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Abstract

There is a public perception that Canada is an ideal place for cultivating global citizenship because of its culturally plural demographics and official policies of multiculturalism. Global Citizenship Education (GCE) is a growing field in Canadian education and is an explicit focus in the Alberta social studies curriculum. This thesis brings together four conversations within which multiculturalism and GCE are both related and conflated: (a) the public perceptions of Canada as a model of cultural diversity and global citizenship, (b) the scholarly discussions of GCE and multiculturalism, (c) the policy context where multiculturalism is set alongside GCE, and (d) the practical ways that the two are mutually related in curriculum and lesson documents. There are four interrelated sections to this thesis; each identifies the tensions inherent to multiculturalism, GCE, and the perceived relationship between these fields. First is a wider philosophical and theoretical framing of the topic. Second is the examination of educational research on the topic. Third is a critical discourse analysis of policy, curriculum, and lesson plan documents in the province of Alberta. Last is a synthesis of the findings from all three sections.

The analysis finds that there are philosophical and ideological tensions inherent to both fields and to the relationships between them. This contributes to conceptual and ideological conflation and confusion. This finding raises some important concerns in terms of
possibilities and constraints to thinking about cultural diversity and social inequities in new ways. It highlights how multicultural contexts of GCE can lead to the recreation of tensions, conflation, and ambiguity. However, the Alberta context demonstrates that a multicultural context can also open critical spaces and possibilities for GCE through engagements with tensions and complexities. Thus this thesis contributes theoretically, by presenting a framework and perspective for interrogating and critically inquiring into the relationship between the two fields. It also contributes to the policy and curriculum discussions in educational research and practice by highlighting the importance of foregrounding key tensions inherent to each field and by identifying the potential negative consequences of leaving these tensions implicit.
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Chapter One
Global Citizenship Education in a Multicultural Context

According to renowned travel writer and essayist Pico Iyer (2004), Canada is the “spiritual home…of the very notion of an extended, emancipatory global citizenship” (p. 62). He goes on to say that “Pierre Trudeau’s inclusive immigration policies [have] given Canadians a sense of connection to both their homes and the world” (Iyer, 2004, p. 62). Canadian schools, it would follow, are the ideal place for Global Citizenship Education (GCE). A key assumption embedded in the premise that Canadians make logical and natural global citizens is that Canada is a multicultural mosaic where differences are valued, recognized, and cherished. After all, Canada was the first country to adopt an official policy of multiculturalism. This thesis examines this premise by identifying key tensions within the fields of multiculturalism and global citizenship education and within the assumed positive relationship between the fields.

The thesis brings together four conversations within which multiculturalism and GCE are both related and conflated: the public perceptions of Canada as model of cultural diversity and global citizenship, the scholarly discussions promoting GCE in multicultural contexts, the policy context where multiculturalism is set alongside GCE, and the practical ways that the two are mutually related in curriculum and lesson documents. It sets out to critically inquire into four over-arching questions: What are the theoretical and ideological tensions within and between multiculturalism and global citizenship education? How are these tensions reflected in the educational research literature? How are the tensions reflected in policy, curriculum and lesson plan documents? And what does foregrounding the tensions inherent to both fields and to their perceived relationship demonstrate about the possibilities and constraints of conceptualizing GCE in a multicultural context in terms of public discourse, scholarship, policy, and practice? Correspondingly, there are four interrelated sections to this thesis. First is a wider philosophical and theoretical mapping and framing of the topic. Second is the examination of educational research on the topic. Third is a critical

---

1 Pierre Trudeau was leader of the federal Liberal Party and was Prime Minister of Canada from 1968-1979 and from 1980 to 1984. He was the first Prime Minister to adopt an official policy of multiculturalism in 1971.
discourse analysis of policy, curriculum, and lesson plan documents in the province of Alberta where GCE is an explicit part of social studies. Last is a synthesis of the findings from all three sections.

I begin by examining the wider theoretical literature to identify philosophical and ideological tensions inherent to historical and contemporary ways of imagining political community. I examine tensions of inclusion and exclusion that are part of conceptualizing community and diversity through a national frame, and global frame, and in schooling for the 21st century citizen. The first section of the thesis, the theoretical section, draws on a range of critical theoretical literature to examine how tensions inherent to political community, citizenship, cultural diversity, social inequities, globalization, and education shape the topic of this thesis. It presents a framework for pushing thinking beyond the modern assumptions underlying calls for new citizenship education for the 21st century. This framework also helps to map out the theoretical and ideological ways that multiculturalism and GCE are related and conflated. The framework develops a perspective that is used to identify and interrogate the assumptions underlying the calls for new ways of teaching and learning for the 21st century citizen, including GCE. Building from this framework, the next section reviews educational research literature and identifies that the two fields are conceptually ambiguous and tend to be conflated both in theory and research. Indeed, a main argument and challenge in this thesis is the intersecting and historically shifting language around cultural diversity, citizenship education, nation-building and global education that shapes the fields and terms used in relation to multiculturalism and GCE. Having established that multiculturalism and GCE are generally conflated and their relationship conceptually ambiguous, I set out to examine to what extent the wider tensions and confusions are evident in policy and practice.

A methodology chapter sets up the third section: a critical discourse analysis of educational texts in the province of Alberta. This section examines how the wider theoretical tensions are reflected in policy and how these tensions inform understandings of citizenship in the 21st century. Ultimately, the analysis finds that there are ideological tensions inherent to both fields and to the relationships between. This finding raises some important concerns in terms of possibilities and constraints to thinking about cultural diversity and social
inequities in new ways. I argue that some of the ideological tensions actually work to create dynamic and critical spaces. However, other versions of multiculturalism and global citizenship education potentially shut down more critical possibilities and reify the modernist assumptions inherent to the ways of thinking that construct the inequities these fields are meant to address. These tensions play out in certain ways that I will map in educational policy, curriculum, and lesson plans so as to contribute to the conflation of the fields. This leads to the constraining of critical work and a perpetual recreation of the wider tensions through vague terminology that serves as a conceptual umbrella for what are in fact distinct (and even contradictory) ideological and philosophical stances. Identifying the main discourses that operate to neutralize and normalize what are actually points of tension and conflation helps to identify these spaces in a way that is neither evident in scholarly research nor educational policy and practice.

This thesis promotes a foregrounding of these tensions in theory, policy, and practice and calls for an acknowledgement of the sets of dynamics that constrain and limit their engagement. At the same time, it highlights how multicultural contexts such as in Alberta, Canada represent a particular situation where conversations about inclusion and exclusion are prioritized and central to a citizenship narrative. While this context can lead to the recreations of tensions, conflation, and ambiguity; the Alberta context demonstrates that a multicultural context can also create possibilities for GCE to engage with tensions and complexities around issues of inclusion and exclusion and cultural diversity. Thus this thesis contributes theoretically, by presenting a framework and perspective for interrogating and critically inquiring into the relationship between the two fields. It also contributes to the policy and curriculum discussions in educational research and practice by highlighting that it is important to foreground that there are ideological and theoretical tensions inherent to each field. It also suggests some potential consequences of leaving these tensions implicit including the foreclosing of spaces for critical discourses.
Context: Multiculturalism and Global Citizenship Education: Parallel Imaginaries

In *The Heart of the Matter: Character and Citizenship Education in Alberta Schools* (2005), one of the key elements of citizenship is identified as “National consciousness or identity”. Three subpoints describe this element: (a) Sense of identity as a national citizen; (b) Awareness of multiple identities, such as regional, cultural, ethnic, religious, class, gender; and (c) Sense of global or world citizenship (AE, 2005b, p. 6). Developing a consciousness of and identity as Canadian is seen as explicitly linked to respecting multiple cultures and to having a sense of global citizenship. The concepts of Canada’s cultural diversity and the development of a sense of global citizenship are related or at least are not mutually exclusive. In fact, the connection between multiculturalism and global citizenship is seen as reflective of the new realities of the 21st century learner:

The Alberta Social Studies Kindergarten to Grade 12 Program of Studies meets the needs and reflects the nature of 21st century learners. ... It fosters the building of a society that is pluralistic, bilingual, multicultural, inclusive and democratic….It promotes a sense of belonging and acceptance in students as they engage in active and responsible citizenship at the local, community, provincial, national and global level. (AE, 2005a, p. 1)

However, both multicultural and global citizenship education are complex and contentious topics in education scholarship (Pashby, 2006).

The current educational context in Alberta is defined by official and popular conceptualizations of multiculturalism, varying ideas around global citizenship, and a strong sense that education must change and adapt to 21st century realities. While multiculturalism relates to national diversity, global citizenship extends a notion of citizenship to those outside of the nation. Scholarly literature on citizenship education prioritizes an inclusive approach to cultural diversity and increasingly promotes a notion of global responsibility; but, the links between multiculturalism and GCE are largely assumed. While there is a sense that multicultural understandings extend to global relations, some argue that multicultural and global interculturalism are not necessarily mutually reinforcing and that in some ways multicultural and global approaches to diversity can be conflicting (e.g., Kymlicka, 2003). Thus, in the context of GCE policy and practice in a multicultural context, an important
question emerges: Are multicultural and global citizenship education mutually reinforcing and complementary approaches, or are they ideologically and conceptually distinct? Furthermore, what can a study of this relationship reveal about the theoretical and ideological tensions inherent to educating citizens for the 21st century in a multicultural context?

In Canada, the ideal of the multicultural mosaic describes demographics and defines both a national sense of Canadian identity and the country’s international reputation. Pico Iyer’s (2004) claim that Canada is the spiritual home of global citizenship is not the only example of Canadian multiculturalism being assumed to positively connect to developing and leading global citizenship. In a speech given to open a conference on Diversity and Canada’s Future, well-known multiculturalism theorist Will Kymlicka (2003a) asserted that “One of the most powerful aspects of Canadian identity is the belief that Canadians are good citizens of the world....In Canada, to be indifferent to our obligations as citizens of the world is seen as ‘unCanadian’” (p. 358). Similarly to Iyer (2004), he links the idea of Canadians being natural global citizens to Canada’s multicultural policy:

[It] is often seen as a distinctively Canadian characteristic to tolerate and accommodate diversity....Canada is unusual in the extent to which it has built these practices into its symbols and narratives of nationhood. Canadians tell each other that accommodating diversity is an important part of Canadian history, and a defining feature of the country. (Kymlicka, 2003a, p. 375)

These statements made in a magazine article (Iyer, 2004) and in a keynote speech at a conference (Kymlicka, 2003) are evidence of a popular view of a sense of global citizenship relating to Canadian multiculturalism. However, Michael Byers, Canada Research Chair in Global Politics and International Law, contributes a different point of view in an article in the periodical The Tyee (2005): “If we're going to talk about global citizenship, let's talk frankly about how and where power vests and is wielded in today's world, about our own country's complicity in the global power game, and about the hypocrisies and hollowness of less rigorous or more benevolent conceptions of global citizenship, whether at UBC or elsewhere”. And Yasmin Jiwani (2006) challenges the perception that Canada is the natural place for the cultivation of global citizens:

Canada is perceived to be a leader in the international human rights arena. It is regarded as an egalitarian nation, motivated by a desire for justice for
minorities and the underprivileged. Canada is a signatory to various international accords, conventions, and agreements upholding the rights of indigenous peoples and marginalized groups, including women and children. Yet, the rhetoric is hollow…As a colonial and colonized nation, Canada puts forward a public face that is part of its own mythology — that boasts a multicultural complexion and a multiracial workforce, a nation signified by its image of a peaceful kingdom amid the havoc and turmoil characterizing the rest of the world. (p. 112)

This small selection of quotations demonstrates the tensions inherent to the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship in Canadian academic and popular discourse. And similarly, the two fields are brought together in the field of education. For example, in a pamphlet produced by the Children’s Identity and Citizenship in Europe (CiCe) network called *World Citizenship Education and Teacher Training in a Global Context*, Canada is described as extremely well positioned for GCE. The authors note the prevalence of multicultural education, and although they recognize that there are on-going challenges around social cohesion, they present Canada as a leader in GCE (Cappelle et al., 2011, p. 22). Looking at the history of multiculturalism, citizenship education, and global education in Canada, there are some clues as to how these two fields have developed along parallel tracks.

**Background to the Problem:**

**The Parallel Histories of Multicultural and Global Citizenship Education in Canada**

In this section, I provide the historical and political context for the topic by first outlining the parallel histories of the fields of multiculturalism and GCE and by identifying ideological tensions inherent to the history of conceptualizations of cultural diversity in the national and global imaginary in Canada. I then explain why Alberta is a significant place to study the perceived relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship.

Cultural diversity and citizenship are and have been central concepts as well as key issues in Canada’s educational agenda throughout its history. Meanings and values attached to the terms citizenship, Canadian identity, and diversity have changed over time and are reflected in educational policies and programs (Joshee, 2004). While global citizenship education is a relatively new field (Davies et al., 2005) and there have been various versions of multiculturalism and multicultural education (Joshee, 2009), K-12 schooling has served a
central role for the dissemination of national character at the same time as it has reflected and produced visions of Canada’s role in the world. According to Richardson (2008b), “the ideological orientation, content and purpose of global citizenship education has changed with the times and Canada’s evolving image of itself” (Richardson, 2008, p. 53). These shifts are related to the evolving process of building, establishing, and critiquing Canada’s national imaginary.

In Canada, issues around cultural diversity were initially managed through policies that controlled immigration, citizenship, and education. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, federal legislation limited access to the rights and privileges of citizenship. By 1906, there was a great deal of concern regarding the national character being compromised by the growing numbers of non-British immigrants. Correspondingly, by 1910 there was an unofficial White Canada policy which included a clause in the immigration rules prohibiting immigrants of a particular race, class, occupation or character. Meanwhile, under the terms of the British North American Act (1867) which created Canada as a dominion, each of the four provinces were granted exclusive jurisdiction over education; today, all ten provinces and three territories have ministries or departments of education. Canada’s public system of education developed mainly between 1840 and 1870 and was “part of deliberate strategy by political liberals to forge a new political nationality” (Mitchell, 2003, p. 393). The overall mission of public education in Canada until the early 1900s was the installation of Canadian patriotism and national identity so that schools were a homogenizing force used to create good Canadian citizens in an image of British loyalists (Richardson, 2002b). Nation-building required citizens and therefore students who spoke the national language and knew Canada’s literature, history and geography; students needed to internalize the national values (Osborne, 2000, p. 9). Therefore, the main focus was teaching English language and British ways to those not of British origins (although the French held some special language and religious rights). This assimilation approach was most strongly targeted at the First Nations and Inuit peoples who were governed through relations with the federal government which created a

---

2 For example, men of Chinese origin were disenfranchised in 1885, and in the early 1900s, men of South Asian and Japanese origin were denied voting rights (Joshee, 2004).

3 Between 1896 and 1914, over three million immigrants came to Canada, and given that by then emigration from Britain and Western Europe was slowing, Canada began accepting Eastern and Southern Europeans including Poles, Ukrainians, Hutterites, and Doukhobors (Li, 2000, p. 2).
system of residential schools. However, there were distinct local and regional contexts of pluralism and diversity management. Indeed, there was never a monolithic diversity and citizenship education approach across Canada despite the strength of dominant assimilationist beliefs and policies⁴.

The late 19th and early 20th century marked the origins of global education in Canada which, as with the characterizations of citizenship, encouraged social and political initiation and assimilation. Evans, Ingram, MacDonald, and Weber (2009) trace interest in international perspectives and issues to the curriculum of the early 20th century and point out the educational work being done by church groups and international organizations such as the Red Cross that developed along with global governing bodies like the Commonwealth, the League of Nations and later the United Nations (see also Osborne, 2000). However, any attention to international issues or a global perspective was lodged in a framework of assimilation tied to a pedagogy of learning about the mechanisms of government and one’s responsibilities to others and to Canada. This version of global content in citizenship education was disseminated through dull and pedantic teacher transmitted content, and there was a lack of critical thinking as to the implications of power relations invested in international relations or global content (Evans et al., 2009).

World War II was a major turning point regarding cultural diversity policy in Canada. Despite restrictive immigration policies, many Europeans immigrated to Canada, and by the 1940s a fifth of the population was of neither British nor French origins (Joshee, 2004). The expansion of the railway system played a major part in defining and expanding notion of Canada as the cultural mosaic. There were multicultural fairs across the country, and scholars from various disciplines influencing public policy began articulating the concept that cultural diversity was an asset. This vision of Canada’s cultural diversity was explicitly articulated in the Citizenship Act of 1947. This Act defined Canadian as a citizenship distinct from British and included a significant amount of rhetoric relating to the importance of cultural diversity (Joshee, 2004, p. 132). This highlighting of diversity in positive rhetoric demonstrates a shift

---

⁴ Joshee (2004) points out that while there were segregated schools for Black children in Nova Scotia and Ontario and attempts to segregate Asian children in British Colombia, schools in the Prairies were experimenting with instructing children in languages other than English. Manitoba accommodated the French-speaking minority with French schools without allowing others to make such claims thereby not giving up on Anglo-conformity.
from straight assimilation to the idea of integration. However, it was integration as assimilation (Joshee, 2004).

The integration as assimilation and tying citizenship with diversity principles were reflected in educational policy. Mitchell (2003) notes the way that the education systems effectively expanded the philosophy of liberalism whereby individual rights required the recognition of diversity; this ethical strand of liberalism was articulated by educational authorities in the 1950s and 1960s who promoted a progressive model for education. Indeed, Canadian educational systems were influenced by the American theorist John Dewey (Mitchell, 2003, p. 393). Progressivism was broadly a humanistic philosophy premised on tailoring the school system to meet the needs of individual students, promoting special programs for talented or challenged students, and bringing those previously excluded for being perceived as different into the system (Mitchell, 2003, p. 393). While not directly about cultural or racial differences, this ethical liberal approach to education formed the basis of what would expand into social justice liberalism in the 1970s and 1980s, and continued the integration approach. Thus, the more positive rhetoric around diversity reflected in the integration model corresponded with the turn to progressivism in education. Integration was a more positive approach, at least rhetorically, and evidence of Canadians’ acceptance of diversity.

At the same time, in terms of schooling constructing global imaginaries in Canada, the experiences of World War II and the geopolitical relations in which Canada was engaged impacted the construction of the global imaginary in Canadian schooling (Richardson, 2008b). The notion of Canada as the good, diverse and tolerant country in opposition to Nazis (Joshee, 2004, p. 132) was reinforced by the studying of perceived to be bad countries in order to reinforce the rightness and superiority of Canada. The cold war era also set up a vision of Canada as distinct from communist countries. The imperial division where Canada

American philosopher John Dewey argued for a strong focus on individual development through educational programs that reflected actual, real-world situations that citizens encounter in a pluralistic democracy (Mitchell, 2003, p. 393). Dewey was a prolific writer, and it is difficult to discern his influence on education in a few simple sentences. However, for an introduction to Dewey’s philosophy in relation to education see Dewey (1924, 1938). For further explication of the influence of Dewey on contemporary philosophy of education, especially in terms of pluralism and democracy, see Parker (2002, 2003), and for a critical analysis of Dewey’s version of progressivism in the context of Canadian education see Callan (1990).
was privileged through its ties to the British Commonwealth became mirrored in the ideological divisions embedded in the Cold War. Richardson (2008b) notes how social studies during this time focused on learning about communism to understand the motives and methods of the rival system and to reinforce the “rightness” of democratic capitalism (p. 59).

During the 1960s and 1970s, the expansion of the multicultural mosaic model in education continued as multicultural festivals were already established (Joshee, 2004). There was a strong belief in the notion that pluralism is good for nation-building. In addition, the nurturing of an ethical self through a liberal discourse of rights and of ethical relations working through difference was strong and tied to Deweyan progressivism (Mitchell, 2003). These two factors worked together to build on a strong narrative of Canada as inherently good and accepting. Students were taught about how the Canadian cultural mosaic is distinct from American models of the melting pot (Mitchell, 2003). Meanwhile there was an increased interest in global education during the 1970s. There were new theories, methods, and conceptual models reflecting global and trans-national themes in work done by charities, academics, classroom teachers, governmental and international development agencies. There were also new education movements including peace education, development education, and environmental education. The Canadian International Development Agency had been founded in 1968. This ushered in a new era of Canadian internationalism and inspired many young volunteers to contribute to a global vision of Canada’s role in the world by volunteering overseas and coming back to establish development education centres across the country (Evans et al., 2009).

Since the days of Laurier, Canadian prime ministers were concerned about notions of cultural pluralism in relation to creating frameworks to reduce the animosity between the two colonial factions, British and French; there was a growing group of immigrants who did not fit into either group. The Quiet Revolution heightened these tensions, and in 1971, Prime

---

6 The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) was formed in 1968 by the federal government. It is the main organization through which the Canadian government delivers development assistance to foreign countries. Its creation signaled “a shift from aid as charity to international development as partnership” (Morrison, 1998, p. 62). In addition to overseas development work and partnerships with NGOs, CIDA became involved influential in global education in Canada. In the 1970s, CIDA funded the opening of development education centres to raise public awareness about their projects overseas. These centres contributed to the development of global education programming in Canada until federal funding cuts in the 1990s led to the closure of most of these centres (Evans et al., 2008, p. 27 citing Hollingworth, 1983).
Minister Pierre Trudeau first used the term “multiculturalism” in a debate. The Multicultural Policy was announced in 1971 as a complementary policy to bilingualism (Li 2000, 10). It led to the creation of the Multiculturalism Directorate which promoted many programs to help “ethnic groups” keep their traditions, customs, folklore and languages thereby reifying the mosaic approach to Canadian identity and reinforcing the “multicultural image of Canadian society” (Li, 2000, p. 10). Although it is associated with the 1970s and Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau’s Liberal government, the official policy of multiculturalism was predated by a long history of cultural diversity relations and to categorizations of diversity rooted in colonialism and race. Notions of cultural difference are strongly framed by a particular categorization of cultural groups in Canadian history. Kymlicka (2005) uses the term the “three silos” to describe the main groups defined by and served by cultural diversity discourse and policy in Canada (p. 1). The first refers to “ethnocultural” groups which predate colonization: Aboriginal peoples. The second group refers to “ethnocultural” groups related directly to the European colonization of Canada: the British and the French (often referred to as the “two founding nations”) (Kymlicka, 2005, p. 1). However, given that the British ultimately governed and dominated the land which is now Canada, this category is generally referred to in relation to Francophone rights within a British-dominated Canada. The third group refers to “ethnocultural” groups formed through immigration, or the “ethnic/immigrant” group. Interestingly, the notion of ethnicity is most directly associated with immigrants despite the fact that each group obviously has ethnicity. Kymlicka (2005) describes the three groups as “three silos”, which are not horizontal layers but vertical silos.

---

7 It was under Progressive Conservative Prime Minister Brian Mulroney’s government that in July 1988, the federal government passed the Multiculturalism Act which legislated the official policy of multiculturalism started by Trudeau. At the time, it was the first national multicultural law in the world. It put into law the theory of multiculturalism that was initiated in 1971. The multicultural policy was to be implemented in all government agencies, departments and Crown corporations which were and are required to have plans, programs, procedures and strategies for decision-making that take into account encouraging the full participation of all minorities.

8 Kymlicka (2005) does acknowledge this terminology as slightly problematic though common: “It would be more accurate…to describe this third category as “ethnic groups formed through immigration…It’s important to emphasize that many members of these groups may be second, third or fourth-generation descendents of the original immigrants.” (Kymlicka, 2005, n. 1, p. 27).
because they are defined using different principles and are disconnected in terms of legislation and administration of cultural accommodations (p. 1).  

Importantly, critics have pointed to the unequal power relations between these silos that present the Canadian multicultural project as essentially a vertical mosaic. Rather than three separate vertical silos described by Kymlicka (2005), the vertical mosaic—a term first used in the 1960s by sociologist John Porter—refers to the hierarchical relationships that exist between Canada’s cultural groups: “The Canadians of British origin have retained, within the elite structure of the society, the charter group status with which they started out, and that in some institutional settings the French have been admitted as a co-charter group whereas others have not” (Porter, 1965, p. xiv-xiii). More recently, Jiwani (2006) speaks about the vertical mosaic as “racially based internal hierarchies of power and privilege” (Jiwani, 2006, p. 10-11; see also Bannerji, 2000). Indeed, in terms of demographics, the face of Canadian society changed significantly between 1971 and 1991. Due to changing immigration policies, there were significant changes in terms of ethnic and racial differentiation in what had been called the “Third Force”, or those not of British or French descent (Li, 2000, p. 3). In 1983, the report of the House of Commons Special Committee on Participation of Visible Minorities in Canadian noted a strong sense of urgency and characterized Canadian society as “multicultural and multiracial” while recommending further Multiculturalism initiatives towards race relations; this was met with reservations on behalf of some White ethnic groups more concerned with cultural preservation (Li, 2000, p.

Generalizing, Kymlicka (2005) maps out the history of each group. The Aboriginal peoples of Canada are legislated through the Royal Proclamation of 1973 and the Indian Act. They are governed through the federal department of Indian and Northern Affairs. Guiding concepts include treaty rights, Aboriginal rights, common law title, sui generis, property rights, fiduciary trust, self-government and self-determination. French Canadians are legislated through Quebec Act of 1774, British North America Act of 1867. Their framework piece of legislation is the Official Languages Act and central constitutional provisions include sections 16-23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (CCRF). Federal government agencies are Intergovernmental Affairs and the Commissioner for Official Languages. Main concepts include: bilingualism, duality, (asymmetric) federalism, distinct society, and nationhood. Ethnic immigrant groups are legislated through the 1971 parliamentary statement of multiculturalism, the Multiculturalism Act and Section 27 of the CCRF. Federal agencies are the federal department of Heritage and Citizenship and Immigration, and key concepts include multiculturalism, citizenship, integration, tolerance, ethnic diversity, inclusion (Kymlicka, 2005).

In the 1960s and 1970s, the so-called third force was still mostly European. By 1981 decline in dominance of those of Euro origin other than British and French in this ‘third force’ and even further so by 1991. By 1986 “visible minorities” were 6.3% of population, by 1991 they were 9.4% in 1991 and by 1996 they were 11.2% (Li, 2000, p. 5). For example, Canadians of “African origin” rose from less than 1 percent in 1971 to 3.4 in 1991 and of “Asian” origin from 5 to 21.6 percent b/t 1971-1991 (Li, 2000, p. 7).
11). As a result, there was a greater emphasis on multiculturalism policy as a vehicle for promoting racial equality and racial harmony; this included employment equity reforms\(^\text{11}\).

In the area of global education, the 1980s saw an extension of a vision of Canada as a world leader of peace and a champion of human rights through its policy of accommodation and tolerance (Osborne, 2000). According to Mitchell (1993), multiculturalism and the rights-based discourse connected Canada to a new world order where a strong national identity based in accommodation and respect for diversity was seen to lead to progress, international cooperation, and increased economic prospects (p. 282). Like multicultural education, the period of the 1970s to the 1990s saw the momentum continuing for global education initiatives. Evans et al. (2009) observe that during the second half of the 20\(^{th}\) century there was more interest in citizenship and global dimensions of education. Education policy and discourse were influenced by domestic cultural diversity issues including the Quiet Revolution in Quebec, increased politicization of First Nations groups and aboriginal land claims, as well as changing immigration patterns all of which posed challenges to the existing concept of Canadian citizenship. In addition to these diversity issues at home, the increasing sense of American influence on the economy along with Canada’s policy of growing involvement in peacekeeping missions abroad created interest in global issues within Canadian education.

Though the 1980s saw the highest point of interest and investment in multiculturalism in Canada, by the end of the decade, increased support for multiculturalism and for bringing control of the constitution to Canada from Great Britain led to difficult constitutional debates and decreased support of the state’s role in public life (Li, 2000). By the 1990s a strong ideological campaign had taken hold that swung the political climate of Canada to the right and promoted laissez-faire economic policies at the same time that it entrenched the notion of public governance (Mitchell, 2001, p. 61). There was also a neoconservative ideology emerging through a discourse of harkening to a glorious past and constructing a sense of crisis that Canadians do not know their own history (Joshee, 2004 see also Sears & Hyslop-

\(^{11}\) In 1984, the term “visible minorities” became an official term through the Royal Commission Report on Equality of Employment. This report led to the 1986 Employment Equity Act which put forward a policy of the specific inclusion of First Nations people, women and “persons who are, because of their race or colour, in a visible minority in Canada”, all of whom were to receive measures to improve employment opportunities (Li, 2000, p. 50).
Joshee (2004) observes that along with citizenship education, attention to multicultural education lessened by the mid-1990s with the shift in focus to Canada’s competitiveness as a labour force in the global economy. In tandem with the impact of neoliberal policies on multicultural education, by the middle of the 1990s, funding cuts led to the closure of almost all the development education centres that had been created in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s (Evans et al., 2009).

By the middle of the first decade of the 21st century, the Conservative Party formed a minority government with its leader Stephen Harper as Prime Minister, and they now lead the government with a majority. This current right-wing federal government is reaffirming neoliberalism while introducing some neoconservative ideology (Joshee, 2009). The main rationale for promoting any form of multiculturalism is economically-based. According to Joshee (2009), the Department of Canadian Heritage (2007) states a main goal of multiculturalism is to “leverage the benefits of diversity” (Joshee, 2009, p. 98 quoting Department of Canadian Heritage 2007, p. 26). In an explicit way, multiculturalism is seen as a resource for global business relations in Canada.

Similarly, by the turn of the 21st century, there was a strong economic discourse influencing the global imaginary in schooling. Yet, at the same time, there has been a recent increase in theory and policy work in global citizenship education. This recent scholarly work has highlighted a multi-faceted and transformative version of citizenship education “(e.g., civic literacy, active engagement, equity and inclusion, and a local-to-global perspective).” (Evans et al., 2009, p. 25). Evans et al. (2009) note that specifically the concept of global citizenship education is becoming more recognized and used by ministries of education, educators, and educational researchers. However, they find that despite being a growth-area in citizenship education, global citizenship not well developed over all. Yet, despite the prevalence of an economic agenda of global relations, there is some evidence that global education remains connected to issues of justice and diversity. At a national level, the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada (CMEC) increasingly describes that the

---

12 The Department of Canadian Heritage also finds areas of shared interest with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade such as “social cohesion, and pursuing priority activities such as the promotion of cultural exchanges in important markets like the United States as well as in key emerging markets like China and Brazil” (Joshee, 2009, p. 98 quoting Department of Canadian Heritage, 2007, p. 26).
relationship between the themes of citizenship and global understanding are central to curricula nation-wide (Evans et al., 2009). Contrary to its general education reports in the 1990s which presented strongly neoliberal views of multiculturalism (Joshee, 2004), its 2000 report *Education in a Global Era: Developments in Education in Canada*, promoted an expansion within curricula of wider understandings of citizenship including broader definitions of civic engagement and the inclusion of a complex approach to public issues, both local and global (Evans et al., 2009, p. 28). Their 2001 report, *Education for Peace, Human Rights, Democracy, International Understanding and Tolerance* lamented the decrease in funding to global education and citizenship education initiatives during the 1990s.

Conceptions of the global imaginary passed on through education have changed along with Canada’s status as a nation and its perceived role in international affairs (Richardson, 2008b). In this sense, they reflect as much about how Canada is imagined as how a Canadian imaginary imagines the world. Richardson (2008b) points to an early emphasis in education on the rights and responsibilities implicit in Canada’s membership in the British Empire and the Commonwealth (of former British colonies) and then a focus on Canada’s extensive UN involvement as well as Canada’s relationship with the US and post-cold war participation in a matrix of organizations and agreements (e.g. NATO, WTO, G8, NAFTA). Through these various articulations of the global imaginary in Canadian education, Richardson (2008b) points to a common and traditional paradigm of “expanding horizons” as a model for history and social studies education. Students are ideally lead “from knowledge of local contexts to progressively wider and more sophisticated understandings of self and community” (Richardson, 2008b, p. 54 citing Egan, 1999; Kincheloe, 2001; Sears, 1997). Similarly to Joshee’s (2004) observation that Canadians generally continue to support multiculturalism, global citizenship education remains tied to issues of culture and diversity despite the economic instrumentalist trend of the 1990s.

---

13 Formed in 1960, CMEC brings together authorities responsible for education to try to coordinate education across the country to the largest extent possible and to communicate about Canada’s education systems to key international for a like the OECD (Joshee, 2009, p. 97).
Global Citizenship Education in Alberta:  
A Complex Political Context

Alberta has a reputation for being the Texas of Canada. In the nationally syndicated newspaper *The Globe and Mail*, columnist Gary Mason used the term in an article commenting on the spring 2012 Alberta provincial election. He sums up the myth: “Alberta was supposed to be the Texas of Canada, a rural hinterland populated by rednecks in Stetsons whose idea of fun was performing doughnuts in their pick-up trucks” (Mason, 2012, par, 3). Mason’s piece notes that the election of a female premier and a Muslim and Harvard-educated mayor in Calgary suggests that the stereotype is out of date. Indeed, the dominant view from the outside of Alberta is that it is a conservative province politically and in terms of social norms; however, as with any stereotype, this reputation has never told the full story. Palmer and Palmer (1982) characterize Alberta as a paradoxical combination of “maximum economic power and success and maximum political alienation” (p. 20). Furthermore, they note that while right-wing political conservatism has been “all pervasive” in Alberta, the province was also the site of two major protest movements in the United Farmers of Alberta (UFA) and the Social Credit party.

The political history of Alberta is marked by long reigns of single party rule, weak or divided opposition parties, and a tendency towards what Palmer and Palmer (1987) call “one-man rule” by a strong leadership personality (p. 21). From the time of its inception as a province in 1905 until 1921, the Liberal party dominated provincial politics. Significantly for the topic of this thesis, Alberta has always been an ethnically diverse province with forty to fifty percent of the population neither of British nor French origin dating back to as early as 1905 (Palmer & Palmer, 1982, p. 22). During the agricultural era of the province, “rural block settlements gave ethnic diversity a solid geographic, cultural, social, religious and linguistics base” (Palmer & Palmer, 1982, p. 22). At that time, ethnic difference was barely accepted by the dominant Anglo-Protestant majority. Yet, with urbanization, ethnic diversity became generally understood as an asset (Palmer & Palmer, 1982).

Educational developments in Alberta have followed with the general national trends but with a particular Albertan flare. For example, during the era of the UFA, students, as in the rest of Canada, learned about important figures in Canadian and British history; however,
a 1921 curriculum revision focused on increasing vocational programs and delayed formal history courses until grade seven (von Heyking, 2006, p. 1130). With the severe economic downturn of the 1930s, many farmers went to the cities for work and better access to relief; this corresponded with an increase in class conflict and discrimination against those ethnic groups seen as taking jobs away from “real” Albertans (von Heyking, 2006, p. 1131 citing Palmer & Palmer, 1990, p. 247-52). This situation contributed to the political change from UFA to Social Credit. At this point, politicians argued that Alberta needed a curriculum that reflected life in the West. The result was a combination of practical curriculum suited to life in Alberta with progressive approaches influenced by Dewey emphasizing preparing students for their role in social life but interpreted so as to emphasize the local character of a “made-in-Alberta” curriculum (von Heyking, 2006, p. 1132). Textbooks from that era reflected the main issues seen as provincial concerns; for example, they referred to economic imperialism in examining the dominance of Eastern Canada over the West (von Heyking, 2006). In a sense then, Alberta’s self-image has existed in a paradox of old and new; traditional and progressive. From 1945 to the late 1970s, national images and priorities became more prominent in Alberta education as Canadian patriotism and nationalism heightened during World War II. A new social studies curriculum was developed in the 1970s and implemented in the early 1980s; it answered a federal call for more Canadian content in schools while also using some of the required topics to assert Alberta’s uniqueness. This included an examination of historical and contemporary examples of the Canadian West being subordinated by Central and Eastern Canada (von Heyking, 2006, p. 1140).

The popular narratives of Albertan identity running from the New West to the Boom Province have been strongly contested by aboriginal groups and postcolonial scholarship (e.g., Rosenbert et al., 2010). And yet, Alberta was also an initiator in the area of diversity education. In 1983, Premier Lougheed established the Committee on Tolerance and Understanding that set out to encourage tolerance and respect for minority groups in Alberta. Ron Ghitter served as chairman of the consultative committee and expresses going into communities across the province: “It was an experience at times apparently pitting those with deeply held religious views against the more secular responsibilities of the broader pluralistic community, while bringing an awareness to Albertans that behind our aura of prosperity and comfort were very disturbing signs of prejudice and discrimination” (Ghitter, 2001, p. 14).
The final report of the committee recommended an evaluation of curriculum to ensure it encouraged “shared experiences among the diverse population in our schools” (Ghitter, 2001, p. 14).

Meanwhile, global citizenship has emerged as both an explicit concept in policy and curriculum (which is unique among Canadian provinces) and as a strong interest among teachers. For example, in 1988, the Alberta Teachers Association began the Global Education Project, and there is now the Global, Environmental and Outdoor Education Council made up of Alberta teachers. This council produces a journal and hosts annual conferences and retreats. It represents a strong push for global education, environmental sustainability education, and social justice and human rights issues in education. Their summer 2012 edition of the journal includes an article written by Earl Choldin who is a global education team leader with the University of Alberta International, former director of the Alberta Global Learning Project, and the president of the Canadian Multicultural Education Foundation. He makes a clear link between global citizenship education and the multicultural context of Alberta:

The schools and society in which we teach global citizenship have changed…: for several years, Canada has been welcoming a quarter of a million immigrants a year, most from Asia and Africa. So we are a much more heterogeneous society….This creates both challenges and opportunities for a global education….In [the areas of protecting the environment and preserving human rights] there has been considerable change and our students come to us with new attitudes and ideas. In general, society’s views have become more polarized, making our work more challenging, as global educators take advantage of controversial issues for their great teaching value. (Choldin, 2012, p. 29)

Alberta is thus an interesting place to examine how multiculturalism and global citizenship education interact and to map out the ideologies working within the relationship between the fields. I chose to include an empirical section to this thesis in order to deepen the findings from the theoretical section. It was outside the scope of the project to analyze all documents relating to multiculturalism and global education in Canada. Given that Alberta is the only province (at the time of my research) to have global citizenship explicitly included in its policies and courses devoted to globalization, nationalism, and ideologies, I selected it for my
study. Indeed, it is because it is a leading context in Canada for the inclusion of multiple perspectives (including, importantly, First Nation, Métis, and Inuit) and proposes the cultivating of global citizens that I chose to examine how wider theoretical tensions are reflected in documents from Alberta.

**Breakdown of Research Questions**

A preliminary glimpse into the context of global citizenship education in the multicultural context of Canada generally and Alberta specifically suggests that multiculturalism and global citizenship education have parallel histories. And, while there are popular understandings that Canada’s multicultural context makes it a logical if not ideal place for GCE, there are tensions inherent to both fields and wider ideological and political contexts shaping how they are assumed to be related. Therefore, this thesis sets out to engage in a critical inquiry into four key questions and several sub-questions:

1. **Within the theoretical context, what are the tensions within and between multiculturalism and global citizenship education?**
   a. What are the tensions inherent to imagining political community through modern, liberal notions of citizenship?
   b. What are the tensions inherent to understandings of citizenship in relation to diversity and globalization?
   c. What are the tensions inherent to schooling and citizenship education as main sites for the dissemination of notions of national and global community?

2. **How are these tensions reflected in the educational research literature?**
   a. the research literature specific to citizenship education in the context of globalization
   b. the research literature specific to the explicit relationship between multicultural education and global education
   c. the research literature specific to global citizenship education in multicultural contexts
d. the research literature specific to multicultural education and global citizenship education in Canada

3. How are the tensions reflected in policy and curriculum documents, and publically available lesson plans in Alberta?
   a. What conceptual ambiguities are evident in the documents that contribute to the conflation of and/or relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship?
   b. What are the main discourses through which ideologies of cultural diversity and equity, citizenship and globalization are iterated?

4. What does foregrounding the tensions inherent to both fields and to their perceived relationship demonstrate about the possibilities and constraints of conceptualizing GCE in a multicultural context in terms of public discourse, scholarship, policy and practice?

Organization of the Thesis

I start from the notion that the public conversation, policy conversation, and practitioner (in terms of writers of lesson plans) conversation have all unproblematically linked global citizenship education and multicultural education, assuming a focus on one leads naturally to the other. What I have sought to do in this thesis is to bring clarity to these conversations by:

1. Mapping out the philosophical and theoretical context of the topic;
2. Examining the ways each of the ideas is taken up in the theoretical and educational literature;
3. Understanding how the two ideas are connected in the literature;
4. Explaining the consequences of this lack of conceptual clarity in terms of policy and practice; and
5. Proposing new ways to understand the connections and to probe the assumptions underlying these fields that are useful to the ultimate goal of both fields: the promotion of diversity, equity, and social justice

To achieve this, I will first sketch out the philosophical underpinnings of my argument and examine the theoretical context in which these two fields emerge and relate. Building on the theoretical framework constructed in that section, I articulate some key areas of philosophical confusion and conceptual and ideological conflations inherent to the theoretical context of the topic. I apply Andreotti’s (2010b, 2010c) framework of two distinct epistemological, ontological, and ideological approaches to teaching and learning in the 21st century to map out the larger tensions defining the theoretical and ideological context of the topic. Using that her framework, I argue for a particular perspective on the confusion: it is important to foreground tensions and to interrogate modernist assumptions in order to avoid reinscribing the epistemological and ontological ways of thinking that have led to hegemonies of cultural power within educational approaches to citizenship, global, and multicultural education. I then examine the educational literature in the two fields in light of my philosophical approach and mapping of the theoretical context. Moving into the empirical research section, I articulate my methodology for using critical discourse analysis to examine key educational texts from Alberta to understand how the lack of clarity in the thinking has affected policy and curriculum development in that province. I will be building an argument about the relation and conflation of these fields through identifying central conceptual confusions and key discourses in the Alberta texts. I end by bringing the theoretical, policy, practice, and public conversations back together to show what I believe are some promising avenues for moving ahead in these fields.
Figure 1 Outline of the chapters into the four sections of the thesis.
This chapter has set up the topic of the thesis by raising the popular perception that Canada’s multicultural context makes it an ideal place for global citizenship education. Canadian multiculturalism has developed in tandem with citizenship education and global education. However, tensions around hierarchical understandings of cultural and racial groups in Canada and in the connection of the national and global imaginary in Canadian education to a sense of superiority raise some concerns around the perceived natural relationship between multiculturalism and GCE. The next chapter will start the first section of the thesis. It will present the philosophical framework that I will use to map out the theoretical context of the topic.
Chapter Two
Locating the Research and the Researcher:
Theoretical and Praxis Context

In this short chapter, I will outline my approach to philosophy of education and identify the philosophical stance from which I will explore the theoretical and empirical sections of the thesis. First, I locate the research in my PhD program and in the context of how I came to study this topic. I also locate the work within a distinct version of situated philosophy of education. Next, in order to also situate the critical discourse analysis that is an empirical study of educational texts in the latter part of the thesis, I elaborate on this philosophical stance by making explicit my theoretical foregrounding of ideology and discourse and by locating my work within a turn in the social sciences towards discourse studies. I apply this broader theoretical context to the study of education through a notion of praxis. I also articulate a guiding analogy—towardizing from the pivot-point—that frames my approach to identifying complexities, tensions, and paradoxes. While towardizing from the pivot point, I intend to make conclusions and find insights within a shifting ideological and philosophical landscape.

This thesis is being completed as part of a doctoral program in Philosophy of Education in the department of Humanities, Social Sciences and Social Justice and in a collaborative program: Comparative, International, and Development Education (CIDE). I situate my work within the CIDE program in that it probes the notion of internationalism, and this thesis situates the Canadian, and specifically Albertan, context within the current pressures of internationalization and globalization on education. While it is not explicitly comparative in nature, there will be some comparisons made to the U. K. and American contexts and those in other Canadian provinces. I situated this thesis within the field of philosophy of education by referring to Burbules and Knight Abowitz’s (2008) mapping of the meta-debate inherent to the field. They identify a broad division within contemporary philosophy of education whereby the field is characterized by two fundamentally different views of the nature and purpose of philosophy. While this “meta-debate” is rarely engaged explicitly, “it is exemplified in one way or another in many of the paradigmatic
disagreements we have with one another” (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, 2008, p. 268). One view looks at philosophy as a mode of inquiry whose virtue is based on its distanced objectivity and commitment to “timeless standards of argument and reason” because of “its recurring attention to fundamental questions of truth, value, and meaning that establish continuity across philosophers from before Socrates to the present day” (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, 2008, p. 268). This view understands philosophy as objective, distanced, reliable, and reason-based. The other view is a “radically historicized account” that views philosophy “as the expression of worldviews within a particular cultural and historical context, always partisan and implicated in social dynamics of power, and merely contingent in its ability to persuade or compel assent...” (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, 2008, p. 268). While Burbules and Knight Abowitz (2008) acknowledge that there are few philosophers of education who adopt either of these views in the extreme, they describe a familiar divide.

This thesis engages theoretically with the second view of situated philosophy as historicized and implicated in the production of worldviews through discourses. Rather than applying the canon of valued philosophers starting with Socrates and mining the great works of philosophy to apply to my inquiry into contemporary citizenship education, I look at what is going on in a moment and context in education and draw on and apply insights from contemporary theorists. This approach helps me to identify distinct sets of assumptions underlying the conflation of particular complexities and tensions related to my topic. I attempt to theorize and identify the expression of worldviews within the current cultural and historical context and to make explicit the assumptions underlying ideologies defining social dynamics of power—historicized and new—that compel consent. At the same time, I try to define my partisan and implicated set of assumptions as an educator exploring these complexities. I find a situated approach to philosophy helps me to work to locate the historical and contextual worldviews that operate in overlapping and contradicting ideologies. These conflicting forces coexist in what are seen as neutral concepts like citizenship education, multiculturalism, and global education. Thus, the theoretical context of this thesis is aligned with a “radically historicized” approach to philosophy, particularly its prioritization of the notion of the turn in social sciences and philosophy towards recognizing and mapping out ideological landscapes through identifying discourse.
When considering my work in terms of philosophy of education, it is a situated and historicized approach in that I am very influenced by post-modernist, post-structuralist, and postcolonial accounts of how so-called objective approaches to argument and reason have failed to recognize the degree to which the notion of neutrality is a myth. My interest in the philosophy program at OISE/University of Toronto was largely influenced by my varied experiences as a student and an educator. I entered my Bachelor of Education program at McGill after transferring out of the general Bachelor of Arts program at the end of first year when I decided to pursue studies of education and a career as an educator. My undergraduate studies were from that point on characterized by praxis in that I took academic courses in the faculty of Arts at the same time as I was taking courses in the Faculty of Education and completing a series of practicum experiences. I spent one semester studying in England and needed to catch up on a credit, so while spending one of three summers in Dawson City, Yukon, I took a distance education course on First Nations and Inuit Education. Much more so than my first year general (traditional) philosophy course or my required philosophy of education course, that distance education course engaged me critically and challenged much of what I had considered neutral about education. For the first time, I began to conceptualize ethnocentrism and to recognize the degree to which the education system to which I had devoted myself was complicit in systemic injustices among so many First Nations communities. This critical and historicized lens engaged my undergraduate learnings and had a major influence on my view of education.

I witnessed some of the complexities of the role of education in First Nations and multicultural contexts first hand when doing my final practicum placement. I had previously been placed in urban schools in Montreal and took the opportunity to do my final student teaching placement in Chibougamau, an isolated town over 500 kilometers north-east of Montreal. The school served a few White English-speaking students; a number of White, French-speaking students who had a parent/grandparent educated in English in Canada (hence could claim the right to English education under Québec language laws14); and a

---

14 Bill 101, the Charter of the French Language (1977), defines French as the official language of Québec. It legislated French as the habitual language of business, communications, and education. French education was compulsory for immigrants including people from other provinces which limited English language instruction to the children of those who had been educated in English in Québec. After some supreme court challenges put the law in tension with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, a grandfather clause
group of students from the nearby Cree reserve who were billeting in town to play hockey. I followed that with teaching in two extremely diverse schools in Toronto during my first years of contract teaching work. Those years of teaching were shaped significantly by the neoliberal educational reforms of the Progressive Conservative government led by Mike Harris\textsuperscript{15}. I then taught at an elite private school in Campinas, Brazil where I experienced a number of intersecting issues of privilege relating to classism and ethnocentrism. When I started graduate work in education, I brought with me this wide variety of experiences and collection of various inherent tensions brewing underneath the surface of my understanding of education. A central tension had to do with the fact that in nearly all of my experiences—locally in Toronto, regionally in Quebec, and internationally in Brazil—I have been in positions of privilege as a middle-class, white, heterosexual woman from the Global North and from an urban centre. The interdisciplinary approach to my Master’s program at York introduced me to critical scholars such as Stuart Hall and Henry Giroux and to cultural studies and postmodern critiques. I began to find different concepts through which to identify the tensions inherent to my teaching experiences: culture and race, privilege and oppression, hidden curriculum and standardization. Discourse was a central concept in that learning. I began to understand how norms are produced and reproduced into hegemonic systems. Courses on globalization introduced me to analyses of neoliberalism and the influence of capitalistic values when conflated with liberalist notions of democracy. When it came time to pursue doctoral studies at OISE, I continued to engage in a variety of courses from the introduction to philosophy of education course, to a self-directed reading course, to cultural theory and citizenship theory courses, to a course on decolonizing education and including a course on HIV/AIDS and Women’s Rights in Southern Africa taught by a visiting scholar (Seodi White).

\textsuperscript{15} Mike Harris was premier of Ontario from 1990 to 2002. His government made sweeping reforms to education and this era was accompanied by a great deal of labour strife and protests by teachers. His reforms included the introduction of a new standardized curriculum from Kindergarten to Grade 12 which included standardized testing. His government cut the number of school boards and how they received their funding. The education reform policies of his government increased the amount of time teachers had to spend in the classroom (my first year of teaching included the 6/7 policy where I had to teach an extra class for half of the year totaling my students to 180 and denying me any preparation time during the school day every other day). I also remember the extremely poor morale among teachers at this time and watching television commercials sponsored by the Harris government suggesting teachers were not doing their jobs well enough.
Because I continue to regard my work as outside of a particular discipline and as influenced by many so-called disciplines, and because I have continued to work part time as an educator in a variety of positions and am in Toronto high schools regularly and volunteer at a youth centre serving newcomer Canadians, my theorizing is always implicitly at least in part a response to my experiences in schools and as a teacher. I appreciate Burbules’ and Knight Abowitz’s (2008) notion of situated philosophy. They recognize that “we are continually tossed between the ideas that we are all philosophers who only happen to apply our tools to educational problems, or that we are educationists seeking philosophical underpinning for issues of policy and practice to which we feel commitments on other grounds” (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, 2008, p. 271). I align myself with the latter. They promote a complex and “situated” view of philosophy of education:

[Situated philosophy] is self-reflexive, recognizing how its conditions and circumstances of practice influence the content of the work that is done. It is particular, reflecting the unique contexts, cultural influences, identities, and spaces that bind and frame it. It consciously considers the conditions of its own reproduction over time. And it attempts to measure and weigh its effects, the social repercussions of the texts and ideas it produces. (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, 2008, p. 271)

Thus, this thesis will be written from the point of view of an educator seeking to identify and analyse the rationales and key governing discourses underlying the relationship between global citizenship education and multiculturalism. I also intend to practice a version of situated philosophy whereby I recognise that my work is contextualized and governed by my own political and theoretical stances as well as by the conditions of writing a thesis.

**Situated Philosophy and the Discursive Turn:**

**Theorizing From the Pivot-Point**

This approach to philosophy of education is highly influenced by a post-modernist, post-structuralist, and postcolonial account of how so-called objective approaches to argument and reason do not account for the degree to which neutrality is a myth. Both my conceptualization of multiculturalism and of global citizenship education prioritize the ideological nature of notions of citizenship, community, and schooling and recognize the role of schooling in relaying hegemonic views of what it means to be a citizen of a diverse
community locally and globally. In this sense, my work uses the notion of the discursive turn (Andreotti, 2010a, 2010c, 2011a, 2011b) to recognize the extent to which current scholarship is involved in deconstructing and examining how language constructs reality and governs understandings of self, other, and state. Indeed, I borrow the term from Andreotti, but it is an overall description of the fact that identifying and analyzing discourses is a common and central preoccupation across the humanities and social sciences (Fairclough, 2004, p. 123).

It is a challenge to describe the complex field of discourse studies (MacLure, 2003); however, some overarching concepts serve to introduce how I understand the turn to recognizing and analyzing discourse in wider theoretical work and through an application to the study of education. Discourse is used in the social sciences in a variety of ways and often under the influence of Michel Foucault (Fairclough, 2004, p. 214). Foucault’s work (1972, 1977, 1979, 1980) provides analyses of social history and contemporary culture through which he demonstrates that discourse constructs and positions social subjects. In Foucaultian terms, discourses describe, diagnose, and normalize truths about the natural world that become taken-for-granted categories which, in turn, form the basis of how populations are governed and govern themselves. While ideologies are belief systems through which people understand and act in the world, discourse is the primary way ideology is produced: “[E]ach discourse is a product of historical and social circumstances that provide the discursive practices—terminology, values, rhetorical styles, habits, and truths—that construct it” (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 655). Through the relationship between discourse and ideology, knowledge is produced within language.

Language describes and produces the belief systems through which people understand and act in the world. And, as Hartley (2004) (drawing on Volosinov, 1973) points out, “language is never a transparent medium through which truth can be observed” (p. 106). In this sense, no discourse is exempt from ideology as there are at any given time numbers of contending ideological discourses at play in a given social context. Yet, although both

---

16 I do not mean to infer that Foucault is the only scholar to have influenced the discursive turn but rather am highlighting his contribution to how I understand the concept of the discursive turn in this thesis. Indeed, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine the complex history of discourse studies and inherent debates around which traditions and specific theorists led to the discursive turn. For more on this, Luke (1996) offers a lengthy genealogy of what he calls the “linguistic turn” in social sciences (p. 124), and Van Dijk (1993) offers a synthesis of the complex history of the development of discourse studies (p. 251).
knowledge and power are central to the way ideological discourses are produced, iterated, regulated, institutionalized, and resisted, there is no single unitary ideology that is all encapsulating: “Even within what is often called a dominant ideology there are contending and conflicting positions – as between, say, different educational philosophies and policies” (Hartely, 2004, p. 106). Thus, one objective version of truth is not observable through language because there are many contending, overlapping, and/or conflicting ideological discourses at play in any given context. In fact, even dominant ideologies, those narratives that take on a neutral status by being taken as given, include contending and conflicting positions. Goldberg (1993) describes dominant discourses as “those that in the social relations of power at a given moment come to assume authority and confer status—reflect the material relations that render them dominant” (p. 194). In this sense, discourses name and therefore make conceivable and comprehensible the social condition (Goldberg, 1993, p. 194).

Camicia and Franklin (2011) refer to the notion of “discursive fields” which are genres and topics that are contextually related when groups construct diagnoses, prognoses, and calls to action (p. 313 drawing on Steinberg, 1999; see also Tully 2008). The next chapters will examine how nationhood, citizenship, globalization, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism function as discursive fields that are conjoined in particular ways in the current context of educating the 21st century citizen. Despite potentially distinct and even competing ideologies and points of view, strong discourses emerge that make it appear that the field is changing; ideologies are expressed through different terms and concepts using new rhetoric but remain based on fundamentally the same world view. In this way, discursive fields are contested spaces with dominant discourses emerging. This enables hegemonic ways of thinking to become ongoing processes while new rhetoric makes a discourse appear to change or renew. Reading discursive fields through the discursive turn allows a theorist to see that ideologies shift and change through particular iterations and political manifestations; however, metanarratives like nationhood (as will be discussed in the next chapter) remain a conceptual umbrella for containing and shaping shifting ideologies. According to Parker (2011), discourse is working language: “language that shapes while it represents, language in connection to circumstance including the constraints and opportunities of its use” (p. 489). In this sense, discourse is not only about conveying meaning, but it is also about reinforcing
some practices while at the same time “slighting” others (Parker, 2011, p. 489-490). Camicia and Franklin (2011) note that not all discourses have the same weight because all discourses are embedded in a larger political economy in which one discourse can be favoured over another and function hegemonically to become dominant. In this sense, the concept of ideology is dynamic: “ideology is not a set of things but an active practice, either working in the changing circumstances of a social activity to reproduce familiar and regulated sense or struggling to resist established and naturalised sense thus to transform the means of sense-making into new, alternative or oppositional forms, which will generate meanings aligned to different social interests” (Hartley, 2004, p. 106).

According to Andreotti (2010c), the discursive turn is identified by “an emphasis on the ideological nature of language and its role in social praxis, including the social-historical construction of social realities and identities” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 235). The discursive turn in social sciences proposes a correlation between language and reality and is represented in the tracing of “different interpretations of words to socially and historically constructed and culturally located ‘metanarratives’, or stories that offer grand explanations of history or of knowledge” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). A key component of the discursive turn is therefore the recognition that one phrase or one concept can carry and produce significantly different meanings tied to significantly different positions, be this grand metanarratives (such as nation-hood or progress) or overarching concepts of the need for new ways of schooling to educate the 21st century citizen. Multiple, overlapping, or contradictory ideologies can work within what are perceived as neutral descriptions of reality. Discourses can “reproduce and regulate” or can “struggle to resist established and naturalised sense” in order to generate new meanings resistant to the hegemonic ideologies (Hartley, 2004, p. 106). For example, the phrase multiculturalism in Canada can refer to a description (e.g. Canada is a multi-cultural country), political programs (multicultural policies and collective rights), and normative ideologies (minoritized and/or marginalized ethno-cultural groups in Canada deserve certain rights or recently, multiculturalism is a failure) (Inglis, 1996; see Figure 1). Therefore, one word, in this example multiculturalism, can represent different referents and encapsulate what can be an ideologically contested concept. Similarly, global citizenship can refer to a description of the perceived increases in interconnections among peoples and political systems in the contemporary geopolitical moment, to formal and informal political
organizations and programs (UNESCO, World Trade Organization, NGOs, religious organizations, charities) and normative and contending ideologies. It can also describe a coming together of two fields: global education and citizenship education (Davies et al., 2005). Thus, understanding discourse is particularly useful in this thesis because of the challenge of distinguishing between the main fields of study (multiculturalism and GCE). By looking at the distinctions and conflations within each field and between the fields, particular tensions are evident as well as the different ideological uses of the terms in each of the conversations I explore: public, scholarly, policy, and practice.

Thus, the discursive turn is both an ontological orientation and an epistemological one. Andreotti (2011b) uses the metaphor of a constantly swinging pendulum to describe how trying to theorize with the recognition of the way language constructs reality leads to a constant struggle to “think otherwise” (p. 308). She finds this particularly the case in global citizenship education initiatives wherein a central issue “is the agonistic and antagonistic motion between the excess-straitjackets of homogenising universalisms (especially those advocating normalcy and civility) versus parochial specifisms that freeze self-other identities,
negotiations and possibilities for relationships ‘otherwise’” (Andreotti, 2011b, p. 308, italics added). Theorizing GCE is thus implicated in other motions including: the dynamic relationship between essentialism and anti-essentialism (and trivialization of power relations), unexamined ethnocentrism versus absolute relativisms, deficit versus romanticized versions of difference, fantasies of supremacy and entitlement versus paralysis in complicity and guilt, and paternalism and salvationism versus indifference and alienation (Andreotti, 2011b, p. 308). For (Andreotti (2011b),

in the process of writing, at the heart of this struggle is the irresistible (and unattainable) desire to break the shackles of language through language itself and to find an unambiguous concept, analytical tool or pedagogical strategy that can, at least provisionally, put an end to one’s reason-language-complexity crises (and the moment this is achieved, another crisis – or cycle of learning – starts again). (p. 308)

I use an analogy of theorizing from the pivot-point to recognize the potential in identifying and engaging in paradoxes rather than only trying to apply the traditions of Western philosophy to solve them. The discursive turn is both a response to and a product from within modernism. The discursive turn—recognizing the way that language shapes reality—is characterized by an inherent dualism in the history of thought as it can be framed as both a response to and product from within the grand metanarrative of the modernity and the Enlightenment itself (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). However, Andreotti (2010c) points out that Western philosophy does not own the discursive turn as the insight gained from recognizing the way language constructs reality can be traced to many other cultures seen as inferior in (neo)colonial order such as oral and monist traditions (see also Appiah, 2008). The way knowledge is understood in the context of the educating the 21st century citizen relates strongly to the orientation of one’s perspective from the discursive turn. As Ball (2004) articulates, “Epistemologies and ontologies may clash and grate but the resultant friction can be purposeful and effective…in providing different lenses through which to see and think about the social world. This means stepping back from simple certainties and thinking instead of paradoxes or holding onto ambivalence” (p. 2). Freire (1998) also speaks to the sense of locating oneself critically and theoretically on what I conceptualize as a pivot-point. He theorizes a paradox whereby at the same time one recognizes the power of ideology to
define truths and tries to resist that, one also finds a degree of cynicism that can result in a closing off rather than an opening up:

In the course of the critical exercise of my resistance to the manipulative power of ideology, I bring to birth certain qualities that in turn become a store of wisdom, indispensable to my teaching practice. On the one hand, the necessity for this critical resistance creates in me an attitude of permanent openness toward others, toward the word; on the other hand, it generates in me a methodical mistrust that prevents me from becoming absolutely certain of being right. (Freire, 1998, p. 119)

Thus, many theorists express this sense of embracing the skeptical and ambivalent while also recognizing the discomfort and sense of disorientation given our socialization into modernist metanarratives. Much of this discomfort is around giving up “being right” in favour of working within complexities and negotiating sets of assumptions with which to make sense of what we know.

Applying the discursive turn to the study of schooling represents a space of praxis. Foucault’s influence on the study of education is explicated by Luke (1994): “If there is no social space, domain of practice, or life world outside of discourse, then the focus of much educational research and, quite possibly curriculum and instruction can begin to move from a concern with behavior, skill, and mind to discourse as a constitutive pedagogical category” (p. 9). In turn, Foucault’s work can be applied in education to demonstrate how schooling and pedagogical discourses therein are implicated in systems of governmentality, surveillance, and moral regulation (Luke, 1994, p. 9). Educational theory in the discursive turn can be characterized by the theoretical pivot-point from where a theorist can try to map the different (dominant and marginal) discourses at play in a particular field (e.g. multiculturalism, global citizenship education), identify tensions within or between them, and look for where there are resistant and critical spaces for thinking in new ways, or otherwise. Dillabough (2002) reminds that “no language pedagogy will ever be free of its ‘regimes of power’”: “In making such a case, however, the resulting conclusion should not be that all pedagogical approaches are characterized by dangerous master narratives…For if we do, we are free to ignore the political complexity of students’ needs…and may contribute to a larger

For example, Stronach and MacLure (1997) speak about embracing the “disappointment” of certainty (p. 4-5).
contemporary practice of depoliticizing theory, the self, and the communities within which we operate” (p. 208). There are important ideological stances to be made from within the moving and dynamic pivot point. Currently, these include what to do in face of current neoliberal policies that cut funds and programs supporting marginalized students and that overpower critical and justice-oriented programs in the name of building future workers for the global economy rather than for a just world. Thus, educational research must somehow balance the dynamics of the pivot-point by identifying discursive spaces that allow for more spaces of reflexive philosophy within the existing interplays of ideologies of schooling.

Indeed, Steinberg (1999) argues that “the multivocal nature of discourse” means that it is possible to find “gaps, contradictions, and silences in [the] taken-for-grantedness” (p. 751). He goes on to say that there can be a political purpose in finding the contradictions in hegemonic discourses because “[b]y exposing these, challengers can inject alternative meanings to articulate their sense of injustice” (Steinberg, 1999, p. 751). Thus, the idea of the pivot-point helps to characterize an essential paradox of a situated, reflexive philosopher. One’s work is always unfinished and reflexively incomplete in terms of one’s analysis and articulation of a philosophical stance; and, at the same time, one stands on principles to diagnose, analyze, and suggest ways to critique and ways to think.

I recognize that this thesis is also an example of what Burbules and Knight Abowitz (2008) identify as situated philosophy in that the theories and theorists I choose to use and the problems I identify are contextualized in a given historical moment (2012), geopolitical context (contemporary multicultural Canada), as well as in an institutional situation of writing a thesis (Ontario Institution for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto) by an educator with specific personal experiences and social positions (as described previously). In this sense, this is not neutral work, and I engage in an approach to synthesizing, theorizing, and analyzing in such a way that I both question academia and the role of schools at the same time that I am an educator engaged in critical work and teaching in secondary schools and teacher education. In this sense, situated and radically historical philosophy is itself defined by a central tension that is similar to the tensions that I will argue define the context of this study. Burbules and Knight Abowitz (2008) articulate this sense of dynamic engagement: “There is a fundamental tension here, one that might be termed ‘binocularism,’ both holding and questioning particular views at the same time” (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, 2008, p.
This binocularism is a dynamic engagement with an inherent tension: holding up as problematic and questioning dominant views of citizenship, difference, globalization, and schooling and at the same time working with the assumption that schooling and education are integral to the functioning of a society. Their binocular analogy compares to Andreotti’s (2011b) swinging pendulum.

Similarly, I use the concept of a pivot-point to describe the sense of looking away from, outside of, and “otherwise” (Andreotti, 2011b, p. 308) at the same time as engaging in the currently constructed ideological and instrumental situation that defines educating in the 21st century. A pivot-point analogy includes a sense of the dynamics of (at least) two directional pulls. At any given point of view, there is the possibility of being pulled in a different direction. There is a dynamic sense of movement and of views in (at least) one direction or another, but the other side(s) of the pivot are always defining how and from where the point turns. In this sense, my version of reflexive educational philosophy connects to Stronach and MacLure’s (1997) use of the frame of postmodernism to emphasize the ability of an analysis to find productive spaces for complexity and multiplicity. This helps to generate problems obscured by commonsense and taken-for-granted metanarratives as well as to resist a sense of closure associated with educational philosophy as objective inquiry (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, 2008).

