5: Global, Citizenship, and Education as Discursive Fields:
Towards Disrupting the Reproduction of Colonial Systems of Power

Karen Pashby

This chapter considers the growing interest in framing global citizenship education (GCE) using

post/de-colonial perspectives and discourse studies. These perspectives alert to the real

possibilities that despite good intentions, educating for global citizenship can reinforce unequal

colonial systems of power. I draw on Andreotti and Souza's (2011) understanding of

postcolonial studies as a set of productive questions. These queries raise for study seemingly

neutral frames of references and metanarratives that shape approaches to GCE. In the same way

that many scholars call for de-colonizing education (e.g. Willinsky 2008; Abdi 2008), Andreotti

and Souza 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" (2011, 2). This

particular movement within the broader field of global education arises from and responds to

central tensions inherent in articulating and practicing GCE. Specifically, this chapter examines

the ways that GCE emerges from a nexus of inter-related discursive fields, each of them

contested as well as marked by particular histories, challenges, and possibilities. It then reviews

the main themes of the scholarly literature on GCE and the critiques of the field, highlighting

those that call out GCE theory and practice for failing to interrogate or change what are often

taken-for-granted colonial systems of power. Finally, it considers the risks of failing to

interrogate good intentions behind GCE initiatives in non-formal and formal educational contexts.

One way to begin to examine critiques of global citizenship, particularly as applied in educational policy and practice, is to understand how the words global, citizenship, and education each represent discursive fields. Andreotti (2010c) speaks about the "discursive turn" as a paradigmatic moment when the social sciences moved from a belief in an empirical and objective idea of truth to one that recognized how realties are described and constructed and therefore are not neutral. In this new understanding of reality, social theorists recognize the role of language in relaying worldviews and ideology and governing social relations. The discursive turn coincided with work that is influenced by the post-traditions, including post-modernism, post-structuralism, and post-colonialism (Andreotti 2010a, 2010b). These traditions probe the metanarratives of modern society and expose them as not neutral but constructed out of socio-historic contexts. For example, Anderson (2006) deconstructs the idea of the nation and demonstrates that, although it has significant historical and material impacts on humans, the nation is actually a metanarrative, or imagined human construct. Metanarratives, or legends as Pike (2008a) refers to them, become so taken-for-granted that they become unquestionable and appear natural and neutral. In this sense, education can help to recognize the legends that construct reality in particular ways and favour certain worldviews which present as universal. In GCE these include a dominant view of helping global others that neither includes the stories of those who are the most marginalized from their own perspective nor accounts for the on-going reproduction of colonial systems of power. Yet, schooling can also help reconstruct the dominant legend that is currently defining how young people learn about the world.

Global citizenship education generally extends the idea of rights and responsibilities beyond the limits of the nation-state. It can be understood in a variety of ways and reflects different ideologies and ideas of what is and ought to be desired of citizens. Specifically, Andreotti argues that it is important to recognize how a term such as global citizenship is: a) *situated* in one specific culture, era, and/or geopolitical context; b) *partial* and liable to seen differently by others; c) *contingent* because its use and understanding depends on the context in which it is used and understood; and d) *provisional* because its use and understanding can and does change (2010c, 236). In fact, many critiques of global citizenship and GCE have arisen out of such attentiveness to this discursive aspect.

Tully (2008) determines that global citizenship is comprised of two fields—citizenship and globalization—which are each contested: "When we enquire into global citizenship….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, 15). Thus, global citizenship as a conjoint field represents the gathering together of "formerly disparate activities" under a new "rubric" wherein global citizenship becomes a topic and problem for research, policy, and theory (Tully 2008, 15). Similarly, Camicia and Franklin identify GCE as a discursive field insofar as it intersects critical work on globalization, citizenship, and education (2011, 313). Discursive fields occur "when groups construct diagnoses, prognoses, and calls to action, and are partly structured in ongoing processes of hegemony" (Steinberg 1999, 748). Global citizenship discourses are interested in what is going wrong in the world—or what are key global issues—and what should be done about them. In relation to formal education this

includes school curriculum, pedagogy, and programming. At the same time, the intersecting

discourses are framed by dominant ways of thinking about global relations including who gets to

define a global problem and who gets to be a global citizen (Pashby 2011). Mannion et al. also

argue that GCE is a discursive field insofar as it represents a "floating signifier that different

discourses attempt to cover with meaning….[and converge] within this new nexus of intentions"

(2011, 444). Thus, when understood discursively, global citizenship becomes a complicated idea

that is infused with various meanings and can be used and understood in different ways in

different contexts including various sites of education.

