indeed, Tomlinson (1999) reminds us that the capitalist "free market system is not an inevitable destiny for all economies but a contingent historical development, … a product of the recent history of the West" (p. 67). Abdi (2008) reiterates this point, stating the current practices of economic globalization are not "natural happenstances of the natural order, [and] have a lot to do with the highly eschewed and historically located hegemonic structure of the world" (p. 74).

Neoliberalism. Spawning from the exploitative capitalist relations of the present global economic structure, neoliberalism, through discourse and ideology, is a powerful mechanism for ensuring the hegemony of the West. Giroux (2004) maintains:

> With its debased belief that profit-making is the essence of democracy, and its definition of citizenship as an energized plunge into consumerism, neoliberalism eliminates government regulation of market forces, celebrates a ruthless competitive individualism, and places the commanding political, cultural, and economic institutions of society in the hands of powerful corporate interests, the privileged, and unrepentant religious bigots. (p. xvii)

Harvey (2003) echoes Giroux, and adds neoliberalism has "pervasive effects on ways of thought and political-economic practices to the point where it has become incorporated into the common-sense way we interpret, live in and understand the world" (p. 2). Indeed, Harvey maintains neoliberalism is currently the driving force behind the uneven geographical development that characterizes our globalized condition. One of the ways this unevenness is perpetuated is through the discourse of meritocracy, which suggests an individual's success is attributable to their own efforts and abilities as opposed to mediated by large, and potentially unjust, global structures. In this way, meritocracy is an imbedded assumption within the dominant Western Eurocentric norm and it works in tandem with the individualistic and entrepreneurial facets of neoliberal ideology. According to Young (2011), neoliberal, meritocratic discourse

"attempts to isolate the deviant poor and render them particularly blameworthy for their condition, which then justifies the application of paternalistic or punitive policies to them" (p. 23).

Aid and global citizenship education. Harvey (2007) expands on the relationship between neoliberal principles and the positioning of certain groups in the world. He maintains the new capitalist institutional practices of the International Financial Institutions (IFI's)[1] of the 1970's, which "provided convenient vehicles through which financial and market power could be exercised" (p. 13) did not suit the needs of all nations, and actually served to deteriorate the conditions of the lower classes in many cases. Due to the relative power of the IFI's and Western capitalist superpowers, "'rogue nations' defined as those that failed to conform to these global rules [were] dealt with by sanctions or coercive even military force if necessary," (p. 13) regardless of the social and economic devastation wreaked on vulnerable populations. This way, according to Harvey, neoliberal strategies were, and are presently, "articulated through a global network of power relations" (p. 13).

Similarly, this global positioning of nations and people is fuelled by the manifest destiny discourse (i.e., superiority of the West's economic and cultural development), as well as by the notions of linear causality and meritocracy. According to Popkewitz (1980) the relationships established in the linear causality model between events often follow a "linear progression and in a hierarchical order, such as from primitive to modern, or from the introduction of some variable that is additive to the growth of society, such as … industry or agriculture" (p. 310). This notion is illustrated in the ways in which Indigenous cultures and people have been labelled as 'traditional' and 'historical' as compared to the 'modern' and 'industrialized' West. Similarly, the discourses of meritocracy place the outcome of success onto the shoulders of the individual, attributing success to individual effort. In actuality, meritocracy supports privileged individuals

[1] International Financial Institutions include the Bretton Woods Institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Regional Development Banks such as the African Development Bank (AFDB), and other bilateral and regional financial institutions.

due to the cultural and social capital such groups hold (Bourdieu, 1974). For instance, students from dominant cultures have an advantage over students from minority cultures in many ways, for example on standardized exams since these exams have largely been normed on, and are therefore biased towards favouring, dominant cultural norms, knowledges and expectations (Ladson-Billings, 2004). These exams are then used to allow some to access more benefits within society and hold others back. Indeed, the competition model of neoliberal meritocracy is not based on any objective norms, but upon norms steeped in the dominant culture (Ladson-Billings, 2004).

Meritocracy and the notions of manifest destiny and linear causality produce real, socially sanctioned inequalities, which in turn become learned 'facts' in schools and embedded within the structures of society. For instance, in a society driven by neoliberal discourse and meritocracy the failure of minority students is attributed to their own lack of knowledge or effort, and this becomes part of the tacit knowledge picked up throughout our educational experiences.

Along the same lines, Andreotti (2011) emphasizes that discursive inequality can occur within global citizenship discourses when one's home culture and way of life is assumed to be superior (i.e., culturalism). Interestingly, culturalism is a trait shared by many cultures; it is not an inherently Western trait. Yet the relative power and privilege of the West unproblematically promotes its position of superiority. Similarly, building on this notion of linear causality, Andreotti maintains the "notion of seamless progress and the projection of Western ontologies as universal problematically triggers a 'civilising mission' of the 'global north' to educate, enlighten and save the South from 'ignorance' and self-generated poverty" (p. 153). Additionally, the linear causality model promotes simplistic 'add and stir' models that, according to Case (1993), disregard global complexities and the power-imbued nature of global relations. Case offers the example of producing more food to stop world hunger: this simplistic, linear 'solution' ignores the intricate and complex nature of global poverty reduction. Indeed, as Easterly (2006) asserts, the chronic failings of Western aid to actually do what it says it is going to is partly due to the

West's conviction that it is their 'burden' to help less fortunate nation-states, and aggravated by and add and stir approach driven by the narrow interests and short-sighted plans of the West. The main cause of aid's failure, Easterly claims, is lack of inclusion of the interests and needs of disenfranchised populations. Clearly, the simple add and stir approach championed by linear causality "eliminates from consideration the contradictions, tensions, and resistances that occur in social life" (Popkewitz, 1980, p. 310). Ultimately, the discourses promulgated by these neocolonial and neoliberal assumptions dangerously maintain that due to a lack of attributes compared to the West, some countries and people are ill equipped for success, underdeveloped, and 'less-fortunate,' and therefore must be challenged within global citizenship education.

Market citizenship. Neoliberal discourses have significant impacts on global citizenship education. According to Apple (2001), neoliberal discourses shape "what counts as a good society and a responsible citizen" (p. 414), and this has sparked a significant conflation of meaning between education for global citizenship and education for competition in the global market place. Recently, Richardson and Abbott (2009) maintain global citizenship education has been tied to "neoliberal constructs of the 'world as a market,'" (p. 384) yet ideological tensions exist between the goals of global citizenship education and the neoliberal economic policies that govern the globe and influence education policy. They maintain, "a radical disjunction between developing world-mindedness on one hand and preparing students to compete in the global economy on the other certainly supports the idea that global citizenship education continues to struggle between two competing ideologies" (p. 385).

In the same way, neoliberalism affects what kinds of citizenship(s) are valued (Giroux, 2004; Shultz 2007). The narrow conceptualizations of citizenship offered by neoliberalism have serious implications for global citizenship education. Shultz (2007) maintains if "[t]he key aim of global citizenship education efforts [driven by neoliberal policy] is to increase transnational mobility of knowledge and skills [then] [g]lobal citizenship … is primarily linked to global economic participation" (p. 252). This is dangerous, since "without attention to issues of power

and access, [neoliberal] global citizens will assume that their position of privilege is a natural position and a sign of success … [disregarding] any need for structural change" (p. 252). Similarly, the citizen-as-consumer neoliberal model implied by neoliberal discourses has implications for how students engage with the notion of difference. According to Roman (2003), students and teachers are framed as consumers of international and national difference and become "differentially entitled citizen-consumers in a global marketplace in which cultural practices are mere commodities" (p. 276). Roman cautions that as difference becomes commoditized in the "free" knowledge economy, "learners and educators are taught that cultural practices are turned into gendered, racialized, classist, ablest, and nationalistic notions of "difference" to be played up or down, depending on the warnings for particular forms of cultural capital" (p. 277). In addition, the difference-as-commodity model eschews any possibility for authentic engagement with difference as it essentializes certain identities, places and cultural practices.

Agency, reification and globalization. Agency is an important facet of socially just global citizenship. Yet the sheer magnitude and breadth of global issues and 'wrongs' in the world can prove to be very daunting (and in some cases immobilizing) for those engaged in global citizenship education. This is unfortunate, since Richardson and Abbott (2009) state engaging with globalization and injustice require "a sense of agency and a disposition to act that can only emerge from an understanding that students are fully implicated in the challenges globalization presents" (p. 386). In part due to the individualized understanding of social relations proliferated by neoliberal discourse (Giroux, 2004) and the diminishing ideals of the welfare state (Fraser, 2009; Giroux, 2004; Young, 2011), many people are losing a sense of collective participation within, and hence responsibility for, social structures and their concurrent effects. Indeed, Young (2011) maintains, "we passively regard the complex workings of our society as like natural forces whose effects are fortunate for some, unfortunate for others, but not a matter of justice for which we should take collective responsibility" (p. 40). Yet this reification of social

processes prevents social actors from implicating themselves within social structures or processes that are unjust, and further mystifies the important relationship between historic injustice and present social injustice. Reification, according to Young (2011), involves "actors' treating products of human action in particular social relations as thought they are things or natural forces … [and as] objective facts we must deal with" (p. 154). These include, but are not limited to, market forces, globalization, and structural injustices such as poverty. Thus, social facts are rendered as things independent of human agency (Young, 2011), the so-called 'naturalness' of the current global condition is reinforced, and possibilities for minimizing injustice are lessened.

Lunga (2008) critiques conceptualizations of globalization that frame it as a reified, natural, ahistorical phenomenon. She says:

> [These concepts are] problematic because [they have] a homogenizing effect, and by naturalizing and universalizing globalization, these definitions succeed in concealing the trajectories of uneven distribution of resources and exploitation by the poor by the more powerful nations. (p. 196-197)

In a related way, many authors critique the uncritical use of the word 'interconnectedness' within the realm of global citizenship education. As Case (1993) suggests, uncritical use of the terms 'interconnected' and 'interdependence' oversimplifies the complexities of global relations. Whereas the notion of manifest destiny reinforces the power and superiority of the West and classifies the world's people within the oversimplified developed or developing binary, the term 'interconnectedness' masks real issues of power, dependency and access. Case states "interdependence connotes a sense of reciprocity or mutual dependency which is potentially misleading because many global interconnections reflect grossly unequal dependencies" (p. 322). Thus, Roman (2003) asserts that it is critically important for "educators and students … to pay historical attention to the uneven, contradictory, and often conflicting interests of power in the social relations that defin[e] the stakes in and boundaries of belonging to particular communities" (p. 283).

Neoliberalism and diverse conceptualizations of globalization have significant implications for how people enact their global citizenship (Shultz, 2007). Shultz states, "the neoliberal global citizen learns to expect unrestricted access to the rewards of a liberal global economic system" (p. 256). This is based on an unproblematic understanding of globalization as a network of systems dedicated to the fast-paced life of knowledge sharing, economic trade, and a specific definition of "success." This understanding is based on what Roman (2003) calls the dominant conception of "globalization from 'above' [which] emphasize[s] discourses of national and global competitiveness, efficiency, consumption, and productive citizenship" (p. 269). On the other hand, the transformationalist global citizen "understands his or her role as one of building relationships through embracing diversity and finding shared purpose across national boundaries [with the main goal of] joining together to create social justice" (Shultz, 2007, p. 255). Globalization in this case is conceptualized as "highly uneven" and it "has resulted in a complex and dynamic sets of international, national, and local relationships that has created new patterns of inclusion and exclusion" (p. 253-254). Thus different discourses of neoliberalism and globalization within global citizenship education play an important role in shaping how global citizenship is constructed.

Both Lunga (2008) and Roman (2003) stress that globalization must be considered as a politicized, socially constructed entity that is inherently uneven in its effects, and cannot be disconnected from issues of power. Thus, it is important to recognize that people are unequally positioned within the relations of globalization based on the interaction between their multiple positionalities (based on racialization, class and gender) and the culturally and socio-economically dominant group/structures. As was mentioned above, unequal positionings of people in relation to the structures of globalization are symptomatic of historical colonialism, which has shaped present structural injustices that maintain racialized, Eurocentric neocolonial exclusions. Indeed, according to Massey (1994) globalization is a complex process involving an "ever-shifting geometry of social/power relations" (p. 4) that are inherently uneven in scope and

impact, and without a systematic interrogation of the root causes of the injustices imbedded within the structures and relations of globalization or an understanding of our social positions in relation to these structures, these injustices may be conflated with understandings of globalization as innate and unstoppable and thus promote ambivalence as opposed to the will to act.

Responsibility and Citizenship

Both Young (2011) and Fraser (2009) re-conceptualize the notion of responsibility for a globalizing world, and thus offer insights into how we might conceptualize the responsibilities and actions of global citizens. Regarding our responsibility to structural injustice Young (2011) maintains, "if we contribute … to the processes that produce structural injustice, we are responsible in relation to that injustice" (p. 107). Thus, social actors are intricately connected due to our actions in relation to one another and are responsible to one another for the relative privileges and oppressions social structures produce. Yet typically, understandings of responsibility to others have been bound within the nation-state and limited to national citizenship identities. Fraser (2009), elucidating the exclusionary, hegemonic nature of the nation-state, states many consider the "Keynesian-Westphalian frame … to be a major vehicle of injustice, as it partitions political space in ways that block many who are poor and despised from challenging the forces that oppress them" (p. 20). Thus, Fraser maintains using "territoriality as the sole basis for assigning obligations of justice, given patently trans-territorial problems such as global warming," (p. 5) is highly problematic and serves to negate peoples' legitimate claims to issues of social justice. Similarly, an adherence to bounded nation identities promotes bounded notions of citizenship, belonging, and responsibility. Young (2011) also contends obligations of justice must not "be restricted to members of the same nation-state. Some structural social processes are global in scope and condition the lives of many people within diverse nation-state jurisdictions" (p. 125). Fraser's (2009) reconceptualization promotes postwestphalian notions of citizenship that are fluid, formed at multiple levels and scales, and promote multiple avenues for collective action and agency. Indeed, according to Young (2011), "ontologically and morally, … social connection is

prior to political institutions" (p. 139) including the nation-state, therefore the notion of responsibility must also be reconceptualized using a postwestphalian frame.

Recognizing that many structural processes extend transnationally, Young (2011) maintains "responsibility in relation to injustice … derives not from living under a common constitution, but rather from participating in the diverse institutional processes that produce structural injustice" (p. 105). Fraser (2009) extends this notion by describing how global issues might be addressed in a postwestphalian world. She proposes the 'all affected principle:'

> This principle holds that all those affected by a given social structure or institution have moral standing as subjects of justice in relation to it. On this view, what turns a collection of people into fellow subjects of justice is not geographical proximity, but their co-imbrication in a common structural or institutional framework, which sets the ground rules that govern their social interaction, thereby shaping their respective life possibilities in patterns of advantage and disadvantage. (p. 24)

The notion of 'political responsibility' describes how we can conceptualize justice and our actions beyond the nation-state, and offers a fruitful frame for global citizenship education. Both Fraser (2009) and Young (2011) touch on the notion of political responsibility, which entails being conscious of and acting to minimize the injustice that is a product of the social structures in which we are a part. Thus, by exercising political responsibility, we recognize the collective nature of social relations and work to reorganize our collective relationships towards socially just aims. Political responsibility also includes exposing the fissures within social structures that maintain injustice, and holding accountable those who benefit from these injustices. Social actors are responsible for injustice on the grounds that they "participate in the structural processes that have unjust outcomes" (Young, 2011, p. 110). Indeed, Young asserts the need to exercise our political responsibility "is largely unavoidable in the modern world, because we participate in and usually benefit from the operation of these institutions" (p. 92). In essence, the need to exercise political responsibility is imperative in this era of globalization.

Political responsibility and agency. According to Pike (2008), "an understanding of the link between local action and global change is critical to actualizing the full potential of global citizenship" (p. 232). This link is crucial for global citizenship education since it links individual agency to greater notions of global, and hence political, responsibility. Equally important, according to Pike (2008), is awareness that non-action also impacts the global system by way of perpetuating the status quo (p. 230). Pike (2008) stresses the importance of "a conviction that the actions of individuals, working in harmony, do make a difference, even at the global level" (p. 230). This conviction, however, is challenged by a number of factors. For instance, Young (2011) contends often people have difficulty "linking individual consciousness to macro-social processes" (p. 170). Similarly, social actors may legitimately feel constrained by the same social structures that they wish to change. In addition, Shultz (2011) maintains "[n]eoliberalism … has produced a disengaged and distracted citizen whose relationship to the public sphere is both passive and obedient; shaped by the values of the market and committed more to market success than the public good" (p. 21). As mentioned above, this disengagement contributes to reified understandings of social structures wherein people treat them as given and beyond their control to change. Thus, individuals are less likely to realize and take ownership of their role within unjust social structures.

Part of realizing our agency and collective responsibility involves realizing that we are all positioned within social, economic and political relations of society as opposed to outside them. Therefore we must reject reified understandings of social structures and pay attention to how our socio-historic positions interact with these structures and the people that participate in them. This recognition includes analyzing our relative privilege and power (or lack thereof), and understanding that we have "certain responsibilities by virtue of their social roles or positions" (Young, 2011, p. 104). Indeed, Young contends:

> Persons and institutions that are relatively privileged within structural processes have greater responsibilities than others to take actions to undermine injustice. … Their being

> privileged usually means, moreover, that they are able to change their habits to make extra efforts without suffering serious deprivation. (p. 145)

Those who are victims of injustice also have important roles in dismantling unjust structures, which include naming the injustice that is afflicted onto them and working with others to propose purposeful solutions to remedy injustice. Young (2011) cautions that well-meaning outsiders can actually cause more damage by inflicting irrelevant solutions upon disenfranchised groups. Therefore it is important for all those who contribute to unjust social structures to exercise their responsibility in this globalizing age.

Even when a sense of agency and implication is realized, certain types of actions aimed at bettering the world (e.g., the tokenistic, charity-based 'add on' global citizenship projects mentioned above) may detract from socially just aims. Fraser (1997) differentiates between two different approaches for remedying injustice, namely the affirmative approach and the transformative approach. Fraser maintains affirmative approaches aim "at correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements without disturbing the underlying framework that generates them … [while transformative remedies] correct inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the underlying generative framework" (p. 23). Fraser critiques affirmative remedies, stating they leave intact the deep societal structures that maintain racial, economic, cultural and political inequality, thus merely 'scratching the surface' of injustice. Indeed affirmative remedies serve to reinscribe and promote injustice by stigmatizing certain groups through processes of misrecognition and misrepresentation. By describing the relationship between affirmative redistribution, recognition and racial inequality, Fraser critiques affirmative remedies further:

> Affirmative redistribution to redress racial injustice in the economy includes affirmative action, the effort to assure people of color their fair share of existing jobs and educational places. Affirmative recognition to redress racial injustice in the culture includes cultural nationalism, the effort to assure people of color respect by revaluing "blackness," while leaving unchanged the binary black-white code that gives the latter its sense. …

> Affirmative redistribution here fails to engage at the deep level at which the political economy is racialized. … Leaving intact the deep structures that generate racial disadvantage, it must make surface reallocations again and again. The result is not only underline racial differentiation; it is also to mark people of color as deficient and insatiable, as always needing more and more. (p. 30)

Affirmative remedies promoted within global citizenship education that follow the logic outlined by Fraser (1997) therefore have the potential to reinforce negative stereotypes and misrepresent entire groups of people. Transformative remedies, on the other hand, truly work towards realizing social justice; they deconstruct racialized, gendered, and classed dichotomies, and replace them with "networks of multiple, intersecting differences that are demassified and shifting" (Fraser, 1997). These transformative remedies are also preventative as opposed to surface-level and interventative, according to Young (2011), as they restructure institutions and relationships as opposed to merely addressing the symptoms of injustice. Thus, as Young (2011) asserts, the political responsibility that we hold as social actors engaged in common social structures must include acting together to transform the institutions that perpetuate injustice. Young (2011) outlines her 'social connection model' which, (similar to Fraser's (2009) all affected principle), outlines the responsibility that social actors have for one another by virtue of their participation and connectedness within social structures that produce and maintain injustice. The social connection model of responsibility Young (2011) proposes says "those who participate in the production and reproduction of structural processes with unjust consequences share a responsibility to organize collective action to transform those structures" (p. 184). This model is forward-looking in that it recognizes the on going nature of structural injustice and, while understanding the relationship between historical injustice and present injustice, works towards positive social change. The social connection model, grounded in the notion of political responsibility, draws upon the notions of individual agency and collective responsibility and offers constructive possibilities for global citizenship education.

Significance of the Literature Review

It is apparent from the literature review that there are tensions surrounding the definitions, conceptual understandings, and practices of global citizenship education. Similarly, citizenship is evolving due to the processes of globalization, and global issues are increasingly trans-national in scope. Therefore it is important to study how global citizenship is constructed within school contexts through the lens of social justice. The review highlights that global citizenship education also has the potential to reinforce historic colonial relations that disenfranchise certain groups, as well as proliferate Eurocentric, essentialized assumptions about the world and its people. Global citizenship education for a globalizing world, therefore, would benefit from a critical analysis of globalization and global issues and the dominant ideologies that reinforce marginalization and exclusion.

This review addresses the need to investigate the embedded ideas and structures in global citizenship education, for example, specific global education discourses that may serve to perpetuate a condition of binariality. Embedded colonial ways of thinking attribute to this binariality within global citizenship education, which is characterized by knowledge construction confined by the us/them, West/Rest, and developed/underdeveloped binaries. Thus, the ideas and ideologies of global citizenship education must be interrogated so that we might understand how global citizenship education serves to tame or transform social structures.

As a context for considering this need for further study, social justice frameworks such as those suggested by Fraser (2009) and Young (2011) offer new spaces for conceptualizing "citizenship as a social process, constituted by discourses and practices through which people and groups become political subjects" (Conway, 2004, p. 369) by articulating the relationship between injustice and political responsibility in this globalizing era. As suggested by Fraser (2009) and Young (2011), citizenship for a globalizing era involves agency and political responsibility. Thus, making use of a social justice theoretical perspective can be particularly helpful in an examination of the impacts of global citizenship education initiatives since they

encompass common issues and goals at the intersection of globalization, citizenship, responsibility, and education.

This literature review assisted me in shaping my research questions, which include:

I. What is the relationship between global citizenship education and social justice?

II. How do teachers' and students' understandings of the world and globalization interact with their constructions of global citizenship?

III. How might global citizenship education discourses either perpetuate unjust social relations or offer spaces of possibility for social justice?