Applying the Discursive Turn to Education:
Praxis

The discursive turn raises the philosophical complexity of what public education should aim to do because it recognizes that even when there is an explicitly articulated goal for education, there can be multiple interpretations. Statements can be presented as neutral slogans in educational policy and resources when they in fact represent distinct and potentially contradictory ideological and philosophical conceptualizations of schooling tied to distinct worldviews. For example, Andreotti (2010c) highlights a commonly heard statement: the role of education should be to “equip learners to participate together in a globalized world” (p. 235). Applying the framework she ties to the discursive turn, this statement can be deconstructed by applying four characteristics of deconstructing a
A discourse is a) situated (exists in a particular culture and circumstance), b) partial (another person can see things differently), c) contingent (comes out of a particular context), and d) provisional (can change) (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 235). Each word in that commonly heard and read-as-neutral phrase could be interpreted differently in different contexts: “These interpretations will depend on shared cultural assumptions of what counts as real or ideal and what counts as knowledge” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 235). She points out two potential interpretations in the terms “globalized world”, “participate”, and “equip”. A universalist representation of modernism could interpret “globalized world” by using a metaphor of an engineered machine. The basis of control, stability, and predictability relates to an understanding of progress as consensual and rooted in one universal and harmonious future about which there is consensus. “Participate” might be understood as compliance with that order and with normative ways of being, knowing and seeing: “Following from this logic, ‘equipping learners’ could mean inculcating values, and transmitting content and skills that would enable learners to conform to the predetermined idea of society described above” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). Yet, on the other hand, another logic framed as postmodern, might associate “globalized world” with a metaphor of organic systems or networks that are always changing with interdependent, autonomous parts which negotiate interchanges. This view understands that such a globalized world can never be fully understood or controlled in its totality because multiple meanings, interpretations and interchanges happen “in context” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). In this case, “participate” is associated with the idea of being able to perform in a system or network “to negotiate meaning or carry out interchanges within and between different parts or communities, to generate new knowledge, to ‘learn as you go along’, in context” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). To equip learners refers to the creation of spaces to become able to engage with complexity, uncertainty, and diversity in this system or sets of networks.

Thus, the discursive turn can be used as a way of understanding that it is possible to “trace different interpretations of words to socially and historically constructed and culturally located ‘metanarratives’, or stories that offer grand explanations of history or of knowledge” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). It highlights the way “equipping learners to participate together in a globalized world” can be read as neutral when it has at least two distinct interpretations representing distinct views of the world, of education, and of participation. It is thus very
important to recognize the multiple and potentially contradicting ideologies inherent to what are often used as neutral discourses: multicultural or multiculturalism and global citizenship or learning for the 21st century citizen. It is also significant to recognize the difference between dominant and marginalized meanings. There are dominant meanings which are related to the dominant metanarratives and stories heard regularly in mainstream media and government materials, including policies and resources for schooling. And, there are those which are not as often heard and which challenge hegemonic understandings. By making such distinctions, theoretical work and research analyses can work from the pivot-point, recognizing tensions and defining dynamic and critical discursive spaces. Thus, examining and mapping dominant and marginal discourses is important work to understanding what notions of nationhood and global community are disseminated and reproduced through schooling. Both schools themselves (classrooms: lessons, organization, activities, resources; schools: hallways, classrooms, schoolyards and embedded hierarchies) and educational policies (curriculum documents, policy papers on character or citizenship education) are powerful places for the production and regulation of ideologies through discourses. Hartely (2004) states that “discourses are power relations”: “It follows that much of the social sense-making we are subjected to – in the media, at school, in conversation – is the working through of an ideological struggle between discourses” (p. 74, italics added).

The next three chapters use the framework of situated philosophy, the discursive turn, and theorizing from the pivot point to identify the wider theoretical tensions and paradoxes that contribute to the conceptual confusion and conflation of multiculturalism and global citizenship education. They inquire into the first research question: what are the tensions within and between multiculturalism and global citizenship education? The next chapter looks at the theoretical context of the issue through the lens of Benedict Anderson’s (2006) theory of imagined communities. It is framed by the question, what are the tensions inherent to imagining political community through modern, liberal notions of citizenship? I apply Anderson’s theory to identify the inherent tensions in the emergence of citizenship as an institution of political community especially those pertaining to issues of ethnocultural diversity and corresponding inequities. Anderson’s (2006) theory contributes to a situated and historicized account of how national citizenship emerged through a dynamic truce between Enlightenment notions of rational beliefs in progress and emotional feelings of
fraternity and symbolic attachment to nationhood. This dynamic was institutionalized through citizenship when a nation-state provided protection and structures of political organization to citizens in exchange for loyalty. Essential to the development of citizenship in this modernist dynamic was a delineation of who belonged and who was not a citizen. Through various claims of inequality and exclusion, citizenship developed through a liberal framework in Western democracies such as Canada. This involved an expansion of citizenship to be more inclusive while still needing to maintain the sense of belonging and fraternity that is the basis of the imagined community. Thus a main paradox of citizenship is the inclusion/exclusion dynamic.

The following chapter, Chapter Four, expands on the notion of imagined community to consider the relationship between national citizenship and cosmopolitanism, especially as pertaining to issues of equity and ethnocultural diversity. Its inquiry is framed by the question: What are the tensions inherent to understandings of citizenship in relation to diversity and globalization? I trace the distinctions between multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism and within cosmopolitanism to demonstrate the conceptual confusion and ambiguity. While there are some distinctions, there are many ways in which the two fields are conflated within a wider conflation of different versions of liberal ideology. Furthermore, similarly to the national citizenship paradox of inclusion-exclusion, cosmopolitanism is defined by paradoxes of universal and particular and of national-global impulses. Having considered the wider theoretical tensions inherent to national citizenship and cosmopolitanism, the Chapter Five examines how schooling—citizenship education more broadly, and the emerging field of GCE more specifically—functions as a site of praxis for these wider theoretical paradoxes. It engages the question: what are the tensions inherent to schooling and citizenship education functioning as main sites for the dissemination of notions of national and global community? It explores theoretical work explicating the extent to which schooling socializes and reproduces inequities and ethnocentric, colonial ways of thinking at the same time that it is a site for the interrogation and transformation of systems of oppression; and GCE seeks to assist in the latter. Having looked at the conceptual ambiguity and inherent tensions in national citizenship, cosmopolitanism, and in schooling and citizenship education, and having argued that the current context of globalization contributes an imperative and heightening of particular tensions, I present a framework
through which to unpack calls for new teaching for the 21st century citizen. This framework helps me to argue for a particular view of educating for the 21st century citizen rooted in the discursive turn. It is based in a foregrounding of theoretical and ideological tensions, an interrogating of modernist assumptions around equity and diversity, and a promotion of thinking otherwise from within the dynamic paradoxes that continue to reproduce national and global issues.

Figure 3 Organization of the three theoretical chapters by research questions

These three chapters set up an examination of the extent to which educational research literature distinguishes between or conceptually conflates the fields of multicultural and global citizenship education. From there, I set out the methodology for the critical discourse analysis of Alberta educational texts and then present my findings and analysis.
Chapter Three
Imagined Communities and the Modern Citizenship Dynamic

The concept of the pivot-point introduced in the last chapter is a way to articulate a situated and reflexive approach to outlining the theoretical context for the study of the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship education. The pivot-point is also tied to the discursive turn in social science and philosophy that recognizes the “constitutive force of language – its power to create that which it seems simply to describe” (MacLure, 2003, p.4). National citizenship describes political membership and contributes significantly to notions of identity. In order to identify and analyze the tensions inherent to the perceived relationship between multiculturalism and GCE, this chapter takes a wider theoretical frame by looking at the broader tensions inherent to notions of political community. Thus, this chapter is framed by the question: What are the tensions inherent to imagining political community through modern, liberal notions of citizenship?

There are a number of key tensions examined in this chapter. First, I use the lens of the pivot-point and discursive turn to highlight the work of Benedict Anderson (2006) in deconstructing a central metanarrative of modernity and citizenship: the nation. His theory helps to articulate how historical materialism and discourse analysis combine to construct the nation. The nation is the governing discourse of political community despite a number of paradoxes: the nation is old and new, limited and sovereign, open and closed, diverse and particular. The chapter builds on Anderson’s (2006) work to demonstrate that theorizing from the pivot-point reveals a number of dualisms and dynamic spaces in the tensions that are sustained within discourses and between conflicting discourses operating in the metanarrative of the nation. From this standpoint, concepts like historicity and the new imperialism help to explain how, as a governing discourse, citizenship both includes and excludes by defining the spatial aspects of political community within and outside of the imagined nation. Thus, the nation can be unpacked through the four features of applying the discursive turn; the concept of the nation is partial, situated, contingent, and provisional.

Next, the chapter links the imagined nation to the institution of citizenship. Anderson’s work tied nationhood to Enlightenment ideals and historical geopolitical
changes, and through the development of modernism, citizenship became the manifestation of the imagined nation. Citizenship is implicated in how nationhood is imagined in spatial dimensions through geographical boundaries and through symbolic discourses of community that determine both who is and is not a member. In response to claims of injustices and exclusions, liberalism applies a discourse of rights to the citizenship dynamic. Thus this chapter begins to define the theoretical context of this thesis through Anderson’s work on deconstructing the nation and uses a lens of the discursive turn and the theoretical pivot point to outline geographical, symbolic, and ideological contestations of citizenship in terms of: colonialism and the new imperialism, identity and difference, and the extension of citizenship rights. These contestations correspond to a number of tensions defining the theoretical context of this thesis. The end of this chapter looks at the current context of theorizing citizenship from the pivot-point. Calls for new, flexible, and even multiple versions of citizenship reveal citizenship to be a discursive field in which various theoretical stances and ideological assumptions are held in tension with calls for new versions of citizenship. Ultimately, this chapter outlines a key tension important to studying the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE: While in some ways, citizenship is being theorized in new post-modern terms and rhetoric, it ultimately remains lodged in the modernist assumptions that Anderson’s (2006) work demonstrates can be traced back to a set of paradoxes inherent in Enlightenment thinking.

Unpacking the Metanarrative From the Pivot-Point:

The Imagined Nation

Anderson’s (2006) work unpacks the metanarrative of nationhood. His work is useful to examining what theoretical and ideological conditions frame how political community is conceptualized in public, political, and educational contexts. By rejecting a neutral notion of nationality and nation-ness, he reveals the symbolic power of nationhood as the center of nation-state models. In the afterword to its most recent re-publication, Anderson (2006) explains how *Imagined Communities* troubled extant conceptualizations of the nation through combining a type of historical materialism with discourse analysis: “This formulation [of the nation as imagined] opened the door wide for critical assessment of the kind of age-old nationalism propagated in most contemporary states through the means of mass
communications and state-controlled educational institutions” (p. 226). Recognizing the dominance of the nation as a governing framework of political community, his theory highlights the role of schooling in socializing young people into a consciousness of a national community (see also Barr, 2004). The nation is imagined because even in the smallest of nations, members will not know most of their fellow citizens, and yet, “in their minds of each lives the image of their communion”: “In fact, all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined. Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined” (p. 6).

The nation is imagined as community through a deep, horizontal comradeship between individuals who may never meet each other. Thus, belonging to a nation is a discursive construction in the form of a metanarrative that over-rides extremely different ideological, political, and geographical contexts. Anderson (2006) contends that “nation-ness is the most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time” (p. 3). Thus the concept of belonging to a nation is ultimately a discursive construction that operates as a metanarrative over-riding extremely different ideological contexts. From emerging independent former colonies, to communist countries, to liberal democracies, individual nations are imagined as political communities (Anderson, 2006). People in places with distinct political and ideological governments such Cuba, Sweeden, the USA, Indonesia, China, Brazil, and Denmark consider themselves citizens of a nation. Thus, the metanarrative of nationhood is a conflation of universalism and diversity whereby everyone has a nationality but each one is particular. The contradiction between the great political power of the nation-state and these philosophical tensions is significant to understanding how a critical conceptualization of the nation is viewed from the theoretical pivot-point. Nationhood functions hegemonically as the dominant model of political community at the same time that the concept is critiqued and deconstructed through work like that by Anderson. Nationhood defines who is included and who is excluded in any contemporary moment through appeals to an imagined past. Identifying these paradoxes opens theoretical space for acknowledging and unpacking what are otherwise un-interrogated assumptions.
Tensions Inherent to the Nation: 
Paradoxes of History (new and old) and Spatial Construction (includes and excludes)

Anderson’s (2006) theory of imagined communities describes how nationhood is constituted through a series of paradoxes. First, deconstructing a normative view of nation reveals a contradiction of historicity. Nation-states are modern and at the same time Anderson (2006) notes “their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists” (p. 1): “If nation-states are widely conceded to be ‘new’ and ‘historical,’ the nations to which they give political expression always loom out of an immemorial past, and, still more important, glide into a limitless future” (Anderson, 2006, p. 11-12). Thus, the concept of the nation works discursively to both tie a community together through a sense of a long, shared, past of commonality and to organize and group communities into distinct modern nation-states. A second paradox inherent to how nationhood is imagined is the conflation of universalism and diversity: “The formal universality of nationality as a socio-cultural concept – in the modern world everyone can, should, will ‘have’ a nationality, as he or she ‘has’ a gender –vs. the irremediable particularity of its concrete manifestations, such that, by definition, ‘Greek’ nationality is sui generis” (Anderson, 2006, p. 3). Nationality is thus a construction of identity and is both a specific type of universal category and a particular description. Therefore, Anderson (2006) points out the contradiction between the political power of nations and “their philosophical poverty and incoherence: “In other words, unlike most other isms, nationalism has never produced its own grand thinkers….” (Anderson, 2006, p. 5). By deconstructing the concept of nation, theorists can understand where injustices inherent to social dynamics of power within nations are formed and normalized.

In order to explain how nationhood persists with such dominance and legitimacy in political thought despite these paradoxes, Anderson (2006) takes a cultural artifact approach to nationality through his definition of the nation as “an imagined political community” (p. 6). Importantly, he adds, it is “imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (p. 6). The nation is “limited” in that even a hugely populous one has “finite, if elastic boundaries” on the other side of which are other nations: “No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind” (p. 7). This limitedness of the nation is marked by a particular contradiction in that nations are defined by determined boundaries, and yet there exists the possibility of
naturalization of outsiders in even the most insular nations: “Seen as both a historical fatality and as a community imagined through language, the nation presents itself as simultaneously open and closed” (p. 146). In this sense, nationhood works as a discourse that balances a dynamic paradox of simultaneous inclusion and exclusion. In a modernist view, the nation is normalized as a sovereign political identity; its coherence is taken-for-granted. Therefore, the nation functions as a metanarrative. We can trace the metanarrative back to a particular inception rooted in a set of geopolitical phenomena.

**Historicity and the Situated Context of the Imagined Nation:**

**National Citizenship and the Enlightenment Dynamic**

Anderson (2006) describes the way formerly governing assumptions and metanarratives were overturned and replaced by nationhood in the 18th and 19th centuries. Script language lost its privileged access to and inseparability from ontological truth. In terms of political organization, mass communication broke down the previously held together transcontinental solidarities such as Christendom and the Islamic Ummah (Anderson, 2006, p. 36). Also, this era saw the loss of the belief that society was naturally organized around and under higher centres wherein monarchs ruled by divine dispensation. Human loyalties were no longer necessarily understood as hierarchal and centripetal. This allowed for the possibility of imagining the “deep, horizontal comradeship” of nationhood (Anderson, 2006, p. 7). Therefore, the construction of the nation-state, as an axis of political and territorial organization and a metanarrative of identity and governance, emerged from a particular culture and context historically. As Ross (2007) notes, the idea of the sovereign nation came to maturity at a stage in human history when freedom from tyranny was a rare and precious ideal. It is also imagined as limited because it must have finite (if elastic) boundaries on the other side of which are other nations.

The Enlightenment project was central to the conceptual shift to nationhood as the axis of political community. Generally, the Enlightenment was a time period in which a shift in philosophy impacted worldviews. Arts and science developed and promoted a strong sense of progress in the understanding of world, self, and morals. Modern progress would further
justice through institutions and towards an overall achievement of happiness. As Richardson (2002b) explains,

In a political sense this sentiment, founded at once on control and progress, found its expression in the idea of the nation-state….Beginning with the French Revolution and as an extension of the Enlightenment Project, the nation gradually replaced the monarch as the focus of people’s loyalty, and the idea of the uniqueness of the national character emerged as a basis for the existence of the nation. (p. 52)

Thus, the imagined nation became the civic nation with structures of constitutions, elected legislatures, and written civil and criminal law codes. The people became citizens of a nation and thus “owed the state their loyalty, while the state,…the government, owed its citizens protection” (Richardson, 2002b, p. 53). As a political construct, the nation required a contract between the governed and governors involving a very abstract challenge: to earn the loyalty of its people. The realization of the potential for national identity to arise as the basis of modern political organization required a dynamic characterized by the sustainment of a key tension, or what I refer to as the Enlightenment dynamic of modern citizenship. This tension is defined by, on the one hand, the Enlightenment concepts of reason, logic, and efficiency to be embodied in the state, and on the other hand, an emotionally powerful notion of national character constructed through a romantic idea of its people as a mythic folk18 (Richardson, 2002b, p. 53). Citizenship is an example of conceptual hegemony which, as Goldberg (1993) states, “turns not only upon the totally imposed order of terms in defining the social [and in this case political] subject, but also upon the subject’s acceptance of the terms as her own in self-definition and conception” (p. 194).

This Enlightenment dynamic of citizenship—drawing on the emotions of camaraderie imagined through nationhood and on the logic and rational progress promised in the new

---

18 Anderson (2006) describes the power of the idea of nation and how the sense of unity between fellow-members of nations is reinforced through media. A basic and essential example is the deep communal sense of connection achieved through a national anthem: “No matter how banal the words and mediocre the tunes, there is in this singing an experience of simultaneity. At precisely such moments, people wholly unknown to each other utter the same verses to the same melody. The image: unisonance. Singing the Marseillaise, Waltzing Matilda, [O Canada] and Indonesia Raya provide occasions for unisonality, for the echoed physical realization of the imagined community “(p. 145). The space of the nation in terms of where it ends and where it begins and who it includes and who it excludes is fundamentally tied to the way various media communicate and enable performances of nationhood through powerful symbols.
nation-state—was implicated in the inclusion/exclusion paradox. Despite the promise of freedom from tyranny, the nation-state inherited social inequalities. Goldberg (1994) points out that this project of national citizenship was complicit with the construction of race and racism: “The rational, hence autonomous and equal subjects of the Enlightenment project turn out, perhaps unsurprisingly, to be exclusively white, male, European, and bourgeois” (Goldberg, 1994, p. 208). Thus, central to the metanarrative of nation and its expression in citizenship in a modern nation state are key assumptions around who is and is not a political subject, a citizen, and a member of the national camaraderie.

Indeed, building from a position of situated philosophy, the discursive turn is a key lens through which I understand Anderson’s (2006) theory of imagined communities (Anderotti, 2010b, 2010c). Metanarratives, such as the nation are broad stories which function as the basis for constructing meaning and justifying actions (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). The discursive turn highlights the importance of historicizing and culturally locating hegemonic ways of thinking and placing those metanarratives in relation to ontological and epistemological assumptions. An important implication of the discursive turn is that to put a name to something is to choose a possible story, not to describe a universal truth. Philosophically, this does not mean that no reality exists but rather that experiences of reality—including real, material ways in which nationhood functions (Burns 2008)—are mediated by language. In this sense, language is always unstable, so we cannot nail it down “as meaning is always attributed in context, depending on other meanings that have been attributed before” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). By implication, the discursive turn recognizes any given society is constituted by a plurality of discourses and not one discourse can claim legitimacy in the way grand narratives of modernity have done. Anderson’s (2006) theorization of the nation as imagined community demonstrates how a dominant narrative can be constructed as legitimate and highly valued on political and on personal levels despite inherently contradictory logics.

The discursive turn is evoked to recognize that the stories of reality which constitute our knowledges are a) always situated (they are culturally bound), b) they are always partial (what one perceives or means may not be the same as another), c) they are always contingent (dependent on context), and d) they are always provisional (subject to change) (Andreotti,
2010c, p. 236 italics added). For example, Anderson’s (2006) theory of the nation as an imagined community demonstrates that the concept of the nation-state is a dominant and normative way of organizing territorial and political boundaries and identities. It is a discursive construct. The emergence of the nation as metanarrative was situated in the context of its original inception during a time of great epistemological and ontological change historically and was reinforced by the dominance of Enlightenment assumptions. The nation is partial in that it is rooted in Western modernist worldviews and in European imperialism. Furthermore, the normative power of the nation is the way that it is accepted as a universal concept despite extremely distinct local contexts and ideologies. It also serves as a conceptual umbrella for different conceptual paradoxes. The nation is contingent on Enlightenment and modernist assumptions. In the current context of globalization associated with the increase of complexity and difference and the sense that some boundaries are blurring, many theorists challenge the prevalence of the nation (e.g. Hart & Negri, 2000).

Finally, the concept of the nation is provisional. The conceptual umbrella of nationhood remains a dominant organizing principle of political and territorial community. Yet, there are not only distinct ideologies functioning under the concept of nationhood. There are also historical and political changes which can broaden notions of nationhood through a perceived evolution of political ideology (e.g. liberal multiculturalism).

As Anderson’s (2006) theory of imagined communities demonstrates, the discursive turn promotes the importance of historicizing and culturally locating hegemonic ways of thinking and working to recognize the sets of epistemological and ontological assumptions underlying them. Thus, the theoretical pivot-point is an outcome of the discursive turn. The emphasis on the ideological nature of language and the role of language in social praxis reveals the social-historical construction of social realities including how people understand their own and others’ identities.

**Historical Materialism and Nationhood’s Complicity with Colonialism:**
**Spatial Dimensions of Political Community**

The way the imagined nation functions as a metanarrative is tied to the real and material impacts and manifestations of the inclusion-exclusion paradox. Critical engagements
with Anderson’s work have stressed the real, material outcomes and effects of the imagined community. For example, as Burns (2008), drawing on Grossman (1996) points out, “customs, nostalgia, memories and longings for place fold into an imaginary set of commonalities that with time and a great deal of investment shape nations in real, material ways and inform normative definitions around citizenship and nationhood” (p. 350, italics in original). Thus, it is important to recognize the extent to which the nation is not simply a “fictitious template upon which cultures write themselves” but becomes “the material outcomes of imagined identities, histories, geographies and so on” (Burns, 2008, p. 350). These material outcomes are implicated in the paradoxes of imagining nation such as the inclusion/exclusion tension.

The concept of belonging to a nation through citizenship status has been tied intimately to the pursuit of nation-building and colonial practices of territorial acquisition including encounters with the existing inhabitants of colonized land. Nation-building is a literal and symbolic extension of the modernist narrative of progress and Western Enlightenment. Nation-building is constructed in a spatial dimension through the geographical manifestation of political boundaries and expanding territorial and economic power. The Western, European nation is constructed through an imaginary of who is within it (symbolic and deep camaraderie with material realities) and who is outside of it (defining the other through colonialism and imperialism19). Richardson (2002b) probes this paradox: “…Western national identity emerges from a binary relationship that requires the presence of a non-Western ‘other’ for complete realization” (p. 14-15). And Goldberg (1993) describes how nation-building was an extension of the Enlightenment dynamic and the inclusion-exclusion paradox. Thus, nation-building through colonialism is a manifestation of the ethnocentrism embedded in imagining nationhood:

If there is any content to the concept of cultural chauvinism then it does not lie simply in the refusal to recognize the values of other (in the case of non-

19 Imperialism and colonialism are mutually related processes. In a historical understanding, imperialism is about dominating lands from afar, and colonization is ruling a foreign land on that land. Both concepts involve overt, direct measures as well as less obvious discursive modes of power that constructs ideologies of community (Said, 1994; Smith, 1999; Willinsky, 1998). Imperialism and colonialism have and continue to govern powerfully both on a level of physical and social institutions and on an epistemological level by enforcing a particular world view.
European and non-Western) cultures; it lies also in the refusal to acknowledge influences of other cultures on one’s own while insisting on one’s own as representing the standard of civilization and moral progress. This became the nineteenth-century modernist legacy of the Enlightenment project, and it was in the name of the principle of utility emerging from the Enlightenment that this was carried forward. (Goldberg, 1993, p. 215)

A postcolonial view of nation-building highlights the construction of citizenship identity through political and symbolic boundaries and spaces; imagining the nation involves imagining who is in and who is outside the nation. The political and ideological moves in the 20th century towards rights and inclusion within nation-state structures (which will be examined in greater detail in other sections of this and other chapters) raises a central anxiety inherent in the study and theory of citizenship in the contemporary context (Asad, 2000).

Within the current global context, the term new imperialism acknowledges the continued influence of colonialization. Tikly (2004) argues that the contemporary global moment is marked by the emergence of a new form of Western imperialism. Although former colonies are officially independent, Tikly (2004) observes that within a discourse of development, so-called Second and Third world populations are incorporated into “a regime of global government” (p. 173). In this sense, the new imperialism speaks more to a subtle, unofficial form of power and control than that of earlier imperialism, and neo-colonialism functions through a powerful discourse that gives former colonies official sovereignty while they are in fact still dominated by Western nations. Thus Tikly (2004) identifies two strands of the new imperialism: a) a new context of Western domination through a sense of transnational movement and the emergence of a global elite, and b) a post-structural and culturalist turn in social studies through which new frameworks emerge to understand and analyse this new imperialism. Therefore, similarly to how Andreotti (2010c) describes the discursive turn as a swinging pendulum, both a product of and response to modernism, and how I describe the contemporary theoretical context as a pivot-point, Tikly (2004) identifies a dualism in the new imperialism. At the same time that there is an extension of colonial
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20 According to Asad (2000), “the discourse of identity indicates not the rediscovery of ethnic loyalties so much as the undermining of old certainties.” (p. 12). He explains how in a European context a discourse of inclusion creates conceptual and political tensions: “The idea of European identity, I say, is not merely a matter of how a more inclusive name can be made to claim loyalties that are attached to national or local ones. It concerns exclusions and the desire that those excluded recognise what is included in the name. It is a symptom of anxieties” (p. 12).
ways of thinking and practices, there is a new way of engaging in social sciences that can theorize, explain, and interrogate the processes of colonization. Thus, using the framework of the discursive turn, the nation and its colonial project is situated, partial, contingent, provisional, and ultimately a story of modernism. In this sense, the discursive turn enables a critical geography of citizenship and explication of how political boundaries and extensions of citizenship responsibilities are constructed to reinforce others through an us-versus-them mentality.

Anderson’s (2006) theory of imagined nations uses historical materialism and discourse analysis to deconstruct how nationhood functions as a normative metanarrative for political organization. Anderson’s (2006) work deconstructing nationhood as imagined community also exemplifies how metanarratives work to strike a dynamic tension between contradictory concepts that are essentially paradoxes, and demonstrates the material consequences of the normalization of this metanarrative. One paradox is characteristic of discursive fields (Steinberg, 1999): the nation is modern/new/relevant and old/eternal. The imagining of nation has held discursive and material significance through various historical incidents and geopolitical issues. Correspondingly, there can be a sense that nationhood has changed and progressed, and yet, the hegemonic processes of imagining who is and is not a citizen remains based on a fundamentally modern point of view tied back to Enlightenment ideals.

Contestations of Citizenship and the Expansion of Rights

Anderson’s theory of imagined communities relates to how colonial ways of thinking have and continue to function to define cultures and communities. Thus, the question of how to account for cultural differences within an imagined community becomes implicated in the universal yet particular paradox and in constructions of cultural boundaries. Said (1994) evokes the discursive turn to recognize the complex ways that divisions are acknowledged between cultures and in terms of normative values that include or exclude within cultures. This postcolonial understanding of the power of certain stories of culture and nationhood to imagine an us and to exclude those as them defines an important example of how discourse constructs power relations. However, consistent with the discursive turn, postcolonial
theorists also challenge those binaries as they recognize and interrogate them. For example, Smith (1999) points out that “the binary of colonizer/colonized does not take into account, for example, the development of different layerings which have occurred with each group and across the two groups” (p. 26-27). Furthermore, in the context of the discursive turn and the interrogation of the grand metanarrative of the nation, the imagining of community and the conceptualization of citizenship can been understood as tied strongly to a relatively neutral concept of culture that is in fact a racialized discourse (Goldberg, 1993). In the context of the new imperialism, Tikly (2004) argues that “‘race’ has increasingly been superseded (although not entirely replaced) by a recourse to a new emphasis on culture within western societies as the basic category for explaining difference and conflict (for example in terms of an ‘inevitable’ ‘class of civilizations’ between the Muslim and Christian worlds) and for legitimizing inequality” (Tikly, 2004, p. 177). This relates strongly to Anderson’s theory of imagined communities in that there are tensions inherent to seeing a nation as both based in antiquity and a contemporary site of communal belonging.

Modern citizenship was formed in relation to the imagining of the nation as community and the principles that (a) every nation is defined through ethnicity and a shared history, and (b) every nation has a state (Delanty, 2006). I have outlined the conceptual contract at the heart of the translation of nationhood in citizenship or what I call the Enlightenment dynamic. Correspondingly, modern citizenship became a normalized modular form of political community membership and an institutionalization of nationhood through the historical processes of modernization and colonization. According to Tully (2008), modern citizenship formed from two key scenarios:

(1) the modernisation of the West into modern nation states with representative governments, a system of international law, decolonisation of European empires, supranational regime formations and global civil society; and, in tandem, (2) the dependent modernisation and citizenisation of the non-West through colonisation, the Mandate System, post-decolonisation, nation-building and global governance. (p. 16)

It is outside the scope of this thesis to fully categorize the field of postcolonial studies. I will be drawing on the term postcolonial as used by others and will use it myself throughout this thesis. Following Andreotti and Souza (2011), I “conceptualize the prefix ‘post’ in postcolonialism as a constant interrogation, a possibility that is ‘not yet’ but that may announce the prospect of something new” (Andreotti & Souza, 2011, p. 2). I also, draw on their work in order to “define postcolonial theories as tools-for-thinking rather than theories-of-truth” and “acknowledge their situatedness and partiality” (Andreotti & Souza, 2011, p. 2).
In this sense, citizenship is a manifestation of the imagined community of nationhood theorized by Anderson (2006).

Anderson’s notion of the imagined nation has important implications for the contested nature of citizenship. Citizenship is the key concept that defines political community in contemporary democracies. The idea of who does and does not count or belong is essential to the way the community of the nation is constructed and imagined. In order to be a citizen, one must be recognized by others as a citizen through a national imaginary, and this requires shared common cultural values or identity: “Those whose faces do not fit with the majority collective perception of the ‘imagined community’ may find that they are excluded de facto from full participation in social life” (Painter, 2002, p. 95). The normalized, dominant perception of the imagined community of citizens is tied the Enlightenment dynamic of inclusion/exclusion; consequently there are individuals or groups who do not, despite legal membership, enjoy the power to exercise their citizenship to its full potential in the social arena. Goldberg (1993) points out that “subjects assume value only insofar as they are bearers of rights, and they are properly vested with rights only insofar as they are imbued with value” (p. 220-221). The process of identifying as or being identified as belonging to the imagined community may disengage a legal citizen from his/her sense of duty, exercise of rights, and potential capacity for participation (Pashby, 2008). As Appiah (2005) reminds us, “[i]magined, as Benedict Anderson would insist, doesn’t mean unreal: nothing could be more powerful than the human imagination” (p. 243, italics in original). Correspondingly, citizenship is not a neutral concept and is a complex concept; it “embodies the multifarious and complex character of the political subject” (Isin & Wood, 1999, p. 25).

So-called new social movements and critical theoretical frameworks have built on the acknowledgement of the colonial past and present of nation-building and have contributed to the posing of important challenges to modern citizenship\(^\text{22}\). Reading Anderson’s (2006)

\(^{22}\) Mohanty (2010) describes how from the mid and late twentieth-century a number of movements have politicized identity as the “anchor for collective struggles against oppression and injustice”; these include anti-colonial movements in the Global South, to the women's, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT), race and ethnic, and disability rights movements (p. 531). She argues that these identity-based struggles led to the emergence of new interdisciplinary movements such as “Women's and Gender Studies, Indigenous Studies, Disability Studies, Race and Ethnic Studies, LGBT Studies, and most recently, Postcolonial Studies” (Mohanty, 2010, p. 532).
*Imagined Communities* through a lens of the discursive turn, a pivot-point theorist, similarly to Golderg (1993)’s work, can recognize that particular subjectivities do and have not fit the culturally and historically normalized citizen. This type of analysis exposes the citizenship narrative as one of systemic exclusion wherein the central motif, rather than being universal equity, is social conflict and the struggles of marginalized groups for equality and recognition (McCollum, 2002, p. 169).

**Liberalism and the Extension of Rights: Broadening the Imagined Community**

The imagined nation meets liberalism in a construction of citizenship as extension of rights. T. H. Marshall’s (1950) seminal work articulated a historical typology of citizenship from strict political definitions of citizenship that emphasize the relationship between the individual citizen and the state, to a broader definition that emphasizes the relationship between the citizen and society as a whole (Isin & Wood, 1999; McCollum, 2002). His work was rooted in a concern about the class segregation in England during the mid-twentieth century and challenged the seemingly straight-forward idea of defining citizenship according to geo-political territory. Thus, he noted the tension in the spatial dimension of imagined community as the dynamic of included/excluded became unbalanced. Liberalism thus expanded to include more individuals in its version of rights which reflected the recognition that some groups of people were not fully included in the political community; however, there was no challenge as to the deeper reasons for this inherent exclusion as the metanarrative of nationhood persists. In this sense, the idea of rights is a discursive field (Steinberg, 1999) that conjoins with citizenship (Tully, 2006). There is a sense of *new* rights being constituted out of what is an on-going process of nation-state hegemony based on modernist assumptions that are not interrogated. In this sense, liberal rights represent an extension of or broadening of the imagined nation.

Marshall (1950) argued that the development of citizenship since the eighteenth century has been defined by the acquisition of three categories of rights: a) civil rights – based on individual freedoms of speech, thought and faith, and associated with the development of a judicial system establishing rights to property, contracts, and justice; b)
political rights – enabling participation in public decisions and political life and associated with the development of the electoral system; and c) social rights – based on rights to things of vital importance, namely economic and social security, and associated with the development of the welfare state which ensured the right to a certain standard of living. Marshall raised the relationship of citizenship to social inequalities and in turn raised the question of whether modern citizenship had become a provision of class inequality (Isin & Wood, 1999; Kymlicka 1995). He therefore theorized that a progression of citizen rights to include more classes into the national contract could correct injustices (Soysal, 2012, p. 2).

Marshall’s (1950) work can been criticized for its exclusive focus on class (as opposed to, for example race or gender) and for assuming a linearly progressive framework of rights acquisition that fails to account for the sites of social struggle that defined the provision of rights to particular groups. Goldberg (1993) contributes that “[t]he rights others as a matter of course enjoy are yet denied people of color because black, brown, red, and yellow subjectivities continue to be devalued; and the devaluing of these subjectivities delimits at least the applicability of rights or their scope of application people of color might otherwise properly claim” (p. 221). However, Marshall’s version of the progress of rights has had a strong influence on a critical view in scholarship of the relationship between citizenship and inequality. Marshall’s framework has also served as a jumping-off point for important challenges to the way that dominant discourses of citizenship are tied to ideological stances that reinforce systems of power within a national community:

The sociological question as to whether there is an inherent conflict between citizenship and class formulated by Marshall now needs to be expanded. The sociological question postmodern societies face today is whether there is a conflict between citizenship and different forms of identity. How does citizenship contribute to or ameliorate sexual, gender, national, ethnic and regional identities? (Isin & Wood, 1999, p. 30)

23 I drew on a number of summaries of Marshall’s (1950) work in articulating a brief version of three categories of rights including Isin and Wood (1999), McCollum (2002), and Painter (2002).

24 See Isin and Wood (1999, p. 25) and Patten (2001, p. 283) for a review of Marshall’s concern with citizenship rights as tied to questions of class. Later in this section, Marshall’s framework of citizenship as systematic and chronological accession of rights is questioned by a feminist critique, and citizenship is understood as a site of struggle and conflict. Fraser (2005) also speaks to justice claims as economic redistribution and legal or cultural recognition.
These types of interrogations of the assumed citizen subject are taken up by critical scholarship that has arisen from the twin pressures resulting from increased polyethnic dimensions in virtually all Western democracies and an increase in nationalistic sentiments from minority groups. As Kymlicka (1995) noted at the end of the 20th century, “[t]he settled rules of political life in many countries are being challenged by a new ‘politics of cultural difference’” (p. 193). Habermas (1994) articulates that “[a] correctly understood theory of rights requires a politics of recognition that protects the integrity of the individual in the life contexts in which his or her identity is formed” (p. 113). Thus rights are intrinsically connected to citizenship identity.

Tully (2000) has also taken up the demands of difference on modern concepts of citizenship. He notes that the varying forms of recognition and accommodation sought are as numerous as the struggles they represent, including feminists, gays-lesbians, refugees, immigrants, and indigenous peoples; and he insists that these challenges are not new: “[T]hese types of struggles for recognition all have histories which pre-date by centuries the emergence of the concept of ‘identity politics’. Nevertheless, they are referred to as ‘identity politics’ because they often exhibit … characteristics in the present which render them significantly similar to each other and significantly different from their past forms” (Tully, 2000, p. 218). Thus he calls on a reformulation of liberalism to include diversity and highlights the interplay between identity, rights, duty, and participation. He emphasizes

the role that the democratic freedom of citizen participation plays in engendering a sense of belonging and the complex forms this freedom takes in multicultural and multinational societies, the freedom not only to participate in accord with one’s cultural and national identities when they are publicly recognized…., but also to participate in the ongoing contests over how these are to be acknowledged, recognized and accommodated. (Tully, 2000, p. 212)

The discourse of rights is an essential part of the expansion of liberalism in response to the inclusion/exclusion dynamic of the imagined political community of the nation. Multiculturalism represents an extension of individual rights to collective rights based on the specific needs of ethnocultural minorities such as self-determination or the right to maintain certain traditional practices (Kymlicka 1995). Tully’s (2000) insistence on the importance of inclusion in the discussions of recognition of difference connects to Fraser’s (1997) nuanced
understanding of rights and of the complex relationship between justice and difference. She argues that social injustices often require both recognition and attention to the redistribution of power and resource. For example, race inequalities are rooted in socio-economics. Racialization is part of a history of marginalization from economic power which demands a redistributive approach. At the same time, race-based inequalities are tied to a cultural component which requires a recognition of difference. The struggle for defining and recognizing rights connects to Fraser’s (2005) more recent work revealing that justice involves not only questions of redistribution and recognition but also involves who gets to frame issues of and responses to justice.

Indeed, another inherent paradox of citizenship involves what Benhabib (2008) refers to as a “dialectic between constitutional essentials and the actual politics of political liberalism” (p. 109). She argues that rights must be challenged and rearticulated in order to retain any original meaning and acknowledges a tension inherent to the liberal expansion model of citizenship: “It is only when new groups claim that they belong within the circles of addressees of a right from which they have been excluded in its initial articulations that we come to understand the fundamental limitedness of every rights claim within a constitutional tradition as well as its context-transcending validity” (Benhabib, 2009, p. 109). Indeed, identity based social movements have had significant influence on both academic understandings and political arenas (Mohanty, 2010). There is thus a demand for a notion of citizenship that accounts for an evolved understanding of multiple, overlapping, and shifting identities, and that responds to the exclusionary nature inherent to the modern ideal of citizenship. There is a desire for a more socially just citizenship that redresses these inequities by relinquishing a selective level of control over the exclusions inherent to modern notions of citizenship. In the current context of critiques of the inherent exclusion-inclusion paradox, citizenship must negotiate the various and diverse identities within its membership as modern assumptions regarding the equality between individuals are contested. However, it is important that it takes a claim from a position of exclusion to make visible the inherent boundaries to inclusion. Questions of diversity have heightened through the twentieth and into the 21st century and have resulted in a large amount of scholarly literature calling for changes to citizenship. At the same time this scholarship reasserts citizenship as the primary discourse of political community.
Contemporary Theorizing of Citizenship

Citizenship is a topic of much scholarly interest and has received heightened attention at the turn of the 21st century (Sears & Hyslop-Marginson, 2007). According to Sears (2009), “It has become almost a cliché to say that citizenship is a contested concept. That is because it is true. Both citizenship and its constituent concepts such as rights, participation, responsibility, due process, etc. are often used as slogans to promote particular agendas rather than convey precise meanings” (p. 2). Western liberal democracy is rooted in the Enlightenment dynamic (reason and emotion; protection of the state and loyalty of the citizens through camaraderie), and through expansion of liberal theory through a recognition of the inclusive/exclusive dynamic of imagining the political community, a strong discourse of rights emerges. At the same time, as Sears and Hughes (1996) note, “[D]isputes about citizenship arise not only because it is an internally complex concept, but also because it is a normative one” (p. 125). Thus, as in its origins in the Enlightenment dynamic, citizenship is both a legal status and a normative concept relating to the emotive ways that a sense of belonging to the political community is constructed.

Theorizing citizenship requires engagement in the struggles and articulations inherent to relations of difference. Kymlicka and Norman (2000) identify two main topics of attention among political philosophers: “the rights and status positions of ethnocultural minorities in multiethnic societies” and “the practices and responsibilities of democratic citizenship” (p. 1). Adding group differentiated rights to the modern concept of citizenship remains problematic if the hegemonic quality of citizenship as tied to the imagined nation is not addressed. Feminist theorists such as Arnot and Dillabough (2004) and critical race theorists such as Goldberg (1993) have challenged the sense of group-differentiated rights as part of the modernist progression of liberal rights. Collective rights protect the individual’s right to one’s cultural identity; they also re-inscribe difference in protecting and thus solidifying an other who is not imagined as part of the nation and therefore needs special collective rights based on a minority ethnocultural identity. Thus there is a tension between, on the one hand, expanding liberalism through collective rights and following a modern telos of rationality and progress and, on the other hand, recognizing complicity of the imagined national frame in effectively marginalizing particular groups. There is also multiplicity in the various ways
individuals and groups identify and are/are not identified as citizens and as ethnocultural and/or racial minorities. The discursive turn helps us to recognize this conundrum and to question the neutral universalization of modernism via citizenship and nation-building. In the context of the discursive turn, national identities are “no longer the exclusive collective identities of people in an age of cultural pluralism and the anarchy of multiple identity projects. Identities are overlapping, negotiable and contested” (Delanty, 2000, p. 59).

Many of the tensions and struggles around citizenship have involved the politics of identity in citizenship theory. Citizenship in modern western liberal democracies is rooted in the exclusion-inclusion dynamic that characterizes the imagined community of the nation. The nation is defined by an outward view and by an inward view both of which involve inclusions and exclusions. A modern predicament and source of much theorization in citizenship scholarship is the question of how to balance liberal individual rights with the social stratification based in power imbalances (such as gender, race, sexual orientation, socio-economic status) often deeply implicated in the inclusion-exclusion definition of the nation-state. A main question is how, as Rosaldo (1999) promotes, to “distinguish the formal level of theoretical universality from the substantive level of exclusionary and marginalized practices” (p. 253). A number of theorists using feminist lenses have rejected the universalist ideal and have challenged the assumption of homogeneity underlying conceptions of cultural communities so essential to the sense of belonging required of and by citizenship (Delanty, 2000, p. 44 citing Benhabib, 1992; Fraser, 1989; Lister, 1998, 1996; Mouffe, 1992; Young, 1989, 1990; among others). For example, Arnot and Dillabough (2004) acknowledge the deeper forms of power operatives in the construction of citizenship identity and reject the presumption that social actors are autonomous25. They raise a concern with the liberal notion of individual autonomy on which citizenship in democracies is based, suggesting that individuals are meant to be “connected to a political imaginary and a symbolic social order that may have little to do with realized or ethical vision of citizenship”(p. 169). Correspondingly, they expose an inherent contradiction in citizenship:

Within such a political imaginary, individuals (the ‘I’) are expected to identify with a concept of citizenship as members of the collective ‘we’ and to gain a
sense of moral and political belonging. Yet paradoxically, even though ‘the people’ are thought to ‘speak’ as citizens, citizenship is understood to be a position that cannot be spoken from. The citizen per se has no substantial identity because he/she can only be viewed within an abstract understanding of liberal democratic practice. The concept of citizenship therefore denotes an empty space that, theoretically, could be occupied by anyone. (Arnot & Dillabough, 2004, p. 169-170)

Arnot and Dillabough’s (2004) feminist view links the power of the imagined community of citizens to an undermining of the political agency of certain individuals and groups of individuals that serves to maintain power imbalances. Arnot and Dillbough (2004) question how the acquisition of citizenship enables full female agency, for “to possess citizenship or to occupy the space denoted as ‘citizenship’ is, for many, an arbitrary act which has little to do with the development of any notion of oneself as a socially embedded, rather than autonomous actor in the state” (p. 176). Thus, challenging the grand narrative of universal humanity and the relevancy of the ideal of the autonomous individual raises an important question about the recognition of difference (Delanty, 2000, p. 80).

The important concept of citizenship rights operates as a discursive field that is ongoing and is conceptualized through ideological contestation. As Rosaldo (1999) points out, “[t]he new social movements have expanded the emphasis on citizens’ rights from questions of class to issues of gender, race, sexuality, ecology, and age. In effect, new citizens have come into being as new categories of persons who make claims on both their fellow citizens and the state” (p. 255). This raises attention to the contractual nature of the relationship between citizens of a nation and the state and the abstract challenge of the state earning the loyalty of its people rooted in the shift from monarchy to nation-state via Enlightenment ideals (Richardson, 2002b). This dynamic became a question of recognition in the twentieth century and especially through the expansion of liberalism to include group-differentiated rights. As described in Chapter One, in Canada, this was manifested in multicultural policies in the 1970s and employment equity policies in the 1980s.

Nationhood remains the main concept through which notions of belonging to a political state are imagined, and yet questions of diversity tease out the dynamic tension of inclusion-exclusion characterizing the metanarrative of the imagined community. While
liberalism sought to expand on the modernist principles of nation-state formation to be a more inclusive version of community through extending series of rights (including multiculturalism in the case of Canada), its premise of the relationship between the autonomous individual and the state is made increasingly complex. As a discursive field, citizenship continues to be evoked but often through calls for new formations. The newness evokes a sense of historical shift that is associated with demographic descriptions of multiplicity and pluralism within the national imaginary. For example, Delanty (2000) calls for a new version of citizenship that is reconciliatory. And he identifies the self-other dualism:

Modernity was a discourse of the emancipation of the self, but the question of the other is being asked only now. The problem with ‘self-determination’ in postmodern times is that there is no one single self but a plurality of selves. In this move beyond the contours of the modern age we have to ask the question of the responsibility of the self for the other. The rethinking of democracy – which is a discourse of self-determination – that this entails will force us to re-establish a link with citizenship – where self and other find a point of reconciliation. (Delanty, 2000, p. 3)

The idea of multiple identities is increasingly challenging the homogenous stability of the modernist narrative of nationhood (Ross, 2007). At the same time that scholarship in the discursive turn points out tensions inherent to modernist narratives of nationhood and citizenship, citizenship scholarship also points out the popularity of the term social cohesion in citizenship policy (Joshee, 2004). As Sears and Hyslop-Marginson (2007) point out, “[t]he desire to promote social cohesion implies an underlying fear that industrialized societies confront serious fragmentation in the face of economic globalization and growing cultural diversity” (p. 52). Indeed, a critical understanding of the concept of citizenship brings together philosophy, social studies, and politics. As Staeheli and Hammett (2010) articulate:

[P]rocesses of citizenship formation reflect gaps between philosophical arguments and the requisites of governance at particular moments, in particular contexts, and in support of particular goals. Thus, while they perhaps rely on moral and political philosophy as guides in imagining citizenship, various institutions and agents associated with governing and ruling (whether in the state, economy or civil society) may have their own interests in governing in particular ways and in furtherance of particular ends. (Staeheli & Hammett, 2010, p. 272)
Therefore, citizenship as tied to nationhood represents both a strong topic of scholarly attention and an ambiguous field of overlapping theoretical impulses and ideological complexities.

Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* contributed to deconstructing and a historical situating of the concept of the nation. As a manifestation of the metanarrative of nationhood, the nation-state functions as a universal discourse of political community. The nation-state categorizes and materializes through identities, histories, and political geographies. As Anderson (2006) notes in the preamble to the most recent edition,

Almost every year the United Nations admits new members. And many ‘old nations,’ once thought fully consolidated, find themselves challenged by ‘sub’-nationalisms within their borders – nationalisms which, naturally, dream of shedding this sub-ness one happy day. The reality is quite plain: the ‘end of the era of nationalism,’ so long prophesied, is not remotely in sight. Indeed, nation-ness is the most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time. (p. 3)

In this sense, everyone either has a nationality or wants/needs a nationality, and nationhood remains a functioning metanarrative despite inherent paradoxes and political and theoretical contestations. And yet, citizenship is increasingly both reasserted as a dominant concept of political community and is highly contested. The question of how to manage the symbolic and real boundaries of the nation-state remains implicated in the fundamental inclusion-exclusion dynamic inherent to imagining nationhood. In this sense, the discursive turn reveals the tensions inherent to the inclusion-exclusion paradox of nationhood. This statement by Anderson (2006) also recognizes the inward-outward dynamic of imagining the nation that is central to nation building and the new imperialism.

**Identity Politics in Canada:**

**Culture as a Discursive Field**

Anderson’s (2006) theory of imagined communities contributes to understanding the colonial roots of the construction of exclusion inherent to nationhood in a Canada. In 18th and 19th century Canada, nation-building coincided with colonizing of indigenous peoples, negotiating with the French-speaking minority, and delineating the inclusion/exclusion of
various immigrant groups. While the First Nations community was defined by Indian status that on the one hand gave them certain rights, it also defined them in colonial terms as other than Canadian. As wards of the state and correspondingly assumed to be unable to look after themselves, Aboriginal Canadians were positioned as lesser-than Canadian citizens; thus the institutionalization of their citizenship identity established and reinforced a hierarchy. Furthermore, the various immigration policies ranging from parsing out land in the prairies to White, European settlers to charging a Head Tax on Chinese immigrants demonstrates that race and culture have always been tied to who does and does not belong in the Canadian national imagination. As Isin and Wood (1999) contend, nation-building can be characterized as “an imperialist practice that [has] found its strongest expression in citizenship to mark out the Other. This practice has included the categorization of land as ‘territory’ and people as ‘races’. Both presuppose ownership and control” (p. 55). Furthermore, as Richardson (2008b) points out, global imaginaries in Canadian citizenship education have changed with Canada’s status as a nation and its perceived role in international affair including versions reflecting imperialism, Cold-War dualism, Peace-Keeping mythology, International Development, Environmentalism, and Neoliberalism.

Nation-ness as Canadian-ness is imagined through discourses and metanarratives. The “gaps” between philosophical arguments and the functioning of governments at “particular moments, in particular contexts, and in support of particular goals” identified by Staeheli and Hammett (2010) are increasingly evident in the context of multiculturalism in Canada in the early 21st century (p. 272). Strong-Boag (2002) describes the sense of a gap between those who are and those who have not been included and have not experienced full emancipation through Canadian citizenship: “Feminists and Aboriginal and working-class activists, among others, today point to the hegemonic state’s persistent, misrecognition of or total blindness to their interests. Whether the specific debate involves land claims, multiculturalism, childcare policy, free trade, citizenship education, recognition of the full humanity, or, more narrowly, the full citizenship of different groups of Canadians is at issue” (Strong-Boag 2002, p. 37). This explains a philosophical move to account for these gaps towards a notion of

---

26 When analyzed from a theoretical pivot-point, it is possible to acknowledge that while the legislation of identity on basis of colonial definitions of race, the politicization of First Nations and corresponding growth in postcolonial scholarship challenge this very categorization (Lawrence, 2010).
multiplicity in citizenship identity theory. Writing about the Canadian context, Abu-Laban (2002) argues for

A multiculturalism premised on equity, on the notion that cultures are dynamic and differentiated, and on the idea that individuals may have multiple identities, allows for a perspective that recognizes the historical and contemporary overlap and intermingling of cultures that have resulted from processes of colonialism, diasporic migratory movements, and more recently the globalization of cultural flows (including information, images and music). (Abu-Laban, 2002, p. 464, see also Hébert et al., 2008)

However, this concept of a new, flexible citizenship that accounts for multiplicity is a tall order (Pashby, 2008). Furthermore, it is tied directly to the global imperative and the strong presence of a discourse of globality in contemporary citizenship theory which will be discussed in the next chapter.

**Contestations of the Spatial Dimensions of Citizenship:**

**Globalization as a Discursive Field**

Viewing Anderson’s (2006) work from a lens of the discursive turn and from the theoretical pivot points highlights the way that political community is a combination of deep camaraderie forged through symbols and stories and a deep institutionalization of that membership into governing systems. These systems include both material systems of government and organizing concepts such as citizenship. This chapter has discussed the question: What are the tensions inherent to imagining political community through modern, liberal notions of citizenship? Central to how nationhood remains a metanarrative for political community is how it holds together multiple ideologies and balances some key tensions inherent to paradoxes of citizenship: a) the nation is both contemporary and old, and b) it includes and excludes. As an organizing concept of political community, citizenship is similarly defined by these tensions. The institutionalization of the nation into citizenship followed an Enlightenment dynamic of reason and emotion; protection and organization by the state and loyalty of the citizens through an emotional and symbolic fraternity. In liberal democratic contexts, this dynamic has shifted through different manifestations of rights and recognition. As a concept, citizenship appears to change, and in a liberal framework, to expand, and yet, although there may be distinct versions of ideologies operating and even
competing within the overarching concept of citizenship, ultimately, it stays true to its modernist inception and the basic theory of imagined nations. Perceived changes are adjustments to rather than interrogations of the tenets of citizenship.

Therefore, citizenship is a discursive field (Camicia & Franklin, 2010; Steinberg 1999), and as Tully (2008) argues, it is an inherited field of “contested languages, activities and institutions”: “One could say that the hopes, dreams, fears and xenophobia of centuries of individual and collective political actors are expressed in the overlapping and conflicting histories of the uses of the language of citizenship and the forms of life in which they have been employed” (Tully, 2008, p. 15). Citizenship has always been tied to the paradox of inclusion and exclusion that characterizes the spatial dimension of political community by defining who is and who is not a citizen. As nation-building was achieved through colonialization during the time of the inception of the nation in the 18th and 19th centuries and through to today’s context of the new imperialism (Tikly, 2004), the idea of the global and of flows of people, resources, and power had always been a part of how the political community of the nation-state is imagined. In this sense, the national imaginary is defined through an imaginary of what counts as the global.

In the contemporary context, the notion of the global imperative (Pashby, 2006, 2008) reflects the strong sense that global connections and interdependence economically, politically, culturally, and socially are exerting particular pressures on political organization and social trends. Thus, Tully (2008) connects the field of citizenship to a “similarly contested field of globalisation” (p. 15). The discursive field of globalization includes the language of global and globalization as well as the activities, institutions and processes referred to with these terms: “While more recent [than citizenship], it compromises a similarly central and contested domain. Globalisation has become a shared yet disputed vocabulary in terms of which rival interpretations of the ways humans and their habits are governed globally are presented and disputed in both practice and theory” (Tully, 2008, p. 15). Thus, both citizenship and globalization are contested discursive fields; they relate in particular ways in the discursive turn. When they are combined together, as in theories of global citizenship or cosmopolitan citizenship, they bring together their contested histories of meaning: “When we enquire into global citizenship, therefore, we are already thrown into
this remarkably complex inherited field of contested languages, activities, institutions, processes and the environs in which they take place” (Tully, 2008, p. 15). The next chapter will examine the relationship between the national imaginary and the global imaginary in the context of a turn towards language of cosmopolitanism and global citizenship.
Chapter Four
Citizenship and Globalization:
The Global Imperative and the Cosmopolitan Turn

The previous chapter examined the tensions inherent to imagining political community through modern, liberal notions of citizenship. It explored how political community is organized into nation-states through a balancing of reason and emotion or what I call the Enlightenment dynamic, a key tension on which modern citizenship is based: emotional camaraderie and loyalty combined with rational institutionalization and protection. Nationhood is imagined through the corresponding paradoxes of historicity (the nation is new and relevant at the same time that it is rooted in linear nostalgia) and spatiality (the nation excludes and includes, and it is closed and open geographically and relationally to other nations and peoples). As nationhood became institutionalized into citizenship, nation-building functioned through the processes modernization and colonialization (Tully, 2008). The inclusion-exclusion tension became visible in some important ways when those excluded began to make claims to full inclusion and expanded rights.

In nation-states such as Canada citizenship expanded through a liberal ideology of rights to include more sets of rights and to assert the state’s role in ensuring recognition and inclusivity (Kymlicka, 1995). And yet, citizenship is a discursive field in that it appears to shift but remains rooted in a particular set of assumptions. The new ways of responding to inherent tensions of national citizenship through expanding liberalism fail to interrogate the sets of assumptions on which the tensions are based. Rather, the expansion of rights and recognition adds to the existing framework. In the contemporary context of globalization, citizenship is a heightened discursive field as theorists respond to perceived pressures of globalization at the same time as they recognize that globalization is a discursive field of its own. The relationship between citizenship and globalization is thus characterized by the theoretical pivot-point. Breaking down the various conceptual, theoretical, and ideological trends within each discursive field and between them helps to identify the tensions and to find dynamic spaces for movement within the field. It also helps to recognize closed spaces that entrench the field in persisting fundamental assumptions.
This thesis is interested in the theoretical and conceptual relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship education. Building from the previous chapter, this chapter sets out to identify the tensions inherent to understandings of citizenship in relation to diversity and globalization. There are pressures associated with contemporary globalization resulting in a heightened pressure for responding to the global in education. I call this the global imperative (Pashby, 2006, 2008). In order to understand how the global comes together with citizenship, and how this conceptual teaming-up is related to multiculturalism within the discursive field of citizenship, it is necessary to examine how theoretical literature makes sense of the global imperative. In the context of the global imperative there is a resurgence of literature on cosmopolitanism. Breaking down versions of cosmopolitanism is a good place to begin to examine the relationship between the national imaginary and the global imaginary in discourses of citizenship.

This chapter looks at how theorists define and categorize the cosmopolitan turn in terms of understandings of community (Strand, 2010a). It examines how the concept of global citizenship comes from the application of cosmopolitanism to two conjoined discursive fields: globalization and citizenship (Tully, 2008). This chapter will examine Delanty’s (2006) categorization of cosmopolitan theories into three categories each of which relates differently to the inherent paradox of nationalism and globality. These include universal, liberal, and postcolonial theories. Using his categorization as a guide, I will do a close reading and comparison of a liberal theorist (Kymlicka) and a universal theorist (Nussbaum) and will consider to what extent their versions of cosmopolitanism are distinct. I will focus strongly on how multiculturalism is taken-up in the cosmopolitan theories. The chapter also looks at the how different versions of globalization contribute to the discursive field of global citizenship. There is a dominance of binary views framing understanding of globalization (from above versus from below; homogeneous versus heterogeneous impacts). Drawing on Burns’s (2008) work, the chapter breaks down how globalization functions as a discourse for expressing regulative ideologies. It becomes evident that currently strong neoliberal understandings of globalization are shifting the citizenship dynamic from being about loyalty to the state in exchange for protection and rights to a focus on the citizen as an individual actor in the global economy.
This chapter also examines how postcolonial views of cosmopolitanism critique the ethnocentric liberal premise of extension of rights to an autonomous subject (Delanty, 2006; Mignolo, 2000). These theories of cosmopolitanism also raise important tensions around the extent to which current processes of globalization emerge out of colonial relations of power in a new imperialism (Tikly, 2004). Bringing these complexities back to the theoretical pivot-point, I draw on Strand’s (2010b) notion of the dynamic paradox inherent to cosmopolitanism as a metaphor. Its paradoxical quality invites dynamic discussions around political community in the current global context and creates spaces for new ways of thinking and knowing. Finally, I consider how the dominance of the extension model of citizenship crosses conceptual and ideological distinctions and examine what tensions remain unexamined and problematic in this model, particularly as relating to multiculturalism.

**Citizenship in the Cosmopolitan Turn:**
**Mediating the National and the Global**

Strand (2010b) refers to the sense “that we are now experiencing a ‘cosmopolitan turn’ within the social and political sciences, including within the discipline of education” (Strand, 2010b, p. 229). There is rescaling of contemporary global politics from being structured around national sovereignty to new set of relations and agencies outside of nation-states: “politics work across national borders which appear more porous and involve horizontal relations and networks (Lingard, 2009, p. 226, see also Fraser, 2009). As with many of the theorists cited in this chapter, Lingard (2009) does not declare that the nation-state is no longer powerful; however, he asserts that it functions “in different and globally strategic ways” that have a direct impact on educational policy (p. 226). His analysis points to the significant extent to which understanding geopolitics today and the role of the nation-state therein is characterized by the theoretical pivot-point; it exists within an overlay of the traditional modern frameworks of national sovereignty and the complexities of the re-scaling of geopolitics in the context of contemporary globalization. This impacts policies around structuring and financing K-12 and post-secondary education. Also, as is the focus of this thesis, the global imperative impacts the dissemination of content and pedagogy regarding political community and membership in the context of educating the 21st century global citizen.
Understanding the relationship between the national and the global is central to different theorizations of the cosmopolitan turn. The interest in cosmopolitanism is described as a resurgence because, according to Beck (2011), it is essentially an old idea being infused with apparently new meaning. A theoretical discourse of cosmopolitanism functions descriptively and ontologically as it attends to an evolving and complex social reality in the contemporary global moment. Cosmopolitanism is also a way of seeing the world, a form of consciousness, an ethos and an emerging paradigm of social and political analysis (Strand 2010a). Echoing Strand’s (2010b) identification of the cosmopolitan turn, Delanty (2006) finds “it is possible to speak of a revival of cosmopolitanism, which is an older tradition to that of the nation and gives expression to a different dimension of belonging to that of nationalism” (p. 357). Thus cosmopolitanism is both distinct from and strongly related to nationalism and globalization.

Delanty’s (2006) definition of cosmopolitanism reflects its inherent conceptual confusion: “By cosmopolitanism is meant the consciousness of globality and of postnational ties; it is a critical and reflexive consciousness of heterogeneity as opposed to the quintessentially modernist spirit of an homogeneous vision of sovereign statehood. But it is too, despite its ancient origins, a modern creation and expresses the embracing of otherness and plurality” (Delanty, 2006, p. 357). Thus, cosmopolitanism is conceptualized through historicity (it is both modern and ancient) and spatiality (it relates to both universal as global and particular as post-national, and it concerns questions of inclusion and diversity). Conceptualizing cosmopolitanism evokes historical materialism and discourse analysis in a similar way as does Anderson’s (2006) deconstruction of the imagined political community of the nation. Similar dynamic tensions are thus inherent to both national imaginaries and global imaginaries of community. This helps to explain the degree to which these terms are distinct and conflated, and therefore why it is a challenge to distill what multiculturalism means in the context of the cosmopolitan turn.

In today’s context, the discursive field of globalization frames the relationship between cosmopolitanism and nationalism. Delanty (2006) argues that cosmopolitanism only makes sense in relation to nationalism and that it is a mistake to see them as fundamentally different because they can be complementary concepts. In fact, he uses Canadian federalism
as an example of a *national* tradition that evokes a degree of *cosmopolitanism*. This raises an important question relevant to this thesis: to what extent and under what theoretical frame does multiculturalism count as cosmopolitanism? Is multiculturalism the same as cosmopolitanism? Delanty (2006) includes multiculturalism indirectly as a cosmopolitan trend in national contexts in his citing of Canadian federalism; he also refers to multiculturalism as part of the dimensions of globalization:

> In place of the hyphen that has linked the nation to the state are now multiple points of connectivity. The cross-fertilization of all nations as a result of the many dimensions of globalization—ranging from migration, multiculturalism, global information and communication technologies, and Americanization—has loosened the links that have tied the nation to the state, a process that has led to the release of the nation from the state. This situation, which has often been characterized as a post-sovereign world, is the context in which nationalisms emerge and also the context in which cosmopolitanism takes root. (p. 358)

Thus Delanty (2006) evokes multiculturalism in relation to national federalism, cosmopolitanism, and globalization. In Delanty’s work, multiculturalism is about nations disconnecting from states and is about movements and migrations. Yet, the previous chapter demonstrated that multiculturalism is also viewed as an extension of nation-state citizenship through rights and recognition. In the context of globalization, as a concept, multiculturalism is formed within what Delanty refers to as the “paradox” of modernity in which both nationalism and cosmopolitanism exist (2006, p. 357).

**Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism and Historicity:**

**The Paradox of Modernity**

It is challenging to distill the relationship between nationalism and cosmopolitanism and the way that multiculturalism is conceptualized within this relationship. In order to explain the paradox of modernity that produces both nationalism and cosmopolitanism, Delanty (2006) reviews the history of cosmopolitanism. The origins of cosmopolitanism can be traced back to an ancient consciousness of the world. Its etymological roots tie to a Greek conception of human belonging, *kosmopolities*, by bringing together the world of the *polis* with the *cosmic* order of the Gods. This concept was a working paradox: “a cosmopolitan
notion of belonging emerged in which the universal and particular were combined in a non-contradictory relation” (Delanty, 2006, p. 359). Towards the end of the classical Athenian period, the Stoics took up a more universalistic concept of belonging and identity involving a vision of community broader than one’s immediate context. This was an expansion model of community that challenged “exclusivist patriotism”; at the same time, it never promoted a predetermined and disembodied natural universal that could be found and legislated by scientists or political elites (Delanty, 2006, p. 359). Hence, Delanty (2006) asserts that from its inception cosmopolitanism has been a dimension to mediate between the national and global; thus it is a reflexive relation to both.