It is important to understand and map the many ways that critical conversations about

globalization converge with conversations about citizenship and educational practice in the

contemporary moment. In particular, some key postcolonial critiques have evoked the discursive

turn by recognizing the power of particular narratives to construct artificial and colonial

divisions between cultures and peoples (Said 1994). Specifically, and relevant to the study of

global citizenship, postcolonial critique has questioned and interrogated how constructions of an

us and a *them* are inherent to conceptualisations of citizenship and schooling (Willinsky 1998).

While it is outside the scope of this chapter to offer a full definition of postcolonial critique,

Andreotti (2010) helps to identify key strands or versions of postcolonial theory. One version

takes up hyper-self-reflexivity as a strategic way to recognize the complicity of and investment

of everyone in "coercive and repressive belief systems" (Andreotti 2010, 238). This hyper-self-

reflexivity is intended to promote a capacity to relate to others that is otherwise from inherited

and seemingly neutral sets of relations that are in fact embedded in colonial patterns of thinking

and relating. However, it is not prescriptive. Other strands of postcolonial theory focus on

bringing to the fore those voices historically marginalized by colonial violence (ibid.). For the purpose of this chapter, I align with Andreotti and Souza who "define postcolonial theories as tools-for-thinking rather than theories-of-truth" (2011, 2).

Unpacking *the global*: globalization and cosmopolitanism as contested fields

Unpacking the *global* referent in the discursive field of global citizenship underscores the centrality of both the idea of contemporary globalization and the notion of a global community. Many of the theoretical contestations have focused on whether globalization creates a global community that is becoming more similar or comprised of more difference. Either way, there is a sense of what I have called a global imperative (Pashby 2008) whereby the world seems more global than ever before, global issues take on a particular urgency, and schooling is required to attend to the global. In the global imperative there is a constant pressure to teach students to understand, prepare for, and succeed in a world defined by globalization.

Globalization is as unavoidable today as it is complicated, and social inequalities and conflicts continue and intensify. The political, economic, technological, and cultural processes that characterize globalization are associated with increasing intra-state conflict and increasing inequalities within and between societies (Ibrahim 2005, 177). Many of the processes associated with contemporary globalization seem new: increased mobility, fast access to more and more sources of knowledge via the internet, and intensifying global marketization, among many others. Yet, movements of peoples and goods are, of course, not at all a new phenomena. There is, however, much concern across academic disciplines and geographical contexts regarding the extent to which there is increasing homogeneity or heterogeneity as a result of today's intensified

movements of peoples, resources, and ideas. This puts particular pressures on those seen as needing to save their cultures. Burns warns that "the repetition of this dichotomy [of homogenisation or heterogenisation] positions globalization in a predatory role, linking the inevitable repercussions of global living with the inability of minoritarian cultures to produce an effective counter-hegemonic polity" (2008, 347). The repetition of such binary narratives—also including globalization from above or from below—is a way of trying to make sense of contradictory transnational conditions but raises new problems. Highlighting the discursive aspect of global citizenship, Burns points out that "rather than seeing globalisation as a finite or linear set of processes [as in both homogeneous and heterogeneous views] it becomes a vast assemblage of competing and contradictory forces that organise and manage populations" (2008, 348).

Connected to these contradictory understandings of globalization is what Strand refers to as "the cosmopolitan turn" in social and political sciences and in education (2010a, 229). Like globalization, cosmopolitanism is an ambiguous, contested, and conflicting discursive field, and it is a popular way to theorize the complexities inherent to both globalization and belonging to a global community. Cosmopolitanism generally refers to the idea that all humanity belongs to the same community and that this should be cultivated (Strand, 2010a). Rizvi underscores the link with globalization when he argues that "the notion of cosmopolitanism has the potential to bring together both the facts and the values associated with complex connectivity" (2009, 259). Drawing on Mignolo's work, Strand (2010b) argues that cosmopolitanism is an ideal still awaiting its realization. There is a central paradox wherein new normative theories reflect an ideal of global connectedness beyond national, religious, and political borders, and, at the same

time "long-established ideas and ideals of cosmopolitanism are now being contested by a developing worldwide and extremely complex social reality" (Strand 2010b, 233). Mignolo offers this critique in another way by interrogating the mutually dependent processes of modernization and colonization: "Coloniality...is the hidden face of modernity and its very condition of possibility" (2000, 722).