Chapter 3: Methodology

This study aims to understand the relationship between participants' global citizenship constructions and their corresponding understandings of the world and globalization, in part by analyzing particular discourses within a particular global citizenship education initiative. In order to probe this area, I analyzed the experiences and perspectives of students and teachers engaged within a specific global citizenship program using a case study approach. The methodological choices in this study are based on the ontological assumption that realities are multiple and socially constructed, therefore I chose a qualitative case study design that emphasized the participants' unique context and location. In order to explore the participants' perspectives and understandings, I used semi-structured interviews and one focus group interview. This chapter presents the methodology that frames how I will present my data and my interpretations, guided by my theoretical approach.

Methodology

This qualitative case study is based on constructivist principles. Thus, along with the ontological assumption that realities are multiple and constructed I accepted the epistemological assumption that knowledge, too, is socially constructed, and strived to recognize the "situated nature of knowledge, the partiality of all knowledge claims, [and] the indeterminacy of history" (Giroux, 1992, p. 26). I chose a qualitative approach since I yearn for understanding as opposed to generalization of findings (Golafshani, 2003).

This research also recognizes the profound relationship between participants and researcher (Mertens, 2005) and how they are bound in a knowledge creation process. Similarly, it recognizes the contested and politicized nature of global citizenship and initiatives related to global citizenship (Mertens, 2005). Due to this constructivist and interpretive framework, the methodological choices made were guided by the underlying axioms of interpretivism. For instance, this research was based on an emergent design since critical attention was paid to the multiple unfolding realities between the researcher and participants (Guba, 1981). To attend to the

study's objectives, an interpretive framework emphasizing the illumination of meanings was used (Hoshmand, 1989). This constructivist approach ensured that the subjective experiences and understandings of the participants were at the centre of inquiry (Mertens, 2005).

According to Berg (2009), a case study approach provides rich, thick description of specific phenomenon, and has the potential to generate new knowledge that may act as a catalyst for future research. Thus, this qualitative study aims to add to the growing body of knowledge regarding constructions of global citizenship in the classroom.

Case study. Schweisfurth (2006) maintains that global citizenship education, "while being global in outlook, is not global in nature," (p. 42) nor should there exist a universal 'one size fits all' approach to global citizenship initiatives in educational spaces. Global citizenship education is "a distinctly culture-bound exercise … [and it] is therefore of interest to look at its nature in specific contexts" (p. 42). Thus, a case study approach was utilized in order to illuminate meanings and complexities in context. According to Myers and Zaman (2009), "a case study approach is ideally suited to understanding the subtlety and complexity of adolescents' [and educators'] beliefs about citizenship in a global age' (p. 2602). Similarly, case studies are conducted in order to "optimize understanding … rather than generalize beyond" (Stake, 1994, p. 236). Therefore, this study pursued a qualitative case study involving a particular global citizenship initiative within a specific school context in order to investigate the local, unique meanings and constructions of global citizenship in that context.

Case selection and profile. I conducted this research at a large, diversely populated urban high school in a major city in Alberta. In fact, one of the teacher participants described Amber Rock's uniqueness by expressing that more students at the school celebrate Eid than Christmas. The school offers a number of different programs for its students related to academics, athletics, leadership and global citizenship education. My supervisor initially recommended the specific school site and after I researched its global citizenship initiatives online through their school website, I pursued the school as a research site due to the multiple opportunities (Stake,

1994) for me to engage with students and teachers regarding the area of global citizenship. My supervisor gave me the name of a teacher I could contact at the school, and I contacted him via email and invited him to consider participating in my study. The response I received from this initial contact was positive, and he agreed to act as my intermediary and assist me with acquiring respondents. Shortly after this exchange we had a meeting at the school so that I could learn more about the global citizenship education program at the school. The specific global citizenship education initiative that I chose as my focus is called The Relations Program.

The Relations Program. The Relations Program at Amber Rock High School brings together students and teachers from approximately 16 different countries throughout the school year through the medium of high-tech, conference style engagements. The Program utilizes a range of multimedia and communications technology in order to facilitate long distance, live connections orientated towards global citizenship. Students are selected for the class based on a written essay signalling their intent to be involved in The Relations Program class. The Program is growing; participants expressed that as resources increase, so too will the number of students and the magnitude of the Program itself.

The general aims of The Relations Program, according to The Relations Program course outline, include the following:

1) Students will study the world's most imminent challenges and participate in the dialogue about globalization to address these challenges.
2) Students will collaborate with other students around the world through videoconferences and propose solutions for achieving the United Nations Millennium Development Goals.
3) Students will critically analyze the feasibility of their proposed solutions.

These aims are realized through a combination of classroom work, international connections and dialogue. The outline also states that The Relations Program is modeled after the United Nation's goal of 'building a global community and understanding' since, through globalization, the world is becoming increasingly connected and interdependent.

The Relations Program has two components including 1) *Quad Connections:* individual country connections with a particular school within that country and 2) *Major Relations*: multi-country videoconferences with a number of schools representing different countries, as well as guest speakers from various government, non-governmental organizations, and/or the private sector. The Quad Connections component involves individual country connections between Amber Rock High School and another school, such as Green Field Secondary in China for example. Each connection is structured around specific tasks or projects that the students then research and prepare to share. The first connection is a 'get to know you' session that introduces each school and country. The second connection addresses the question, *What is the most pressing issue you see that your country is facing*? The third connection addresses the question *What is your vision for your country's future?* The last connection includes individual projects the students have prepared. An example of these projects is the assignment "the Same but Different," which involves students finding common ground between their two cultures while remaining conscious of their differences through research and live dialogue. The Major Relations videoconferences, on the other hand, are tied to the social studies curriculum and incorporate the Eight Millennium Development Goals (Eradicate Extreme Hunger and Poverty, Achieve Universal Primary Education, Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women, Reduce Child Mortality Rate, Improve Maternal Health, Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other Diseases, Ensure Environmental Sustainability, and Develop a Global Partnership for Development). Although 'global' in outlook, the Eight Millennium goals represent ideas and initiatives of the United Nations, the World Bank, the World Health Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and bilateral aid agencies. Notably, these goals have been critiqued for being implemented by the elite without true regard for the actual needs and realities of people who are deeply suffering (Easterly, 2006). Amber Rock High School, through The Relations Program and the dedication of Andrew (*Teacher*) in particular, has a number of global partnerships with organizations dedicated to global education and global citizenship including the United Nations.

Therefore, certain Major Relations videoconferences are based on themed virtual classroom packages (e.g., Tobacco, Environment) that these organizations offer. The conferences themselves happen at various times of the day in order to accommodate numerous time zones, and the students in The Relations Program class participate in a number of different ways including helping with the technology, presenting statements addressing the conference theme, and hosting the event itself.

In addition to the videoconferences that are held many times throughout the academic year, The Relations Program also has a course component that builds upon the conventional Social Studies curriculum and allows students the opportunity to reach beyond it. Class time is used to debrief and reflect on the videoconferences, plan and prepare for future conferences and engage with the relevant Social Studies curriculum topics. In essence, The Relations Program offers an enrichment opportunity in the area of social studies and global citizenship for a small but growing number of students at Amber Rock. In addition, the students gain, through the model of project-based learning, hands-on experience planning and promoting international videoconferences.

One of the teacher participants described The Relations Program as being an organic, democratic process. New ideas from other Amber Rock teachers or partnering schools are incorporated throughout the year. Schools are invited to participate mainly by invitation from Andrew, who connects with schools and teachers across the world through mailing lists, Google searches and international travel. High speed Internet is required for involvement, yet Amber Rock loans the necessary equipment to schools without access to video communications technology.

Data Collection

Data collection occurred in December 2010 over a three-week period. During this time I conducted six individual semi-structured interviews with two teachers and four students. I also conducted one focus group interview with three student participants, one of whom did not

participate in an individual interview. All but one interview were conducted in two classrooms related to The Relations Program and occurred immediately after the end of day bell rang. One interview with a teacher participant was held in an administrative office during mid afternoon. The semi-structured interviews ranged in length from 33 minutes to 47 minutes. The focus group was 49 minutes long.

I purposively sought to include participants engaging with The Relations Program in order to identify "information rich" (Mertens, 2005, p. 317) respondents whose knowledge and perspectives would address the research questions. The student participants came from diverse backgrounds and each held unique positions and opinions about global citizenship. It must be noted it is not the intent of this study to generalize the findings, only to offer rich and thick descriptions of the context for the reader to make judgments about the 'fittingness' of the results to other similar contexts (Guba, 1981).

Semi-structured interviews. Qualitative interviews were used in order to explore the personal and subjective expressions of participants regarding their constructions of the world and global citizenship. I used a semi-structured interview style in order to provide consistency through theme-based questions, but at the same time allow room for participants to take the interview in different directions if they so wished. This style accommodated the participants' multiple and different understandings of reality (Berg, 2009), and reflected the complex, multiple expressions of global citizenship among the participants (Couture, 2009). Thus, the semi-structured interviews used in this research involved "theme-oriented descriptions of meaning" (Hoshmand, 1989, p. 23). The interview structure allowed participants to speak freely, challenge specific interview questions, and focus on elements of global citizenship important and critical to them, while allowing me to include new probing questions when necessary.

The interview questions stemmed directly from my research questions. A copy of the Interview Guide for Student Participants may be found in Appendix C, and the Interview Guide for Teacher Participants may be found in Appendix D. During data collection, I found myself

becoming more comfortable with the interview process and was able to allow the participants to shape the interview questions early in the process. Also, upon thorough post-interview reflection, I made changes to subsequent interview questions in order to allow the questions to grow and reflect what the research participants were saying. My first interview helped to generate more questions and thus helped to guide my subsequent interviews.

Focus groups. The purpose of focus group interviews, according to Berg (2009), is to "effectively elicit [a] breadth of responses" (p. 159) at one time in a small group setting. I chose to include a focus group interview because I wanted to experience and understand how the students' constructions of global citizenship might be enriched or challenged by their peers. In terms of working with youth, Berg (2009) maintains focus group interviews facilitate informal and intimate conversations, and in that regard are "an excellent means for collecting information from … teens" (p. 159). The choice to include only students in the focus group was based on the differential power dynamics that can come into play when you involve both authority figures (e.g., teachers) and youth with little relative social power. I wanted the students to be able to speak freely and believed they would feel more able to do so among their peers. I also wanted to record the knowledge creation process between the student participants, as focus groups are "dynamic interactions … that can stimulate discussions during which one group member reacts to comments made by another" (p. 163). Similarly, I wanted to gather information on the possible tensions or discords within their group discussion.

I facilitated the focus group interviews using a moderator's guide (Berg, 2009) [Appendix E]. This guide included a statement about the rules of the focus group, a copy of the excerpts that I had the students reflect upon, and my probing questions. I included a shorter guideline for the student participants, which outlined the excerpts and focus group questions in order to increase the students' understanding and comfort.

Data Analysis

The data for this study consisted of 6 individual interview transcripts (from four student participants and two teacher participants), and one focus group transcript that involved 3 youth participants and myself. The data analysis process for this study was driven by insights gleaned from the data as opposed to a single structured procedure (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 12). The interview transcripts were thoroughly analyzed and coded into conceptual and thematic categories. Relevant literature regarding social justice theory was also analyzed, and the themes that emerged were applied to the interview data. The same process was followed for a selection of relevant global citizenship education literature. Allowing themes and categories to emerge from the interview transcripts as well as from the literature, I approached the data analysis both inductively and deductively (Berg, 2009). The overall process was cyclical in nature, involving data collection through interviews and focus groups, reflection upon the data, further data collection, and so on (B. Tye, 1990). Aligning with the ontological underpinnings of this research, this strategy ensured a spiralling rather than linear progression to the research design (Berg, 2009).

Corbin and Strauss (2008) maintain that "analysts … bring to the investigation biases, beliefs, and assumptions," (p. 80) so a challenge for me was recognizing these biases as they came up during the data analysis process. Very quickly I had to recognize my assumptions about what I thought I was going to find in the data. Slowly I realized that I needed to let the data speak for itself and allow the themes and concepts to emerge from it, as opposed to search for them. As I allowed the process to unfold, I became more aware that "sensitivity grows with exposure to data" (p. 230). From the beginning until the end of the analysis process I used memos to write conceptual and analytical notes to myself in order to capture and clarify my thoughts.

Study Trustworthiness

This study falls under the constructivist paradigm, and consequently follows different criteria for judging trustworthiness than the positivist paradigm. According to Lincoln and Guba

(1985), the terms 'credibility,' 'transferability,' 'dependability,' and 'confirmability' are appropriate for interpretive research as opposed to the more conventional terms used in the positivist paradigm, namely 'internal validity,' 'external validity,' 'reliability,' and 'objectivity.'

Credibility. Credibility refers to "establish[ing] confidence in the 'truth' of the findings" (Guba, 1981, p. 79). Multiple data collection methods were used to enhance the credibility of this study, not as a means of mutual confirmation (Berg, 2009) but as a means to deepen and enrich my investigation. Also, I used a recording device during the interviews and focus group in order to facilitate cross-validation (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2006). In order to strengthen credibility, I pretested my interview and focus group questions on my peers (Berg, 2009; Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2006). Pretesting allowed me to discuss and edit the questions to better address my research questions. Similarly, I engaged in a process of peer debriefing (Guba, 1981) with a trusted colleague, which allowed me to test my growing insights and receive constructive feedback.

All transcripts were sent to the study participants electronically and they were invited to change or add to their transcripts as they saw fit. Through this process of member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), three of the seven participants took the opportunity to enrich or clarify specific descriptions they had given in their interview.

Transferability. Transferability refers to "the degree to which the findings of a particular inquiry may have applicability in other contexts" (Guba, 1981, p. 80). In order to increase the study's transferability, I aimed to provide thick description of the case "in sufficient detail so that the reader can make good comparisons" (Stake, 1994, p. 241). I also engaged in purposive sampling of my respondents in order to "maximize the range of information uncovered" (Guba, 1981, p. 86), versus representative sampling with the purpose of generalizing findings. It must be noted that this study is not intended to offer any generalizable findings about the Alberta population, but to offer insight into the constructions of global citizenship within a

particular school setting both by highlighting positive practices and by illuminating and challenging particular elements of the initiative.

Dependability and confirmability. Dependability refers to the consistency of the study if repeated in another context, and confirmability refers to "the degree to which the findings … are a function solely of … respondents and conditions of the inquiry and not the biases, motivations, interests, perspectives, and so on of the inquirer" (Guba, 1981, p. 80). Dependability was enhanced by the use of multiple data collection methods and interview pre-testing, and the thick descriptions offered of the case and findings. Confirmability was enhanced by my own researcher reflections, as they provided opportunities for me to critically interrogate my location and the specific biases and beliefs that I bring to this study.

Ethical Considerations

This study was in compliance with the University of Alberta's regulations for conducting ethical research with human participants. As I mentioned above, I contacted my first participant via email and he subsequently acted as an intermediary who helped me gain further participants. After gaining approval from the School Board, I gave a presentation to a group of potential participants regarding my purpose and theoretical frame. Following the presentation I gave each participant an Information Letter [Appendix A] and a Consent form [Appendix B] for consideration. This allowed time for the youth participants to have their parents/guardians sign the consent forms before the interview process.

According to Berg (2009), "ensuring confidentiality is critical if the researcher expects to get truthful and free-flowing discussions" (p. 181). Confidentiality was enhanced by the use of pseudonyms. Although I did not have the focus group participants sign an additional confidentiality agreement, I did discuss with them the importance of group confidentiality during the beginning of the focus group.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I described the constructivist ontological underpinnings of this research,

and connected the socially constructed nature of knowledge with my qualitative case study research design. Similarly, the qualitative case study approach was described to address the uniquely culture-bound nature of global citizenship and global citizenship education. The specific global citizenship initiative 'case' for this study (i.e., The Relations Program) was described, along with the specific data collection methods: semi-structured interviews and a focus group interview. The study's trustworthiness was maintained through methods including member checking, pretesting the interview questions, researcher reflection, 'memoing,' and rigorous data analysis. The next chapter reveals the rich findings that I came to through my interactions with the data.

Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter presents an organized representation of the rich data that I accumulated through individual and focus group interviews. The findings that emerged through analysis included four broad thematic categories: evolving perspectives, constructions of the world, global citizenship, and discourses and binariality. Each of these overarching themes is enriched by multiple sub-themes and was helpful in elucidating important issues within the realm of global citizenship education. Along with a common adherence to Westernized understandings of the world, a pervasive and overarching perspective that emerged from the participant's collective remarks was the inevitability of global issues.

Evolving Perspectives

Aim of program. The participants described the overall aim of The Relations Program as encouraging learning about and from a range of different perspectives from multiple sources including individuals, schools, professionals, and different groups of people from varying cultural backgrounds and locations. Although the theme of 'learning from multiple perspectives' was evident in both the students' and the teachers' responses, there were slight differences regarding specific program aims between the two groups.

For the student participants, the program was about raising awareness of global issues. Hakim expressed the program helped *"open [his] eyes to a bunch of stuff around the world" (Interview, Student)* and Kevin said *"the videoconferences ... have gotten me thinking about more issues going on around the world, such as the eight Millennium Development Goals" (Interview, Student)*. In addition, the students saw The Relations Program as a way to engage with others in order to propose solutions to world issues, since they were acutely aware that people in general are not privy to a wide range of global perspectives on a daily basis. Leah stated:

> *I think [the purpose of The Relations Program] is to raise global awareness and to help people understand everybody's perspective. I think that's the reason why we have people*

from all over Canada, the world, Alberta, everywhere, is to understand what they see because we may not be able to see it from where we are. *(Interview, Student)*

The teacher participants described The Relations Program as developing active, critical thinkers with a global outlook. They maintained the program aimed to increase students' critical thinking and problem solving skills, show students that they are members of the greater global community, help students see beyond narrowly defined local/individual perspectives, provide opportunities for cross-cultural enrichment, and encourage action and involvement in numerous organizations geared towards 'making a difference.' Barry mentioned The Relations Program was important for developing critical, informed students that are able to make sound, stereotype-free judgements about the world. He stated:

The way I see it, the kids would develop a little bit of a better sense of how the world works, develop some critical thinking, so when they make a statement about another place or another country it's based on fact and not simply rumour or stereotype. (Interview, Teacher)

Barry expressed this critical perspective would help students interrogate the multiple and conflicting messages about the world that they receive on a daily basis.

A relationship between the aims of the program and preparing students for success in the world and the global economy surfaced in participants' dialogue. This success depended on the ability to navigate intercultural exchanges by communicating effectively with people across difference. Andrew stated:

I think that we live in a global economy, and besides just the enriching cultural awareness that can be built, I think that kids need to learn how to work with people in different places. They need to learn how to work asynchronously with people. They need to learn how to work remotely with people, and how to struggle through language barriers and make it work - how to try and find common ground. (Interview, Teacher)

Andrew explained that during one of the Quad Connections the students participated in the activity entitled *The Same but Different*, which involved them finding common ground between their two cultures while remaining conscious of their differences. This activity offered an example of how students were asked to navigate intercultural exchanges and relationships. The student participants recognized this supposed positive relationship between navigating through new cultural relationships, acquiring new perspectives and knowledges, and their own success in the global arena. For instance, Keira maintained, *"[the purpose of this program] is to make us more aware of what's going on in the world, because the better educated you are then the better decisions you can make" (Interview, Student).*

The participants experienced and reacted to these multiple perspectives, issues, and ways of life in many ways. Hakim spoke of the astonishment that accompanied finding out about particular issues in another country. He stated:

> *When we were talking to Pakistan they said the government parties kill each other off to gain power, and the people from Pakistan were talking about it like it was nothing … but the people here were like amazed by it, and just disgusted. (Interview, Student)*

According to Andrew, the students struggled at times with pausing to consider the contextual causes for a country's issues, seeing them solely from a Western frame. He stated, *"we have issues that we see countries are facing, and inevitably the kids are like, 'yeah well they're not becoming a democracy' or something, basically, how can they become more like us? That's their issues that they need to face" (Interview, Teacher).* Yet through the connections the student participants came to recognize that what might seem like a big issue to students in one country (i.e., Alberta Tar Sands in Canada) may not even be known by students in another country, and this enriched participants' sense of how the world views Canada and North America in general.

The participants also spoke about barriers to The Relations Program and ways it could be improved. For instance, adjusting to time zone differences, getting over technological hurdles, and not having enough time within the curriculum were described as obstacles to The Relations

Program's success, yet none seemed to be completely detrimental to the initiative. The participants, it seemed, took each challenge in stride. Some students at Amber Rock spent the night at school in order to avoid missing early videoconferences. Only Hakim spoke to the small amount of students in The Relations Program class as an area for improvement. He said, *"only eleven kids in this whole school actually get to do this. So if we had more of it, it would be way better" (Interview, Student).*

Technology and mediated communication. In general, the student participants spoke of the value of communications technology to enhancing their perspectives. For instance, Kevin stated:

> *At the beginning of this year I really didn't think technology changed my perspectives from the way I see anything around the world, but ever since I got into this Relations Program I realize that technology does make a huge impact on us and just how we see everything going on around us. (Interview, Student)*

Leah maintained, *"[without communications technology], I don't really know how else we'd connect to people over the world" (Interview, Student).* Andrew described technology and mediated communication (communication through technology) as increasing people's awareness of the local and global consequences of their actions, as well as enriching opportunities for global personal connections. He said:

> *There's not a whole lot of excuse for us not to be aware of the consequences of what we are doing … technology has made us very aware of what's going on everywhere. And it allows us to make personal connections where before we could not. I can have a personal relationship with someone I've never seen and never will, who is in a very different cultural, geographical location than myself, because of technology. (Interview, Teacher)*

The idea of communicating over technology as providing students with 'real' relationships and knowledge as opposed to textbook comprehension was evident in the interviews. Andrew said, *"our program is about making living textbooks, right? In the sense that*

kids are about relationships and kids can't have a relationship with a book" (Interview, Teacher). Andrew juxtaposed the idea of mass-produced knowledge through textbooks and videos with the power of real-life connections that happen during the videoconferences. He conveyed*, "this isn't something that's going to be mass-produced, it's a connection between two individuals. And that's what life is built on. I think the more we can make education relational, the more power it has" (Interview, Teacher).* Keira also valued the 'realness' of the connections. She stated, *"it is a lot cooler learning from the root of the source" (Interview, Student)*.