Delanty (2006) notes the emergence of a particularly modern imagination of cosmopolitanism associated with The Enlightenment era when the concept regained popularity. The notion of freedom inherent to cosmopolitanism was attractive to Enlightenment intellectuals and nationalist leaders. Thus cosmopolitanism mediated between nationalism (as connected to the right to be free from tyranny) and worldly citizen (as expressing freedom of movement): “The emergence of the modern notion of the self-legislating subject, which lies at the heart of modern philosophical thought, gave to both nationalism and cosmopolitanism the basic animus of freedom as a political and personal goal and ideal to be pursued” (Delanty, 2006, p. 359). Indeed, nationalism and cosmopolitanism reflect different aspects of modernity. Nationalism reflects the homogenizing nation-state while cosmopolitanism reflects the pluralisation of modern culture and social relations. Thus, their mutual implication is yet another paradox. Cosmopolitanism evokes universalism and openness while nationalism exists within the closure of a political community within the nation-state: “Cosmopolitanism expresses the...
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27 Delanty (2006) expands on this point by categorizing three major strands of the Enlightenment in which cosmopolitanism resonated. First, Republicanism conceived of peoplehood as a territory of self-legislating subjects which leaves room for a cosmopolitan orientation to the world through a principle of human freedom. For example, in the French Revolution, “[t]he principles of the revolution were held to be universal and applicable to all nations fighting injustice and tyranny” (Delanty, 2006, p. 359). However, although these ideas spread to other nation-states, it was the French republic that promoted this cosmopolitanism. Secondly, liberal nationalism took up the 19th century belief that nations of a certain size could gain independence from major powers (e.g. Greek, Bulgarian, Italian, Irish nationalist movements). This idea gain support from liberals in countries such as Britain. In this model “nationalism itself is a demonstration of the cosmopolitan principle that people can imag[ine] a political community beyond the context of their immediate world” (Delanty, 2006, p. 360). Finally, a Kantian cosmopolitanism is associated with the Enlightenment thinker’s moral philosophy and reflected a vision beyond internationalism that saw the world as fundamentally connected (Delanty, 2006, p. 360).
universalistic dimensions of the nation and is in tension with particularistic tendencies. It may be suggested that cosmopolitanism as a movement towards openness resists the drive to closure that is a feature of the nation-state” (Delanty, 2006, p. 361).

Ultimately, Delanty (2006) argues that by viewing nationalism and cosmopolitanism as mutually implicated, a theory of cosmopolitanism can resist some political aspects of globalization as well as can resist what he calls new nationalisms. In a way, Delanty (2006) indirectly evokes a notion of theorizing from the pivot point by looking for dynamic spaces inherent to paradoxes. However, the ambiguity around what counts as national or bi-national or multicultural and what counts as cosmopolitan remains. It seems as though Delanty (2006) is conflating diversity in the nation with diversity in the global through cosmopolitanism as a more open version of nationalism; but if cosmopolitanism mediates the national, how does it mediate questions of diversity? Is cosmopolitanism just an expansion of multiculturalism or is it a particular adaptation of it? Therefore, Delanty’s (2006) work is helpful in locating my attempt to distill the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship in a paradox of modernity where cosmopolitanism and nationalism co-exist. His theory takes me so far as to locate multiculturalism as akin to cosmopolitanism, as a point of mediation between the national and the global, and as a reflex of the paradox of modernity. Yet, the scholarly work on modern citizenship as an extension of liberalism through expanded and materialized set of rights as analyzed in the last chapter leads me to recognize that cosmopolitanism may be distinct from multiculturalism in particular ways.

Categories of Cosmopolitanism:
Liberal Versus Universal Theories

Broadly, cosmopolitanism is a conceptual space mediating and interacting with the idea of the imagined nation. However, there are distinct versions of cosmopolitanism that interact in distinct ways with nationalism in the modern paradox. Questions of diversity and the inclusion/exclusion dynamic of imagining community are central to the distinctions and overlays of different versions of cosmopolitanism. Delanty (2006) defines three categories of theory, each expressing a particular relation of cosmopolitanism to the nation: the liberalist, the universalist, and the postcolonialist. I will first focus on the liberalist and the universalist
before examining postcolonialist theories of cosmopolitanism. According to Delanty (2006),
the liberalist category assumes the modern, liberal concept of the nation can articulate
cosmopolitan trends as in his example of Canadian federalism with its official policies
bilingualism and multiculturalism. In contrast, he identifies the universalist category as
seeing cosmopolitanism as different from and superior to nationalism. It is relevant at this
point to examine in detail two of the theorists Delanty (2006) refers to in relation to liberal
and universal categories of cosmopolitan theories both of whom have framed my
understanding of the relationship between multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism: Will
Kymlicka and Martha Nussbaum.

**Will Kymlicka:**

**Group-Differentiated Rights, Interculturalism and Domestic Versus
Cosmopolitan Versions of Multiculturalism**

Kymlicka’s work has been fundamental to the development of multiculturalism as a
liberal theory of group-differentiated rights (1995, 1998, 2001), and his more recent work has
His work both articulates and evokes the distinctions and convergences between discourses
of diversity when considered a matter a) of national policy (multiculturalism), b) of
interpersonal relations (interculturalism), and c) of international or global understanding
(cosmopolitanism). Kymlicka’s extensive work theorizing multiculturalism is an important
contribution to liberal theory in terms of extending the national imaginary and by protecting
those individuals whose ethnocultural identities are distinct from those of the majority
culture. In his theory of multiculturalism, individual liberal rights require the awarding of
group-specific rights to certain ethnocultural minorities. These rights ensure access to the
institutions of the societal culture without the barrier of discrimination based on ethnicity.
This insures fair terms of integration for newcomer immigrants. Correspondingly,
multiculturalism is a two-way street in that the dominant culture must be open to other
cultures and to modify traditions and customs accordingly (Kymlicka, 1995). Kymlicka
(1995) maintains that an exclusive focus on the rights of the individual have left certain
minorities vulnerable to injustices at the hands of the majority and that “[a] comprehensive
theory of justice in a multicultural state will include both universal rights, assigned to
individuals regardless of group membership, and certain group-differentiated rights or ‘special status’ for minority cultures” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 6). Expanding liberalism’s basis in individual rights, Kymlicka (1995) insists that polyethnic group rights promote equality and cultural diversity within mainstream culture. Kymlicka’s argument for group rights is based on his assertion that they are consistent with liberal principles of individual freedom and social justice because political life in a nation-state is defined by decisions about language, education, courts, public holidays, etc., that are made by and to the advantage of the majority thereby disadvantaging ethnocultural minorities in various ways.

Thus, multiculturalism, in theory and in the practice of policies and laws granted group-differentiated rights, is a version of liberalism that articulates social justice aims. These aims include both the recognition of distinct ethnic identities within the imagined national community and the redistribution of a degree of power through the addition of collective rights (see also Joshee, 2004). However, Kymlicka (2003) makes a strong distinction between macro-level multicultural policies and practices and micro-level intercultural relations. Kymlicka (2003) describes interculturalism as dispositions of individuals who are capable of interacting with people from different cultures. While interculturalism can embody the spirit of multicultural policies by encouraging individuals within a multicultural state to interact with one another, and while ideally the two concepts work together, multiculturalism does not necessary correlate with interculturalism. He argues that some groups may claim protection under multicultural policies and laws but isolate themselves from other cultures.

While his work in the late 1990s and early 2000s focused on a national, and particularly Canadian, theory of multiculturalism; recent work considers multiculturalism in the contemporary global context. In a preface to a collection of essays edited by James Banks based on the Bellagio Citizenship Education and Diversity Conference, Kymlicka (2004) notes persisting cultural and economic marginalizing of minority ethnic groups despite
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28 The conference, originally titled “Ethnic Diversity and Citizenship Education in Multicultural Nation-States’, was held at the Rockefeller Foundation’s Study and Conference Centre in Bellagio, Italy on June 17th to 21st, 2002 and included participants from 12 nations (Banks, 2004). A major purpose of the conference was to create a forum to identify problems and issues related to designing an approach to civics education that promotes participation from all groups in a nation-state and that remains strongly committed to respecting cultural differences (Banks, 2004a).
multicultural policies and practices. He acknowledges that some “cynics” point out that multiculturalism’s popularity has coincided with the rise of a neoliberal agenda of social cohesion that focuses on a tolerance of ethnocultural diversity without addressing economic inequities and while glossing over the two-way street of integration. Correspondingly, multiculturalism becomes a “smoke screen” (Kymlicka, 2004, p. xv). Yet, Kymlicka (2004) insists that the neoliberal retrenchment of the welfare state has occurred regardless of any endorsement of multiculturalism. He does acknowledge that there is “an important challenge here about how to ensure that the ‘recognition of diversity’ strand of multiculturalism does not become disconnected from the ‘social equity’ strand” (2004, p. xv).

Kymlicka (2004) also recognizes that the fact that multiculturalism has operated exclusively within the context of the nation state can be perceived as a concern in today’s global context. He insists, however, that the logic of multiculturalism can be extended to connect to a more global, cosmopolitan view of citizenship:

[T]he logic of multiculturalism can be seen as pushing beyond the boundaries of the nation-state, particularly in the context of immigrant groups. Respecting immigrant ethnic identity involves, in part, respecting the desire of immigrants to maintain strong links with their country of origin. At a formal level, this may involve accepting the idea of dual citizenship. At a more general level, it involves accepting the idea of immigrant ‘transnationalism,’ not just multiculturalism within a single nation. (2004, p. xv)

Kymlicka interprets this criticism as essentially about a question of loyalty and personal identity on the part of immigrants. From this position, he notes that Western democracies have accepted dual citizenship without any noticeable costs nor is there convincing evidence to support any claim that dual citizens are less patriotic. However, he does express some concern that the pursuit of so-called transnational conceptions of identity and citizenship may actually serve to displace the development of more just and inclusive nation-states.

---

29 This criticism is indirectly supported by Joshee (2004) in Chapter 5 of the Banks text: “It is important to unpack this concept [of social cohesion] in order to fully understand the latest direction in citizenship and multicultural education. . . . It is invoked as a corrective measure that can help to increase social solidarity and restore faith in the institutions of government. It is important to note, however, that invoking social cohesion does not ultimately call into question the basic neoliberal project” (Joshee, 2004, p. 147).

30 Here Kymlicka (2004) uses Greece and France as examples of Western democracies that have experienced a rise in neoliberalism without committing to any official policy of multiculturalism.
this concern to a conflict between what he distinguishes as *domestic* multiculturalism and *cosmopolitan* multiculturalism. Domestic multiculturalism emphasizes learning about and respecting the histories, identities, and cultures of those groups with whom one shares a common state in order to ensure that the state is more just and inclusive. In contrast, cosmopolitan multiculturalism “privileges the learning of international languages and cultures…particularly the influential world cultures as a way of enhancing one’s economic opportunities and cultural capital in a globalized world” (2004, p. xvi)\(^{31}\). In this way, multiculturalism is used as a vehicle of privilege in the context of globalization:

> In order to avoid a potential backlash against multicultural education, it is increasingly being sold as a way of enhancing the cultural capital and economic opportunities of all students, including students from the dominant group, in a context of increasing globalization. Multiculturalism, one increasingly hears, is ‘good business’. (2004, p. xvii)

Interestingly, although he argues previously that neoliberalism can exist alongside multiculturalism through a discourse of social cohesion, the neoliberal business case for multiculturalism troubles him (see also Joshee, 2004).

Evidently, Kymlicka (2004) conceptualizes distinct, overlapping, or even competing, discourses of diversity in the way he describes domestic versus cosmopolitan multiculturalism. He sees the latter as a potential threat to the liberal principles of justice at the heart of multiculturalism because they are tied to global economic capital rather than to equity and because group-differentiated rights are enshrined and enforced through *nation*-state structures. Despite arguing against critics of multiculturalism earlier by declaring that neoliberalism is not necessarily incompatible with multiculturalism, he does seem to reassert a liberal social justice vision from within a global market mentality. Thus, he insists that “[w]e need to continually remind ourselves that multiculturalism is not just about expanding individual horizons, or increasing personal intercultural skills, but is part of a larger project of justice and equality” (Kymlicka, 2004, p. xvii). Here, he makes a strong distinction between multiculturalism as a domestic framework that ensures justice and equity within a state, interculturalism as a personal skill not necessarily tied to liberal principles of justice

\(^{31}\) Kymlicka (2004) lists English, French, German, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and Spanish as “the influential world cultures” (p. xvi).
and equity, and cosmopolitanism as an extension of multiculturalism but as manifested in intercultural skill development that is tied to global economic opportunities and capitalism. Therefore, other than suggesting that immigrants can have transnational loyalties and dual-citizenship, Kymlicka positions a notion of cosmopolitanism as either a misappropriation of domestic multicultural principles or as the trading of intercultural skills on the global market.

Delanty (2006) critiques the liberalist category represented by Kymlicka whereby multiculturalism and group rights are essential to the nation. Delanty (2006) problematizes the fact that this category of theory reduces questions of cosmopolitanism and diversity to relatively specific issues such as special rights and claims to autonomy. Interestingly, Delanty (2006) does not consider these global issues; they are domestic issues. Delanty (2006) acknowledges that “Kymlicka is quite explicit on the limits to cosmopolitan claims, which is why his approach is simply a modification of standard liberalism” (p. 365). Interestingly, he does not cite Kymlicka’s (2003) work on cosmopolitanism as distinct from multiculturalism and interculturalism. I would argue that Kymlicka would find that his version of cosmopolitanism is quite distinct from his prioritization of multiculturalism in the nation; and thus Delanty’s (2006) critique that liberal cosmopolitanism fails to set up a basic tension with the category of the nation is a moot point. If anything, it points to the way that theorists such as Delanty conflate multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism or at least to the confusion inherent to theorizations of the relationship between the concepts. Whereas, in my reading, Kymlicka expresses multiculturalism as quite distinct from cosmopolitanism, Delanty conceptualizes multiculturalism as an example of national versions of cosmopolitanism. Hence, there is more evidence of the conceptual and theoretical ambiguity defining the relationship between multiculturalism and global orientations to difference.\(^{32}\)

\(^{32}\) Ong (1999) also notes that writing on citizenship “seldom examine how the universalistic criteria of democratic citizenship variously regulate different categories of subjects or how these subjects’ location within the nation-state and within the global economy conditions the construction of their citizenship….Seldom is attention focused on the everyday processes whereby people, especially immigrants, are made into subjects of a particular nation-state” (p. 263).
Martha Nussbaum:
Universalist Cosmopolitanism and the Linear Expansion Model of Citizenship

Within the context of Kymlicka’s (2004) introduction to the collection of essays based on an international conference on diversity, it is interesting to consider how his theories about multiculturalism and diversity compare to those of Martha Nussbaum whom Delanty (2006) associates with the universalist category of cosmopolitan theory. She uses a discourse of cosmopolitanism to theorize cultural diversity and cross-cultural understanding in the context of contemporary globalization. Nussbaum (2002b, 2002c), like Kymlicka, rejects and raises attention to the myth of the neutral state and neutral traditions of citizenship. Writing in promotion of cosmopolitanism, she argues that a lack of self-criticality on the part of the nation actually interferes with the most basic of democratic principles: deliberation. She centers her theory on a commitment to cultural diversity and global awareness and insists on self-criticality as integral to the promotion of a more just global order:

One of the greatest barriers to rational deliberation in politics is the unexamined feeling that one’s own preferences and ways are neutral and natural. An education that takes national boundaries as morally salient too often reinforces this kind of irrationality, by lending to what is an accident of history a false air of moral weight and glory. By looking at ourselves through the lens of the other, we come to see what in our practices is local and nonessential, what is more broadly or deeply shared. Our nation [the U.S.] is appallingly ignorant of most of the rest of the world. I think this means that it is also, in many crucial ways, ignorant of itself. (Nussbaum, 2002c, p. 11)

Her emphasis on self-criticality is comparable to Kymlicka’s notion of the dominant culture needing to be able to modify its traditions and institutions to accommodate just and fair terms of integration on the part of immigrant groups. The self-reflexivity could combine with a deconstruction of the imagined community of nation; however, the notion of imagining a community is not troubled and thus neither is the Enlightenment dynamic of citizenship. Rather, she critiques the spatial limits of imagining community as nationhood.

In *For Love of Country*, Nussbaum’s (2002c) controversial 1996 essay “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism” is reprinted with a new introduction relating it to a post-September 11th 2001 context and with eleven of the original responses from well-known theorists.
Nussbaum (2002a, 2002b, 2002c) focuses on the United States as a dominating community with power and influence internationally and whose citizens take their cultural and economic dominance for granted. At the same time, her spatial understanding of extending citizenship to cosmopolitanism is rooted in the extension of loyalty in a linear manner from local to national to global levels. Nussbaum’s work seems to take as a given that multiculturalism functions at the national level. She (2002a) argues for a model of cosmopolitan education through which students learn to see themselves in terms of their families, religions, ethnic or racial communities, and even their country. However,

they must also, and centrally, learn to recognize humanity wherever they encounter it, undeterred by traits that are strange to them….They must learn enough about the different to recognize common aims, aspirations, and values, and enough about these common ends to see how variously they are instantiated in the many cultures and their histories. (Nussbaum, 2002c, p. 9)

Thus, she conceptualizes the nation as one important community among many identity markers and sees a global view of community as a natural extension, through a series of concentric circles, of family, region, and nationhood. Through this conceptualization, she can argue for the prioritization of extending the cosmopolitan circle past the perceived limits of patriotism.

The final premise of Nussbaum’s argument for cosmopolitanism relates to the problems associated with nationalistic patriotism and pushes for a consistent and coherent argument based on those distinctions that “we are prepared to defend” (2002c, p. 14). Recognizing the spatial boundaries of a national imaginary without interrogating the metanarrative itself, she adds a critical dimension to Kymlicka’s view of multiculturalism as fair terms of integration and cosmopolitanism as immigrant transnationalism. She questions why it is that the same person who lived in China “wasn’t our fellow” when living there, but when she or he dwells in the United States, she or he “magically becomes our fellow” and takes on both certain duties and mutual respect: “I think, in short, that we undercut the very case for multicultural respect within a nation by failing to make central to education a broader world respect” (2002a, p. 14). Thus, she inherently makes a distinction between multiculturalism as a theory of liberal democracy that responds to a national context of diversity, and cosmopolitanism which extends the moral premise of respect for cultures to a
global scale. She goes so far as to suggest that a multicultural model is inherently caught in a paradox of its national limits. Therefore, she prioritizes a global view of equity and diversity over a domestic one. Differently from Kymlicka’s theory, in her conceptualization, intercultural understanding skills build towards socially just relations between states and peoples on a global level. It is an expansion of the principles of equality and recognition inherent to liberalism from a national political imaginary to a global moral imperative. She also argues that working towards the acquisition of knowledge of others and, reflexively, “ourselves”, will result in a type of thinking that “will have large-scale economic and political consequences” (2002a, p. 14). She includes an economic, business case, imperative for cosmopolitan education. Thus, her argument reflects but does not interrogate the context of neoliberalism in defining the conjoint discursive fields of globalization and citizenship (Tully, 2008).

Nussbaum raises attention to the importance of recognizing those cultures that go unnoticed both because it is important to expand one’s awareness and because it is essential to debunking a neutral view of one’s own culture. Both she and Kymlicka use the pronouns us and our to describe a particular citizen subject who is presumably the audience of their works. In both cases, it is assumed to be that citizen who is an existing member of the nation-state or a citizen who has been integrated into a dominant culture and needs to respect, accommodate and/or learn about those with other cultures. Therefore, each conceptualizes multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism as rejecting a neutral, taken-for-granted idea of citizenship, and while both recognize the exclusive tradition of citizenship. Both Kymlicka (1995, 2003, 2004) and Nussbaum (2002a, 2002b, 2002c) appeal to a normative liberal democratic view of who is the citizen-subject. Furthermore, in his critique of the liberalist and universalist categories of cosmopolitanism, Delanty (2006) argues nationalism and cosmopolitanism reflect different aspects of, but are both part of, the cultural horizon of modernity. While Delanty distinguishes their work into two categories, I find that essentially, both are liberal theories rooted in a national view of citizenship that can broaden. Thus, both become entwined in those paradoxes of the individual versus the collective and unity versus diversity that define the liberal problematic on which contestations of citizenship are based. Indeed, the overlaps and convergences of the notions of multiculturalism, interculturalism, and cosmopolitanism demonstrate that theorizing equity and diversity within local, national,
and global contexts is tricky business and is always implicated in the very power dynamics such theory works to modify.

Delanty (2006) critiques the universalist category of cosmopolitanism represented by Nussbaum as failing to account for multiple forms of identification and overlapping identities. This critique is further developed by Mitchell and Parker (2008) who challenge the way Nussbaum (2002a) frames a debate of cosmopolitanism versus patriotism. They point out that the processes of mixing and movement associated with globalization in the past several decades has in fact led to a “pluralisation of orientations and a multiplication of subject positions” (Mitchell & Parker, 2008, p. 779). They interrogate the assumption of “a naturallyness of affinities at particular scales. Further, these scales are presumed not only to be ‘received’ rather than produced, but are represented as inflexible and continuous through time” (Mitchell & Parker, 2008, p. 777). A critical analysis of contemporary citizenship suggests that the perceived increase of spatial and temporal flexibility is associated with multiple allegiances rather than with “an essentially static and unidirectional movement of affinity from an inner concentric circle to outer or from warm to cool” (Mitchell & Parker, 2008, p. 779). Indeed, the concept of concentric expanding circles re-inscribes the prioritization of a normalized—and ignorant—Western, (North)American citizen who does not know about the world outside of the United States and needs to expand in a linear fashion through the addition of cosmopolitan education (Pashby 2011a). Mitchell (2003) offers another critique of linear extension model of cosmopolitan citizenship expressed by Nussbaum (2002b). She observes that contemporary citizenship moves between scales in different historical and geographical moments, from local to national to supranational or transnational sets of positioning and back again: “the being and becoming of a citizen as an active participant in a democratic community shifts” (Mitchell, 2003, p. 389). Thus, the universalist (liberal) version of cosmopolitanism represented by Nussbaum (2002b) substitutes an expansion of the national imaginary to a global imaginary without changing the assumptions of citizenship subjectivity as if one can simply extend one’s sense of political community outward.
Postcolonial Versions of Cosmopolitanism and
Cosmopolitanism in the Making

After the liberalist (Kymlicka) and universalist (Nussbaum), Delanty (2006) describes postcolonialist as the third category of cosmopolitan theory. Postcolonial theories of cosmopolitanism also take up the modern paradox of nationalism and cosmopolitanism. Linking to Anderson’s theory of the imagined nation and to the theoretical pivot-point, Delanty (2006) defines a postcolonial cosmopolitan view as making visible the exclusion/inclusion paradox of nationhood so that “the nation is formed in a narrative of transgression and negotiation with otherness; it is, as a result, a fundamentally hybrid category” (Delanty, 2006, p. 365 citing Bhabha, 1990). In this sense, he connects postcolonial views of cosmopolitanism to what I have highlighted about Anderson’s (2006) theory of imagined nations. Nations are neither unified nor homogenous and are built on incomplete and perspectival stories of a collective existence. Delanty (2006) understands that this “is more true today than in the past when marginal groups of people are coming to play a greater role in defining national identity: women, immigrants, colonial peoples are less ‘outside’ the nation than within it” (p. 365-366). Interestingly, this connects to the group-differentiated rights Kymlicka (1995) promotes as multiculturalism. In this sense, social justice versions of liberal multiculturalism that emphasize rights, recognition, and redistribution (Joshee, 2009) open up spaces for recognizing and negotiating the inclusion-exclusion paradox of nationhood. However, a postcolonial view challenges the neutral notion of the political subject inherent to liberalism.

Delanty (2006) argues that in a postcolonial view, the nation is a hybrid and multivocal category and “is thus already cosmopolitan” (p. 366). He distinguishes postcolonial cosmopolitanism from one extending from “Eurocentric” Enlightenment ideals (2006, p. 366). Delanty (2006) appreciates how the postcolonial version of cosmopolitanism avoids some of the “dualistic assumptions of the universalist position and offers a broader vision of the nation than in liberal nationalism” (2006, p. 366). However, he argues that in a postcolonial view, cosmopolitanism can be reduced to a condition of hybridity unique to those nations created out of colonialism (Delanty 2006, p. 366). Interestingly, he does not recognize, as Tully (2008) does, that modern citizenship in various Western nation-states was

According to Strand (2010b), contemporary globalization frames a shift towards a broad recognition of mutual interdependence on a world scale and the desire to overcome “national presuppositions and prejudices” (p. 230). This cosmopolitan turn has resulted in a huge increase in the number of “normative and truthfully prescriptive theories of world citizenship, global justice and cosmopolitan democracy” (Strand, 2010b, p. 230). Similarly to Delanty (2006), Strand (2010a) recognizes that there are many versions of cosmopolitanism marking its current resurgence in scholarship. He asserts that cosmopolitanism is “an ambiguous and contested term carrying contradictory images and visions—of, for example, cosmopolitanism old and new; cosmopolitanism of the West versus cosmopolitanism of the rest; and between a cosmopolitanism from above versus a cosmopolitanism from below” (Strand, 2010a, p. 104). In a similar way to how Delanty (2006) both refers to the paradox inherent to the etymological roots of the term cosmopolitanism and appreciates postcolonial views that acknowledge eurocentrism, Strand (2010a) recognizes that the philosophical roots of cosmopolitanism are embedded in European discourses and a Western cosmology. Thus, he argues, any theory being called cosmopolitanism in a Western context is contestable because “a biased cosmopolitanism of the West may well disturb and continue to marginalise non-Western representations, visions and experiences” (Strand, 2010a, p. 105). Furthermore, there is a “vital dilemma” inherent to any version of cosmopolitanism that provides a secure version of community in the global imperative (Strand, 2010a, p. 105). The question of matching a “Western image of a harmonious, well-ordered, orderly, and rational global society contrasts the lively particulars of the worldly and creative cities of today” (Strand, 2010a, p. 105)

Another conceptual challenge is how to account for the multiple and various experiences of globalization. According to Strand’s (2010a, 2010b) theorizing of the cosmopolitan turn, the new global order requires a new design for social production of cultural norms which involves the contestation of established ideas of citizenship and loyalty.
This version of globalization is associated with the idea of the decline of the nation state, new patterns of immigration, multiple citizenships (Marshall, 2009; Tully, 2008), virtual networks, the influence of supranational institutions (such as the WTO, IMF), and a growing knowledge-based economy (Gilbert, 2007). These phenomena are cited by Strand (2010b) as comprising rationales for renewed calls for a cosmopolitan ethos: “In other words, the many faces of contemporary cosmopolitanism in the making make cosmopolitanism a many-faceted, ambiguous and contested ideal” (p. 233, italics added). His notion of cosmopolitanism in the making reflects that cosmopolitanism is a discursive field.

Globalization, Cosmopolitanism, and Ideologies of Difference

The various versions of cosmopolitanism raise attention to the challenges and significance of conceptualizing multiplicity and difference in the conjoint discursive field of global citizenship (Tully, 2008). Each of the three categories of cosmopolitan theories identified by Delanty (2006) (liberal, universal, and postcolonial) engages with an idea of how to cultivate a sense of global community through, beyond, and in tension with the symbolic and geographical boundaries of the imagined nation. While the previous chapter articulated the contestations marking citizenship inclusion through rights and recognition, and this chapter has looked at the national-global paradox inherent to different categories of cosmopolitan theory, the discursive field of globalization is similarly marked by contestation. Globalization both describes contemporary processes and experiences of reality and is a discourse that reflects particular ideologies. In this sense, it is also defined by the pivot-point as it is deconstructed and problematized at the same time that it is a strongly governing discourse defining the contemporary moment. In terms of the complexities of citizenship identity in the global imperative, the significant place of globalization theory in philosophical and social science scholarship has been accompanied by a postmodern deconstruction of identity. Correspondingly, a recognition of cultural production results in complex understandings of multiple identities (Delanty, 2000). Indeed, the discourse of globalization is comprised of multiple tensions and competing ideologies framing issues of cultural diversity and geopolitical relations.
A significant strand within globalization discourse relating to citizenship involves contrasting descriptions of, and responses to, the impact of globalization has on cultural diversity. According to Burns (2008), the discourse of globalization in relation to its impact on cultures is framed largely by a binary set of strands representing homogenous versus heterogeneous views. The homogenizing version constructs a global world wherein difference is erased and the world shrinks to one space. Homogeneity fails to account for how power remains unevenly distributed. Furthermore, in many cases borders and divisions between nations have deepened so that citizens often hold onto nationalist and patriotic discourses despite greater mobility, instability, and change (Burns, 2008). In contrast, in a heterogeneous model difference is lost to speed and to the intensity with which objects, events, and ideologies are (re)produced through processes of globalization. Burns (2008) argues that this view places too much power with the global:

The mourning of lost identities, be they cultural, national or sub-cultural, is problematic for it re-inscribes each of these as a contained or stable entity. In particular, it positions the nation as a fixed and entirely tangible structure and undermines minoritarian critiques of the nation as a social and political entity whose regulatory practices exclude those who do not adhere to certain norms. (Burns, 2008, p. 347)

Indeed, a discourse of the loss of nation-states and identities imagined through the nation is rooted in linear nostalgia for what used to be before globalization (Burns, 2008, p. 248). Thus, this version of globalization contributes a barrier to interrogations of the nostalgic imagined community.

Burns’s (2008) work highlights the discursive turn and the contemporary theoretical context of dualism and dichotomy impacting how the global imperative is interpreted and used in analysis. Her articulation of the homogeneity-heterogeneity binary will shed light on later sections of this thesis examining how curriculum documents and teacher lesson plans interpret the impacts of globalization on cultural identities. She raises attention to how discrete cultures are understood in relation to globalization and the tendency to erroneously essentialize a crisis: “Whether one is describing globalisation as a process of homogenisation or heterogenisation, the repetition of this dichotomy positions globalisation in a predatory role, linking the inevitable repercussions of global living with the inability of minoritarian
cultures to produce an effective counter-hegemonic polity” (Burns, 2008, p. 347). She argues that the repetition of binary narratives onotologizes and essentializes what are actually irregular, contradictory, and I would add situated and historicized, sets of transnational conditions. Thus, she theorizes a complex and dynamic view of the global imperative in relation to culture using a third theory of globalisation based on a Foucaultian theory of governmentality. In this view, “Rather than seeing globalisation as a finite or linear set of processes [as in both the homogeneous and heterogeneous views] it becomes a vast assemblage of competing and contradictory forces that organise and manage populations” (Burns, 2008, p. 348).

Burn’s (2008) theory of globalization as governmentality reflects the pivot-point by breaking down how the discursive field of globalization is currently being co-opted by neoliberal ideology. Drawing on Foucault (1991), she finds that neoliberalism is a good example of an effective “art of government” (quoted by Burns, 2008, p. 345). Going beyond the binary of either an imposed homogeneity or a de-centered heterogeneity, governmentality understands globalization as a set of movements that come together into new modes of regulation. Neoliberal ideology emphasizes individual responsibility and self-care so that individuals are ultimately given the task of ensuring their own social and economic wellbeing. Furthermore, this is “inextricably linked to one’s level of self-efficacy” (Burns, 2008, p. 345). Correspondingly, neoliberal versions of globalization are implicated in current views of citizenship. Individual citizens are put in the role of “entrepreneur and manager of the self and of others”, and therefore any financial, social, or health-related deficiencies can be placed on an individual’s inability to manage him/herself appropriately rather than on government policy, practice, or lack thereof (Burns, 2008, p. 251).

Tying together the conjoint discursive fields of globalization, citizenship, and cosmopolitanism, Soysal (2012) argues that the current notion of citizens being able to contribute at local, national, and global levels is implicated in neoliberalism: “while expanding the boundaries and forms of participation in society, this project at the same time charges the individual as the main force for social cohesion and solidarity” (p. 2-3). In turn, this neoliberal individualism impacts negatively on the principles of liberal inclusion and recognition, as those not members of the dominant societal culture are not only outsiders
needing to be included in national identity but are now also required to prove their potential and worth as individuals. Significantly, neither Nussbaum (2002a, 2002b, 2002c) nor Kymlicka (2004) interrogate the extent to which neoliberalism contradicts a social justice imperative by emphasizing individualism and meritocracy rather than on removing the systemic barriers faced by minoritized and marginalized groups. Kymlicka (2004) does express a resistance to what he calls cosmopolitan multiculturalism as based in a business case rationale. In a neoliberal context of the free market, a normative version of being cosmopolitan is being worldly and making consumer choices. Problematically, this version of cosmopolitanism—“travelling to certain ‘exotic’ places, watching certain anthropological television documentaries, eating in certain ‘ethnic’ suburbs”—fails to take into account operations of power “and give[s] majoritarian cultures cause and permission to consume the minoritarian Other” (Burns, 2008, p. 353)34.

A main question arising from the cosmopolitanism literature is who is and who gets to be a cosmopolitan? Glick Schiller, Darieva, and Gruner-Domic (2011) refer to an tendency of cosmopolitan literature to ignore the everyday activities of people not belonging to elite travelers and also point to the new formulations of cosmopolitanism from below (e.g. Werbner, 2008). The latter suggests there are spaces for individual agency despite the dominance of neoliberal ideology by “drawing attention to the role that ordinary individuals and social groups play in the making of a new cosmopolitan order by transcending symbolic and social boundaries” although these accounts tend to be more descriptive than theoretical (Glick Schiller et al., 2011, 407). Furthermore, Werbner’s (2008) analysis of cosmopolitanism fits into the same paradox of theorizing globalisation that Burns (2008) describes as the homogenous-heterogeneous binary. Thus the from above/from below and homogeneous/heterogeneous binaries reflect an inherent tension of contemporary uses of cosmopolitanism in the global imperative: will it be theorized and governed from above and applied to local particularities or will it emerge from below in the complex and situated

34 In this sense, neoliberalism is an extension (or perversion) of liberal notions of diversity. Critiques of liberalpluralism problematize the way that cosmopolitan discourse can conflate with diversity in local contexts to conflate heterogeneity into homogeneity as described by Burns (2008). Citing Mitchell (1995), (Andreotti (2011a) argues that liberal versions of diversity blend with neoliberal capitalist hegemony: “Liberal multiculturalism produces a discourse of cosmopolitanism based on the blending of essentialist and “authentic” ethnic accessories or identities, resulting in a kind of supermarket “happy hybrid” cosmopolitanism that becomes part of the mainstream culture” (p. 109).
various realities of living in the contemporary global moment? This is a tension between abstract universalism tied with economic imperative from above and concrete, rooted moral commitment from below; either way, there is the potential for binaries through an overstated sense of homogenization from above and through a romanticization of the local below. However, in the context of the new imperialism (Tikly, 2004), Mignolo (2000) asserts the important distinction between “local histories that plan and project” globalization processes and “others that have to live with them” (p. 721).

The question “how do we cope with differences and conflicts?” is central to the fact that the world is or at least feels smaller through intensified contacts within, across, and beyond national, social, political, cultural, and religious borders (Strand, 2010a, p. 103). In this sense, the global imperative and the related cosmopolitan turn involve somewhat of an Andersonian imagining of *global* community or at least is an engagement with difference and culture within stronger and multiple levels of global connections (Beck, 2011). As a discursive field, globalization is related to various notions of complexity, interconnections, and multiplicity that combine with historicity and the challenging of hegemonic modern, global designs. Mignolo (2000) uses the term “diversality” to describe a critical and dialogical cosmopolitanism:

> While cosmopolitanism was thought out and projected from particular local histories (that became the local history of the modern world system) positioned to devise and enact global designs, other local histories in the planet had to deal with those global designs that were, at the same time, abstract universals (Christian, liberal, or socialist). For that reason, cosmopolitanism today has to become border thinking, critical and dialogic, from the perspective of those local histories that had to deal all along with global designs. (p. 744)

A radically historical and situated philosophy of cosmopolitanism is centered in diversality which is “relentless practice of critical and dialogical cosmopolitanism” (Mignolo, 2000, p.

---

35 See also Tully’s (2008) distinction between civil-cosmopolitanism and civic-diverse citizenship. The former is rooted in modernism and in the nation-state (and includes expansion of rights such as multiculturalism). The latter, favoured by Tully, focuses on local diversity connecting with diversity internationally through on-going dialectical relationship. While the model of civic-diverse citizenship certainly promotes local diversity in the face of globalization from above, it privileges the local, and beyond a respectful comparative engagement with various local civic communities, it is not clear exactly what diverse citizenship looks like.
His use of the term diversality is strongly related to theorizing from the pivot-point. By applying the discursive turn to recognize complexities and identify tensions, critical spaces can be located and used to push for new imaginings. Mignolo’s (2000) notion of diversality serves as a new imagining, a thinking otherwise, of global community that “rejects the blueprint of a future and ideal society projected from a single point of view (that of the abstract universal) that will return us (again!) to the Greek paradigm and to European legacies” (Mignolo, 2000, p. 744 drawing on Zˇizˇek 1998). Mignolo’s (2000) vision of diversality is similar to Burns’s theory of governmentality in prioritizing a critical view of how globalisation functions as a discourse that defines how and what particular individuals and groups can and do understand as cosmopolitanism. It dissents from a neoliberal version in which cosmopolitanism is “a set of qualities or skills mobilised by a class of ‘global citizens’ who live in urban centres and/or have access to global travel” (Burns, 2008, p. 354). Rather, theorizing from the pivot-point, the concept of diversality recognizes power dynamics and opens up tensions in paradoxes to locate dynamic spaces.

The Cosmopolitan Paradox as Epistemic Ruptures and Theorizing from the Pivot-Point

The current resurgence of cosmopolitanism operates within both the discursive turn and the global imperative. Images and visions of cosmopolitanism are embedded in both local and transnational spaces; different notions of cosmopolitanism reflect inconsistent images (Strand 2010a). Therefore, in contemporary philosophy, social theory, and educational studies, the term cosmopolitanism functions in multiple ways: a) as a metaphor for a way of life (that evokes a particular set of paradoxes); b) as a multi-faceted and contested moral, political, and legal ideal; and c) as a way of looking or a perspective on a common and contemporary social reality (Strand 2010a).

Despite the multiple visions of cosmopolitanism relating to philosophy, social sciences, and education, Strand (2010a) articulates some shared ambitions. First, and related to the discursive turn’s critical reading of metanarratives and imagined communities, there is a strong project of overcoming national presumptions within the social sciences which entails a reconceptualization of the basis of analysis when the nation state is no longer the neutral
and assumed root of analysis. This is a shift away from what Beck (2011) refers to as “methodological nationalism” (p. 1537). Second, there is a common recognition that the current era of globalization is characterized by a level of mutual interdependence. Third, there has been a large increase in normative and prescriptive theories of world citizenship, global citizenship, and global justice (e.g., Nussbaum, 2002b; Benhabib, 2007; Fraser, 2005). Despite these broad shared ambitions, cosmopolitanism is a highly contested term that remains to a large extent associated with the privileged lifestyle of academics. Strand (2010b) uses the phrase cosmopolitanism in the making to “draw attention to the fact that processes of globalization are mirrored in and shape contemporary social, cultural, political and educational discourses, and that the current transformations are generated by and generate ontological and epistemic shifts” (Strand, 2010b, p. 230). Evoking the theoretical pivot-point, Strand (2010b) notes that “as contemporary cosmopolitanism simultaneously refers to the new ways of the world and the new ways of seeing the world, the current makings of a new cosmopolitanism comprise some inherent contradictions” (p. 230, italics in original). In this sense, cosmopolitanism is a discursive field. The question remains, how new is this new ontology and epistemology?; to what extent, in the context of the discursive shift and theoretical pivot point, are theories of cosmopolitan (or world or global) citizenship lodged within new discourses of modernism or new ways of thinking that interrogate modernism and inspire thinking “otherwise” (Andreotti, 2010b, p. 10)?

Earlier in this chapter, I reviewed the etymological roots of the Greek word *kosmopolites*. Drawing on Delanty (2006), I referred to the paradox inherent to cosmopolitanism as both a wider understanding of relating in the cosmos and a specific understanding of the political community of the polis. Delanty (2006) connects this paradox to the conceptual tension and mutual implication between nationhood and cosmopolitanism. As another example of theorizing from the pivot-point, Strand (2010b) also breaks down the word cosmopolitan to demonstrate its inherently paradoxical nature, but for a different purpose. There is an essential ambiguity in juxtaposing *kosmos* to *polis*, “an orderly whole to a lively particular; an all-encompassing universality to a definite body of fellow citizens; a harmonious design to a dynamic social reality” (Strand, 2010b, p. 236). Viewed as a metaphor, cosmopolitanism compares and contrasts the contemporary global moment to this “impossible image” (the cosmos-like polis) while at the same time determining that the
moment is actually cosmopolitan. Thus, he locates the “mystery of cosmopolitanism” in “that it compares reality with an impossible image, while concurrently asserting it to be something that it is not, namely this impossible image” (Strand, 2010b, p. 236).

While cosmopolitanism thus seems like an impossible paradox, Strand (2010b) uses its metaphoric quality as a source of dynamic theorizing. He defines a paradox as “an argument where the premises are true and the reasoning appears to be correct, but the conclusions contradictory or mutually excluding” (2010b, p. 236). As another way of reasoning, metaphors concurrently lead to two seemingly inconsistent and mutually excluding conclusions: “‘this is that’ and ‘this is not that’” (p. 236). Drawing on Quine (1966), Strand (2010b) argues that such paradoxes, or anomalies, serve a productive function by bringing on a “crisis in thought” that makes a previously trusted pattern of reasoning explicit and contradictions made visible so as to be avoided or revised. In this sense, “metaphors—with their paradoxical attributions—thus help expand already existing ways of knowledge” (Strand, 2010b, p. 236).

Strand (2010b) uses this theory of impossible paradoxes of cosmopolitanism as metaphor to define the “cosmopolitan outlook” which is “a diagnostic and normative point of view that signifies epistemic ruptures” (p. 233 drawing on Beck, 2006; italics added). The use of the term diagnostic corresponds to Mignolo’s (2000) call for critical cosmopolitanism that is a response to what is wrong about globalization on behalf of those marginalized by globalization. The use of the term normative describes the banal way that an increasingly cosmopolitan reality in a context of globalization is an accepted and taken-for-granted premise (Beck, 2011, p. 1348). The fact that cosmopolitanism is both diagnostic and normative explains the conceptual confusion inherent to the discursive field. However, recognizing the paradoxes and naming and examining the tensions opens up the possibility for epistemic and ontological shifts. By recognizing the fact that cosmopolitanism is a discursive field, theorizing from the pivot-point acknowledges the difference between, on the one side, new ways of seeing and knowing that use different terms but merely expand on modernist traditions, and on the other side, pushing the paradoxes and tensions to find dynamic and critical spaces. These critical, dynamic spaces open up possibilities for reasoning and imagining community and globality and for recognizing and interrogating
modemist traditions and assumptions. Applying Strand’s (2010b) view, the metaphor of cosmopolitanism educates as the paradox opens something new which leads to a radical invention of new ways of learning and potentially a thinking “otherwise” (Andreotti, 2010b, p. 10).

**Conceptualizing Multiculturalism in the Cosmopolitan Turn:**

**Nailing Pudding to the Wall**

When cosmopolitanism is taken up as global citizenship, it, as Tully (2008) theorizes, brings together a conjoint field of citizenship and globalization. Similarly to the idea of cosmopolitanism in the making (Strand 2010b), this field is characterized by multiple meanings and manifestations. These include “the way that formerly disparate activities, institutions and processes have been gathered together under the rubric of ‘global citizenship’, so becoming a site of contestation in practice and formulated as a problem in research, policy and theory, and to which diverse solutions are presented and debated” (Tully, 2008, p. 15). Thus in the same way that cosmopolitanism is defined by the paradox of the national and the global, and is both normative and diagnostic, global citizenship education joins discursive fields which are characterized by these inherent tensions. It also inherits the inclusion-exclusion paradox of imagining community. These paradoxes and contradictions contribute to the conceptual ambiguity and confusion inherent to the field of GCE. Yet, they also represent possibilities for epistemic ruptures (Strand, 2010b, p. 233).

Contemporary globalization is associated with the production of new economic interconnections and ties that exert a set of pressures onto the spatial dimensions of political community, culture, and citizenship in the global imperative. Mitchell and Parker (2008) note these new elements of globalization produce new types of discourses (“e.g., about globalization’s inevitability or desirability as well as about “natural” boundaries and “natural” forms of cultural belonging”) (p. 778). Importantly, the spatial scales associated with cultural belonging that are constructed in the context of globalization are not neutral: “rather they reflect specific configurations of power that must be identified contextually” (Mitchell & Parker, 2008, p. 778). Interestingly then, a pivot-point vision of the global imperative and the cosmopolitan turn can be identified among the debates about the extent to
which cosmopolitanism either replaces the national imaginary as the dominant space for citizenship or is an extension of national citizenship (Nussbaum 2002b). Yet, aligning with Delanty’s (2006) argument that cosmopolitanism and nationalism are mutually implicated, Pike (2008b) argues that “the national versus global citizenship debate is predicated upon the false premise that you cannot have both” (p. 80).

Another new discourse associated with the cosmopolitan turn is multiple citizenships which exists as a dynamic and flexible discourse of the global imperative (e.g., Heater 2004, Ross 2007). This multiple citizen “feels responsibility and allegiance to community, city, region, continent and planet as well as to a nation” (Pike, 2008b, p. 80). However, in Pike’s (2008b) terms, this multiple citizen is rooted in the nation-state: “‘Pride’ in one’s nation ‘is therefore ‘pride’ in the whole nest of relationships in which one’s nation is embedded, including the historical connections that have prompted immigration” (Pike, 2008b, p. 80). Ultimately, this version of citizenship as multiple remains rooted in the linear extension model that assumes a neutral and natural logical extension from the local to the national to the global community.

Beck (2011) ties back to Anderson (2006) in focusing on the distinctions between the historical dimension of citizenship inherent to national and global views: “Both types of imagined communities, that is, national and cosmopolitan, have in common that they are not a matter of choice but are givens. But with an important difference: In the national case the given is a matter of origin; in the cosmopolitan case it is the future” (p. 1353-4). Indeed, cosmopolitan theorists trying to re-imagine community and citizenship through an engagement with equity and diversity are competing against a reassertion of nationalism (Delanty, 2006). This new nationalism is tied to neoconservative ideologies of diversity that hearken back to a grand past through a reassertion of patriotism (Joshee, 2004). In this view, national communities are imagined through a common past from where cosmopolitan communities anticipate the future through the present (Beck, 2011, p. 1354). In earlier work, Beck (2002) refers to the attempt to define “globalization” and “cosmopolitanization” as similar to trying to “nail pudding to the wall”: “‘Globalization’ is a non-linear, dialectic process in which the global and the local do not exist as cultural polarities but as combined and mutually implicating principles” (p. 17). Indeed, the local, the national, and the global
are conceptual constructs: “In reality, there is no irrefutable demarcation between the global and the local. While globalization of the political economy seems to form a global monoculture, the emergence of postmodern, postcolonial, and multicultural theories demonstrates an increasingly complex understanding of the diversity of human cultures. The bifurcation of the global and the local appears to be problematic…” (Li, 2003, p. 55). The question of how multiculturalism is conceptualized within these complex discursive fields remains challenging as it is evoked in discussions of the local, the national, and the global and in conceptualizations of and descriptions of nationalism, cosmopolitanism, and globalization.

The question of how to frame and govern notions of cultural diversity within this complicated process remains defined by various ideological versions of globalization. While some scholars speak about multiple citizenship, there are also multiple versions of cosmopolitanism; and, as Marshall (2011) points out, some may clash with others. Glick Schiller et al. (2011) make “an effort to move beyond multiculturalism without embracing national or global narratives of universalism” through conceptualizing “overlapping identities and socialities and the intersectionality of diverse representations” (Glick Schiller et al., 2011, p. 701-702). They point to a key theme cutting across the literature referred to in this chapter. The discursive turn is characterized by an analytical view that makes explicit the ways notions of culture, community, citizenship and globalization function as discourses through which distinct ideologies define particular worldviews. It reveals the “ultimately essentializing nature of culturally and ethno-religious-based paradigms” of culture, community, citizenship, and globalization that creates and reinforces discourses and political projects and produces naturalized, bounded difference (Glick Schiller et al., 2011, p. 701).

Conceptualizing the theoretical landscape framing the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship is reflective of the discursive shift in philosophy and social studies. This chapter has answered the question what are the tensions inherent to understandings of citizenship in relation to diversity and globalization? Recognizing conjoining and intermingling nature of discursive fields leads to a recognition that concepts like nation, citizenship, globalization, culture, and cosmopolitanism represent tensions between old and new ways of thinking and function discursively as conceptual spaces of
contradictions and conflations. A situated philosophy of education aims to locate and analyse the social realities in which education functions in different ways rather than applying philosophical rationality to the sphere of education. In this sense, the discursive turn provides a framework of historicized, situated, and critical analysis that recognizes ambivalence and tensions. Breaking down metanarratives that govern ways of being and seeing the world helps to recognize spaces of weakness within hegemonic ideologies. Inherent tensions become visible so as to create spaces for thinking otherwise. In this sense, the discursive turn represents a swinging pendulum as it is working from within these metanarratives and modernist premises to respond to and interrogate them. I use the idea of the pivot-point to express how I attempt to theorize from a reflexive and situated space. Recognizing tensions and paradoxes inherent to what are commonly used and even naturally/neutral held meaningful and valuable concepts represents the opportunity for opening up new discursive spaces. This is a theoretical stance defined itself by contestation as by being dynamic and moving, it cannot guarantee a secure stance. However, in this and the previous chapter, I have attempted to demonstrate the significance of working to acknowledge the set of assumptions underlying concepts of nationhood, citizenship, diversity, globalization, and cosmopolitanism. This situated theoretical context highlights a move to recognize and even revise theoretical paradoxes associated with liberalism and universalism at the same time as resisting a strong neoliberal governmentality. This move is also evident in the multiple versions of cosmopolitanisms which to varying extents represent extensions or moves within modernism and to a lesser extent raise attention to the importance of interrogating those premises towards imagining otherwise. The next chapter narrows the wider theoretical context outlined in this and the previous chapter. It examines how the wider tensions and paradoxes of imagining community in the national-cosmopolitan dynamic play out when being applied to the project of schooling.
Chapter Five
Schooling and Citizenship in the Global Imperative:
Educating the 21st Century Citizen

The cultivation of a democratic citizenry is no simple challenge. On the one hand, schools must help people articulate who they are, who they want to be, and how they want to live with others. On the other hand, schools must help people learn to take the standpoint of others into account, to reverse perspectives and see the world through different eyes. The former requires preparing people to appear in the world; the latter involves helping people learn to let others appear. (Benhabib, 2008, p. 110)

Political scientist and philosopher Seyla Benhabib analyzes one of the most famous examples of multicultural controversies in contemporary times when in 1989 France three Muslim high school students wore their headscarfs to school despite laws banning them. This action launched them into a conflict with their school and eventually the French state and its justice system. Using this case as an example, Benhabib (2008) articulates how schooling becomes a site of praxis where citizenship understandings and misunderstandings play out in multicultural contexts. Evoking the theoretical pivot-point, this quotation also exposes yet another paradox relevant to examining the context of schooling for citizenship in the 21st century multicultural context: schools must help citizens articulate themselves and to see the world through others’ eyes.

Similarly to how the discursive turn challenges the metanarratives of nationhood and how the fields of globalization and citizenship interact discursively in the context of the cosmopolitan turn, the idea of educating citizens for the 21st century reflects multiple, contested, overlapping, and normative discourses. The discursive turn raises the complexities inherent to concepts of schooling by recognizing how public education is a site for the dissemination of normative views of nationhood, citizenship, and in the context of the global imperative, views of globalization and global citizenship. This chapter looks at how the field of education functions as a space of praxis for the application of the wider philosophical, theoretical, and ideological tensions identified in the previous chapters. To inquire into the question of the tensions inherent to schooling and citizenship education in disseminating
notions of national and global community, this chapter examines the paradoxes inherent to schooling citizens in the past and in the present, particularly in relation to issues around diversity and cohesion. It looks specifically at how citizenship education is being taken-up within the context of contemporary globalization and a corresponding imperative to respond to globalization in education. It argues for a historicized account of the complicity of schooling in the reproduction of social inequalities and examines to what extent the conjoining discursive fields of citizenship and globalization combine, conflate, or overlap through discourses of citizenship education. It also examines how global citizenship education (GCE) has emerged as a field with some overarching rationales as well as inherent tensions. Finally, the chapter ends by providing a theoretical framework through which to make sense of the sets of tensions, conflations and paradoxes marking schooling for the 21st century citizen in a multicultural context of global citizenship education: post-as-after and post-as-interrogating modernism (Andreotti, 2010b; 2010c; 2011a; 2011b). The framework helps to argue for a particular perspective on the conflation that prioritizes tensions and pushes beyond mere rhetoric of new ways of educating towards thinking otherwise.

Schooling the Imagined Community:

Applying the Discursive Turn and the Pivot-Point

The narrative of nation-building is a hegemonic discourse of the project of K-12 education; it has been historically, and it continues to adapt to the dominant ideologies of state today. State-run and mandatory schooling developed in Western, liberal democracies such as Canada through the turn of the twentieth century to a fully developed K-12 system by mid-century. Indeed, schooling is tied to Anderson’s (2006) deconstruction of the metanarrative of nationhood and the corresponding project of nation-building; schooling is a site for the imagining of nation. In Chapter Three, I used the term the Enlightenment dynamic to describe the way citizenship institutionalized the imagined community of nationhood through balancing a strong adherence to reason and logic with an emotive connection of camaraderie among members. Through citizenship, nationhood is institutionalized; the state offers protection against tyranny in exchange for the loyalty of its citizen. Thus the modern notion of national identity represents a synthesis of two separate
abstractions: the nation as a “social contract” and a romantic notion of its people as mythic “folk” (Richardson, 2002b, p. 53).

Compulsory public schooling emerged in Western democracies including Canada as a response to the industrial revolution. Fundamentally, schooling was an extension of state power during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Western democracies. By contributing to the realization of the “Enlightenment Project”, schooling is a central cog in the modernist project of nation-building through values of control and progress (Richardson, 2002b, p. 54). Schooling was a common solution across nation-states to what were perceived as new issues associated with industrialization, secularization, and nationalism (Mitchell, 2003). Schooling serves a strong role as national curricula perpetuate and manufacture national myths for two interrelated purposes: “grounding national consciousness in some kind of legitimizing historical tradition and garnering the allegiance of the people to the existing political status quo” (Richardson, 2002b, p. 54).

Schooling disseminates myths, or “legends” (Pike, 2008c, p. 226) that become normalized into metanarratives—ways of imagining the nation. These stories define who constitutes a community (local, national, or global) including differences within or between communities. Thus schooling is a key means through which citizens are socialized into the inclusion-exclusion dynamic inherent to imagined communities. The challenge has been that much of how schooling contributes to socializing individuals and groups of individuals into the dominant ideologies is so normalized that it is not obvious. Therefore, the discursive turn is particularly important in theorizing education. In describing the “hidden curriculum”, Giroux (1983) maintains that an investigation into the relationship between citizenship and

36 Governments faced unprecedented problems as the Industrial Revolution brought major changes to existing social patterns. Social norms and values were rocked; at the same time that new kinds of labour were needed with social organization to match problems associated with urbanization (Osborne, 2008). Religion, a main source of social organization and moral discipline, was increasingly being challenged by secularism and, as Anderson (2006) theorizes, the national imaginary continued to grow, “providing the social cohesion and communal discipline that seemed to be threatened by the decline of religious faith” (Osborne, 2008, p. 26).

37 Osborne (2008) notes that schooling was one of many such institutionalized organizational structures of state control: “Schooling was one of the many extensions of state power that were a feature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, taking its place alongside the creation of public health systems, state pension and insurance schemes, professionalized police forces, publicly owned and operated transportation, communications and power services, and all the other manifestations of what the British sometimes called “gas and water socialism,” whether at the local or the national level” (Osborne, 2008, p. 27).
schooling needs a more clear and strong conceptualization of how power functions than educators generally have: “Such an analysis will examine and recognize how ‘what it means to be a citizen’ is conveyed through the dominant rationality in a given social order” (p. 326). Therefore, Giroux (1983) raises the question of what schooling claims it does, but also “what in fact schools may unintentionally do as institutions that exist in a particular relationship with the state” (p. 327).

From a theoretical lens recognizing the discursive turn, it is evident that “the educational ‘project’ is far greater than mere schooling itself, but rather encompasses the creation of social identities, the maintenance of power relations, and the reorganization of the relationship between a capitalist economic formation, the state and its citizen-subjects” (Mitchell, 2003, p. 391). Schooling functions as an umbrella concept containing different sets of politics and ideologies that come together under the assumption that nation-building requires a compulsory education system. Thus, as a form of socialization, schooling functions within a hegemonic view of institutionalized education as a key part of the functioning of society and of the need for the state to determine and disseminate national narratives for the sake of nation-building. Osborne (2008) identifies that schooling manages to span political leanings. Historically, he argues, conservatives look at schooling as a place for stabilizing society while liberals see schooling as promoting options for all without being at the expense of others. Ultimately, Osborne (2008) argues that public schooling was designed for social policy more so than to establish universal education for the benefit of all children. It served a powerful role in narrating the national imaginary to the populous and

---

38 Fairclough (2004) highlights the importance of framing theories of social construction with a notion of resistance in terms of the dynamic ways in which discourses construct social identities: “Where social constructionism becomes problematic is where it disregards the relative solidity and permanence of social entities, and their resistance to change. Even powerful discourses such as the new discourse of management may meet levels of resistance which result in them being neither enacted nor inculcated to any degree.” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 209)

39 In this sense, and as Adbi and Richardson (2008) argue, education combines a structuralist-functionalist perspective with a particular liberalist perspective so that “education will continue benefitting those whose relationships with these learning paradigms are already privileged and who understand well how to climb the contemporary socio-economic and political ladder” (p. 2).
therefore played a corresponding role of defining who was included and excluded as a citizen\(^{40}\).

**Schooling and Difference: Historicity and Resistance**

Schooling, like citizenship, is defined by a set of contradictions. It is posed as a solution for, originally, the conditions of industrialization and modernization and, now, the problems associated with globalization. It is also an agent for socialization into the modern nation-building project. Thus schooling is provisional and normative. Like Anderson’s (2006) theory of the imagined nation, schooling is generally seen as a normative and neutral reality of society despite the fact that it is defined by and disseminates distinct and diverse ideologies, is subject to various and specific theoretical critiques, and does change and adapt to hegemonic ideologies.

The evocation of the notion of schooling as a site for transformation is held in tension with the premise that schooling is implicated in perpetuating ideologies of exclusion. Indeed, my understanding of the role of public schooling in contemporary democracy is defined by a key paradox. As Glass (2000) points out, public education in democracy accentuates inequities among students and citizens so that educational, social, economic, and political power is unfairly distributed along the lines of class, race, gender and ability: “Yet no other institution besides public education endeavours even to begin to address these issues. Schools, with all their faults and despite questions about their own causal role in the injustices, remain crucial to a hope for creating more fair and equitable communities” (p.

---

\(^{40}\) Citizenship education linked with character education to focus on personal values, and the ideal of citizenship connected to community service including finding ways to bring immigrants into mainstream community (Joshee 2004). Character education was defined by creating a dutiful version of service rather than developing skills and disposition towards political action (Osborne, 2000). And, while schooling tended to be a “form of socialization to the status quo”, Osborne (2000), evoking another pivot-point in the relationship between schooling and socialization points out that it was not monolithically so because citizenship education in the democratic context of Canada has always held the “promise of democracy and change” (Osborne, 2000, p. 18-19). Indeed, negotiation is as much a part of constructing hegemony as is imposition (Osborne, 2000, p. 9).
Tupper’s (2008) writing reflects how applying the discursive turn qualifies and makes visible a contradiction within the promise of democratic education:

That ‘democratic’ should be used to describe education is somewhat misleading, given the role of education in both the colonial project and the suppression of women. While I do not dispute the transformative potential for education, I am aware of the ways in which it has been used as a tool for cultural transmission, as a tool for cultural genocide (residential schools serve as a poignant example of this), and as a tool for the maintenance of the status quo which privileges certain socio-cultural groups at the expense of others. (Tupper, 2008, p. 67)

And, Abdi and Richardson (2008) go so far as to say that, based on the role of schools as “the main agents in the reproduction of the dominant perspectives and practices of life” so as to create and sustain “social hierarchies”, “education must be viewed as overwhelmingly counter-democratic” and thus does not simply require, but “deserves” deconstructive and reconstructive analyses (p. 4). Schooling reproduces inequalities by treating equally students from very different circumstances and who have different orientations towards the future, distinct language systems, particular motivational patterns, and varying access to cultural capital (Olssen, 2002).

Willinsky (1998) speaks to the double-bind of education in the context of its complicity with defining difference. He explains how schooling extends the meaning of difference by developing the ability to identify what distinguishes “civilized” from “primitive”, “West” from “East”, and “first” from “third” worlds so that “[w]e are educated in what we take to be the true nature of difference” (Willinsky, 1998, p. 1). However, there have always been competing ideologies at play in education, and from a theoretical pivot-point perspective, it is evident that “if education can turn a studied distance between people into a fact of nature, education can also help us appreciate how that distance has been constructed to the disadvantage of so many people” (Willinsky, 1998, p. 1-2). Schooling

Discussing citizenship education in New Zealand, Olssen (2002) connects education to the development of a vision of citizenship that is encapsulated in the emergence of the welfare state’s insistence on universality and equal opportunity. He identifies a problem with the social democratic conception of equality presumed through citizenship in that “injustice arises as much from treating unequals equally as it does from assuring equal access to the opportunities available in society” (p. 11). Thus he also identifies a criticism of education in a unified state system based on curriculum structures and assessment practices that are anything but neutral.
plays a strong role in relaying dominant ideologies at the same time that it represents an institutionalized space for the deconstruction of colonial narratives. Therefore, the concepts of historicity, complicity, and situatedness are crucial. Indeed, in the context of the new imperialism, Tikly (2004) promotes the importance of education as it is a “key site for discursive struggle over versions of social reality”: “[D]iscourses about the nature of social reality and of human nature itself, including those about education and development provide the bricks and mortar, the final recourse in relation to which hegemony and counter-hegemony are constructed and contested” (Tikly, 2004, p. 178).

If schooling can be the site of discursive struggles, then it can also be a site for discursive domination. Schooling is a tool for colonization in that there is a continued replication of socio-economic inequities globally, and teachers and students participate in the cultural and political legacies of colonialism (Asher & Durand, 2012). Freire (1998) warns against any neutral vindication of schooling as a vehicle for social transformation insisting that “[e]ducation [is] a specifically human experience, is a form of intervention in the world” (p. 90-91). Evoking the theoretical pivot-point, he asserts the importance of recognizing the dominant ideology along with its unmasking: “The dialectical nature of the educational process does not allow it to be only one or the other of these things” (Freire, 1998, p. 91). Indeed, “Education never was, is not, and never can be neutral or indifferent in regard to the reproduction of the dominant ideology or the interrogation of it” (p. 91). The transformative potential of education lies in its ability to expose taken-for-granted ideologies. Through education, new ways of knowing can be encouraged along with those that have been silenced in the past; this can contribute towards promoting alternative ways of imagining what the future can or should be (Asher & Durand, 2012). Thus, it is essential that any critical approach to pedagogy or education for critical consciousness account for the link between historical configurations of social forms and the way they work subjectively (Mohanty, 1990).

Thus, theorists have challenged the predication of schooling’s role in developing citizens through “Western discourses that are intent upon collapsing citizenship education into notions of ‘imagined consensus’” (Camicia & Franklin, 2011, p. 311). Postcolonial theorists probe the ways that schooling intends to achieve consensus as it names, classifies
and sorts so as to perpetuates relations of domination and subjugation: “Discourses of community, whether local, national, or global, direct curriculum reform and the notions of community contained within curriculum” (Camicia & Franklin, 2011, p. 311). Indeed, different and competing visions of community, what constitutes the local, national, and global community, remain a key tension inherent to educational policy and resources. Ultimately, applying the discursive turn, schooling is therefore situated in a Western, modern project of liberal nation-building. Contestations of its role in emphasizing exclusions reinforces that it is a partial discourse. Schooling mirrors both how the nation is imagined and how citizenship functions as a normative discourse.

Schooling, Citizenship Education and the Global Imperative: Praxis

As an inherited field from citizenship and a conjoint field with schooling, citizenship education is therefore characterized by theoretical and conceptual ambiguity and is also a discursive site for contending ideological and political positions. The extremely wide and prolific writing on citizenship education in scholarship and policy over the past twenty years is evidence of the persistence of citizenship as a key discourse in the organization and understanding of contemporary democracy despite being a contested field (Sears & Hyslop-Marginson, 2007). A main source of theoretical attention is the issue of difference and recognition. Chapter Three referred to the complex ways citizenship has been conceptualized in relation to the imagined community of the nation-state and the intersecting political philosophy and ideological tenets of liberalism. The discourse of rights and recognition respond to inherent tensions and paradoxes of imagining community that emerge in particular ways through the application of liberalism and corresponding claims and contestations. It is not surprising that the conceptual and theoretical complexities defining citizenship theory are inherited in the field of citizenship education. Indeed, the topic of education and schooling serves as a praxis space for the application of larger conceptualizations of nationhood and citizenship, and thus theoretical work in this area provides further insights into the tensions and ambiguities that define the larger discursive field of citizenship.
According to Barr (2005), there is widespread agreement that schools play a crucial role in educating future citizens; however, there is great disagreement as to what citizens should be like, and what curriculum and pedagogy is best suited to “achieving effective citizenship” (Barr, 2005, p. 55). It is a main topic of attention across Western, liberal democracies; however, as Sears (2000) points out, “although democratic citizenship shares common features across the world, it is not generic but always located in a particular context which shapes both the institutional and social form it takes” (Sears, 2009, p. 2). Sears and Hughes (1996) argue that in North America, the main subject through which educating for citizenship has been exercised is social studies, “at first history and geography, later sociology, political science, and economics” (p. 124). And, although educating for citizenship is central to social studies policies, curricula, and resources, they note a total lack of consensus regarding conceptualizations of citizenship; this tension is embedded in the ongoing debate about the purposes of social studies: “This debate continues, in part at least, because citizenship, as it is used in the field, is a contested concept” (Sears & Hughes, 1996, p. 124). Thus, a theoretical engagement with citizenship education is characterized by the pivot point; it is a dominant discourse in general educational rationales and in specific social studies curricula at the same time that it is a conceptually ambiguous and theoretically contested concept. Indeed, Tully (2008) talks about the intersecting fields of citizenship and globalization, so education generally, and citizenship education specifically becomes another field of intersection. Schooling for citizenship becomes a discursive field for determining practical questions. For example, what should students learn about globalization and what kind of citizens schools should be developing to meet the characterizations of the 21st century context of globalization?