The colonization of the Americas in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and Africa in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were global designs representing the consolidation of "an idea of the West: a geopolitical image that exhibits chronological movement" (Mignolo 2000, 722). According to Mignolo, it is not impossible to conceive or analyse cosmopolitan projects beyond these parameters. He insists on distinguishing a) cosmopolitanism from global designs and b) cosmopolitan projects from critical cosmopolitanism. Global designs are driven by the will to control and homogenize, whereas cosmopolitan projects can either be complementary or dissenting in relation to global designs. For example, he describes how after World War I, modernizing missions displaced Christian and civilizing missions, and the global market became the final destination of global designs. Mignolo identifies the recent revival of cosmopolitan projects—of which global citizenship education may be one example—as "attentive to the dangers and excesses of global designs" (2000, 723).

In its current resurgence, a "cosmopolitan outlook" is both "a diagnostic and normative point of view that signifies epistemic ruptures" (Strand 2010b, 233). It is both "a new way of seeing the world and a new and emerging paradigm of social and political analysis" (ibid.). Cosmopolitanism as a new outlook for the twenty-first century is generated by and justified by

"the social reality which it examines" (Strand 2010b, 234). Mignolo's critique is strongly related to this concomitant recognition of a new reality and new way of understanding and thinking about cosmopolitanism. Critical cosmopolitanism considers how colonialism is reproduced both in the identification of global issues and in the culture of responding to these issues. His work points directly to the normative epistemology at the root of a neutral and decontextualized idea of cosmopolitanism as a universal ideal. Critical cosmopolitanism, on the other hand, attempts to interrogate and negotiate how colonial systems of power and colonial difference continue to be produced, reproduced, and maintained by global designs. Historically, cosmopolitanism has been the imposition of what are constructed as universals but are projections of particular local histories onto other local histories. Thus, critical cosmopolitanism advances critiques that have contested the taken-for-granted assumptions about both globalization and cosmopolitanism.

Citizenship as a contested field: including while excluding

The project of citizenship is another source of contestation in the discursive field of global citizenship education (GCE). Citizenship is a modern concept premised on the Enlightenment project of controlling natural forces in order to advance the world and the self in the direction of moral progress. The nation-state has embodied this ideal of control and progress. The structures that are now taken for granted—"formalized constitutions, elected legislatures, and written civil law"—replaced the monarchy as the main focus of loyalty in the seventeenth century: "The people, now become citizens, owed the state their loyalty, while the state, now become the government, owed its citizens protection" (Richardson 2002, 53; see also Delanty 2006). Citizenship in this sense is aligned with universal ideas of cosmopolitanism in that they are

situated in modern Western epistemology, ontology and the modern project that produces and reproduces colonial systems of power.

Citizenship is formed through what I have called the "enlightenment dynamic" (Pashby 2013, 46). It promotes a feeling of camaraderie and solidarity that is made possible by emotional ties to the nation and the idea of a shared national belonging (Anderson 2006). At the same time, citizenship is enabled by modern ideas of logic, rationality, and teleological progress institutionalized in the state itself. As Mignolo describes, this development has occurred simultaneously with colonialism. Indeed, national citizenship has always been involved in a paradox of belonging. Even though originally the state was to provide freedom from tyranny, the social inequalities inherited by modernity from feudalism ensured that national citizenship was complicit with perpetuating inequalities and reinforcing who does and does not belong. Goldberg has pointed out that "the rational, hence autonomous and equal subjects of the Enlightenment project turn out, perhaps unsurprisingly, to be exclusively white, male, European, and bourgeois" (1993, 208).

The famous sociologist T. H. Marshall (1950) wrote a historical typology of citizenship in which he argued that, in the mid-twentieth century, citizenship had moved from a strict political definition emphasizing the individual's relationship to the state to a broader conceptualization emphasizing the citizen's relationship to society (Isin and Wood 1999; McCollum 2002). Marshall's work arose from a concern about class segregation in England, and he challenged taken-for-granted ideas of citizenship defined simply by geo-political territory. He pointed out that the development of citizenship since the eighteenth century had been defined by a series of

acquisitions of rights: *civil* (freedom of speech, thought, faith; and development of a judicial

system); *political* (decisions and political life and the development of the electoral system); and

social (economic and social security associated with the development of the welfare state)

(Pashby 2008). His typology proposed that citizen rights could be enlarged to allow more classes

into the national contract and thereby correct social injustice (Soysal 2011). However, Marshall's

work has since been criticized for its exclusive focus on class and for assuming a linear and

progressive framework of rights acquisitions without accounting for the various social struggles

that have defined the provision of rights to particular groups in certain historical contexts.