Participants articulated differences in opinion regarding the quality of communication over video communications technology. Hakim described communicating over technology as being *"more like we are standing right beside them. We're not talking to them through a wall or something like Facebook … because we can see their expressions" (Interview, Student).* Kevin said, *"you basically feel like they are sitting up in front of the room and you're sitting there and you're talking to them" (Interview, Student).* Although Andrew admitted communicating was always better in person, he said the videoconferences and communicating over video communications technology were much *"better than nothing happening at all" (Interview, Teacher).* Yet both Leah and Keira conveyed dissatisfaction with the mediated communication. Keira stated:

> *It's like I'm communicating with my television … although I know it is real live people who are actually listening in and talking to me personally, I don't feel that connection, though? It's not like you and I talking right now. (Interview, Student)*

Leah preferred *"being real" (Interview, Student)* and learning about people through reading their body language, which proved to be a great challenge for her due to the delay and pixilation that often occurred while using the communications technology. Leah's comment was interesting, given that one of the aims of these connections, according to Andrew, was to produce real-life relationships.

Similarly, Barry expressed the connections were *"definitely not a substitute for travelling to these places and seeing cultures first hand … [because] you can't make out facial expressions or body language. You're not really getting the same message that you would be if you were having a face-to-face conversation with them" (Interview, Teacher).* This quote spoke to the potential for miscommunication across distance and cultures. Andrew also expanded on this, and stated:

> *The better quality we can have the better it is because we can see more subtleties of communication. If you're just a series of boxes like it can be sometimes on Skype, I can't see your furrowed brow. I can't see your yawns and differentiate them from something else. I can't see necessarily the inclination of your body. (Interview, Teacher)*

In addition, miscommunication of the videoconference expectations between the multiple schools occurred for a number of reasons according to the participants, including partnering schools neglecting to check their email or read instructions thoroughly. Barry expressed, *"at the end the last connection was supposed to be their partner presentations that they had been working on, which kind of tanked for Nicaragua; they didn't do what they said they were going to do" (Interview, Teacher).* Not checking email regularly or showing up late to the videoconferences represented examples of 'cultural differences' expressed by the teacher participants, and proved to hinder the videoconferences in one way or another. Barry expressed, "*in some cultures showing up an hour and a half late is not an issue, but in this medium it does not work at all. You've got to show up at the time that you're going to show up" (Interview, Teacher).* Similarly, Andrew said:

> *Some cultures are just so laid back that they'll show up and they haven't done anything. Other cultures have put in tens of hours for each conference and another hasn't done anything. Communications and dealing with those cross-cultural understandings are very significant on the organizing side. (Interview, Teacher)*

The participants made no particular references to Western cultural differences that might have impeded the videoconferences.

Critical perspectives. Andrew emphasized the importance of developing an informed, critical perspective. He conveyed, "*we don't want uninformed kids talking to uninformed kids. We want them to do their research; we want them to think critically about what's going on, and think critically about the process that they're embarking on to discover this" (Interview, Teacher).* The students were developing their own critical voices in a number of ways, in part by constructing critical classroom discourses as well as through the videoconference exchanges. For instance Hakim was critical of the mismatch between the discourses of equality within the videoconference or classroom discussions and the actual global reality. He shared, *"I think when people talk like they have to be politically correct, like a teacher or something, they usually make it look like we're all supposed to be equal. But it's not happening" (Interview, Student).* Two students participants were critical of media messages, particularly from news networks, and saw the videoconferences as a way to gain a critical perspective and critique biased, Western news sources. Kevin stated, "*[the news] comes from a Western perspective - we change things into the way we see it. So, throughout this process I'm taking different perspectives and basically blending them all together and getting the one more truthful one" (Interview, Student).* Leah also viewed gaining people's perspectives as a way to sift through biased information from the news. She expressed, *"[the videoconferences] make me more aware because I get to see how people are feeling… because lots of the news, global news, personally I find extremely racist and biased. I don't think they give out the message properly" (Interview, Student).*

The Relations Program class includes a debriefing component in which participants engage in critical dialogue and explore beyond mere surface level components of global issues. Here, the participants discuss the subtleties and nuances of communication and question the underlying meanings of the mediated discussions. Typically, Barry and Andrew record specific

exchanges during the videoconferences that 'don't sit quite right' with them in order to further explore them with the students later with critical probing questions. Barry revealed:

> *There'll be mental notes I'll take during the conferences, so if I hear something like that doesn't sit quite right with me I'll make a mental note or jot it down … then I'll solicit 'what did you like about this connection? What didn't you like about it?' And then I'll add my own thoughts. (Interview, Teacher)*

Students are also asked to bring up certain elements of the conference discussion that they have particular questions about. The teachers facilitate these sessions and make it clear to the students that everyone has bias and a particular lens that they approach global issues with. Indeed, Andrew described the debriefing sessions as *"most powerful when the information is not readily apparent" (Interview, Teacher)*. He continued:

> *For instance, we are able to discuss the deeper meanings - during our connection with China we noticed they were rephrasing some of the questions that were asked. A student asked 'when do you think China and Taiwan will be back together' and the Chinese teacher rephrased the question to the students, in spite of the fact that the students could hear her question, as 'when do you think China and Taiwan will be happy together.' (Interview, Teacher)*

By engaging with these hidden meanings, The Relations Program class members can become attuned to realities that are not initially apparent. Andrew also described the debriefing sessions as a way to investigate and question individual perceptions of places and people. In reference to a prior connection with Pakistan, he and the students addressed the questions, *"what's so different in their perception of themselves from our perception, and why do we perceive Pakistan the way we do?" (Interview, Teacher)*.

Andrew expressed that mainly he, through searches on the Internet, educational technology mailing lists, and through the UNESCO Associated Schools Project Network, choses participant schools. He said if need be, *"for developing countries we actually provide*

videoconferencing cameras for them so they can participate" (Interview, Teacher). Critically aware of the dangers in the ways participant schools are identified and the privileged status of the majority of the schools, Andrew revealed:

> *[Not having access to high speed internet and not being able to include those countries] limits our perspective. Because it tends to be the more affluent schools that are able to participate. So we have to be very conscious in our debriefing with the kids with respect to the schools' perspectives. We have to be very conscious just in terms of what our students see and what they perceive and then debrief that within a greater context that we know is there" (Interview, Teacher).*

When asked about their conceptualizations of inequity and inequality, the student participants conveyed that these concepts were barely, if at all, part of regular classroom discussion. For instance Leah said:

> *With inequality I don't think it's really been talked about yet because nothing that we've done so far is about inequality, like the environment… rising temperature, climate change. I guess AIDS kind of had to do with inequality in the way like they shouldn't be judged. I don't think yet we've done anything with inequality so we haven't really talked about it. I think our next one is about education in Africa maybe? (Interview, Student)*

Leah's comment expressed an interesting paradox that implied inequity and inequality were not related to the global issues that The Relations Program have studies thus far, as if they were separate issues to be studied on their own as opposed to embedded within global issues. Although Leah recognized a relationship between inequality and AIDS, this connection was nonetheless limited to a particular region and particular issues: Africa and AIDS.

Constructions of the World

Constructions of the world and how it moves. The participants described the current global state as individualized, un-collaborative, and inwardly focused. This included nation-centeredness, which the participants described as nation-states being focused on themselves as

opposed to the larger, global picture. For instance, Keira described the world as very independent and stated nations only help other nations if they can afford to, or, as Leah maintained, if it is in their best interest. Similarly, Hakim expressed his frustration with the unconnected nature of organizations working towards improving the global condition. He maintained, *"instead of having diverse people working, you know, 50 different organizations working for 50 different things that are all somehow connected… if we could make them all work for one thing, that thing will be solved" (Interview, Student)*. Kevin spoke to the nation-focused nature of the world by touching on the importance of national citizenship, yet he emphasized the need to become global in outlook and responsibility. He stated:

> *People think their national citizenship is more important, especially powerful countries like Canada and the US. They are always like, 'we are Canadian' or 'we are American,' but really everyone's a part of the world and they all have the same responsibility to help solve these [global] issues. (Interview, Student)*

Critiquing the notion of nation-centeredness, Andrew pointed out the *"post-national" (Interview, Teacher)* nature of many world problems and pressed the need to address issues in ways that reflect this global interconnectedness. In general, the participants' reflections on this 'individualized' global state included undertones that seemed to value acting in an interconnected way.

The participants described different people in the world mainly by comparing people in the developing world to people in Canada. In terms of access to technology, Keira expressed, *"people in less fortunate countries aren't able to access technology, at least not easily like we are" (Interview, Student)*. Kevin described people unable to act for social change in places such as Africa or China as *"scared" (Interview, Student)*. In order to become empowered social actors, Kevin suggested, *"I think that they should first contact organizations to help them out and then be open and try and get people to support you with what you're thinking about" (Interview,*

Student). When asked about the reasons for the social and economic stratification across the globe, Keira explained:

> *I think that some people just got ahead and they just happened to be situated in those places, so they brought everyone else with them. Some people were just able to get ahead - they had the intelligence and such, and strategies to be able to get ahead and to make things happen like that, while others weren't educated enough in some cases. (Interview, Student)*

The youth also described the state of the world as generally *"bad."* This appraisal was based on the negative impact humans have had on the environment and global warming, the terrible state of the global economy, and instability of international relations between the US and nation-states such as Afghanistan and Iraq. Leah, describing our world as *"on the edge,"* said:

> *I find that we're almost at the tipping point because right now the US is in Afghanistan… and I personally think that somebody's in there are they're going to do something back on the US and possibly even Canada cause we're kind of just following them and doing what they do. (Interview, Student)*

Barry described the potentially negative influence governments have on individual states. He maintained, *"over the years such corrupt government systems have come into place in many countries in the world, [and they] continue to put down and suppress human rights" (Interview, Teacher).* Similarly, Leah entertained the idea that many national and global issues countries face have to do with their governments. She said, "*I just think that all the problems begin from the government, maybe. Because if the people aren't getting educated, the government controls that, so then maybe the government is at fault?" (Interview, Student).* On the other hand, Hakim expressed faith in technology and its ability to improve the current global condition. He stated, *"technology and knowledge, that's the only thing we are going up in. And hopefully that will help us fix the other stuff" (Interview, Student).*

Constructions of global issues. The Relations Program served to open the participants' eyes to the number and magnitude of global issues. Kevin *"had no idea all these issues were so big before" (Interview, Student).* These global issues, according to the participants, included global poverty, the deteriorating environment, unequal access to technology, the exploitation of people in developing nations brought about by economic globalization, and discrimination due to racism.

The participants described many of these global issues as *"inevitable."* For instance, they spoke of both global poverty and the exploitative behaviour of transnational corporations (and economic globalization in general) as inevitable and unstoppable. With regards to economic exploitation Barry said, *"it's not something you can stop, but it's something that certainly needs to be addressed by nations that have it" (Interview, Teacher).*

In terms of global poverty, Leah found the Millennium Development goal of 'Eradicating Extreme Hunger and Poverty' reasonable, since completely eradicating hunger and poverty *"is impossible" (Interview, Student).* Keira, too, said, *"there's always going to be someone who is hungry" (Interview. Student).* In general, Africa was most frequently described as dealing with the negative effects of poverty. According to Keira, poverty in Africa could be attributed to lack of education. Although she maintained she did not want to generalize or talk about *"Africa as a whole,"* she said:

> *There are parts of Africa where they're not very well educated so they don't understand that maybe they shouldn't birth so many children if they can't feed them and take care of them and stuff? And I think that's why there's a lot of poverty and stuff. (Interview, Student)*

Constructions of my place in the world. The participants each reflected upon their own place in the world (i.e., identity, positionality, country) by comparing their own social locations and home country to those of other people and places. The participants expressed that The Relations Program made them realize that they *"have it better"* in Canada, especially in regards

to Canada's education system and the fact that Canada is a safe place to be compared to other nations. For instance, Keira stated:

> *This is kind of biased but I do think that we are a little better educated about what's going on. And maybe because we have a democracy in Canada and we're not… like in China they have communism, which, I don't personally agree with. I think that I have it better here than I would if I were to have to go to another country. (Interview, Student)*

In terms of violence and safety, Kevin said:

> *My perspectives have changed dramatically. Like I always thought Canada was… I didn't really picture Canada as safer than any other country, just because I didn't know what was going on except for through our news. And when we connected to Pakistan I realized that the students there are used to bomb threats and all that dangerous activity around them. (Interview, Student)*

According to Keira, *"we don't have that [violence] here, or we do but in much, much smaller doses" (Interview, Student)*. On the other hand, Umut reflected on Pakistan's perception of Canada as 'safe' and then complicated the conception. He said:

> *When we were connecting with Pakistan they thought we were a really, really safe country. There was violence in their country and they were, like, 'I'm sure you guys have never seen violence like that before. It must be hard for you guys to interpret.' But it's not really that hard; Canada's not that safe in itself either. It might be safer than other countries but it still has its rough sides. Most of us [in this school] are from other countries anyway. (Interview, Student)*

In this case, Umut's Immigrant experience gave him a different view on the perceived 'safety' of nations. Similarly, Hakim's time in Lebanon offered him a familiarity with the violences of war that he had not been exposed to in Canada. Regarding the reactions of the Pakistani students during a videoconference to local bombings that had occurred in their area, he said *"I could talk about it like it's nothing too, because I've seen it happen" (Interview, Student)*.

Both teacher participants were highly reflective, and they reflected on their positions in the world by speaking about confronting their own contradictions that they live with in their lives. For instance Barry spoke of being an avid globetrotter, yet mentioned, "*at the same time, I haven't really explored Canada, I've explored more of the world than my own country. I've had Americans tell me overseas, 'you really should see your own country, it's very beautiful*'" *(Interview, Teacher).* Andrew said he makes the point of bringing up these contradictions with his students. He articulated:

> *I live in Edmonton, and I live in the suburbs, and unlike when I lived in Europe where we had no car, I live in a very different reality. I live with those contradictions, and I acknowledge those with my students, and the importance of helping students to see these contradictions that we have even within ourselves, and the responsibility we have to make them less. (Interview, Teacher)*

Constructions of globalization. The participants described globalization as an active process involving people and nations becoming an interconnected, global village. They also described it as establishing the world as a community, in part through communications technology and mass travel networks. Although the student participants did not offer any specific descriptions of the processes of globalization, they offered general descriptions of what it meant to them. According to Hakim, globalization was "*people from all around the world getting together. Like we are becoming kind of this one country, this global village" (Interview, Student*). Leah maintained, *"globalization to me is, basically… I think is taking away, like on a map, imagining the world without the water separating everyone, and basically everyone being together" (Interview, Student).* Kevin described globalization in a positive light, including a process of international and transnational communication with other countries that can facilitate a move towards positive common goals that are going to help the global community. He described:

> *Whenever I think of globalization I think of the world doing something, like as a whole just because of 'global' as the world and 'ization' as in like a verb going to do*

something. So I think of all the countries uniting against one common goal. (Interview, Student)

Keira's conceptualization differed slightly from the other descriptions. Reflecting a more globalist out look, she maintained globalization itself was as a neutral, unproblematic process, separate in nature from its effects. She stated:

I think globalization is just the process of two or more different identities or nations or communities or ways of life and cultures and such, coming together. Whether or not they share their ideas and thoughts and feelings with each other, I don't think that really affects globalization. I just think globalization is them coming together. (Interview, Student)

The participants attributed globalization with specific effects. First, globalization was seen as opening up opportunities for increased global knowledge and perspective. Barry stated:

It's almost like you live in an apartment, and everyone around you is doing other things. The process of globalization would be turning those concrete walls into glass. Now you can see what's happening everywhere, you can see what your neighbour is doing, but you can also hear everything that's going on, so it's being constantly connected to everything around you. (Interview, Teacher)

Hakim spoke to how telecommunications technology, as a product of globalization, assisted in greater global awareness and knowledge. He said, *"now, I could pretty much tell you everything about [something] if I wanted to. I could search it up and I could tell you everything" (Interview, Student).* Hakim was, however, sensitive to the fact that not all people are positioned equally in relation to technology and education, and pointed out that there are differences in what people know and what they are able to know about the world. Andrew touched on the relationship between this expanded awareness and global responsibility and spoke of globalization as a vehicle for realizing our global influence. He stated, *"through the growth of technologies and through the growth of communication, and through the growth of transportation, energy, I am*

expanding my influence and my responsibility, and also what influences me, is expanding out… outside of that" (Interview, Teacher).

Participants described globalization as having both positive and negative elements. The possibility of new discoveries and solutions to global issues being shared through the interconnectedness of globalization were seen as contributing to the greater good. For instance Hakim suggested, *"let's say someone in America figures out how to cure AIDS. People in Africa will benefit from it. That wouldn't have happened if it weren't for globalization" (Interview, Student).* In terms of negative aspects of globalization, the potential for catastrophe due to the interconnected nature of the global financial system was addressed. Also, homogenization of the world's people and cultures was seen as a threat to global diversity yet the participants did not speak to specific reasons for how the elimination of diversity would result in negative consequences. Kevin did mention that homogenization was a problem because of the potential loss of historical figures and cultures and the concomitant threat to the First Nations groups that *"had a big contribution to their country's development" (Interview, Student).*

The participants described transnational companies as products of economic globalization that have great power and influence on a global scale. In addition, participants spoke to how transnational corporations imposed Westernized values and products through economic, capitalist expansion techniques. They recognized globalization as a force and vehicle for the West to impose its way of being in the world, particularly through these economic means. Barry asserted:

> *If you look at developing countries that largely had subsistence agriculture, with globalization you've got these multinational corporations that want access to cheap labour markets. So [these countries are] lowering their standards so much just to get those corporations into their country. Yes it benefits the people at the top in that country – the government that receives tax money, but the people at the bottom now are being forced to work in factories as opposed to just simply growing crops with their families*

and just living, so it changes the dynamic of culture, essentially, and it really screws a lot of people over. (Interview, Teacher).

Adding to the complexity of her description of globalization and speaking to some of the negative effects of economic globalization Leah stated:

I don't think [the elimination of diversity and the fact that people are becoming like a big global family] are happening for good reason[s]. Companies are pretty much the most influential people because they make what you buy and then that makes everybody else buy that and then everyone starts acting a certain way because of TV shows. I think big companies are doing it not to make the world one, but they want money, so if they move to another country, they'll influence them, they'll buy their stuff, they'll tell people, and they'll move to another country and now they got two countries and then they'll move to another one and it just keeps going. I think they're making everyone more similar but not for a good reason, just because they want more money. (Interview, Student)

The participants spoke about a number of different ways in which globalization intersected with and affected their own lives, positionalities and identities. Ironically, Keira addressed how globalization is increasing diversity in places like Edmonton and Canada, while Leah and Kevin spoke to how globalization is creating homogenization and is eliminating global diversity. Similarly, Keira talked about accessing the richness of knowledge from her local surroundings due to the multiplicity of difference that globalization brings about, as opposed to needing videoconferences to gain knowledge from elsewhere. She stated, "*there's not two people in Edmonton, probably, that are the exact same and come from the exact same background. Everyone's so different here. In that sense I don't really necessarily need to have videoconferences (Interview, Student).* For Hakim, being able to access diverse information from the Internet was a big personal impact of globalization, as well as the fact that he speaks two languages at home and that many of his clothes are made in countries other than Canada. Barry and Kevin talked about globalization as enriching their personal identities and citizenships. For

instance Barry said, *"I've started to think of myself more as a citizen of the world" (Interview, Teacher).* For Kevin, globalization has helped him to realize the role of Canada and other developed nations as helping developing nations. He said, *"[globalization] affects my identity by knowing that I am a part of this change and that I'm actually going to be making a difference eventually in my life" (Interview, Student).*

The experiences and histories of three student participants in particular greatly affected their conceptualizations of globalization, global issues, and development. Hakim, Leah and Umut either spoke about family members in countries other than Canada, or had personally lived in non-Western nations. Leah had relatives in Syria, Hakim had lived in Lebanon for seven years, and Umut's family was originally from Turkey. For Umut, globalization and the needs of his home country played a large part in his educational position in Canada. He said, *"my parents came here and their main goal was to get me educated here so I could go back to Turkey and help out the Turkish country and the society" (Interview, Student).* Speaking to the expanded perspectives his time in Lebanon afforded him, Hakim expressed, *"I kind of almost have both views [of the world] already, because I've seen it from the Lebanese point of view and I've seen it from the Canadian point of view" (Interview, Student)*. Interestingly, Hakim's 'expanded' view projected a possibility of only two worldviews instead of many. Leah spoke to the number of changes that Syria had gone through over the last ten years, specifically noting the impact of globalization on Syria's food sources and education system. Noting the pressures of globalization she said:

> *Before they didn't allow certain foods to go into Syria. They were too expensive and they did not want to import more than they exported. They thought that they could all work together and then they'd make their country, but then they realized that that doesn't work. (Interview, Student)*

Global Citizenship

Agency. The participants spoke to the notion of agency in a number of different ways, and provided examples of their own definitions and actions. Andrew described agency:

> *[As] equip[ing] students so that they are aware of [the fact that their actions have consequence in the greater world], aware of how they are aware of it, and that they feel a sense of responsibility as well, for their place in it, and the need to be active. (Interview, Teacher)*

Yet, as Keira mentioned, "*most of the people I know don't want to change the world" (Interview, Student).* She touched on the personal nature of individual action, including the fact that not everyone is geared towards making the world a better place and may lack the know-how to do so. She said, *"I think there's a want to act but just not the know-how. If I did know what needed to be changed [in the world] I don't think I'd know how to change it" (Interview, Student).* On the other hand, Leah maintained, "*sometimes adults don't really see that [youth] can make a difference*" *(Interview, Student).* She also alluded to the notions of greed and individualism that serve to undermine agency. She said*:*

> *Adults could be influenced by [the greed of large companies] and then the adults don't end up caring about global issues so they don't participate in them and then youth would be undermined and start to believe this. I think I've heard quite a few 'what can I do?' so I think eventually as much as you start seeing this or hearing this, you'll eventually come to think it. (Interview, Student)*

The participants named influencing the government and bodies in charge as avenues for enacting agency since these organizations hold power to effect change. Influencing government was seen as having more influence than the action of individuals. For instance Leah said, *"the big people that can make a difference can [affect change in global issues] but I think you should do what you can" (Interview, Student).* Barry maintained:

I think you have much more of a chance to influence things at a global level if you're voting for a party that's reflecting your values because they're the ones that really have the resources to get that done. You going and building a water fountain or whatever in some African nation, I'm sure that's important for a very small number of people, but I don't think you're going to affect the same kind of change that you would if you can influence government and the people who are really pulling the purse strings. (Interview, Teacher)

The *"think global, act local"* phrase, so commonly used as to become like a mantra, surfaced within the interviews. Particularly, the participants each expressed the important need to act locally. Andrew spoke to the advantages of acting at a local level by stating, "*what I receive in return locally is much more immediate" (Interview, Teacher)*. This local action, according to Andrew, is *"much more real" (Interview, Teacher)*. Yet some participants complicated the *"think global, act local"* moniker in regards to the specific spheres of influence that The Relations Program engendered. For instance, Leah expressed that The Relations Program helped her to act in provincial, national and global spheres as opposed to at the local level. She said, *"I personally don't think this course helps with our stuff in our [city]… in our country yes, but in our city, no. I'm more involved with our province, our country and then the world" (Interview, Student)*. Keira also separated local actions from global actions. She mentioned spreading awareness about global issues as a local act, while giving the example of going to South America to build a school to represent a global act.