**Citizenship Education in the Global Imperative:**

**Conjoining Discursive Fields**

The philosophical challenges of deciding how to educate citizens in the contemporary context of globalization inherits the tensions and conceptual ambiguities of globalization discourse, and particular tensions become apparent when intersecting with discourses of schooling. Although there is much scholarship theorizing how best to reform education to better fit the demands of globalization, Agbaria (2011) laments the lack of attention to just
how the global imperative is being framed and rendered (Agbaria, 2011, p. 58). The question of schooling for global citizenship is thus caught in the conceptual and ideological complexities marking the discursive field of globalization (Davies et al., 2005, p. 69) and its conjoining field of citizenship (Tully, 2006). Across the citizenship education literature there is no challenge to the assumption that schooling ought to attend to globalization and to encourage learning about globalization. Yet, there are significant conceptual ambiguities and ideological complexities regarding exactly what globalization is, what it means for schooling and citizenship, and how to address it through schooling. The discursive turn is key to understanding the global imperative in education as Agbaria (2011) argues that globalization is essentially “discourse driven”; language plays a significant role in the context of understanding and making sense of contemporary globalization in education: “the vocabulary used to frame and render globalization is endowed with the performative power to bring into being the global realities it claims to inform” (Agbaria, 2011, p. 67). Thus, there is a global imperative in education, but it is conceptually ambiguous and is characterized by the multiple meanings and ideologies attributed to globalization as a discursive field.

There is a strong sense that schooling must take-up the contemporary global context, and this is coupled by a body of scholarship drawing attention to the problematic way a neutral and normative understanding of globalization stands in for what is a complex discursive field. This tension is manifested in assumptions about what constitutes the global or cosmopolitan classroom. A corresponding assumption is that at the basic level, globalization has led to more diversity in the classroom which is therefore more cosmopolitan in the sense of enabling students to be open to and able to interact with a variety of world cultures (Burns, 2008, p. 354). In this sense, cosmopolitanism, as linked with the global imperative, is all about mixing with a range of people from different cultural backgrounds as part of students’ daily life experiences. This begs the question again, is a “global” or “cosmopolitan” classroom different from a multicultural one?
Ideologies of Globalization and Citizenship Education: Double-Crises

Reflecting the conjoined discursive fields of citizenship and globalization, citizenship education discourse reflects particular versions of globalization. Much recent scholarly literature has raised concerns with the influence of neoliberalism on education generally, and citizenship education more specifically (e.g., Joshee, 2004; Mitchell, 2003; Shultz, 2007). Schooling thus is a space of praxis where wider theories of globalization are interpreted through applied concepts regarding the what and how of K-12 schooling. Agbaria (2011) defines the global imperative in education when he points to the large amount of literature “examining how globalization has been influencing education and how we can reform education to better fit the economic, political, cultural and ethical demands of globalization” (Agbaria, 2011, p. 58).

Conceptualizing schooling in the global imperative is situated in particular provisions of time and space. Ball (2008) conceptualizes a spatial dimension to the global imperative by identifying a strong sense of urgency reflected in calls for new policies which “reflects the space and time compressions of globalization itself” (p. 197). In the context of neoliberal versions of globalization, pressures of the global market subordinate the idea of education for social good and moral citizenship. Instead, a neoliberal view promotes the human capital vision of the knowledge economy where education creates new kinds of labour to meet market needs (Ball, 2008, p. 198). Furthermore, reflecting the way neoliberalism adjusts the Enlightenment dynamic of citizenship as expressed through the contract between a protecting state and loyal citizen, the discourse of new education for the 21st century global economy focuses on the individual as self-contained. In order to meet the needs of the “new economies we must be constantly learning and ‘updating’ ourselves, making ourselves relevant, having the right skills, making ourselves employable” (Ball, 2008, p. 199). Thus at

---

42 Another spatial dimension of schooling involves the space where schooling occurs. I distinguish between a more general concept of education as dissemination and engagement with knowledge processes and schooling as a state institution for teaching and learning. Education can transcend the confines of a classroom. Thus education and schooling are not necessarily synonymous (Giroux, 2003, p. 38). Indeed, as Derrida (2002) reminds us, “[schooling] occupies only a limited time and space in the experience of the subject, citizen or not, who has access to the image outside school, at home, or anywhere” (p. 60).

43 Ball (2008) does point out the tendency to exaggerate the extent to which a knowledge economy is tied to actual employment.
the same time as the spatial dimension of citizenship education broadens to engage with the
global market, it reduces the social contract to individualization: “this [version of learning] is
a responsibility passed from the state to learner…” (Ball, 2008, p. 199). In a similar vein,
Schattle (2008) considers that an economic imperative has become conflated with a civic
imperative so that capitalism is a necessary condition for democracy:

Civic competence as an ideal increasingly has been fused with a _laissez-faire_ outlook on the world economy. The economic arrangements typically associated with neoliberalism—deregulation, privatization, free trade, and cuts in taxes and public services—are justified by advocates of unfettered global capitalism as necessary routes for expanding and sustaining peace, freedom and democracy. (Schattle, 2008, p. 83)

The results of this neoliberalization of the Enlightenment dynamic of citizenship impact the
spatial dimensions of schooling for citizenship in the 21st century. Inheriting the tensions of
the wider context discussed in the last chapter, neoliberalism also forecloses more social
justice orientations to collective rights and equity initiatives in education such as
multiculturalism.

Ultimately, contemporary education policy is two-faced. One face looks at an
imaginary past of the imagined community defined by ideas of traditional values and social
order through shared heritage (Ball, 2008). In this view, schools reinforce social boundaries.
The other face looks towards an imagined future “of a knowledge economy, high skills,
innovation and creativity and a meritocracy within which social boundaries are erased” (Ball,
2008, p. 206). This dualism explains the complexities of theorizing schooling in the current
global imperative. The two faces harken back to the original tensions inherent to imagining
community through which the nation became a metanarrative. It is both open and closed,
sovereign and limited, and historical and new (Anderson, 2006). Similarly, the two-faces of
education policy in the contemporary context of globalization reflect a set of fixed national
and social identities and also a post-national world (Ball, 2008, p. 206). While Ball (2008)
promotes a view that sees the connections in the world as “flexible and fluid, within which
identities can be continually remade”, the question of how those connections are iterated,
performed, and constructed through different ideologies remains salient (p. 206). Different
ideologies of global interconnectedness reflect the tensions inherent to imagining community through an outward and inward looking vision of the inclusion-exclusion dynamic.

An outward looking perspective on interconnectivity can be tied to the new imperialism through the outward looking version of nation-building. In neoliberal terms, nation-building occurs through global markets. A neoliberal version of interconnections is problematic from the standpoint of democratic education: “Idealizing the global as a novel process of interconnectedness conceals inequality and disguises the long-standing interdependence and imbalanced power relations among countries, regions, and cultures” (Agbaria, 2011, p. 70). The imagined community is also defined by an inward looking version of the inclusion-exclusion dynamic. Agbaria (2011) points out that the discourse of globalization impacts the way that schooling looks inward in terms of interconnections between different groups. Agbaria (2011) links the strong discourse of school reforms to a growing perception that schools are performing poorly and/or are not meeting the demands of the “new global economy”: “The difficulties schools face are compounded by another growing perception that now they must not only provide skills for the information age but also prepare students for effective citizenship in multicultural societies battling poverty and inequality, escalating social problems, and the breakdown of civility” (Agbaria, 2011, p. 63). In this sense, the citizenship dynamic is shifted to a more individualistic manifestation in neoliberalism while social justice concepts of rights and recognition remain salient.

Thus, the global imperative exerts pressures on citizenship education. Indeed, schooling and citizenship education in the contemporary context of the global imperative reflect what Agbaria (2011) calls a “double crisis of both performance and legitimacy” (p. 63, citing Boyd, 2003). Social studies (the curricular home of citizenship education) must meet the global economic challenge. It must emphasize economic issues and skills valued under neoliberalism. It must also prepare students (by emphasizing multicultural content) for effective citizenship in multicultural societies in which poverty and inequality are problems and there are perceived escalating social problems. This is another tension in the spatial dimension of educating the 21st century citizen. Schooling needs to respond to and engage in globalization from above the level of the nation-state at the same time that it must account for
the perceived growing diversity from within the nation-state attributed to processes of globalization.

McCollum (2002) also identifies social, political, and economic challenges facing societies today and defining discussions around citizenship education. Reflecting the complex theorizing of citizenship and the politics of difference and identity reviewed in Chapter Three, she evokes the theoretical pivot point and the new imperialism. As discussed in Chapter Three, Tikly (2004) identifies two strands of the new imperialism a) a new context of western domination through globalization, and b) the emergence of the discursive turn in social studies which enables a critical analysis of these processes. Similarly, McCollum (2002) notes two strands of challenges in citizenship education in the global imperative. At the same time that under neoliberalism there is “the inadequate accommodation of social equity with cultural diversity”, there is also “the politics and theory of postmodernism, which challenge traditional, static notions of culture, identity, and the nation-state” (p. 170). She argues that people are more open to recognizing cultural and moral diversity, and yet, a major contemporary problem facing society today remains how to connect the legitimacy of cultural diversity to corresponding social equities.

Indeed, the struggles and ambiguity inherent to the contemporary context of the intersecting discursive fields of citizenship and globalization can be applied through praxis to education. Correspondingly, much is demanded of citizenship education in the context of the global imperative (Pashby, 2006; 2008). Osborne (2008) expresses both the precarious and ambivalent position of citizenship education and its imagined possibilities:

Democratic citizenship in an increasingly interdependent world, in which some of the most important challenges we face increasingly transcend national borders and call into question national sovereignties, demands more than socialization to what exists, training in useful skills, and indoctrination in the conventional wisdom of the day…today the questions facing democratic citizens demand a range of knowledge, a capacity for thought and reflection, an ability to listen and debate, a respect for reason and justice, a reasoned (though not unconditional) respect for the beliefs and values of others, a disposition to participate in public life, and the skills needed to apply these principles to specific cases and to live with the ambiguities and contradictions that may arise. (Osborne, 2008, p. 32)
Osborne’s (2008) characterization of the complex conceptual realities of constructing citizenship education in the context of the global imperative raises the application of the cosmopolitan turn in education. Similarly to the calls for new, flexible models of citizenship (Pashby, 2008), much is demanded of schooling in the context of the global imperative. The tensions inherent to what constitutes the political-spatial framework of citizenship education are highly contingent on the fact that K-12 schooling was created by and is run by state institutions. As in their construction as tools of the state to respond to the great changes associated with industrialization, schools present both a solution for key issues and an extension of the complexities of the current global context.

**Citizenship Education in the Cosmopolitan Turn:**

**Global Citizenship Education**

In Chapter Four I discussed how Tully (2008) theorizes that through the concept of global citizenship, cosmopolitanism becomes a discursive space for the conjoining of the fields of globalization and citizenship. Reflecting Strand’s (2010b) notion of cosmopolitanism in the making, there are many versions of the cosmopolitanism being applied to citizenship education in such a way as to reframe citizenship education’s assumed national allegiance: e.g. post-national, world citizenship, cosmopolitan education, global citizenship education (GCE)\(^4\). According to Andreotti and Souza (2011), the concept of GCE is prominent in Europe and the Americas. The concept represents distinct agendas, and different theoretical frameworks inform discourses attributing different meanings to the words global, citizenship, and education resulting in different curricula and initiatives in education. However, GCE can be defined, in varied contexts, through the trend of encouraging educators to “bring the world into their classrooms” and/or promoting and deliberating global issues and perspectives in the curriculum (Andreotti & Souza, 2011, p. 1).

\(^4\) For the purpose of this thesis, I include all literature speaking to global orientations to citizenship education in my review of global citizenship education. However, I acknowledge that there are particular debates about terminology, especially between cosmopolitan citizenship and global citizenship education (see Evans et al., 2009, p. 19).
Global Education and Citizenship Education: 
Joining the Fields

According to Davies, Evans, and Reid (2005), “[g]lobalisation, internationalisation and cosmopolitanism are key features of contemporary debate. Forms of education mirror and contribute to these debates” (p. 66). They pose the question, “how to come to grips with the changing nature of citizenship in a globalising world?” (p. 72). GCE is a possible field through which to answer this question through a combination of the fields of global education and citizenship education. They see GCE as an evolving and as of yet unrealized concept, but one with some important possibilities. They remain concerned that GCE “resist simplistic notions that may suggest that educational responses to globalisation can be achieved merely by adding international content or token global education type activities to citizenship education programmes” (Davies et al., p. 85). There is overlap between the fields, but they are distinct in terms of origins and foci with global education being more political: “Citizenship education seems to emphasize either community based involvement or classroom based cognitive reflection. Global education tends (not exclusively) towards the affective” (Davies et al., 2005, p. 84). Indeed, global education is more fragmented given that it draws from a much wider base, and yet, it also seems to be more obviously engaged with issues that “require immediate and perhaps radical attention” (84).

Davies et al. (2005) point to the work of Pike and Selby whose Global Teacher, Global Learner (1988) was very influential in England. Pike and Selby moved to Canada and promoted global education at the OISE/University of Toronto in the 1990s. Looking at some of their work, it evidently contributes to the point made by Davies et al. (2005) regarding the broad basis of global education. Pike and Selby’s (1999) framework of global education is based strongly in systems theory in that it prioritizes relations and theorizes the “multifaceted and interlocking threads of global education theory and practice” (p. 12). They articulate a set of intersecting dimensions that encompass global education: spatial, issues, and temporal. These three dimensions interact through what they call an inner dimension. The inner dimension characterizes the two “complementary pathways” of global education: the journey outwards and the journey inwards. Ideally they are experienced simultaneously (Pike & Selby, 1999, p. 13). Pike and Selby’s (1999) work can be seen as an instigation of the field of
global citizenship education which would proliferate in the early 21st century. They proposed that “the issues dimension suggests a rethinking of curriculum so that students are better prepared to respond constructively to the challenges of global citizenship” (Pike & Selby, 1999, p. 13). Also, the temporal dimension of global education focuses on the interactions between phases of time: “past, present, and future are not discrete periods but are deeply embedded, one within another” (Pike & Selby, 1999, p. 13). Significantly, the temporal dimension reflects a degree of skepticism towards the certainty and know-ability of the traditional modern, liberal version of educating citizens. They encourage the skills of “coping with change and uncertainty” and the attitude of “tolerance of ambiguity and uncertainty” (Pike & Selby, 1999, p. 16).

Overall, Pike and Selby’s (1990) framework of intersecting dimensions of global education represents an important movement towards a social justice, diversity, and equity model. It is an integrated approach that responds to and seeks to interrogate the relationship between globalization, citizenship, and schooling. Davies et al. (2005) take-up the invitation to global citizenship in Pike and Selby’s global education work by distinguishing global education from citizenship education and at the same time suggesting that bringing the two fields together can encourage transformation within traditional citizenship education and add legitimacy to global education. According to Davies et al. (2005), citizenship education is given higher legitimation than global education and has a more established place in curriculum. A main rationale for bringing together citizenship education and global education is actually related to the conceptual ambiguities inherent to the discursive field of globalization. Davies et al. (2005) acknowledge the difficulties in characterizing the nature of globalization, but argue that it does “exist, its nature can be described and it has significant potential to impact upon the nature of education that is experienced” (p. 69): “The need to recognise the potential, and need, for new forms of education is a central part of what we are suggesting” (Davies et al., 2005, p. 69).
Global Citizenship Education:

Key Themes

Davies et al. (2005) identify an agenda for bringing together global education and citizenship education, and correspondingly there has been a large amount of scholarly writing in educational journals, book compilations, conference papers, and symposiums devoted to GCE. Andreotti (2011b) articulates that “[t]he different meanings attributed to ‘global citizenship education’ depend on contextually situated assumptions about globalisation, citizenship and education that prompt questions about boundaries, flows, power relations, belonging, rights, responsibilities, otherness, interdependence, as well as social reproduction and/or contestation” (Andreotti, 2011b, p. 307). Marshall (2011) adds that GCE discourse must be understood as operating within normative structures and dominant ideologies; furthermore, despite differences in types and agendas of GCE, there are similarities that define conceptualizations of GCE, “especially when placed in Western, liberal-economic country contexts.” (Marshall, 2011, p. 415). Indeed, my reading of the international scholarly literature on GCE encompasses a broad range from more liberalist and humanistic frameworks (e.g., Nussbaum, 2002b; Noddings 2004) to more critical frameworks (e.g., Andreotti, 2006; Andreotti et al., 2010; Pike, 2008c; Richardson, 2008b; Shultz, 2007).

Some overarching concepts define a loose synopsis of common themes in the scholarly literature on GCE. A global approach to citizenship education in recent scholarly work recognizes that urgent and troubling issues are global in scope: e.g. poverty, global warming, AIDS, racism, wars (Banks, 2004; Ghosh, 2008; Noddings, 2004; Nussbaum, 2002c; Richardson, 2008b). Thus, there is a moral imperative for extending a notion of citizenship to those outside of our national borders (Basile, 2005; Noddings, 2004). There is a push for students to gain a sense of agency and action that goes beyond charity and includes structural critiques of social issues (Davies, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2004; Shultz, 2007). Pike (2008a) theorizes that GCE “challenge[s] educators to acknowledge the ever-changing patterns of relationships among human communities, and between humans and their environments, and to help students explore the implications of such trends in terms of their rights and responsibilities, their allegiances and loyalties, and their opportunities for meaningful participation” (p. 45-46). Many scholars writing about GCE argue for a new
approach that resists the trend of educational materials being overwhelmingly Western-American-Global North-centric. These materials problematically emphasize neoliberal values of consumerism over critical democratic engagement while celebrating globalization from above (Pike, 2008a; Talbert, 2005; Kachur, 2008). Concurrently, schools are seen as a strategic place for promoting a commitment to social justice (Glass, 2000; Pike, 2008a; 2008c; White, 2005) and for developing a global sense of community: “Schools are places where people learn inclusiveness, civil courage, and how to live in communities encompassing diverse relationships” (Abdi & Shultz, 2008, p. 8-9).

As a concept, global citizenship in education recognizes that contemporary processes of globalization problematize homogenous notions of national citizenship. Increases in the mobility and movements of peoples who spend parts of their lives in different nation-states and who have multiple loyalties and commitments challenge previously taken-for-granted notions of the monolithic nation-state. Therefore, according to the literature, through GCE, schooling can engage with contemporary complex experiences of citizenship and identity (Pashby, 2011a citing Banks, 2004b; Banks, 2009; Castles, 2004; Davies, 2006; Guilherme, 2002; McIntosh, 2004; Osler & Starkey, 2003; Pike, 2008a; Scott & Lawson, 2002). GCE concepts and pedagogies are generally premised on the importance of being explicit about epistemological perspectives and cultural norms in order to promote engagement with “the links between conflict and interpretations of culture” (Davies, 2006, p. 6). This engagement also promotes an understanding of how different topics and disciplines of study are interrelated (Basile, 2005). In this sense, GCE promotes the creation of new “legends” of the relationship between the local and the global (Pike, 2008c, p. 226), or as Willinsky (1998) articulates it, “Where is here?” (p. 241). The more critical work on GCE distinguishes from humanistic soft liberal approaches and uses an explicit discourse of social transformation (Andreotti, 2006). Critical GCE work aims to empower individuals to go beyond a benevolent discourse of helping. Critical GCE promotes recognition of complicity within

45 I have argued that the scholarly writing is limited in that it is largely written from within that same geo-political context (Pashby, 2011a).

46 For example: “The global economy (really meaning the U.S. idea of free-trade) is expanding at the expense of human rights and environmental protection. And where else but in social education lays the foundation for an alternative to this dehumanizing, demeaning, and homogenizing movement?” (White, 2005, p. 79).
geopolitical power relations. In critical GCE approaches, students are led to think differently and to reflect critically on the legacies and processes of their own cultures and contexts so that they can imagine different futures and take ethical responsibility for their actions and decisions (Andreotti, 2006; see also Eidoo et al., 2011).

Instrumentalist Agendas and the Double Crisis of Educating Global Citizens

There is a distinction between how GCE is conceptualized in scholarly work and how it is articulated in curriculum, policy documents, and teaching resources (Evans et al., 2009). Pike and Selby’s (1999) work attempts to connect the theoretical dimensions of global education with practical dimensions. The work in GCE has continued to be marked by an interplay between theory and practice. There are interpretations of theoretical considerations in broader scholarly work in philosophy, sociology, political sciences, postcolonial studies, etc. The interplay of these interpretations direct the work in conceptualizing GCE and in applying it through grass-roots efforts on the part of educators and NGOs doing GCE in practice. In this sense, GCE has inherited the broad basis of global education critiqued by Davies et al. (2005). With such a broad umbrella for all the work being called GCE in theory and in practice, it is helpful to try to articulate some distinctions.

Marshall (2009) provides a useful way to conceptualize the competing agendas within the broad agenda for GCE in practice in K-12 schooling in the U.K. She identifies a significant tension in GCE materials and in the calls for GCE in media that echoes Agbaria’s (2011) theory of the double-crisis of performativity (competing in the global economy) and legitimacy (responding to the growing diversity and social inequities resulting from globalization). She finds two key instrumentalist agendas within GCE discourse. The first, “technical-economic instrumentalism” is based in pragmatism and reflects an arguably neoliberal understanding of legal structures, rights, responsibilities that focuses on equipping learners for participation in the global economy. The second is “global social-justice instrumentalism” which she says is more emotional and arguably more of an “active” commitment to and understanding of economic, political, legal, cultural injustice (Marshall, 2009, p. 255). Interestingly, her distinction mirrors the Enlightenment dynamic of reasoned
logic and emotional camaraderie that is the basis of the modern citizenship contract (Richardson, 2002b). Despite the fact that there are other agendas at play, and that these two are complex and “increasingly indistinguishable”, “the dualism is nevertheless helpful for exploring conceptualizations of and relationships among post-national citizenship educations in the UK and elsewhere” (Marshall, 2009, p. 255). For example, Marshall (2009) points out that the social justice agendas have comparatively reduced influence in comparison to economic-instrumentalist agendas. This is reflected in the push for notions of equity in much of the GCE literature.

When examining the breadth of literature on the importance of criticality in GCE, a question arises as to what extent an instrumentalist agenda for global social justice reflects a soft as opposed to a critical version of GCE (Andreotti, 2006). Furthermore, Marshall (2009) acknowledges that from a certain view, one that I would argue represents the discursive turn, the economic-social justice binary represents a false dichotomy. Both the technical-economic and global social justice agendas “are based upon an exclusionary underlying principles upheld by a legal, liberal-democratic ideological and political stance, value system, and understanding and experience of human rights” (Marshall, 2009, p. 255). In this sense, both agendas are instrumental to the modernist project of citizenship which itself is based on an inclusion/exclusion paradox. In the previous chapter I outlined a tension between abstract universalism tied with economic imperative from above and concrete, rooted moral commitment from below. In a similar way, Marshall’s (2009) identification of the false dichotomy of the technical-economic and global social justice instrumentalism combines with Agbaria’s (2011) evocation of the double crisis of globalization in education (pressure from above to be competitive in global market, diversity from below needs to be responded to). Within a Western, modern, liberal framework, there is the potential for false binaries through an overstated sense of globalization causing homogenization from above and through a romanticization of the local below (Burns, 2008).

Marshall (2009) includes the discourse of action as part of the global-justice instrumentalist agenda, and it is also prominent in the GCE literature in terms of defining how it joins citizenship with global education. Indeed, evidently, according to my summary of the GCE scholarly literature, the largest impulse in the literature reflects the global social
justice agenda and resists the technical-economic agenda. For example, in examining the move from a global studies approach in social studies to global *citizenship* education, Davies (2006) notes that the addition of the term *citizenship* confirms a direct concern with social justice above minimal interpretations of global education’s goals of “international awareness” or helping students to become more “well rounded” (p. 6). She contends that as citizenship involves implications of rights, responsibilities, duties, and entitlements, GCE implies a more *active* role (Davies, 2006, p. 6). In light of the concerns about citizenship education moving away from social justice orientations towards an emphasis on neoliberal principles of social cohesion and corporate ideology, much of the writings on GCE call for a reclamation of an activist commitment. Thus GCE emerges as a corrective to globalization as defined by neoliberal politics and global economic players. As Talbert (2005) insists, “To challenge the notion of global democratic citizenship as defined by corporate power blocs, it is essential for the social studies educator and student of the 21st century to explore and inquire in a way that will lead far from the isolated Western notion of democracy and citizenship” (p. 52-53).

A discourse of action can be problematic when it relays the assumption that every student can engage in their democratic context in the same ways and when it ignores the differentiation of social and political capital and position among students in public education (Kennelly & Llewellyn, 2011). Indeed, the notion of action inherent to GCE inherits the spatial tensions of the cosmopolitan turn. Mitchell and Parker (2008) contribute that in terms of conceptualizing citizenship in the global imperative, space is not an empty container in which social action occurs, but rather constructions of spatial dimensions of citizenship produce social action and vice versa “in a mutually constitutive dynamic” (p. 799). Marshall (2011) points out that a unifying feature amongst different types of GCE is the assumption of global interconnectivity which is very much a part of the social imagination of global citizenship: “…global citizenship education discourse rarely recognises that this presumed ‘empirical reality’ is entrenched within a liberal-democratic framework that assumes all citizens have the same rights, opportunities and responsibilities, when some marginalised communities and individuals in the world experience a very different lived-reality” (Marshall, 2011, p. 415). This raises a significant tension in the widely held
conceptualization of global citizenship as an extension from local and national citizenship and as an agenda for citizenship action.

**GCE in National Schooling:**

**The Paradox of Modernity**

Indeed, global orientations to citizenship education are implicated in the dynamic and conceptually ambivalent relationship between the national and the global evident in cosmopolitan discourse, what Delanty (2006) calls the paradox of modernity. The paradox is embedded in the double crisis of performativity (in global markets) and legitimacy (in complex multicultural contexts) (Agbaria, 2011). Mitchell and Parker (2008) point out that Nussbaum’s insistence on prioritizing cosmopolitanism over patriotism is another example of a false binary of instrumentalism. Echoing my review of the conflation of liberal (Kymlicka) and universal (Nussbaum) theories of cosmopolitanism, they highlight the way that conceptual tensions and ideological contentions around the spatial dimension of global citizenship education fail to make explicit problematic assumptions regarding students’ sense of their global identities:

Instead of viewing children and youth as unformed, unaware, and hence supremely malleable subjects who should be educated into firmly scaled positions as world citizens (as preferred by Nussbaum) or into national citizens (as desired by her many critics), educators might notice and validate their transient and flexible understanding of scale and allegiance and interrogate the relationship of these to the macro structuring forces of global capitalism and geopolitics. (Mitchell & Parker, 2008, p. 799-780)

Mitchell and Parker (2008) argue that debating between national or cosmopolitan citizenship in education de-historicizes the relationship of citizens with spatial dimensions. It also de-historicizes how schools connect with citizen formation and how citizen formation is influenced by geopolitics. Ultimately, they acknowledge a sympathetic allegiance with Nussbaum’s notion of the cosmopolitan citizen, “for it seeks to trouble the national container present in virtually all discussions of civic education, thereby opening new possibilities for imagining a more democratic future. But its binary needs to be questioned, too, to the extent that it forecloses this potential” (Mitchell & Parker, 2008, p. 780). Thus, particularly in the context of neoliberalism where questions of diversity and equity are interpreted in terms of
economic and entrepreneurial strategies and neoliberal versions of interconnectivity at best, and completely overpowered by an economic instrumentalist agenda at worst, there is a degree to which GCE theorists use the lens of global citizenship to reclaim social justice versions of liberalism. There is the possibility that a GCE agenda could fall into the false dichotomy of economic versus social justice instrumentalism by promoting what amount to soft versions of GCE based in neutral, modernist assumptions. However, despite this, there is a critical and resistant impulse that unites much of the GCE literature and suggests that asserting social justice in specifically, strategically, and reflexively global rather than national orientations creates or allows for the creation of critical spaces from which to resist neoliberalism.

It is important to situate the two instrumentalist views identified by Marshall (2009) in a normalized assumption of the linear expansion model of citizenship. A main criticism of the liberal and universal categories of cosmopolitan citizenship reviewed in the previous chapter is the consistent neutral basis in a national to global linear expansion model of broadening citizenship. Indeed, the extension model is a normative conceptual framework (Richardson, 2002a). In his widely cited article (including in Alberta curriculum documents), Osborne 2000 expresses a strong version of global citizenship education as linear progression: “the spatial dimension of citizenship recognizes that citizenship is not one single locus of identity, but that citizens are members of various overlapping communities – local, regional, national, and global.”(Osborne, 2000, p. 72). Despite the debates about how the global level is imagined, the national community holds the most salience in terms of citizenship. Pike (2000) argues that a key problem in global education is the lack of attention to the continuing influence of national culture. Osborne (2008) notes that the spatial dimension of citizenship can acknowledge overlapping political communities (local, national, global), but the nation remains the strongest spatial frame: “internationalists and cosmopolitans of various stripes make a …case [about developing world citizens]. However, the nation-state is here to stay, at least for the foreseeable future, and the task of schooling is to produce national citizens who understand that their nation co-exists with others in a world of nations and who are committed to democratic principles” (p. 32). Indeed, the centricity of the nation raises questions of “how and under what conditions it is possible for schools to take up the task of educating for global citizenship” (Richardson, 2008a, p. 57).
Applying the discursive turn, it is important to consider how imagining a global citizenship community is rooted in the narratives of nation-building, especially given the prevalence of the linear extension model. Richardson (2008a) argues that “In part, [the] failure to understand the pivotal role national culture plays in globalization is the product of the deep structures of Western education” (Richardson, 2008a, p. 57). Drawing on Willinsky (1998), he asserts that “these deep structures are specifically and intentionally imperial and organized around “learning to divide the world” in such a way that Western privilege is reinforced and reproduced in schools” (Richardson, 2008a, p. 57). Andreotti and Souza (2011) articulate a similar postcolonial critique of soft versions of GCE:

Some of [the] initiatives to produce global subjectivities [in GCE] tend to prescribe the adoption of strategies that very often foreclose the complex historical, cultural and political nature of the issues, identities and perspectives embedded in global/local processes and events and in the production of knowledge about the self, the other, and the world; in spite of the complexity of contemporary globalization, many of these [GCE] initiatives seem to echo the simplistic us/them, here/there binarism denounced and addressed by postcolonial critiques decades ago. (Andreotti & Souza, 2011, p. 1)

Therefore, it is important to consider how conceptualizations of GCE imagine the nation and how global citizenship is imagined from a national framework of state-run schooling: “And these questions are made all the more complex given the persistence of the nation as both a disciplining structure of civic engagement and a symbolic force of affiliation” (Richardson 2008a, 57). Despite the challenges associated with theorizing GCE in national context, Richardson (2008a) “suggest[s] that there are emergent conceptions of global citizenship that offer students ways in which they might reimagine themselves as involved actors in a global civic society” (p. 57). An important element of reconceptualizing political community through GCE is reorienting the civic imaginary away from exclusions of others and from the “xenophobic language that promotes the construction of a menacing foreign Other as the chief focus of civic and national identity” (Richardson, 2008a, p. 60). Thus, Richardson (2008a) connects back to the tension inherent spatial outward-inward/exclusion-inclusion boundaries framing imagined nations. This raises the question to what extent does revising

47 They cite Andreotti, 2006; 2010; 2011; Andreotti and Souza 2008; Andreotti, Jefferess, Pashby, Rowe, Tarc & Taylor 2010; Souza and Andreotti 2009)
the civic imaginary through global citizenship impact on how others are constructed in a domestic multicultural context?

Given the argument made in the previous section of the chapter that global orientations to citizenship education are associated at least with an assertion of a social justice agenda against a dominating technical-economic agenda, and that critical spaces are possible therein, another question arises: to what extent does the global social justice agenda of GCE influence the multicultural context of the double crisis of globalization? Is the perceived crisis of responding to the external influence of the global market and the internal crisis of increasing demographic diversity shaped by the instrumentalist dualism identified by Marshall (2009)? In other words, is GCE implicated in a false binary pivoting around a normative and diagnostic wheel between neoliberalism and social justice without interrogating the underlying modernist assumptions on which that wheel is anchored? Furthermore, exactly who is the assumed subject of global citizenship education (Pashby, 2011a)?

These questions raise attention to the relevancy of the extension model of citizenship in the lived realities of students. Richardson (2008a) argues that research is starting to show that students are already thinking of themselves as global citizens (see also Myers, 2006). Burns’s (2008) point out that some versions of cosmopolitanism fails to acknowledge who has access to cosmopolitanism in the context of neoliberalism reminds those of us theorizing GCE us to be careful about the assumptions made around students’ civic subjectivities. Indeed, Taylor (2011) reminds us “A global citizenship education of ‘bringing the world into our classrooms’ forgets that our classrooms are always already in this world” and in the context of the new imperialism that inherits geo-political power relations written through social categories and identities (p. 177, see also Dillabough & Kennelly, 2010). Todd (2010) also understands the cosmopolitan turn in education as a response to “the real, on-the-ground issues currently being articulated around questions of citizenship, belonging, and intercultural exchange” (p. 244). Connecting back to the quotation that started this chapter (Benhabib, 2008), she cites controversies around the wearing of Muslim forms of dress to schools (e.g. hijab, niqab, burqa, jilbab) as a key reason for calls for cosmopolitan education in Europe.
Thus, what might be seen as multicultural issues of the nation are responded to through discourses of cultivating cosmopolitan citizenship (see also Pashby, 2011a).

Indeed, Pike (2008b) raises the role of the educator in negotiating the complex discursive fields framing GCE. Research by Evans (2004) examined how specialist secondary school teachers characterized educational pedagogy in secondary school curriculum in Ontario and in England. He found teachers understand citizenship education in a variety of ways, and their pedagogical approaches are often disjointed from the content they are teaching. Their own personal beliefs about social justice content are often not reflected in how they describe their pedagogy (Evans, 2004, see also Rapoport, 2010). Indeed, teachers’ own conceptualizations of GCE are situated in their personal and geopolitical contexts and are enabled or constrained by the available public and professional discourses operating in their teaching context. Pike (2008b) argues that “the vagueness of the concept of global citizenship, and its openness to multiple interpretations, remains a key challenge, particularly for educators” (p. 79); and points out the inherent privilege in a central concept inherent to GCE: “the goal of ‘changing the world’ carries with it a disconcerting acknowledgement of the view that those of us presently in control have not got it right” (Pike, 2008b, p. 80). However, in a certain view, the ambiguity in conceptualizations and theories of the spatial dimension GCE could be interpreted as a dynamic ambivalence and critical space for pedagogy.

Postcolonial Critiques and Critical Literacy:
Theorizing GCE Pedagogy From the Pivot-Point

As with deconstructing the spatial dimensions of the national imaginary discussed in Chapter Three and the postcolonial critique of cosmopolitanism in Chapter Four, there is a growing body of scholarship identifying and working against a version of GCE that is complicit with the new imperialism. Andreotti and Souza (2011) recently edited a collection of chapters on the topic of postcolonial perspectives of global citizenship education. In the introduction they highlight the main postcolonial critique of “global ethnocentric hegemonies that reproduce and maintain global inequalities in the distribution of wealth, power and labor in the world” (Andreotti & Souza, 2011, p. 1; see also Andreotti, 2010a). Certain GCE
initiatives “uncritically embrace the normative teleological project of Western/Enlightenment humanism [and] …conceptualizations of humanity/human nature, progress and justice. Such investments structure an epistemic blindness to one’s own ontological choices and epistemic categories and thus to radical difference itself. (Andreotti & Souza, 2011, p. 1-2) GCE work is thus situated in the larger theoretical tensions inherent to imagining community in the context of the cosmopolitan turn. Given the tensions inherent to the popular assumption of the linear extension of citizen, GCE is characterized by another theoretical pivot-point.

Critical GCE work rooted in postcolonial critiques seeks to promote social justice, diversity, equity, and rights without accepting and inheriting the inclusive-exclusive paradox of citizenship. Correspondingly, theorizing from the pivot-point recognizes the importance of equity and diversity while keeping in mind the rights not just to redistribution and recognition, but also to participation in the framing of rights issues (Fraser, 2005). These tensions are inherent to the linear extension model on which most GCE concepts are based and present a conundrum around human rights:

Consensual approaches to citizenship education grounded on hierarchical ideas of belonging that privilege the nation-state (i.e. belonging first to the local, then the regional, national, international, and so on) and global governance through benevolent global institutions and an unexamined and uncritical commitment to human rights abound in educational literature. Challenging the normative, ethnocentric, ahistorical, and paternalistic ethos of these approaches, without falling into an uncritical rejection of human rights is very difficult. Part of the difficulty lies in establishing a position of critical engagement (as opposed to critical disengagement and uncritical engagement) with issues where one can both support (in certain contexts) and be critical of something (in other contexts and at the same time). If the choices are only either uncritical engagement or critical disengagement, exploring the historical, political, and culturally located construction of human rights and its dependence on nation-states can be perceived as an attack on the universal legitimacy of human rights and nation-states. (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 211)

Critical GCE must engage with interrogating while not completely undermining human rights and nation states. Furthermore, the potential for uncritical engagement is evident in Marshall’s (2009) identification of the false dualism of economic-technical and global social justice instrumental agendas. Her findings demonstrate the potential for GCE to reinforce soft liberalist approaches at best or to be co-opted by neoliberalism. The fact that she finds that social justice agendas pale in comparison to the prevalence of neoliberal versions of
GCE in public and policy discourses also points to the significant potential for soft versions of GCE to open up critical spaces for critical versions of GCE. The uncritical engagement or critical disengagement dichotomy described by Andreotti (2011a) both diagnoses this dualism and reinforces the importance of a critical reflexivity to engage it and find the dynamic spaces in the tensions.

The heavy emphasis on human rights literacy in GCE literature is also troubled by Todd (2008) who challenges the notion of cultivating humanity which is often taken for granted in education theory and policy regarding global citizenship, human rights, and democracy (see also Pashby, 2011a). She argues that this trope can “actually preclude responding to the pluralism into which cosmopolitan projects also put so much of their energy” (Todd, 2008, p. 8). The conception of intrinsic goodness at the root of calls for “cultivation” and “caring” for humanity is based in implicit universalism which “hinders the way we reflect on the very antagonisms that cosmopolitanists work so hard to counter” (Todd, 2008, p. 8). Thus, Todd (2008) promotes a reconsideration of the assumptions underlying commitments to humanity that “read humanity as an education problem” (p. 6).

Andreotti (2006) recognizes that there is “no universal recipe” for an approach to GCE that will be relevant in all contexts. Therefore, she notes that “it is important to recognize that ‘soft’ global citizenship education is appropriate to certain contexts – and can already represent a major step” (p. 8). However, she argues that if educators are not “critically literate” so as to be able to engage with assumptions and the implications and limitations of any approach including their own; they may end up unconsciously reproducing the practices and ways of thinking and acting that harm those educators indeed to support. As Andreotti and Souza (2011) describe, “despite claims of globality and inclusion, the lack of analyses of power relations and knowledge construction in this area often results in educational practices that unintentionally reproduce ethnocentric, ahistorical, depoliticized, paternalistic, Salvationist and triumphalist approaches that tend to deficit theorize, pathologize or trivialize difference” (p. 1). Ultimately, given that GCE is very popular as a
discourse in English speaking Western democracies such as Canada, the U.K., Australia, New Zealand and the U.S.A., “[t]he question of how far educators working with global citizenship education are prepared to do that in the present context in the North is open to debate” (Andreotti, 2006, p. 8). Indeed, Marshall (2009) notes that there will be different ways of theorizing the relationship between what she refers to as post-national or global citizenship educations around the world. Thus, it is key that context is recognized and that previous and new models of citizenship education are situated and historicized as located in a Western and European context (Marshall, 2009, p. 257).

Indeed, the critical end of the GCE spectrum is receiving more attention. In fact, Andreotti (2010c) calls for a post-critical and postcolonial GCE “so as to acknowledge complexity, contingency (context-dependency), multiple and partial perspectives and unequal power relations” (p. 241). She argues that teachers and students engaging in soft versions of GCE have been cognitively shaped by Enlightenment ideals and have an emotional investment in universalism (i.e. the projection of their ideas as what everyone else should believe), stability (i.e. avoidance of conflict and complexity), consensus (i.e. the elimination of difference) and fixed identities organized in hierarchical ways (e.g. us, who knows, versus ‘them’ who don’t know). (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 242-243)

Therefore, a post-critical GCE involves “learning to unlearn” by “making connections between social-historical processes and encounters that have shaped our contexts and cultures and the construction of our knowledges and identities” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 243 citing Through Others Eyes, 2008). A post-critical GCE helps learners recognize that social groups are internally diverse and experience conflict. Indeed, “culture is a dynamic and conflictual production of meaning in a specific context” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 243 citing Through Others Eyes, 2008). Thus GCE represented a dynamic field in which critical discourses take up neoliberal versions and social justice versions of citizenship. This application of critical GCE is encouraging more work that engages with meeting the needs and realities of 21st century global citizen learners.
A Framework for Understanding Citizenship Education in the 21st Century Global Imperative:
Two Versions of Postmodernism

In this section, I will draw on a framework adopted by Andreotti (2010b, 2010c) to argue for taking a particular perspective on the sets of ideological tensions and philosophical confusions outlined thus far. The framework accounts for tensions inherent to the wider theoretical context and the more specific theoretical literature on citizenship and citizenship education. Andreotti (2010b, 2010c) provides useful framework for understanding how the broader concepts of citizenship and the cosmopolitan turn play out in application to theorizing citizenship education in the context of the global imperative. It applies her conceptualization of the discursive turn to map out two distinct approaches to global citizenship education in the context of 21st century globalization. Two overarching philosophical distinctions inform an underlying dichotomous set of logics defining the historical context of contemporary education in liberal democracies. She defines them in terms of how they relate calls for new ways of teaching and learning to progress from past, modern versions of education; thus, both can be conceptualized as referring to post-modern ideas. They both respond to a sense that there needs to be new teaching and learning to reflect new realities of the 21st century citizen. However, despite the rhetoric of newness, they differ as to how new the corresponding ways of thinking are. On the one hand, there is a version of postmodernism that sees teaching and learning in the 21st century as an extension of modernism that pushes past the twentieth century but maintains a modernist telos; and on the other hand, there is a version that interrogates modernism.

As this section of the chapter will explain, this framework is very helpful in identifying and un-packing the sets of tensions that are inherent to the rhetoric of global citizenship and teaching for the 21st century citizens wherein distinct versions of reality and sets of ideologies are conflated into normative terms. I do, however, acknowledge the fact that the use of the term postmodernism can provoke a critique of a certain version of postmodernism in education theory that is associated with “high intellectualism” where, from her privileged position as academic, the theorist writes eloquent and highly theoretical analyses that are removed from the material realities of the lived experience of the students in
the educational context they analyze (Dillabough, 2002, p. 209). The critique is relevant to
the previous discussion in this chapter about the extent to which global orientations to
citizenship education serve to resist neoliberal versions of globalization and assert social
justice (albeit sometimes from a soft instrumentalist agenda) thereby potentially foreclosing
important critical spaces for critical versions of GCE. Indeed, this is an important critique
and one that is not outside of but rather included in Andreotti’s (2010) framework.
Furthermore, the concept of theorizing from the pivot-point helps me to articulate a situated
version of philosophy of education (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, p. 2008). Andreotti’s
(2010) framework of two versions of postmodernism helps me to further explicate this notion
of the pivot point. While breaking down these two versions of modernism allows me to
locate and un-pack distinct logics and ideologies that function under umbrella terms like
asserts: “Theory is dialectical. It is therefore both a representation of previous ideas and a
reaction to them” (p. 209). Using the theoretical pivot-point as a lens into Andreotti’s (2010)
work, I recognize her deconstruction as two sets of logic in tension rather than either-or
opposites. This is similar to how Strand (2010b) conceptualizes the paradox of
cosmopolitanism as epistemic ruptures that create dynamic engagement.

In the first logic, the *post* of postmodernism is understood as *after* modernism.
Andreotti (2010b, 2010c) identifies three rationales for educational reform and for the need
to adapt to 21st century realities in this view that she defines as a “cognitive adaptation”
approach (2010b, p. 7). She identifies this approach as inherently tied to neoliberal ideology.
First, reflecting the technical-economic imperative, the economy is changing and this
requires innovators so that human capital is reconceptualised as creativity and
entrepreneurship rather than in industrialized terms. In this version of the 21st century global
society, there is an impetus to explore new markets, consumer identities, and fashion trends.
In this logic multiculturalism contributes to the development of an effective and competitive
workforce as the national economy will need workers who can be effective in “multicultural

48 Maclure (2006) sums up the impact on this critique on critical scholars in education: “I have avoided
using the word [critical] in my own writing over the last few years, partly because of its unavoidable tendency
to deflect engagement and provoke instead a routine recitation of accusations—selfindulgence, arrogance,
vanity, relativism, frivolity, etc.—and an endless round of territorial and definitional disputes. (Who’s in and
who’s out? What’s the difference between postmodernism and poststructuralism? Does deconstruction
‘belong’?)” (p. 226).
teams” within and between nations in order to take advantage of different ideas and promote creativity (Andreotti, 2010b, p. 7). This is the business case for multiculturalism (Kymlicka, 2003; Joshee, 2004). Secondly, there is a mismatch between 20th century learning and 21st century teaching due to the increased access to digital technologies and the need for digitally mediated modes of learning. This relates to the strong discourse of interconnections and connectedness where interconnections are inevitable and are either romanticized or demonized (Burns, 2008). Finally, there is a strong rationale in the cognitive adaptation approach that evokes a liberal social justice discourse in calling for the opportunities for the inclusion of those who have been marginalized into the modernist framework. In this view, education can provide tools for identifying opportunities for participation in old and new markets. This connects to Marshall’s (2009) identification of the global social justice agenda in GCE.

The post-as after-modernism philosophical framework manifested in a cognitive adaptation approach is critiqued by Andreotti (2010c). First, it assumes that all excluded or marginalized individuals and/or communities desire the ideals of the 21st century as after-modernism. Also, the logic is consistent with the modernist view of progress as just and linear; it is simply re-inscribed in the notion of a movement in time through post-modern terms. In this sense, the idea of 21st century learning and teaching is a universalist metanarrative based on 20th century teleological foundations. Under this logic, 21st century learning is meant to progress a country’s economic advantage, and educators are led to adopt those subjectivities, pedagogies, and epistemologies that are compliant with the shifts and uncertainties of current economies. The main discourses through which this ideology is produced include the “new global world order” and the need for world excellence in education to produce cosmopolitan subjects who follow the authority of the global market (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 240; see also Parker, 2011). Also, similarly to how the global social justice instrumentalist agenda folds into the technical-economic instrumentalist agenda through basic assumptions of autonomy and equality (Marshall, 2009), in a post-as-after modernism logic, notions of social justice focus on inclusion into the global order, into the modern metanarrative of progress. From an equity perspective, the cognitive adaptation logic recognizes that 20th century thinking created the hegemonic systems and inequalities that result in an unequal distribution of wealth and labour. Logically then, a post-modern 21st
century cognitive adaptation offers opportunities for those who were excluded and marginalized in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century to become “new knowers and be included (economically and civically) in ‘21st century’ societies” (Andreotti, 2010b, p. 8). They simply need the right tools to find those opportunities for participation. This is an individualist neoliberal version of the citizenship dynamic.

Andreotti (2010c) identifies a competing logic that defines the dichotomous nature of the idea of education for the 21st century. It is another vision of a new education for the 21st century where the post- is understood as “questioning-” or “interrogating-” modernism. She calls this approach epistemological pluralism and determines that it is also trying to meet the needs of 21st century school’s complex realities; however, it sets out to disrupt and challenge the status quo rather than to extend the logic of modernism with 21st century iterations. Central to this vision is the importance of pluralizing knowledge because the current system is complicit in epistemic violence through the assertion of a dominant western, scientific, and positivistic view of knowledge. This stance rejects one universalizing idea of humanity and sees it as coercive. Social problems are in fact evidence of the failure and/or effects of the imposition of Enlightenment ideals. According to this view, the construction of majority and minority groups has created a set of social relations that is normalized as neutral and normal to the extent that no alternative is possible. The logic of epistemological pluralism works against the cognitive adaptation approach (Andreotti, 2010b). The post-as-after-modernism view sees the 21st century as essentially a neoliberal order that is more complex than a 20\textsuperscript{th} century way of thinking but is actually reproducing the ways of knowing, thinking, and relating that caused the problems equity-based education is trying to ameliorate and solve.

This framework helps to map out some inherent tensions in theoretical discussions of citizenship education in the context of the global imperative. Citizenship education in the 21st century is conceptually ambiguous, ideologically loaded, and widely contested. There are at least two key visions of teaching and learning for the 21st century citizen; one is an extension of modernism while the other is an interrogation of modernism. Both seek to change education to meet new realities; however, only the latter attempts to revise epistemological and ontological visions of education and community. GCE literature promotes an engagement with notions of equity and justice; however, it is also characterized
by inherent tensions that define what I have been referring to as the pivot-point in contemporary theorization of education. First, schooling is both a form of socialization into an inherently exclusionary national imaginary at the same time that it is the place for critiques of nationhood and the colonial imaginary implicit in nation-building. The global imperative is characterized by a strong sense that the current geo-political context of globalization is exerting pressures on education. These can be characterized by a double crisis where schooling is in need of reform to adjust to the new global order at the same time that it must address the sense of crisis and complexity around the perceived increased diversity in the classroom resulting from processes of globalization. Added to this dualism is the question of the spatial dimension of citizenship education and how the project of nation-building is extended or interrogated through global citizenship education.

GCE literature emerges as a response to these tensions associated with the global imperative in education. While some versions of GCE remain soft and reflective of the post-as-after modernism vision of teaching and learning in the 21st century, others, such as those influenced by postcolonial critiques, work towards thinking otherwise through interrogating modernism. In practice, educational policy is framed by a neoliberal context in which an economic-instrumentalist agenda both overpowers and conflates with a global social justice agenda. The social justice agenda is still significant, as are soft versions of GCE; they represent that there are some spaces in which equity remains a strong discourse. The reality is that schooling currently works within a state-run program; thus, theorizing citizenship education for the 21st century is inherently characterized by a pivot-point responding to and interrogating modernist views of citizenship, and Andreotti’s framework of the two versions of postmodernism helps to map those tensions out. The current ideological landscape of citizenship education is defined by both versions and by the tensions between them.

Having examined the tensions inherent to the wider theoretical and ideological context of conceptualizing GCE in the context of multicultural nation-states, I will next move onto the second section of the thesis. In order to set-up the empirical study in section three, I conducted a review of educational research literature relating to my topic. Thus, the next chapter will build on the framework of post-as-after- and post-as-interrogating- modernism and of theorizing citizenship education for the 21st global citizens from the pivot-point. It
narrows the scope of the inquiry by looking specifically at the educational research that relates to the topic of this thesis: the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE.
Chapter Six
Research Literature Review

The previous chapters have sought to provide the theoretical context informing how multiculturalism and global citizenship education relate within larger paradoxes and contending ideologies of political community, citizenship, globalization, cosmopolitanism, and schooling. I have established that there are some inherent tensions and conflations within conceptualizations of these fields in theory. These tensions can be broadly understood through the framework of two versions of teaching and learning for the 21st century citizen: post-as-after modernism and post-as-interrogating modernism. The latter version pushes beyond a discourse of newness to a critical reflexivity and a probing of normalized assumptions that contribute to a thinking otherwise. The post-as-interrogating modernism pushes for a foregrounding of the broader theoretical tensions. These include paradoxes and dichotomies such as inclusion/exclusion in citizenship, looking in and looking outwards in citizenship education, homogeneous-heterogeneous binaries of globalization, and economic and social justice imperatives in GCE. These sets of tensions can be stuck in binary positions that foreclose critical movement or, as I have argued, certain paradoxes can be evoked in a dynamic way to create critical discursive spaces for thinking otherwise.

In this chapter, I will turn to educational research literature to examine what educational research has been done that relates to the topic of the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE. Thus, the previous four chapters drew on theoretical literature and educational literature that theorized the broader context in which the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE is situated. Some of the literature specific to education used in the previous section will be drawn on again in this chapter; however, now the focus is on the research specific to the topic of this thesis as opposed to that which helps to map out the theoretical context.

A main challenge for reviewing educational research relevant to this topic is the difficulty in defining clear lines of distinction between multiculturalism, multicultural education, global education, citizenship education, and global citizenship education. The previous chapter outlined the move from global to global citizenship education (e.g. Davies
et al., 2005) and summarized some key rationales for, instrumentalist agendas of, and critiques of GCE. Evidently there is a wide range of conceptualizations and contestations of GCE. Therefore, I approach this educational research literature review with an explicit acknowledgement of the impossibility of grouping the research into distinct categories. However, I have attempted to organize the literature into four sections based on what they contribute to framing my empirical research. This chapter will examine what educational research has been done that relates to the topic of this thesis: the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship education. It engages with the question how are the tensions marking the wider theoretical context reflected in the educational research literature? Specifically, I look at

1. the research literature specific to discourse analyses of citizenship education and social studies in the context of globalization
2. the research literature specific to the explicit relationship between multicultural education and global education
3. the research literature specific to global citizenship education in multicultural contexts
4. the research literature specific to the Canadian context

I chose to organize this review from most macro and general to most specific in terms of topic and context. First, I examined wide discourse analyses research into the main ideologies framing citizenship education and social studies in the context of contemporary globalization. This literature is important to situating my research within the wider related discourse analysis research. Inherent in these studies are conceptualizations of multiculturalism and GCE to which I paid special attention. I then looked at what research has been done on my topic by searching for titles and subject headings that included multiculturalism or multicultural and global or global citizenship education. This set of literature covers a wide range from theoretical pieces to empirical research in teacher education. My focus is what the research demonstrates about wider conceptualizations of each field and the relationship between them. As a third way to review the educational research literature relevant to my topic, I did a close study of the literature explicitly on GCE
in terms of what references to and assumptions about multiculturalism are made. Finally to narrow into the context of my study, I identified some key pieces of literature relating to the Canadian context to examine the extent to which they implicitly connect the two fields.

Therefore, there are four key sections to this literature review, each contributing to mapping the way tensions are inherent and/or explicit to the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE and examining to what extent and how the fields are both related and conflated. Some common themes emerged among the sections:

- The fields of multiculturalism/multicultural education and global orientations to education including GCE are related and conflated throughout the educational research literature.

- Both fields and their relationship are seen as particularly important and necessary in the context of the global imperative. They are understood to be mutually reinforcing fields and to positively relate conceptually. Potential contradictions or tensions in doing GCE in multicultural contexts are not evident.

- The current ideological landscape shapes the different conceptualizations of global orientations to education and views of multiculturalism therein

- The ideological landscape is framed by post-as-after and post-as-interrogating modernism understandings of educating citizens for the 21st century. Neoliberal, neoconservative, and key aspects of liberal social justice ideologies operate through distinct discourses but all fall under the post-as-after modernist view. Certain liberal social justice discourses help to create critical spaces through which to open-up to a post-as-interrogating modernism view.

- Some of the conceptual confusion and ambiguity inherent to the way the fields are both related and conflated can be explained by the way the fields themselves and the relationships between them are taken-up within the larger ideological context.
Within different ideological strands, multiculturalism can be considered both a distinct agenda from GCE and a version of cosmopolitanism. Global orientations to citizenship are flexible and can be taken up by different ideological positions.

The relationship between multiculturalism and GCE is also framed by contextual factors including national setting, regional setting, and demographic setting.

In the Canadian context, historical discourses and contemporary ideologies define the fields of multiculturalism and GCE in similar ways; however, GCE appears to have a stronger social justice agenda.

Overall, the literature review reinforces the argument that the relationship between the fields of multiculturalism and GCE are conceptually ambiguous and marked by conflations and confusions. There is little attention to potential tensions inherent to the relationship and this is tied to the way the fields are seen as expanding one to the other at the same time that they are seen to naturally relate in a positive way. The conceptual confusion can be partially explained by the wider ideological context in which notions of citizenship, globalization, and diversity are articulated through distinct ideologies but common terms. An overall sense that GCE can create spaces for critical conversations that can raise issues around equity and diversity and probe the modern assumptions of citizenship co-exists with the strength of the linear extension model of citizenship based in universalist and rights-based claims.

Review of Discourse Analysis Research on Citizenship Education in the Context of Contemporary Globalization

Discourse analysis studies by Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006), Parker (2011) and Agbaria (2011) identify the ideologies and tensions inherent to conceptualizing citizenship education broadly, and social studies more specifically, in the context of the 21st century global imperative. These studies demonstrate a dominance of economic ideologies framed by neoliberalism; nationalist and patriotic discourses framed by neoconservatism; and political and rights-based discourses framed by liberalism. They also find that dominant discourses are mediated by marginalized discourses that are deemed more critical such as gender, class, race, and culture. Cosmopolitan, global, or transnational citizenship are generally considered
marginalized discourses and are conceptualized in confusing ways. In some iterations, this includes a conflation with multiculturalism and multicultural education. An overarching theoretical framing of nationalism versus cosmopolitanism and economic versus cultural agendas indicate that citizenship discourses are implicated in the tensions identified in the earlier sections of this thesis such as Marshall’s (2009) distinction between the technical-economic and global justice instrumentalist agendas. Furthermore, citizenship discourses across ideological versions share an inherent framework that reflects the extension model (local to national to global citizenship). Most of the citizenship education discourses align with a post-as-after modernism framework with a few marginalized discourses pushing at and opening spaces for a post-as-after modernism framework. A significant theme emerging from these discourse analyses of citizenship education in the context of the global imperative is the conflation of different versions of liberalism alongside the emergence of neoconservative views of citizenship. Critical and social justice oriented discourses are present, especially in more scholarly work in the areas, but are not influential in policy and curriculum.

Knight Abowitz and Harnish’s (2006) discourse analysis of texts related to citizenship and citizenship education from 1990-2003 in contemporary Western democracies, particularly the U.S. find that citizenship is an extremely present overarching concept. However, there are various citizenship discourses that reveal contradictions and paradoxes inherent to understanding citizenship in educational contexts. Consistent with the framework of post-as-after modernism and post-as-interrogating modernism, they find a dominance of “Enlightenment-inspired” notions of citizenship over “critical discourses” with the most influential discourses tying to “civic republican”—patriotism and loyalty—and “liberal”—political and economic—frameworks (p. 657). Civic republicanism is a neoconservative ideology that positions citizenship as the key concept through which to heal a fragmented civil society and is based on notions of commonality, cohesiveness, and unity; learning about traditions and history of the nation squeezes out space for humanistic, international, and/or critical content and pedagogy. Civic republicanism versions of citizenship education also express a concern with the balkanizing effects of multiculturalism.
At the same time, liberal discourses are dominant. First, a neoliberal version focuses on an explicit economic rationale for education. Second, a stronger liberal discourse is what they call “political liberalism” (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 662) which includes an emphasis on justice and fairness given the diversity inherent to national contexts; the educational agenda focuses on individual freedom and learning the “multicultural national history” (p. 665).

While the civic republican and liberal frameworks are the most influential in citizenship education discourse, other, more critical discourses are active in contesting what remain firmly dominant views. The political liberal framework of citizenship shares with the critical frameworks encouragement of students’ involvement in school and community governance as well as learning how to take part in culturally diverse public life. However, ultimately, the two dominant discourses—civic republicanism (neoconservatism) and liberalism (neoliberal and political liberalism) remain strongly influence by “Enlightenment-inspired citizenship discourses” thereby belying “a vibrant and complex array of citizenship meanings that have more recently developed out of, and often in opposition to, these dominant discourses” (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 654). Critical discourses raise issues that are neutralized in the dominant discourses such as issues of membership, identity, and engagement by trying to expand and deepen liberal agendas of human freedom. They focus on exclusions based on gender, culture, ethnicity, nationality, race, sexuality, and socioeconomic class; however, Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) find that critical discourses are found more in scholarly and theoretical texts than practical curricular texts (p. 666). Applying the two versions of modernism framework, the critical discourses in some cases expand a post-as-after modernist framework, and some critical discourses create spaces that push towards a post-as-interrogating modernist framework.

Interestingly, Knight Abowtiz and Harnish (2006) locate another key tension. They find a conflation of distinct ideologies in a discourse they call “transnational citizenship” (p.
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51 Critical discourses challenge the dominant conventions of citizenship inherent to civic republican and liberal visions, pushing these borders and seeing them as “socially constructed, artificial, and, worse, misleading in terms of how the borders lead us to envision, categorize, and engage in problem solving both with and against other nations and people” (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 681).
It focuses on local, national, and international communities, and in the most dominant view is reflective of the linear expansion model of citizenship. While civic republican discourses reinforce the meaning of national borders through a neoconservative reassertion of an imagined nationalist past, liberal discourses are more pragmatic about acknowledging diversity and international relations but still understand citizenship as membership in a nation-state. In a more critical framework, discourses of transnationalism emphasize the interdependence of all nations in terms of global resources and through a shared human identity. Overall, however, the dominance of the Enlightenment-inspired discourses mean that while transnational discourses can create a more complex civic identity for students, the rhetoric reflects a universalist, humanitarian value system rooted in Enlightenment assumptions.

However, reflecting the dynamic position of theorizing from the pivot-point, Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) find that an intersection of transnational and critical discourses opens up a critical space for understanding national issues of identity categories: “Social class, race, and gender are categories of identity that cross national borders; transnationalist discourses often are used in strategic ways to further political interests shaped by these and other identity markers” (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 677). Furthermore, their analysis highlights how “transnational citizenship discourses are exceedingly flexible” and can thus be used in support of both populist forms and more critical forms of citizenship: “they can alternatively be assimilated within neoliberal goals of expanded markets and consumerism….Political identities still subject to exclusion in nation-states can increasingly construct political and economic allegiances across national borders. Transnational citizenship thus presses on questions of traditional notions of civic membership and identity” (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 679). Their research emphasizes the importance of critical discourses creating space in the flexible understandings of global orientations of citizenship education in light of the dominance of neoliberal and neoconservative versions.

For example, they note that “Terms such as ‘global’, ‘international’, ‘transnational’, ‘cosmopolitan’, and ‘intercontinental’ are often invoked, referencing a boundless or indefinite area to emphasize the larger contexts that citizens share…This leads to the prevalence of terms such as ‘collective,’ ‘group,’ ‘community,’ and ‘collaboration.’ The construct of universal human rights is a primary value as well as rhetorical tool in this discourse” (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 677).
Narrowing in the discourse analyses that have been done in educational research and that relate to the topic of this thesis, Parker (2011) studies the discursive functioning of notions of international education in the context of democratic citizenship education, particularly in the U.S. His findings confirm much of what Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) found in terms of the marginalized presence of critical discourses of citizenship in education. He examines how commonly heard and accepted phrases such as “our global economy”, “our increasingly interconnected world”, and “global citizens” are connected to understandings of citizenship in education (p.487). He finds that the discourse of national security combine with the discourse of school failure to dominate understandings of international education by pushing other more critical and social justice-oriented meanings and initiatives to the margins. He does not identify the wider ideological context; however, it appears that military logics reflect neoconservatism, economic logics reflect neoliberalism, the failing schools discourse has both neoconservative and neoliberal connections, and the culture and social discourses reflect some version of liberalism as social justice. Significantly, like Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006), he finds there are alternative discourses that mediate the wider discourses (Parker, 2011, p. 494).

The alternative discourses identified by Parker (2011) include “global perspective” which is imbued with transnational cultural meaning, “cosmopolitanism” which reflects transnational political meaning, and “international student body” which relates to cultural meaning in a student-centered orientation (Parker, 2011, p. 494). Significantly, Parker (2011) finds that the global perspectives discourse is essentially a version of multiculturalism: it is “a re-scaling of “multicultural education” from the national arena, where traditionally it has been kept, to the global arena. This entails an extension of one of multiculturalism’s key principles—knowledge, recognition, and respect for diverse cultures—from within the nation to cultures outside the nation” (Parker, 2011, p. 494, italics in original). In contrast, Parker (2011) identifies the cosmopolitan discourse with a political meaning where schools should shift primary allegiance from national to global citizenship. Thus, in his study, the global perspectives discourse is a version of multiculturalism, and cosmopolitan refers to a political loyalty outside the nation. Again, this is evidence of the various ways cosmopolitanism and global orientations to citizenship are conceptualized. He notes that the terms like “global citizens” or “world citizens” are more often found in academic symposia than in the other
areas and only somewhat in educational practice in the U.S. (Parker, 2011, p. 495). Thus, for the purposes of this study, the fact that global citizenship is explicitly expressed in the Alberta curriculum is significant.

Finally, Parker (2011) finds the discourse of international student body focuses on implicit curriculum rather than schools’ explicit curricula through progressive, culturally responsive pedagogy and an assets-view of the “global student population of the school” and “the cultural and linguistic characteristics of students” (Parker, 2011, p. 496). Schools where this discourse is prevalent have “Cultural” or “Heritage” fairs (Parker, 2011, p. 496). This appears to be a highly context-specific discourse to the American citizenship context. It is essentially a supplanting of international for multicultural as a means to secure funding for issues associated with the marginalized positions of students from ethnic minority groups.

There is a version of the demographic description and the programmatic versions of multiculturalism (Inglis, 1996) where the former is called internationalism and the latter is called multiculturalism. Schools with culturally pluralistic demographics use a discourse of internationalism as a strategy of cultural capital. They do not call themselves a multicultural school. Ironically, Parker (2011) notes that overall, across the examples he studied, the cultural discourse of global perspectives is stronger than cosmopolitanism among educators because there is a basic adoption of multiculturalism. This is an important finding in relation to this thesis. It suggests that educators conceive of global perspectives and global consciousness-raising as compatible with if not the same as multiculturalism. Therefore, Parker’s (2011) findings appear to distinguish between global perspectives (as expansion of multiculturalism), cosmopolitanism (political loyalty extending beyond the nation), and international schools (as an assets version of local multiculturalism). This exemplifies how not only global orientations to citizenship education a conflation of distinct versions, but they are also conflated with versions of multiculturalism in various discursive ways.

Narrowing the review of literature even further from citizenship discourses (Knight Abowtiz & Harnish, 2006) and international education discourses (Parker, 2011), Agbaria’s (2011) discourse analysis of social studies literature relating to the mission of preparing citizens for the global age describes a great deal of conceptual ambiguity around the discourse of globalization in education. He studied discourses of globalization in the social
studies education discourse community in the U.S. from 1990-2005. He found educators are assumed to be ready and able to prepare their students for globalization: “[In the social studies literature] globalization is commonly conceived as a threat that a "different" and “improved” education will help the students cope better with its complicated problems” (p. 61). Therefore, social studies discourses reflect the rhetoric of the need for new teaching and learning for the 21st century encapsulated in Andreotti’s (2010b, 2010c) framework of post-as-after/post-as-interrogating modernism framework.