Isin and Wood point out that the idea of an inherent conflict between citizenship and class as

articulated by Marshall must now 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?" (1999, 30). And another important question not only problematizes the contested

idea of the expansion of rights to citizens, but also the process by which modern citizenship is

implicated in reinforcing and managing exclusions and inclusions central to the project of

modernity (Said 1994). The colonial legacy of the modern project has continued to be

implicated in how citizenship is conceptualized and practiced (Said 1994). On the one hand,

contemporary citizenship is central to systems of representative government, international law,

the political de-colonization of former European colonies, and the formation of supranational

regimes and global civil society through such organizations at the U. N. (Tully 2008, 16). On the

other hand, citizenship and its application or denial has also been tied to "the dependent

modernization and citizenisation" of the non-West through colonisation, the Mandate System,

post-decolonisation, nation-building and global governance" (ibid.).

Education as a related and contested discursive field: the paradox of decolonizing

Tully (2008) talks about the intersecting fields of citizenship and globalization, and as the

increasing popularization of the idea of global citizenship education indicates, education proves

to be another field of intersection. The philosophical and sociological challenges of deciding how

to educate citizens in the contemporary context of globalization inherit the tensions and

conceptual ambiguities in both globalization and citizenship.

As the previous sections have outlined, the discursive turn in social sciences has unpacked and

interrogated some of the basic terms of social organization, including citizenship. We can

recognize that phenomena associated with globalization and with citizenship are: *situated* in

certain historical contexts (e.g. states going through political de-colonization versus former

colonizing states), *partial* in that we cannot recognize all the ways of experiencing the

phenomena, *contingent* on the set of analytical tools we employ to make diagnoses and calls for

action, and *provisional* because our understandings of them can and do change. As with

globalization and citizenship, the discursive turn helps us to understand that schooling, or formal

education, is not a neutral social institution but is situated in a Western, modernist project. In this

way, schooling is a partial rather than a natural or neutral occurrence. We can also see that

normative views of schooling produce and perform particular views of society and nation-

building which can be critiqued from various theoretical frames. Schooling in modern Western

liberal nation-building projects is contingent on the economic and political climate as well as the

settlement processes defining a particular national context. Schooling is also provisional as it changes over time according to the dominant ideology that is framing curricula, content, and pedagogy. Like the nation-state and citizenship, formal education is generally seen as a normative and neutral part of social organization. However, it also is subject to various and specific theoretical critiques that point out how the project of schooling changes and adapts to hegemonic ideologies.

Historically, in Western democracies mass schooling was an extension of state power during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Osborne 2008). In this sense, it was never neutral. Wrigley, Lingard and Thomson point out that schooling is situated within—and responds to—a wider set of hegemonic discourses and social and political relations: "School structures and cultures, as well as patterns of classroom language and learning, can either reinforce social inequality or challenge it" (2012, 106). Similarly, Osborne (2008) notes that schooling occupies a particular paradox whereby it is constructed as a solution to perceived "problems" within modern industrialization, and at the same time it produces and re-produces social stratification based on class.

Much like citizenship, schooling is also implicated in the production and reproduction of colonialism. Willinsky points out that education is caught in a double-bind insofar as it is complicit with efforts to define difference by constructing what distinguishes 'civilized' from 'primitive,' 'West' from 'East,' and 'first' from 'third' worlds: "[w]e are educated in what we take to be the true nature of difference" (1998, 1). However, education has never been simply a straight-forward affair of cultural transmission, so "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" (Willinksy 1998, 1–2). Dominant ideologies are relayed through schooling at the same time that schools are a key institutionalized space for the potential deconstruction of colonial narratives.

Schooling is complicit in the tandem processes of modernization and colonialization, yet it is also a site looked to for the promotion of social justice. Tikly explains that social reality can be discursively challenged and reconstructed through education: "[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" (2004, 178). This basic tension is unavoidable because if schooling can be the site of discursive struggles, then it can also reinforce discursive domination. Asher and Durand (2012) express this paradox. On the one hand, schooling is a tool for colonization, and teacher and students participate in cultural and political legacies of colonialism as well as continual reproductions of global socio-economic inequities. Yet, "[a]t the same time, [one] recognize[s] the transformative potential of education, precisely because it permits exposing taken-for-granted ideologies, disseminating new and previously silenced ways of knowing, and advancing alternative ways of imagining the future" (Asher and Durand 2012, 2).