Andrew pressed the need to motivate students to act by equipping them with the tools they need for informed action. He stated:

We're educated as consumers rather than as producers, so we have everything coming at us, but we're never educated with an empowering perspective that ok, you learn something, now let's change our behaviour, right? I think it's actually detrimental to educate without motivating. (Interview, Teacher)

Building upon this, Andrew stated, *"every single one of our conferences ends with an action component" (Interview, Teacher),* yet interestingly the students were unable to give concrete examples of actions directly related to the goals and implications of the videoconferences that they were either currently a part of or had been in the past. Keira, however, did mention a future HIV/AIDS awareness project that would involve tying red ribbons on their school peers on global AIDS Awareness Day, yet this project was in the planning stages. Kevin mentioned he was writing a letter to the city regarding the use of nuclear energy, yet it was unclear if this action was a direct result of the videoconferences or not. Similarly, although the students maintained that they themselves were talking a lot more about global issues with their families and friends, there remained ambiguity about the purpose and direction about specific 'agentic' activities that the students listed. For instance, Kevin stated,

> *I've been doing basically everything I can to try and help these [global] issues. I've had late nights researching and trying to think of ways that I could help with these issues … Since I've started taking this class and ever since I hosted the last conference I've been thinking of starting my own conference, I haven't really decided what it's going to be about, but I know for sure I'm planning on making it one of the eight millennium development goals. I'm thinking about having fundraising for just different projects that need help with anything they're doing to help these issues, and I'm basically trying to get people in my community informed about all these issues and how they can help. (Interview, Student)*

None of the activities Kevin described (researching, hosting a conference, and donating money), however, were connected to a specific purpose or cause, nor did they seem to have a clear direction.

Andrew touched on the problem of apathy and disempowerment that can occur when youth are faced with the task of addressing global issues. He said, *"they see all these things that are going on, but they're not motivated or empowered to actually act on it. I think that they*

become apathetic, and they become bitter, and they become un-empowered" (Interview, Teacher). Problematically, the apparent lack of an action component in The Relations Program seemed to engender a feeling of apathy and disengagement for Umut. He stated:

> *In our connections I personally see a lot of thought but no action. We talk about it, we learn their perspective, they learn ours, and then it's over. In Turkey there's a saying: even a donkey could carry books. So it takes a person to actually read the books and use the knowledge. Anybody could have the knowledge and not use it. (Interview, Student)*

Umut illustrated apathetic disengagement by explaining his reaction after a partnering school had asked Amber Rock for help in the form of resources. Umut maintained:

> *When they asked for our help the first time, it was like wow, this is kind of really serious … but we don't really do anything. So the first time I felt something, but right now I don't really feel anything. (Interview, Student)*

Even Hakim recognized that *"talking on the Internet is … not exactly the same as action" (Interview, Student).*

Constructing global citizenship. The participants described a global citizen as someone who is informed about the goings on of the world and is working towards improving the global condition and ameliorating global issues. In general, the youth described global citizenship in terms of action and the teacher participants described it as a combination of action through the realization of personal agency and awareness that their actions have global implications. Each participant addressed the inextricable relationship between global citizenship and individual action. Indeed, the participants recognized that acting at any level in the world first required the choices of individual people, and thus addressed the relationship between individual agency and global citizenship. There were, however, qualitative differences in the participants' descriptions between the nature of these actions and the relationship between individual action and global responsibility.

Keira's conceptualization of global citizenship involved mere action in the world. For Keira, acting in the world and being a member of the planet implied global citizenship. She stated:

> *I think you're just given that [label of global citizen] as soon as you step foot onto this earth, and you're taking part in some form of global activity whether it's something in your own city, like you're living your life in your own town, or you're actually flying overseas to go change the world. As long as you're acting in the world then you're taking part in being a global citizen. As a global citizen, just go through your life happily and don't cause violence and havoc in your area, so everyone can work together nicely and life goes on. Don't intrude on how other people work. (Interview, Student)*

Keira's discussion of global citizenship implied that if people 'mind their own business and stay out of the way of others' then they are doing their part as a good citizen. This comment also spoke to the participants' individualized understandings of the social.

Hakim described a global citizen as someone who helps people or issues outside of Canada. He did not consider himself a global citizen because he said he *"doesn't really help anyone outside of Canada" (Interview, Student)*. Hakim continued:

> *To be a citizen of something you have to be a part of it, and to be a part of something you have to be helping it out and fixing it anyway you can. You either are or you're not a global citizen, and that all depends on your actions and your perspective on things. (Interview, Student)*

For Hakim, global citizenship was performative and based on personal perceptions and agency, yet his description was limiting in the sense that it described helping elsewhere as a global citizen's main role. Interestingly, Hakim's description described the importance of action to global citizenship yet it simultaneously negated a global citizen's political responsibility. In essence, his description left untouched the responsibility of all social actors and their role in sustaining the unjust structures that cause and maintain global issues. He said he *"doesn't really*

help anyone outside of Canada," yet this doesn't appear to leave space for the recognition that his actions do have consequence on a global level, global citizen or not.

The teacher participants, on the other hand, seemed to infuse the added dimension of political responsibility right into their descriptions of global citizenship. For the teacher participants, a global citizen was able to see him or herself as being a part of the greater global community. In essence, a global citizen sees beyond the nation and understands that the globe is continually the community that they live in. In addition, a global citizen thinks about the impacts of their actions on people elsewhere. For Andrew, a global citizen sees their *"actions as having consequences for people [they] will potentially never see and never have a connection to. [A global citizen] has a responsibility to have a positive impact in the world, locally and globally, and minimize negative impacts for individuals" (Interview, Teacher).*

Although some participants talked about local actions as well, a global citizen as someone who is active *outside* their country and doing work to impact the world *outside* their locality was a theme in the students' discussions. This involved acting to help issues and places outside of Canada, talking to people outside of Canada and learning about the needs and perspectives of these people, playing a significant role in the global community, and travelling overseas to 'change the world.' Describing the distinction between local and global citizenship, Leah maintained, *"once you start doing things globally, and participating in things happening outside of your country and learning about the globe, then I think you are [a global citizen]" (Interview, Student).* Andrew said, *"my role as a teacher is to show [the students] that as an individual I do have a connection to people in other places that I don't necessarily see who are very far away from me" (Interview, Teacher).* He spoke to minimizing negative impacts on people elsewhere by being critically aware of the consequences of our actions. Although he was mainly concerned with how the actions of him and his students affected people elsewhere, he did emphasise the importance of having a positive influence both globally and locally. Kevin, also, said:

A global citizen would try to take action for the problems in their local community or global community. Anyone can be a global citizen to an extent as long as they want to help the global community and they are determined to do so. Even if they're not doing anything and they just want to, I consider them a global citizen. (Interview, Student)

Although Kevin maintained a global citizen could act on multiple levels, by saying people are still global citizens by merely *wanting* to help he does not necessarily implicate global citizens in their day-to-day actions.

Most of the participants described global citizenship as manifesting differently depending where and how a person is socially, economically, and politically positioned in the world. Issues like having adequate living standards, access to education and a viable source of income all played into the realization of global citizenship. For instance, Andrew said:

I certainly believe that there's a hierarchy of needs. And quite honestly if I have a choice of whether my children would eat, or I'm working in a destructive mine, or working in a gold mine that's using mercury to extract, I would choose to feed my children. So that manifestation in terms of the socio-economic is a huge difference. Whether I'm even informed, and access to information in terms of consequences, whether I'm raised in a society that will allow me to see the impact of my actions would also change how I would see [the world]. … I think that [global citizenship] is going to manifest itself very differently depending on culture, depending on economics, depending on all those things. (Interview, Teacher)

Helping. The theme of 'helping' surfaced in the interviews. The participants expressed that their desire to help sprouted from early dreams of making a difference in the world. For Hakim specifically, wanting to help the global condition came from his experience living in Lebanon. He revealed:

I always used to care about global issues because I was born here but I went to Lebanon for seven years and lived there. But we were kind of, like, higher… high society because

we came from here. But I used to see all the people living in the ghetto and stuff, and they were all poor and stuff. So because of that I got interested in helping people. (Interview, Student)

Knowledge before action. The youth participants were very clear about the need to be knowledgeable about the particular circumstances involved before acting to 'help' in a given situation. This included an awareness of local perspectives. Knowing exactly what people want and need before acting was particularly important for Hakim. He said:

Some people only [act to help a situation] from one side, and now I kind of want to see both sides before I act. It would help me a lot if I try to help other people then I know exactly what to do or more of an idea of what to do. And also it helps me think about wanting to gain more perspectives. (Interview, Student)

Additionally, Hakim and Umut both said help should be given only when it is asked for. Umut asked, "*why would you want to help developing countries for no particular reason?" (Interview, Student)*. Hakim expanded on this idea, and stated:

The role of a person who needs help would be asking for it. For the person who can grant help to do his part, they need to be asked. If you don't get asked for anything, then you're not going to do anything. (Interview, Student)

Hakim offered the example of Afghanistan to illustrate a scenario where 'help' is not asked for yet is given anyway by the United States. Here he explained the Afghani people did not see the Americans as coming in to help, but rather to impose their own ways of life. Keira, also, cautioned against of giving 'help' when it is not asked for. She expressed:

If you do feel like something should be changed you shouldn't just immediately act on that. I think you should discuss it with the people who are living that life, because they may agree and say 'you have a cool way of living, but I like my way, so I think I'm going to stick to that instead of you just jumping in and changing my life without me liking it that much.' (Interview, Student)

Keira gave the example of Past President Bush's decision to change governmental structures in the Middle East to reflect a more democratic model. She said, "*Bush was acting on his own ignorance and didn't really consider that maybe it's not that bad, just because their life isn't run like ours" (Interview, Student).*

Ignorance and acting without knowledge of local situations came up as a major barrier to promoting successful, culturally relevant help to those in need, especially with regards to Western nations that act according to their own agenda. For instance Keira articulated:

> *If someone really truly thinks that someone else's way of life in general is wrong and they tried to act upon that, there's that ignorance there that they don't know exactly what's going on. I guess there's the barrier there, they don't know if it's the best thing to change it or not. And just that lack of understanding. (Interview, Student)*

Speaking to the state of global aid currently and the fact that oftentimes aid is given without a proper understanding of the needs of local people, Hakim said, *"I would say we have to get more information from the developing world about what they need or what they want" (Interview, Student).* Similarly, in talking about the 'global action' of building a school in South America, Keira stressed the importance of including the voice of the South American people as opposed to imposing a North American way of doing things.

Umut challenged Westernized helping, and described it as hegemonic and exclusionary. He said:

> *To me, the developed countries are saying 'Ok this is the problem. We're going to have to fix it.' And they come up with a way to fix it by themselves. But not all developing countries necessarily agree with their way of fixing it. (Interview, Student)*

On a similar note, Umut problematized the notion of helping based solely on a Western agenda. Wary of the implications of building a school elsewhere and the impact of Western influence on the people, he problematized the notion of a helping global citizen and questioned the cultural relevancy of a school built by people from Western nations in a non-Western nation. He stated:

Being a global citizen, you could build schools in other countries, but I'm not sure if I agree with this idea. Because you're going to build schools, but those schools have to have… like the school system originated from one country so, no matter what school you put up there, it's not going to be that country's school. It's going to be, I don't know, an American school or a Canadian school and that's going to have that influence on the people. I'm not sure if it'll make it better and I'm not saying it'll make it worse either. I'm unsure of the effects. (Interview, Student)

Adding another dimension, Hakim built on Umut's concerns:

The best way to help anyways is not to actually help, just to give them the tools to help themselves. So building a school but not actually occupying it. Letting them find teachers… giving them first steps and not finishing it for them. It doesn't have to be a Canadian school, it just has to be a school that was built by Canadians, but is left for whatever country. (Interview, Student)

Hakim expressed the importance of offering help when it was needed and ensuring that the perspectives and knowledges of the people being helped were heard throughout the process.

Before you can help, fix yourself first. The participants each expressed the importance of helping yourself before you can help others. Barry communicated:

You gotta take care of your own house before you move out and help others, so I think in my mind, I think it's important to have that global perspective, you know, it's that old moniker 'think global, act local' and I think it's important to get involved at a local level because if you don't help the people that are sort of in your own backyard, I think you're a bit of a hypocrite. (Interview, Teacher)

Similarly, Hakim said*:*

To fix a problem you have to fix it from within first. So I would say for example, before we can go help people somewhere else in the world, we have to help our own homeless people and our own unemployment rates and whatever. My responsibility as a citizen is

to first help Edmonton out and then Canada than the global if we get to reach that point. Because if we can't help ourselves, we can barely help other people. If we put all our forces together then … we could focus on other issues, working our way out to everybody. (Interview, Student)

As was clear in Hakim's quote, the idea of fixing from within first and then moving outward to help the global community came up in the participants' dialogue. For instance Leah articulated, *"if everyone deals with their local stuff then the whole world will be dealt with. And then once the whole world is dealt with then you can become interconnected together" (Interview, Student*). Leah had a similar view as the rest of the participants, yet she honed in on the individualist nature of the 'help yourself first' technique. She maintained, *"I think if everybody just minded their own business, fixed everything of theirs and then helped, I think it would be a little bit better" (Interview, Student)*.

Kevin pointed out the difficulties countries have taking ownership of their own issues. He said*:*

We don't really worry about what's in our backyard, we worry about what other people are doing … I think we're always looking elsewhere because we don't really want to put the blame on ourselves. It looks bad and you don't really want to walk down the road and everyone's talking about pollution, and you're like well that was us … It just sounds weird saying that you are at fault for something that's so huge. (Interview, Student)

Leah, too, mentioned, "*not everyone is willing to take care of their own stuff" (Interview, Student).* According to the participants, taking ownership for world problems is lacking in the world, which reflects a diminished sense of political responsibility.

'Us' helping 'them.' Western, developed nations were seen by the participants as able and obligated to help developing nations due to their relative status and resources. The participants characterized 'help' as including aid in the form of education, technology, medicine, and financial aid. According to Hakim, talking and sharing knowledge with others were

considered examples of helping. He said, "*I think just us actually talking to them in the conferences is helping them in a way, because some stuff that we said they didn't really know of. So then we are actually helping them already, I think" (Interview, Student)*. Barry maintained:

> *There are countries that really do need help. Over the years such corrupt government systems have come into place that continue to put down and suppress human rights and I almost think, yeah, it is the role of developed countries… of I guess, Western liberal democracies to… not obviously to go in and take over and kick them out, but to maybe covertly help internet access and allow getting communication technology and knowledge so people can make their own decisions. (Interview, Teacher)*

Speaking in regards to Canada, Kevin said, *"since we are a developed country we should take on responsibility of helping those in need" (Interview, Student)*. Keira, too, said, "*if we can help then we should help" (Interview, Student)*.

Western, developed nations were automatically labelled as helping nations on the global stage, and this label was tied to a country's identity and role in the world. In regards to a focus group vignette, Leah attested:

> *I'm not saying for sure because I don't know this, but chances are we probably help them out in at least some way, maybe we've donated money or we've supplied them with medicine. There's a chance in some way shape or form someone from the West has helped them. (Interview, Student)*

For Kevin, the Western helper nation title affected his identity and citizenship roles. He stated:

> *I think globalization it affects me personally, my identity, by knowing that Canada and other, basically more developed countries, are working towards helping the developing countries in the state of donations and trying to help their government make certain laws and get control over their people again. (Interview, Student)*

Leah expressed the importance of letting people choose what to do with help that is given, and emphasized the value that could be achieved by incorporating local knowledges. She

articulated, *"if they put their own perspective of the world into it, they might and probably will develop better technology, you know?" (Interview, Student).* Though according to Leah, helping should not be an obligation, and should be given only if a particular country is in a position to do so and wishes to. She stated:

> *If you have the power to do more then I think you should, but I don't think anyone should make you do more - you should out of the kindness of your heart do more, because the more you do, it's going to sound selfish, but it's going to help you in return. (Interview, Student)*

According to Keira, sometimes nations do not know how to help. Yet she too spoke to the potential selfishness of wealthier nations, stating, *"wealthier nations could help, I think we just don't know how to in most cases. Either that or we don't see how it would benefit us to go help" (Interview, Student).* Leah also expressed her concern about people asking for help but not giving anything in return. She contended:

> *The fact that [the developing country depicted in the vignette] are saying they don't want to buy our stuff, but we can help them for free? I don't think that's very fair. North Korea doesn't ask for help and we also don't have to give them stuff. I don't agree with North Korea, the way it is, but they don't ask for stuff and we don't sell it to them, because they don't want anything from us and they're not going to take things but not buy things, you know? (Interview, Student)*

The discourse of The Burden of the West surfaced in Leah's dialogue. She felt very strongly about the need for countries to work to fulfil their own needs just as Western developed nations have apparently done. For instance, she asserted:

> *This is going to sound kind of rude, but we made the technology and if they maybe… I don't know, I just don't find it very fair that we have to work for it and then we have to give it to you, you know? I don't think it's fair… to basically teach them everything we know, because we worked for it, and I think they can work for it to. I can understand*

helping them, but I don't think we should just give it so they can do it, because if we do that it's not really fair. We're not going to do everything for country, you know? (Interview, Student)

As opposed to just 'giving' developing countries technology Leah mentioned that developed countries should *"hold their hand a little, but not give them technology" (Interview, Student).* Yet Hakim challenged the Burden of the West discourse by introducing the notion of responsibility. He described the complexity embedded within the discourse of helping:

When we're talking to each other, there's usually the whole, some people think too bad, that kind of thing, or they're poor, there's nothing we can do about it or we shouldn't care, hopefully they can help themselves like we helped ourselves. And there's the other side where we are like we should help them because we have a responsibility to help them. (Interview, Student)

Both Umut and Hakim also described instances where Amber Rock students were asked for help directly from the students they were conversing with in other parts of the world during a videoconference. Hakim expressed:

I remember Mexico and I think Croatia, they were asking us to actually help them. They were like, 'your country should help us because we need stuff.' Or at the AIDS [videoconference], they were like, 'our country doesn't know anything about it, and other countries do have the responsibility towards us to help us out.' (Interview, Student)

We are positioned differently to help. People were recognized by the participants as having different relationships to 'help' for a number of reasons, including their economic position and personal allegiances. Keira maintained:

I think we have different roles because some people are able to help more than others. So I think if you are able to help, then you should totally help as much as you can. But I don't think some poorer nations like Africa or whatever, are going to be able to go out

and help, like, Pakistan with their bombings. Their just not able to, they don't have money to travel and they don't have technology in most parts. (Interview, Student).

Umut had a complex relationship with the notion of helping due to his Turkish national heritage. He declared, "*before helping globally, personally, I think I should help my country before that, because I feel like it's kind of like my responsibility" (Interview, Student).*

Discourses and Binariality

The discourses of 'development' surfaced in the interviews in a number of ways. The participants described development in educational and financial terms, and also with respect to access to health care. Hakim even described development abstractly as implying *"going somewhere" (Interview, Student).* The notion of 'going somewhere' was an idea that Leah, Hakim, and Umut all agreed with, which suggested a linear model of development with a beginning, middle and end. Each of the three students agreed that the arrival point in this linear trajectory was to be like the West.

In addition, the participants spoke of development by using large generalizations to describe the qualities of development and developing countries. Leah maintained, *"lots of people in developing countries are dying" (Interview, Student),* and Umut explained, "*to me the countries that are developing, they're more cultured [than developed countries]" (Interview, Student).* The participants also addressed different terminology in regards to describing development. For instance, while Keira used the phrase *"less fortunate countries" (Interview, Student)* to describe developing nations, Barry recognized that the term *"developing"* is more politically correct than the older term *"Third World,"* and thus acknowledged the need to be mindful of the terms used.

People in developing nations were described as having better work habits than people in Canada because, according to Leah, *"people in developing countries are not going to miss work because they need it, they need the cheap wage that they get. Here [in Canada], they miss a day they don't care" (Interview, Student).* Similarly, Umut maintained, "*personally I think people in*

developing countries work much harder than people in developed countries. Because here it's like care free. Here you're working for a luxury, there they're working for a living to support their family, their household" (Interview, Student).

The discourse of development also appeared as Andrew described how Amber Rock provided videoconference technology to schools that were unable to access it. He said, *"for developing countries we actually provide videoconferencing cameras for them so they can participate, which are donated to us" (Interview, Teacher).* What was interesting here is that he said *"developing countries"* instead of *"those schools that may need technology,"* and thus his statement had the potential to generalize that all schools in developing countries need technology.

The participants also problematized the developed/developing binary and critiqued its usage. Barry said, *"I have a hard time sometimes not getting into this paternalistic … 'it's the developed countries role to help along the developing' attitude, because it sounds so patronizing" (Interview, Teacher).* Similarly, Kevin rejected the use of the binary entirely. He articulated:

> *As a global citizen I believe that the whole… the world shouldn't be seen as developing and developed countries. They should be seen as equals no matter what their government is or no matter how their people act. I find that negative because when those countries hear that they could take it as 'we're not important enough to be called developed. They don't think our way of civilization is good enough.' (Interview, Student)*

Hakim also troubled the developed/developing binary and the assumption that all people in developing nations are poor. He stated, *"there are people in the developing countries that are richer than people that are here. It doesn't matter. I think work habits, how hard people work, depends on the person themselves" (Interview, Student).*

Although critiqued by some participants, the developed / developing binary permeated the entire focus group interview and many of the individual interviews. Yet the focus group participants challenged the use of a singular Westernized scale for development. In fact, participants rejected the notion of using this singular, universal classification of 'development' to

rank different nations. The participants maintained that development means different things in different contexts, and that one place may be more developed in certain aspects than another place, and vice versa. For instance Leah said:

> *Who are we to determine what's farther ahead and what's behind? I think that … they could be more developed in a different way. We can't really judge it, it's not fair to judge if you're judging on economy or socially and stuff, it's not fair because they could be more advanced in one way than we are, so, they could be judging us and saying that we are underdeveloped because we have not as good social skills as them, you know? (Interview, Student)*

Umut also suggested, "*you can still be developed in a sense but you don't have to be like the West" (Interview, Student)*.