Agbaria (2011) finds that globalization is often used to “rationalize and thus legitimize emphasizing cross-cultural skills” (p. 61). Thus social studies for the global imperative is premised on a strong sense that cultural diversity is a description of 21st century realities and that cultural diversity is a universal concept that links local contexts and global contexts. However, conceptual tensions inherent in that assumption are not evident in the literature. He defines a double crisis: social studies must meet the perceived global economic challenge (by emphasizing economic issues) while also meeting domestic multicultural agenda (by emphasizing stronger focus on multicultural content). Therefore, Agbaria (2011) conceptualizes global education as extending from multicultural education:

Despite the theoretical distinctions between global education and multicultural education, the former emphasizing the cultures and peoples of other lands and the latter dealing with ethnic diversity within the United States (Banks, 2004), global education emerges in this discourse as a version or an extension of multicultural education rather than as an independent stream of education. (Agbaria, 2011, p. 63)

Agbaria’s (2011) work demonstrates three key themes relevant to this study. First, he presents evidence of the global imperative whereby an ambiguous and conceptually vague vision of globalization exerts pressures on social studies education. Second, he locates a tension in the ideological landscape between economic and cultural impulses associated with the global imperative. His theorization of the double crisis connects this dualism to the influence of global citizenship discourses defining a paradox where schooling reasserts the nation and national issues of diversity at the same time that it reflects a neoliberal ideology of
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53 The discourse community included social studies educators, curriculum practitioners, and researchers. (Agbaria, 2011) studied how discourses were disseminated through two journals (Social Education published by the National Council for the Social Studies, and The Social Studies published by Heldref Publications).
opening up to global markets. Thirdly, his work explicitly identifies global education discourse as an extension of multiculturalism, linking the fields through an emphasis on culture and diversity and distinguishing them only through the linear extension model.

Thus overall, studies of wider discourses of citizenship education, global/international education and social studies education in the context of globalization highlight some contradictory trends. While the ideological landscape is marked by the dominance of neoliberal economic ideologies, neoconservative nationalism ideologies, and liberal political ideologies; marginalized discourses include critical discourses reflecting the discursive turn and probing the exclusionary visions of citizenship education inherent to dominant discourses. Within this ideological landscape, there is a tension between national and global allegiances. There is a dual logic of economic and cultural/social rationales; this demonstrates similar findings to Marshall’s (2009, 2011) research into GCE agedas in the U.K. (technical-economic and global social justice). There is also wider philosophical tension between the largely Enlightenment-based and critically-based philosophical foundations which seems to connect to Andreotti’s (2010) post as after versus post as interrogating modernism. The Enlightenment-based discourses are comprised of neoconservative, neoliberal and political liberal views of citizenship education in the global imperative. The more critical and more marginalized discourses are identified through critical spaces opened up through discourses of global and cultural interconnections and transnational identity categories that experience exclusions: race, gender, sexual-orientation, sexuality, religion, etc. (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006).

Discourses of global citizenship span across and within these distinctions. In this context, global/international/transnational/cosmopolitan orientations to citizenship and education are taken-up in ways that reflect the wider dominant and marginalized ideologies. Parker (2011) sees significant distinctions between different uses of discourses of internationalism in education. Similarly, Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) see the potential for transnational discourses to be taken-up and taken-over by dominant discourses; however, they also see the flexibility of discourses of transnationalism as significant in the potential to open up critical spaces. Indeed, Agbaria’s (2011) work suggests that in the context of the global imperative discourses of globalization influencing social studies
education evoke discourses of cultural diversity in such a way as to reflect the inherent
tensions of contemporary globalization.

The Relationship Between Multicultural and Global Education

Given that my review of relevant scholarly research into discourse analyses of
citizenship, international education, and social studies reinforced the tensions found in my
reading and analysis of the theoretical literature, I next decided to look at what research had
been done specifically on the relationship between the fields of multiculturalism and global
education. I wondered if that literature would provide stronger distinctions between the fields
than was evident in the wider discourse analysis research. However, I found that scholarly
literature explicitly attending to the relationship between multicultural and global education
does not make strong distinctions. The literature highlights mutual and positive conceptual
relationships between the fields. This compatibility is assumed within a broader frame of
promoting equity and diversity and opening spaces for critiques of the status quo but
underlying tensions are left unattended (e.g., Cole 1984; Cortés, 1983).

Ukpokodu’s (1999) theoretical piece, “Multiculturalism vs. globalism” argues for a
complimentary and simultaneous implementation of a multicultural and a global approach to
education. She argues that both fields can encourage students’ civic responsibility to develop
through “broader understanding of human commonalities and human diversity” (p. 300).
Again, a familiar theme is the sense of a global imperative: “Both multiculturalism and
globalism are needed to prepare our students for national and global citizenship. Failure to do
some will result in the inadequate preparation of American citizens for the realities of the
21st century” (Ukpokodu, 1999, p. 300). Thus there is both a technical-economic vision of

Cortés (1983) argued for the strategic coming together of “multiethnic” and “global education” arguing
that despite separate histories, rationales and special interests, both fields seek to reform the status quo through
encouraging “human understanding, communication and equity” (p. 568). He saw a transnational vision of
citizenship as encouraging relations among different ethnicities in the national (U.S.) by learning about
processes of stereotyping and avoiding stereotypical thinking” (Cortés, 1983, p. 569). He finds a key
commonality in the fields is the tension around how to conceptualize ethnicity as both a particular and global
concept (Cortés, 1983, p. 570). Thus, his theorization acknowledges the tensions of national-as-particular and
global-as-universal views of cultural diversity but answers this tension through creating a national-global
balance by merging the fields. This relates to Cole’s (1984) work that argued for a combination called
“multicultural global education” and assumed a mutually reinforcing relationship.
preparing students for realities including participation in the global market and a global social justice vision of promoting diversity as part of civic responsibility.

An important piece of educational research literature relating to bringing together multicultural and global education is Merryfield’s (1996) report on how teacher educators in Canada and the U. S. bridge multiculturalism and global education entitled *Making Connections Between Multicultural and Global Education: Teacher Educators and Teacher Education Programs*. Her report is based on the premise that a pairing of multiculturalism and global education is necessary in a time when the world is “undergoing dramatic change” (p. 11). She argues that multiculturalism and global education should be brought together to “prepare teachers for diversity, equity, and interconnectedness and the local community, the nation, the world” (p. 11). Although this thesis is not looking directly at teacher education, many findings from her study shed light on the ambiguities inherent to the perceived relationship between multicultural and global education in terms of wider discourses and conceptual ambiguities. There is overlap through issues of immigration, race, cultural identity and preservation, and cross-cultural understanding. Global education is implied to be broader as it includes environmental, development, and human rights issues outside of cultural matters; on the other hand, multicultural education focuses on domestic dimensions of cross-cultural communities that are outside the realm of multicultural education (Case cited in Merryfield 1996, p. 26).

Highlighted teacher education programs are based in a linear expansion model and on the assumption that understanding diversity locally complements and/or establishes a global view of diversity; the reverse is also assumed. Learning about global inequities helps to understand local inequities associated with multiple cultures living together in one nation (Merryfield, 1996, p. 19). Indeed, her study highlights the importance of making controversies and differences central to rather than avoided by programs that link multicultural and global education. However, there is a lack of explicit theoretical grounding of the assumed relationship between the fields and the broadening vision of multicultural education. This theoretical paucity in tandem with the global view as enabling a local consciousness point to the abstract and ambiguous quality of the relationship. According to Merryfield (1996), across the programs, teacher educators choose to ground their programs,
classes, projects and research with theories of multicultural and global education. She does not elaborate to describe those theoretical frameworks and how they work to bring the fields together. Thus her study is characterized by the theoretically amorphous nature of the perceived relationship between multicultural education and global education. Her study, similarly to the theoretical pieces (Cortés, 1983; Cole, 1984; Ukpokodu, 1999), is largely descriptive of the existence of a relationship between the two fields and focused on ways that they come together with no explicit attention given to the potential contradictions in terms of concepts, ideologies, or practices beyond the usual national-global tension.

Conceptually, in Merryfield’s (1996) study the fields are related through topics of interconnections, diversity, and equity (specifically race and culture). The foregrounding of critical consciousness and reflexivity points to the transformative promise inherent to bringing together the two fields. There is an implicit social justice ideology in the calls for equity and diversity; however, the vision of changing the world seems to rest on the assumption that promoting diversity, rights, and awareness will open up critical spaces. Although there is a discourse of equity that recognizes there are marginalized and privileged groups, there is an over-riding assumption that everyone can join the multicultural-global education project and that it is inherently inclusive. This assumption is rooted in and extends from a modern, liberal project. In this sense, it represents a post-as-after modernist approach (Andreotti, 2010b).

More recently, Wells (2009) wrote a piece arguing that although there is significant overlap between the fields of multicultural and global education, often they are seen as competing fields and may be used in ways that are not complementary. Like Merryfield (1996), his focus is teacher education which suggests that teacher education is a main area of research on the relationship between the fields and points to the need for policy and theory based research on this topic. He argues that global education can be seen as an “add-on” to multicultural education which is already an “add-on” to standard curriculum (p. 142). Furthermore, he notes that “multicultural educators have many legitimate concerns about the potentially negative effects of poorly developed global examples used to teach
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55 She lists James Banks, Paulo Friere, Robert Hanvey, Cameron McCarthy, Anna Ochoa, Christine Sleeter, and Carl Grant (Merryfield, 1996, p. 20).
multiculturalism (Wells, 2009, p. 11). Although he does not elaborate on this point, some possibilities come to mind including the potential further othering of ethnocultural minority students from the national sense of belonging when they are seen to be part of the global level or experts on a global issue. However, Wells (2009) argues that global perspectives can inform several multicultural concepts in teacher education although there are important limitations. He cites Merryfield (1996), in defining commonalities through the topics of a) advancing human goals of justice, equity, and peace; b) recognizing diversity at every level from local to global; and c) engaging with the fact that there are interconnections in the world.

Thus, Well’s (2009) work represents an extension of Merryfield’s (1996) study in that he contributes more attention to the tensions and challenges associated with linking multicultural and global education. For example, he includes a section on race and ethnicity calling it “one of the most tension-inducing topics” (p. 145). He argues that global examples such as South-Africa (pre- and post-apartheid) where whites are a privileged minority can help American students challenge the perception that white privilege comes from being the numerical majority56. Furthermore, he argues that understandings of race as a socially constructed concept may be initiated or expanded through global examples since students are often tied to U.S. racial and ethnic organization schemes. He also looks at similar possibilities for addressing issues relating to gender, classism, ableism, and religious discrimination through bringing global education into multicultural education.

As with the other literature on the relationship between the fields, Wells’s (2009) model of the complementary relationship is conceptualized as a dialectic where multiculturalism broadens to help frame issues of equity and diversity in global contexts and the reverse is also the case. His example of South Africa constructs the global as a different national context, so the example is potentially more of a comparative international approach than an approach that explicitly looks at global relations of cultural and racialized power imbalances. Ultimately, his study focuses on teacher education, and the responsibility for bringing together the fields and handling the challenges and tensions inherent to them rests

56 He says, “Using well-crafted examples and structured reflection can lead to wider discussions of a global form of white privilege that U.S.-based examples likely never will” (Wells, 2009, p. 145).
on the practicing teacher. His piece does a stronger job at identifying controversial subjects inherent to the fields, but the tensions inherent to bringing them together are not flushed out. Also, there is no analysis as to how educational policies encourage or discourage the perceived complementary content of multicultural and global education.

Lucas’s (2010) work highlights the tensions inherent in how the relationship between multicultural and global education is conceptualized in different demographic school contexts. She did a qualitative study of how a group of social studies teachers in the U.S. conceptualize multicultural and global education in a suburban middle school with mostly affluent and mostly white students. Her study reinforces the conceptual and theoretical ambiguity inherent to the assumed positive and mutually reinforcing relationship between multicultural and global education. She found many have difficulties conceptualizing each field and use them interchangeably and without articulating their purpose to their students. In fact, despite overlaps of topics and foci, she argues that the spatial dimension remains a critical distinction: while multicultural education focuses on issues within the context of the nation in which students live, global education is directed at issues outside the nation. Lucas (2011) found that when teachers fail to make this distinction, they are unconsciously substituting global for domestic issues which can be potentially problematic. Blurred distinctions lead teachers to mistakenly equate cultures with nations thereby constructing homogenous cultures where there is diversity.

Furthermore, she argues that multicultural education is often marginalized because of a popular view that it is primarily for students of colour despite the fact that many advocate multicultural education for all students (Lucas, 2011, p. 212). She locates a gap in the literature that corresponds to the postcolonial critique of the assumed object and subject of GCE (see Pashby, 2011a, 2011b). She also finds a lack of attention to the effects of multicultural and global education in schools with a student population that is primarily affluent and white. In this context, she found teachers did see global education as relevant but did not think multicultural education was relevant. Thus, she raises the issue of global education supplanting multicultural education: “Both need to play a central role, and although they hold similar values, they are different and have different objectives” (Lucas, 2011, p. 215). This finding is significant in light of Parker’s (2011) finding that schools in
diverse and marginalized communities are calling themselves international. It raises an inherent tension also found when comparing Kymlicka’s and Nussbaum’s work in Chapter Four around the assumed neutral subject of the expansion models. Indeed, although my research will not examine individual teachers’ understandings, Lucas’s (2011) does shed light on the wider philosophical and ideological conflations and confusions that contribute to the ambiguity and shape the popular and official discourses teachers can draw on.

In the research on teacher education and the focus on a global approach to multiculturalism in citizenship education, while there are sometimes tensions acknowledged, the over-riding assumption is that the two fields do and should work collaboratively. Based on my review of the literature, more theoretical attention and empirical study is needed to identify the differences that define these two fields of study and to attend to the question of whether or not they are theoretically and conceptually distinct. In my review of the educational literature that deals explicitly with their relationship, multiculturalism and global education come together as both respond to the global imperative and to the sense of increased diversity in the nation. They often come together through a social justice orientation to equity and diversity. There are some distinctions in terms of curricular and pedagogical areas and different agendas in different demographic contexts. Also, citizenship discourses play out in relation to particular national-imaginings. Evidently, in the U.S. there is a strong conflation of global/international and multicultural education (Parker, 2011). However, Pike (2008c), writing about the state of global education in Canada, finds a similar phenomenon of a conflation of global and multicultural education: “No doubt…there are some elements of ‘global education,’ without the term being used, being practiced in classrooms up and down the country, where teachers are endeavouring to …ensure equitable consideration of the needs of minority groups” (Pike, 2008c, p. 224).

Overall, the relationship between the fields is assumed to be positive. Given the research on wider discourses and ideologies, the fields and their perceived relationship are always already contextualized in an ideological landscape influenced by dominant ideologies (neoliberalism and to varying extents neconservatism and liberal social justice) and reflecting the dual crisis of globalization (looking outward at global markets and inward and growing
diversity) (Agbaria, 2011). The confusion is also implicated in the particular national and local contexts of diversity.

Global Citizenship Education and Conceptualizations of the Relationship With Multiculturalism

Like the literature on the explicit relationship between multiculturalism and global education, the GCE literature itself emphasizes a positive relationship with multiculturalism. The relationship is often expressed through a social justice agenda for transformation that is reflective of a critical impulse in the context of the global imperative and as a response to the influence of neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies in citizenship education. There is a strong sense that GCE creates critical spaces in citizenship education. As with the literature explicitly attending to the relationship between the fields, the GCE literature identifies conceptually similar and corresponding ideas linking to multiculturalism such as cultural diversity, equity, and human rights. The tension between soft and critical approaches to GCE identified by Andreotti (2006) is evident in the ways different scholars writing about GCE frame the connections to multiculturalism. It also is evident in the fact that some key tensions remain unexamined, especially around local-national-global dynamics of identity categories relating to what are considered global issues. A main theme in this GCE literature is the ambiguity, conceptual conflation and dualism inherent to how the spatial dimension of citizenship is expressed through references to multiculturalism and to multicultural contexts. This is particularly evident in how the literature treats the push for human rights literacy.

Evidently, global and cosmopolitan orientations to citizenship education are of particular interest in national Anglo-Western contexts of high immigration and multiculturalism (the U. S., the U. K., Canada, Australia, and New Zealand). In these contexts, the concept and educational agenda of GCE is seen as opening up a more just and complex discourse of community wherein diverse individuals and groups belong and feel connected to a larger political community. There is a strong sense that traditional conceptualizations of national citizenship alone do not meet the contemporary global context and that this is particularly relevant to multicultural societies. Banks (2008), drawing on Benhabib (2004) and Castles & Davidson (2000), articulates that global citizenship education
represents a transformative view of citizenship education by attending to the realities of multiple identities and belongings. According to Banks (2008), a global orientation to citizenship education should help students to identify with people from diverse cultures across the world in a way that is different from internationalism because in his view, GCE rejects inward-looking patriotism and parochial ethnocentrism. This sentiment is similar to Kymlicka’s (2004) worry about cosmopolitan multiculturalism reinforcing a tourism approach to internationalism. Rather, in Banks’s view, students view social justice and equity globally and are concerned about threats to the global community including global warming, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and various wars in such a way as to reinforce multiculturalism at home: “Students can become cosmopolitan citizens while maintaining attachments and roots to their family and community cultures” (Banks, 2009, p. 313).

Banks (2009) posits that the role of school is to help “students understand how cultural, national, regional, and global identifications are interrelated, complex, and evolving” (Banks, 2009, p. 313). The complexity of global issues is seen as applicable to the “dynamic” ways students’ identities are constructed in their local context: “Students should be able to critically examine their identifications and commitments to understand the complex ways in which they are interrelated and constructed” (Banks, 2009, p. 313 see also McIntosh, 2004). While it is clear that a complex notion of identities is an important element of critical GCE and critical multiculturalism, an important tension is left unexamined in Banks’s work: a dynamic, interactive, and complex understanding of identity construction does not disallow for contradictory sentiments between national and global citizenship identities. In Banks’s view, a critical approach necessarily promotes a positive interaction57.

Dower (2008) weighs in on the potential tension between national and global approaches to diversity:

If the values of citizenship are taken to be either (1) the celebration of patriotism in such a form that posits one’s country’s superiority or rallying round the flag, so that responding to need in one’s own country takes priority as a matter of principle because of strong communitarian arguments, etc., or

57 Banks (2009) elaborates on the local context of the global citizenship classroom: “In democratic and transformative classrooms and schools, students from diverse groups interact and deliberate in equal-status situations. They also develop positive racial and ethnic attitudes as well as the knowledge, skills, and perspectives to deliberate with students from diverse groups” (p. 314).
(2) the promotion of one’s citizenship in such a way as to imply that these were right/superior to those either of minorities within one’s own country or of other countries and cultures, then the values of citizenship would indeed clash with the values of global citizenship, at least as these are normally understood. (Dower, 2008, p. 50)

He acknowledges that GCE might have a doctrinaire and proselytizing vision of universal values as inherently acceptable. Further, he recognizes that a global acceptance of universal values or concept of global citizenship could be held in parallel with a national intolerance of other cultures within a society in the publically endorsed values of citizenship in a similar argument as is made by Kymlicka (2003). However, like Banks (2009) Dower (2008) contends that a mainstream emphasis within global citizenship discourse is a multicultural view of respect for difference. He draws on Nussbaum to assert that the acceptance of tolerant global ethics is the best and most principled basis for “genuine multicultural citizenship within a country” (Dower, 2008, p. 50). Therefore, ultimately the multicultural rationale for constructing a global ethic through GCE is response to and rejection of neoconservative visions of protecting traditional national cultures. In this sense GCE opens a critical space for reasserting social justice oriented visions of citizenship education and diversity. A main premise underlying work in GCE is the notion that there is a dialogical relationship between respecting and valuing diversity in the local context and engaging with intercultural understandings of a global community. The assumption is that students will value democratic principles in a holistic way that resolves conflicts and misunderstandings.

Osler’s (2008) notion of education for cosmopolitan citizenship conceptualizes a global orientation that “acknowledges our global inter-connectedness, recognises our multiple and shifting identities and equips young people to contribute and to engage constructively with difference at local, national and international levels, while at the same time acknowledging our shared humanity and human rights” (2008, p. 22). She does not position her cosmopolitan citizenship view as an alternative to national citizenship; rather, the focus is a re-imagining of national community as diverse through an extension of

58 While Osler (2008) makes a strong distinction between educating for cosmopolitan citizenship and a global citizenship education as promoted through non-governmental organizations (and in Olser & Starkey 2003, 2007), much of her conceptualizations are consistent with the literature I am referring to as GCE.
Benedict Anderson’s “imaging oneself in communion with others” to those outside the political and geographical boundaries of the nation.\(^{59}\) However, others warn that some discourses of diversity are centered on an idea that “we are all the same” and all want the same things that serves to erase differences and to privilege Western ways of knowing (Richardson, 2008b, p.53). Pike (2008a) offers an interesting take on how the very possibility of re-imagining community is itself a privilege asserting that “post-nationalism is a luxury of the prosperous and secure” (p. 43). He notes that “advocates of global citizenship, principally from Western industrialized countries with a recent history of prosperity and security, would do well to remind themselves that their nation’s stability is built upon a legacy of nationalism” (p. 43). In this sense the cosmopolitan ideal is a privilege of those who can take their national identity and nation-state status for granted, and national-stability is a pre-condition for its re-imagination.

This critique troubles Osler’s and Banks’s assumption that global orientations necessarily ameliorate cultural inequities in national citizenship imaginaries. Furthermore, global citizenship is implicated in the paradox of modernity and the national-global tension. In Noddings’ (2004) insistence that peace education must be central to GCE, she reveals this paradox: “A global citizen must see war as contrary to all of the concerns we have identified—... to the balance of diversity and unity, and to the well-being of all of earth’s inhabitants. Yet if war comes, the vast majority of us will stand—sadly, perhaps even angrily—with our own nation” (Noddings, 2004, p. 4). Therefore, while there are some main rationales and conceptual and pedagogical premises from which GCE literature links itself to multiculturalism, there are key tensions characteristic of theorizing from the pivot-point.

Myers’s (2006) research on conceptualizations of GCE in multicultural contexts exemplifies the national-global tension. Her study finds students and teachers in the U.S.

\(^{59}\) Kymlicka (2003) suggests that in some cases international-interculturalism can work against national multiculturalism. Furthermore, the positive results of multicultural education should not be over-emphasized. As Pigozzi (2006) notes, “...no single discipline or sphere of activity can solve the problems on its own. Well might we be deeply concerned that history textbooks provide a ‘balanced view’ of the past, but we also know that most of the useable and formative history learned by children is learned outside of school, from family, from the media, from films, from theatre, from comic books, and from other sources as well. Well might we strive, and we should strive, to eliminate the mechanisms of violence and oppression from school dynamics, but a child may well return to a society where those forces are given full rein. Multi-cultural and multi-ethnic curricula have been used in societies that exploded, ripped apart by the forces that the education system bravely strove to tame” (p. 2).
consider “the immediacy of multicultural education...a more powerful draw”: “This situation highlights a fundamental dilemma in teaching about cultures, peoples, and topics that are distant from the students' and teachers' direct experiences. An understanding of global studies as fundamentally cultural is also problematic because it may avoid more controversial and political topics” (Myers, 2006, p. 387). This finding contradicts Wells’s (2009) work that found global education might be seen as more neutral and easier than multicultural education. Whichever way it is read, this point is directly related to two key factors: a) the influence of the national geo-political and multicultural context, and b) the lack of theoretical grounding evident in global citizenship education: “When the term [global citizenship education] appears [in the U.S. educational literature], it is often used with similar meanings to those ascribed to global education or multicultural education (e.g., Banks, 2003; Noddings, 2004) and rarely defined and given a coherent theoretical foundation” (Myers, 2006, p. 370).

Myers’s (2010) more recent study raises the assumptions made about students’ citizenship identities as embedded in the extension model of local-national-global citizen. He finds that global citizenship, “as an ‘imagined’ construct that reflects a shared sense of place and values” is a very tangible identity for the high school students he studied who were taking global education courses. He goes so far as to recognize that a multicultural context suggest students identify with places outside the United States: “Ignoring this global dimension in citizenship educational practices is likely to lead to student resistance and disengagement, especially in multicultural democracies in which many youth have international backgrounds and experiences” (Myers, 2010, p. 498). Again, there is the suggestion that multicultural experience is international experience. While it is important to trouble the assumption of linear expansion embedded in the dominant citizenship education discourse, the issue of defining local others as international or foreign raises an important tension inherent to the way citizenship education produces narratives of the imagined nation. This is a particularly important tension given the strong assumption that GCE and multiculturalism are mutually reinforcing fields.

As touched upon the previous chapter, an important conceptual link between GCE and multiculturalism in the GCE literature is the call for GCE to encourage greater human rights literacy. As Heater (2003) articulates, “whether one is considering multicultural
education...or global education, one development is clear: that all these approaches have heightened the awareness of educationists that education for citizenship must give a high priority to learning tolerance and teaching about the nature of human rights” (p. 196). This concept is tied closely into the way the spatial dimension of citizenship is conceptualized. In one view, critical human rights literacy corresponds with the linear expansion model.

Gaudelli and Fernekes (2004) found that when GCE approaches to curriculum design and instructional strategies teach students about the scope and significance of human rights issues in a way that “expanded to include national but also international perspectives”, the approach can be “successful to some degree in ‘countersocializing’ these adolescents to re-examine their knowledge base, attitudes, and values with respect to human rights” (p. 23). Thus, through GCE, critical space is made to examine questions of equity and justice and to expand a sense of community and rights.

Indeed, there is evidence in the GCE literature that human rights literacy opens a critical space through which to combat neoliberal visions of globalization and to assert more critical ideologies (Rizvi, 2009). There is a strong ethical imperative inherent to the theoretical and empirical research on GCE and a focus on human rights literacy that is conceptualized in resistance to neoliberalism and as constructing a flexible and dynamic local-national-global dialectic. Indeed, the linear expansion model articulated by Banks (2009) is an interactive and dynamic space in that it engages with global issues of equity while practicing equitable relations in the local context. The flexible spatial dimension of citizenship conceptualized in the GCE literature remains somewhat ambiguous and contradictory in some senses, but it is clear that it pushes for more critically-oriented visions of citizenship in the global imperative which include multiculturalism and other critical impulses. Peters, Blee and Britton (2008) argue that “in one sense global citizenship education … offers the prospect of extending both the ideologies of human rights and multiculturalism, perhaps, post-colonialism, in a critical and informed way” (Peters, Blee & Britton, 2008, p. 11).

In many ways, GCE represents a post-as-after modernism approach in the ways that it is seen in relation to multiculturalism. Scholars generally understand GCE to be a logical development of liberal social justice approaches to multiculturalism in order to meet 21st
century realities and issues. The two fields work in a dynamic, positive interaction. This conceptualization is posed overtly against a closed patriotism (neoconservatism) and an economic imperative (neoliberalism). The question remains to what extent this version of GCE represents a global social justice instrumentalist agenda which Marshall (2009) critiques for being fundamentally rooted in Enlightenment assumptions and to what extent this version of GCE opens up important critical spaces through which a post-as-interrogating modernism becomes possible. Attempting to trace and break-down the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE is thus a confusing and challenging project that is embedded in wider philosophical and ideological conflations

Schattle (2008) provides a useful view into these conflations. In his large literature review of GCE programs in schools and universities that cites largely U.S. and U.K. examples, he notes the fields are embedded in wider and particular ideologies. Schattle (2008) finds the use of the term GCE is indicative of the large extent to which multiple ideologies overlap and even contradict one another within the field of GCE:

Many educational institutes have invited multiple meanings of these terms to compete and co-exist—thereby not even attempting or wishing to resolve contestation....The lack of widespread and effective decontestation claims is perhaps the strongest indicators that global citizenship educational initiatives are providing evidence mainly of adaptations within familiar ideologies rather than the onset of a new ideology. (Schattle, 2008, p. 89)

He focuses on those ideological adaptations of GCE situated within the “wide umbrella of liberalism with its fundamental emphasis upon individual rights and liberties” (Schattle, 2008, p. 74). The uncontested multiple versions of GCE operating in the field of education co-exist because, as Schattle (2008) argues, they ultimately represent three “competing strains of liberalism”—moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism, and neoliberalism—which are distinct and contradictory, but are tied to basic assumptions of individual rights (Schattle, 2008, p. 90). In this sense, the ideological constellation of GCE is firmly located in the post-as-after modernism vision of educating citizens for the 21st century (Andreotti, 2010b): “In the end, global citizenship educational programs provide further evidence

He recognizes but does not elaborate on the extent to which environmentalism is an influential in framing GCE, calling it “an ideology of its own” (Schattle, 2008, p. 74).
especially of the present state of pluralism within liberalism, with multiple versions of liberalism simultaneously competing for validation as public debates about globalization along with our collective understandings of global interdependence and its implications, continue to unfold” (Schattle, 2008, p. 90-91).

Indeed, Schattle’s (2008) research is significant in relation to Delanty’s (2006) identification of three versions of cosmopolitanism: universal (moral cosmopolitan), liberal (liberal multiculturalism), and postcolonial. He finds that multiculturalism counts as global citizenship in a similar way as Delanty (2006) does thereby further demonstrating the conceptual ambiguity and a degree of conflation between multiculturalism and GCE. Yet, Schattle (2008) does not describe any GCE programs as relating to what Delanty (2006) calls postcolonial cosmopolitanism (see also Andreotti , 2010c). Furthermore, Knight Abowitz and Harnish’s (2006) and Parker’s (2011) discourse analysis of citizenship education in the context of globalization findings align with Schattle’s review of GCE programs. The main difference is in their indication of the influence of neoconservative ideologies. Their mapping of the discourses of citizenship education finds a conflated discourse of global citizenship that is flexible and thus could be opened up through critical discourses to challenge and interrogate neoconservative, neoliberal, and liberal versions of citizenship based in Enlightenment assumptions. Similarly, Schattle (2008) does find that while educational programs for global citizenship do not resolve uncertainty or debate about what global citizenship means, they do seem to have opened up critical spaces. He finds “new lines of inquiry and new avenues of debate regarding the meaning of ‘global citizenship’” and individually the meanings of global and citizenship (Schattle, 2008, p. 89). Overall, Schattle’s (2008) research finds that GCE programs represent adaptations of different versions of liberalism that contribute to the confusion and conflation in terms GCE and its relationship to multiculturalism.

Schattle’s (2008) work on the extent to which GCE operates as field that adapts to and conflates with different versions of liberalism points to the wider ideological landscape defining citizenship education in the context of the global imperative. When looking at teaching global citizenship education in a national context of multiculturalism, there are contending ideologies underlying normative usages of the terms and how cultural diversity is
taken-up. However, the extent to which the two fields overlap or are distinct is more challenging to determine. The wider scholarly literature appears to treat liberal multiculturalism and moral cosmopolitanism as distinct referents of essentially similar ideologies reflecting the importance of respecting cultures and getting along. A key theme arising from this literature is the conceptual conflation between multicultural and global education in the U.S. context. However, it also raises the question of how particular national imaginaries mediate and relate to a perceived relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship education. Indeed, as Evans et al. (2009) argue, “context matters” (p. 30).

**Canadian Discourse Analyses:**

**Multiculturalism and Global Citizenship Education**

The discourse analyses of Canadian citizenship education materials reflect themes emerging from wider research into democratic citizenship education discourses as well as specific discourses particular to the Canadian context. In this section, I somewhat echo the other sections of the literature review but with a Canadian focus. I will first review Bickmore’s (2006) study of citizenship education discourses in Canada. I then look at the work of Pike and Selby (1999) and their connections between multiculturalism and GCE in the Canadian context. I will then connect the work of Joshee (2004, 2009) and of Richardson (2008b), in multiculturalism and GCE respectively to connect historical and contemporary discourses analyses of the two fields in the Canadian context.

Bickmore (2006) studied the curricular (grades 1-10) treatment of conflict, diversity, peace, and justice issues in three Canadian provinces (Manitoba, Nova Scotia, and Ontario). She found the most prominent discourse to be a neutral ideal of Canadian multiculturalism with an emphasis on harmony and a marginalization of conflict and critical viewpoints. Where injustices are presented, they are seen as in the past or virtually resolved. Given a mix of contradictory expectations for citizenship—“everything from being good by being compliant to an exhortation that young individuals can and should change the world”—, citizenship education curricula represent an ideologically crowded conceptualization so that “there was consequently considerable space … to use these curricula in relatively conservative or relatively transformative ways” (p. 381). Her study draws attention to the
ambiguity with which democratic language introduces curricular documents in promotion of a committed, active, critical, inclusive citizen agency and at the same time each curriculum presented skill-building expectations and subject matter that could “open important spaces for pluralistic democratic engagement” (p. 381). Significantly, she finds that like national identity, notions of “global citizenship responsibilities” are presented similarly across provinces (Bickmore, 2006, p. 380). Teachers have the opportunity to take up controversial issues and probe notions of internationalism and globality but there are “only very rare explicit requirements here to do so” (Bickmore, 2006, p. 380). This is comparable to Schattle’s (2008) findings in that Canadian citizenship education functions as a space for the adaptation of various liberal ideologies. There is a strong social justice emphasis on diversity and equity; however, this emphasis in citizenship education in Canada seems similar to what Marshall (2009) identified as a social justice instrumentalism and is thus consistent with a post-as-after modernist framework. However, there are spaces found in curricula for probing assumptions and working towards a post-as-interrogating modernist perspective and epistemological pluralist approach.

In terms of research on the explicit relationship between multiculturalism and global education, I did not find literature relating to the Canadian context. However, Merryfield’s (1996) study of connections between multicultural and global education highlights the work of Pike and Selby at the University of Toronto in the 1990s. Indeed, their work (1999) demonstrates the extent to which multicultural education is seen as part of the broad basis of global education. Their two part teacher resource In the Global Classroom Book One (1999) and Book Two (2000) was an outcome of the Ontario Green Schools Project in the 1990s. In their introduction, which articulates and builds from an integrated model of the global

---

61 There are similar findings in relation to social studies textbooks. Bromley (2011) conducted a comparable study of how social studies textbooks in British Columbia resolve the tension between what she identifies as two contradictory goals: a) promoting cohesive national identity and b) teaching respect and equality among diverse groups in a globalized world: “These findings illustrate that rather than a transition from an older, national model of civic education to a new, global model, there is a blending and integration of conceptions of national identity, multiculturalism and human rights.” (Bromley, 2011, p. 161).

62 This project occurred from January 1993-1995 and was funded by the Richard Ivy Foundation. It set out to “green” seven schools (both elementary and secondary as well as several associated schools) in two Ontario school boards and to facilitate the infusion of global education (Selby, 2000, p. 91). The project included six strands: school ground naturalization, school plan, school ethos, curriculum, telecommunications, and community (Selby, 2000, p. 91). It also set out “to promote social justice, multiculturalism, holistic health, safe schools, citizenship and democracy across the school community” (Selby, 2000, p. 91-92).
dimensions of teaching (spatial, issues, temporal, and inner dimension), they include racism as an example of areas for integrating global education. The area of racism points to the implied basis of global education in multicultural education broadly and a more directed version of critical multiculturalism, anti-racist education, more specifically. Pike and Selby (1999) include a variety of strategies for integrating racism as a topic through a cross-curricular approach to global education. These include:

- “reflecting on personal prejudices and the impact of being unfairly treated (language arts, social studies)” (p. 21)
- “utilizing national statistical data that is broken down according to ethnic, cultural or religious background (mathematics)” (p. 21)
- “analyzing claims for the genetic or inherent superiority of one race over another (science, social studies)” (p. 22)
- “exploring the links between racism, sexism, homophobia and cruelty to other species (social studies)” (p. 22)
- “appreciating the art, music and literature of indigenous peoples and visible minorities in Canada and elsewhere (art, language arts, music)” (p. 22)
- “examining the history of the Quebec separatist movement and comparing attitudes on the issue from various provinces (French, history, social studies)” (p. 22)
- “predicting the future impact on Canadian society and identity of the present policy on immigration (social studies)” (p. 22)

It is significant that global education in this model conceptualizes racism in a Canadian context as tied to the intersectional nature of marginalized positions (racism, sexism, homophobia) and as framed by both immigration and the separatist movement in Québec. In this sense, racism is a conceptual umbrella for any discrimination related to ethnic identity.

For more on the distinction between multicultural and anti-racist education see Yon (2000), James (2008), and Ghosh (2002). Some would include anti-racism in critical multiculturalism (Joshee, 2004; 2007). For more on critical multiculturalism see May (2009).
Pike and Selby’s (1999) work demonstrates the way that a global education frame highlights issues of multiculturalism in a Canadian context at the same time that it frames these issues through discourses of Canadian multiculturalism. Thus, they highlight the significance of national contexts of multiculturalism to the way that issues of ethnocultural and racial inequities and diversity are taken-up within a broader frame of global education. The analysis of the Alberta documents in Chapters 8 and 9 will demonstrate the extent to which this represents a space for conceptual confusion; there is both a foregrounding of critical diversity issues and a foreclosing of the discourses through which they are examined when global citizenship education is conceptualized within a national and provincial multicultural context.

While there is not a lot of research relating to the explicit relationship between multiculturalism and GCE in Canada, I find it useful to examine and compare how Joshee (2007, 2009) and Joshee and Johnson (2008) map historical and contemporary discourses of multiculturalism and citizenship in education to how Richardson (2008b) maps historical and contemporary discourses of GCE. Such a comparison finds that the two discursive fields interrelate ideologically and have done so historically. Work by Joshee and Johnson (2008) finds that a web of distinct and inter-related discourses framed notions of diversity and citizenship in 1920s-50s Canada in three overarching historical discourses. First, in the commonwealth discourse, Canadian identity is based on British and Christian traditions. Overt references to the White race by liberal imperialists prove that in the commonwealth discourse; the idea of justice sat unproblematically beside white supremacy.64 Second, in the mosaic as Canada’s unique identity, governments promoted a vision of Canada as a country that included all immigrant groups, especially those of European origin, and celebrated diversity and tolerance as hallmarks of Canadian tradition. The mosaic discourse saw that groups are cemented by the idea of a unique Canadian diversity, but the underlying assumption was that British traditions of openness and Christian values that make an inclusive approach to different cultures possible. The third discourse, citizenship as social action, accentuated a vision of citizenship as action that better a more equitable society as a whole and emphasized the importance of active participation in building equitable

---

64 For example, the Anglican Archdeacon of Montreal was quoted in 1947: “The British Commonwealth and Empire today is a necessity to the world; its importance for Europe lies in the fact that it is the champion of the world supremacy of the White Man” (Gower-Rees, 1947 as cited in Joshee & Johnson, 2007).
It demonstrates the historical roots of social justice orientations to citizenship (Joshee et al., 2009).

Richardson’s (2008b) mapping of the imperial imaginary in global education ties strongly with Joshee and Johnson’s (2008) articulation of how discourses of cultural diversity in Canada are rooted in British, Christian liberal traditions of inclusivity and benevolence. Historically, and in parallel to the commonwealth discourse, he notes that there was an early emphasis in Canadian schooling on the rights, responsibilities, and superiority implicit in being a member of the British Empire and Commonwealth. By the time of the post-World War Two era, he identifies a bi-polar imaginary which mirrored the imperial divisions but with the ideological divisions embedded in the Cold War. Social studies across the provinces included learning about communism to understand the motives and methods of the rival system in order to reinforce the rightness of democratic capitalism (Richardson, 2008b, p. 59). Another imaginary emerged in the 1960s; the multipolar imaginary was a sharp contrast to the bipolar in its emphasis on international cooperation, multilateralism, and interdependence. Rather than memorizing facts, it encouraged students to actively engage in global issues by asking questions about disparities and suggesting solutions. However, Richardson (2008b) notes that the multipolar view was ultimately critiqued for substituting a singular view of the world as a village for the imperial view of the West as the economic and political model. Thus, it maintained a fundamentally nineteenth century understanding of the obligation of the “West to make it right” (Richardson, 2008b, p. 60). Thus, Richardson’s (2008b) mapping of the historical global imaginaries in Canadian education parallels Joshee and Johnson’s (2008) identification of central discourses framing citizenship and diversity in Canadian history. While Richardson’s (2008b) work extends chronologically from where Joshee and Johnson end, key themes connecting the two include imperialism, appreciation for differences in cultures, forging a unique Canadian identity, and social action.

programs; however, like Knight-Abowitz and Harnish (2006) and Parker (2011), she finds evidence of neoconservatism as well. Also similar to their findings, social justice discourses are marginal. Joshee (2004, 2009) finds there is a resurgence in neoconservative discourses around the relationship between multiculturalism and education in Canada but these operate largely at the federal level and less strongly at the provincial level of education65. Neoconservative discourses glorify a vision of the past that is associated with the dominant (White, middle-class, anglophone, British) group and its view of traditional values66. This reinscribes a “we” versus “they” mentality where the “we” is the dominant group who are hard-working, decent and virtuous citizens and the “they” are the “others”, including indigenous peoples, immigrants, women, and the poor who are lazy, immoral, and permissive (Joshee, 2009, p. 96-97 drawing on Apple, 2006).

The most dominant discourse of multiculturalism in educational policy is neoliberalism. In an explicit way, in the current context of dominant neoliberal ideology, multiculturalism is seen as a resource for global relations in Canada. Joshee (2009) identifies four main neoliberal discourses in educational policy relating to multiculturalism in Canada. The neoliberal business case discourse values multiculturalism “to the extent that it is a resource for international business and provides a strategy for managing workplace diversity” (p. 99). Thus, those in ethnocultural communities are constructed primarily as contributors to the economy and workers and consumers thus are not citizens first and foremost in terms of being political and social agents (see also Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2002). In the equity of outcomes discourse some individuals need help to achieve the same success that everyone wants in a system that is essentially fair. In a related discourse, equality as sameness, inequality is not the norm and there are many ways of being different and diverse. Thus, it is based on a paradox: everyone is different and the same. Social cohesion is a very strong

65 Examples include the Fraser Institute and the Dominion Institute.
66 Since 1997, the Dominion Institute has published a yearly survey to see what Canadians know about themselves; the results are reported on Canada Day and suggest that there is a crisis in Canada because average Canadians cannot recite back specific facts about law, geography, and military history. This project has been criticized by leaders in field of citizenship education for trivializing citizenship to a game of trivia (Sears & Hypslop-Marginson, 2007). However, Joshee (2004) observes that they have a strong presence in directing the public discourse in Canada. Right-wing think-tanks focused on economic competition and renewing pride in Canada’s shared memory and pride as tied to its competitiveness and supporting a free-market, and they are currently well-funded and prominent in the national media.
neoliberal discourse understood as a corrective measure to a splintering society. The social cohesion discourse is a response to the consequence of market-focused policies and programs which encourage competition and individualism which then cause tension in the social and political realm of society (Joshee, 2009). Social cohesion is invoked as a way to restore faith in the institutions of government and promoting security. The main concept is that seeing past differences and being nice to others helps to make an effectively functioning society; any focus on difference presents a challenge to the idea of social cohesion.

Joshee (2009) notes that through to the late eighties and early nineties, liberal social justice discourses were strongly evident in educational policy in Canada. Despite the neoliberal onslaught of the 90s, and the current resurgence of neoconservative discourses, especially at the federal level, Joshee (2009) notes that there is still evidence, albeit muted, of liberal social justice discourses: “The current policy landscape is not as hospitable to critical multicultural education as it once was, but this does not mean that multicultural education has been forgotten in Canada. Quite clearly the struggle for social justice and equity continues” (Joshee, 2009, p. 106). There are liberal social justice discourses in Canadian education policy relating to a nurturing, caring, and just society. These include identity-based, recognition, and rights-based discourses. The identity-based discourse links to earlier versions of multiculturalism and bilingualism and asserts that particular identities are valuable and therefore ought to be supported and developed. The discourse of recognition focuses on accepting these identities as valid and valuable within the public life of the community. The rights-based discourse focuses on individual rights and is closely linked with common understandings of human rights. The discourse of redistribution recognizes that goods and power have been and continue to be unequally distributed among social groups and seeks to address this problem. Therefore multicultural education policy work, particularly at the local level, is very much an “on-going dialogue” wherein neoliberal and neoconservative discourses get modified by liberal social justice discourses and “vice versa” (Joshee, 2009, p. 106).

As Sears and Hyslop-Marginson (2007) argue, “The desire to promote social cohesion implies an underlying fear that industrialized societies confront serious fragmentation in the face of economic globalization and growing cultural diversity. Citizenship education is considered a bulwark against such decay” (p. 52).
Richardson’s (2008b) research into contemporary global imaginaries in Canadian conceptualizations of GCE finds a similar ideological tension as Joshee (2004, 2009). Educators and theorists are struggling to unite under a broad agenda for GCE that is in fact marked by two distinctly different imaginaries based in two distinct ideologies. One, the ecological imaginary, is encapsulated by notions of ecological relationships, interrelatedness, and the importance of physical and cultural diversity. In this view, GCE serves to develop in students a sense of connectedness, empathy and appreciation for diversity and differences and to contribute a critique of globalization’s contributions to inequities. This imaginary can be connected to Marshall’s (2009) findings of the global social justice instrumentalist agenda of GCE in the U.K. (see also Li, 2003). The ecological imaginary has become popular with critical scholars and can also be associated with the social justice oriented frameworks in the late nineties and in recent scholarly work, and thus opens up important critical spaces in education. However, Richardson (2008b) defines a competing imaginary that threatens the transformative potential of the ecological imaginary. The monopolar imaginary is based on individualism and neoliberal economic ideals and emphasizes superficial differences asserting that individuals have the same fundamental wants and needs so that by serving self-interests, one is serving the interest of the planet and all its inhabitants (see also Shultz, 2007). Similarly to what Marshall (2009) found in the technical-economic instrumentalist agenda for GCE in the U.K., in this view, GCE should develop in Canadian students the knowledge and skills to be competitive and successful in the global arena because globalization is inevitable and is essentially a positive force. There is a parallel then between the way global citizenship is imagined in this latter view and Joshee’s concern about the way that a context dominated by neoliberalism re-frames equity and diversity as individual development and social cohesion.

Discourse analyses work in Canada around diversity and citizenship education in the global imperative thus reflect the wider ideologies found in studies of the U.K., the U.S. and Western democracies more generally in that multiple ideologies overlap and contradict within the discursive fields of multiculturalism and global citizenship and shape the confluations, confusions and ambiguity that defines their assumed positive relationship. While neoconservatism is a strong discourse tied to national imaginaries and inherent to how nations are imagined through global citizenship education, there is also a conflation of
distinct versions of liberalism. In this context, GCE can represent a critical space in the web of intersecting ideologies, and it can also represent a space for the assertion of dominant neoliberal discourses or strengthening neoconservative discourses. Thus, it is important to consider the way work in each field relates and to examine underlying assumptions and potential tensions inherent to assuming that the fields of multicultural and global education naturally and positively work together. As Evans et al. (2009) argue, contextual factors are extremely relevant to assessing the extent to which educating “for the global dimension of citizenship” is prioritized in curricula and in schools (p. 30). Differently from Bickmore’s (2006) finding of general similarities across provinces in terms of projections of the national and global versions of citizenship, they argue that while orientations to global citizenship often view global themes as “matter of self-interest”, provincial and territorial contexts of educational administration in Canada present challenges and opportunities. The next chapter begins a specific look into the ways these wider ideological tensions and conceptual ambiguities play out in the context of the province of Alberta and its citizenship education policy, social studies curriculum, and secondary school social studies lesson plans.

**Synthesis of the Chapter**

In this chapter, I set out to inquire into the following question: How are the tensions defining the broader theoretical context reflected in the educational research literature? Some key interconnecting themes emerged within and across the four sub-sections of the literature review.

1. The research literature specific to discourse analyses of citizenship education and social studies in the context of globalization.
   - The wider ideological landscape of citizenship education, global education and social studies education is framed by the dominance of neoconservative discourses of patriotism and security, neoliberal discourses of economic imperatives, and looser liberal notions of political involvement.
   - Critical discourses are marginal but do create critical spaces for mediating the dominant ideologies. They include equity discourses around race, gender,
class, sexuality, religion, etc. and also include discourses around transnationalism and global perspectives.

- The various ideologies framing citizenship education, global education, and social studies education can be mapped onto Andreotti’s (2010b, 2010c) framework of post-as-after and post-as-interrogating modernism. Enlightenment-inspired discourses dominate while more critical discourses interrogate and open spaces for challenging modernist assumptions.

- Multiculturalism is most evident as a critical discourse of race, diversity and equity. However, it is also conflated with different discourses of global orientations to schooling.

- Global orientations span across the ideological landscape and correspond to particular discourses that evoke particular versions of multiculturalism.

- The broad uses of discourses of transnationalism and global orientations demonstrate the potential for global citizenship initiatives to reify the dominance of neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies; however, the existence of the critical discourses also demonstrates the potential for notions of global citizenship to create critical spaces.

2. The research literature specific to the explicit relationship between multicultural education and global education:

- Global education and multicultural education are seen as mutually reinforcing and positively reinforcing.

- They are seen as distinct in terms of their spatial orientations (national and global); however, they are also seen as similar in that they relate to a shared set of issues.

- Multiculturalism and global education are conceptualized within a dominant version of citizenship as extending in a linear mode from national to global. Through a liberal social justice approach to equity and diversity,
multiculturalism is sometimes conceptualized as being broadened by global education. There is a strong assumption that this leads to a more critical awareness of equity issues in the local and national contexts.

- While the literature largely assumes a mutual reinforcing relationship, the fields are also conceptualized as representing competing agendas. In the educational arena, both multicultural and global education can be understood as add-ons. In some cases, multiculturalism is seen as an entrenched field with global education as an additional add-on. In other cases, global education is seen as more relevant than multicultural education (particularly in school communities not described as pluralistic in terms of cultural demographics).

- There are little to no other tensions acknowledged between the two fields other than the competing space within the educational field. There is a lack of theoretical grounding of the two fields and of their relationship.

3. The research literature specific to global citizenship education in multicultural contexts

- There is a strong rationale for implementing GCE content and pedagogy in multicultural contexts. This is tied to the double impulse associated with globalization (need to open up to global markets and need to attend to the issues related to increased cultural diversity at home).

- GCE works with critical multicultural models that resist neoliberal agendas and promotes social justice view. This rationale reflects Marshall’s (2009) distinctions between economic-technical agendas and global social justice agendas of GCE. Multicultural contexts are understood as providing rationales for the latter agenda. Human rights literacy is a strong approach.

- GCE promotes a complex understanding of identity categories and diversity that can support a self-critical and complex view of cultural relations within the local and national contexts.
• The extent to which GCE and multiculturalism as seen as compatible is reflective also of the extent to which the approach to GCE recognizes the potential for Westerncentrism and the potential tensions inherent to both national and global understandings of interconnectivity.

4. The research literature specific to the Canadian context:

• The Canadian context is shaped by a strong assumption of a functioning version of multiculturalism in the literature on global education.

• Historically, discourses of imperialism, celebrating diversity, and promoting civic action are consistent across the fields of multiculturalism and GCE.

• The current ideological landscape is most strongly dominated by neoliberal ideologies. There are neoconservative ideologies also shaping notions of diversity, especially at the federal level. Liberal social justice discourses are evident but are marginalized in both multicultural and GCE contexts. However, a critical, ecological view is strong in GCE although it competes against a neoliberal view.

Given that schooling is a function of nation-building and is run by governments, citizenship education is layered with power dynamics reflecting both global geo-political influences and national narratives responding to the global imperative. Thus, the next section of the thesis will turn to a more specific discourse analysis of wider ideologies framing the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE in the Canadian context and in the specific case of Alberta citizenship education and secondary social studies documents.
Chapter Seven
Methodology

Discursive Turn, the Theoretical Pivot-Point, and
Educating the 21st Century Citizen:
Synthesis of Theoretical Context and Literature Review

In Chapters Two through Four, I used the lens of the discursive turn to examine the wider theoretical context defining the topic of this thesis and to look at how that wider theoretical context is evident in a praxis relationship to citizenship education and schooling. In Chapter Two, drawing on Burbules and Knight Abowitz’s (2008) notion of a radical philosophy of education, I described the pivot-point as an analogy for situated, historicized, and reflexive position of theorizing influenced by the discursive turn. The discursive turn proposes a correlation between language and reality and is represented in the tracing of “different interpretations of words to socially and historically constructed and culturally located ‘metanarratives’, or stories that offer grand explanations of history or of knowledge” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236). The pivot-point reflects the recognition of contradictions and paradoxes in discourses that are often understood as neutrally descriptive, and it seeks to evoke the dynamics inherent to tensions to find critical spaces towards thinking otherwise.

In Chapter Three, I explored how nationhood (Anderson, 2006) as intrinsic to nation-state-building and national citizenship is a metanarrative and includes some inherent paradoxes. The imagined nation inherently excludes as it includes. The spatial boundaries are constructed outwardly (through imperialism) and inwardly (through categorization of identity differences in relation to the imagined folk of the nation). These tensions are made visible at particular moments of academic, social, and political critique. Liberalism includes an expanding model of rights that seek to address unfair exclusion while reinforcing the legitimacy of liberalism as an ideology of nation-building. The tensions inherent to nationhood and citizenship are central to the accepted premise of contemporary theory that citizenship is as contested as it is a dominant discourse for identity and political organization (Sears, 2009).
Based on the recognition of nationhood as a metanarrative and citizenship as a contested concept, Chapter Four considered how, in the current context of globalization, cosmopolitanism and global orientations to citizenship are the focus of much scholarly attention. Indeed, the cosmopolitan turn is reflected in the amount of scholarly and popular attention to the concept of building global community in response to the sense of increasing interconnections associated with the complex processes of globalization. According to Tully (2008), the concept of global citizenship comes from the application of cosmopolitanism to two conjoined discursive fields: globalization and citizenship. The inherent paradox of cosmo-polis represents a dynamic space for negotiating and conceptualizing community (Strand, 2010b). While Delanty (2006) understands a dynamic relationship between the national and the global imaginary through the paradox of modernity (national-global) and identifies various versions of cosmopolitanism, his theorizing demonstrates the tendency to see multiculturalism as both a form of cosmopolitanism and of nationalism. A view of globalization as governmentality (Burns, 2008) highlights the discursive turn by pointing out how notions of globalization are constructed through particular ideologies with neoliberalism currently dominating. As the nation-state remains the main institution of political organization, the cosmopolitan turn is expressed through a liberal (e.g. Kymlicka) and universalist (e.g. Nussbaum) view of extending a notion of community and of loyalty to others from the local to the national to the global dimension. Meanwhile, neoliberal understandings of globalization shift the citizenship dynamic from being about loyalty to the state in exchange for protection and rights to a focus on the citizen as an individual actor in the global economy. Postcolonial views of cosmopolitanism critique the ethnocentric liberal premise of extension of rights to an autonomous subject (Delanty, 2006; Mignolo, 2000). They also raise important tensions around the extent to which current processes of globalization emerge out of colonial relations of power in a new imperialism (Tikly, 2004).

In Chapter Five I examined how this wider theoretical context is evident in conceptions of schooling and citizenship education. Schooling is both a tool for transmitting the values, traditions, and symbols of the imagined nation and is a method for socializing young people into wider systemic organizations. At the same time, it is a space for promoting equal opportunity and social inclusions so as to transform the status quo. In the current context of neoliberalism, a focus on diversity, equity, and recognition are interpreted in
individualistic terms. The citizenship dynamic becomes about states protecting an individual’s right to personal development in exchange for participating in the economic development of the country. Correspondingly, citizenship education has become conflated with character education (Osborne, 2000). Schooling is also a site for the application of the cosmopolitan turn. Schooling experiences a dual crisis (Agbaria, 2011) in the context of contemporary globalization: it faces the pressures of preparing students for performance in the global economy and the pressures of retaining legitimacy amidst an increasingly culturally diverse and socially stratified student demographic. At the same time, calls for global citizenship education seek to reassert a social justice and critical view of imagining a global community. While some more critical versions of GCE reflect a theoretical and pedagogical version of the pivot-point, others remain rooted in liberal frameworks that are tied to the expansion model of citizenship. In terms of actual GCE programs, Marshall (2009) calls this the economic-technical and global social justice instrumentalist dualism of GCE agendas. Andreotti’s (2010b, 2010c) framework of the two versions of postmodernism—post-as-after and post-as-interrogating modernism—helps to make sense of wider philosophical and ideological distinctions inherent to versions of the schooling for the 21st century global citizen. Some versions are continuations of the assumptions of expansion and progress inherent to modernism. They may call for a wider expansion of modern ideals and for the inclusion of those currently marginalized so that they can also imagine a future using a telos of modern progress. Other versions of citizenship education for the 21st century global world recognize and unpack the tensions inherent to its paradoxes in order to look towards a future that might be imagined otherwise. Importantly, the pivot-point version of theorizing sees paradoxes as dynamic and productive. By recognizing the tensions, a theorist can not only find spaces for new ways of thinking by breaking down the commonsensical assumptions underlying dominant discourses, but can also recognize productive spaces created by the discourses that are not dominant but that push at and resist dominant ideologies.

In Chapter Six, my review of the research literature on the explicit and implicit relationship between multiculturalism and GCE finds an overall conceptual ambiguity within each field and in terms of the assumed mutually reinforcing and positive relationship between the two. I found little to no research examining the tensions inherent to imagining
global citizenship in a national context of multiculturalism. However, broader discourse analyses in Western, liberal democratic contexts as well as research specific to the Canadian context, point to the large extent to which the fields, and their relationship, are embedded in a larger ideological constellation. There is a strong tension between versions of citizenship education, diversity, and global citizenship based in neoliberal terms (and to a particular extent in neoconservative terms as well) on the one hand, and those pushing for social justice and equity agendas on the other. Joshee (2007, 2009) finds that multiculturalism in citizenship education policy in Canada follows this trend through a specific set of discourses while Richardson (2008b) finds GCE functions through a similar dichotomy of neoliberal versus ecological/social justice ideologies. Work by Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) point out that discourses of transnational (or global) citizenship are flexible in that they can be taken up by neoliberal and neoconservative versions but can also be opened up by social justice versions that then can mediate and resist the dominant views. Schattle (2008) finds that the field of GCE is essentially a constellation of different, competing versions of global citizenship reflecting an overall conflation of what are actually distinct interpretations of liberalism. These findings works help to map the wider conceptual confusion; however, they do not specifically explain the specific relationship between GCE and multiculturalism.

This chapter will set up the next section of the thesis which will examine how these conceptual ambiguities play out in the Alberta context. In this chapter I will set up a critical discourse analysis framework for a textual analysis of Alberta education documents. In the next chapters, Chapters Eight and Nine, I will identify main discourses in the texts and examine how ideological shifts and contentions impact how the fields of multiculturalism and global citizenship are conceptualized independently and in relation to each other. In Chapter Eight, I will describe and analyze the background and context of the Alberta social studies curriculum. I will analyze the character and citizenship education policy document and the broad social studies curriculum program of studies. I will then summarize the overall types of conceptual ambiguities and specific discourses relevant to the relationship between GCE and multiculturalism as a link to Chapter Nine which is the analysis of the specific secondary social studies courses and corresponding lesson plans. Therefore, in this chapter, in order to set-up the empirical section of this thesis, I will lay out my methodology by explaining my understanding of and particular approach to critical discourse analysis. I will
also explain the specific method through which I approached and conducted the discourse analysis of Alberta education texts.

**Discourse Analysis and Situated Philosophy of Education**

The first part of this thesis outlined a situated philosophical account of the wider theoretical landscape in which the concepts of multiculturalism, global citizenship, and education are conceptualized philosophically and ideologically. It was an exercise in situated and reflexive philosophy in that I drew on literature that helped me to make sense of my topic. Rather than mapping “established continuity across philosophers from before Socrates to the present day”, I examine the “philosophically underpinnings for issues of policy and practice” (Burbules & Knight Abowitz, 2008, p. 268). Indeed, in Chapter Two I situated myself as an educationist using philosophy to make sense of the issue of how a multicultural context is relevant to doing global citizenship education. In order to further that approach, I have chosen to expand the inquiry from a situated philosophical study to an empirical study of how the two fields of multiculturalism and GCE relate in policy and practice. Discourse analysis is an appropriate methodology as it is consistent with the premise of reflexive and situated philosophy and is also consistent with my framing of the work in the discursive turn.

Lingard’s (2009) explication of discourse analysis is connected to the premises of a situated and reflexive philosophy of education. He focuses on critical policy analysis which in application to my work I will broaden to include analysis of policy as well as curriculum and lesson plans. Lingard (2009) refers to three critical positionalities that are relevant to the selection of methodology. First, there is the positionality of the researcher; in my case, I am a doctoral student in a Philosophy of Education program that is combined with a Comparative, International and Development Education program who is doing a combined theoretical and empirical study as part of my thesis requirement. Second, there is the positionality of the theoretical and political stance of the policy analysis which Lingard (2009) argues has implications for the intellectual resources brought to the research topic. The beginning section of this chapter summarizes the explicit way I have articulated my theoretical stances and my position on the importance of deconstructing and mapping tensions inherent to philosophical and ideological framings. This has allowed me to engage in an interrogation of
the assumptions on which approaches to citizenship and education are based. The use of critical discourse analysis frames the political stance, and this will be further explicated in this chapter.

The third positionality is the spatial location of the researcher (Lingard, 2009). In this case, I am writing from the context of Toronto, Ontario Canada and am thus positioned in the Global North; I am writing from within the national context of the topic and from within an educator’s perspective (having taught in a variety of contexts in Canada and in Brazil); however, I am writing from outside the context of Alberta which will be the focus of the policy, curriculum, and lesson plan analysis. This presents some limits as to the contextual details that would be available to an educator with experience living and working in Alberta. Yet, it also provides some distance from the enactment of policy and policy text analysis when my focus is on what discourses operate through the texts rather than on how they are used in classrooms per se. Furthermore, I am positioned as a member of the Canadian public in that all of the Alberta texts I will be using are available online through open-access websites. This is significant in that I did not interview any policy maker, lesson plan writer, or educator. The conclusions I will be making are from whatever I found online and therefore lack some important nuances that could have been gained through a direct experience with the individuals and through particular questions related to my research. This is particularly the case with the on-line interviews with curriculum developers and summer institute session leaders as well as the lesson plans. There is thus a danger of making conclusions based on texts that have been edited by another party (in the case of the on-line videos) and without access to the classroom application (in the case of the lesson-plans). Furthermore, the lessons and summer institute sessions are intended for use and viewing by social studies teachers in Alberta. However, for the purposes of this study which is interested in what discourses are evident in official and popular understandings, the texts available for public access are indicative of what discourses are published and articulated publically and officially in that they are all sanctioned by the Alberta Ministry of Education. It would be a very interesting but very different study to examine the extent to which individual policy makers and educators understand and mediate these dominant discourses as individuals. I am interested in this particular study in mapping the widely available discourses.
The fourth positionality relevant to the choice of methodology in a critical policy analysis is linked to what Lingard (2009) calls the “temporal location” of the education policy analyst (p. 230). This temporal positionality is important to the chronological position of the actual set of policies in relation to earlier policies (which will be discussed in the Alberta context section that sets up the policy analysis) and to what extent the policies I study represent change. I also interpret temporal location to acknowledge my interest in the historical context of calls for GCE in terms of examining how new are the new ways of teaching and learning for the 21st century citizen. I am interested in the temporal salience of the global imperative and the discursive turn as well as their impact on the chronological development of modernism and articulation of postmodernism. While much of my study refers to history (in Canada especially), my attempt to infuse a situated philosophy within a notion of historicity recognizes the extent to which my view of what is important from the past is framed by my understanding of current issues and imperatives.

Discourse Analysis:
Why and What

Discourse analysis provides an appropriate methodology for examining how my historicized and situated account of the perceived relationship between multiculturalism and GCE plays out in educational policy, curriculum, and unit/lesson plan texts. Discourse analysis is a broad term and represents a wide range of theoretical and methodological scholarship (e.g., Luke, 1994, 2002; van Dijk, 1993; MacLure, 2003). I draw on the work of a number of scholars focusing on a critical emphasis within a necessarily shifting and difficult to pin-down understanding of discourse analysis as a methodology. Luke (2002) describes that critical discourse analysis is challenging to distill to particular and formalized analytic and methodological techniques. He notes that it “is more akin to a repertoire of political, epistemic stances: principles reading positions and practices for the critical analysis of the place and force of language, discourse, text, and image in changing contemporary social, economic, and cultural conditions” (Luke, 2002, p. 97). In this section I outline some key principles I take from scholarship in this area in order to frame the method by which I analyzed educational texts in the empirical section of this thesis.
Critical discourse analysis is aligned with the concepts of the discursive turn and theorizing from the pivot-point. MacLure (2003) describes how discursive analyses break down boundaries between social science and humanities and unsettle humanistic narratives of truth, progress, and emancipation by insisting that truths are textual: “the way we see the world is ‘always already’ infected by language (MacLure, 2003, p. 4). Similarly, Van Dijk (1993) emphasizes that a critical version of discourse analysis focuses on power relations and the way that certain discourses dominate and become hegemonic. This stance is aligned to the situated and historicized version of philosophy of education work in that critical discourse analysis “does not primarily aim to contribute to a specific discipline, paradigm, school or discourse theory”; rather, “[i]t is primarily interested and motivated by pressing social issues, which it hopes to better understand through discourse analysis” (Van Dijk, 1993, p. 252). Society is institutionalized into such functions as government, business, politics, schools, health care, and media communication bodies (Santos, 2008). Discourse analysis helps to recognize how language is historically defined through these institutions and ide connected to ideologies. Discourses regulate social practices by carrying contextual, ideological, and historical perspectives. Identifying discourses assists in recognizing how they function within a social order and are underpinned by similar sounding discourses. This provides insights into how social practices are conventionalized and hegemonies formed into taken-for-granted neutral assumptions (Santos, 2009).

The term discourse can be a bit confusing because it is used in a general sense in reference to language and images and also is used more specifically to refer to different ways of “representing aspects of the world” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 215). Discourse analysis looks to identify different discourses which represent different perspectives on the world and are associated with different relations people have in the world: “Discourses not only represent the world as it is (or rather is seen to be), they are also projective imaginaries, representing possible worlds which are different from the actual world, and tied in to projects to change the world in particular directions” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 124). Discourses are reflective of

---

68 Discourses thus constitute social realities and common sense through what are actually cultural struggles over meaning: “When different discourses come into conflict and particular discourses are contested, what is centrally contested is the power of these preconstructed semantic systems to generate particular visions of the world which may have the performative power to sustain or remake the world in their image, so to speak” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 130).
and play a performative role in wider ideological constellations. Strongly used and valued terms, such as citizenship and globalization are constructed discursively (Tully, 2008). Discourses do not all hold the same weight because they are embedded in a larger political economy wherein one discourse can be favoured over another: “Dominant discourses create and maintain a kind of gravitational pull on marginal discourses, a pull that seeks standardisation, assimilation and efficiency” (Camcia & Franklin, 2011, p. 313). Thus, an “order of discourse” is “a particular social ordering of relationships amongst different ways of meaning making, i.e. different discourses and genres and styles” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 206). Dominance is one aspect of this ordering: “some ways of making meaning are dominant or mainstream in a particular order of discourse, others are marginal, or oppositional, or ‘alternative’” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 206). In turn, an order of discourse can become normative as “part of the legitimizing common sense which sustains relations of domination” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 207).