Because schooling is a vehicle both for cultivating citizens and reinforcing social inequalities and colonial imaginaries, the global imperative asserts a particular set of pressures on education (Pashby 2008). Schooling must respond to the increasingly diverse and unequal demographics

associated with increased mobility at the same time as it responds to the perceived needs of the nation-state in an era of global market competition (Agbaria 2011). Thus, a key area of concern is global education, which is broadly defined as teaching students about global issues and, even more broadly, refers to global trends in education. While global education has a long history, there has been a recent resurgence of interest in bringing global education to classrooms at all levels of schooling. Much scholarship theorizes what best reform in education will fit the demands of globalization, but Agbaria points to a lack of attention regarding how the 'global' is being framed and rendered in educational scholarship:

> [T]his literature often approaches the "global" as a monolithic concept but not as a discursive formation imbued with competing perspectives. As such, the "global" is regularly employed as detached from the social context, institutional realities, and discursive practices through which it is ratified. Moreover, it is not fully clear as to what kind of globalization educators are urged to prepare their students for. Thus, the little knowledge on how globalization has been represented obscures what has been legitimized about globalization and how to educate about it. (2011, 58)

Therefore, the intersecting discursive fields of global/globalization/cosmopolitanism, citizenship, and education/schooling represent a nexus of inherited and contested discourses and metanarratives contributing to what it means to educate citizens in the twenty-first century.

The nexus of intersecting discursive fields: Global Citizenship Education

The field of global citizenship education (GCE) has for the most part taken on the challenge posed by Agbaria (2011): give stronger attention to education about globalization and for global community. Davies, Evans and Reid (2005) identified its emergence at the turn of the twenty-

first century as a bringing together of global education and citizenship education. Within this bridging of global education and citizenship education, international scholarly literature on GCE encompasses a broad range. Some work draws on liberal humanistic frameworks (e.g., Nussbaum 2002; Noddings 2005) while others employ more critical frameworks to promote GCE (e.g., Andreotti 2006; Andreotti et al. 2010; Pike 2008a; Richardson 2008; Shultz 2007). As Andreotti describes, "[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, 307). In this sense, GCE discourses, for the large part, operate within normative structures and dominant ideologies. Yet, despite differences, there are some overarching themes and rationales in the field of GCE, "especially when placed in Western, liberal-economic country contexts" (Marshall 2011, 415). Based on a review of scholarly literature (Pashby 2013), some of the key themes include:

- an acknowledgement that that urgent and troubling issues are global in scope: e.g. poverty, global warming, AIDS, racism, wars (Banks 2004; Ghosh 2008; Noddings 2005; Nussbaum 2002; Richardson 2008).

- a moral imperative for extending a notion of citizenship to those outside of one's national borders (Basile 2005; Noddings 2005).

- a need to promote a sense of agency and action among youth. This ought to go beyond charity to address structural critiques of social issues (Davies 2006; Ladson-Billings 2005; Pike 2008b; Shultz 2007).

- a challenge to and resisting of the overwhelmingly Western-American-Global North centric nature of most education materials. Educational resources tend to emphasize neoliberal values of consumerism rather than critical democratic engagement and focus on globalization from above and preparing students to be global workers and consumers (Pike 2008b; Talbert 2005; Kachur 2008)[i].

- a call for global citizenship to become an educational imperative because schools can play a strategic role in promoting a commitment to social justice (Glass 2000; Pike 2008a; 2008b; White 2005) and developing a global sense of community (Abdi and Shultz 2008).

- an imperative to engage with contemporary processes of globalization which problematize homogenous notions of national citizenship as well as a need to conceptualize schooling as a space for engaging with contemporary complex experiences of citizenship and identity (Banks 2004; Banks 2008; Castles 2004; Davies 2006; Guilherme 2002; McIntosh 2005; Osler and Starkey 2003; Pike 2008b; Scott and Lawson 2002).

- a focus on pedagogical approaches that are explicit in their inclusion and recognition of different epistemological perspectives and cultural norms. This imperative promotes engaging with "the links between conflict and interpretations of culture" (Davies 2006, 6).

Overall, the GCE scholarship in English both recognizes problematic narratives of globalization and promotes the creation of new "legends" about the relationship between the local and the global (Pike 2008b, 226).