According to Leah, *"the people from the West made [development]" (Interview, Student)* and Leah, Umut, and Hakim all agreed that current notions of development were Western constructions. Similarly, Umut suggested, "*developed is just a word for Westernized" (Interview, Student).* Yet there was an interesting tension between this understanding of development as a Western construction and the students' assertions that one can indeed be developed in different ways. For instance Leah stated, *"we can't judge them based on us because not everyone's the same, so we can't say you're underdeveloped because you're not like us" (Interview, Student)* within the same conversation that the students had agreed development was a Western construction, and hence, measured in purely Western terms. Interestingly, Hakim and Umut discussed how the West has not always been developed and argued the West's innovation was historically borrowed from non-Western places. Consider this brief exchange during the focus group interview:

> Hakim: *"Most of our technology is based on something that they have done… almost everything. Everything's based on something that's based on something that's based on something that they made."*

Interviewer: *"Who's they in that sentence?"*

Hakim: *"Developing Countries. Like at some point in history…"*

Umut: *"They were the developed."*

Hakim: *"Yeah."*

Interviewer: *"Because the West as it is now is not as old as other places were at one point?"*

Hakim: *"Yes. India for example made the numbers, and now we use them for computers, the binary code."*

The traditional/urban dichotomy also appeared in the participants' dialogue. The West was considered to be modern and developing countries were considered traditional. Umut spoke to the tension between people wanting to preserve tradition and the forces of development and urbanization working upon them. He maintained:

> *I could talk on Turkey's behalf, they really want to get Westernized. Especially the young generation. Turkey … wanted to be like Europe and they've been trying to do that for over 80 years. It's like a 50/50 situation. Half the people want tradition, half the people want to be Western. (Interview, Student)*

Umut expanded on this tension inherent with the urban/traditional dichotomy by speaking to the seemingly inevitable nature of development, along with some advantages of it. He expressed, "*leaving tradition is not always a good thing. I am a very traditional person … but being more developed could be a good thing, but it also has its side effects, a double edged sword" (Interview, Student).* Technology, according to Umut, was considered important for countries to grow, but should not over power local traditions and ways of life. He continued:

> *You also need some technology for the good of the country I guess, because you can't be locked up in yourself because then you won't really go anywhere, you'll always stay the same. I think it needs to be like a mix, but more tradition, but technology still has to be there. (Interview, Student)*

Generally, Umut saw preserving tradition and culture as antithetical to development.

Umut and Hakim had an interesting discussion about whether or not the role of global citizens was to impart 'urban' knowledge to the rest of the world or to ensure cultural relevancy for people, and used the example of building a school for people in a developing nation. Umut challenged Hakim and asked, *"if we built the school and let them find teachers and … found a farmer to teach agriculture, then a fisher to teach about fishing because that's what you really need in that country, you'd be perfectly fine with that?" (Interview, Student).* Hakim replied, *"Yeah. I think we do, do that. I think there are countries that in their schools they don't actually learn what we learn… like farming…" (Interview, Student).* Umut answered, *"I know, but acting as a global citizen should we do that, or should we impart urban knowledge like science, math, social, L.A.?" (Interview, Student).* Although this conversation did not progress much beyond this point, it illuminated the need to address the tension between the perceived roles of global citizens and the actual needs and wants of people in local situations, along with highlighting the apparent disconnect between 'modern' or 'urban' knowledge and 'traditional' knowledge.

Along similar lines, Keira talked about old and new cultures (Aboriginal cultures and Western culture, respectively) and globalization's threat to diminishing older cultures through homogenization. Specifically, both her and Kevin spoke of Aboriginal cultures as traditional and in danger of disappearing. Although she agreed that assimilation and acculturation *"eliminates old cultures," (Interview, Student)* Keira expressed:

> *We should accept and take in different cultures. We can still learn about those old cultures and have our new formed cultures, because we do that in school anyway. We have our American/European culture here but we also have a mixture of other cultures. Even in school, although we don't go super in depth, all throughout grade 4, 5 and 6 social we had at least one term dedicated to First Nations people culture. I don't see why, if we were to form new cultures and to accept other people's cultures and stuff, why we couldn't still do that with other cultures. (Interview, Student)*

Here, Keira spoke to the need for cultural recognition, yet addressed the changing and hybrid nature of culture in our globalizing milieu.

The participants were all very attuned to the significant political, cultural, and financial power that the West holds in relation to notions of development, and in general on the world stage. Thus, the 'West and the Rest' binary surfaced in the interviews in interesting ways. For instance Umut maintained, *"the West holds all the power of how people should perceive other places and how they should help them" (Interview, Student).* Interestingly, the participants personally identified with the West and development, and referred to the West or developed nations as *"us"* or *"we."* For instance Hakim said, *"... we need to give them something" (Interview, Student)* and Leah expressed, *"I think we do need to help them" (Interview, Student).* Similarly, Leah stated, *"transnational corporations ... impose our way of thinking because it's our stuff we created… like Walmart and stuff" (Interview, Student).*

Chapter Summary

This chapter focused on the participants' constructions of the world, globalization, and global citizenship in relation to their experiences within their schools' global citizenship education initiative, The Relations Program. The chapter was organized around four main themes, namely evolving perspectives, constructions of the world, global citizenship, and discourses and binariality.

This chapter explored the multiple ways in which the participants' perspectives and identities were influenced by their involvement in The Relations Program. Although participants engaged in critical perspective building, the differences between Canada and places elsewhere were highlighted in ways that served to reinforce rather than break down certain assumptions about their home country and other countries. Specifically, the student participants constructed entrenched ideas of Canada as 'safe' through comparisons with other places.

The chapter also discussed the participants' increased awareness of global issues, yet interestingly they spoke of these issues as inevitable and with a degree of passivity. The apparent

lack of avenues for agency for the student participants, both within and outside The Relations Program, was also discussed.

The chapter addressed the rich discussions around the discourses of development that surfaced within the dialogue, which served to simultaneously reinforce and problematize the developed/developing binary. Although some negative affects of globalization were discussed, the participants showed an unproblematic view of interconnectedness that did not address the multiple and uneven relations inherent within the processes of globalization.

Lastly, global citizenship and global citizenship action was relocated essentially to the 'global.' This was surprising since the participants highlighted the strong connection between individual agency of social actors and global citizenship, which implied locally inspired action. The participants did express the importance of knowledge before action, and displayed complex understandings of the roles of differently positioned nations and people in relation to the notion of 'helping.'

In the next chapter I will present my discussion of the data, which is rooted in my conceptual framework.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Based on the findings of this study, and through the social justice frameworks offered by Fraser (1997; 2009) and Young (2011), this chapter suggests the participants' discussions reflected an 'Inward Out' model. The Inward Out model can be captured in the phrase 'think local, act global' as opposed to the more traditionally recognized 'think global, act local' mantra. The Inward Out model fits the phrase 'think local, act global' because it represents thinking and acting from our local location, our local knowledges and internal beliefs about what we think needs to be done, and what we personally think we should do about it. These understandings rely heavily on our uninvestigated worldviews and they lack a global perspective that is based on critical and compassionate knowledge building. Similarly, this model privileges the local of the social actor by treating it as an assumed ideal starting platform.

Characteristics of the Inward Out model are displayed within the chapter's discussion of five themes that were synthesized from the findings of the current 'case' of a global citizenship education program. The themes were conceptualized and named as 'limited perspectives,' 'essentialism,' 'globalization and positionality,' 'discourses and binariality: development, individualistic neoliberalism, and the burden of the West,' and 'responsibility and agency.' The findings suggest that the worldview of the participants, along with their understandings of global issues and 'development,' greatly impacted their constructions of global citizenship. The participants' adherence to a limited Western frame apparently foreclosed any real opportunities to step out of the developed/underdeveloped binary that persisted within the dialogue. For example, the participants used Western centric descriptions of global citizenship to frame the citizenship of people in developing countries, thus potentially limiting their understanding of the agency of others. In addition, the participants' portrayal of global issues as inevitable, along with their reified descriptions of globalization, evidently constricted their understanding of global citizenship and global citizenship actions (Young, 2011). These understandings were consistent with an Inward Out model that privileges the local and worldview of the participants.

In addition, this chapter highlights certain discourses within the participants' dialogue that served to promote Eurocentric, colonially-tainted understandings of the world. Results of the current analyses would suggest that global citizenship education must include an interrogation of these problematic discourses before one can move beyond the disenfranchisement of certain groups through the process of misrecognition.

Conversely, the 'Outward In' model incorporates the global into the local of the social actor. This model truly reflects the 'think global, act local' statement as it involves thinking and acting by first viewing our socio-location *in relation to* the global structures that it interacts with. This awareness contributes to realizing our political responsibility to, for, and within the world's issues. Similarly, the Outward In model does not take the notion of worldview for granted, and systematically interrogates how the way we see the world interacts with our actions within it. The Outward In model will be expanded upon later in the chapter in order to propose further direction for socially just global citizenship.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between social justice and global citizenship education by considering how students' and teachers' understandings of the world and globalization affect their global citizenship constructions, and by exploring the impact of certain global citizenship discourses on these same constructions. Along with providing thoughts and comment regarding the results of the analyses, this chapter poses a number of critical questions that aim to further probe and enrich the discussion. Similarly, because of the great generative potential global citizenship education holds, this chapter aims to examine the ways that global citizenship education programs might be enriched, deepened, and strengthened.

Limited Perspectives

Global citizenship education engages with a multitude of global issues and typically involves cross-cultural learning and dialogue with others in different nations-states and localities. Particularly important for the realm of global citizenship education, Alcoff (1991) maintains, is that a speaker's "social location [and] identity has an epistemically significant impact on that

speakers claims," (p. 7) thus affecting the truth-value and meaning of what is said. Important to consider, therefore, is the relative power granted to the knowledges and positions of those speaking from 'Western' or 'globally northern' locations. For instance, Said (as cited in Shahjahan, 2005) warns about the "'positional superiority' which puts the Westerner in a whole series of relationships with the [Other] without ever losing him the relative upper hand" (p. 220). The positional superiority of Western knowledge and perspectives has been heightened historically due to a number of factors that this section will address.

Issues of positional superiority, which are characteristic of the Inward Out model, were brought to light by participants' comments in regards to the post-videoconference debriefing sessions. For instance, 'cultural difference' in relation to work ethic and technological promptness was named a common hindrance to the success of the videoconferences by the participants. Yet in their discussion of cultural difference, cultures were consistently compared to, and hence labelled different from, the West, which also suggested the assumed cultural superiority of the West. On the other hand, Andrew described that in the debriefing sessions he asks his students critical questions such as, *"why do we perceive Pakistan the way that we do?" (Interview, Teacher).* This line of questioning reflects a starting point for analyzing the worldviews of The Relations Program participants, yet it implies that the class will or should have similar thoughts and ideas about Pakistan given the fact that they are all students and teachers in a Western school. In reality, each teacher and student represents multiple locations and identities; the idea that the entire class, or even the entire West, might have similar thoughts and assumptions about Pakistan and that these thoughts and assumptions are rooted in the same location is unrealistic. These notions of cultural superiority and uniform Western ways of thinking reflect the idea that the West is one homogenous location that can be known, and is therefore absent of contradictions, dynamic interactions, and power relations. Thus, although it was indicated that the debriefing sessions aim to highlight the importance of recognizing that everyone has a particular lens through which they view the world and that an awareness of these differences was important, it was not evident that

the sessions were debriefed in a way that attended to the Western frame of The Relations Program participants. It would be useful to understand how The Relations Program might include the voice of the individuals from other schools participating in the videoconferences in order to introduce more productive challenges to their own worldviews. This way the Western frame itself might be recognized as a lens through which The Relations Program participants understand the world, and opened up to a critical interrogation. Interestingly, the student participants addressed the biased nature of Western news information, yet the biased nature of their own views through which they view the news and the world in general was not addressed. This suggests the difficultly in seeing and critiquing our own worldview as we engage with the world; this is a task for global citizenship education. Global citizenship education that disrupts taken for granted worldviews would include critical questions to be engaged by both students and teachers. For instance, Western notions of time and efficiency could be challenged in a guided classroom discussion.

Ironically, the participants maintained the main goal of The Relations Program was to enhance and include multiple perspectives on global issues. Yet, in addition to Western-centric debriefing sessions, it appeared that Amber Rock was very much in control of the decision-making about what schools participate in the videoconferences. This pointed to unequal partnerships among videoconference participants since the decisions about who could come to the table to discuss the particular global issues seemed to be made by one party, as opposed to collectively decided by multiple parties from multiple locations. In essence, this process for choosing schools to participate in the videoconferences has paternalistic undertones as it involves teachers in the global north gazing at the globe and picking out what 'countries' would be of interest to talk with. An open dialogue within The Relations Program (ideally involving other partnering schools) about which schools are chosen and why could promote a discussion regarding issues of access and simultaneously address the logistical complexity of bringing participants together for the videoconferences. This open dialogue could reflect an organic process that explores the dynamic interplay between the local contexts of the participants' larger

social structures that connect them with people elsewhere, thus reflecting an Outward In approach. This way schools might be chosen through the lens of political responsibility, thereby creating more teaching and learning opportunities where the worldviews and positions of the participants might be critiqued and understood in a broader way. Similarly, the topics for the videoconferences could also be chosen through this open, exploratory format. Interestingly, the teachers and students of The Relations Program did not decide on the topics and issues to be discussed at the videoconferences together, democratically. Yet according to Myers (2010) a democratic process that includes the voice and input of students is important, especially since students are the ones who are going to be future global citizens, and thus they require a voice in the construction of their global citizenship education programming. Indeed, global citizenship education has implications for the future citizenship practices of these youth.

Many videoconferences were largely driven by packages provided to The Relations Program by partner organizations (e.g., a virtual classroom package offered by Feeling the World on Tobacco or a package on the Environment offered by the United Nations), which had the potential to limit the perspectives and scope of the videoconferences. A danger in running a conference that is driven by an outside set of mandates or goals such as these is that they can limit the perspectives present, as well as serve the interests of the partner organizations. For instance, the criteria used to choose these particular topics and the ways these topics are presented represent the dilemma that the global is really someone's local applied universally (i.e., Organization A promotes a particular strategy for minimizing violence against women, yet this strategy may be incompatible with the cultural realities of some videoconference participants). Global citizenship education, therefore, must pay critical attention to the ways in which private actions and interests including non-governmental organization (NGO) partnerships may actually contribute to socially unjust aims by preventing or silencing the knowledges and perspectives of disenfranchised groups.

An interrogation of worldview and an awareness of how different perspectives are

represented within global citizenship education are particularly important for the field. Since, in Western contexts, Western knowledge is seen to be superior to 'Other' knowledges (and therefore universal), global citizenship education must include an analysis of the worldview of those in the global north in order to "unravel the biases, … misrepresentations, and marginalization that go on in the "Western" knowledge production about the 'Other'" (Shahjahan, 2005, p. 220). Thus it is imperative that global citizenship education acknowledges the notion of positional superiority.

Essentialism

Alcoff (1991) asserts that speaking for and about others involves acts of representation in which the speaker "participat[es] in the construction of [the other's] subject-positions" (p. 9). This construction, Alcoff (1991) states, is never neutral and "will most likely have an impact on the individual [or group] so represented" (p. 10). Thus, the danger of misrecognition is present within global citizenship initiatives involving intercultural learning and communication. Fraser (1997) describes misrecognition as a symbolic or cultural injustice that "is rooted in social patterns of representation, interpretation, and communication" (p. 14), which may include cultural domination, non-recognition, and disrespect. The injustice of misrecognition includes the stigmatizing discourse that people in the global south are deficient and inferior to the West. This cultural injustice is promulgated by Eurocentrism, or "the authoritative construction of norms that privilege traits associated with 'whiteness'" (p. 22) and the dominant culture.

Importantly, Andreotti (2011) warns that uncritical approaches to global citizenship education may reproduce these essentialistic, Eurocentric assumptions. Similarly, in her critical discussion of global citizenship education initiatives, Shultz (2011) describes treating non-Western cultures in a binaric "relation to Western modernized culture as if both are static, containable, disconnected" (p. 21) as a dangerous practice, and cautions against "educating about 'Others' as deficient victims even as attempts to address structural violence are employed" (p. 21). The participants' dialogue pointed to the issues of misrepresentation, misrecognition, and essentialization that both Andreotti and Shultz address.

Miscommunication based on 'cultural difference' suggested issues of misrecognition within the current study. The participants expressed that miscommunications arose out of 'cultural differences' related to work ethic and accountability. For instance, they expressed minor frustrations about the miscommunication that occurred due to the Western view of 'time' and 'punctuality,' although in reality not all cultures share these values. Similarly, the participants attributed differences in accountability (e.g., partner schools not completing their share of the work) and the result that not every school was able to contribute fully to the videoconferences to cultural differences. Problematically, discussions such as these around notions of cultural difference have the potential to contain 'deficiency' undertones, if not explicit critiques about non-Western cultures. Granted, to help minimize miscommunication and meet the needs of the other schools, the students and teachers at Amber Rock aimed to accommodate the multiple time zones involved in the videoconferences. Some students would even sleep over at school in order to attend at an extremely early or late hour. Yet the participants judged the partnering schools using Western standards of efficiency and punctuality. Andrew's assertion that the reason some cultures were unprepared for the videoconferences because they are *"laid back" (Interview, Teacher)* sent the erroneous message that these people are lazy. These miscommunications were largely blamed on schools in other countries and were not seen to be the fault of Amber Rock. Typically, other schools were blamed for *"not checking their email regularly"* or *"not reading the instructions thoroughly."* These assumptions were not sensitive to issues of language barriers or technological hurdles and, reflecting an Inward Out model, seemed to emanate from an unquestioned Western frame. Unfortunately Andrew and Barry both spoke of these miscommunications as affecting the organizational side of the videoconferences: in reality they have the potential to send strong messages to the Amber Rock students about other cultures while simultaneously reinforcing negative stereotypes. Therefore, with regards to these types of 'cultural differences' that appeared to impede the running of the videoconferences from the perspectives of The Relations Program participants, one might consider the assumptions about

cultures or people that are being reinforced and also consider examining whether these miscommunications and assumptions (positive or negative) are taken up within the classroom context and debriefed. Indeed, the study findings indicate the potential for the serious issue of cultural misrecognition to be promoted through miscommunication and misunderstanding during mediated videoconference engagements.

Similarly, the participants expressed the importance of gaining 'real' knowledge and experience through interactions with other people, yet the notions of miscommunication and misrecognition have the potential to obscure 'reality' through exchanges that are characterized by unchallenged assumptions and stereotypes, thus rendering them inauthentic. Again, one could consider a number of questions including: How is this notion of 'cultural difference' that the participants kept referring to taken up in class? Are stereotypes reinforced or broken down? Is there room for genuine understanding and recognition, or are negative social patterns of representation reinforced or left untouched? These are important questions for combating issues of essentialism within global citizenship education.

Also, the "Same Across Difference" activity had the potential to obscure the fluid and non-monolithic character of culture by treating it as knowable and static. Aiming to be an activity of cultural recognition, one might suggest that it actually served as an act of cultural misrecognition through the stigmatization of certain populations and the reinforcement of negative stereotypes, thus misrepresenting entire groups of people. In this sense, culture and cultural difference are made to be describable and tangible as opposed to fluid and non-essentialized. This activity represents what Fraser (1997) calls an affirmative remedy. She critiques such activities, stating they leave intact the deep societal structures that maintain racial, economic, cultural, and political inequality, thus merely 'scratching the surface' of injustice as opposed to engaging with the underlying structures that maintain such inequality. In the example of this activity, fluid understandings of culture appeared to be limited while sharp bounded notions of culture were reinforced, and this has the potential to lead to exclusions, generalizations,

and feelings of superiority. It thus seems of vital importance that global citizenship initiatives work to combat essentialism as opposed to potentially re-inscribing and promoting injustice by reinforcing the us/them, superior/inferior binaries.

Along the same lines, the participants' Canadian citizenship was strongly emphasized since The Relations Program was set up in a way that forced each school to act as a representative of their home country, to be referred to as 'Canada,' 'Nicauragua,' and 'China,' for example. Yet having program participants acting as representatives of their country can promote bounded understandings of national identities and cultures. Indeed, Massey (1994) reminds us that Canadian identity and what it means to be 'Canadian' are both socially constructed and based largely on the interests of the dominant culture, therefore protectionist and nationalist attitudes may potentially arise out of this type of program format as program participants measure, compare, and construct the cultures and identities of others.

Other issues regarding the themes of essentialism were raised based on the participants' discussions of people 'elsewhere.' Characteristic of the Inward Out model, the participants spoke in binaric terms as they generalized and compared the work habits of people in developing countries to those in developed nations. The notion that people need their jobs more in developing nations than people in developed nations like Canada suggested that people in developing nations are poor and in need of money. Similarity, it obscured the fact that people in Canada are in differential social positions and degrees of need.

Knowledge from elsewhere was also treated as 'located' elsewhere, indicating another Inward Out model characteristic. For instance Keira said, *"it is a lot cooler learning from the root of the source" (Interview, Student)* than from textbooks. Interestingly, Barry maintained one of the aims of the aims of The Relations Program was to create *"living textbooks" (Interview, Teacher)* through the interactions with others. Yet both of these comments placed the knowledge of others elsewhere, which suggested this knowledge was considered static and isolated to specific geographical locations as opposed to dynamic and socially constructed. Also, seeing

cultures 'first hand' as opposed to talking with people in a videoconference setting was seen as superior by Barry, yet this comment seemed to promote culture as static and geographically bound as well. This issue of locatedness (also a characteristic of the Inward Out model that the participants displayed) further promoted the idea that the sources of global issues existed 'elsewhere,' and this appeared to minimize the responsibility of the participants in global issues and name Western knowledge as absent of culture.