However, there are always dynamic spaces through which to adapt dominant discourses and even to create new discourses: “hegemony will always be contested to a greater or lesser extent in hegemonic struggles. An order of discourse is not a closed or rigid system, but rather an open system, which is put at risk by what happens in actual interactions” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 207). Goldberg (1993) adds that “[c]onceptual hegemony turns not only upon the totally imposed order of terms in defining the social subject, but also upon the subject’s acceptance and terms as her own in self-definition and conception” (p. 194). Fairclough’s (2004) understanding of hegemony is rooted in Gramsci’s (1971) work and emphasizes “how power depends on consent or acquiescence rather than just force, and the importance of ideology” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 218). Therefore, discourses have material effects. Although they include representations of “how things are and have been, as well as imaginaries—representations of how things might or could be”, as Anderson (2006) and Richardson (2008b) have demonstrated, such imaginaries can be enacted as “actual (networks of) practices – imagined activities, subjects, social relations etc. can become real activities, subjects, social relations, etc.” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 207).

69 Discourses can be materialized, for example, “economic discourses become materialized … in the instruments of economic production” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 207).
Critical discourse analysis contributes a political dimension to the notion of the pivot-point. Van Dijk (1993) highlights “the role of discourse in the (re)production and challenge of dominance” and defines dominance as “the exercise of social power by elites, institutions or groups, that results in social inequality, including political, cultural, class, ethnic, racial and gender inequality” (p. 249-250). Reproduction processes can involve different types of discursive power relations through “overt support, enactment, representation, legitimation, denial, mitigation or concealment of dominance among others” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 250).

Critical discourse analysis is thus interested in how structures, strategies, and other properties of text and communication events function in these modes of reproduction. In the context of the global imperative and the sense both of great change and of persistent and even growing inequities, discourse analysis is salient in terms of historical context, political implications, and robust scholarship: “It’s particular concern is with the radical changes that are taking place in contemporary social life: with how discourse figures within processes of change, and with shifts in the relationship between discourse ... and other social elements within networks of practices. We cannot take the role of discourse in social practices for granted, it has to be established through analysis” (Fairclough, 2004, p. 205).

Discourse analysis is also relevant to this study in that it raises attention to the conflation of space-time in normalized versions of political community. Fairclough (2004) refers to the concept of “space-times” to represent how difficult or impossible it is to understand space and time as distinct qualities:

Space and time are not just naturally given. Space-times are social constructs, different social orders construct space-times differently, and constructions of space-time are dialectically interconnected with other social elements in the constructions of social order as networks of social practices. Moreover, a social order constructs relations between different space-times (e.g. between the local and the global in contemporary society), and these relations are a focus of contestation and struggle. These relations are assumed in a banal way, and sometimes contested, in our ordinary activities and texts. (p. 224)

As Andreotti’s (2010b, 2010c) theoretical framework of the two versions of postmodernism demonstrates, notions of educating for citizenship in the 21st century global imperative are implicated in various versions of new ways of thinking about education. Multiculturalism and GCE represent discursive fields that are implicated and conjoined in the way discourses of
globalization and citizenship construct a set of relations: between the local and the national and between the national and the global. My analysis of policy discourse will seek to identify and critique the banal ways in which these fields are used and may be accepted as mutually reinforcing.

Education policy, particularly character and citizenship education policy and social studies curricula, are places where wider discourses are applied to the project of educating students. As Camicia and Franklin (2011) note, “[d]iscourses of community, whether local, national, or global, direct curriculum reform and the notions of community contained within curriculum” (p. 311). Different visions of community are presented through policy and curriculum, and these are sources of constant contention as various stakeholders wish to have their views prevail and their sense of community reinforced (Camicia & Franklin, 2011, p. 312). In this sense, educational policy becomes a site of praxis where larger discourses are applied to the context of schooling. Critical discourse analysis of educational policy texts can reveal particular points of tension inherent to larger discourses when applied to the sphere of education. Joshee (2007) notes that “[p]olicy discourses tend to be part of larger patterns of reasoning found in the society” (p. 174). And, as Singh and Taylor (2007) point out, “[e]ducational policies are re-contextualized discourses; that is, they are constituted through the selective appropriation of texts from outside the arena of education to form a specialized discourse about education” (Singh & Taylor, 2007, p. 303). Indeed, any educational policy, curriculum document, or publically available and sanctioned unit/lesson plan is made up of overlapping layers of discourse and these discourses various discursive threads that are “negotiated through struggles” (Thomas, 2005, p. 47). Thus, discourse analyses of educational policy text seek to identify what ideologies are out there and how they work to construct ways of thinking of political community in the context of the global imperative. Critical discourse analysis also seeks to point out the way that dominant discourses obscure more marginal, critical discourses in order to raise attention to the processes of hegemony and to find and communicate spaces for resistance.
**Policy Web:**

**A Framework for Discourse Analysis**

Joshee’s (2007) policy web is a very useful framework for understanding how ideologies work through and within educational policy. Drawing on some of her previous work (Joshee & Johnson 2005), and looking at discourses of diversity in education policy documents, Joshee (2007) argues that policies are discrete at the same that they are interrelated. Thus the web metaphor is a way of conceptualizing how “policies on diversity in education must be read within the context of the full range of policies addressing diversity” (Joshee, 2007, p. 174). There are different levels in the policy web—such as school, school district, teacher union, provincial level, national level, international level—and there are multiple forms of policy relating to diversity including equity, multiculturalism, gender equality, (dis)ability, human rights, and I would add global citizenship and pluralism (Joshee, 2007, p. 174). The rings on the web correspond to the levels at which policy is formally developed. The crosscutting threads—which are connected but not always in a linear manner—correlate to how policies at different levels address similar issues but are not necessarily consistent or even complimentary:

> The points at which the threads cross the rings represent discrete policy texts, each of which is the result of historical struggles. A significant aspect of the web is that it draws our attention to the open spaces between the threads. It is in these spaces that individuals have some freedom to act in ways that support, extend, or undermine stated policy objectives and to introduce new ideas that may influence the policy discourse. (Joshee & Johnson, 2005 quoted in Joshee, 2007, p. 174)

The policy web is a complementary framework to understanding how the theoretical pivot-point relates to identifying dominant discourses in order to find the dynamic spaces where alternative discourses are resisting and even creating room for thinking otherwise. Thus, Joshee (2007) points out that the policy web is not about seeing written statements as leading to immediate changes in the system; rather, it helps to identify how dialogue, texts, action, and inaction can develop a web shaping and shaped by policy discourse (p. 175). Andreotti’s two-versions of postmodernism provide a wider lens through which to examine the inherent assumptions that relate and distinguish discourses that call for new education for citizens of the 21st century.
Critical Discourse Analysis of Alberta Texts:

The Method

The research question relating to the empirical section of this thesis is: How are the tensions found in the theoretical context and literature review reflected in policy and curriculum documents, and publically available lesson plans in Alberta? It is broken down into two sub-questions: a) What conceptual ambiguities are evident in the documents that contribute to the conflation of and/or relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship? b) What are the main discourses through which ideologies of cultural diversity and equity, citizenship, and globalization are iterated?

In my review of the discourse analysis literature in Western, liberal democratic contexts generally and in Canada specifically in previous chapters, I highlighted some key discourses that framed my analysis of the Alberta texts. These works help me to understand a broader ideological and philosophical context and provide me with some ways of thinking about and looking for discourses. They assisted me in mapping out how the concepts of multiculturalism and global citizenship and the relationship between them are conflated within a set of philosophical and ideological tensions. Some interrelated frames include: extension model of citizenship versus complexity and multiplicity of subject positions (Mitchell & Parker, 2008), Enlightenment-inspired versus critical discourses of citizenship (Knight-Abowitz & Harnish 2006), economic instrumentalist agenda versus global social justice agendas of GCE (Marshall, 2009), and the double crisis in education of performativity in the global market versus legitimacy for a diverse demographic (Agbaria, 2011). Also, the Canadian context of multiculturalism and GCE is marked by a dominance of neoliberalism across provinces but with some liberal social justice ideology of equity and diversity mediating the context (Joshee, 2004, 2009); GCE represents a strong space for ecological and social justice discourses despite strong neoliberal global imaginaries (Richardson, 2008b). The research I reviewed provided a key question to frame my approach to studying the documents: to what extent can global citizenship present a conceptual space through which to promote a post-as-interrogating approach to teaching and learning citizenship in the 21st century? Furthermore, how are multiculturalism (as a liberal ideology of extended rights) and multicultural education (as an approach that seeks to include the voices of all students and to
interrogate curriculum and approaches for ethnocentric bias) conceptualized within these opening spaces?

Using the policy web as a framework, I conducted a discourse analysis of policy texts in Alberta. I set out to map the discursive constructions of cultural diversity through national and global imaginaries and through the perceived spatial dimensions of citizenship. The policy web provides an overarching framework for my methodology. There is an emphasis in a critical approach to discourse analysis “on the ideological work of the policy texts in representing, relating, and identifying. How policy texts construct and sustain power relations ideologically is of particular interest in critical policy research” (Taylor, 2004, p. 437 italics in original). This requires an examination of particular aspects of the texts; how they are organized and how those sections categorize particular discourses, use of grammatical and semantic features (transitivity, action, voice, mood, modality) and words (e.g., vocabulary, collocations, use of metaphor, etc.) (Taylor, 2004, p. 437 citing Fairclough, 2001). I set out to identify features in the text that help to trace intersecting discursive fields of citizenship, globalization, nationhood, and cultural diversity. Then I analyzed the discursive practices that are drawn on in the production of the Albertan texts. I also considered the extent to which the different levels of policy text (broader character and citizenship education policy, curriculum rationales and program of study specific course curriculum, and individual unit and lesson plans) use similar, distinct, or overlapping discourses. Ultimately, the policy web framework is tied to an analysis of these policy texts as social and cultural practice (Santos, 2008). I set out to uncover the logics underlying how particular education texts conceptualize global citizenship and national citizenship in relation to cultural diversity and to identify specific discourses that are associated “with particular language, metaphors, and underlying logic” (Joshee, 2007, p. 177).

In the next section of the thesis, the empirical study (Chapters 8 and 9), I set out to identify discourses emerging from Alberta citizenship education and social studies texts to help determine how the fields of GCE and multiculturalism relate and to what extent the Alberta documents reflect the broader philosophical and ideological tensions found in the theoretical and literature review sections. Following the notion of the policy web, I selected a variety of texts and a variety of levels of texts all of which were publically accessible. I
started with the citizenship and character education policy document *The Heart of the Matter* (2005b) which represents the wider provincial level policy context. I then looked specifically at the social studies curriculum with a focus on grades 10, 11, and 12. This choice was based on my own professional interest as an experienced secondary school teacher and teacher educator in the intermediate-senior social science curriculum and instruction class at OISE/University of Toronto. Also, the grades 10-12 curricula articulate important themes relating to the topic of my thesis. Grade 10 focuses on globalization, Grade 11 on nationalisms, and Grade 12 on ideologies. In order to add another layer to the policy web, I used the internet to search for unit and lesson plans available for teachers.

I found links to lesson plan through the Learn Alberta website which is supported and administered by the Digital Design and Resource Authorization Branch of Alberta Education. I found that through a collaboration with the Critical Thinking Consortium, Learn Alberta has made available a series of lesson plans organized into units based on the overarching critical inquiries presented in the social studies curriculum. I found more unit and lesson documents through the website for the Society for Safe and Caring Schools and Communities (SACSC), an initiative started by the Alberta Teachers’ Association and other community organizations. Looking through all of these unit and lesson plans, I selected and downloaded those that most closely related to my topic in that they expressed understandings of multiculturalism, global citizenship, and/or a relationship between them. From the Learn Alberta website, I reviewed twenty-five lessons from Grade 10, nineteen lessons for Grade 11, eighteen lessons for Grade 12. I chose to read more closely those that related implicitly or explicitly to the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship including for Grade 10, “Globalization and Cultural Identities” (AL, 2008b), “Enhancing Cultural Identities” (AL, 2008c), and “The Future of Collective and Individual Rights” (AL, 2008d). I also examined some lessons for Grade 11 teachers: “Nationalism and Personal Identity” (AL, 2008k), “Competing Nationalist Loyalties” (AL, 2008f), “Redesign Canada’s Coat of Arms” (AL, 2008m), “Motives for International Involvement” (AL, 2008h), “Framing Effective Foreign Policy” (AL, 2008g), “National Interests and Internationalism” (AL, 2008j), “Competing Nationalist Loyalties” (AL, 2008f), “Promoting or Challenging a Canadian Identity” (AL, 2008l), “Analyzing a Canadian Identity” (AL, 2008e), and “The Future of Canada” (AL, 2008n). Overall, of fourteen lessons posted, I looked closely at four lessons for
Grade 10 and one for Grade 12 from the SACSC website all of which were contributed by Tracey Lyons, a Program Manager at SACSC. These included Lessons for Unit One of the Grade 10 curriculum which was called Global Issues Awareness: Lesson One “Issues…What Issues?” (SACSC, n.d.a) which introduces the themes of CIDA and the UN Millennium Development Goal, Lesson Two “Tell Me About It” (SACSC, n.d.b.) where students expand on their understandings of CIDA themes, Lesson Three “A Lived Experience” (SACSC, n.d.c) where students research a global issue by learning about a undeveloped country/region, and Lesson Four “Preparing and Sharing” (SACSC, n.d.d) where students communicate their findings. I also looked at four lessons written for Unit Six of the Grade 12 curriculum and specifically one called “Globalization With or Without You” (SACSC, n.d.e). These lessons focused on complex definitions of globalization and the extent to which people choose to be a part of globalization or if it happens without the consent of citizens.

While double-checking to see if there were any other lesson plans available on the Learn Alberta website, I came across a series of videos that allowed me to access more levels of the policy process. These included interviews posted online of curriculum developers and videos of lead-teachers’ explaining the curriculum to set up the context for the curriculum analysis. I included these videos as contextual and background texts and analyze them in the next chapter. This led me to search for any scholarly literature providing more information as to the background to the development of the social studies curriculum. I found an article by Richardson (2002a) on the importance of the Western Canadian Protocol (WCP). I also conducted my own reading of documents published through the WCP (2000) which is included in the context and background description and analysis.

I read/viewed all of the above texts—*The Heart of the Matter*, the social studies curriculum (program of studies and specific course curricula), videos including interviews with curriculum developers, documents relating to the Western Canadian Protocol on Social Studies, and lesson plans—highlighting key words, phrases, and concepts that expressed understandings of citizenship, diversity, globalization, and relationships therein. I then did a closer reading which included identifying connections to the discourses I had identified from the literature on citizenship education discourses. I also focused on how multiculturalism and/or multicultural context were implicitly and/or explicitly related to global citizenship. I
considered to what extent the documents reflected the wider discourses and points of tensions highlighted in the literature review. I looked specifically for the liberal social justice, neoliberal, and neoconservative discourses relayed by Joshee (2004, 2009). I also considered what global imaginaries, as defined by Richardson (2008b) were evident. I was particularly interested in what discourses contributed to a conflation between the fields as reflected in the research literature review.

For each text I took detailed notes on four key aspects of discourses (Knight Abowitz & Harnish 2006) as related to multiculturalism and global citizenship (and the relationship between them) as well as more general concepts of citizenship, diversity and globalization. My goal was to break down the use of language in the text to identify what discourses accounted for conflation of the concepts and where there were unexamined tensions between the fields. The four aspects include: a) claims and evidence put forward, b) choices of rhetoric (including vocabulary, slogans, style, etc.), c) promotions of moral and political values, and d) descriptions of the context from which or in which the text is produced (including how the national context of multiculturalism is described and how the context of 21st century globalization is described) (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 655).

Organizing my notes into a series of charts representing different texts and according to these four aspects helped me to identify overall discourses within each set of texts and similarities and differences between the texts and between the levels of texts. This helped me to identify the main discourses operating to express and/or conflate the relationship between multiculturalism and globalization. Having identified the main ideological and conceptual themes in each text and having begun to identify discourses that were present across texts and that were more prevalent in some than others, I began to categorize which texts and which uses of language created spaces for critical discourses. I then went back to specific texts to read more closely and to select key quotations to support the identified discourses. Overall, I approached the discourse analysis in three main stages a) connecting the texts to the existing discourses I identified in the wider literature, b) examining how those discourses operated in particular ways to contribute to conceptual ambiguity and identifying new discourses, and c) going back for multiple readings to select strong examples.
Thus, I had a systematic approach to my document analysis. However, it is important to note that there are limitations to my approach. There is a lack of inter-reader reliability as despite having gone through a step-by-step process, my findings are reliant on the extent to which I was able to maintain internal consistency in my reading of all documents. It is possible that were someone else to follow the same procedure, they would find more or less to interpret than what I found. However, the systematic approach I took to reading and re-reading the texts allowed me to pull out significant nuances. My interpretation of the texts contribute both to a deepening of my findings from the theoretical and ideological mappings of the topic conducted in the first two sections of the thesis and to providing insights into the Alberta texts themselves.

The next chapter will look at the background to the social studies curriculum in Alberta in order to set the context of the key messages in and rationales for the development of the curriculum. I will then analyze Heart of the Matter, Alberta’s character and citizenship education policy and the Program of Studies for the Alberta Social Studies curriculum. Based on the analysis of the contextual texts, policy text, and general social studies curriculum, the chapter will conclude with a summary of the main findings that will set-up the analysis of individual secondary social studies courses of study and the unit and lesson plans.
CHAPTER 8: Wider Policy Documents and Summary of Findings

| a) Character and Citizenship Education Policy: Heart of the Matter | b) Alberta Social Studies Curriculum: Western Canadian Protocol for Social Studies, Video Interviews with Curriculum Developers, Videos of Summer Institutes for Social Studies Teachers, Social Studies K-12 Program of Studies |

Summary of Findings:

| a) Conceptual Conceptual Ambiguities | b) Key Discourses Framing Multiculturalism, GCE, and the Relationship Between Them All Ambiguities |

CHAPTER 9: Analysis of Secondary Social Studies Courses and Unit/Lesson Plans

| Social Studies Courses: Grade 10 (globalization), Grade 11 (nationalism), Grade 12 (ideology) | Publicly Available Unit and Lesson Plans: a) Safe and Caring Schools and Communities Initiative, b) Ministry of Education and the Critical Thinking Consortium |

CHAPTER 10: Synthesis, Discussion, and Conclusion

Synthesis includes an analysis of how the findings from the empirical section reflect and connect to the findings from the theoretical and literature review sections.

Figure 4 Organization of the discourse analysis of Alberta texts according to topic and chapter.
Chapter Eight
Alberta Context:
Discourse Analysis of Wider Policies

The main question guiding the empirical research section of this thesis is: to what extent Alberta educational policy documents, secondary social studies curriculum, and corresponding unit and lesson plans reflect the conceptual ambiguity inherent to the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship education? Building on the framework of the policy web (Joshee, 2007), this chapter looks at the wider levels of educational policy texts and sets up the context for a study of the more specific courses and accompanying lesson plans in the next chapter. I begin with a discourse analysis of the character and citizenship education policy document *The Heart of the Matter* (AE, 2005b). Moving from this wider policy document on citizenship and character education, I begin to look at the context of the social studies curriculum development in Alberta by considering the influence of the *Western Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Basic Education’s* common curriculum for social studies on the way diversity is framed in the Alberta social studies curriculum. For further context, I analyze and review a series of videos and interviews posted on *Alberta Education*’s website. These videos provide background information as to the curriculum developers’ articulation of understandings of diversity, citizenship, and identity as well as the discourses circulated by leaders of professional development presentations. I will end by summarizing the main conceptual ambiguities and corresponding discourses that emerged from my discourse analysis of the different texts across the policy web. This chapter thus sets up the discourse analysis of the social studies curriculum and lesson plans in the next chapter.

**Alberta Citizenship and Character Education Policy Document:***

*Heart of the Matter*

Because policies use language which “commands and instructs”, its discourse “attempts to constrain the possibilities for interpretation” (Lingard, 2009, p. 233). This section examines the main citizenship education policy document in Alberta and looks at what discourses of diversity, culture, identity, citizenship, and globalization are opened up
and constrained. In 2005, Alberta Education published *The Heart of the Matter: Character and Citizenship Education in Alberta Schools*. Its program for character and citizenship education was in part an extension of work that had begun years earlier under the banner of Safe and Caring Schools. Safe and Caring Schools (SACS) is an initiative of the Alberta Teachers Association (ATA) that was started in 1996 through a grant from Alberta Education’s *Safe and Caring Schools* program. In 2003, the ATA and other community organizations that had been involved in SACS formed the Society for Safe and Caring Schools and Communities (SACSC). According to its website, the mission of SACSC is “to encourage home, school and community practices that teach, model and reinforce socially responsible and respectful behaviours, so that living and learning can take place in a safe, caring and inclusive environment” (SACSC, n.d.). SACSC provides resources for curriculum, and some of their unit and lesson plans will be addressed in the next chapter. Not surprisingly, there are numerous references to SACSC in *The Heart of the Matter*.

Overall, *The Heart of the Matter* highlights a version of character and citizenship based on common values, consensus, and interpersonal skill development. There is a strong link if not full conceptual conflation between citizenship and character. The document refers frequently to diversity in Alberta through a focus on inclusion and respect and on the prevention of prejudice. However, neoliberalism is a dominant ideology framing a positive view of diversity. The document speaks about the importance of individuality and respect for oneself and others as important to fulfilling the social and economic potential of individual students and of the province. This is what Joshee (2009) refers to as the business case for diversity. Furthermore, global citizenship is seen as coexisting with national identity through the concept of balancing claims of the nation against claims that transcend national boundaries. Thus, while global citizenship is an extension of national citizenship, it is also characterized by tensions between the claims of the nation and those that are global in scope. Furthermore, there is a strong sense that global citizenship is essentially about developing character and interpersonal skills. In this sense, there is an instrumentalist and neoliberal view of both diversity and global citizenship.

*The Heart of the Matter* describes the context of teaching and learning in the 21st century:
Classrooms today represent a microcosm of our rich and diverse society. Alberta schools are dynamic environments that emphasize high standards, and respect and safety, but we cannot take this for granted. (AE, 2005b, p. 3)

This quotation demonstrates an assets rhetoric of diversity ("rich" and "dynamic") as tied to neoliberal notions of standards and a security discourse of safety. The rationale for the document is rooted in a sense that education for the 21st century in Alberta requires a defensive response to a sense of change. This is expressed in the idea of not “taking for granted” the positive, safe, and strong status quo. Correspondingly, the status quo is characterized by high standards of safety and respect for all students, and students may “take for granted” their positive school environment because they all enjoy safety and respect.

_Hearth of the Matter_ includes several references to cultural diversity. On the first page, it refers to the expectation that students completing secondary school “respect the cultural diversity and common values of Canada” (AE, 2005b, p. 1). This is evidence of the mosaic narrative of cultural diversity working with social cohesion. Citizenship is conflated with character in this document through neoliberal ideology. Education “contributes to personal development and opportunities” and to students’ “ability to fulfill social and economic potential as a province and as a people”: “Character and citizenship education contributes to the development of conscientious community members and responsibility citizens” (AE, 2005b, p. 3). Being a conscientious member of a community and a responsible citizen is thus about interpersonal skills and economic contributions. National identity includes a “sense of identity as a national citizen”; an awareness of multiple identities such as regional, cultural, ethnic, religious, class and gender; and a sense of global or world citizenship (AE, 2005b, p. 6). Being a Canadian citizen means that you are aware that there are multiple identities, and the assumption is that despite these different categories, there is a shared overall identity as a national citizen that is positively and neutrally related to being a global citizen. At the same time, this notion of respecting differences is based on the rationale of personal development to fulfill economic potential.

_Hearth of the Matter_ expresses the expansion model of global citizenship. It refers to global citizenship as “part of national identity, in which students come to see themselves as members of a world community and learn to balance the claims of nation against claims that
transcend national boundaries” (AE, 2005b, p. 6). The idea of “claims” evokes a recognition and rights discourse, and these liberal social justice discourses (Joshee, 2004) are framed in a weighing of national and global (transcending national boundaries) issues that are and can be balanced. The claims are not about highlighting tensions and mutual complicity. The positive linear extension model of citizenship also includes multiculturalism as an issue that assists in this expansion: “As understandings of citizenship expand to address issues such as human rights, language, nationalism, globalization, equality, multiculturalism and pluralism, citizenship education is becoming more centred on the concept of inclusion and respect for diversity” (AE, 2005b, p. 5, italics added). The assets discourse of diversity (through inclusion and respect) becomes a catch-all for a variety of seemingly related diversity “issues” addressed by citizenship. This is a weak version of the liberal social justice discourse of recognition. Furthermore, the conflation of citizenship with character connects “essential skills” such as “thinking before acting”, “maintaining friendships”, “dealing with feelings”, “accepting consequences” and handling “peer pressure” with “a foundation for responsible, global citizens” (AE, 2005b, p. 43). Thus, the document highlights the idea of infusing and understanding multiple perspectives as a way to reduce prejudice and as an individual skill. This is quite distinct from a broader and more complex framework of global social justice that goes beyond prejudice reduction to interrogating the basis of prejudices and systemic categorizations of identity markers.

*Heart of the Matter* demonstrates several conceptual ambiguities defining citizenship education in Alberta. At the same time that there is a respect for diversity and for multiple identities, there is a strong overall sense of national identity and common values which are themselves framed through regional particularity. Citizenship education is seen as changing in correspondence with the “expanding” understandings of citizenship and reflecting the dynamic context of rich diversity and high standards in Alberta classrooms which are microcosms of wider society (AE, 2005b, p. 3). There is a strong sense of expanding citizenship identity and responsibility outwards to the level of global citizenship. Some issues such as human rights, multiculturalism, and pluralism are understood as central to what citizenship can address in the global imperative—issues that evoke inclusion and respect for diversity and that touch on larger systemic issues of discrimination. However, interpersonal
skills of prejudice reduction, following rules, and getting along are the main skills seen as fundamental to global citizenship development.

**Western Canadian Protocol**

Another text representing a wider level on the policy web is the *Foundation Document for the Development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten to Grade 12* (WCP, 2000). I will take some time here to examine the influence of the WCP on the social studies curriculum by drawing on an analysis by Richardson (2002a). The work by the Western Canadian Protocol provides insight into the categorizations of diversity identities in the curriculum. The Protocol is a collaborative initiative bringing together ministries of education in Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, the Yukon Territory, and the Northwest Territories to foster awareness of common educational goals across curriculum areas. The vision statement of the *Foundation Document for the Development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten to Grade 12* reflects an assets view of diversity framed by a mosaic approach to including diverse cultural perspectives. Multiple perspectives and diversity are achieved through giving particular attention to Aboriginal and French Canadian groups. A strong notion of inclusion and recognition is tied to meeting the needs of 21st century citizens and to a progressive evolution in liberal democratic citizenship in an expansion model of global citizenship:

> The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies K-12 will meet the needs and reflect the nature of the 21st century learner and will have the concepts of Canadian citizenship and identity at its heart. It will be reflective of the diverse cultural perspectives, including Aboriginal and Francophone, that contribute to Canada’s evolving realities. The Framework will ultimately contribute to a Canadian spirit – a spirit that will be fundamental in creating a sense of belonging for each one of our students as he or she engages in active and responsible citizenship locally, nationally, and globally. (WCP, 2000, p. 5)

This language is extremely similar to the vision statement of the Alberta Social Studies Program of Study that will be analyzed in the next chapter.
According to Richardson (2002a), the initial social studies document was the most controversial of the Western Canadian Protocol’s curriculum frameworks because of its explicit treatment of Francophone and Aboriginal communities. He argues that the Protocol represents an “attempt to design a regionally based curriculum of national identity that was reflective of cultural diversity rather than cultural uniformity” (Richardson, 2002a, p. 3). The draft document clearly states that the purpose of the proposed social studies curriculum is to enable students to “appreciate and respect Aboriginal, Francophone, English language, and multiple perspectives” (Government of Alberta, 1999 as quoted in Richardson, 2002a, p. 3). Although, the document redeemed the important role of Aboriginal and Francophone Canadians in the formation of national identity,

the Protocol performed a significant disservice in effectively drawing lines between identity communities in such a way that it marginalized a large and growing number of “other” Canadians (non-Anglophone ethnic minorities) who did not enjoy constitutional protection of their cultural and linguistic identities. And who, by virtue of their assigned “otherness,” assumed the status of decentred peoples on the fringes of the host society. (Richardson, 2002a, p. 3)

Richardson (2002a) finds that the “special attention accorded First Nations and Francophone Canadians” is consistent with a view of the legitimate and logical extension of constitutional guarantees for both groups under the Canada Act of 1982 which gave the Canadian government control over its constitution and ended the role of the British parliament in this regard (p. 5). It included the Constitution Act of 1982 wherein First Nations citizens have rights of self-determination with direct implications for education and Francophones’ linguistic and cultural rights are tied to educational control. Indeed, these groups have experienced (albeit it very differently so) marginalization within the Canadian citizenship project, and their inclusion into social studies curricula represents both an extension of their constitutional guarantees and an attempt at redressing their absence from social studies curricula. In this sense, the Protocol highlights two of the diversity silos (aboriginal groups and Francophones) without the third (“ethnic/immigrant group”) (Kymlicka, 2005, p. 1). Indeed, only these two groups are named, and non-Anglophone/Francophone ethnic minorities are described in vague terms in relation to “multiple perspectives” so that they are effectively relegated to the status of unspecified “other” (Richardson, 2002a, p. 5-6).
Thus, Richardson (2002a) determines that “questions emerge about whether cultural redress justified the Protocol’s relegation of non-Anglophone minorities to subordinate or subaltern status” (Richardson, 2002a, p. 6). By naming the importance of the contributions of Francophone and Aboriginal minorities, the Protocol’s social studies framework fell into a conceptual trap of promoting diversity while paying special attention to two particular groups: “What is more, to the degree that it created a “named” national hierarchy, the Protocol fell prey to a reductionist approach to national identity formation that has deep roots in modernism and that acts at once as a privileging and exclusionary mechanism” (Richardson, 2002a, p. 7). Indeed, the directness of language when referring to Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives is “an implied national ranking structure” (Richardson, 2002a, p. 8). Thus subtle but “undeniable” borders “separate and delineate the power and position of “named” from “unnamed” groups” (Richardson, 2002a, p. 8). Indeed, Richardson’s (2002a) critique of the Western Canadian Protocol’s framework for social studies suggests that the three silos that Kymlicka (2005) describes are in fact part of a vertical mosaic (Jiwani, 2006; Porter, 1965).

Not only does the “including Francophone and Aboriginal perspectives/contribution” approach to social studies effectively ignore a significant and growing population of non-Anglophone ethnic minorities in Canada’s North and West, according to Richardson (2002a) it is a substantial retreat from previous curricula which had recognized the officially multicultural nature of Canada. Richardson’s (2002a) analysis of the draft document raises important implications in shifts in wider discourses including “official perceptions of cultural difference and the impact those perceptions had on the design of the Protocol” (p. 8):

If the intent was to create a regionally based curriculum of national identity around the acknowledgement of cultural difference, of different ways of expressing “Canadianness,” then such a curriculum should have genuinely recognized the open-ended and ambiguous process of national identity formation in diverse societies rather than have narrowed it to particular acts of cultural redemption and preservation. To have done otherwise was to have risked the construction of significant boundaries of privilege and recognition between identity communities in Canada and, ironically, to have reproduced some of the same exclusionary processes the Protocol was designed to remedy in the first place. (Richardson, 2002a, p. 8)
Richardson’s (2002a) analysis is based on the draft document published in 1999 and responses to it through consultations. However, the basic framework of a diversity dichotomy with odd references to what Li (2000) refers to as the third force of ethnic minorities is consistent in both the 2000 Foundation Document for the Development of The Common Curriculum Framework for Social Studies Kindergarten to Grade 12 and the Program of Study for the Alberta Social Studies curriculum. Thus the Protocol’s work reflects a version of the Canadian diversity trichotomy where two silos are prioritized (Francophone and Aboriginal) while the third force is neither fully acknowledged nor deconstructed for its inherent diversity particularly in terms of the racialization of certain groups. This description of Canada in the document includes a reference to multiculturalism through an overarching liberal social justice discourse that is framed by the French Canadian and Aboriginal diversity dichotomy:

Canada is a country of strong regional loyalties, committed to diversity and social justice, and one that is politically organized as a parliamentary democracy. It is subject to economic and cultural influences and the effects of organization. Cultural interaction has helped defined who we are as Canadians at this point in our history. The Framework will reflect the historical context and importance of Canada’s First Peoples and founding nations, as well as the geographic and demographic realities of western and northern Canada. The Framework will promote intercultural understanding and be inclusive of Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives. It will support multiculturalism, pluralism, and bilingualism, all of which contribute to a Canadian spirit. (WCP, 2000, p. 3)

This description and statement of intention builds from a mosaic approach that draws on a notion of pluralism. The mosaic trope can expand to include regional loyalties as well as geographic and demographic differences. Ultimately, there is a common “we” as Canadians that represents the cement holding the mosaic together through a positive approach to inclusiveness and organization rooted in the traditions of liberal parliamentary democracy. It is difficult to distinguish between the description that Canada is diverse, the ideological basis of social justice, and the political and programmatic organization of respect for diversity through parliamentary democracy (Inglis, 1996). This conflation is also evident in the final sentence which refers to multiculturalism and pluralism and bilingualism. The overall assumption is that the diverse demographics leads to a belief in supporting diversity and
intercultural understanding. However, while multiculturalism is referred to in relation to a vague idea of pluralism and also to bilingualism (and interestingly not to indigeneity); interculturalism is promoted through the inclusion of Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives not through any other perspectives from ethnocultural minority groups.

Social Studies Curriculum Developers and Summer Institutes

The Western Canadian Protocol documents on social studies had a strong influence on the development of the current Alberta social studies curriculum. Shirley Douglas was Program Manager, Social Studies, K-12 at Alberta Education's Curriculum Branch in 2005 when the current social studies curriculum was implemented. In a 2005 interview (available on the Alberta Learning website) with two other curriculum developers, she directly links the writing of the Alberta social studies curriculum with the Western Canadian Protocol. She explains that working with other provinces on the Western Canadian social studies program provided her the opportunity to meet people from the North and to appreciate a “richer diversity than we [have] here in Alberta” (Douglas, interview question 1, AL, 2007b). She says that process also clarified directions for Alberta by bringing in “right away at the very beginning…the aspects of multiple perspectives and the total inclusion of Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives” (Douglas, interview question 1, AL, 2007b). This combination of multiple perspectives and special attention to Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives is a framing discourse of the curriculum. Douglas is joined in the interview by Debbie Mineaul (Program Manager, Aboriginal Content), and Daniel Buteau (Program Manager, Social Studies, French Language).

They talk about the many heated discussions that arose when determining details of the curriculum. Douglas speaks about a moment of individual enlightenment as to her Anglophone privilege: “life had been a peach for me….being raised English speaking. Never had an issue of my point of view or perspectives. An unexamined life and unexamined experiences” (Douglas, interview question 1, AL, 2007b). She also expresses an understanding of privilege:

It would have been easy for me to say “I can’t deal with these people any more”...we kept continuing to come back to the table, and I recognized
through one conversation/argument with Debbie...that I could lead this project and move onto something else but she couldn’t because [Debbie] couldn’t because she was living an aboriginal experience in Canada in Alberta. Daniel was living an experience that....would be part of his experience. That was pretty profound for me that I wasn’t just wearing one hat one day. (Douglas, interview question 3, AL, 2007d)

Douglas expresses a profound and significant sense of enlightenment into privilege. She recognizes how her First Nations colleague is bound in her identity category in a way she, as a White, English speaking Albertan from a settled family, can take for granted. She combines this sense of personal enlightenment and taken-for-grantedness with a desire for the curriculum to be transformative. Yet, at the same time her interview statements reflect a defense of the status quo. Douglas says that she felt she was the “defender of the majority perspective” and was concerned about how much room was given to Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives and where to fit them in and how. Interestingly, this also led her to be the one to think about newcomers:

I’m a born and bred Albertan. My colleagues are born in other provinces and don’t have the same deep rooted affinity in Alberta that I didn’t even know I had until I had to defend it....Where am I in this picture? And at the same time, we have a huge newcomer population.... who wanted to see themselves in this program as well. Where are the Asians, where are the Ukranians, where are the Muslims in this program? So it was this constant fragmentation of what I thought were the good solid pieces we could all rely on....it’s about whose voice matters and who is entitled to share....that’s why we wrote the program in a questioning fashion, a more transformative document that asks students those questions—what stories of aboriginals peoples do we need to know in order to make meaning of their life and existence? (Douglas, interview question 2, AL, 2007c)

She alludes to privilege in the realization of her affinity to her Albertan identity (that is not part of the recognition discourse because it is the assumed norm); this leads to a deconstruction or “constant fragmentation” of the solid assumptions underlying a common Albertan identity. However, according to Douglas, the uncertainty defining the tensions
inherent to questions of identity in social studies translated into a critical thinking approach in the curriculum that uses a lot of to-what-extent questions (which I will argue set up some straw-person analytics). The content around tensions defaults to an assets discourse of diversity through recognizing the contributions of multicultural others (especially Aboriginal groups and Francophones). This is essentially a liberal multicultural stance that aligns with a post-as-after rather than post-as-interrogating version of modernism.

Douglas recognizes the need to include the voices of the Asians, the Muslims, the Ukranians who live in Alberta; these groups were literally not at the table with the three main curriculum developers when they were having these great discussions. Her only recourse is to the critical impulse tied with the multiple perspectives discourse that is inherent to liberalist principles of the right to be recognized and the importance of sound reasoning. The assumption is that by writing “the program in a questioning fashion” it is a more “transformative document”. Her explanation reflects a desire for a new style of learning for 21st century citizens that aligns with a post-as-after modernism logic:

Rather than a transmiss[ion] model that would give you the language teachers used of “covering the material”…it’s like feeding the horses…the new model because of our uncertainty and questions we were asking… whose responsibility is it to run Canada’s national parks...these questions will never be answered, and arguments will continue. (Douglas, interview question 3, AL, 2007d)

The open-ended questions are seen as reflecting the complexities of the contemporary moment. However, this version of a tensions and complexities discourse is rooted in a post-as-after-modernism stance in that the questions do not actually provoke a sincere interrogation of the status quo. Rather, the content focuses on a cognitive adaptation (Andreotti, 2010) version of appreciating and including multiple perspectives (not examining them as multiply positioned perspectives within wider power dynamics) and using sound logic to answer open-ended questions.

The version of liberal multiculturalism expressed by Douglas and reflected in the curriculum is framed by the Canadian trichotomy that is vertically structured with the
constitutionally protected groups at the top as the Two Founding Nations, the specific inclusion of Francophone and Aboriginal perspectives, and the other cultures included from time to time. Buteau speaks about his experience trying to meet the needs of Francophone students who longed for recognition:

the first thing [francophone] students told me when asked what all Albertans should know about you as francophone Albertans they told me we want them to know that we exist….they also said we want them to know that we aren’t all from Québec…[and to be] recognized as francophones and also Albertans….We want them to know that we have been here for a very long time…that we are from here”. (Buteau, interview question 2, AL, 2007c).

He thus expresses a sense of redress through recognition. And Mineault focuses on how the Aboriginal context presents opportunities for “both sides” (First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and non-Aboriginal people) to learn about history. She recalls a consultation in a First Nations community where a parent said that the curriculum represented the first time her son felt he could share his story (Mineault interview question 2, AL, 2007c).

These interviews shed light on the strong, albeit often vague, connection between citizenship and identity in the social studies curriculum. Douglas says that the previous program used identity as an “add-on feature” attached to culture and community (interview question 2, AL, 2007c). The current curriculum reflects an assets discourse of diversity that works with a taken-for-grantedness discourse:

Once we …partnered [identity] with citizenship, it provided us with a dynamic relationship that explained why some children will go to the rescue of other students, why they will stick their necks out. It wasn’t so much that they were better citizens, but they had a stronger sense of themselves. They were comfortable in their own community, they felt supported. So, those two factors together brought us to a point where we said if aboriginal students don’t feel a sense of belonging and connectiveness to the school and community why would they want to go to school…why would they want to vote…if it’s not about citizenship and not about identity, it’s not in the new program….they would enhance their own identity, have a sense of curiosity of
what was happening in Alberta and in the world. And would want to take some action to hold on to the things that are really valuable and to let go of the things that are there to delight and interest us and not divide us. (Douglas, interview question 2, AL, 2007c)

Thus, the assets discourse refers to recognition and contribution through a soft liberal social justice discourse of identity (Joshee, 2004). The importance of a culturally relevant curriculum for Aboriginal students is also framed as central to a neoliberal social cohesion version of citizenship. Ultimately, the assets discourse falls back to a liberal assumption that individuals, in this case students, neutrally belong to a state community. The taken-for-grantedness discourse is a version of the equality-as-sameness liberal social justice discourse (Joshee, 2007, 2009) whereby it is assumed that those who experience some barriers to a sense of belonging simply need to be recognized in terms of contribution. Furthermore, liberal social justice discourses of identity and recognition are presented as the root of an extension model of citizenship from local to provincial in this case. This is significant given Richardson’s (2002a) critique of the special prioritization of Aboriginal and Francophone communities at the expense of other cultures.

At the same time, as Richardson (2002a) notes, the importance of the insertion of Aboriginal perspectives and wide-ranging consultations with First Nation, Métis, and Inuit communities to redress their exclusion from previous documents is extremely significant. As Douglas (interview question 2, AL, 2007c) describes:

just looking at multiple perspectives through aboriginal voices. It’s quite dynamic because ultimately you have to really engage in understanding the worldviews are held within the languages. There was reluctance to this document written largely in English…it took us a long time to develop that relationship…that trust…this was authentically a way for them to examine a program and to help us design it….they had to change some of the wording to take away from the outsider perspective…to really add the oral tradition and language and identity. (Douglas, interview question 2, AL, 2007c)

In fact, as the curriculum analysis will demonstrate, the curriculum does include a contributions discourse of Aboriginal peoples and also makes references to oral traditions.
However, it is done in a manner that is consistent with a modern liberalist version of pluralism as evidence of liberalism’s expansion and progress (Mitchell, 2003). Indeed, as Douglas says, “ultimately, the goal was to achieve mutual recognition and to balance out those perspectives” (interview question 2, AL, 2007C). The main goal was not to examine the reasons why Aboriginal perspectives have been silenced in the past, but rather to correct a wrong of the past through recognizing their contributions and seeing diversity as an asset. In this way, the assets discourse defines a new present without actually interrogating the basic assumptions underlying the framing of categories of inclusion/exclusion inherent to modern liberal citizenship. This assets correction is consistent with a view of liberalism’s progress through recognizing past wrongs and thereby legitimizing its current form (Mitchell, 2003).

Therefore, the testimony of the curriculum developers suggests that the multiple perspectives discourse is essentially about recognition and the inclusion of FNMI and francophone perspectives. The narrative is about learning about those identities because they have formerly been silenced or absent. For example, Mineault describes a young boy from a First Nations community who can bring in a story from his family’s oral history—passed down from many generations—to tell at show-and-tell and not be criticized for it being “far-fetched” (interview question 2, AL, 2007c). Or, as Buteau describes, francophone students need to see that they are acknowledged as existing in Alberta. These are important corrections to historical exclusion on the parts of these groups. It is particularly significant that the inclusion of Aboriginal oral histories contributes to the pluralism of epistemologies included in the curriculum. However, the silencing of other cultures through the naming of Aboriginal and Francophones is salient (Richardson, 2002). What would a new immigrant from Brazil or U. A. E. or Pakistan have to say about the curriculum and the extent to which she/he feel she/he belongs?

In a 2004 Social Studies Summer Institute for Social Studies put on by Alberta Education, David George, an elementary school principal from Medicine Hat who served on the advisory committee for the social studies curriculum describes the inclusion of multiple perspectives: “this is not Aboriginal studies, this is not Francophone studies, this is social studies, but we’re finally doing the right thing. We are acknowledging them in a way that is meaningful and will help elevate ourselves if we do it with integrity” (AL, 2006a). He
invokes the discourse of “new” teaching for the 21st century by warning against the risk of “taking new topics and teaching them in old ways” (AL, 2006a): “this is a program of studies that has a new approach. It’s still social studies…it elevates and changes focus and gives new approaches and makes it meaningful for student learners for the 21st [century]” (AL, 2006a).

The rhetoric of “elevating” is consistent with the assumption that by adding to and broadening a notion of citizenship through pluralism, social cohesion will be achieved. He says the curriculum, especially the program of studies, was embedded in the Western Protocol documents and articulates what Richardson (2002a) identifies as the logical extension of the constitutional argument for prioritizing Aboriginal and Francophone communities. The curriculum is embedded in a wider version of pluralism that combines the assets discourse of a unique history of Canada with a version of multiple perspectives that allows everyone to have a difference:

> If we understand the elements of being Canadian…if we strive to understand that…we have a constitution [and a history] that is very unique…aboriginal and francophone by law and by history…also multiple perspectives…that’s not all folks. My community in Medicine Hat has a history that there were prisoners of war there…there’s a perspective that ought to be a part of the program. (AL, 2006a)

Interestingly, this version of pluralism broadens both the importance of the identity and recognition discourses to a wider Canadian national imaginary at the same time that it gives everyone a piece of the mosaic. Without employing a two-way version of multiculturalism where a dominant culture must adjust to account for the integration of immigrants (Kymlikca, 1995), George acknowledges some diversity within diversity, “there isn’t an Aboriginal perspective…there are many”, and insists that “we don’t need to have Aboriginal students to do that or to need to do that nor do we need Francophones…but we need to understand this stuff to be Canadians” (AL, 2006b). Thus, the two silos approach is embedded in the diversity as an asset discourse and goes beyond specific culturally responsive teaching to those groups to validating everyone’s contribution as part of the fabric of the uniquely Canadian national narrative. Importantly, the liberal social justice discourses of recognition and identity are evident (and in other places rights-based discourse is there),
yet the assets discourse of diversity does not include a clear iteration of redistribution (Joshee, 2004, 2009). George’s comments demonstrate the conceptual conflation of an idea that everyone gets a difference on the one hand and of the unique history of Francophone and Aboriginal contributions to Canadian nationhood on the other.

At the 2008 Social Studies Summer Institute, Keith Millions, Program Manager, Social Studies, French Language Services Branch of Alberta Education, was a social studies teacher on secondment from Edmonton Public Schools. He speaks to the use of the term "pluralism" and its relationship to multiculturalism in the social studies program: “Multiculturalism is a part of pluralism, but pluralism is broader” (AL, 2008a). He focuses on the words “recognizes” and “contributions”: “We recognize that there are contributions being made by all Canadians from all walks of life from all language groups, all religious groups...from all different ideological orientations...but we’re all Canadians. We’re all making some contribution in some way or form to Canadian society” (AL, 2008a). He tells the educators in attendance that pluralism is the key concept of the Grade 10 program of study. His notion of pluralism is tied strongly to an assets and contributions version of diversity. He describes how students of his try to understand how pluralism is different from multiculturalism so he tells them to look at the level of the school. He makes an analogy to school spirit and how everyone cheers for the Wagner Warriors (school team): “but do all get along?”.

They all have their individual group identities, yet together they are Wagner warriors and when the swim team does well against another team, it’s “yey us” similarly to how when Canada wins a hockey game against another country in the Olympics, “yey Canada”. However, we have people who are making all sorts of different contributions. (AL, 2008a)

Evoking the symbolic level of imagining community, this is a liberalist notion of pluralism as respecting others and getting along; he does not describe the different power relations inherent to these different school groups. Do the band students get the same accolades as the athletes? Why is the name of the sports team assumed as the name of the school community? His analogy is an expression of the way that narratives of spirit and unity contribute to the imagining of community, in this case, a school loyalty. He notes that the former Grade 10
program of study referred to multiculturalism as “Let’s create Canadian unity” whereas pluralism, in the new program of study, is “let’s recognize the diversity in Canada and the contributions that diverse people are making to our common Canada” (AL, 2008a). There is a sense that the discourse of pluralism allows for more individuals and groups to be recognized through a stronger focus on diversity. In a way, it is a widening of the mosaic; but the cement that brings it all together is liberalism’s ability to include (Joshee & Pashby, 2008). Thus, his interpretation of the discourse of pluralism is based on a strong social cohesion discourse that is enabled through a version of pluralism as recognition and diversity as an asset. This version of pluralism is not connected to a redistribution discourse but to a celebrating diversity, everyone-gets-a-difference, and everyone contributes discourse that exemplifies that a general notion of Canadian liberalism: recognize past wrongs and celebrate everyone because it is the right thing to do. This does not represent a discourse of redistribution of power and resources nor is there an interrogation of the modern liberal principles that caused exclusions. Rather, there is an underlying conceptualization of an expansion of liberalism in a modern telos of progress.

At the 2008 Summer Institute for Social Studies Corinne Sperling was a seconded Social Studies Resource Manager in the Learning and Teaching Resources Branch at Alberta Education. She elaborates on the expansion model of pluralism as everyone-gets-a-difference that replaces the use of multiculturalism in the curriculum. She speaks to the importance of including as many multiple perspectives on an issue as possible “to encompass as many people so that you are including all those students within your classroom to see themselves in these issues” (AL, 2009). She also speaks to the use of the term “pluralism” in the new program of study but adds a different point to the distinction from multiculturalism (AL, 2009. She says that pluralism refers to the Canadian context beyond “multiculturalism” in that “it’s not just about culture and language, and we are really opening that up to include socioeconomics, geographic perspectives, ideological perspectives, gender perspectives....we’ll really broaden those perspectives for students” (AL, 2009). She understands pluralism as an expansion of liberal multiculturalism to include other categories of identification. The pluralisation of the word perspectives serves to signal diversity within these categories. It is interesting that she lists geographic perspectives and ideological
perspectives alongside more overtly systemic categories as gender perspectives and socioeconomics without distinguishing a redistribution discourse for those categories.

This is perhaps a reflection of a particular Albertan imaginary as regionally and ideologically distinct within Canada. Thus, the discourse of pluralism replacing multiculturalism becomes an umbrella concept for diversity as assets-contributions, everyone-gets-a-difference, and multiple perspectives. The everyone-gets-a-difference discourse articulates pluralism as an expansion of the diversity discourse to go beyond cultural differences, but, in the Alberta context, it is framed by more dominant regionally based Alberta identity categories. Ironically, it is possible to apply Richardson’s (2002a) critique of how the well-intended inclusion of Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives serves to silence and other non-Anglophone ethnocultural minorities. While Richardson (2002a) critiqued the focus on only two constitutionally defined ethnocultural groups, the Alberta curriculum focuses on those two and at the same time opens up spaces to include every type of difference. The inclusion of so many categories into liberal social justice recognition (Joshee, 2009) serves to deny the distinct systemic experience of particular identity categories (such as socioeconomic status, race, gender, sexual orientation). It is consistent with the modernist paradox of citizenship identity as both including and excluding through an assets model of diversity that ignores the systemic distinctions between racial and cultural groups in society (Richardson, 2002a).

In an on-line video from the 2004 Summer Institute, Jackie Hobal, Social Studies Project Coordinator for the Edmonton Regional Learning Consortium, speaks about how to teach global citizenship by treating the classroom as a community. She directly links global citizenship education to character education:

When we talk about global citizenship it’s the way we treat each other…and once we decide what it means to be citizen in the classroom, we can talk about a citizen in the world. When we have citizenship we belong and have membership to something and with that membership comes rights and responsibilities… What are my rights as a student, a member of this classroom, what are my responsibilities?….that’s all character education, that’s the Safe and Caring Schools project…that is your classroom rooms that
you develop. But as a teacher in a democratic classroom…you develop [the rules] together…these belong to us….this is what we said our classroom is going to look like and to feel like. (AL, 2007a)

Hobal’s comments make a link between interpretations of the curriculum document and the version of citizenship as character education in *The Heart of the Matter: Character and Citizenship Education in Alberta Schools* (AE, 2005b). The view of global citizenship education she presents is a localized version of the extension model of citizenship based on belonging through democratic rule and deliberation. In a sense, the everyone-get-a-difference discourse of pluralism allows for a broad version of citizenship that can also include a global dimension in its liberal inclusion framework.

**Social Studies Program of Studies**

As Kennelly and Llewellyn assert, “Educational discourses are powerful arbitrators of dominant norms and values within societies” and curriculum documents are “one avenue through which the ideological elements of schooling for citizenship can be discerned” (Kennelly & Llewellyn, 2001, p. 900). Bickmore (2006) argues that curricula are a) grounded in prevailing assumptions, b) reflect political will, and c) influence resources for teaching. The *Alberta Program of Studies for Social Studies* (AE, 2005a) contains overlapping, interrelated, and conflicting discourses in the intersections of multiculturalism and global citizenship education. While it expresses many of the discourses evident in the wider citizenship and character education document *The Heart of the Matter* (AE, 2005b), there is less emphasis on neoliberal technical-economic discourses and more evidence of social-justice (Marshall, 2011). Overall, it contains more discursive spaces for critical views than does *The Heart of the Matter*; however the dominant discourses remain framed by a conflation of liberal ideologies whereby neoliberal versions can dominate.

The document contains evidence of what Richardson (2002a) refers to in terms of the influence of the Western Canadian Protocol on discourses of diversity. Also evident is what the videos from the Summer Institutes refer to in terms of a particular version of pluralism that is both broader than multiculturalism and focused on recognizing the contributions of Aboriginal and Francophone peoples. It presents distinct categories of identity as individual
attributes to be respected by individuals as opposed to linking identity categories to social and systemic categorization of difference; therefore, different contexts and conditions of identity categorization are conflated into an everyone-gets-a-difference framework. Thus, it continues the diversity as an asset and as positive attributes discourse of diversity evident in *The Heart of the Matter*. The program vision frames the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse with the Canadian diversity trichotomy:

Central to the vision of the Alberta social studies program is the recognition of the diversity of experiences and perspectives and the pluralistic nature of Canadian society. Pluralism builds upon Canada’s historical and constitutional foundations, which reflect the country’s Aboriginal heritage, bilingual nature and multicultural realities. A pluralistic view recognizes that citizenship and identity are shaped by multiple factors such as culture, language, environment, gender, ideology, religion, spirituality and philosophy. (AE, 2005a, p. 1)

Importantly, the description of Canada in the program vision combines multicultural realities, Aboriginal heritage, and French-English bilingualism thus representing all three silos. However, the next sentence adds more identity categories on as factors shaping citizenship. These are as diverse as gender and ideology. Thus pluralism is defined by multiple differences with some differences more constitutionally and historically significant.

The program of studies rationale connects this version of Canadian pluralism with global citizenship in its stated learning goals: a) “understand the principles underlying a democratic society”, b) “demonstrate a critical understanding of individual and collective rights”, c) “understand the commitment required to ensure the vitality and sustainability of their changing communities at the local, provincial, national and global levels”, d) “validate and accept differences that contribute to the pluralistic nature of Canada”, and e) “respect the dignity and support the equality of all human beings” (AE, 2005a, p. 3). As with *The Heart of the Matter*, there is assumed to be a linear move from respecting pluralism in Canada to respecting it on a human or global-wide level. An assets and positive vision of Canada’s cultural diversity and the development of a sense of global citizenship are related or at least not presented as mutually exclusive; they can be interpreted as connected through a basic respect for human rights. This document contains language not found in the wider character and citizenship education document *Heart of the Matter*. This includes “critical
understandings” of “individual and collective rights”. Here there is a sense that one must take a critical view of rights and at the same time individual and collective rights are presented as mutually reinforcing or at least not contradictory concepts. The language of “changing communities” is also significant as well as “vitality and sustainability” which represents a shift from The Heart of the Matter’s discourse of defense of the status quo and taken-for-grantedness of safety, respect, and high standards. Beyond the notion of change inherent to an extension model of communities (local through to global), there is no hint of potential tensions inherent to the differences that contribute to the nature of Canada. The fall-back conceptualization is respect for human rights as general liberal rights; however, unlike “individual and collective rights”, human rights do not require a “critical understanding”.

There is a strong extension model of citizenship, and the connection between multiculturalism and global citizenship is reflective of the new realities of the 21st century learner:

The Alberta Social Studies Kindergarten to Grade 12 Program of Studies meets the needs and reflects the nature of 21st century learners. ... It fosters the building of a society that is pluralistic, bilingual, multicultural, inclusive and democratic. The program emphasizes the importance of diversity and respect for differences as well as the need for social cohesion and the effective functioning of society. It promotes a sense of belonging and acceptance in students as they engage in active and responsible citizenship at the local, community, provincial, national and global level. (AE, 2005a, p. 1)

This statement contains a variety of discourses expressing different ideologies. There is the assets discourse of Canadian diversity as a reflection of its inherently inclusive and unique identity. Many words are used to describe the assets discourse, including both pluralism and multiculturalism (two concepts Summer Institute videos spend time distinguishing). The assets discourse combines with a social cohesion discourse of diversity as a necessary component of an effective functioning society. The idea is that students need to respect diversity to function in a unified society where individuals get along. The assets discourse of citizenship forms the basis for the extension model of citizenship through the local to community to provincial to national to global levels. There is a strong linear sense of belonging: citizenship identity expands neutrally from local through national to global.
The discourse of multiple perspectives is closely tied to the conceptualization of Canadian pluralism as everyone-gets-a-difference and diversity as an asset:

A key component of effective social organizations, communities and institutions is recognition of diversity of experiences and perspectives. The program of studies emphasizes how diversity and differences are assets that enrich our lives. Students will have opportunities to value diversity, to recognize differences as positive attributes and to recognize the evolving nature of individual identities. Race, socioeconomic conditions and gender are among various forms of identification that people live with and experience in a variety of ways. (AE, 2005a, p. 5)

Fundamentally, this statement appears to be rooted in a liberal understanding of individuality and individual differences. The statement hints that some categories of identity are more salient (e.g. race, socioeconomic conditions and gender) which potentially reflects a redistribution discourse; however, ultimately one must view difference as positive and acknowledge individual experiences rather than challenge systemic categorizations. This version of pluralism ties to the Wagner Wariors school spirit version of imagining community. The assets version of diversity is strongly associated with the effective functioning of society and with social cohesion; thus, any critique of or acknowledgement of tensions within or between defined “forms of identification” would be seen as a negative approach, indeed negating the effective functioning of society (Joshee, 2004, 2009).

Everyone becomes a Wagner Warrior when the hockey team does well. The band members and drama students get to be recognized for their contributions and everyone can feel part of the most valued identity of political community when a sports team wins just like “when Canada wins a hockey game against another country…yey Canada” (AL, 2008a).

The assets approach to diversity connects to “the development of a vibrant democratic society”. Indeed, diversity is described as “an important asset in the evolution of Canadian society” (AE, 2005a, p. 5). The political and moral value of appreciating diversity is thus understood as a natural evolution of Canadian liberal traditions of inclusivity and is framed by the diversity trichotomy and the cultural mosaic. The program of study identifies manifestation of “this [Canadian] diversity”: “First Nations, Inuit and Métis cultures”; “official bilingualism”; “immigration”; and “multiculturalism” (AE, 2005a, p. 5). This assets discourse of the diversity trichotomy appears to be a conflation of demographic-description
Multiculturalism is both a distinct concept and a conflation of all three referents (Inglis, 1996). The section goes on to state that “accommodation of diversity” is “essential for fostering social cohesion” through respect for: “individual and collective rights”, “civic responsibilities”, “shared values”, “democracy”, “rule of law” and “diversity” (AE, 2005a, p. 5). Again, social cohesion frames the contributions, identity, and recognition liberal social justice discourses (Joshee, 2004), and together there is an overall conflation of liberal discourse (Schattle, 2008) that expresses a logical and neutral evolution of rights through a responsible and law-abiding citizenry.

In the “Strands of Social Studies”, the description of the “Time, Continuity and Change” strand expresses the tensions and complexity discourse through the concepts of dynamics and change. Here there is a recognition of historicity that reflects the influence of the discursive turn in social studies. The tensions and complexity discourse is also framed by the multiple perspectives discourse which is iterated here without the parenthetical inclusion of Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives:

Understanding the dynamic relationships among time, continuity and change is a cornerstone of citizenship and identity. Considering multiple perspectives on history, and contemporary issues within their historical context, enables students to understand and appreciate the social, cultural and political dimensions of the past, making meaning of the present and make decisions for the future. (AE, 2005a, p. 6)

The notion of dimensions reflects a stronger critical space for the expression of the multiple perspectives discourse. However, again, not only is there a linear sense of logical progress towards the future, there is no sense of conflicts between these multiple perspectives. This statement expresses an asset-based, positive assumption that more perspectives means stronger decision making which implies stronger logic and clarity of thinking rather than more nuances, tensions, power relations, and complexities.

It is interesting to compare two other strands of social studies included in the Social Studies Program of Studies: Global Connections and Culture and Community. The Global Connections strand expresses the discourse of global consciousness as an understanding of complexities and tensions. It goes so far as to mention that conflicts exist:
Critically examining multiple perspectives and connections among local, national and global issues develops students' understanding of citizenship and identity and the interdependent or conflicting nature of individuals, communities, societies and nations. Exploring this interdependence broadens students' global consciousness and empathy with world conditions. Students will also acquire a better comprehension of tensions pertaining to economic relationships, sustainability and universal human rights. (AE, 2005a, p. 7)

This is a main area in the social studies program of studies for the articulation of a global imaginary beyond merely stating the extension model. It includes many concepts and choices of rhetoric that are not used in other sections where the assumed citizen is a national one in a local school in the province of Alberta. This section contributes a global lens. For example, here, the multiple perspectives discourse is connected to a notion of criticality. There is a strong discourse of global consciousness in which the liberal social justice discourse of redistribution is articulated through the idea of “tensions” around economics and human rights. There is a strong iteration of the extension model of citizenship through the notion of “broadening”; however, in this instance, it is described along with words like “tension” and “conflict”. This is the first time the word conflicting is used in this way as a descriptor of the nature of individuals and communities. Elsewhere conflict is generally used as something to be overcome via (vague or never made specific) principles of democracy and processes of social studies skills.

The rhetoric of interconnections and multiplicity seems to align most closely here (in comparison to the rest of the document) to a notion of complicity and thus to a critical version of GCE (Andreotti, 2006). Students are to develop a global consciousness that is not articulated in the same way as a national consciousness. This is perhaps because the unique Canadian mosaic and assets vision of diversity is assumed to be naturally inclusive. In a global consciousness, the idea of different conditions of life around the world and notion of empathy suggests that there are poor conditions. This is a particular global framing of the taken-for-granted discourse that is more closely related to a redistribution discourse of liberal social justice than it appears to be in a local or national frame. This could be a space through

70 The word conflict is often followed by or associated with the word resolution. For example, in the skills and processes section of the program of studies, students are to “engage in problem solving and conflict resolution” (AE, 2005a, p. 2) and in the “Social Participation as Democratic Practice Section”, students are to “demonstrate skills of cooperation, conflict resolution and consensus building” (AE, 2005a, p. 7).
which a teacher could open up discussions of the complicity of Canadian policies, trade relations, and consumer patterns in these poor conditions; and of the epistemological violence experienced by First Nations communities. In the social studies Program of Study, global citizenship, as expressed through the “Global Connections” strand of social studies, is a space for a more critical, complex, and situated view of diversity than citizenship education that is not framed by global consciousness. This is significant given the strong citizenship as linear extension model. The global consciousness discourse opens up the possibility of a reversal of that extension model where rather than Canadian citizenship naturally extending from an assets model of diversity, looking at human suffering across the globe, including in Canada, can help to encourage self-critique, historicity and a situated understanding of what are identified as global problems.

The next strand is “Culture and Community”. It inherently describes the Canadian context as complex but unlike the global connections strand, there is no language around tensions or conflicts:

Exploring culture and community allows students to examine shared values and their own sense of belonging, beliefs, traditions and languages. This promotes students’ development of citizenship and identity and understanding of multiple perspectives, issues and change. Students will examine the various expressions of their own and others’ cultural, linguistic and social communities. (AE, 2005a, p. 7)

This is a distinctly less critically framed statement than what is found in the Global Connections strand. Although it includes the word “change”, there is a very normative, neutral vision of individual self-esteem as sharing. The everyone-gets-a-difference discourse is expressed through the vague identity discourse expressed in the words “belonging, beliefs, traditions, and languages” and “cultural, linguistic and social communities”. This lists a lot of concepts as related to a vague notion of developing citizenship through identity. The normative and neutral notions of shared values and individual sense of self are rooted in the idea that everyone has cultural, linguistic, social communities which are positively associated with belonging in a pluralistic society. There is a strong assumption that all students can express their beliefs, traditions and languages that appears rooted in the specific inclusion of Aboriginal and Francophone experiences; there is not the sense that someone who speaks
Urdu can feel s/he belongs by sharing her/his language. Again, the lack of any language of potential tensions within or between these identity concepts is significant. While the use of terms “issues” and “change” suggests there can be conflicts and/or tensions inherent to multiple perspectives on culture and community; overall, there is an assumption that everyone can express their sense of cultural community. This harkens to a classic liberal assumption of the autonomous citizen subject which is critiqued through a complex discursive and postcolonial understanding of the inclusion/exclusionary paradox of citizenship. Furthermore, simply examining different expressions of communities does not necessarily help encourage a sense of belonging in a citizenship development capacity. This is a major assumption made in the document.