Towards a more critical approach to GCE: postcolonial critiques

Within the wider field of GCE scholarship, a key body of work is promoting a more critical approach. A critical approach would require the explicit treatment of power relations in terms of resource distribution and epistemological privilege (Andreotti 2006). Critical GCE work aims to interrogate and move beyond a benevolent discourse of raising awareness about an identified global problem and helping global others who are worse off. Critical GCE promotes recognition of complicity within geopolitical power relations. This view of GCE does not prioritize helping students to feel good, but rather facilitates a dynamic engagement in recognizing the legacies and processes of the culture and context in which they live and were raised and how this frames their relation to others and to global issues. The intention is to create pedagogical spaces where students can imagine a future that is distinctly different from—rather than that reinforces— current ways of being and relating, and this includes engaging deeply in the idea of what it means to take ethical responsibility for actions and decisions in the complex times in which we live (Andreotti 2006; see also Eidoo et al. 2011).

Much of the more critical scholarship within the GCE literature engages post/de-colonial perspectives and critiques. Mignolo defines decolonization as a process of "delinking" from Western macronarratives (2011, 273). Abdi (2008) also links postcolonial critique to an active attempt to decolonize education. In calling for a decolonization of the imaginary as a precondition for educating for citizenship, he points to "the negative role colonial education (or miseducation) has played in the process of disenfranchisement" and proposes "reeducating people for inclusive citizenship and social development" (Abdi 2008, 66). Andreotti and Souza (2011) align line with critiques such as those of Mignolo and Abdi that centre on the

reproduction of colonial systems of power through modern processes and institutions. They point out that many 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 and Souza 2011, 1–2). Critical GCE work rooted in such postcolonial critiques attempts to trouble the paradox of schooling as a site of de and re-colonization. It attempts to work towards social justice, diversity, equity, and rights without accepting the inherent systemic inequities in a historical and contemporary vision of educating citizens (Pashby 2013). Correspondingly, an approach to GCE focused not just on raising awareness of global issues but also on changing the conditions that create problems in the first place must promote the rights of those historically and currently marginalized. This means not just promoting the rights of recognition and participation as equals, but also enabling a redistribution of power and resources and supporting their right to participation in how issues are named and framed (Fraser 2005).

A postcolonial approach to GCE engages with unequal relations of power rather than solely focusing on the inclusion of those seemingly marginalized into the universally defined good life. In a postcolonial framing, global problems are often rooted in ethnocentrism and hegemonic unequal power relations that result in inequities of distributions of wealth and labour. Andreotti insists that "humanity needs to be faced and its potential for harm recognized" (2011a, 94). The potential for harm includes racism, as it is central to the social order and ideologies of cultural superiority and leads not only to discrimination but also deficit thinking and epistemological violence. The emphasis of GCE in a postcolonial approach goes beyond an awareness of issues

that are identified as global problems but are generally understood to be and are framed as problems that are specific to those in so-called 'undeveloped' countries (Tikly 2004). It is a GCE for fundamental structural and relational change based on a clear social critique of who controls "knowledge production, power and representation" (Andreotti 2011a, 95). It is an approach to GCE that also endorses a commitment to reflexivity, "unlearning privilege," and "learning to learn from below" (ibid.).

Unlike Western humanism that tends to avoid or deny conflict and uncertainty and neoliberalism that seeks to manage it through individual skill development and economic rationalizations, postcolonial versions of GCE see complexity, diversity, uncertainty, conflict, and difference as learning opportunities. However, Andreotti (2011a) notes that a postcolonial approach can also elicit sadness on the part of students when they face of repeated systemic inequalities and can also prompt scepticism towards traditional 'making a difference' techniques. This can result in resistance to postcolonial pedagogies and feelings of guilt and paralysis. It is very difficult to work outside of a dominant paradigm seen as benign and neutral, and it is existentially challenging to confront the ways one's well-intended efforts to raise awareness about and campaign against global issues can lead to actions and ideas complicit with inequalities. Working towards a vision of GCE that takes up postcolonial critiques means opening up a new conceptual and ideological space of struggle and relating to others. It can be a dynamic space of possibilities. Andreotti (2011a) suggests that there is a perceived and inevitable choice between uncritical engagement and critical disengagement. This dichotomy reflects a central challenge of not throwing the baby out with the proverbial bathwater. How can we support some key GCE

work being done and promote it in certain contexts and at the same time remain critical of and perhaps advocate our opposition to GCE in other contexts (Andreotti 2011a, 211)?