Globalization and Positionality

The participants' constructions of globalization reflected the themes of 'interconnectedness' and 'global community building.' Hakim's statement elucidated this idea: *"I describe [globalization] as people from all around the world getting together. Like we are becoming kind of this one country, this global village" (Interview, Student).* Yet, as Case (1993) and Roman (2003) indicate, these sorts of constructions obscure the multiple, complex factors that contribute to peoples' unequal positionings within the processes of globalization. Overall the participants championed a neutral and somewhat positive 'interconnectedness' model of globalization. Yet this indicates an absence of consideration for (or interrogation of) the economic, cultural, and political structural injustices that advantage some and disenfranchise many. Although some participants addressed the power imbalances of the global economic system and the negative effects of economic globalization, they focused solely upon disadvantaged, developing nations as opposed to including a discussion of the responsibility of 'developed' nations to these particularly devastating effects. Similarly, economic globalization and its concomitant effects were described as reified, inevitable processes, yet this has the potential to limit understanding and interrogation of the historical process and relations of globalization that continue to inscribe certain groups in positions of power. Thus, the participants' understandings of globalization as reified had the potential to further prevent understandings of globalization as a set of power-imbued relationships.

In addition, the participants discussed globalization as expanded one's ability to 'view' the world, access knowledge, and understand global issues, which suggested universal access to technology and global communication. Yet the notions of globalization 'opening up' the world, increasing access to knowledge, and allowing people to view everything around them are erroneous (and characteristic of the Inward Out model) due to the fact that people are placed differentially within the relations of globalization: those less in control of the driving forces behind globalization have less access and ability to see everything that is going on around them. Massey (1994) asserts that the discourse of time-space compression, which currently shapes mainstream understandings of globalization and interconnectedness and is very much tied to the erroneous assumption that technology is available to everyone equally, is typically proliferated by dominant groups. She states, "this time-space compression needs differentiating socially" (p. 148) since we are not all affected by it on the same way, and processes of globalization must be considered on multiple levels and from multiple locations. For instance, "different social groups, and different individuals, are placed in very distinct ways in relation to [the] flows and interconnections" (p. 149) of capital, transportation and telecommunications. We must ask about the politics of mobility and access, since "differential mobility can weaken the leverage of the already weak. The time-space compression of some groups can undermine the power of others" (p. 150).

The participants' constructions of globalization indicated particular, narrow understandings that, according to Shultz (2007; 2011), will affect how they understand and enact global citizenship. Indeed, these narrow understandings have the potential to promote unproblematized assumptions about the ability of all people to participate freely within the processes of globalization, rendering the relations inherent within globalization neutral and neglecting critical understandings of the processes that serve to disenfranchise certain groups. Thus, it is imperative that global citizenship education problematizes particular understandings and discourses of globalization, especially since globalization typically is conceptualized from the

dominant cultural perspective. Similarly, it is important for global citizenship education programs that utilize telecommunications and technology to ask how the relative mobility of some affects others who might not have access to communications technology.

Discourses and Binariality

Discourse is a powerful form of representation (Hall, 2007). Specifically, "[a] discourse is a group of statements which provide a language for talking about – i.e., a way of representing – a particular kind of knowledge about a topic" (p. 56). Discourses shape and control the way in which certain bodies of knowledge are constructed in particular contexts. The area of global citizenship education is itself shaped by a range of discourses, and in turn produces its own set of discourses as it is practiced. Consequently, certain discourses may act as powerful forms of misrepresentation and serve to politically and culturally disenfranchise certain groups or individuals. Indeed, discourses stemming from colonial relations of dominance serve to produce "representations and practices that name, marginalize, and defin[e] difference as the devalued Other" (Giroux, 1992, p. 33).

Andreotti (2011) asserts global citizenship education discourses and practices must be problematized due to "the long-term potential implications for … specific construction[s] of the learners' identities and privileges as 'global citizens'" (p. 145). Specifically, Andreotti addresses a number of harmful implications produced by these unproblematized discourses. These implications include:

> The reification of hierarchies of worth of knowledges and contributions, the reinforcement of a contested teleological notion of development based on Western parameters, an increase in self worth and privilege for 'Northern' partners, the corroboration of unequal power relations, obstructed and tokenistic dialogue, a missionary feeling on the part of northern partners reproducing colonial relations of power, [and] the reinforcement of assumptions of cultural and economic supremacy. (p. 145)

According to Giroux (1992) it is imperative that problematic discourses be taken up within global citizenship education so that students and teachers might critically address how oppressive representations deny the humanity of others, while learning how to challenge these representations and the underlying power imbalances that they reinforce (p. 33). Considering the writings of Andreotti and Giroux, the next section discusses exemplars of discourses that were highlighted as part of the data analysis.

Development. Shahjahan (2005) highlights the dominance of "'Western' knowledge through its association with colonialism and capitalism … [and] the violence inherent in 'Western' … ontology, epistemology and methodology" (p. 224). This violence, in part, is maintained through discourses of 'development' that serve to reinscribe the us/them, superior/inferior, developed/underdeveloped, and rich/poor binaries, and thus a condition of binariality. This binariality, characteristic of the Inward Out model, is reinforced by pervasive Western discourses of development that treat the 'developing' world as a homogenous region of deficiency (Smith, 1999). These discourses affect the ways in which global citizenship is constructed and enacted within schools.

The discourse of development saturated the discussions with the participants in numerous ways. In general, the participants described development in a linear fashion with the West representing the epitome. However, although this linear view of development persisted it was not necessarily unidirectional. For instance, some participants pointed out the West could be underdeveloped in some ways also, and they rejected the idea of using only Western notions of development. For instance Umut declared, *"you can still be developed in a sense but you don't have to be like the West" (Interview, Student).* Although the youth participants problematized Western notions of development, the participants' descriptions of development also displayed a number of tensions and contradictions. For instance Hakim said he had now experienced *"both views" (interview, Student)* of the world since he had spent seven years living in Lebanon, yet his statement appeared to reinforce the developed/developing binary by simplifying the world into

two over-generalized categories. The other participants also used over-generalized, stigmatizing statements to represent developing countries that had the potential to obscure the complexity and diversity within the 'developing' world. At the same time, however, participants expressed their disdain for the developed/developing binary due to its paternalistic and negative connotations. Similarly, although the participants agreed that development was a Western construction and addressed the relative power that the West holds in relation to development, they stressed that people and countries are in fact 'developed' in different ways from each other and specifically from Westernized constructs of development. An interesting contradiction that escaped scrutiny within the dialogues was that although the participants championed multiple forms of development, the Eight Millennium Development goals that serve as the foundation for many of The Relations Program videoconferences represent particular, Western ideas about development themselves.

These tensions were partly problematized during the focus group discussion, yet it appeared there had not been previous discussion about development. This was surprising given that many of the videoconference themes revolve around the Eight Millennium Development goals and topics directly related to development issues. Some of the student participants displayed strong and complex opinions about development, which included problematizing Western orientations of development and aid while exposing its hegemonic nature. Yet as was mentioned above, although multiple forms of development were entertained the participants' dialogue overall was still framed tightly by the West/Rest development dichotomy, and this pointed to the assumed superiority of the West within the predominant Western-centric development model. This conversation represented an example of the type of critical dialogue that needs to be present within global citizenship education so that students and teachers might build the critical knowledge and understanding to step out of the 'West and the Rest' frame that is so often taken for granted.

The participants referred to the West as "us/we/I." In essence, this suggested they had internalized the West's identity and felt comfortable speaking as representatives of the West. A danger of this discourse, especially within the context of development, is that it can promote an essentialized, narrow view of Canada as developed and defined by its ability to help others, as well as the notion of a reified, homogenous West. Similarly, it has the potential to disregard the numerous disenfranchised populations living within Canada's borders who could be described as 'underdeveloped,' as well as infuse the concept of 'Western helper' into the participants' identities while casting the majority of the world as deficient and needing some kind of Westernized assistance. Similarly, the participants spoke about having it *"so much better"* here in Canada, yet this discourse indicated a false dichotomy between the 'betterness' of Canada and the rest of the world while potentially reinforcing assumptions about Canada's superiority. This has serious potential implications for how the participants construct their identities and roles as global citizens, including internalizing a sense of cultural and positional superiority in relation to others from non-Western locations. Without problematizing the West/Rest and the developed/developing binaries within global citizenship education, feelings of cultural superiority may be reinforced.

Although participants asserted that development should not necessarily be dictated by Western standards, the traditional/urban binary expressed in the participants' dialogue reinforced a linear, unidirectional model of development. This model, according to Sztompka (1993), is based on imperialistic, Eurocentric rankings wherein nation-states are placed on a common ladder of civility and progress. The West, in this linear model, represents the top rung. Interestingly, the student participants conflated the traditional/modern and the rural/urban binaries and often times used urban as the opposite to traditional. The youth used urban to imply modern and traditional to imply rural, which appeared to further entrench the binaries yet obscure them at the same time. Without a deep engagement with the meanings of 'traditional,' 'modern,' 'rural,' and 'urban' within global citizenship education, social problems and misunderstandings based on an

understanding that a slower, more localized lifestyle is somehow lesser than a modernized one are proliferated. Such thinking leaves many questions about why societies more connected to farming, local community, and with orientations to tradition are labelled as somehow deficient. Given this, one might consider how global citizenship education initiatives might address underlying beliefs about tradition being the antithesis of development. Similarly, a question that that might address some of these misunderstandings within the global citizenship classroom is: Who feeds the urban, modern citizen? Critical dialogue that aims to interrogate discourses of development and to further dispel notions of Western superiority, therefore, is an important ingredient for socially just global citizenship education.

In a similar way, indigenous peoples and cultures were described as historical and 'in the past,' and were thus considered to be under threat of disappearing due to homogenization. Keira's comment regarding learning about these *"old"* cultures suggested that they will eventually be subsumed within the Western cultural tradition and relegated to mere history textbooks. Based on a seemingly Western-centric perspective, this points to the need for other cultures to adapt into the Western motif in order to prosper through globalization. Given this mentality, Western cultures are unquestionably assumed to persist and dominate in this globalizing milieu. In this way, the traditional/urban binary has paternalistic, Eurocentric undertones that need to be challenged within global citizenship education.

Neoliberalism and meritocracy. The participants' discourse also indicated neoliberal discourse. As was pointed to above, the ways in which participants framed development around Western concepts such as technology, capital, and health while speaking about non-Western nations using over-simplified generalizations produced the potential for misrepresentations of so called 'developing' nations. Keira's statement explaining that people in the world are positioned the way they are due to their historic ability to get ahead, their skills, and intelligence versus others who were not educated enough to get ahead suggested mis-informed meritocratic thinking. Similarly, Umut described Turkey as 'behind,' yet this statement was based on a socially

constructed, Western scale and ignored the long and regionally (if not globally) significant Turkish history.

Given the myth of meritocracy embedded within neoliberal discourse, it is no wonder that people internalize early on that the reason Africa is 'starving' is because Africans are somehow lacking in knowledge or skill. These discourses inform students' conceptualizations of poverty as existing only in 'developing' nations. Another problem lies in the fact that poverty becomes learned as an inherent trait of the people who are hungry, and to 'fix' their hunger they need to work harder, have fewer children, and become more like the modern citizen. These understandings will influence how students and teachers perceive the notion of aid and helping, and inform how they conceptualize and construct global citizenship and global citizenship actions. Similarly, the 'development' model may become unproblematically subsumed within a Western model of progress and development where all developing countries are on, or should be on, a path towards Westernization. Thus, social inequality becomes rationalized and normalized before it is even recognized as a symptom of hegemony.

The Relations Program also aimed to enhance students' ability to navigate through relationships with different people and cultures around the world. Similarly, the Program promoted a global perspective with the overarching themes of preparing students for participation in the global market place. Yet these aims could be characterized as individualistic and based on the neoliberal entrepreneurial model. Shultz (2007) critiques neoliberal models as they limit students' citizenship practices to economic spheres and leave out important aspects of citizenship for a globalizing world such as political responsibility, while neglecting to address issues of power and access. Similarly, due to the consumer-culture embedded within it, Roman (2003) warns that neoliberal global citizenship education treats difference as a commodity to be consumed, wherein difference becomes essentialized as opposed to engaged with on its own terms.

The study findings and discussion regarding neoliberal discourse surface important questions about the context for global citizenship education. Neoliberal ideology poses a threat to the critical nature of global citizenship education. Through neoliberal and meritocratic discourses an educational context is created where students (whether they are part of the dominant culture or not) internalize the structures that support neoliberalism and meritocracy. Global citizenship education infused with neoliberal tenets limits a critical engagement with the world causing students to acquire a skewed, alienated view of it, and thus will hinder their ability to deconstruct dominant hegemonies or assumptions (McLaren, 1994). Thus without interrogation, global citizenship education will come to reinforce the global reality in which elites hold the power, and redistributing this power is virtually futile.

Burden of the West. The discourse of the Western helper is an embedded idea within the dominant culture that it is the 'burden' of people in the West to help 'less fortunate' countries. In fact, the rapid transition from colonialism to foreign aid which characterized much of the process of so-called 'decolonization' played directly into the Burden of the West theme, which "emerged from the West's self-pleasing fantasy that 'we' were the chosen ones to save the Rest" (Easterly, 2006, p. 23). Thus, the 'myth' of meritocracy plays into the infamous Burden of the West discourse as Westerners take on the role of hero helper by aiming to lift those who are unable to be successful (by full fault of their own) up into the wonderful ream of 'developed.' The participants' comments, at times, suggested the 'Burden of the West' discourse, which has the potential to generate problematic ideas and stereotypes about disenfranchised groups, label certain groups as in perpetual need, and support idealistic conceptualizations about global citizens in the West. Also, the idea that globalization enriched the personal citizenship and identities of participants because of the heightened awareness they gained (e.g., their role and responsibility to help resolve global issues) indicated paternalistic undertones. Seen in this way, globalization and the developed/developing binary have the potential to contribute to the development of global citizen identities as benevolent 'First World' helpers whose duty it is to save diminishing nations

in the developing world from themselves. Positively, the participants stressed the importance of knowing the specifics of a particular case, whether local or global, before acting to 'help' it, which pointed to complex understandings of global citizenship actions in the world. For instance, some of the student participants critiqued aid as a Western prerogative, recognizing that developing countries do not always have a voice in how the aid is used. Although this suggested an understanding that the needs and realities of those on the receiving end must be represented within the 'helping' relationship, other potentially problematic discourses surfaced in the dialogue.

'Help' motivated through 'kindness' as opposed to an act of political responsibility was another indication of the Burden of the West discourse that was suggested by the participants' dialogue, specifically promoted by Leah. Here, helping seemed optional, and as something that should be applauded when given. Problematically, if citizens in developing nations are viewed as being in self-induced poverty traps (Easterly, 2006), and if the West's 'selfless' aid or help does not appear to change this state, then feelings of resentment and misunderstanding may surface. This mind set can lead to citizens in Western locations feeling like developing nations 'owe' them something in return for receiving help. For instance, Leah had strong feelings about not just 'giving' developing nations technology and resources since according to her, *"we worked for it, and I think they can work for it to. … We're not going to do everything for country, you know?" (Interview, Student).* Yet the potential danger of this mentality lies in its dismissal of the multiple, unequal relations of power that contribute to peoples' positions on the global stage and the negative assumptions and ideas that become attributed to people in 'developing' nations. Essentially, this thinking can promote colonially-tainted understandings of people's positions in the world. This line of thinking can also negate the political responsibility of the West in relation to the global injustices that perpetuate structural issues such as poverty. Thus, global citizenship for students in Western locations may become conditional, and entrenched with ideas about cultural superiority.

Similarly, the participants' dialogue suggested that a global citizen may be narrowly described as someone who 'helps other less-fortunate countries' and recognizes the altruism of their own nation, yet this is problematic for global citizenship education. Along these lines, action and involvement in change are important aspects of global citizenship, yet they may remain centred around helping developing nations reach their potential, and thus reinforce the developed/developing binary. This sets up a highly paternalistic relation that can also disregard Canada's role in unjust global structures. The use of the adjective 'less-fortunate' also suggested an underlying assumption about the naturalness of the uneven economic and political positionings of different countries and groups of people in the world.

Africa was consistently named as a region suffering from inequality, experiencing major issues such as poverty and lack of education, and in need of 'development.' Unfortunately, extending from the theme of the 'Burden of the West,' Africa inevitably becomes the shared image for poverty and oftentimes becomes the focus of many global citizenship initiatives and programs. The imbedded discourses of the "White Man's Burden" (Easterly, 2006) run so deep it is not surprising that our minds commonly drift to Africa when we think about aid, poverty, and starving children. These discourses and thought patterns have the potential to misrepresent African people by way of negative generalizations and stereotypes, and must be challenged within global citizenship education.

Agency and Responsibility

The participants discussed global issues with passivity and spoke about global problems as 'inevitable' in many instances. For example poverty was discussed as inevitable, yet this has the potential to neglect understandings of global issues as having systemic roots in the global economic and social structure. Similarly, the participants typically characterized economic globalization and its effects as unchangeable. This assumed inevitability could have detrimental effects on the students' perceptions of the world and their ability to create lasting, meaningful change through informed action. Indeed, ignorance is the enemy of hope. Without hope for a

better, more socially just world, the world itself is denied for what it is (Freire, 2000). As Freire states, "the dehumanization resulting from an unjust order is not a cause for despair but for hope, leading to the incessant pursuit of the humanity which is denied by injustice" (p. 91-92). The difference between hopelessness and possibility is elucidated by Young's (2011) argument about social justice, which suggests it is neither natural nor socially just for people to be in a position of poverty. Poverty is a structural injustice perpetuated by unjust social structures and produced by the multiple and complex actions of social actors: poverty is therefore changeable by the actions and agency of social actors.

In general there appeared to be a lack of direction for students to realize their agency or explore ways to express agentic behaviour within The Relations Program. Umut's apparent apathy, which was symptomatic of the non-action of The Relations Program that was touched on in the youth participants' dialogue, points to the important need for 'agentic outlets' in global citizenship education. This also suggests the youth were indeed yearning for global citizenship that moves beyond merely learning about other places (Davies, 2006) and takes constructive steps towards ameliorating global issues. Providing socially just opportunities for students and teachers to realize their agency, and hence political responsibility, may enrich global citizenship education.

Realizing agency through channels attached to the nation-state, however, was a theme that arose in the dialogue. Influencing government can be a powerful way to express your voice and create change in wealthy democratic nations (Easterly, 2006). Yet this avenue is not available to all people equally and alternative avenues for action must be explored. Indeed, by assuming the government or people in positions of power are the bodies with the most influence may potentially foreclose other opportunities for action that are driven by individual agency and collective action. Influencing those with power is productive, but according to Young (2011) it can also delimit the perceived sense of influence of individuals working in a collectivity. Similarly, Fraser (2009) reminds us of the exclusionary, unjust nature of the nation-state and pushes for post-national notions of citizenship and action.

On a global scale, the participants spoke to the seemingly disconnected, inward-focused nature of the word and nation-states. Their dialogue addressed how the individualist understandings of social relations that dominate the current cultural condition (Young, 2011) can undermine agency and collective responsibility. Yet two themes arose in the participants' dialogues that seemed to be in tension with their laments about the individualist nature of the world and its people, namely 'minding our own business' and 'helping ourselves first.' While stressing the importance of helping ourselves before others and staying out of people's business has numerous positive applications on the global scale (e.g., nation-states taking responsibility for global issues that they contribute to by 'fixing themselves first' and the negative consequences that can happen when one nation tries to forcefully change the government of another), the danger lies in the dismissal of an interrogation of our own actions, our taking responsibility for them, and an understanding how our actions are linked to perpetuating or stopping global injustice. Here, the image of an ostrich with its head buried in the sand comes to mind. The notions of 'fix yourself first' and 'mind your own business' seem to neglect the systems and relations in place that prevent certain people and countries from 'fixing themselves,' and present a narrow view of responsibility. Problematically, this view assumes a level of 'choice' to act versus realizing a responsibility to related to issues of political responsibility. The participants' statements about helping yourself first and then becoming connected with other places in order to help them suggest the irony in these two themes. Indeed, the world is actually already connected in so many ways, and for the most part people and countries do not have a choice in terms of being connected due to the power-imbued relations of globalization. So, this notion of 'choosing' to become connected after you have your own local issues dealt with is problematic since it sets connectedness and responsibility up like choices while dismissing political responsibility. Similarly, this idea eschews the ways in which we are already so deeply connected, which is an important theme for global citizenship education.

The ‘fix yourself first before helping others’ theme also indicated a partition between local issues and global issues, thus mystifying their interconnectedness. The separateness by which the participants spoke of local and global issues and actions had the potential to impact how they conceptualized global citizenship and global citizenship actions. For instance, the participants were largely unable to link local actions to their greater global effects. This was an interesting finding, given that the ‘think global, act local’ moniker was a familiar phrase used by The Relations Program participants. Similarly, they spoke in ways that indicated sharp divisions between ‘local’ and ‘global.’ A ‘global’ action that was discussed a number of times in the interviews was the notion of building a school elsewhere. Problematizing building a school elsewhere within The Relations Program class could be a powerful conversation that might problematize the local/global binary that was evident in the participants’ dialogue. Indeed, the local perspectives of those in the recipient country could be included alongside the local perspectives of the students in Canada. The ‘global’ might then be problematized as the students navigate between this perceived global endeavour, its local reality, and investigate whose local is being projected as the common global.

The participants generally associated global citizenship with global actions, which suggested the agency of global citizens exists in the realm of the global. Yet there are dangers in categorizing a global citizen by their ‘global’ actions for it confounds the notion of political responsibility. For example, while describing how global citizenship would look for different people different parts of the world, the participants suggested mediating factors such as poverty, employment, and government prevented people realizing full global citizenship in developing countries. Andrew gave the example of an individual choosing to feed their children by working in a destructive mine versus quitting their job for political reasons and letting their family go hungry. This individual’s immediate need (i.e., feeding his/her family) was seen as preventing them from realizing full global citizenship. Unfortunately, the global citizenship to which Andrew and the other participants were referring was consistent with a Western model that reflects

specific actions and behaviours such as providing help to those in need, speaking out against injustice and making your voice heard, and connecting with others across the globe. Yet if people are seen as unable to act as global citizens in a capacity similar to the Western ideal, this has the potential to open the floodgates for promoting a Westernized agenda of global citizenship. By associating global citizens with global actions and by using solely Western definitions of global citizenship, the agency and citizenship of disenfranchised people are severely diminished while Western constructions of global citizenship are promoted as dominant and superior in global citizenship education.