Interestingly, as in the Global Connection strand, there are critical discursive spaces evident in the Dimensions of Thinking section through a tensions and complexities discourse. Through “Problem Solving” Students are to “consider the causes and dimensions of problems” and “to determine possible courses of action and consequences of potential solutions for a problem that may have multiple or complex causes and that may not have a clear solution.” (AE, 2005a, p. 9). And in the section on “Metacognition”, “students become knowledge creators and contribute to a shared understanding of the world we live in—a key feature of democratic life and commitment to pluralism” (AE, 2005a, p. 9). Thus, there is space here for examining different epistemic visions of the dimensions of global issues. However, again, this potential critical space is framed strongly by a neoliberal, monopolar and post-as-after modernism emphasis on individualism, autonomy and logic as progress articulated elsewhere and in the broader citizenship education document. This combination of the opening of some critical spaces and the assertion of a wider conflated liberal framework is further evidence of the theoretical and conceptual ambiguity and double impulses marking the relationship between local and global visions of cultural diversity and of engaging in citizenship responsibility.

The “Historical Thinking” section represents how the tensions and complexities discourse gets undermined by a neoliberal focus on individualism. This section of the Program of Studies Dimensions of Thinking section both expresses a rhetoric of transformation and critical reflection on the past and asserts a strong modernist logical and
rational basis. On the one hand, “Historical thinking is a process whereby students are challenged to rethink assumptions about the past and to reimagine both the present and the future” (AE, 2005a, p. 9). This is evidence of critical discourse that is framed by a liberalist modernist base: “It helps students become well-informed citizens who approach issues with an inquiring mind and exercise sound judgment when presented with new information or a perspective different from their own” (AE, 2005a, p. 9). The goal is “sound” judgment and respect for differences rather than a nuanced understanding of the tensions around recognition and redistribution and around who gets to frame issues of rights (Fraser, 2005). Importantly, this section also refers to historical skills involving looking at patterns and putting events in context “to assist in the construction of meaning and understanding” (AE, 2005a, p. 9). Yet, despite this gesture to the discursive turn, ultimately, the individual development discourse is strong in the assumption that looking at the past helps students “define their identities”; it is not clear just how this happens other than it is a logical extension of historical thinking and skills.

There is nothing in this section on confronting challenges to one’s identity from a study of the past (for example, looking at the devastating effects of genocide, colonialisation, and institutional racism)\(^71\). There is the possibility to acknowledge the worldviews that constructed the assumptions on which structural violence has been based; however, the modern liberal individual citizen evolving and progressing is present in the assumption that all students will find a sense of belonging from studying the past:

> Exploring the roots of the present ensures the transmission and sharing of values, and helps individuals to realize that they belong to a civil society. Historical thinking develops citizens willing to engage in a pluralistic democracy and to promote and support democratic institutions. (AE, 2005a, p. 9)

This is an assets discourse of diversity as leading to effective societies and personal development. Ultimately, the idea of students constructing meaning and understanding is not extended to a wider post-as-interrogating approach to deconstructing hegemonic and

\(^71\) Garrett (2011) also examines how social studies curriculum is constituted by difficult knowledge including studying wars, famines, genocides, injustices and slavery. See also Britzman (1998, 2000) who theorizes representations of social and historical traumas in pedagogical contexts and Boler (1999) considers the role of emotions in education.
normative views. Instead, it reflects a post-as-after modernism approach that is based on a cognitive adaptation to the idea of new complexities and to an individual sense of becoming enlightened that leads to social cohesion and inclusion into the status quo (Andreotti, 2010b, 2010c). The focus is on not taking the status quo for granted rather than on building an epistemologically pluralistic version of education for thinking otherwise.

**Key Findings:**

**Areas of Conceptual Ambiguities and Significant Discourses**

This chapter has begun to answer the overarching question guiding the empirical inquiry into the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE: How are the tensions found in the wider theoretical and ideological context reflected in policy and curriculum documents, and publically available lesson plans in Alberta? The next chapter will build on the description and analysis of both the context and background to the current social studies curriculum and the discourse analysis of the wider policy documents set out in this chapter. It will present the description and analysis of specific secondary level social studies courses and corresponding lesson plans available online. As a way to conclude this chapter and set-up the next chapter, I will relay the main areas of conceptual ambiguity and the main discourses I found across citizenship policy, social studies curriculum, social studies courses, and accompanying lesson plan documents that were relevant to examining the conceptualization of GCE and multiculturalism as discursive fields and of the relationships between them.

**Conceptual Ambiguity**

The first sub-question for the empirical section of the thesis is: what conceptual ambiguities are evident in the documents that contribute to the conflation of and/or relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship? My critical discourse analysis of the texts finds there are several areas of conceptual ambiguity implicated in how multiculturalism and GCE are both related and conflated in Alberta policy documents and lesson plans: (1) individual and collective rights in relation to identity groups; (2) pluralism and multiple perspectives; (3) expansion model of citizenship; (4) different versions of globalization; and (5) critical-thinking straw-person approach.
1. Individual and collective rights and identity

In some places, such as the grade twelve course, individual and collective rights are studied as distinct. However, for the large part, across the documents, they are seen as a mutually reinforcing pair rather than as distinct or potentially in tension with one another. Any notion of collective rights being in tension with individual rights falls back on the extent to which any claims of collective rights are consistent with the principles of liberalism (Kymlicka 1995). Similarly, other liberal social justice discourses of recognition and identity are tied together under a mutually reinforcing individual and collective framework. The emphasis on rights is significant; however, there is conceptual ambiguity around the difference between an individual right and/or an individual claim for recognition and a collective one.

2. Pluralism and multiple perspectives

All documents reflect a strong ideal of diversity as an asset as well as a strong discourse of social cohesion. One conceptual tension therefore is the ongoing challenge of recognizing diversity in terms of different groups and diversity within those groups as well as supporting a cohesive sense of community. There are very few references to multiculturalism, and curriculum developers and Summer Institute presenters express the message that the 2005 social studies curriculum provides a broader notion of diversity. However, at the same time that it broadens pluralism and diversity to include a wide range of identity markers and influences (from religion to socioeconomics to gender to philosophy to ideology and so on), it demarcates certain diverse groups as diverse in a special way. Indeed, the Canadian diversity dichotomy frames notions of pluralism and diversity in the documents. In a few instances, the texts the language of the Two Founding Nations of Canada refers to Canadians of British and French origins. However, the texts mostly pay explicit and special attention to First Nations, Métis and Inuit and Francophone contributions. There are few references to other cultures. These are generally conflated into one group and this other culture group is rarely demarcated along racial lines, countries of origin, language spoken at home, religion, or immigration history. Thus, a main point of conceptual confusion is the broadening of a discourse of diversity from multiculturalism to pluralism at the same
time that there is a narrowing into special status of Aboriginal and Francophone communities within the Canadian mosaic.

The emphasis on including multiple perspectives suggests a broadening of epistemological and ontological foundations and a broadening of complexities and contributions. Yet, the discourse of multiple perspectives actually correspond with three options: a) French and/or First Nations, Métis and Inuit perspectives, b) examining an issue from a pro and con binary approach (for or against, strong or weak, opportunities and challenges), or c) building individual skills of interpersonal relations and making sound judgments. An example is the focus in the grade eleven course on national versus non-national loyalties where “contending” non-national loyalties refer to a broad range of factors (“religion, region, culture, race, ideology, class, other contending loyalties”) while “contending” nationalist loyalties include (Canadian nationalism, Québécois nationalism, First Nations and Métis nationalism, Inuit perspectives) (AE, 2007b, p. 21). In this case, the discourse of multiple perspectives reflects the idea that everyone-gets-a-difference but some differences (Aboriginal and Francophone) are more important. Significantly, the curriculum uses a questioning technique to build in critical thinking. This occurs in the section in the Grade eleven course examining “to what extent should individuals and groups embrace a Canadian identity?” (AE, 2007b, p. 23). However, the strength of the social cohesion and mosaic discourses throughout all the documents reinforces that national context as a cohesive identity.

3. Expansion model of citizenship

The documents reflect a strong discourse of citizenship as expanding through a building of awareness, of responsibility, and of identity from local to (sometimes) regional/provincial to national to global citizenship. There is a strong idea of the importance of responding to global problems which starts with awareness. Therefore, the idea of global citizenship responsibility is tied to awareness of issues or what I term response-ability. This is distinct from how citizenship is rooted in respect for difference and affirmation of identity in local expressions of citizenship. The specifics of the scales change in that sometimes citizenship expands from local to global or from national to global levels, and other times it includes regional; however, the expansion model is definitely a strong conceptual framework
for global citizenship across the documents and is emphasized with language of broadening and expanding ideas of citizenship. Conceptual confusion arises in that at the same time that there is a strong conceptualization of citizenship as expanding and broadening in a linear process from local to global, strong distinctions made between global and international issues and between global citizenship and foreign policy or between issues that are domestic versus issues that are global. Furthermore, there are implicit distinctions made between Albertans/Canadians (defined in a pluralistic model as everyone is different) and global-local others (immigrants). In one of the lesson plans students study a global issue and look up a country where it occurs and then can interview someone in Canada who emigrated from that country (i.e. global issues do not occur in Canada) to learn about that global issue. The idea that liberalism itself has expanded to include collective rights and diverse understandings of Canadian identity is implicit in the notion of citizenship extending out to the global realm. However, as the notion of pluralism in Canada is itself characterized by conceptual ambiguity if not outright contradictions, the concept that citizenship extends naturally to the global dimension is problematic. Furthermore, a key content area for understanding globalization is the impact global processes have had on cultural identities. In this case, Canada’s context of multiculturalism (framed through the three silos and prioritizing Aboriginal and Francophone groups) is a strong frame for understanding globalization which represents a reversal of the expanding out model in that globalization impacts on individual and national identities. This raises important tensions inherent to any assumption that multiculturalism and global citizenship education are mutually reinforcing.

4. Different conceptualizations of globalization

Globalization is articulated as having an impact and as a force. At the same time as globalization clearly is a process that exerts pressure by impacting cultures and identities in positive and negative ways, people can choose to respond to it. It is articulated in terms of global consciousness and tensions around economics, human rights and environmental sustainability. Historical globalization is articulated in relation to colonization and ethnocentrism. Globalization is also a process which represents a new world order in which individuals must participate to fulfill their own and Alberta’s potential.
5. Critical thinking straw-person

The social studies courses in grades 10, 11 and 12 are organized by one overall key issue and then into sections called “related issues”. These are posed as questions such as, in the Grade 10 course, “To what extent should I as a student respond to globalization?” which corresponds to the overall key outcome “[s]tudents will understand, assess and respond to the complexities of globalization” (AE, 2007a, p. 13). Similarly, the Grade 11 course is based on the key issue “to what extent should we embrace nationalism?” which corresponds to the overall key outcome “students will understand and respond to the complexities of nationalism” (AE, 2007a, p. 13). The posing of the question suggests a critique of the assumptions underlying the key concept and a deconstruction of the way the main term—globalization or nationalism—functions as a governing concept. The use of the question phrase “to what extent” gives the impression that a dichotomous binary is being avoided in the answer, and yet, the main analytical framework used for exploring the questions is often a binary framework. Teachers could facilitate activities and discussions around these questions in such a way as to interrogate assumptions and have students respond with complex answers.

However, I did not find examples of this type of discussion in the unit and lesson plans I looked at. For example, students are to study opportunities and challenges presented by globalization to culture and identity in Grade 10 and study nationalist versus non-nationalist loyalties in the Grade 11 course; examples of binaries are much more evident than continuums. Thus, the potential for criticality is limited by a strongly liberalist logic that is based on the assumption that students will examine different perspectives but ultimately select one by using sound judgment. They are generally neither led to examine the tensions inherent to different points of view nor to determine the difference between dominant, hegemonic understandings and marginalized understandings. In fact, the latter are often constructed as alternative views while dominant views are neither named nor identified as dominant which reflects the overall lack of attention to issues of power. Furthermore, alternative views are listed in a pluralism framework rather than categorized according to ideological and philosophical framings. Thus, the seemingly critical questions, meant to
broaden perspectives (according to the curriculum developers) are straw-person constructions.

Discourses

The second sub-question framing the empirical research section of this thesis is what are the main discourses through which ideologies of cultural diversity and equity, citizenship and globalization are iterated? I found eight discourses which contribute to the way multiculturalism and GCE and the relationship between them is framed in the Alberta context.

1. Diversity is an asset

This discourse is connected to the mosaic vision of Canadian identity as inherently inclusive. It is expressed in generally positive and neutral understandings of Canadian diversity and also through specific terms framed by the prioritization of Aboriginal and First Nations groups and their contributions to what is an inherently inclusive Canadian identity. It also works within a neoliberal frame to express what Joshee (2004, 2009) identifies as business case model for appreciating how diversity contributes to the fulfillment of the economic potential of individuals and the province.

2. Everyone-gets-a-difference

This discourse is an expression of the broader discourse of pluralism as replacing multiculturalism. It is related to Joshee’s (2004, 2009) liberal social justice discourses of recognition and identity in the attention to the importance of supporting identities and the importance of validating those identity as part of public life. However, it is most often aligned with equality as sameness where inequality is not the norm, and those who are not equal want to be the same as those whose identity fits the norm. There are many ways of being different and diverse—everyone is different and the same culturally (Joshee 2004, 2009). The everyone-gets-a-difference discourse does not necessary connect to notions of injustice and equality. Rather, connecting to the diversity as an asset discourse, it broadens the realm of what constitutes being different so that everyone and anyone can claim a difference. In this way, it serves to de-politicize the liberal social justice discourses of
multiculturalism. It is related to Joshee’s (2004, 2009) liberal social justice discourses of recognition and identity but is closer to the neoliberal discourse of equality as sameness where inequality is not the norm and there are many ways of being different and diverse – everyone is different and the same culturally. It also expresses a neoliberal version of social cohesion by broadening the realm of what counts as different so that all can claim a difference thereby de-politicizing more systemically bound categories such as race and ethnic culture so that there is even less possibility to speak about privilege. It also allows recognition and identity discourses to refer to members of privileged identity categories (e.g. a middle class white male can claim a difference of philosophy) without distinguishing between systemic hierarchies.

3. Multiple perspectives

This discourse is related to the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse but is used specifically in regards to the idea of perspectives as tied to identity where the everyone-gets-a-difference is distinctly about multiple claims to difference. It can be framed by different variations of liberalism and works with an assets view of diversity and the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse to reinforce how in a liberal democratic society such as Alberta, Canada, liberal foundations encourage different points of view. At the same time, the multiple perspectives discourse is strongly framed by the diversity dichotomy as the term multiple perspectives is frequently followed by the phrase “including Aboriginal and Francophone perspectives”. Again, there is a lack of systemic differentiation. The idea is that since everyone gets a difference, the main way to have an assets model of diversity for an effective society is to respect that there exist different perspectives. There is also the strong notion that more perspectives are better and that adding perspectives necessarily constructs diversity in perspectives. This is potentially problematic if the power-relations inherent in how perspectives exist and are included in mainstream discourse are not examined.

4. Taken-for-grantedness

This discourse is most often a substitute for the idea of the status quo. It expresses the importance of not taking the status quo for granted thereby the status quo as a normative and positive space. The assumption is that Alberta students experience the status quo in a positive
and neutral way that can be taken-for-granted. The wider citizenship education policy expresses a defense of the status quo as safety, respect, and high standards. This is a neoliberal version of the taken-for-granted discourse. A liberal social justice version reflects a hint of recognizing privilege in that there is an acknowledgement that there are some issues of inequality and unfairness in the status quo that need to be recognized. Thus, this social justice version of the discourse represents the potential for opening up a critical space. That critical space could make room for a complex notion of complicity in the sense that students could understand that they and their communities (local, regional and national) are embedded in systems of power that are inequitable. Such a taken-for-grantedness as complicity discourse would be evidence of a critical version of GCE (Andreotti, 2006)

5. **Multicultural others as resources for understanding global problems**

This discourse represents somewhat of a flip of the diversity as an asset discourse and the expansion model of citizenship. In the context of studying global issues, immigrants from so-called developing countries become a resource for understanding global problems in those countries from which they have emigrated. In this sense, their deficit position having experienced a global problem in another country becomes an asset for students in Alberta to become enlightened and to learn about those problems.

6. **Global consciousness**

This is a marginal discourse that is limited to the Global Dimensions section of the curriculum and to the Dimensions of Thinking particularly the Historical Thinking section. This discourse uses words and phrases such as interdependence, tensions, conflict, complexities, problems with multiple and complex causes with no clear solution, historical globalization, ethnocentrism, and rethinking assumptions. It is the main discourse in which notions of redistribution come up. It is also strongly associated with a notion of global consciousness and empathy with world conditions as opposed to ideas of international responses to global issues and foreign policy. It represents an important critical discourse; however, it is not highlighted in the lesson plans and is largely framed by more dominant discourses including taken-for-grantedness and impacts of globalization.
7. **Impacts of globalization**

While the discourse of global consciousness focuses attention on tensions, complexities, empathy, and different conditions in the world; the impacts of globalization discourse presents Alberta students as individuals with choices and globalization as a force. They can choose to respond to globalization and whether or not to embrace it. They can evaluate the positive and negative impacts of globalization on culture and identities. This discourse is less about complexities and more about making sound judgments based on binary options.

8. **Global citizenship as an extension of national citizenship**

This discourse is expressed through language of extending, expanding and broadening citizenship and through the ordering of sentences where global or world citizenship is placed at the end of sentences or small paragraphs that start with ideas of national citizenship. It assumes that this is a natural progression and a desirable progression.

This chapter has analyzed citizenship education policy and the development of and articulation of the social studies program of studies in Alberta. It has begun to answer the research question: How are the wider theoretical and ideological tensions reflected in policy and curriculum documents, and publically available lesson plans in Alberta? It has started this by also outlining the main conceptual conflations and the main discourses through which multiculturalism and GCE are iterated, related, and conflated. Building from the context and analysis of broader policy documents and background to the development of the curriculum reviewed in the first section of this chapter, the next chapter examines specific courses in the secondary school level social studies program and publically available lesson plans. It examines how these areas of conceptual ambiguities and particular discourses are evident in the framing of the fields of multiculturalism and GCE and the relationship between the fields.
Chapter Nine
Discourse Analysis Findings:
Senior Social Studies Courses and Lesson Plans

The wider provincial educational policy context represented by *the Heart of the Matter* is evidence of a Canadian diversity trichotomy frame of a national imaginary with an emphasis on two of the silos, Aboriginal and Francophone peoples (Kymlicka, 2005). It expresses an extension model of citizenship expressed through an assets discourse of diversity, everyone-gets-a-difference, and multiple perspectives that are most strongly framed by neoliberal visions of social cohesion through individual development and fulfilling the social and economic potential of individuals and society. The Social Studies Program of Studies appears to open more critical spaces than does *Heart of the Matter*, especially in the Global Connections and Dimensions of Thinking sections. It is pulled together by a strong conflation of liberal versions of citizenship.

Overall, these two policy texts present a number of related conceptions of citizenship. Citizenship is about respecting the evolution of citizenship through the past and respecting different points of view. The wider documents present a notion of citizenship that recognizes that there are multiple perspectives and multiple identities but not that perspectives and identities are multiply positioned within larger relations of power. Citizenship has progressed through greater inclusion and extends to the global level neutrally and logically. Central to the extending inclusion is special recognition to Aboriginal and Francophone peoples. Thus the extension model of citizenship is expressed through the diversity as an asset discourse expressing the notion of a unique Canadian identity of inclusivity. Everyone has a difference and understanding that and appreciating the status quo leads to social cohesion and conflict resolution where conflicts are acknowledged. The status quo can be taken for granted unless other perspectives are respected. The status quo is worth preserving in its values of safety, respect, and high standards. Furthermore, in the national frame, it can extend to include all types of differences; in a global frame, the status quo in other places is recognized as requiring empathy for those living elsewhere who suffer a poor quality of life.
This chapter continues with the findings from my discourse analysis of the Alberta social studies curriculum. It focuses on the senior secondary social studies courses and lesson plans available to teachers through the SACSS website and Alberta Education website. I provide an overview of each document and highlight the way the conceptual ambiguities and discourses identified in the previous chapter emerge from a close reading of these texts. Thus, I identify how these levels of the policy web (Joshee, 2007) express dominant and marginal discourse and create and or undermine critical discursive spaces.

Social Studies Courses:
Grades 10, 11, and 12

The senior social studies courses encompass three sequential grades (10 to 12). Grade 10 is “Perspectives on Globalization”. According to the course description, “Grade 10 explores multiple perspectives on the origins of globalization and the local, national and international impacts of globalization on identity, lands, cultures, economies, human rights and quality of life” (AE, 2005a, p. 12). Grade 11 encompasses “Perspectives on Nationalism” and “explores the complexities of nationalism in Canadian and international contexts and includes study of the origins of nationalism and the influence of nationalism on regional, international and global relations” (AE, 2005a, p. 12). The Grade 12 course is “Understandings of Ideologies” and “explores the origins and complexities of ideologies. Students will investigate, analyze and evaluate government policies and actions and develop individual and collective responses to contemporary local, national and global issues” (AE, 2005a, p. 12). The expansion model of citizenship is evident in all three descriptions. The very fact that multiple perspectives on globalization and nationalisms are taught and that in Grade 12 students are explicitly taught about ideology and the limits of liberalism demonstrates the interesting spaces for critical discourses evident in the design of the courses.

There are different versions of the courses (e.g. 10-1 “Perspectives on Globalization” and 10-2 “Living in a Globalized World” (AE, 2005a) depending on the intended post-secondary outcome for students. For the sake of clarity, I will be listing the titles of level 1 courses which are intended for students expecting to pursue post-secondary education at a university. The language is only somewhat changed in the other levels.
Overall, the Grade 10 course contains a number of conceptual ambiguities and discourses summarized in Chapter 8. The Grade 10 course on globalization is strongly rooted in the discourse of multiple perspectives. The pluralism framework is evident in the pluralizing of words like “peoples” and “identities” (AE, 2005a, p. 13, p. 20). Globalization is presented as a process whereby the world’s inhabitants are increasingly interconnected and interdependent. The document expresses that this global imperative results in heightened responsibilities for individual (and somewhat collective) action. The word most closely used with globalization is impact. There is a strong sense that globalization is a force, and individuals can choose to go with it or respond to it. A notion of agency is promoted through questions—for example, asking students to examine the extent to which they should respond to globalization.

The grade 10 curriculum also expresses an expansion model of citizenship that connects globalization, citizenship and identity. In terms of a discourse of new learning for 21st century citizens, there is a focus on problem solving as well as strong sense of the need for more skills in social studies in order to develop citizenship in a globalizing world. The course includes an important section on historical globalization and imperialism as continuing to have contemporary effects, particularly on Aboriginal peoples. This section expresses a tensions and complexities discourse. Yet, there is little focus on the impact of historical globalization on other marginalized groups besides a general theme; for example, migration is mentioned as a possible sub-topic for studying wider themes. There is, however, a strong discourse of the impact of globalization on cultures and identities through a possibilities and challenges binary. This section is strongly framed by the diversity as asset discourse of unique Canadian identity, and it expresses the Canadian diversity dichotomy with a focus on Francophone language revitalization and Canadian content laws in response to Americanization. There are hints of the diversity trichotomy with references to other cultures; however, multiculturalism is not a main focus. Thus, the vertical mosaic is evident (Jiwani, 2006; Porter, 1965). The multiple perspectives discourse is furthered through a language of various options, different points of view, and pros/cons rather than using a

---

73 In Specific Outcome 4.8, Students are to “analyze how globalization affects individuals and communities (migration, technology, agricultural issues, pandemics, resource issues, contemporary issues)” (AE, 2007a, p. 24)
framework examining differently positioned perspectives and identities. Ultimately, despite some articulations of a global social justice agenda, globalization’s impact on identity is framed in a neoliberal vision of job creation and opportunity.

The course overview reflects the combination of multiple perspectives and extension model discourses as well as the framing of the diversity dichotomy:

Students will explore multiple perspectives on the origins of globalization and the local, national and international impacts of globalization on lands, cultures, economies, human rights and quality of life. Students will examine the relationships among globalization, citizenship and identity to enhance skills for citizenship in a globalizing world. The infusion of multiple perspectives will allow students to examine the effects of globalization on peoples in Canada and throughout the world, including the impact on Aboriginal and Francophone communities. (AE, 2007a, p. 13)

This statement includes multiple perspectives, taken-for-grantedness, and globalization impact discourses. Significantly, the globalization impact discourse is understood through Canadian diversity groupings; the two silos. This is evidence of the fact that national discourses of diversity frame how globalization is understood in social studies and is thus important to global citizenship imaginings. The discourse of quality of life is an expression of the taken-for-granted discourse and is significant in the Grade 10 curriculum. It represents a global social justice discourse of recognizing an unfair world that makes some gestures towards re-distribution but also reinforces a we/they dichotomy. The globalizing world has impacts on cultures, rights, and quality of life; globalization is also understood as ultimately a positive factor for relating citizenship and identity through specific individual skills. These skills include recognizing the existence of multiple perspectives. There is no discourse of tensions and complexities in this section.

The course rationale connects the extension model of citizenship to the global imperative. There is a strong sense of what I will call response-ability in that there are global issues that require response and a corresponding citizenship responsibility in both a local and global spatial dimension:

74 For example, the impact of globalization on women is reduced to job creation and general ‘gender issues’: “analyze impacts of globalization on women (gender issues, labour issues, opportunities for entrepreneurship)” (AE, 2007a, p. 24).
Globalization, the process by which the world’s citizens are becoming increasingly connected and interdependent, demands that students explore responsibilities associated with local and global citizenship and formulate individual responses to emergent issues related to globalization. Recognizing and appreciating the influence of globalization will lead students to develop individual and collective responses to emergent issues. (AE, 2007a, p. 13)

The rhetoric that globalization “demands” is evidence of the global impact discourse. There is a hint of the tensions and complexities discourse here through the notion of interdependence, but that is framed by the global impact discourse. There is a simple idea expressed here: despite the complexities and tensions that might be associated with interconnections and interdependence, an individual must simply know or become aware of the existence of various perspectives and of the influence of globalization in order to respond to issues. Local and global citizenship are not potentially held in tension but responsibilities associated with two levels of citizenship are logically explored and responses made clear.

The key issue for the course is “to what extent should we embrace globalization” with a key outcome that “students will understand, assess and respond to the complexities of globalization” (AE, 2007a, p. 13). The first related issue is “To what extent should globalization shape identity?”(AE, 2007a, p. 20). This section is framed strongly by a recognition discourse of multiculturalism despite the fact that the actual word “multicultural” is never used; rather the pluralism approach is evident with multiple categories of identity being described with a prioritization of culture and language. In the specific outcomes, students will “appreciate why peoples in Canada and other locations strive to promote their cultures, languages and identities in a globalizing world” and “appreciate how identities and culture shape, and are shaped by, globalization” (AE, 2007a, p. 20). The notion of promoting cultures, languages, and identities in Canada is taken as a given; in this sense, the curriculum uses a demographic descriptive version of Canadian cultural diversity (Inglis, 1996). Indeed, in the context of the discourse of pluralism as different from multiculturalism presented in the Summer Institute videos, diversity is meant to be broader than multiculturalism, and students are to explore a variety of ways “in which individuals and collectives express identities (traditions, language, religion, spirituality, the arts, attire, relationship to land, ideological beliefs, role modeling” (AE, 2007a, p. 20).
This related issue is also framed by a binary approach to analysis in looking at “opportunities” and “challenges” that globalization presents to identities and cultures (AE, 2007a, p. 20). Interestingly, and likely because of the conscious shift to pluralism as described by those leading sessions at Summer Institutes, the terms used in this section relate strongly to multicultural discourses, and yet the word multicultural is never used. Opportunities include “acculturation, accommodation, cultural revitalization, affirmation of identity, integration” while challenges include “assimilation, marginalization, accommodation, integration, homogenization” (AE, 2007a, p. 20). Accommodation is both an opportunity and a challenge while both integration and assimilation are considered challenges. This overlap represents the conceptual ambiguity inherent to multicultural discourses.

As the analysis of the unit and lesson plans will demonstrate, I did not find any evidence of this tension being teased out; rather, the section remains characterized by conceptual ambiguity and a marked silence of the term multiculturalism despite the evidence of all three referents of multiculturalism. There is a political-programmatic notion expressed through the diversity as an asset to a distinct Canadian identity that prioritizes recognizing the contributions of Aboriginals and Francophones. Students are to “evaluate efforts to promote languages and cultures in a globalizing world (language laws, linguistic rights, cultural content legislation, cultural revitalization, linguistic revitalization)” (AE, 2007A, P. 20). The global examples are strongly framed by Francophone (language laws and rights) and Aboriginal (cultural revitalization and linguistic revitalization) cultural issues. The assumption is, to use Kymlicka’s (1995) categories, that it is a national minority (French Canadians) and aboriginal groups rather than ethno-cultural immigrant groups who are being impacted culturally by the processes of globalization. The omission of multicultural policies such as heritage language rights as examples of cultural protection is significant. The ideological-normative version of multiculturalism here is the diversity as asset version of the unique Canadian diversity model.

Building from the Global Connections strand and the Historical Thinking dimension in the social studies program of studies, the second related issue “to what extent should contemporary society respond to the legacies of historical globalization?” opens some critical
spaces through historical thinking and the tensions and complexities discourse (AE, 2007a, p. 21). While the term “historical globalization” is never exactly defined, its foundations are described as the “rise of capitalism, industrialization, imperialism, Eurocentrism” (AE, 2007a, p. 21). This section also refers to students “exhibit[ing] a global consciousness with respect to the human condition” and “accept[ing] social responsibilities associated with global citizenship (AE, 2007a, p. 21). The idea of social responsibilities coupled with respect for the human condition makes space for a redistribution discourse. However, again, this critical discursive space is framed by the multiple perspectives discourse as students are to “recognize and appreciate various perspectives regarding the prevalence and impacts of Eurocentrism” (AE, 2007a, p. 21). There is an important critical space opened up through the concept of Eurocentrism. Yet, again, multiple perspectives are not systemically differentiated so that presumably the various perspectives one is to recognize and appreciate may include a positive vision of European settlement. Really, it is an example of a critical thinking strawperson since the dominant discourse of global impact on Aboriginal cultures limits the acceptance of a pro-colonization point of view.

Indeed the other specific outcomes focus on global issues rooted in policies and practices of postcolonial governments in Canada and elsewhere including residential schooling. And, students are to “examine legacies of historical globalization and imperialism that continue to influence globalization” (AE, 2007a, p. 22). This is a global consciousness discourse of tensions and complexities rather than a global impacts discourse which is confusing given that the global impact discourse was so dominant in the previous section. This related issue section of the Grade 10 curriculum demonstrates an influence of postcolonial versions of cosmopolitanism (Delanty, 2006). The inclusion of notions of imperialism and eurocentrism connects to developing a global consciousness that results in social responsibilities to upholding a human condition of equity and fairness. This part of the curriculum seems to offer some evidence of the potential for a post-as-interrogating modernism approach to global citizenship education through the inclusion of an epistemological pluralist approach. However, despite the inclusion of key terms like eurocentrism and historical globalization, an acknowledgement of the negative impact of imperialism which can be seen today, and even the validation of “oral histories”, the multiple
perspectives discourse that is so strong through all levels of policy text assumes individual students can reach a neutral and balanced position.

Overall, the Grade 11 course focuses on “Perspectives on Nationalism” and contains a strong multiple perspectives discourse as well being framed by the diversity-as-asset-to-unique-Canadian-identity discourse. The underlying vision is that there is one national identity but there are multiple perspectives and understandings of that national identity. A conceptual tension inherent to this course is students are lead to question national identity at the same time as it is seen as central to a sense of citizenship belonging. This is evidence of the critical straw-person I identified in the interview with Shirley Douglas (LA, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c), the curriculum developer, who described that asking questions rather than making statements leads to transformation and expresses complexity. Yet, in practice, the questions set up binaries and false dichotomies. For example, individuals experience both national and non-national identities while the curriculum pits one against the other. The course also expresses conceptual confusion regarding developing a global consciousness while analyzing national loyalties and international relations. The curriculum expresses that it is important to understand the complexities of nationalism in order to understand and appreciate the interrelationships among nation, nationalism, internationalism, globalization, citizenship and identity.

The Grade 11 course’s key outcome is for students to “understand, assess and respond to the complexities of nationalism” (AE, 2007a, p. 13). The first Related Issue section is “To what extent should nation be the foundation of identity”, and the general outcome focuses on exploring the relationships among identity, nation, and nationalism (AE, 2007a, p. 13). Nationalism is defined as “an identity, internalized feeling and/or collective consciousness shared by a people” (AE, 2007b, p. 13). The examples given reflect an assets version of European epistemology as the curriculum lists “French Revolution and Napoleonic era, Canadian nationalism, Québécois nationalism, American nationalism, First Nations and Métis nationalism, Inuit perspectives” (AE, 2007b, p. 20). First Nations, Métis, and Inuit nations are validated through a Western notion of nationalism rather than as challenging a European conceptualization of nationalism. Again, there is conceptual ambiguity as Canadian nationalism is listed alongside Québécois and Aboriginal nationalism; and this tension is not
attended to but rather listed along with other versions in a multiple perspectives framework. The only examples from outside of Canada are from France and the U.S. However, the idea of “reconciling contending national loyalties” include “Canadian nationalism, First Nations and Métis nationalism, ethnic nationalism in Canada, civic nationalism in Canada, Québécois nationalism, Inuit perspectives on nationalism” (AE, 2007b, p. 21). It is not clear what ethnic nationalism in Canada refers to or what civic nationalism is, though it may refer to Canadian patriotism.

The main message is that there are many versions of nationalism which corresponds with the pluralism discourse and multiple perspectives framework. Being aware of different perspectives allows students to understand nationalism; the focus is on knowing or being aware of versions of nationalism rather than interrogating nationalism as a governing concept. There is an inherent dominant view that again is not stated through the notion of “alternative” views being respected. Students are to “appreciate the existence of alternative views on the meaning of nation” (AE, 2007b, p. 32). Furthermore, students are asked to evaluate the importance of reconciling nationalism with non-nationalist loyalties such as “religion, region, culture, race, ideology, class, other contending loyalties” (AE, 2007b, p. 19). Interestingly, many of the nationalisms described earlier are defined by these non-nationalist loyalties which demonstrate further conceptual confusing. For example, Québécois nationalism is strongly defined by language and was historically also tied to religion before the Quiet revolution. Furthermore, the listing approach of pluralism continues to place side by side terms and concepts that can be held in tension. Studying ideology as a non-national loyalty is interesting when the Grade 12 course examines liberalism in relation to governance in Canada.

The course also examines internationalism as related to “contemporary global affairs”. Where elsewhere the curriculum documents refer to “contemporary issues” (AE, 2005a 2, p. 6; AE, 2007a, p. 24; AE, 2007c, p. 23) and “global issues” (AE, 2005a, p. 6, 7, 12; AE, 2007a, p. 22, 24.; AE, 2007c, p. 25); the discourse of internationalism appears to relate more specifically to the involvement of nation-states in regional and global “affairs” (AE, 2005a p. 13). This course focuses on understanding the “motives of nation and state involvement or noninvolvement in international affairs (economic stability, self-
determination, peace, security, humanitarianism)” and “explor[ing] understandings of internationalism” (AE, 2007b, p. 23). This suggests there are multiple ways of understanding internationalism, and the focus is on foreign policy trends and supra-national organizations (e.g. United Nations, Arctic Council). Internationalism is foreign policy, and supra-national organizations constitute internationalism. Students are to analyze the impact of internationalism “in addressing contemporary global issues (conflict, poverty, debt, disease, environment, human rights)” (AE, 2007b, p. 23). Thus the nation state is seen as a central figure in the way broad issues are managed at the same time that internationalism is set in tension with nationalism. Students are to “evaluate the extent to which nationalism must be sacrificed in the interest of internationalism” (AE, 2007b, p. 23). It is significant that this section does not refer to global citizenship. Therefore, global citizenship is associated with “demonstrate[ing] a global consciousness with respect to the human conditions and global affairs” (AE, 2005a, p. 2) while internationalism is associated with pragmatic relations between nations and large groups in relation to broad issues.

The straw-person version of critical inquiry is central in the related issue “To what extent should individuals and groups in Canada embrace a national identity”. Yet, there is more nuance in the related goal that students are to “assess strategies for negotiating the complexities of nationalism within the Canadian context” (AE, 2007b, p. 24). Indeed, this section provides a nuanced examination into nationalism as both a normative category and a negotiated construction with differing understandings. The discursive turn is evident in the “appreciate[ion of] contrasting historical and contemporary narratives associated with national identity” and “analyze[sis of] methods used by individuals, groups and governments in Canada to promote a national identity (symbolism, mythology, institutions, government programs and initiatives)” (AE, 2007b, p. 24). There is also the alternatives discourse in the goal of demonstrating “respect the views of others on alternative visions of national identity”. Alternative is a stronger adjective than multiple to use in front of perspectives as it suggests deviating from a dominant, normative perspective which again is not named.

The historical perspectives about nationalism in Canada are associated with French Canadians; First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples; and Pierre Trudeau. Although studying Trudeau’s years as Prime Minister could lead to studying multicultural policy, no direct
references to immigrants are included. “Challenges and opportunities associated with the promotion of Canadian unity” reflect the diversity trichotomy: “Québec sovereignty, federal–provincial–territorial relations, Aboriginal self-determination and land claims, bilingualism, multiculturalism” (AE, 2007b, p. 24). Multiculturalism is not present in the “evaluation of various perspectives of future visions of Canada” which include “pluralism, multinational model, separatism, Aboriginal self-determination, global leadership, North American integration” (AE, 2007b, p. 24). Significantly, the discourse of pluralism seems to replace rather than expand on multiculturalism in this instance. Global leadership is seen as a perspective of future visions of Canada; interestingly, “global” is used rather than “international” in this context.

The Grade 12 course focuses on ideologies. Again there is hardly any mention of multiculturalism or of ethnocultural or racialized minorities outside of Aboriginal and Francophone peoples although racism is mentioned as a contemporary issue. This course expands on the individual-collective dialectic by distinguishing between individualism and collectivism as ideologies. There is explicit attention to global citizenship in this course which is framed by a post-as-after-modernism logic with hints at epistemological pluralism through brief attention to some “alternative” ideologies. Overall, the course overview expresses a focus on old (less evolved) versus new (more evolved) liberalism which is consistent with the expansion of liberalism as progress in the modern telos. The rhetoric of complexities and multiple perspectives reflects the critical thinking impulse consistent across the curriculum. The course overview asserts learning about liberalism as key to global citizenship:

Students will explore the origins and complexities of ideologies and examine multiple perspectives regarding the principles of classical and modern liberalism. An analysis of various political and economic systems will allow students to assess the viability of the principles of liberalism. Developing understandings of the roles and responsibilities associated with citizenship will encourage students to respond to emergent global issues. (AE, 2007c, p. 13)

The expansion model of the progress of liberalism is reasserted in the course rationale:
The principles of liberalism have played a significant role in the development of modern democratic societies. Developing a comprehensive understanding of the evolution of modern liberal thought and the tenets of competing ideologies is important in the development of active, informed and responsible citizens. This understanding will enable students to effectively investigate, analyze and evaluate government policies and actions and develop individual and collective responses to contemporary local, national and global issues. (AE, 2007c, p. 13)

Liberalism is the central ideology against which other ideologies are studied in the course. Modern liberal thought is presented as an evolved ideology that is central to an expansion model of citizenship. Thus the expansion of citizenship from local to (sometimes regional to) national to global levels parallels the evolution of liberalism and is thus rooted in modern liberal principles.

The key issue around which the course is organized is “To what extent should we embrace an ideology?”, and students are to “understand, assess and respond to the complexities of ideologies” (AE, 2007c). However, the course is centered on liberalism. According to the curriculum document, an ideology is characterized by “interpretations of history, beliefs about human nature, beliefs about the structure of society, visions for the future” (AE, 2007c, p. 20). In the first related issue, students look at the relationship between ideology and identity. There is a section comparing individualism as rooted in principles of liberalism including “individual rights and freedoms, self-interest, competition, economic freedom, rule of law, private property” (AE, 2007c, p. 20). These are compared to the principles of collectivism: “collective responsibility, collective interest, cooperation, economic equality, adherence to collective norms, public property” (AE, 2007c, p. 20). The relationship between individualism and common good in societies is described as a “dynamic” (AE, 2007c, p. 20).

There is a strong relationship between ideology and citizenship in another section of the course that is organized around assessing “impacts of, and reactions to, principles of liberalism” (AE, 2007c, p. 21). This section is defined by the key issue “To what extent is resistance to liberalism justified?” (AE, 2007c, p. 21). In terms of “values and attitudes”, the first specific outcome leads students to “appreciate Aboriginal contributions to the development of ideologies”, and later to “explore Aboriginal contributions to the
development of liberalism” (AE, 2007c, p. 21). This is an assets and contribution approach to including Aboriginal worldviews into the curriculum by validating them as ideologies. The evolution of liberalism occurs through inclusion and pluralism and discourses of recognition and contributions. Students are to appreciate the impact on citizens and citizenship of promoting ideological principles; this is another use of the discourse of impact (as in impact of globalization) which is different from a tensions and complexities approach to exploring ideologies and citizenship. The impacts discourse reifies a pro-con and opportunities-challenges logic. Aboriginal experiences are cited as the main example of a perspective on the “imposition of the principles of liberalism” (AE, 2007c, p. 21).

Another specific outcome includes “appreciate[ing] that individuals and groups may adhere to various ideologies” (AE, 2007c, p. 21). This expresses a flexible version of citizenship which adds a nuance to the pluralism and everyone-gets-a-difference framework. Modern liberalism is highlighted as an evolved form of ideology tied to positively to citizenship except in the circumstance of Aboriginal experiences of its imposition; however, individuals and groups are not defined by one ideology. Interestingly, in the course description, modern liberalism, consistently with the critical impulse that justifies liberalism, is explored through challenges by “alternative thought” (AE, 2007c, p. 22). These include “Aboriginal collective thought, environmentalism, religious perspectives, neo-conservatism, postmodernism, extremism” (AE, 2007c, p. 22). These “alternatives” are extremely diverse, and this list hardly reflects neutral items; rather, distinct and contradicting categories are related together as “alternatives” to the dominant modern liberal ideology. This is an explicit expression of a loose version of “modern liberalism” as an evolved and inclusive ideology that accepts and even encourages some critical thinking through challenges and opportunities study or through examinations of alternative thought.

The next section examines “the extent to which the principles of liberalism are viable in a contemporary world” (AE, 2007c, p. 23). This section breaks the study of liberalism down to various perspectives within political and economic systems. It focuses on how governments “reflect the will of the people” and “encourage economic equality”; and it considers the extent to which “liberal democracies reflect illiberal thought and practice (Canada, contemporary examples” (AE, 2007c, p. 23). Contemporary examples are
presumably to be from outside of Canada. The distinction between “alternative thought” and “illiberal thought” is not clear; however, the critical impulse does potentially open up a critical space for a self-critical and reflexive view of Canadian liberalism. Significantly, when the curriculum looks at how governments promote individual and collective rights, multicultural policy is missing. Canadian examples include the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms; Québec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms; First Nations, Métis, and Inuit rights; and language legislation (AE, 2007c, p. 23). Multicultural rights are included in the CCRF, but so are language rights which are listed as a distinct example. Neither multicultural policies nor employment equity policies are listed. Significantly “racism” is included in a list of contemporary issues (which are implied to be other than Canada) through which to evaluate the viability of principles of liberalism (AE, 2007c, p. 23).

The Grade 12 course includes an instrumentalist version of global citizenship that is tied to the assumed dynamic achieved between individual and collective citizenship. The curriculum is significant in its explicit study of ideology as “shap[ing] individual and collective citizenship”; however, modern liberalism is the centre piece of the course and is examined only through a list of alternative thoughts and through a binary of liberal and illiberal thoughts and actions. The last related issue in the course focuses on students “assess[ing] their rights, roles and responsibilities as citizens” (AE, 2007c, p. 24). This includes “appreciate[ing] the relationship between citizenship and leadership”, “exhibit[ing] a global consciousness with respect to the human condition and world issues”, and “accept[ing] responsibilities associated with individual and collective citizenship” (AE, 2007c, p. 24). Students are to “develop strategies to address local, national and global issues that demonstrate individual and collective leadership” (AE, 2007c, p. 24). The citizenship as leadership discourse connects to the way citizenship can be conflated with character as evident in The Heart of the Matter and reflects the impact of globalization discourse’s focus on individual choices. A strong framing of the extension model of citizenship is stated here in correlation to a positive, mutual reinforcement of individual and collective rights. However, there is also the discourse of global consciousness; here it is tied to taken-for-grantedness in terms of having empathy for global community members.
Unit and Lesson Plans

I examined two sources of Social Studies lesson plans created for teachers. The first set were developed through SACSC and are available on their website. The second source is available on the Alberta Education website and is a collaboration of Learn Alberta and a not-for-profit agency called The Critical Thinking Consortium. While I found few explicit connections between multiculturalism and global citizenship education, I did find many implicit connections through an emphasis on the importance of cultural identity that appears to span understandings of Canadian cultural diversity and global issues. Expanding on the curriculum outlines, the lessons express a critical view of globalization and a focus on the impact of globalization on different identity communities.

A Grade 10 lesson created through SACSC on Global Issues has students learn about six of the global issues identified by Canadian International Development Agency as problematic; they are tied to the UN Millennium Goals. These include poverty (health and nutrition); basic education; HIV/AIDS; children’s rights and protection; gender equality; environmental sustainability. After learning about the issues, the students set out to research a “developing country” where “quality of life might be questionable with respect to the issues presented”. The objective states:

Students will identify undeveloped countries and regions, thus increasing their awareness of the struggles and hardships experienced by a large percentage of our world’s inhabitants. This knowledge and understanding will encourage students to take responsibility through action, thereby strengthening their commitment to be active citizens of the world. (SACSC, n.d.a)

The main concepts here are social action, commitment, awareness, and obligation. The main assumption is that with “knowledge and understanding” students will necessarily feel more responsible and be moved to “act”. The quality of life discourse is a global framework version of taken-for grantedness. The taken-for-granted discourse in a global frame emphasizes struggles and hardships and recognizes that the human condition is marked by a lack of quality of life in the global community. This global consciousness discourse has stronger language than what is found in the course description for Grade 10. It emphasizes the strengthening of commitment to action through empathy and knowledge of the suffering
of others; however, as the lesson continues, the taken-for-granted discourse reifies an us versus them dichotomy.

This lesson expresses the multicultural others as resources for learning about globalization discourse. In the Activities for Extension and/or Integration section, “Students can interview new Canadians who immigrated to Canada from an identified country” (SACS, n.d.c). Interview questions “could include those specific to quality of life” (SACS, n.d.c.) The lesson plan suggests that students ask the immigrant what were his or her experiences with the global issue(s) in question. In this case, the context of multiculturalism is seen as a resource for learning global citizenship; and therefore GCE contributes to a we/they dichotomy. The assumption is that there may be a “new Canadian” (racialized) from one of the specified “developing countries” (in the Global South) where quality of life is a problem. By hearing about a personal experience, the student interviewer will gain awareness, will no longer take the status quo in Alberta for granted, and will commit to active citizenship. Another assumption is that the student is not from such a developing country nor does she/he have experience with the global problem. Ultimately the taken-for-granted discourse iterates a strong us versus them mentality through a possible extension activity where students write an essay following the interview responding to the question “do we as Canadians take for granted our quality of life? (SACS, n.d.c.). Based on the way the activity is designed to follow researching a global problem somewhere in the developing world, the assumption is that students will answer yes. Re-distribution is hinted at with the idea of comparing quality of life. However, the twice othering of the immigrant as a domestic and global other is significant. The essay promotes a liberal individual development model of self-reflection and self-enlightenment through recognizing quality of life is taken-for-granted.

Another interesting example is a suggested activity by Alberta Education and the Critical Thinking Consortium called “Globalization and Cultural Identities”. It combines an assets discourse of diversity with the impact of globalization discourse and is framed by a critical straw-person impulse. The main goal is for students to “prepare an effective set of questions to gather information about the impacts of globalization on the identities of various groups” (AL, 2008b). Students are to “investigate the impact of globalization on Canada’s founding nations and cultural communities by deciding whether globalization has, on
balance, enhanced or weakened community identities” (AL, 2008b). This is an interesting version of the diversity trichotomy. First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people are conflated with the so-called third force (Li, 2000) into “cultural communities” in distinction from the colonial language of “Canada’s founding nations” (i.e. English and French). Influences of globalization on cultural identities are broken into the “opportunities” and “challenges” defined in the curriculum (AL, 2008b). The students are led to brainstorm examples of these global influences:

Newcomers may be marginalized because of an inability to speak the dominant languages or because of cultural differences; affirmation of identity may occur because of multicultural television and increased international travel and exchanges. Remind students to look for examples of global effects, not effects that are attributable largely to domestic influences. (AL, 2008b)

Importantly, this statement includes a notion of marginalization. Yet, multicultural television is affirmed and is tied directly to international travel. This suggests a conflation of what Kymlicka (2004) calls domestic multiculturalism versus cosmopolitan multiculturalism. They are to conduct an interview or administer surveys to answer two key questions: “How has globalization in its many dimensions changed individual and collective identities?” and “Have these changes primarily enhanced or weakened individual and collective identities?” (AL, 2008b). There is also an option for teachers to bring in a few “knowledgeable speakers” to class or have teams of students poll particular groups such as “members of Canada’s founding nations (i.e., English and French), First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples and other cultural communities; e.g., Haitians, Vietnamese, Lebanese, Moroccans, Belgians, Germans, Poles, Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, Irish” (AL, 2008b). Interestingly, in this case Aboriginal peoples are distinct from “other cultural communities” who are actually named in a list that expands upon the discourse of the third force without distinguishing between new or long term immigrant groups or between European immigrants or people of colour (Li, 2000).

This lesson represents a descriptive referent of globalization and of identities that connects to a post-as-after modernism version of global citizenship. The assets discourse expresses that Canada benefits from diversity; in this case, Canada’s diversity is a resource for understanding globalization. This is connected to the strong discourse of pluralism as everyone-gaps-a-difference. Thus, this section represents a blend of the economic-technical
instrumentalism of the neoliberal banking case discourse with liberal social justice right-based, recognition, and identity discourses (Marshall, 2009; Joshee, 2009). There is also a strong “equity as sameness” component of the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse which can easily supplant the social justice discourses because all these groups are presented as equally different rather than differently systemically bound. Furthermore, the fact that teachers must be careful to steer students away from naming domestic factors reflects an attempt to separate the domestic multicultural programs and policies from global issues of cultural marginalization or homogenization. On the one hand, Canada’s multicultural demographics and multicultural polices are relevant to the study of identities in the context of globalization, in fact multiculturalism is a resource for understanding globalization; on the other hand, global effects happen outside of Canada and multiculturalism is the same as traveling.

When students create the questions for their interview, the instructions direct them to consider the indicators of a healthy identity to demonstrate “if an identity was enhanced” by an individual or community having experienced a set of conditions. These include: “stronger feelings or attachment or belonging (more important to the person or group)”, “richer experiences (more personally satisfying)”, “greater freedom (more options/greater diversity)”, and “more comforting mindset (less disruptive or upsetting)” (AL, 2008b). Students are to ask questions such as “do you feel that your community has developed a stronger identity in the last 20 years or a weaker one?”, and “What have you gained or lost as an individual living in a more globalized world?” (AL, 2008b). The critical impulse here is framed by a pro-con binary in the “stronger” versus “weaker” language. Interestingly, this set of factors is not probed for interrelatedness in terms of how greater options and greater diversity might, in actual lived experience, have corresponded with less comfort and less feelings of belonging. There is no evidence of a discourse of tensions and complexities here; rather, the critical straw-person logic combines with the everyone-gets-a difference and global impact discourses. This combination contributes to a conflation of global citizenship and multiculturalism and moves critical discourses to the margins. Students and teachers could use these interviews to trouble and interrogate categories of identity in the context of globalization. However, they could just as easily and perhaps more easily use these
interviews to reinforce a post-as-after modernist ideas of global education. The notion of identity is not tied to systemic categorization in a national or global imaginary in this version.

Another lesson for Grade 10 suggested by Alberta Learning in conjunction with the Critical Thinking Consortium is called “Enhancing Cultural Identities” where students “recommend a set of proposals to enhance the cultural identities of identified groups in response to particular challenges and opportunities presented by globalization” (AL, 2008c). Teachers are directed to “ask students to examine strategies that groups use to promote cultural and linguistic interests. This is an excellent opportunity for students to explore Aboriginal issues as they relate to language and culture” (AL, 2008c). One of the topics students are to study is “cultural revitalization”. Here again, the idea of enhancing cultures is an iteration of the diversity as asset discourse; there is no critical systemic understanding. It is indeed an excellent opportunity to explore Aboriginal issues which ought to be an opportunity for a complex, nuanced study of the tensions inherent to the Canadian diversity dynamic. An emphasis on Aboriginal issues rights a clear historical wrong given examples of cultural genocide and a systemic deficit view of Aboriginal cultures. Yet an unintended consequence is the silencing of the voices of immigrants and those identity groups who, along with First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples, experience racism and struggle to keep their culture. I am not suggesting that immigrant and Aboriginal experiences are the same. However, in my reading of the lesson plan, Aboriginal experiences are presented in a way that isolates these experiences of oppression from wider systemic and global processes; these wider inequities of cultural power impact multiple identity groups in particular ways that is glossed over at best in the Alberta texts.

The Alberta Learning and Critical Thinking Consortium lesson plans focus strongly on an assets model of diversity. The lesson “The Future of Collective and Individual Identities” asks “To what extent is globalization healthy for collective and individual identities?” (AL, 2008d). Teachers are directed to discuss the impact of globalization on identities:

Ask students to consider whether globalization contributes to or undermines desirable aspects of collective and individual identities. Framing the question this way avoids the assumptions that globalization necessarily undermines
diversity (globalization presents opportunities to enhance cultural diversity) and that maximal cultural diversity is the ideal. And certainly, there is no presumption of a single desirable identity. (AL, 2008d)

The strong promotion of “maximal cultural diversity” as “the ideal” is, I would argue, tied to the Canadian discourse of diversity is an asset. I would hazard a guess that the discourse of the impact of globalization on cultural identities would be different in another national context (e.g., findings from the U.S. by Parker (2011) about schools with multiple cultures in its demographic using the word international in their name). This direction seems to be an attempt to explicate the multiple perspectives and multiple identity discourse which is very vague in the curriculum documents. It is also evidence of a struggle with the critical impulse straw-person constructed through some of the binary constructs inherent to key questions. In this case, examining how globalization contributes to or undermines collective and individual identities could lead to some students supporting the homogenizing vision of globalization. However, it appears assumed that this stance would not be acceptable in the pluralistic context of Alberta framed by the diversity is an asset discourse. Thus, the lesson plan developers are forced to articulate a strong value statement on behalf of maximal diversity. However, despite this multicultural ideological norm, a belief in diversity which can be traced to multicultural discourses, there is only cursory attention to multicultural policies themselves in both the curriculum and the lesson plans.75

Alberta Learning in collaboration with Critical Thinking Consortium also posts some unit and lesson plans to use with the Grade 11 social studies course on nationalism. They also express the diversity as an asset discourse of Canada’s unique identity through a strong social cohesion message that frames the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse. The extension model frames these lessons as well. The first lesson lists a number of scenarios and asks students “which events make them feel the greatest pride” (LA, 2008k). Most of the examples are of sports (e.g. a schoolmate is drafted to the National Hockey League, a Canadian or Albertan or Ukranian-Canadian wins olympic Gold, Italy wins the world cup in soccer). Others include aboriginal musicians winning a music award, the French language being judged one

75 For example, in the lesson “Global Media and Identity” students are led to speculate on the impact of the practice of McDonald’s in Germany advertising with a mix of English and German on “maintenance of culture and promotion of linguistic identity” (LA, 2008k). This is about a dominant national culture experiencing Americanization without an examination of minority languages within Germany.
of the most romantic languages, and a Haitian-born refuge being appointed Governor General (which did happen to Michaëlle Jean). Having considered whether or not each example makes them feel pride, students are to suggest other “personal, local, national and international events that are sources of personal pride” (LA, 2008k). This statement is consistent with an extension model. “Personal” pride is the first level and pride can be expressed from the individual to local, national and international spheres. There is no suggestion of tensions within or between these levels of pride. In this case, in addition to Francophone and Aboriginal Canadians, the third force of other cultures is evident in these examples through references to Ukranian-Canadians and Albertans who would feel pride in Italy or a connection to Haiti. The list reflects an everyone-gets-a-difference discourse where each item is seen as worthy of pride by at least some students; every student gets a difference to consider in terms of loyalty.

In subsequent lesson, students consider divided loyalties within families and the example given is “a family who has relatives competing on opposing sports teams or for a different national team” (LA, 2008f). This is another example of sports teams being used to explain how students might feel some loyalty to another country and is also an example of the extension model. This example could be read as an interaction of local and global but is framed as an individual family issue; it reflects Kymlicka’s (2004) idea of dual citizenship which does not challenge significantly the multicultural model. Teachers move students along to “introduce[ing] the roots of nationalism”, and students are led to consider that “nationalist sentiments vary depending on the perspective of the various groups involved in a particular situation or state. For instance, students’ identities and allegiances will likely differ even though they all live in Canada” (LA, 2008o). Québécois nationalism is given as an example to study in terms of how different perspectives lead to conflict in nationalist sentiments: “e.g. a federalist perspective may be rooted in historical factors, whereas the separatist perspective may be more heavily rooted in social and political concerns” (LA, 2008o). This could be an invitation to identify and unpack different assumptions and lead to critical engagement with a complex issue; however, as it is stated, the multiple perspectives are categorized as historical or social or political without any reference to power relations. The lesson plan introduces some other examples including the ones listed in the course description as well as “other contemporary case studies” including Tamils in Sri Lanka,
Tibetan independence and Northern Ireland independence to introduce students to the issue of divided loyalties (LA, 2008o). Again the term contemporary examples suggests those that are not-Canadian.

The Canadian flag debate is used as an example of divided loyalties at the national level as an extension of the family example. Then, students are introduced to consensus building when considering matters of divided loyalties through a role play of delegates at a public policy forum. Questions to consider include

How do we ensure that our rights and interests are advanced? How do we ensure that the voices and rights of others are advanced?....What are the concerns about simple majority rule? How important and realistic is it to reach consensus on key issues? Should varying nationalist groups simply be given jurisdiction over certain areas?... (LA, 2008f)

No answers for these questions are provided nor are other possibilities. The idea is that students will know the answers and be able to set up a framework for their discussion because the inclusion of multiple perspectives leads to social cohesion. This links back to the idea of group work skills as key to developing global citizenship as expressed in The Heart of the Matter. The groups suggested for role play represent the diversity trichotomy with the Albertan regional twist: Western Canadians, Québécois, Anglophones in Québec, Anglophones in central Ontario, Francophones outside of Québec, coalition of Aboriginal groups (First Nations, Mètis, Inuit), and coalition of visible minorities (e.g. Muslim Canadians, Black Canadians).

The next lesson expresses how a social cohesion discourse weaves through the diversity as an asset to Canada’s unique identity discourse, the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse, and the multiple perspectives discourse so as to marginalize the space for social justice discourses. The lesson suggests that teachers ask students to “consider the ideal mix of loyalties” by redesigning the Canadian coat of arms to “represent their view of the ideal balance of national and non-national loyalties” (LA, 2008m). Teachers are to stress that in deciding on this balance students “are not to assert their own personal preferences, but to decide from the perspective of someone who wants to develop a truly Canadian
representation” so that they can respect the diversity of groups and rights of individual citizens in Canada (LA, 2008m, italics in original).

The national interests include “Canadian nationalism, Québécois nationalism, First Nations nationalism, Métis nationalism, Inuit perspectives on nationalism, and ethnic nationalism” (LA, 2008m). Ethnic nationalism is distinguished from French-Canadian or any version of Aboriginal ethnicity thereby representing an ambiguous reference to the third force. Non-national loyalties include “religion, region, culture, race, ideology, class and other contending loyalties” (LA, 2008m) which is an iteration of the vision of pluralism in the curriculum documents and program of study. There is no discussion of conflicts within or between these national or non-national loyalties. Reinforcing this neutral categorization, a special note to teachers leading the coat of arms activity says “it may be useful to point out to students that collective symbols might be used to represent particular loyalties. For example, instead of showing specific religious groups, students might use a nondenominational symbol to represent all major religions in Canada” (LA, 2008m). This is an example of the conceptual ambiguity inherent to notions of pluralism as everyone-gets-a-difference.

Religion is offered as common allegiance among ethnic groups and other “national groups” (e.g. French Canadians) at the same time that it is a catch-all for non-national loyalties. This is social cohesion through everyone-gets-a-difference discourse in a particular categorizing of difference. It also represents an example of how the assets discourse of diversity connects to and even redefines the trope of the multicultural mosaic. In this case, religion gets a piece of the mosaic in such a way as to conflate distinct and even contradictory experiences of cultural minoritization in Canada.

The Alberta Learning lesson suggestions mention both multiculturalism and pluralism. In a lesson called “Promoting or Challenging Canadian Identity”, the critical thinking straw-person contributes to conceptual confusion around cultural diversity and the national imaginary. Teachers are to lead students in a brainstorm session on “factors that may either challenge or support a Canadian national identity; e.g., separatism, regionalism, Aboriginal rights, American influence, multiculturalism” (LA, 2008l). In the same lesson, students look at different newspaper headlines relating to the factors and group them into “economic disparity, foreign threats, racial tensions, that impact Canadian national identity”.

They conduct a preliminary assessment of the headlines in terms of the impact on national identity of particular factors. The list of possible factors for assessing headlines is almost identical to the first list with one difference being that rather than multiculturalism, pluralism is listed. This reflects some confusion around the distinction between the two as the Summer Institutes attempted to explain. Including so different factors impacting national identity in the span of a few paragraphs is confusing.

Having heard about the newspaper headlines from the class, students are then to list each factor and examine each headline to declare if the issue it represents presents a challenge or an opportunity to national identity. No criteria are provided as to what constitutes a challenge or an opportunity, nor is there any examination of differences between or within factors. Instead, the discussion leads students to a bigger set of dichotomous questions: “To what extent does Canada have a national identity? Is it getting stronger or weaker? What are the long-term prospects for a Canadian national identity?” (LA, 2008l). These questions suggest a crisis of national identity in pro/con, strong/weak, short-term/long-term terms rather than a discussion of the complexities and tensions of national identity.

Another interesting lesson suggestion evokes Anderson’s (2006) imagined communities by having students study initiatives in the form of “symbols, myths, institutions and government programs that have been used to influence Canadian identity” (LA, 2008e). Possible symbols to study include flags (maple leaf, fleur-de-lis), beaver, coat of arms, national anthem, parliament buildings, hockey, lacrosse and commemorative postage stamps. Institutions include the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, “the Royal Family (Governor General)”, and the armed forces. Programs include Parks Canada, heritage ministers, and the Dominion Institute Canadian history test. The myths represent a more critical space and include “Canada as the ‘just’ society”, Canada as a cultural mosaic, “Canada as a land of boundless opportunity”, and “Canada as a welcoming home for immigrants”. Calling these ideas myths is significant because it suggests that there are significant challenges faced by many Canadians and especially new immigrants that are overlooked. However, the questions that correspond to the list of initiatives do not encourage a critical analysis but rather a evaluation of effectiveness in terms of bringing the country together. Thus, the task is not to deconstruct and examine how these initiatives construct a national imaginary in an
inclusion/exclusion paradox. Each student is assigned one initiative and will write an article or letter to the editor “outlining the nature of the identity-building initiative they researched and their assessment of its successes” based on two criteria: “was it promoting a worthwhile change?” and “did it having a positive lasting impact?” (LA, 2008e). The assumption is creating a national identity through symbols, myths, institutions and programs is a positive, long-lasting project.

In another lesson, students are assigned to role play different Canadians for whom to prepare a profile based on brief information sheets or interviews. Teachers are led to consider including representatives from certain backgrounds including

- leader of an Aboriginal community
- Canadian international business leader
- Francophone living outside of Québec
- Francophone living in Québec
- Maritimer
- Westerner
- African Canadian
- recent immigrant
- Ontarian
- rural mayor/reeve
- urban mayor/councillor
- Council of Canadians member
- representative from the Dominion Institute
- representative from the Parkland Institute
- contemporary religious leader—Christian, Jewish, Muslim, other
- members of various visible/invisible minority groups
- feminist
- person with a disability
- Canadian living abroad or having travelled extensively. (LA, 2008n)

This group is a personification of the definition of pluralism in the program of studies that reflects the everyone-gets-a-difference version of multiple perspectives as ‘the more the merrier’. It also reflects a broadening of the mosaic discourse where everyone is allowed a perspective in an inclusive vision of Canadian identity. Yet, this version of pluralism as everyone-gets-a-difference includes many tiles and many ways to be diverse. Consequently, the power dynamics inherent to the different ways these categorized groups are systemically bound is made even less obvious than it had been in the historical version of multiculturalism as the mosaic (Joshee & Johnson, 2007).

Furthermore, students are to attach to each profile (“a person’s or group’s national identity”—i.e. individuals and groups are conflated) to a related concept such as “pluralism, multinational model, separatism, regionalism, Aboriginal self-determination, global leadership and North American integration” (LA, 2008i). This list includes new concepts such as multinational model, global leadership, and North-American integration though no definitions are provided; rather students are to look them up or describe them. Then, once
everyone has presented, the students take the terms associated with each profile and place them on a continuum from “supports a single, unique national identity to supports diverse, multi-dimensional, pluralist Canadian identities” (LA, 2008i). This continuum is a change from the dichotomous questions reflecting the critical thinking straw-person approach of the last discussion. There is also a strong statement of the possibility of Canadian identity as something diverse and pluralistic rather than static which is an interesting nuance given the earlier assumption of a crisis of national identity. However, the strong everyone-gets-a-difference discourse of pluralism framing all these lessons can undermine this critical space. Along with the critical thinking straw-human logic, the lack of any language related to power and privilege and the dominance of social cohesion discourses undermines the critical potential.