Importantly, there is no one approach to GCE that will be relevant in all contexts. Andreotti explains that "it is important to recognize that 'soft' global citizenship education is appropriate to certain contexts – and can already represent a major step" (2006, 8). However, if educators are unable and unwilling to acknowledge and interrogate the assumptions and implications of approaches to GCE, this lack of reflexivity and contextualized awareness may lead to reproducing the processes and practices that have harmed those members of the global community whom GCE initiatives intend to support. Andreotti and Souza describe the main risk of soft approaches to global citizenship education:

> 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. (2011, 1)

The concepts of context and complicity are very important given that GCE is a popular educational discourse in English speaking, multicultural, Western democracies such as Canada, the U.K., Australia, New Zealand and the U.S.A. There cannot be a one-sized-fits-all approach, and GCE must be contextualized as situated and historicized in order to resist reproducing colonial patterns of thought and action.

Andreotti sums up critiques of the concurrent discursive fields of globalization, cosmopolitanism, citizenship, schooling, and the intersecting discursive field of global citizenship education by noting that 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). (2010c, 242–243)

In response to this critique, she promotes a version of GCE that embraces "learning to unlearn" and that makes "connections between social-historical processes and encounters that have shaped our contexts and cultures and the construction of our knowledges and identities" (Andreotti 2010c, 243). In such a case, students would be facilitated to recognize that social groups are internally diverse and experience conflict. Rather than simply celebrating cultural differences in a superficial way (that can unwittingly essentialize), students can understand that "culture is a dynamic and conflictual production of meaning in a specific context" (Andreotti 2010c, 243). This application of critical GCE is a response to postcolonial critique. And it is a concept that has been taken up quite widely in educational research (e.g. Bryan, Clarke and Drudy 2011; Edge and Khamsi 2012; Martin 2013 among others).

Synthesis and discussion: towards thinking otherwise
This chapter has reviewed the main rationales for an approach to global citizenship education that aims to interrogate and revise—rather than unintentionally reinforce—colonial systems of power. Applications of the discursive turn in the social studies have facilitated a number of

important critiques of key modern ideas that construct and reproduce colonial inequalities through the unquestioned tenets of reason, science, seamless progress, and continued development. Andreotti's (2010c) definition of the discursive turn helps us to understand that key terms and metanarratives such as global citizenship are situated, partial, contingent, and provisional. In fact, global citizenship education represents conjoined and overlapping discursive fields. Each—globalization/the global/cosmopolitanism, citizenship, and education—is contested in terms of both its possibilities to promote justice and equality and also to reinforce the very systems that continue to define difference and inequities.

Global citizenship education emerged as a growth area for scholarship and practice at the turn of the twenty-first century. It encompasses a range of approaches, some of which are more critically grounded. Recently, a great deal of work has mobilized around the critical work in the field. Specifically, scholars and educators are looking to push beyond inherited paradigms and to avoid reproducing systems of inequities embedded in taken-for-granted ways of teaching about the world. As studies in Alberta, Canada (Pashby 2013) and in Northern Ireland (Niens and Reilly 2012) demonstrate, there has been important work done to include global citizenship in curricula. However, teachers and students continue to remain constrained by dominant discourses of charity and personal gratitude that, despite good intentions, can reify rather than problematize an idea of an *us* and a *them*.

Global citizenship is now included as a key plank in the UN Director General Ban Ki-Moon's Global First Initiative, is a major theme of UNESCO's current work, and, along with sustainability skills, has been named in one of the seven UN post-2015 development targets for

education progress. In this sense, it is a mainstream international discourse. And for this reason it is especially important to consider a critical approach informed by postcolonial critiques. It is essential that with this renewed interest we do not repeat the same mistakes and simply inherit approaches from the past repackaged as new. The renewed interest in global citizenship education represents an opportunity for us to interrogate our good intentions and open up spaces for thinking otherwise (Andreotti and Souza 2011). It is possible that such approaches may make new mistakes; however, given the wealth of theoretical work we have to draw on, there is no excuse for failing to do our best to be aware of how our approaches are situated, partial, contingent, and provisional. There will be multiple approaches needed; however, more of the same will certainly not meet the needs of our complex society nor will it enable us to relate to others differently. For, as Pike asserts, "if our educational institutions cannot be catalysts in constructing the new legend, from where is that impetus likely to come?" (2008b, 236).

References

Abdi, Ali. 2008. "De-subjecting Subject Populations: Historico-actual Problems and Educational Possibilities." In *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship,* 65−80. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Abdi, Ali and Lynette Shultz. 2008. "Educating for human rights and global citizenship: An introduction." In *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship,* 1−10. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

AE (Alberta Education). 2005. *Social studies: Kindergarten to grade 12*. Edmonton, Alberta,

Canada: The Crown in Right of Alberta.

http://www.education.alberta.ca/media/773701/soc10.pdf

----------*Social studies 10-1: Perspectives on globalization*. 2007. Edmonton, Alberta,

Canada: The Crown in Right of Alberta.

http://www.education.alberta.ca/media/773701/soc10.pdf

Agbaria, Ayman K. 2011. "The social studies education discourse community on globalization:

Exploring the agenda of preparing citizens for the global age." *Journal of Studies in

International Education*. 1–17. DOI: 10.1177/1028315309334645.