Similarly, by directing global citizenship actions and impacts 'elsewhere' (i.e., globally), this serves to direct the problem elsewhere and out of the local space of the social actor. Characteristic of the Inward Out model, this threatens to dismiss the responsibility of the social actor's own socio-historical position and places the blame upon others 'elsewhere.' In addition, when a global citizen is defined merely through actions that 'help' the world, (through acting locally or globally), then all of the actions of global citizens that fall outside of the realm of 'help' may escape implication in global processes that produce and sustain injustice. The participants relied heavily on the identity of global citizens as global helpers, yet this limited view appeared to neglect the idea that all of our actions (not merely our helping ones) are implicated in the social structures and processes that sustain injustice. The reified understandings of global injustice and globalization suggested by the participants have the potential to reinforce understandings of global citizens as 'helping in the global,' as opposed to more personally responsible and grounded understandings. Indeed, more attention needs to be paid to how global citizenship education initiatives can promote the idea that '*we are* the processes that create the global condition, and therefore *we are* the change.' The Outward In model reflects a starting point for promoting agency and social justice within global citizenship education.

The Outward In model. The Outward In model represents a complex set of multi-directional and evolving processes between the social actor and their position(s) in the world.

Indeed, the Outward In model rejects the separation of the local from the global, a contention that becomes increasingly illegitimate in our globalizing milieu. Importantly, as social space and structure is a product of the multiple connected actions of social actors (Massey, 1994: Young, 2011), global citizenship education must infuse understandings of local and global as connected and dialectical. In addition, the local/global binary needs to be problematized within global citizenship education due to the changing nature of citizenships in our globalizing age (Myers, 2010) and the post-national structure of global issues and relations (Fraser, 2009; Young, 2011). Yet, although it is imperative that the dialectical relationship between the local and the global is addressed within global citizenship education, this relationship must not morph into hegemonic forms that project only certain localities. Indeed, the local/global binary, in the context of global citizenship education, threatens to project specific localities into the realm of the global, which may in turn privilege the local of a few and disavow the local of many. Thus, global citizenship education must arguably detach itself from its adherence to the global and critically incorporate more complicated understandings of the local/global binary. This incorporation might also include a rejection of the binary itself, reflecting Massey's (1994) conceptualization of place which says place must be considered "in terms of social relations" (p. 19) imbued with power and meaning. These relations imply "the existence … of a simultaneous multiplicity of spaces; cross-cutting, intersecting, aligning with one another, or existing in relations of paradox or antagonism" (p. 3). Since Massey (1994) conceptualizes space as socially constructed, fluid, dynamic, and where differential power dynamics and relations are constantly negotiated, people play an active role in shaping the social structure of which they are a part. Thus, Massey's argument challenges the common understanding of globalization as an unproblematic, natural, and inevitable set of flows of relations and interactions and asserts that the processes of globalization are socially constructed and changeable. This is powerful since, as was mentioned above, oftentimes the economic, social, and political injustices inherent within the relations of globalization are attributed to individual deficits of countries and people as opposed to recognized as products of

socially constructed systems of oppression and misrepresentation, and are thus regarded as unchangeable and omnipotent. The Outward In model, therefore, challenges dominant conceptions of globalization and promotes agency through the realization of political responsibility by addressing how the social actor takes up space within global structures.

The notion of eduscape, as offered by Abdi and Naseem (2008), Beck et al. (2007), and Kynaslahti (1998), enriches the Outward In model while further enhancing its significance for global citizenship education. Appadurai (1996) contends arguments that connect globalization with cultural homogenization often fail to consider the processes of indigenization that occur as the forces of globalization penetrate multiple localities. Thus, according to Appadurai "the new global cultural economy has to be seen as a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order that cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models" (p. 32). The concept of eduscape challenges the nature and direction of global cultural flows by articulating the "fluidity, the irregularity and great variety of the globalization process, … [understanding] the extremely complex relationships among these dimensions and the multiple ways in which flows occur among them" (Beck et al., 2007, para. 11).

Based on Appadurai's (1996) arguments, globalization reflects Massey's (1994) conceptualization as an inherently uneven matrix of social/power relations. Globalization may thus be conceptualized as a "series of complex interactions and a synthesis of globalizing and localizing, [where] the local is not separate from, nor a binary of the global, but part of it" (Beck et al., 2007, para. 9). The notion of eduscape, therefore, allows for "the simultaneity of convergence and fragmentation … making opportunity for the 'flows' of discourse to move in 'increasingly non-isomorphic paths' rather than the assimilationist (or conformist) forms of centre-periphery expected from a western-eastern binary" (para. 11) that, as the findings of this research allude to, may be constructed within global citizenship education in Western locations.

Consequently, the concept of eduscape enhances global citizenship education in multiple ways, which are deeply connected to the notion of deterritorialization. These ways include the

breaking down of hegemonic understandings of citizenship and belonging, a penetration and reterritorialization of the developed/developing binary that typically dominate global discourse, enabling an authentic process of self understanding and investigation of our own worldviews in relation to others, and enabling more creative outlets for global citizenship actions and agency through transformative approaches (Fraser, 1997) and initiatives.

Specifically, global citizenship education informed by the logic of the eduscape may be sensitive to the tensions between the local, national, and the global, "with the aim of emphasizing the interconnections among and between larger global processes of domination and local/global social struggle" (Roman, 2003, p. 284). Roman stresses the need for a global citizenship curricula "that at the very least places nation as a taken-for-granted category of student understanding, questioning not only … national myths or dominant truths but, also the exceptionally diverse aspects of nationalism in larger global struggles for equality" (p. 284). Thus an Outward In model enriched by the concept of eduscape assists in preventing any singular 'local' from representing everyone's 'global.' Similarly, global citizenship education is better equipped to reject tokenistic initiatives by adopting a critical, relational discourse (p. 284). This way, the important relationship between social justice and global citizenship education might be realized "through a cross-structural, contingent, and historically dynamic lens" (p. 284-285) offered by the notion of eduscape. Also, global citizenship itself might be constructed differently according to the location of each school or classroom in order to draw on the unique contexts and understandings of students and teachers. By constructing their own meanings for global citizenship and rejecting dominant understandings, students and teachers might feel more ownership and agency within their respective global citizenship initiatives.

The notion of eduscape also attends to the constructed nature of global citizenship by addressing the multiple, unbounded factors that shape our identity and actions in the world. Positively, the participants used global citizenship as a way to describe citizenship responsibilities as extending beyond legal status or boundaries. The numerous ways in which the youth

participants in particular spoke about global citizenship (i.e., as part of their identity, as granted to all by virtue of being born in this world, as a label for those who participate in ameliorating the global condition) reflected their ability to navigate through multiple, diverse understandings of citizenship. The youth also exemplified the inextricable relationship between a social actor's location and personal constructions of global citizenship by addressing the important role of agency within global citizenship. In this way, this global citizenship 'case' indicated a strong foundation for opening up spaces for solidarity between The Relations Program participants and social actors across the world.

Thus, global citizenship education that rejects the local/global binary as a way to separate the local from the global and recognizes how social actors are active participants within global structures will be better positioned to challenge apathy and promote agency. Similarly, it may challenge the condition of binariality often promoted by uncritical approaches to global citizenship education and the discourses that promote it. This kind of global citizenship education would also recognize that the multiple identities and histories of the teacher and student participants play a large role in shaping how global citizenship is constructed within their particular school context. Seen in this light, the eduscape offers a space in which "globalization, itself, can be used effectively to form … powerful coalitions in education that connect people and places to the larger social purposes [of education]" (Daniel, 2007, p. 18). This can be seen in part through the ways in which citizenships are expanding and changing to reflect the constructed nature of citizenship. Similarly, this can be seen through notions of political responsibility and solidarity that people are realizing more and more as we become acutely aware of our intricate, problematic, and deeply powerful connections.

Chapter Summary

Along with an acknowledgement of the dialectical relationship between the local and the global, many of the critiques and suggestions outlined in this chapter have to do with the issue of privileging the local of The Relations Program Participants. This chapter also discussed the

potential effects of neoliberal ideology and Western-centric discourses of development on global citizenship, namely that it becomes tightly bound to the binaries of West/Rest, Us/Them, and Developed/Developing. These discourses contribute to a condition of binariality that reinscribes oppressive, colonial relations and ways of being in the world. Integral to remedying these issues is an interrogation of worldviews and, particularly, Western frames of knowledge and the historical processes that contribute to how we see and understand the world.

Finally it was suggested that agency through the realization of political responsibility was impeded by reified understandings of global structures, and that a new conceptualization of the local/global binary might create space for more inclusive, socially just global citizenship education. The Outward In model and the notion of the eduscape were discussed as important ingredients for socially just global citizenship education that attends to issues of essentialism, cultural superiority, and the separation of the global from the local.

Chapter 6: Suggestions and Reflections

In this final chapter I will present a number of critical questions for the realm of global citizenship education with the aim of providing meaningful contributions to the field through ongoing research efforts. Although my engagement with the data was limited by choice to incorporate a single theoretical lens (i.e., social justice), I was able to critically engage with the participants' dialogue and highlight some of the areas within global citizenship education that require attention. I will reflect on some emerging questions that arose during this research process, and suggest areas for future study.

Social Justice Perspective for Globalization

A critical question that came out of this study is: How we might narrow the gap between unproblematic, reified conceptualizations of globalization that promote an unjust project of Western domination and those that serve to construct globalization as socially constructed and historically contingent? Indeed, global citizenship education must include a problematization of reified conceptualizations of globalization that serve to reinscribe notions of superiority and relations of dominance. Global citizenship education needs to ask the questions: What are the specific challenges presented to global citizenship by globalization? How, or who gets to define what effective global citizenship looks like? How is agency promoted or distorted by competing discourses of neoliberalism and social justice within global citizenship discourses? By asking these critical questions, globalization might be embraced as a complex bundle of inclusions and exclusions as opposed to a neutral, ubiquitous, inevitable phenomenon. These questions are extremely important for global citizenship education as they directly engage with notions of responsibility, agency, and social justice.

Indeed, as globalization further complicates the social, economic, and political relations between regions and people, social justice becomes an increasingly important language for regulating and assessing these multiple relations. Our globalizing world is characterized by multiple global, structural injustices that have implications for how we conceptualize and

understand our responsibility to others. This is particularly relevant in our globalizing world since the grammar of the nation-state "is out of synch with the structural causes of many injustices in a globalizing world, which are not territorial in character" (Fraser, 2009, p. 23). Social justice claims, according to Fraser, must therefore be re-territorialized in order to reflect the multiple citizenship roles that social actors inhabit, and they need to be sensitive to the "competing geographical scales" (p. 2) that issues of social justice traverse. Global citizenship education has the responsibility, then, to provide the context and learning spaces that promote critical engagements with the world in socially just ways that reflect the multiplicity and complexity of global structures and our roles within them.

This study highlighted that not only should global citizenship education be critically analyzed in relation to challenges presented by globalization, but also specific attention should be paid to how global citizenship education articulates, takes up, and critiques globalization itself. The study explored the relationship between particular discourses of development, neoliberalism, Western superiority, and the participants' constructions of global citizenship. Thus, this research represents one starting point for an investigation of the relationship between peoples' understandings of globalization, global issues, and their constructions of global citizenship, including their perceived impact and specific actions as 'global citizens.'

Therefore, not only is "further critical thought, research, analysis and theorization … needed on the impact of different approaches to global citizenship education in different contexts" (Andreotti, 2011, p. 155), but also further investigation into the relationship between peoples' understandings of globalization and the effects on their global constructions citizenship.

Worldview

Particularly important to the realm of global citizenship education is the notion of worldview. For both students and teachers it is imperative that all worldviews are interrogated: particularly, Western frames must not be taken for granted. Thus, global citizenship education needs a critical element so that it might challenge the assumed superiority of the cultural and

economic conditions of Western societies. This would involve problematizing Western discourses about development and global citizenship. The 'development' model is pervasive within global citizenship education and it serves to reinscribe colonial relations of dominance. I propose that global citizenship education would benefit greatly if the development model and discourses of development were removed entirely from the field.

Both of the teacher participants displayed high levels of self-reflexivity, which is an extremely important ingredient for global citizenship education. Andrew and Barry were very critical and reflective, and they discussed the tensions and contradictions regarding their relative privileges with their students. Similarly, Andrew and Barry were aware of the critical lens that I was bring binging to this research project and invited me to share this lens with the students and staff in an informal presentation at Amber Rock. Here, Andrew explained to the students and staff that by engaging with the critical perspectives of others our own ways of doing things might be strengthened and informed. By modeling reflexivity and self-critique, and by welcoming critical perspectives into the classroom, teachers can invite students to begin the process of interrogating themselves and their position in the world in relation to others and to start challenging their respective worldviews. If teachers are able to model this behavior, students in global citizenship education programs may become more able to challenge Western notions of linear causality and cultural superiority so that the "actions of agents in the 'superior' society who help to develop the other non-developed nations" (p. 310) can be critiqued as opposed to uncritically legitimated. Perhaps in depth classroom discussions involving critical dialogue about the meaning of global citizenship, along with a critical interrogation of worldview, will assist in tackling the 'Western helper' motif embedded within global citizenship education.

Hope and Responsibility

One might also ask, if people's citizenship statuses are so unequal and varied across the globe then how could we imagine a kind of citizenship that is, by its very nature, global (i.e., global citizenship)? I think we can imagine it because global citizenship does not rely on any

political body or supra-structure to grant it to people. It is a moral citizenship that is constructed in local contexts and given meaning and breath through local actions with global impacts. Global citizenship is given breath through the realization of political agency that is fueled by hope. In order to breed the kind of hope that shifts understandings of global issues from inevitable to changeable, global citizenship education must engage in meaningful discussions about the structure of the world, globalization, and the historically contingent and constructed nature of global issues. As Lipman (2009) maintains, "students need an education that instills a sense of hope and possibility that they can make a difference in their own family, school, and community and in the broader national and global community" (p. 373). Thus, global citizenship education must create avenues for agency; otherwise students may fall into apathetic, immobilizing stagnation. Indeed, understandings of global structures as reified lead to understandings of injustice as inevitable, which kill agency. Political responsibility that promotes solidarity, therefore, grows out of the hopeful understanding that the state of the world is not merely 'given,' but is historically contingent and changeable.

Given the uneven processes of globalization, the evolving nature of citizenship(s) in this globalizing world, the changing the role of the nation state, and the important need for the insertion of social justice into the field, global citizenship education describes an education that includes a global perspective *and* offers constructive spaces for new forms of action not bound by traditional forms of national citizenship actions. Thus, global citizenship education has the potential to engage with and interrogate dominant worldviews, and asks that we consider the frames through which we deal with the world. Indeed, global citizenship education is an evolving, growing movement that, according to Shultz (2011), is a "generative project of social justice" (p. 14). Shultz (2007) offers the following description of a global citizenship informed by social justice principles:

> [A] global citizen understands herself or himself as intricately connected to people and issues that cross national boundaries. This personal connection with all others reflects an

> understanding that in order to create communities (local and global) that are just, democratic, and sustainable, citizens must understand their connection to all other people through a common humanity. (p. 249)

Thus, it is imperative that education considers the issues that bind us: global citizenship education may hone in on these issues by utilizing globalization as a vehicle for realizing social justice and political responsibility. A critical global citizenship, one that is comfortable with confronting and engaging with controversial, multi-levelled issues, is needed for a globalizing era characterized by multiple and uneven global relations. By engaging with these critiques and barriers, the intent is to make the possibility of socially just global citizenship education more realizable.

Emerging Questions

Globalization, according to Mitchell and Parker (2008), has contributed to an increase in subject positions and diverse orientations. Indeed, the participants were pulled and affected in different ways by their own socio-historical positionalities and identities, and they spoke about the multiple intersections between their locations and the wider world. Inspired by this idea, the data analysis process generated a plethora of new questions and possible areas of study related to the intersection of the national and the global and people's corresponding allegiances.

Pike (2000) maintains that since global citizenship education is itself "infused with distinctive national characteristics, … [the] particular nations and cultures that continue to provide people with their primary sense of belonging … continue to exert a powerful influence in global [citizenship] education systems" (p. 71). This is an important consideration for analyzing students' and teachers' citizenship constructions in a globalized context. Although this contention seems in tension with Fraser's (1997; 2009) call to move beyond the nation-state as an unjust mode of exclusion in this globalizing era, Pike (2000) suggests that global citizenship education does, in fact, challenge the legitimacy of the nation-state "through its analysis of global systems and the impact of globalization" (p. 70). Ultimately, as Shultz (2011) suggests, new citizenships are developing out of the complexity of interconnected "people and their political and economic

structures…, [taking] us beyond the usual nation state boundaries and social roles" (p. 14). Thus, I contend that moving beyond notions of 'national' or 'global' citizenship(s) towards examining the ways in which people navigate between the two constructs might glean insights into the ways citizenships are evolving in this globalized milieu.

Adding to this complexity was Umut's greater personal allegiance to his home country of Turkey than to the globe. This allegiance inspired a number of new questions. I ask: How do you accommodate such allegiance in a global education classroom, and what problems might this pose in Western-centric global citizenship education? Does it stand in contrast with the notion of political responsibility for all? How do students navigate through multiple allegiances? Are dominant culture students more easily able to have the attitude of responsibility for the world because they have a sense their 'Westernized' country is generally safe against threats to its cultural integrity? Do non-dominant culture students hold protectionist attitudes about their home countries or non-Western nations in general, and how do these attitudes impact their global citizenship constructions?

Importantly, Myers (2010) contends that "not affirming and representing a range of beliefs [about citizenship] in the classroom will likely lead to unintended learning outcomes such as civic disengagement and low achievement" (Myers, 2010, p. 499). Thus, global citizenship education needs to be attentive to fostering these evolving citizenships. For instance, I sensed some differences between how Umut and Hakim conceptualized global citizenship and helping and I hypothesize that these differences were due to their minority culture status and life experience within non-Western nation-states, yet there were too few instances of these differences for me to make any informed analyses nor was the intent of this study to pursue these differences. An emerging question I have therefore is: How do students from multiple locations conceptualize global citizenship? Future research might include comparing the conceptualizations of immigrant or refugee students with dominant culture students and outlining specific areas of tension for global citizenship education.

I am also interested in exploring the intersection between the critiques of global citizenship as another form of Western Imperialism and the multiple, complex subjectivities that make up Alberta school classrooms. Take, for example, Andreotti's (2011) assertion that global citizenship education discourses and practices must be problematized due to "the long-term potential implications for … specific construction[s] of the learners' identities and privileges as 'global citizens'" (p. 145). Every time I read this quote I feel urged to ask: Who are these global citizens? Who is in fact 'privileged' and what forms does this privilege take? The critical side of me flashes to a classroom full of middle class white students and although I know that is far from what Andreotti intends, I think it draws attention to an absence in global citizenship theorizing – something I began thinking about during my data collection. Indeed: How does this 'privileging' of the West disenfranchise the Rest within the classroom? Are relations of dominance reinscribed within the classroom and if so, how can a Western-centric global citizenship education resolve this? In a way, I think Andreotti's quote dismisses the complexity of global citizenship construction that occurs within globally northern classrooms. This complexity was illustrated in part through the tensions inherent within the dialogue that arose in my study. As I mentioned above, a number of my participants were minority culture students and some of them had either lived in or immigrated to Canada from non-Western nation-states. Three students in particular, all minority culture students, critiqued Western notions of development and aid and argued for the inclusion of 'local' voice and culture. I agree with Andreotti that uncritical approaches to global citizenship education are in danger of promoting Eurocentric understandings that privilege the knowledge and position of the West, but I also think that blanket critiques of 'northern' global citizenship education may mask the small spaces of resistance that grow within them. As Myers (2010) suggests, "citizenship educators intend to help students make sense of citizenship in light of current world conditions, they should pay attention to adolescents' thinking about their own multiple citizenship identities" (p. 499). Therefore, I think more attention needs to be paid to how minority culture students construct global citizenship so that global citizenship education might

affirm their citizenship constructions in productive ways. Global citizenship education might then be better positioned to address the pluralization of orientations and subject positions that are a reality of our globalized milieu.

Closing Reflections

This research has allowed me to take pause and consider the important relationship between education, inequity, and social justice. Global citizenship education that is socially just might offer, I believe, more space and time for us to take pause to consider the issues that bind us in hopeful, constructive ways.

References

Abdi, A. (2008). De-subjugating subject populations: Historico-actual problems and educational possibilitie. In A. A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 65-80). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Abdi, A. & Naseem, A. (2008). Globalization as an educational framework of convergence: Globalizing the local and localizing the global. In A. A. Abdi & G. Richardson (Eds.), *Decolonizing democratic education: Trans-disciplinary dialogues* (pp. 97-106). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Abdi, A. & Shultz, L. (2008). Educating for human rights and global citizenship: An introduction. In A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.). *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 1-10). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Alcoff, L. (1991). The problem of speaking for others. *Cultural Critique, 20*, 5-32.

Anderson, C. (1982). Global education in the classroom. *Theory Into Practice, 21*(3), 168-176.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review, 3,* 40-51. Retrieved from http://www.developmenteducationreview.com/issue3-focus4

Andreotti, V. (2011). The question of the other in global citizenship education: A postcolonial analysis of telling case studies in England. In L. Shultz, A. Abdi, & G. Richardson (Eds.), *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: theories, practices, policies* (pp. 140-157). New York: Peter Lang Publishers.

Andreotti, V. (in press). *Engaging the (geo)political economy of knowledge construction: Towards decoloniality and diversality in global citizenship education.* Globalization, Society and Education Journal.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Apple, M. (2001). Comparing neo-liberal projects and inequality in education. *Comparative Education, 37*(4), 409-423.

Beck, K., Ilieva, R., Scholefield, A., & Waterstone, B. (2007). Locating Gold Mountain: Cultural capital and the internationalization of teacher education. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies,* 3. Retrieved from http://www.uwstout.edu/soe/jaaacs/vol3.cfm

Becker, J. (1990). Curriculum considerations in global studies. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From though to action* (pp. 67-85). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Becker, J. (1982). Goals for global education. *Theory into Practice, 21*(3), 228-233.

Begler, E. (1993). Spinning wheels and straw: Balancing content, process, and context in global teacher education programs. *Theory into Practice, 32*(1), 14-20.

Berg, B. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bolt, B. (2000). Shedding light for the matter. *Hypatia, 15*(2), 202-216.

Bourdieu, P. (1974). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. J.C. Whitehouse (Trans.). In J. Eggleston (Ed.), *Contemporary research in the sociology of education* (pp. 32-46). London: Methuen.

Brodie, J. (2007). Reforming social justice in neoliberal times. *Studies in Social Justice, 1*(2), 93-107.

Burnouf, L. (2004). Global awareness and perspectives in global education. *Canadian Social Studies, 38*(3). Retrieved from http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/css/Css_38_3/index38_3.htm

Case, R. (1993). Key elements of a global perspective. *Social Education, 57*(6), 318-325.