The conceptual ambiguity inherent to national issues is extended to language around global issues. The set of suggestions for lessons created by Alberta Education and the Critical Thinking Consortium for the Grade 11 social studies course examine international issues through the course lens of nationalism and nation-states’ motivations for international involvement. The language used appears quite distinct from notions of globalization in the Grade 10 lessons as it focuses on internationalism and foreign policy issues, terms not used in the Grade 10 lessons. International issues include a wide range from pandemics, border control, terrorism, children’s rights, and global warming to copyright infringement on music and movies, expanding markets, and intellectual property. Although in earlier lessons, the expansion model combined with a everyone-gets-a-difference discourse to suggest that students hold individual, local, regional, national, and international sources of pride; in this lesson, the focus is on nations as actors. It examines “why nations or states become involved in an international affair that does not directly or obviously affect them; i.e. the event appears to be a localized situation” (LA, 2008h). This is an interesting flip of the taken-for-granted discourse as empathy and action in recognizing human suffering in a global consciousness. Here, it is framed by the stronger neoliberal version in the national frame in that it suggests that nations must warrant it beneficial to their own interests to respond to a global issue.
The next activity lists possible foreign policy issues, and students decide on the viability for international involvement. Teachers are directed to ask students, when rating each option, “to consider the following four criteria for viable options: is affordable or feasible, is culturally and ethically acceptable, will have minimal adverse effects” (LA, 2008g). The economic imperative is the first considered and there are no guidelines for students as to what counts as culturally and ethically acceptable. The conceptual ambiguity continues in the suggested culminating challenge in which “students explore the relationship between national interests and internationalism as they propose a foreign policy response to particular global challenges or opportunities from a designated perspective and then decide, overall, whether internationalism should take precedence over national interests” (LA, 2008j). Here, the critical challenge is in the form of a national-international binary rather than breaking down the complex ways global issues impact various groups within and between national borders. The attempt to make conceptual distinctions continues to be ambiguous when the resource suggests teachers lead students to cut out headlines from current newspapers and magazines and categorize them into three types of issues: “national issues particular to individual nations or states, global issues that impact many countries including Canada, and issues that may initially appear to be localized to a particular nation or state but in fact have international implications” (LA, 2008j).

Thus, the specific course descriptions for Grades 10, 11, and 12 demonstrate a great deal of conceptual ambiguity around citizenship, diversity, and globalization. These ambiguities impact the perceived relationship between multiculturalism and GCE. Confusion is reinforced through a series of interrelated areas of ambiguity including: (a) individual and collective rights in relation to identity groups; (b) pluralism and multiple perspectives; (c) expansion model of citizenship; (d) different versions of globalization; and (e) critical-thinking straw-person approach. The confusion around trying to determine how GCE is conceptualized in the multicultural context of Alberta is evident through a set of

The list of “foreign policy issues” is wide and includes world poverty (world disparity e.g. per capita income figures for selected least developed countries and developed countries, access to water, life expectancy and literacy rates), global warming (evidence of global warming and potential dangers in the near future if nothing is done), pollution of parts of a country by a foreign-owned company (mining gold in Brazil, maquiladoras in Mexico and the unusual rates of cancer among the workers) and the debate over control of an important waterway (Canada’s northern passage—how to establish sovereignty?, Sudan and Egypt). (LA, 2008g)
interconnected discourses. These include: (a) diversity is an asset, (b) everyone-gets-a-difference, (c) multiple perspectives, (d) taken-for-grantedness, (e) multicultural others as resources for understanding global problems, (f) global consciousness, (g) impacts of globalization, and (h) global citizenship as an extension of national citizenship. There is a particular Canadian framing of these discourses related to the three silos conceptual and political organization of diversity claims and diversity groups in Canada. Furthermore, the documents demonstrate a conflation around descriptions of diversity and of globalization and political and ideological responses to diversity and globalization. Overall, in combination with the analyses of *The Heart of the Matter*, the work of the Western Canadian Protocol, and the Social Studies Program of Studies presented in the previous chapter; the analyses of social studies courses in high school and lesson plans available to teachers demonstrate that the wider tensions inherent to the current theoretical and ideological context are reflected in Alberta educational texts. The next chapter will bring all three sections of the thesis (theoretical and ideological context, research literature review, and empirical research) together. It will also attend to the fourth and final question of what can be gained by identifying and foregrounding these tensions and what has this thesis revealed about the possibilities and restraints of conceptualizing GCE in a multicultural context.
Chapter Ten
Discussion and Conclusion

Today society is simultaneously local, national, regional, and global in terms of experience, politics, effects, and imaginaries. Further, these spaces are imbricated with unequal power relations which reflect both contemporary geopolitics and past political struggles. Residual, dominant, emergent, and contested geographies of power, including those of the colonial past and postcolonial present, are at play across these global spaces and manifest in vernacular ways in the local, national, and regional. (Lingard, 2009, p. 233)

Lingard’s (2009) articulation of the complexities marking the current global context raises an important question for this thesis: how are multiculturalism and GCE vernacular ways in which contested geographies of power are manifested? Educators and scholars learn, teach, and research in a complex era marked by both social inequities and systemic marginalization based on ethnicity and race. There is also a growing tradition of scholarship that challenges traditional views of culture, identity, nationhood, and citizenship (McCollum, 2002). Under the new imperialism, transnational movements of people, resources, and information correspond with the emergence of a global elite. At the same time, a postcolonial and poststructural turn in research highlights the way discourses dominate and resist traditional views of citizenship. This provides new frameworks through which to diagnose and respond to issues of diversity and inequities (Tikly, 2004).

Applying Lingard’s (2009) summary of the current geopolitical complexities to the Canadian context, the “simultaneously local, national, regional, and global” experiences and imaginaries come together in the inclusion of GCE in Alberta’s curriculum. This thesis started from the premise that there is a popular conception that Canada is an ideal context for supporting global citizenship because of its official policy of multiculturalism. That concept served as a jumping-off point for an examination of the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE. These fields have developed side by side through the history of Canadian schooling, but there have been few studies examining the extent to which these are indeed mutually reinforcing fields or are fields that are conflated in wider discourses of citizenship and identity.
This thesis has considered three interlinking research questions: Within the current theoretical context, what are the tensions within and between multiculturalism and global citizenship education? How are these tensions reflected in the educational research literature? And, how are the tensions reflected in policy and curriculum documents and publically available lesson plans in Alberta? This chapter will begin by reviewing and synthesizing the responses to those three questions as discussed in the body of the thesis. It will then bring the theoretical and literature review sections together with the findings from the analysis of the Alberta texts. The chapter will also consider the final research question: What does foregrounding the tensions inherent to both fields and to their perceived relationship demonstrate about the possibilities and constraints of conceptualizing GCE in a multicultural context in terms of public discourse, scholarship, policy, and practice?

Given the complex geopolitical context described by Lingard (2009), the thesis first examined philosophical and theoretical literature in order to mark some key tensions evident in the wider context of conceptualizing political community in the global imperative. In Chapter Two I articulated a framework of a situated and reflexive approach to philosophy of education through the concept of the discursive turn and the analogy of theorizing from the pivot-point. The discursive turn recognizes the centricity of ideology and discourse in the way realities are described, responded to, and constructed. An application of the discursive turn examines to what extent a widely held concept or term is a) situated (exists in a particular culture, era, and geopolitical context, b) partial (can be seen differently by others), c) contingent (depends on context), and d) provisional (can and do change) (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 236).

Through the discursive turn, theorists and scholars engaged in research and analyses of educational issues can identify tensions in and interrogations of modernist assumptions. We also work within and are situated within the context from which these emerge. The pivot-point analogy helps me to recognize the contemporary context of theorizing about notions of community and citizenship in the global imperative. There is a dynamic situation whereby particular sources of tensions can be highlighted in order to promote thinking otherwise. Having articulated my philosophical stance, I set out in Chapter Three to identify the main tensions inherent to imagining political community through nationhood and citizenship.
These include the enlightenment dynamic where reason and emotion come together in the combination of the institution of citizenship and the imagining of nationhood. Imagining the nation includes a spatial paradox of inclusion-exclusion and a historical paradox of new and old inherent to the metanarrative of nationhood. The nation is imagined looking inward and outward and is complicit with processes of colonialism and the new imperialism. At the same time, the inclusion-exclusion paradox remains a dynamic space in which liberalism is applied through the expanding of citizenship rights. Multiculturalism and group-differentiated rights (Kymlicka 1995) is one example of this. As the exclusionary premise of citizenship continues to be challenged by critical scholarship and by claims made by marginalized groups, citizenship is a contested discursive field (Sears, 2009).

In the current context of the global imperative and out of this contested concept of citizenship, cosmopolitan approaches to citizenship are emerging in what Strand (2010b) calls the cosmopolitan turn. In Chapter Four I examined tensions inherent to citizenship in relation to globalization and diversity. While contemporary theories of cosmopolitanism somewhat challenge the dominance of the nation as a metanarrative of citizenship, for the most part the modern paradox of cosmopolitanism is a dynamic interplay of the national and the global. Multiculturalism is a discursive field that is caught up in this paradoxical dynamic. Theorists consider it a type of cosmopolitanism (e.g. Agbaria, 2011; Delanty, 2006), while others, particularly from a strictly liberal basis, see multiculturalism as a distinctly domestic field and cosmopolitanism as a potential misappropriation of multiculturalism (e.g., Kymlicka, 2003, 2004). The global imperative exerts a pressure to take up the global in conceptions of citizenship broadly and citizenship education more specifically. Correspondingly, more confusion results from the distinct ways that different ideological and conceptual understandings of globalization conflate in terms such as global citizenship. A governmentality theory of globalization (Burns, 2008) resists a homogenizing-heterogenizing binary shaping how globalization impacts on ethnic cultures. Globalization is a set of a wide array of forces that are managed through a dominating ideology. Neoliberal ideology emphasizes the liberal notion of individual rights to the extent that individuals are ultimately given the task of ensuring their own social and economic wellbeing; if individuals are struggling, that is due to a lack of aptitude rather than government policy, practice, or lack thereof (Burns, 2008; Joshee, 2004). Thus the conceptual confusion around whether or
not multiculturalism is equivalent to, part of, or distinct from cosmopolitan or global views of citizenship. This confusion is reflective of conflations in the wider ideological constellation defining citizenship and globalization.

Next, in Chapter Five, I examined the extent to which the project of schooling is both implicated in and a response to the tensions inherent to the national imaginary and to the global imperative. As a main site for the dissemination of the national and global imaginary of a particular nation-state, schooling is caught in a double-bind (Willinsky, 1998). It teaches difference and reproduces social stratification through overt and hidden curriculum and pedagogy (Glass, 2000). At the same time, schooling offers a space for transformations where students can learn that differences are constructed and can be resisted. In the context of the global imperative, this double-bind is implicated in a broader double crisis. Schooling must prepare students to perform in the global economy and must also respond to increasingly diverse demographics in the nation-state corresponding to social stratification (Agbaria, 2011). The main rationales for GCE in the scholarly literature range from soft to critical to post-critical approaches, but they commonly aim to resist neoliberalism and create spaces for social justice oriented views of citizenship and global relations.

Having mapped the theoretical and ideological landscape in which the relationship between GCE and multiculturalism is contextualized, I presented a framework to explain inherent a key conflation central to calls for new ways of teaching and learning for the 21st century citizen. A particular distinction helps to account for the conceptual ambiguity in the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE as discursive fields. This ambiguity is situated within wider calls for new ways of conceptualizing citizenship education which can be categorized as post-as-after modernism or post-as-interrogating modernism (Andreotti, 2010b, 2010c). The former includes a range of ideological views that respond to the global imperative in citizenship education with a logic of cognitive adaptation. Neoliberal responses are reflective of this version. Some cognitive adaptations of the global imperative are influenced by liberal social justice ideology in seeking to include marginalized others; but approaches that can be characterized as post-as-after modernism fail to engage with or challenge the sets of tensions inherent to normative imaginings of national and global communities. Some social justice approaches can inspire the opening up of critical spaces
and even post-critical spaces. Post-as-interrogating modernism approaches promote epistemological pluralism (Andreotti, 2010b, 2010c). This category includes critical versions GCE (Andreotti, 2006) influenced by postcolonial critiques of citizenship and globalization. Making visible and challenging modernist assumptions leads to an engagement with and foregrounding of the tensions and paradoxes. These include the inclusion-exclusion binary of citizenship inherent to imaging community and the question of who is included in framing the issues of and solutions to claims for rights and recognition (Fraser, 2005). Thus, schooling for the 21st century citizen is marked by sets of conflations between ideologies and also a wider philosophical conflation. A distinction that is often unnoticed in calls for new citizenship education, including GCE, is the extent to which modern assumptions are taken as given and common-sense. This thesis has argued that a post-as-interrogating modernism perspective of interrogates modern assumptions in order to begin to think otherwise and to make ethical choices about how we frame and respond to issues of equity and diversity in the global imperative.

The second section of the thesis examined what educational research has been done relating implicitly and explicitly to discourse analyses of citizenship and globalization in education and on the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE. The main themes from the literature review in Chapter Six reinforce some key tensions that were central to the wider theoretical and ideological context and highlighted two key points. First there is an assumed positive and mutually reinforcing relationship between the two fields based in general values of equity, diversity, and social justice. There is an underlying premise of a linear extension model of citizenship embedded in the assumed positive relationship, and this spatial dimension is also dynamic depending on the particular claims made about the relationship. Learning that engaging with global issues can positively impact local issues of diversity, and principles of multiculturalism extend to the global dimension of citizenship. This corresponds with a lack of attention to the critical tensions inherent to the relationship between the fields particularly around the way otherness is constructed and reified. Second, a wider ideological landscape is marked by a conflation of what are actually distinct and even contradictory discourses through the use of common terminology relating to citizenship, diversity, global citizenship, and transnationalism. Neoliberalism is dominant while liberal social justice
discourses are marginal; however, the latter do create some important critical spaces for mediating the dominant neoliberal discourses.

Thus, the first two sections of the thesis (theoretical and ideological context and literature review) demonstrate that the ways the fields of multiculturalism and GCE are conflated are reflective of and implicated in wider philosophical and ideological tensions. At the broadest level, there is a conflation of various versions of new schooling for the 21st century citizen through rhetoric that is taken up by various versions of liberalism (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006; Schattle, 2008) and that come together under a post-as-after version of modernism (Andreotti, 2010). There are distinctions within this category. For example, neoliberal discourses of social cohesions serve to silence critical discourses. On the other hand, there are those discourses, such as liberal social justice discourses of redistribution and ecological imaginaries of global citizenship; these represent spaces for the possibilities of critical discourses and pushing towards a post-as-interrogating modernist view of educating 21st century citizens. The examples of wider discourse analyses around citizenship education in the context of globalization (Agbaria, 2011; Knight-Abowitz & Harnish, 2006; Parker, 2011) and in the context of multiculturalism and GCE in Canada (Joshee, 2004, 2009; Richardson, 2008) have mapped out these different versions and also the influence of neoconservative discourses which are strongly evident in the U.S. context and evident in multicultural discourses at the federal level in Canada.

The third section of this thesis examined to what extent these wider tensions were evident in the context of social studies in Alberta. The empirical research used critical discourse analysis to examine a variety of policy, curriculum, and lesson plan texts. It contributes two key pieces to the wider research on discourse analysis in Western, liberal democracies broadly, and in Canada specifically. First, it demonstrates how the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship represents a space for conceptual and ideological conflations and tensions to operate. Secondly, it recognizes that some of the critical spaces opened up by liberal social justice discourses of multiculturalism and global consciousness represent the possibility of an interrogation of modernism and a push towards thinking otherwise (Andreotti, 2010). In this sense, there is a context of an established discourse of diversity as integral to the Canadian national narrative of multiculturalism and
evidence of critical potential in certain discourses of global citizenship in Alberta’s social studies curriculum. This finding is a validation of the premise of the introduction, the popular assumption that Canada is a natural place to do GCE. Importantly, the theoretical and empirical findings have also probed this assumed mutually reinforced relationship. Indeed, a GCE approach to social studies can bring out tensions and assumptions in multiculturalism and vice versa. The findings also indicate that a context of multiculturalism in Canada has shifted towards a dominant neoliberal view that emphasizes diversity as good business. Neoliberalism thus de-emphasizes or ignores the systemic ways that discrimination continues to result in barriers to marginalized groups. In this sense, a neoliberal ideology conflates multiculturalism and global citizenship in a reductionist way that forecloses critical discourse in favour of citizenship as interpersonal skills and rising to economic potential. Thus, the key is to avoid recreating the inherited exclusionary tensions of national citizenship discourses in GCE. A post-as-interrogating-modernism perspective emphasizes a focus on examining and interrogating the assumptions that underlie the notions of cultural diversity including the inclusion/exclusion paradoxes that are inherent to conceptualizations of political community in Canada. This work on foregrounding tensions and recognizing and interrogating assumptions can contribute towards thinking otherwise rather than new ideas based on traditional ways of thinking.

**Bringing it Together:**

**Discussion of Findings**

An important contribution of this thesis is the identification of key interconnecting conceptual ambiguities and sets of discourses that contribute to the confusion around what it means to do global citizenship education in a multicultural context such as Alberta. The empirical section sought to examine the extent to which the wider theoretical and ideological tensions are reflected in the context of social studies education in Alberta. It looked for main conceptual ambiguities and key discourses shaping the way multiculturalism, GCE, and the relationship between them are expressed. Here, I review the main findings from section three of the thesis, the empirical research, and connect them to some main points from the first two sections of the thesis.
Conceptual Ambiguities

1. Individual and collective rights and identity

In the Alberta documents, there are many instances where individual and collective rights are articulated as central to citizenship learning and social studies rationales. These two ideas are included in tandem, and the underlying assumption is that they are mutually reinforcing. Interestingly, although the version of pluralism articulated in the wider policy documents and by curriculum developers and lead educators in on-line videos seeks to expand on or replace multiculturalism, the basic concept of collective rights inherent to multiculturalism (Kymlicka 1995) is a strong concept throughout all documents. There is also a conflation between individual and collective rights and individual and collective identities. This contributes to the confusion caused by the idea that everyone-gets-a-difference. The rhetorical rather than substantive connection between individual and collective rights causes a detachment of a systemic recognition of inequities from a general recognition that everyone is diverse in some way.

The mutually reinforcing model of individual and collective rights is tied to the conflation of distinct versions of liberalism (Schattle, 2008). These are all based on a modern liberal assumption of a Cartesian subject whose relationship to the state involves rights and responsibilities. This original liberal principle of the individual’s autonomous relationship with the state relates to what Knight Abowitz and Harnish (2006) refer to as political liberalism. Collective rights can be seen as an extension of liberalism as in multiculturalism; in this view, individual rights are protected through certain collective rights which enable access to the societal culture of the nation by ethnocultural minorities (Kymlicka, 1995). An emphasis on collective rights expresses liberal social justice through discourses of identity, recognition, rights, and redistribution (Joshee, 2004, 2009). This vision of collective rights as an expression of human rights is also expressed in moral cosmopolitanism (Schattle, 2008) and universal cosmopolitanism (Nussbaum 2002) as well as in global social-justice instrumentalism (Marshall, 2009). Neoliberalism focuses on participation of individuals in society as consumers and workers in a global economy, so collective rights are to help to achieve an effectively functioning society (Joshee, 2004, 2009). Neoliberalism expresses individual and collective rights through a technical-economic instrumental agenda of global
citizenship education (Marshall, 2009). Therefore, on the one hand, multiculturalism is underemphasized, and on the other hand, the basic premise of individual and collective rights is emphasized in a normative manner. Liberalism is taken for granted; however, different versions of liberalism co-exist within the Alberta documents, and the use of the concepts of individual and collective rights and individual and collective identities contributes to conceptual confusion.

2. Pluralism and multiple perspectives

Pluralism describes the demographics of Alberta and of Canada as well as the politics and norms around celebrating diversity (Inglis, 1996). It is articulated as a new concept for the social studies curriculum and is strongly articulated through a multiple perspectives discourse. It replaces or expands on multiculturalism which is thus inferred to be passé. The conceptual ambiguity inherent to this notion of pluralism is tied to the imagining of the Canadian nation. Canadian versions of the inclusion/exclusion paradox are expressed through a unity/diversity tension with roots in commonwealth and mosaic discourses of citizenship (Joshee & Johnson, 2007). Canadian multiculturalism is also framed by a three silos approach to diversity where ethnic groups are conceptually and politically separated into Aboriginal groups, Francophones, and other immigrants and ethnic minorities (Kymlicka, 2005). The Alberta social studies curriculum is very strongly framed by attention to two of the silos—Aboriginal and Francophone contributions—so that there is both a broadening of perspectives to include these two groups and a narrowing of recognition to these two groups. At the same time as these two groups are given special recognition, the notion of pluralism is also opened up to recognize many identity groups not previously included in multiculturalism. The new version of pluralism is a broadening concept of belonging which aligns with liberal understandings of inclusion; however, it lacks a close connection to the redistribution strand that was at one time central to multiculturalism (Kymlicka, 2004). This version of pluralism allows more identity markers and categories to be recognized (e.g., gender, socio-economic status, philosophy, geographical location). On the one hand, this brings potentially a stronger focus on systemic forms of inclusion into the notion of pluralism than does a multicultural view. On the other hand, it depoliticizes categories by including many that are not bound by as strongly demarcated systemic constraints (e.g., philosophy).
The strength of the social cohesion and mosaic discourses throughout all the documents reinforces the national context as a cohesive identity rather than a contested space where certain cultural groups navigate the inclusion/exclusion paradox more easily than others.

3. Expansion model of citizenship

The above points of conceptual confusion are implicated in particular ways in the strong expansion model of citizenship (Richardson, 2008). This presents citizenship as expanding through a building of awareness, of responsibility, and of identity from local to (sometimes) regional/provincial to national to global citizenship. However, the specifics of the spatial scales or levels change. Sometimes citizenship is broadened from local to global or from national to global, and at other times it includes the regional level. The latter is evidence of the regionalist sentiment rooted in Alberta identity as discussed in Chapter One. Lesson plans ask students to distinguish between domestic forces and global forces when it comes to current issues in the newspaper as if those distinctions are very obvious. This is a source of confusion when certain issues are not clearly one or the other. For example, on my street in Toronto Tamil Canadians were protesting for months about a lack of response on the part of the Canadian government for what they perceived to be atrocities against their families in Sri Lanka on my street in Toronto; is that a domestic or global issue? Where does it fit on the extension model of citizenship for a Tamil student protesting or for me encountering their protest? Environmental issues such as the Northern Pipeline represent another example. Other blurring issues in terms of global versus domestic forces include refugee issues and the perceived terrorist threat and corresponding Islamophobia.

In addition to the confusion around distinguishing the different levels through which citizenship expands, the linear expansion assumes a very neutral concept of belonging at every level. This can be out of touch with the plurality of subject positions and geopolitical relations of power defining different ideas of citizenship and (dis)enabling different types of citizenship agency. This idea may challenge the concept that all citizens and all students can neutrally and naturally expand their citizenship identities and raises attention to the assumptions made about Albertan students’ citizen subjectivity (Pashby, 2011a). Indeed Mitchell & Parker (2008) point out that the expansion model assumes scales of citizenship are static and continuous through time. And, Mitchell (2003) contributes that contemporary
citizenship moves between scales in different historical and geographical moments, from local to national to supranational and back again. This critique contradicts the linear expansion model that is so strongly central to the Alberta citizenship and social studies documents.

4. Critical thinking straw-person

Another source of conceptual confusion relates to the way the curriculum and lesson plans phrase what are meant to be critical questions. Often these questions set up false binaries and/or replace a deconstruction of sets of tensions. The use of these questions do help to indicate that there are in fact tensions inherent to the topics included in the curriculum; however the questions often add “to what extent” to what is actually a dichotomous question with an either/or binary. For example, a guiding question in the Grade 11 curriculum is “to what extent should national interest be pursued? (AE, 2007b, p. 13). It is tied to the expectation that students will “appreciate multiple perspectives related to the pursuit of national interest” (AE, 2007b, p. 13). In the same course, students are to evaluate whether or not international issues merit involvement by the nation. The critical impulse is necessarily seen as positive and new. It also reinforces a liberal democratic context, for including an acknowledgement of tensions makes liberalism a strong and correct model because it is open to questions.

Part of the confusion results from the fact that the critical impulse, when combined with multiple perspectives, never names dominance and rarely names examples of systemic oppression; rather particular examples are foregrounded. In some cases, this is important, such as including and recognizing rather than silencing the experiences of Aboriginal groups in Canada. However, Aboriginal experiences become the essential example from which one can assume other examples can be based. Furthermore, the inclusion of multiple perspectives presents as critical thinking; however, for the most part, it corresponds to listing many positions or placing them in pro-con binaries rather than to identifying key tensions. Curriculum developer Shirley Douglas presents the inclusion of questions in the curriculum as somewhat of a paradigm shift in pedagogy and content that meets the sense that there are new requirements for 21st century Albertan students. A post-as-after modernism and post-as-interrogating modernism version of new teaching for the 21st century citizen both “align in
their conceptualisation of knowledge, learning, reality and identities as socially constructed, fluid, open to negotiation and always provisional...” (Andreotti, 2010b, p. 6). However, an approach that is reflective of a post-as-after view of modernism is based in cognitive adaptation. On the other hand, from a post-as-interrogating modernism framework citizenship education for the 21st century adapts to new realities and includes sets of knowledges about the new realities through epistemological pluralism. The critical straw-person approach is a cognitive adaptation approach that reflects a post-as-after modernist view. In this sense, other than posing a question, the inherent assumptions of modernism underlying the questions are not probed.

**Particular Discourses Shaping (Mis)understandings of the Two Fields**

I found eight discourses that shape understandings of equity and diversity, national and global interconnections, and citizenship for the 21st century. Thus, breaking them down helps to explain how multiculturalism and global citizenship are related and conflated in the Alberta context and how this is reflective of wider theoretical and ideological tensions. Examining these discourses through the sets of tensions outlined in the theoretical and scholarly literature analysis, I can group them into three interrelated groups. The first group relate individually and together to a broad version of citizenship that is fundamentally about the Canadian imaginary of pluralism and corresponds to an extension model of citizenship based in expanding Canadian approaches to diversity. These include: diversity is an asset, everyone-gets-a-difference, and multiple perspectives. In the second group, discourses redirect or confuse the extension model of citizenship; these include multicultural others as resources for learning about globalization and taken-for-grantedness. The final group includes discourses relating to globalization and the global dimension of citizenship: global consciousness, impacts of globalization, and global citizenship as an extension of national citizenship. Framed and implicated in the large conflations, these groups combine and conflict in particular ways to contribute to the confusion around conceptualizing global citizenship education in a context of multiculturalism in Canada. The sets of discourses can be analyzed in terms of the extent to which they reflect the wider theoretical and ideological tensions in the theoretical and empirical literature I reviewed. They can also be mapped onto the framework of distinguishing calls for teaching and learning in the 21st century: post-as-
after versus post-as-interrogating modernism (Andreotti, 2010b, 2010c). Most of the discourses align with a post-as-after cognitive adaptation approach to the sense of the global imperative in education. Some can be understood to open up critical spaces that push towards a post-as-interrogating modernism approach that is more epistemologically plural.

The first set of discourses reflects the mosaic vision of Canadian identity. Diversity is an asset expresses that Canada is inherently inclusive, and this is what makes Canada unique. Valuing the contributions of aboriginal communities and Francophones is evidence of the proper and progressive functioning of the multicultural mosaic. In this sense, it is an umbrella discourse for various ideologies of multiculturalism as identified by Joshee (2004, 2009). It is compatible with a neoconservative discourse of the tolerant Canadian as well as the neoliberal discourse of social cohesion. The everyone-gets-a-difference discourse is a new version of pluralism for the 21st century that replaces what is perceived as an older, limited version of multiculturalism. So many categories get included and recognized in the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse that identity categories such as race and gender are set side by side a much less systemically bound identity category such as philosophy. In this sense, the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse is easily framed by a neoliberal version of social cohesion that de-emphasizes structural differences in favour of a everyone gets along vision. Correspondingly, any claim of inequity and structural differentiation is inherently a claim against the fulfillment of economic potential and the effective functioning of society. It thus connects to the expansion model of citizenship. There is a broadening of the assets version of diversity based in a mosaic discourse which is itself evidence of liberalism’s and British tradition’s inherent inclusiveness. In a positive way, this discourse could be framed by a social justice view that highlights the intersections of many categories of systemic injustice (such as socio-economic status, gender, sexual orientation) that are not included in multiculturalism and to highlight a redistribution discourse (Joshee, 2004, 2009); however, its strongest iteration in the Alberta educational documents I studied is a weak version of recognition (Joshee, 2004, 2009). Finally, the multiple perspectives discourse focuses on adding content to the existing study of citizenship and is closely bound to the everyone-gets-a-difference and diversity-as-asset discourses. The idea is that more perspectives necessarily enable better and stronger understandings. However, like the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse, the multiple perspectives discourse fails to include a distinction between the
positions of different perspectives within wider power relations. It generally falls back into a more is better logic as opposed to recognizing the possibility that more perspectives highlight more tensions and lines of power imbalances.

These three discourses of Canadian visions of pluralism are flexible in the ways they map across neoliberal and liberal social justice theories. The Alberta documents do not include a significant amount of neoconservative iterations of these discourses, but the provincial political context combined with the national context where neoconservativism is strong raises the possibility that these discourses can be taken up in neoconservative terms. The stronger tension is between neoliberal and liberal social justice framings. And, it is significant that liberal social justice versions are strongly represented, especially in the individual courses and lesson plans. Indeed, they are compatible with the identity-based and recognition discourses which promote the importance of accepting particular identities (including ethnocultural minorities) as valid and valuable (Joshee, 2004). This is also consistent with Kymlicka’s (1995) vision of the extension of liberalism through minority rights. However, his (2004) concern regarding the disconnection between the recognition and redistribution strands of multiculturalism is relevant to these discourses. There is an extent to which power is redistributed in terms of making space conceptually, ideologically, and in curriculum content and pedagogy for particular marginalized voices. However, without a systemic interrogation, it falls back to a mosaic version with built in hierarchies (Jiwani, 2006; Yon, 2000).

Furthermore, the multiple perspectives discourse fails to account for the third category of rights which Fraser (2005) defines as the importance of how issues around recognition and redistribution are framed and by whom (72). Instead of foregrounding tensions inherent to the Canadian multicultural imaginary so as to create critical spaces for engaging with the question of who frames issues and how, the fall back answer, according to what I found in the Alberta education texts, appears to be that everyone will get recognized because everyone-has-a-difference and diversity is an asset. The multiple perspectives are assumed to be positioned equally and included easily and neutrally. There is a notion that they must be included because it was wrong to not include them before; however, there is not a strong sense of systemic barriers that caused exclusions or that continue to frame how
certain groups are or are not included. This group of discourses comprises a base for an extension model of citizenship where Canadian pluralism broadens as citizenship expands from local to national to global levels.

The second group contains discourses that do not easily map onto an extension model. The discourse of *multicultural others as resources for understanding global problems* is framed by a reversal of the extension model where the national is the global. This discourse essentially re-others Canadian immigrants from the Global South as sources of understanding and enlightenment about global issues broadly, and about global problems in particular. It ironically assumes an assets-version of Canadian diversity through a deficit view of these immigrants’ life experiences in the countries from which they emigrated. In addition to further othering cultural minorities from the Global South, it also reinforces the assets view by failing to locate any of these global problems as existing in Canada. This is another example of the lack of attention to how justice issues in a global-national dialectic reflect the relations of power that determine the framing of an issue (Fraser, 2007). For the most part the *taken-for-grantedness discourse* is essentially a substitute for the idea of recognizing the status quo; it is implicitly a discourse of privilege. The status quo is neutral and good and needs to be defended for its attributes of safety, respect, and high standards. The taken-for-grantedness discourse is based in the assumption of a neutral status quo that all students in Alberta appreciate. Thus, it is compatible with a neoconservative discourse of the tolerant Canadian who appreciates the safe society based on what are understood as traditional Canadian values and is concerned that this must not be taken for granted. In other iterations, the taken-for-granted discourse connects to Joshee’s (2004, 2009) neoliberal discourse of equality-as-sameness in recognizing some people do not enjoy the equality that those who seem to have more, and seem to fit the norms of society enjoy. In still other iterations, it is closer to a rights-based liberal social justice discourse where universal human rights are evoked through an empathetic view of world inhabitants not enjoying the quality of life in Canada.

The global framing of the taken-for-granted discourse focuses on quality of life and empathy in a way the national-framing does not. The global framing creates a space for a discussion of privilege and questioning of disparities; however it also expresses a
neoconservative us versus them. In this sense, it is a potential space for the expression of neoconservatism and neoliberalism (Joshee, 2009; Richardson, 2008b) at the same time that it can reflect a global social-justice agenda (Marshall, 2009). This discourse represents the tension between local imaginaries defining GCE in Canada according to Richardson (2008b); it is unclear whether this discourse reflects a multipolar global imaginary view of Canada as the model for the world or an ecological version that acknowledges the ways in which Canada and Canadians are complicit and implicated in global issues. Indeed, it can express both. Thus in this discourse, the extension model is somewhat flipped. It is through learning about the poor quality of life of global others that students learn to appreciate the high quality of life enjoyed in Canada. The discourse of appreciation and recognizing what is taken-for-granted stands in for a recognition of systemic privilege and complicity.

The final group of discourses that I found that relate to how the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE is confusing are all discourses of the global. The global consciousness discourse is the clearest example of a discourse that could align with a post-as-interrogating modernism approach. It is also a marginal discourse not found in the citizenship education policy but in specific sections in the social studies program of study: the Global Dimensions section of the curriculum and the Historical Thinking section. This discourse opens up a critical space for examining the roots and bases of assumptions about ideas of community and citizenship by using words and phrases such as interdependence, tensions, conflict, complexities, problems with multiple and complex causes with no clear solution, historical globalization, ethnocentrism, and rethinking assumptions. It has the strongest iteration of a redistribution discourse. Also, by including ideas such as rethinking assumptions and challenging ethnocentrism, it represents a discursive space through which Fraser’s (2005) question of the right to frame global justice issues can be considered. It is the main discourse that can include notions of redistribution. Significantly, the most critical discourse opening a post-as-interrogating-modernism approach is framed through a discourse of global consciousness. There is no such corresponding discourse relating to a critical consciousness of the national community or national citizenship. This contradicts Delanty’s (2006) conceptualization of the dynamic interplay of national and global through cosmopolitan orientations to citizenship. It also raises an important challenge to linear extension model.
In contrast to how the discourse of global consciousness focuses attention on tensions, complexities, empathy and different conditions in the world, the impacts of globalization discourse presents Alberta students as individuals agents of globalization. It uses a strong language of choice on the one hand and of the overall power of globalization on the other; this is connected to the critical straw-person questions. The concept is that students can choose to respond to globalization and whether or not to embrace it. They can evaluate the positive and negative impacts of globalization on culture and identities by looking at challenges and opportunities associated with globalization. This discourse is a good example of the homogeneous versus heterogeneous binary of globalization critiqued by Burns (2008). Either view of the impact of globalization on cultures essentializes globalization as a cultural crisis. Both views construct globalization in a predatory role: globalization causes a homogenizing of the world’s cultures, and globalization creates so much heterogeneity that the old cultures are no longer relevant. This predatory position of globalization actually contradicts the strong language of choice in this discourse. In combination with the diversity is an assets discourse, students will likely choose to identify the importance of maintaining cultural identity. This is reinforced in the lesson plans where there are opportunities for students to role play identities being impacted by globalization. This discourse is not strongly connected to the global consciousness discourse because of its ironic focus on individual agency and choice at the same time that it evokes the question of the survival of collective identities through cultural traditions. Indeed, cultural identities are frozen and essentialized as a way of saving them from homogenizing processes of globalization without acknowledging that power remains unevenly distributed and that to a large extent borders defining nations have deepened and patriotism remains strong (Burns, 2008). On the other hand, identities are seen as at the mercy of an all-powerful diversifying globalization force through a linear nostalgia for a historical past where cultures were bound and discrete.

The third global discourse is the strongest: global citizenship as an extension of national citizenship. This discourse is expressed through language of extending, expanding, and broadening citizenship. It relies on the extension model logic, but it is expressed through the multiple times that the words global or world are placed at the end of sentences or small paragraphs that start with ideas of national citizenship. When combined with the first set of discourses—diversity is an asset, everyone-gets-a-difference and multiple perspectives—it is
an extension of the celebratory approach to multiculturalism that fails to engage with systemic critiques or systemic changes (James, 2008; Jiwani, 2007; Yon 2000). The global citizenship as an extension of national citizenship discourse points out Marshall’s (2009) critique of the global social justice instrumentalism in that, just like the technical-economic agenda, it is based in exclusionary principles inherent to modern assumptions of citizenship and the assumption that the citizenship is available to all. Indeed, the global citizenship as an extension of national citizenship discourse is compatible with the economic instrumentalist, neoliberal discourses including the business case (Joshee, 2004). Expanding towards global citizenship can be a version of the performativity imperative to prepare students for participation in the global economy (Agbaria, 2011). Significantly, this discourse assumes that the other side of the double crisis, legitimacy in increasingly diverse national contexts, is taken care of. However, this requires the assumption that multiculturalism is functioning at the local and national level and its principles are naturally extended to the global realm. Other discourses, including the immigrants as resources for learning about globalization which reinforces an us versus them dynamic, suggest this is not the case.

It is possible to map these discourses onto the wider theoretical frame of post-as-after- vs. post-as-interrogating-modernism (Andreotti, 2010b, 2010c), onto the wider discourses identified in other educational research on multiculturalism in education (Joshee, 2009) and GCE (Andreotti, 2006; Andreotti & Silva, 2011; Marshall, 2009; Richardson, 2008b), and onto the categories of cosmopolitan theories (Delanty, 2006). Figure 5 demonstrates how some of the discourses I have identified can support neoliberal and liberal social justice ideologies. The global consciousness discourse is most strongly reflective of a post-as-interrogating-modernism approach to teaching and learning for the 21st century citizen. When used in combination with the multiple perspectives and taken-for-grantedness discourses, these ideas can promote a more critical (and perhaps even post-critical) approach to GCE. However, similarly, when the multiple perspectives discourses is used in combination with the everyone-gets-a-difference discourse and when the taken-for-grantedness discourse is used in combination with the multicultural-others-as-resources-for-understanding-global-problems discourse, they strengthen a neoliberal perspective. Figure 5 thus demonstrates the importance of maintaining the liberal social justice discourses that operate in the Alberta policy, curriculum, and lesson plan context as well as the importance
of including more explicitly critical discourses such as what is found in the global consciousness discourse. Without the attention to interrogating neutral assumptions about position and ethnocentrism inherent in the global consciousness discourse and not evident in liberal social justice discourses of rights and recognition, the liberal social justice discourses operate in a pivot-point within neoliberalism. Even if they can resist and/or mediate neoliberalism (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006), they do not interrogate the modernist assumptions underlying the questions of recognition, redistribution, and the framing of these questions (Fraser, 2005). Figure 5 thus demonstrates both the areas for critical attention and possibility for foreclosing critical spaces for GCE in the multicultural context of Alberta and the areas for possibly creating critical spaces and pushing towards a post-as-interrogating modernist approach.

**Figure 5** Mapping discourses onto wider theoretical and ideological landscape using Andreotti (2010), Delanty (2006), Joshee (2009), Marshall (2009) Richardson (2008), Strand (2010)
Overall, I find that tensions inherent to multiculturalism are inherited by global citizenship through the extension model. These include a lack of adequate treatment of race, self-congratulatory inclusion, and superficial celebratory approaches (Bennerji, 2000; James, 2008; Ghosh, 2008; May, 2009; Yon, 2000). Interestingly, the confluences and conceptual ambiguities marking the relationship between the fields, as evidenced in theoretical and research literature as well as in the Alberta texts, also speak to the large degree to which multicultural education has become mainstreamed, for better or worse, into the educational lexicon. In fact, in Alberta, multiculturalism is seen as old and pluralism is a new version. The new pluralism simultaneously inherits some of the basic premises of individual and collective rights inherent to multiculturalism. It emphasizes individuality and social cohesions through an everyone-gets-a-difference discourse. I find it significant that different ideologies function through the terms global citizenship and pluralism, so it is very tricky work to unpack the confluences. The inherent tensions in the individual and collective rights and identity model and the extension model of citizenship raise implications for the strong use of rights discourses (e.g. UNICEF Rights-based schools) when a post-as-after modernism view fails to interrogate the assumptions upon which systemic inequities in geopolitical power relations construct different life contexts around the world.

However, the taken-for-granted discourse raises suggests the basis of an extension model of citizenship is a potentially good start. This is reinforced by Andreotti’s (2006) recognition that soft GCE can be a good start and Knight Abowitz and Harnish’s (2006) assertion that transnational citizenship discourses are flexible. However, as Abowitz and Harnish (2006) also note, this flexibility means it can also be a reification of neoliberal and neoconservative ideologies. In the Alberta curriculum, the taken-for-granted discourse tends to expresses the right-based liberal social justice discourse but not as much of the redistribution. Similarly, a move towards including more perspectives into the curriculum is a good start. Yet, in order to move towards thinking otherwise, there would also be a
recognition of the multiply positioned perspectives in terms of which are dominant and marginalized. In the Alberta context, the inclusion of special attention to Aboriginal issues and perspectives represents an important validation of a historically marginalized group. At the same time, it demonstrates how easily liberal social justice discourses of identity, recognition and rights get disconnected from a discourse of redistribution through the dominance of a social cohesion and equality-as-sameness and equality of outcomes. Overall, the lack of a systemic analysis renders silent many of the tensions that multiculturalism (to varying extents) put forth and this is further neutralized through the new discourse of pluralism.

Implications of the Research

The final question guiding this thesis is: What does foregrounding the tensions inherent to both fields and to their perceived relationship demonstrate about the possibilities and constraints of conceptualizing GCE in a multicultural context in terms of public discourse, scholarship, policy and practice? In this final section, I will examine the significance of my findings in terms of areas for further theoretical and empirical research, directions for policy and curriculum, and implications for my own practice as a teacher educator at OISE/University of Toronto. It is important to note that this section is framed most strongly by my situated approach to philosophy of education. Thus, while I will raise possible directions for policy and practice, I do so from within my limited and situated context as I am not a policy writer nor is this thesis directly about pedagogy per se. Rather, in this section, I reflect on the implications of my findings for future scholarly work, policy work, and my own particular practice as an educator.

Some scholarship is helpful in thinking through the significance of these findings. Dillabough’s (2002) critique of critical pedagogy is useful. She argues for more diligent work at the theoretical level to contribute to the cultural critique of critical pedagogy. This involves paying attention to the epistemological, ontological and existential tensions. Warning of the dangers and “liberal traps” (p. 203) inherent to critical work, she recognizes how it has become somewhat fashionable in educational theory to say that “we ought to live with contradictions in theory” (p. 207). To an extent, it is important to live with tensions and work
with them rather than to conflate them into broader unchallenged and taken-for-granted modernist assumptions that are actually defined by the paradoxes I have discussed. However, Dillabough (2002) insists that “if these contradictions pose serious problems for the groups we are struggling in the ‘name of,’ then our purposes are merely absorbed into an academic and political culture that is no longer relevant to the people it is meant to serve” (p. 207-208). Thus, it is not enough to simply theorize from the pivot-point and point out different tensions. When foregrounding tensions, it is essential to recognize the difference between including multiple perspectives into a normative modernist frame and including multiply positioned perspectives into a post-as-interrogating modernism frame. The latter involves a commitment to bringing issues of systemic power relations and oppression to the centre of educational discussion and practice. It also involves an on-going ethical engagement and self-reflexive practice. This is the political and ethical centre of situated philosophy of education.

Dillabough (2002) identifies an inherent need to broaden critical scholarship in two ways: (a) broaden the study and critique of social culture’s “ever changing and local forms of oppression (e.g., global capitalist policies)” and (b) broaden the “development of political and ethnical consciousness in the ‘social life world’” (p. 212). However, while she does not claim to have found a conclusive answer to this double challenge, her discussion of it reinforces the work of this thesis. She argues that more is required in terms of the social and cultural processes of exclusion and its “nuanced forms” and how they evolve over time (Dillabough, 2002, p. 212). This thesis has shed some light on particular historical and contemporary nuances of the way the inclusion/exclusion paradox of modern citizenship is expressed through various liberal ideologies as well as neoconservative views. This is happening in the discursive fields of citizenship education, multicultural education, and GCE; it is also happening in the particular ways these fields are conjoined. Dillabough (2002) also calls on educational theorists to think seriously about the ethical considerations of theorizing and where it takes our work: “Joining forces in the struggle against a pathologization of the imagined ‘other’ is one step in the right direction” (p. 212).

One way to embark on this unresolved but engaged project is to foreground nuanced understandings of the tensions inherent to the social justice-oriented movements connected to
identity politics. Mohanty (2006) encourages theorists to “ask whether the paradigmatic figures that circulate in the global imaginaries can be understood outside of these frames” (p. 530). She cites

the barbaric (male) terrorist, the imperial soldier, the trafficked woman, the third world immigrant, the civilized democratic citizen, the oppressed Muslim woman, the female domestic worker, the brown/black migrant worker, the IT professional, the refugee, the asylum seeker, the poverty stricken peasant, the indigenous revolutionary, etc. Every paradigmatic figure identified above is infused with gender, race, sexual, national, faith, and class particularities and each can be understood in the context of the relational legacies of colonialism, capitalism, differentiated patriarchies, heterosexualities, and racialized institutions and ideologies. Any discussion of collective struggles and the politics of identity then needs to address these institutional and ideological frames. (Mohanty, 2010, p. 530-531)

This is an important rationale for deconstructing conceptualizations of global citizenship. Burns (2008) argues that applying a lens of governmentality to understanding globalization reveals a neoliberal version of GCE to be “a set of qualities or skills mobilised by a class of ‘global citizens’ who live in urban centres and/or have access to global travel” (Burns, 2008, p. 354). Thus, there is a political economic context from within which certain cultural and consumer practices define what it means to be cosmopolitan. Again, this raises the question of who, in the political economic context of globalization, gets to be cosmopolitan and who is defined as multicultural? This tension reflects the conceptual ambiguity of Delanty’s (2006) version of the paradox of modernity inherent to cosmopolitanism as a dynamic interplay between national and global. Mitchell (2003) demonstrates that multiculturalism serves to re-inscribe a generous dominant culture which benefits from celebrating diversity. In Burns’s (2008) characterization of cosmopolitanism as heterogeneity, she seems to be arguing that a similar process is evident in cosmopolitanization whereby those whose cultural identity is normative and who have the means to travel—or in the case of multiculturalism, to eat out at different restaurants and engage in the celebration of the diversity of others—also counts as cosmopolitan or multicultural.

Tikly (2004) poses an important question in this regard: “[I]s it possible to conceive of a critical social theory and epistemology on which an alternative to western hegemony can be built, and what ought the role of education be in the endeavour assuming it were
possible?” (p. 192). Theorizing from the pivot-point allows me to think of a dynamic response rather than a certain response. As Willinsky (1998) notes, “How far can we go in seeing the world other than as we have inherited it, I do not yet know. The educational project always lies ahead” (p. 262). Evidently, this thesis has demonstrated the challenges and complexities of theorizing and conducting empirical research in the context of the discursive turn. A main limitation of this work is the lack of complete clarity in my findings. I have identified the tensions that cause confusion in diversity, culture, identity, and citizenship emerge. I applied Andreotti’s (2010a, 2010b) identification of two competing logics (post-as-after versus post-as-interrogating modernism) of educating citizens for the 21st century global imperative. I then identified a set of conceptual ambiguities and discourses in Alberta educational documents. This allowed me to identify some areas for immediate attention and for future research in the areas of policy and curriculum and in my own practice.

**Policy and Curriculum**

Global citizenship is emerging as a strong discursive field in educational scholarship and also in public rhetoric. However, in the Canadian context, it is not a concept that is integrated explicitly into curriculum across provinces. The explicit inclusion of global citizenship in the Alberta social studies curriculum is very significant. Conceptualizing GCE in the Alberta context inherits the wider ideological and philosophical tensions that contribute to a conflation and/or confusion with multiculturalism; and yet, particular critical spaces are opened up through the global consciousness discourse. The language of complicity, complexities, ethnocentrism and the dangers of unexamined assumptions represents an important opportunity to examine the role of systems and traditions that contribute to the new imperialism and the perpetuation of inequities. The global consciousness discourse should be more explicit systemically across policy, curriculum, and publically available lesson plans as opposed to being limited to one section of the curriculum. This raises an important question around why a discourse of global consciousness most explicitly connects to a post-as-interrogating approach to modernism. I found that areas framed around domestic questions of social inequalities were more strongly framed by discourses of post-as-after modernism and a cognitive adaptation to the global imperative.
The language of the global consciousness discourse should be more explicitly connected to a national consciousness of complex issues around diversity and systemic injustices.

A limitation of this thesis is the fact that, in order to analyze the most predominant public and official discourses, the sources of data were limited to publically available texts. Further research could look into how educators (at all levels: teacher educators, school board superintendents and area specialists, school administrators, classroom teachers) and students navigate the conceptually ambiguous and contentious field of leading and participating in GCE in multicultural contexts. This is a significant limitation and area for future application of the work I have done in this thesis to map out the relationship between the fields and within the wider theoretical context. In this sense, and from within a framework of situated philosophy of education, this thesis is a teacher’s perspective as I am a practicing teacher and teacher educator.

**In Practice**

Coming back to the situated approach to philosophy of education that I adopted so as to position myself in my research, a question I must ask myself is what lies ahead in my own situated position as an educational researcher and theorist who is also a teacher educator? In this section, I will reflect on how my approach to situated philosophy of education that led me to examine a range of theoretical and empirical literature from a range of disciplines has contributed to deepening my practice as an educator. I will use some examples to help to illustrate the implications of my work to my own context and acknowledge that this is taken out of a wider context of a history of pedagogical approaches to multicultural and global education. This section is limited by my own experiences and is deepened by my situated praxis bringing theoretical work to my practice as an educator.

A key insight I gained from researching and writing this thesis is there are ways to engage in the educational project in such a way as to foreground the tensions instead of glossing over them with neutral rhetoric. Vague and superficial umbrella concepts appear to stand in for what are actually distinct and contending ideologies of diversity and citizenship. When Andreotti (2010c) promotes a post-as-interrogating- instead of post-as-after-modernism framework, she is not arguing that educators should adopt one or the other of
these lenses. She uses it as a conceptual framework through which to think about a pedagogy based on the discursive turn and expressing the traditions of postmodernism, postcolonialism, and poststructuralism. What she does propose to educators, especially those interested in GCE is to “raise our professional game: that we lift the profile of education by increasing the levels of intellectual engagement” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 233).

Correspondingly, I try to take up her call to be serious about engaging with globalization and the social crises in which contemporary educating is embedded. This requires some more lenses and ways of thinking so that as an educator I can encourage myself and my students to make better informed decisions about what we choose to do and how we choose to think about the complex and diverse settings of our work (Andreotti, 2010b). By using her framework as a way to think through the complexities of conceptualizing GCE in multicultural contexts, I have begun that take on her challenge. While this thesis has demonstrated the various ways that scholarship has taken up these tensions, in my experience, there is a lack of appropriate materials with which to foreground tensions in teacher education. This thesis was not about teacher education directly, but as I am currently working in the initial teacher education program at OISE, it serves as a point of reference for my reflections as to the situated and reflexive significance of this work.

I have applied my position that tensions and assumptions should be foregrounded in GCE through the pedagogical choice to use a methodology called Open Spaces for Dialogue and Enquiry (OSDE77) with teacher candidates. This methodology exemplifies the foregrounding of tensions and the unpacking of assumptions through the study of global issues. It is outlined in a teacher education resource called *Critical Literacy in Global Citizenship Education* (Andreotti, Barker, & Newell-Jones, 2006) which came about through a collaboration of educators and academics in eight countries representing global North and global South contexts. They started with the question “what are the challenges for global citizenship education in an interdependent, diverse and unequal world?” and focused on the importance of building skills to deal with complexity, uncertainty and insecurity. The teacher education resource explores issues such as poverty, development, role of education,

---

77 Open Spaces for Dialogue and Enquiry is an educational initiative that is hosted by the Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice at the University of Nottingham and Global Education Derby and is affiliated with the Development Education Research Centre at the Institute of Education, University of London.
consumerism, and terrorism. OSDE offers educators a set of principles and procedures to create “safe spaces of enquiry” towards accessible entry points for learners into issues of social and global justice (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 191). The activities and questions explicitly connect to “North-South power relations, Western supremacy, epistemic privilege and violence, ideas about the origins and justifications of unequal distributions of resources and labor, ethnocentric benevolence/charity, and issues of language, difference, and participation” (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 192). There are stimuli in the form of a series of quotations representing different, and differently positioned (i.e. Global North and Global South; and different ideological stances within each geographical position) perspectives, and they are chosen to promote cognitive dissonance and undecidability (Andreotti, 2011a citing Derrida, 1999). The initiative focuses on the ideas of critical literacy and independent thinking by supporting students:

- to engage with complex local/global processes and diverse perspectives;
- to examine the origins and implications of their own and other people’s assumptions;
- to negotiate change, to transform relationships, to think independently and to make responsible and conscious choices about their own lives and how they affect the lives of others;
- to live with and learn from difference and conflict and to prevent conflict from escalating to aggression and violence;
- to establish ethical, responsible and caring relationships within and beyond their identity groups (Andreotti et al., 2006, p. 3)

In addition to these learning goals, the OSDE methodology is based on three key principles:

- Every individual brings to the space valid and legitimate knowledge constructed in their own contexts
- All knowledge is partial and incomplete
All knowledge can be questioned (Andreotti, et al., 2006, p. 4)

The methodology itself involves six procedures for enquiry:

1. Critical engagement with different perspectives: What are the limitations/implications of each perspective presented?

2. Informed thinking: What are the dominant views? Why are they dominant? How are they constructed? How was my own perspective shaped? Where to find out more?

3. Reflexive questions: What do I think about this and why? Am I open to being challenged?

4. Group dialogue questions: What are the key tensions? What do other people think? What are the assumptions, implications and contradictions?

5. Responsible choices: What does it have to do with me?

6. Debriefing: What have I learned about myself, about others, about learning, about difference, about the topic? (Andreotti, et al., 2006, p. 5)

I have received very positive feedback when I have used this teacher education resource with teacher candidates (in initial teacher education classes) and with experienced teachers (at professional development workshops). It is quite an energizing experience to watch teacher candidates engage in the group dialogue step and get excited by identifying a tension or an assumption. They call out “Karen, we found a tension!” These tensions include, for example identifying conflicts between a moral or religious imperative and an economic imperative when it comes to constructions of culture in education. Last year, teacher candidates in the intermediate-senior social studies curriculum and instruction class adapted the procedures for use during their practicum and for their final unit plan assignment. One group used them in a unit that examined health and wellness issues through a lens of the global issue HIV/AIDS. They used it to present multiple and *multiply positioned* perspectives about living with the stigma of HIV/AIDS. They used the internet to find a variety of perspectives including a Human Resource Director for a Corporation, India; Church Leader,
Britain; Family Member, Uganda; Doctor in a small rural community, Central Africa. The teacher candidate who did the HIV/AIDS stigma lesson told me that the OSDE methodology had helped her to recognize that she had a lot of assumptions based on her background in equity studies about the dangers of a Northern-western development approach to solving global issues. The perspectives on poverty we studied included some voices from the Global South who were in favour of capitalist development for a particular set of reasons that she had never considered. She said this helped her realize the importance of being clear about one’s own sets of assumptions and working to recognize the tensions inherent to your own and others’ views rather than fighting about who is right and wrong. Her application of this learning to her HIV/AIDS stigma lesson demonstrated that there are ways to foreground tensions in both teacher education classrooms and secondary school classrooms.

Colleagues at OISE/University of Toronto David Ast and Jill Goodreau adapted the OSDE for use to discuss the 10th anniversary of the September 11th 2001 attacks on the world trade centre and pentagon. Jill and I have also used it in our initial teacher education classes to critically discuss Remembrance Day messages. I do not mean to suggest that the OSDE methodology is the only approach relevant to what I am advocating for in this thesis. Nor do I mean to ignore the variety of approaches that might be considered similar to it in critical multicultural, anti-racist, anti-oppressive, and global citizenship education approaches. I am sharing it here to illustrate how my work in this thesis has alerted me to the importance of pedagogy that foregrounds tensions in a non-binary manner. Approaches such as OSDE improve on other global education and multicultural education pedagogies I have previously experienced that tend to focus on liberal social justice rights and recognition discourse. Raising awareness about human rights is appropriate content for global citizenship education; however, if such an approach is taken without adequate attention to both a discourse of redistribution and of who gets to frame the rights-based problem (Fraser, 2005), there is a danger of pivoting within certain liberalist circles and not in a dynamic engagement with a post-as-interrogating modernist view.

The procedures I described were articulated in the resource targeted for teacher candidates. There are different versions available for use with adolescents and children (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 203). For example, for elementary students the procedures included “listening to a story” and “taking a picture of one’s thoughts” (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 206).
A main reason for my adoption of the OSDE methodology in my own practice is that its developers situate the initiative in an educational project that lies ahead (Willinsky, 1998) in that they are continuing to adapt it and to have their principles challenged. They have a section on Frequently Asked Questions on their website that engages with critiques such as “Does the methodology allow for racist, sexist or homophobic perspectives of the past to remain unchallenged?” and “Are you promoting absolute relativism as an ideology?” (OSDE, n.d., FAQs). Furthermore, the methodology was focused on knowledge production in “Western” contexts; thus, a main critique was that the stimuli challenged Western knowledge construction but did not focus on knowledge systems based on nonanthropocentric ontologies (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 215). Thus, a spinoff initiative was created called “Learning to read the World Through Others Eyes” that focused on engaging teacher education with indigenous/aboriginal perceptions of social justice (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 218). I do not have as much experience with this initiative but intend to engage with it in the future. The ODSE and Through Others Eyes initiatives engage in the complexities of GCE in such a way that respects the various means through which students in the class come to a discussion; therefore, although they do not explicitly speak to the importance of using a critical GCE approach in a multicultural classroom, they open up spaces for discussion that avoid a celebratory approach to multicultural education and allow for multiple perspectives and multiply positioned perspectives to be engaged.

I am not certain that I have solved the question of how multiculturalism and GCE are related; however, identifying the tensions and promoting a foregrounding of assumptions and complexities in a post-as-interrogating modernism framework has contributed to how I frame GCE in my practice. As I was finishing the full draft of this thesis, I attended a planning meeting with my colleagues with whom I am instructing a teacher education seminar course for a special cohort of teacher educators called Global Citizenship and Sustainable Development. My colleagues are self-titled activist teachers with a commitment to transformative education in the Freirean sense (as they would say). We were looking for a framework to use with the teacher candidates to think through global citizenship in a way that can shape their understandings of the practices and policies we engage with during the course. The latest Banks (2005) resource seemed to be the closest example. Called

*Democracy and Diversity: Principles and Concepts for Educating Citizens in a Global Age,*
it includes some important concepts like imperialism that highlight wider power dynamics in a way not regularly explicit in other materials (e.g. the *ACT: Active Citizens Today: Global Citizenship for Local Schools* resource for middle school teachers in Canada which mentions neither colonialism nor imperialism). However, the Banks resource makes many claims about the importance of recognizing diversity in multicultural schools but fails to explicate on the assumed connection between multiculturalism and global citizenship education other than through some other very broad principles which include democracy and diversity. The main message is that multicultural places are where we naturally do global citizenship.

I do not have the space for a thorough analysis of the document here, but a particular example helps to explain how the work in this thesis has informed my ability to facilitate global citizenship education in teacher education. The section on multiple perspectives defines that “the consciousness that belief systems are socially constructed rather than given by nature and that they therefore can be constituted very differently in various cultures is especially important in today’s multicultural and global interconnected societies” (Banks et al., 2005, p. 23). This is a very different discourse of multiple perspectives than was found in the Alberta texts. Here multicultural and global are both used to describe interconnections in society. On the one hand, the emphasis on the social construction of culture and correspondingly the situated context of worldviews is evidence of the discursive turn and has the potential to reflect a post-as-interrogating view of modernism. On the other hand, this quotation represents another conflation of multicultural and global societies that is left neutral and mutually reinforcing. What is the difference between multicultural and global societies or is the global multicultural or are all societies are multicultural? I now pick up on the neutral and positive assumption and can conceptualize this relationship with more clarity. Multicultural contexts are characterized by a dynamic set of tensions that open critical spaces and possibilities for doing interesting work in global citizenship education. These tensions emerge in a particular way in the Canadian context given the way multiculturalism works as a discursive field. At the time of writing, we have agreed to adapt the Banks framework for use with the teacher candidates and to foreground the section on empire, imperialism, and power.
An anecdote from my experience as a teacher educator contributes to why this area of research is both under-developed and necessary. As I was finishing the penultimate draft of this thesis, I was instructing a class on soft versus critical global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2006) to a group of teacher candidates from the Global Citizenship and Sustainable Development cohort who had just completed their first one month practicum teaching placement. One of the teacher candidates had a moment of realization about the limits of soft approaches. She spoke about how the school where she was student teaching in Toronto was a very racially and culturally diverse school with many newcomers to Canada. She noticed that there were many extra-curricular clubs in which the students participated; however, she noted that there were no social justice clubs or any type of club that engaged in issues around poverty and oppression be they local or global. When she asked her associate teacher about this, the teacher responded that in the past, the school had been very involved in raising awareness and fund-raising for a school “in Africa”. However, there were many students who had newly immigrated from various countries in Africa who did not appreciate the way so-called Africans were portrayed in the posters and videos. They complained that they felt very uncomfortable. As a result, the teacher said, the school simply stopped doing “those types of things”. The soft approach to GCE could only go so far in relationship to a multicultural context. The tensions were shoved away, I would argue, precisely because there was not situated philosophy happening. When the teacher candidate began to use the language of critical global citizenship education, she began to recognize the layers of tensions inherent to her own story. She bridged the question of framing global issues as problems over there and the question of how to be respectful of new immigrants. The process I have gone through in this thesis sheds light on the way that liberal social justice discourses can foreclose critical potential; in the case of this particular school, they simply reached their limits and rather than finding a dynamic engagement with thinking differently from commonsensical dominant discourses of rights and recognition, educators simply shut down the issue.

This thesis contributes to a growing body of work critiquing global citizenship initiatives (e.g., Andreotti’s 2006 critique of the Make Poverty History campaign; and Jefferess’s 2008, 2011, 2012 critiques of the Me to We program by Free the Children) and theorizing the complexities and tensions of GCE concepts (e.g., Andreotti & Souza,
This thesis has important implications for scholarly research, both theoretical and empirical, as well as educational policy and practice. However, because it engaged specifically with multiculturalism and GCE, it did not examine in great detail the potential conflations and intersections with other educational fields (e.g. based on gender, language learning, religion) that also interact with understandings of GCE (Eidoo et al., 2011). It focused on the ways wider discourses function within texts. Although I did have access to some individual voices through the Summer Institute videos, further research would examine the extent to which educators do in fact take up the critical spaces available in the policy and curriculum documents in their own lesson plans and classroom practices. It would be interesting to examine the extent to which students pick up on or negotiate these conceptual confusions. Also, I studied one specific context of how GCE is included in a social studies curriculum. Further research could consider to what extent my findings are consistent in another province or another country. It would be interesting to compare the way conceptualizations of GCE reflect particular contexts of diversity in different national and geopolitical contexts. Finally, further research could examine the use of methodologies such as OSDE in teacher education and in K-12 schools.

Moving Towards the Educational Project that Lies Ahead

In looking forward, I come back to my situated position as someone who negotiates the identity categories of Canadian and Global Citizenship Education. I was attracted to the work on GCE precisely because I felt some tensions inherent to my own privileged position when working internationally and when teaching in various communities in Canada where the student demography was culturally and racially diverse. This thesis has helped me to come to some conclusions. There are particular opportunities in theory and in practice where a global frame helps us to look at the national context in a particularly critical way. A global consciousness discourse can make visible those tensions that tend to be swept under, or perhaps into, the multicultural mosaic. The Canadian grand narrative of the mosaic that includes and recognizes diverse identities opens up some possibilities for examining diversity issues that are not evident in the same way in places such as the U.S. (Parker, 2011). However, that very grand narrative of Canadian multiculturalism also keeps the Canadian imaginary turned away from some important tensions. It is important to bring multiple
marginalized perspectives forward and constantly be testing and examining the assumptions on which critical thinking and multiple perspectives pedagogies are based. Together fields of multiculturalism and GCE can open and foreclose possibilities for thinking otherwise. A situated philosophizing educator can work to bring tensions to the forefront and work towards thinking otherwise.

In Chapter Two, I explained how my own social location and personal experiences brought me to this topic and also make me complicit in the systems of inequities I interrogate. I was raised in a white, upper-middle-class, seven-generation, English-speaking family in Toronto. We loved celebrating multiculturalism by eating at what we called ethnic restaurants. When there were multicultural days at my school, I felt excluded because there was no table recognizing my culture. I did not understand my privileged position. During the constitutional debates of the 1980s and 1990s, family members and I wore t-shirts declaring “my Canada includes Quebec”. When, in 1993, I went on exchange to the north shore of the St. Lawrence River in Québec and found myself living with separatists, I did not feel comfortable putting back on that t-shirt. I knew they would not appreciate it; I felt a tension. The Canadian context of a contested national identity, in this case on the part of French Canadians, brought up a tension around my framing of what they saw as their issue. I had similar experiences teaching as an ex-pat at a private American school in Brazil. I could feel the extent to which I was complicit in many systems of power in the school and in the wider society. The recognition of tensions inherent in my positioning reflects the analogy of the pivot-point which describes my approach to theorizing and making sense of complexities and complicity. I have not resolved that complicity; my approach has contributed to a deepening of understanding wider popular and official discourses and how they shape key aspects of the Canadian multicultural imaginary. Assuming that Canada is the “spiritual home” (Iyer, 2004, p. 62) of global citizenship can further extend a problematic, albeit well-intended, celebratory approach to the fact that Canada has a multicultural imaginary. Using a post-as-interrogating modernism approach (Andreotti, 2010b), for which this thesis has argued, contributes an essential piece to the on-going puzzle towards resolving the complicity of those who are in positions to include others into the multicultural mosaic: multiculturalism must be (at least) a two-way process (Kymlicka, 1995). Good intentions must be forever troubled. From the space of interrogating good intentions and unearthing the problematic sets of modernist
assumptions inherent to liberalism in Canada, an engaging approach to global citizenship can contribute to a critical understanding of multiculturalism. Together, by focusing on how the fields are related in terms of a post-as-interrogating modernism approach, and teasing apart the problematic ways they are conflated in circles of liberal ideologies, multiculturalism and global citizenship education can relate in an engaging dynamic. This dynamic, a pivot-point that engages in interrogating good intentions, can push towards thinking otherwise (Andreotti, 2010b).
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