Conway, J. (2004). Citizenship in a time of empire: The World Social Forum as a new public space. *Citizenship Studies, 8*(4), 367-381.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research 3e: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Couture, J. (2009). Encounters with student agency and citizenship: Finding ways to become ourselves through others. *ATA Magazine, 90*(2), 4-8.

Daniel, Y. (2007). Globalization and the social justice agenda for education: Moving from critique to possibilities. *Brock Education, 16*(2), 12-20.

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review, 58*(1), 5-25.

Davies, L., Harber, C., & Yamashita, H. (2004). *Global Citizenship: The Needs of Teachers and Learners*. Report of DFID Research Project, Birmingham: Centre for International Education and Research.

Easterly, W. (2006). *The white man's burden*. New York: Penguin Press

Fraser, N. (1997). Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. New York: Routledge.

Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.

Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2006). Chapter 22 (pp. 541-548). In *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H. (2004). *The terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. Boulder: Paradigm.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 8*(4), 597-607.

Guba, E. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 29*(2), 75-91.

Hall, S. (2007). The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In T. Das Gupta, C. E. James, R. C. A. Maaka, G. Galabuzi, & C. Andersen (Eds.) Race and racialization: Essential readings (pp. 56-64). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Hancock, D. (2010). Transformational change in education. *ATA Magazine, 90*(4), 4-5.

Hanvey, R. (1982). An attainable global perspective. *Theory into Practice, 21*(3), 162-167.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610*(1), 21–44.

Hickling-Hudson, A. (1998). When Marxist and postmodern theories won't do: The potential of postcolonial theory for educational analysis. *Discourse: Studies n the Cultural Politics of Education, 19*(3), 327-339.

Hoshmand, L. T. (1989). Alternate research paradigms: A review and teaching proposal. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17,* 3-79.

Johnson, D. (1993). Academic and intellectual foundations of teacher education in global perspectives. *Theory into Practice, 32*(1), 3-13.

Johnston, M., & Ochoa, A. (1993). Teacher education for global perspectives: A research agenda. *Theory into Practice, 32*(1), 64-68.

Kapoor, I. (2005). Participatory Development, Complicity and Desire. *Third World Quarterly, 26*(8), 1203-1220.

Kynaslahti, H. (1998). Considerations on eduscape. In S. Tella (Ed.), Aspects of media education: Strategic Imperatives in the information age. Media education publication 8. Helsinki,

Finland: Department of Teacher Education, University of Helsinki. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 428754)

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). New directions in multicultural education: complexities, boundaries, and critical race theory. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 50-65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lamy, S. (1982). Teacher training in global perspectives education: The center for teaching international relations. *Theory into Practice, 21*(3), 206-211.

Lamy, S. (1990). Global education: A conflict of images. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From though to action* (pp. 49-66). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lapayese, Y. V. (2003). Toward a critical global citizenship education. *Contemporary Education Review, 47*(4), 493-501.

Lavia, J. (2007). Repositioning pedagogies and postcolonialism: Theories, contradictions and possibilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 11*(3), 283-300.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lipman, P. (2009). Beyond accountability: Towards schools that create new people for a new way of life. In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.) *The critical pedagogy reader, second edition* (pp. 364-383) New York: Routledge.

Lunga, V. B. (2008). Postcolonial theory: A language for a critique of globalization? *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 7*, 191-199.

Lyons, T. (2006). *Global education literature review: Becoming the change we want to see.* Retrieved from http://www.sacsc.ca/research_and_evaluation.htm

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place and gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

McLeod, J. (2000). *Beginning postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Merryfield, M. (2001). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. In P. O'Meara, H. Mehlinger, & R. Newman (Eds.), *Changing*

perspectives on international education (pp. 244-280). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Merryfield, M. (2002). The difference a global educator can make. *Educational Leadership, 60*(2), 18-21.

Mertens, D. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Mitchell, K. & Parker, W. (2008). I pledge allegiance to… Flexible citizenship and shifting scales of belonging. *Teachers College Record, 110*(4), 775-804.

Myers, J. P. (2010). 'To benefit the world by whatever means possible': Adolescents' constructed meanings for global citizenship. *British Educational Research Journal, 36*(3), 483-502.

Myers, J. P. & Zaman, H. A. (2009). Negotiating the global and the national: Immigrant and dominant-culture adolescents' vocabularies of citizenship in a transnational world. *Teachers College Record, 111*(11), 2589-2625.

Oonk, G. (2000). [Review of the book *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization* by, A, Appadurai]. *Journal of World History, 11*(1), 157-159.

Orr, D. (2002). The Uses of Mindfulness in Anti-oppressive Pedagogies: Philosophy and Praxis. *Canadian Journal of Education, 27*(4), 477-497.

Pike, G. (2000). Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. *Theory Into Practice, 39*(2), 64-73.

Pike, G. (1996). Perceptions of global education in Canada: A passion for internationalism. *Orbit, 27*(2), 7-11.

Pike, G. (2008). Reconstructing the legend: Educating for global citizenship. In A. A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.) *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 223-238) Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pike, G. & Selby, D. (2000). *In the global classroom*. Toronto: Pippin.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1980). Global education as a slogan system. *Curriculum Inquiry, 10*(3), 303-316.

Richardson, G. & Abbott, L. (2009). Between the national and the global: Exploring tensions in Canadian citizenship education. *Studies in Ethnicities and Nationalism, 9*(3), 377-394.

Richardson, G., De Fabrizio, L., & Ansu-Kyeremeh, K. (2009). Being there: Lessons from a global citizenship field experience course in Ghana. *ATA Magazine, 90*(2), 14-16.

Robertson, H. (2003). Decolonizing schools. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(7), 552-553.

Roman, L. (2003). Education and the contested meanings of 'global citizenship.' *Journal of Educational Change, 4*, 269-293.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Education for global citizenship: Teacher agency and curricular structure in Ontario schools. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 41-50.

Shahjahan, R. A. (2005). Mapping the field of anti-colonial discourse to understanding issues of indigenous knowledges: Decolonizing praxis. *McGill Journal of Education, 40*(2), 213-240.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248-258.

Shultz, L. (2011). Engaging the multiple discourses of global citizenship education within a Canadian university: Deliberation, contestation, and social justice possibilities. In L. Shultz, A. Abdi, & G. Richardson (Eds.), *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: theories, practices, policies* (pp.13-24). New York: Peter Lang Publishers.

Smith, M. W. (1999). Teaching the 'third world': Unsettling discourses of difference in the school curriculum. *Oxford Review of Education, 25*(4), 485-499.

Snart, F. (2010). Teacher education and teacher identity in transition. *Learning Landscapes, 3*(2), 141-145.

Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Subedi, B. & Daza, S. L. (2008). The possibilities of postcolonial praxis in education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 11*(1), 1-10.

Sztompka, P. (1993). The sociology of social change. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tikly, L. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 173-198.

Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tucker, J. (1990). Global education partnerships between schools and universities. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From though to action* (pp. 109-124). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tye, B. (1990). Schooling in America today: Potential for global studies. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From though to action* (pp. 35-48). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tye, K. (1990). Conclusion: A look to the future. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From though to action* (pp. 157-178). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tye, K. (2003). Global education as a worldwide movement. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(2), 165-168.

Urso, I. (1990). Teacher development through global education. In K. Tye (Ed.), *Global education: From though to action* (pp. 100-108). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wane, N. (2008). Mapping the field of Indigenous knowledges in anti colonial discourse: a transformative journey in education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 11*(2), 183-197.

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at Empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wright, L. (2009). Leadership in the swamp: Seeking the potentiality of school improvement through principal reflection. *Reflective Practice, 10*(2), 259-272. doi: 10.1080/14623940902786388

Yin, R. K. (1998). The abridged version of case study research: Design and method. In L Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 229-260). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Young, I. (2011). *Responsibility for justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A: Information Letter

Alexis Hillyard
#244 10636-120 St
Edmonton, AB
T5H 4L5

[Date]

RE: Research project information letter

Name of Research Project: ***A Contextual Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Constructions of Global Citizenship***

Researcher's Name: **Alexis Hillyard**

Attention: [Participant]:

Global citizenship education initiatives are growing in popularity and practice across the Albertan educational landscape. Although a highly popularized movement, there remains little empirical research documenting effort to analyze and understand school practices relating to global citizenship. Similarly, global citizenship is a contested concept, meaning different things to different people and is shaped by competing discourses of global competitiveness and social justice. The purpose of this research project is to gain a better understanding of how students and teachers construct, or enact, global citizenship in a globalized era characterized by multiple and uneven economic, social, and political processes. This study is part of my Masters of Education degree and is the focus of my thesis.

For this research project, I will be conducting 4-6 one on one interviews of approximately 30-45 minutes in length. The interviews will be open ended in nature. I will also be conducting a maximum of two focus group interviews that will each involve 4 or 5 participants. The focus group interviews will be approximately one hour in length. I, the researcher, will approach potential interview and focus group participants directly or through an intermediary. The intermediary will be associated with [School's Name] and will be familiar to the students and teachers. Lastly, I will be collecting documents created by the participants such as lesson plans, notes, or reflections that are based on the [Name of the global citizenship initiative that will be the particular unit of analysis of this research]. A digital recording device will be used to record the interviews and focus group. I will keep in strict confidence information obtained in focus group sessions. However, because participants in the focus group will know what the others have said, I will not be able to guarantee confidentiality but I will make every effort to stress the importance of confidentiality to all participants. While anonymity of identity within the bounds of the school site and focus group may be impossible, I will keep individual participant contributions in strict confidence.

I will comply with the University of Alberta Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/gfcpolicymanual/policymanualsection66.cfm. Dr. Lynette Shultz, the research supervisor, will sign a confidentiality agreement in order to ensure that all data is kept confidential.

All interview and focus group data will be typed and sent back to participants for them to verify and make any additions or deletions that they wish. Also, participants will be given the opportunity to verify or reject my researcher interpretations of their comments made in the interviews or focus groups.

Participants have the right:

- To not participate in this research.
- To opt out without penalty and to have any collected data withdrawn from the data base and not included in the study. Participants may contact myself or my research supervisor Dr. Lynette Shultz if they wish to opt out of the research. This may be done verbally, via email, via telephone, or in writing. Contact information is listed at the end of this information letter. Participants may opt out of this research up until January 2011.
- To privacy, anonymity and confidentiality.
- To safeguards for security of data (data are to be kept in a secure place for a minimum of 5 years following completion of research project) and when appropriate destroyed in a way that ensures privacy and confidentiality.
- To disclosure of the presence of any apparent or actual conflict of interest on the part of the researcher(s).
- To a copy of a report of the research findings. If participants are interested in a copy of the research report, they may let me know verbally or in writing, and I will keep a record of this and send a research report to participants via email.

The findings from this research may be used in research articles, conference presentations, book chapters, or web postings. All data will be handled in compliance with the University of Alberta Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants.

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines and approved by the Faculties of Education, Extension, Augustana and Campus Saint Jean Research Ethics Board (EEASJ REB) at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Chair of the EEASJ REB c/o (780) 492-2614.

Thank you!

Alexis Hillyard

Contact Information for this research project:

Alexis Hillyard
Graduate Student Researcher
(780) 908 9453
hillyard@ualberta.ca

Dr. Lynette Shultz
Research Supervisor
(780) 492-4441
lshultz@ualberta.ca

APPENDIX B: Participant Consent Form

Alexis Hillyard
#244 10636-120 St
Edmonton, AB
T5H 4L5

[Date]

RE: Consent to participate in a research project titled ***A Contextual Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Constructions of Global Citizenship***
Researcher's Name: **Alexis Hillyard**

Dear Participant:

Global citizenship education initiatives are growing in popularity and practice across the Albertan educational landscape. Although a highly popularized movement, there remains little empirical research documenting effort to analyze and understand school practices relating to global citizenship. Similarly, global citizenship is a contested concept, meaning different things to different people and is shaped by competing discourses of global competitiveness and social justice. The purpose of this research project is to gain a better understanding of how students and teachers construct, or enact, global citizenship in a globalized era characterized by multiple and uneven economic, social, and political processes. This study is part of my Masters of Education degree and is the focus of my thesis.

For this research project, I will be conducting 4-6 one on one interviews of approximately 30-45 minutes in length. The interviews will be open ended in nature. I will also be conducting a maximum of two focus group interviews that will each involve 4 or 5 participants. The focus group interviews will be approximately one hour in length. I, the researcher, will approach potential interview and focus group participants directly or through an intermediary. The intermediary will be associated with [School's Name] and will be familiar to the students and teachers. Lastly, I will be collecting documents created by the participants such as lesson plans, notes, or reflections that are based on the [Name of the global citizenship initiative that will be the particular unit of analysis of this research]. A digital recording device will be used to record the interviews and focus group. I will keep in strict confidence information obtained in focus group sessions. However, because participants in the focus group will know what the others have said, I will not be able to guarantee confidentiality but I will make every effort to stress the importance of confidentiality to all participants. While anonymity of identity within the bounds of the school site and focus group may be impossible, I will keep individual participant contributions in strict confidence.

I will comply with the University of Alberta Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/gfcpolicymanual/policymanualsection66.cfm.
Dr. Lynette Shultz, the research supervisor, will sign a confidentiality agreement in order to ensure that all data is kept confidential.

All interview and focus group data will be typed and sent back to participants for them to verify and make any additions or deletions that they wish. Also, participants will be given the opportunity to verify or reject my researcher interpretations of their comments made in the interviews or focus groups.

Participants have the right:

- To not participate in this research.
- To opt out without penalty and to have any collected data withdrawn from the data base and not included in the study. Participants or their parents/guardians may contact myself or my research supervisor Dr. Lynette Shultz if they wish to opt out of the research. This may be done verbally, via email, via telephone, or in writing. Contact information is listed at the end of this information letter. Participants may opt out of this research up until January 2011.
- To privacy, anonymity and confidentiality.
- To safeguards for security of data (data are to be kept in a secure place for a minimum of 5 years following completion of research project) and when appropriate destroyed in a way that ensures privacy and confidentiality.
- To disclosure of the presence of any apparent or actual conflict of interest on the part of the researcher(s).
- To a copy of a report of the research findings. If participants are interested in a copy of the research report, they may let me know verbally or in writing, and I will keep a record of this and send a research report to participants via email.

The findings from this research may be used in research articles, conference presentations, book chapters, or web postings. All data will be handled in compliance with the University of Alberta Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants.

You are invited to sign this consent letter in the space provided below once you read the following guidelines for participation:

- As a research participant, you are asked to sign this consent letter to participate.
- You will have the right to refrain from answering any particular questions, and you will have the right to opt out of the research without penalty. If you do choose to opt out of the research, you may do so at any time during the data collection phase, and up until January 2011.
- Processes to provide accuracy of data, security, confidentiality, and anonymity are implemented in the design of the study. A technical recording device will be used to ensure accuracy of data collected from the interviews. Security and confidentiality measures will be implemented, including the back up of data, secure storage of tapes, and a plan for deleting electronic and taped data.
- Only the researcher and her supervisor will have access to data and information. To ensure anonymity, pseudonyms will be used.
- You agree that I can use information in secondary writing beyond the research report, which includes such writing as conference papers, book chapters, or journal articles. The same ethical considerations and safeguards will apply to secondary uses of data.
- You will be able to review research material as part of an iterative process. You will be provided with drafts of analyses for your correction, amendment, and editing. Your interpretations, resistances, and challenges will be taken into account in rewriting and editing processes.
- You may request to be provided with a copy of the research report culminating from this study.

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines and approved by the Faculties of Education, Extension, Augustana and Campus Saint Jean Research Ethics Board

(EEASJ REB) at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Chair of the EEASJ REB c/o (780) 492-2614.

Contact Information for this research project:

Alexis Hillyard
Graduate Student Researcher
(780) 908 9453
hillyard@ualberta.ca

Dr. Lynette Shultz
Research Supervisor
(780) 492-4441
lshultz@ualberta.ca

I consent to participate in a research project entitled ***A Contextual Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Constructions of Global Citizenship***

Participant's Print Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

If the research participant is under 18 years of age:

I consent to allow my child to participate in a research project entitled ***A Contextual Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Constructions of Global Citizenship***

_____ _____
Parent/guardian printed name if participant is a minor

Parent/guardian signature if participant is a minor

I would like a copy of the final research report and Alexis Hillyard can provide me with this report via the following contact method:

Participant's contact details:

_____

Researcher's Print Name: ***Alexis Hillyard***

Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX C: Interview Guide for Student Participants

Your role in the videoconferences

1. How did you get involved? When did you become interested in global issues?
2. Could you expand on a local or global issue that you are passionate about?
3. Tell me a little bit about your involvement with the videoconferences. What is your role?
    a. According to you personally, what do you think the goal of these videoconferences, and all the activities leading up to them, is?
    b. Who gets to decide this/these goal(s)?
    c. How is it decided who gets to participate?
    d. If you could think of the main thing that you get out of participating in the videoconferences, what would it be?
        i. What does it mean to you to be able to talk with multiple people from around the world about global issues?

Technology and mediated experience

4. Speaking specifically about the technology that you use for these events, could you tell me how technology impacts your involvement in the videoconferences?
    a. When you engage with other people using technology, how does this compare to a face-to-face discussion? Do you think you lose anything through this type of encounter, and if not, what do you gain?
        i. Any negatives to using technology?
    b. How does your engagement with these conferences through technology change the way you think about global issues?
    c. How do these experiences impact the way you think about your own life here in Edmonton, your own identity?
    d. How do these experiences and engagements impact your citizenship roles?
    e. How about people or schools don't have access to such technology or these videoconferences, how might they engage with discussions like these? Are they missing out on something?

World

5. How would you describe the state of the world right now?
    a. Do these issues create different responsibilities for different groups of people around the world?

Globalization (beyond the textbook…)

6. How do you define globalization?
    a. Is it good/bad/both? In what ways?
    b. How does globalization impact the way you think about your home, or the place that you live, and your identity?

Constructions of citizenship and global citizenship

7. Let's talk about your citizenship roles. Take for example the issue of climate change (or global access to education). How would you describe your responsibility to these issues as an:
    a. Edmonton citizen, a Canadian citizen, as a global citizen?
    b. Do you consider yourself to be a global citizen? Why?
    c. Can anyone be a global citizen? Why or why not?
        i. If not, what do people need to be a global citizen?

        ii. So is it something that people define individually for themselves, or something that should be granted to them from a political body
    d. How would you talk about global citizenship for people in contexts of poverty, or war, or if they had little access to resources like media and technology?
        i. Does global citizenship look the same for people everywhere, or is it different for people in different contexts i.e., comparing Canada, Japan, and Finland and Ghana?
    e. What are the barriers to global citizenship?
    f. Are there particular roles or actions that global citizens do?
    g. What is the relationship between global citizenship and these videoconferences?
        i. How do you personally, or through your involvement in this class, reflect on issues of inequality or lack of access to resources?

Agency and action

8. Tell me about how this project has helped you to reflect and maybe act upon issues closer to home, and in other places?
    a. Are there any particular actions that you have been a part of based on your involvement with the videoconferences? Or in general?
    b. What suggestions would you have for your school (or your community?) that might support you in your role as an active global citizen?
    c. Do you have any suggestions for people elsewhere? If so, could you be specific about who or where?

APPENDIX D: Interview Guide for Teacher Participants

1. Could tell me a little but about your role in the Connect! Program?
    a. What are the program objectives and who is responsible for setting them? Who do you think should be responsible for setting the course of this initiative?
    b. What is the process for choosing topics or themes for the videoconferences and why are these specific topics chosen?
    c. Which countries participate? How do they become involved? Why should someone participate in this endeavour?
    d. How are issues of access addressed, for example, access to equipment or technology, or things like language barriers? Or are these issues?
    e. What are some of the main challenges or barriers to the Connect! Program and the videoconferences? (These could include things like time, different ideas about programming, technology…?)

2. What are some of the benefits/drawbacks of utilizing communications technology?
    a. How would you compare these connections to face-to-face conversations?

3. How does it feel to be involved in this project?
    a. What do you personally get out of, or gain from your involvement in this project?
    b. How do you think the students involved in this project may benefit from being a part of it?
    c. Could you tell me about the values of the debriefing sessions that happen after the conferences?
        i. Do you have any instances/examples where you have dealt with controversial issues that you could share with me?

4. How do you define globalization?
    a. How does globalization impact the way you think about your home, or the place that you live, and your identity? Or your role as a teacher?

5. People talk about citizenship in many different ways, like local/global/national/Canadian etc. so:
    a. How would you describe an act of citizenship in each of these citizenship spaces?
    b. I'm interested in hearing about how you think about who counts as a citizen in these different citizenship spaces?
    c. How has technology impacted the way people enact their citizenship?
    d. How do global issues change this? In other words, how do these roles affect how people get involved in issues like climate change?

6. Tell me about global citizenship. What does global citizenship mean to you?
    a. Is there a relationship between global citizenship and these videoconferences that you'd like to touch on?
    b. Are there particular roles or actions that global citizens do?
    c. Can anyone be a global citizen? Why or why not?
    d. Do you consider yourself to be a global citizen? Why or why not?

APPENDIX E: Focus Group Interview Guide and Activity

Statement A

We need to learn from them. If they are developed and rich that means they can teach us. Of course not everyone in this country will be able to catch up… at the end of the day, most people here are uncultured and uneducated. But the best ones can be just like those that are developed and rich if properly taught.

Statement B

When we say that a country is "underdeveloped" we are implying that it is backward or behind in some way – that the country's people have shown little capacity to achieve and evolve. The use of the word "developing" is less insulting, but still misleading. It implies that poverty is a natural condition for *some* countries and *some* people, based on a lack of particular attributes compared to the developed West.

Statement C

Developing countries are poor because they lack technology and education. Their systems of governance are not as mature as ours. We need to help by giving them technology, proper work habits, and good education.

Statement D

They come here and impose their education, their technology, and their way of seeing the world. This makes people more competitive and individualistic and breaks our communities. We do not need what they are trying to sell. We need a better distribution of resources so that we can define our own development.

Guiding Questions for the 'Development Statements:'

1. What are the perspectives that you see represented in the statement?

2. Whose voice is being heard? Whose voice is not being heard?

3. Is there anything that you like about this statement? Is there anything that bothers you? Why?

4. What can you say about the views of the world that are captured in this statement? e.g., fair, uneven, socially just, inclusive, one-sided etc... and WHY?

Post-Activity follow up questions:

1. How are these ideas (what we've talked about here through this activity) related to the work that you do within the connections and teleconferences?

2. How are your own citizenship roles impacted by this discussion/activity? For example, what role do you have to contribute to a better society locally, nationally, globally…?

3. What about the notion of global citizenship. How does global citizenship fit into the discussion?