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of

nationalism*. New York, NY: Verso Books

Andreotti, Vanessa. 2006. "Soft versus critical global citizenship education." *Policy and

Practice: A Development Education Review,* 3: 40–5.

———. 2010a. "Engaging the (geo)political economy of knowledge construction: Towards

decoloniality and diversality in global citizenship education." Last accessed July 31, 2015.

http://www.ucalgary.ca/peacestudies/files/peacestudies/Engaging%20the%20(geo)political%20e

conomy%20of%20knowledge%20construction.pdf.

———. 2010b. "Global education in the'21st century': Two different perspectives on the 'post-'of postmodernism." *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning* 2 (2): 5–22.

——— . 2010c. "Postcolonial and post-critical 'global citizenship education'." In *Education and social change: Connecting local and global perspectives*: 238–250. London, England: Continuum.

———. 2011a. *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2011b. "The political economy of global citizenship education." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 9 (3-4): 307–310.

Andreotti, Vanessa, David Jefferess, Karen Pashby, Cash Rowe, Paul Tarc, and Lisa Taylor. 2009. "Difference and conflict in global citizenship in higher education in Canada." *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning* 2 (3): 5–24.

Andreotti, Vanessa and Lynn Mario de Souza. 2011. "Introduction: (Towards) Global Citizenship Education 'Otherwise'." *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education*, 1–6. New York, NY: Routledge.

Asher, Nina and Durand, E. Sybil. "Crafting postcolonial pedagogies: At the intersections of theory and practice". Paper presented at the American Educational Studies Association Congress, San Diego, CA. April 2012. Last accessed, July 31, 2015: http://conference.jctonline.org/index.php/cctcp/2011/paper/downloadSuppFile/655/61.

Banks, James A. 2004. "Introduction: Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies." In *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*: 3–15. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

———. 2008. "Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education." *Educational Researcher* 37 (3): 129–139.

Bryan, Audrey, Marie Clarke, Sheelagh Drudy, Tony Gallagher, and Lesley McEvoy. 2011. "Social Justice Education in Initial Teacher Education: A Cross Border Perspective. A Report to the Standing Conference on Teacher Education North and South. Accessed Sept. 24, 2015. http://scotens.org/site/wp-content/uploads/Social-Justice-Education-in-Initial-Teacher-Education-2009.pdf

Burns. K. 2008. "(Re)imagining the global, rethinking gender in education." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 29 (3): 343–357.

Camicia, Steven P., and Barry M. Franklin. 2011. "What type of global community and citizenship? Tangled discourses of neoliberalism and critical democracy in curriculum and its reform." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 9, (3–4): 311–322.

Castles, Stephen. 2004. "Migration, citizenship, and education." *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*: 17–48.

Davies, Ian, Mark Evans, and Alan Reid. 2005. "Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 53 (1): 66–89.

Davies, Lynn. 2006. "Global citizenship: abstraction or framework for action?" *Educational review* 58 (1): 5–25.

Delanty, Gerard. 2006. "Nationalism and cosmopolitanism: The paradox of modernity." In *The SAGE Handbook of Nations and Nationalism*, 357–368. *London: Sage*.

Edge, Karen, and Khatera Khamsi. 2012. "International school partnerships as a vehicle for global education: student perspectives." *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 32 (4): 455–472.

Eidoo, Sameena, Leigh-Anne Ingram, Angela MacDonald, Maryam Nabavi, Karen Pashby, and Saskia Stille. 2011. ""Through the Kaleidoscope": Intersections Between Theoretical

Perspectives and Classroom Implications in Critical Global Citizenship Education." *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation* 34, (4): 59–85.

Ghosh, Ratna. 2008. "The short history of women, human rights, and global citizenship." In *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship,* 81–95. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Glass, Ronald David. 2000. "Education and the ethics of democratic citizenship." *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 19 (3): 275–296.

Goldberg, David Theo. 1993. "Modernity, race, and morality." *Cultural Critique*: 193–227.

Guilherme, Manuela. 2002. *Critical citizens for an intercultural world: Foreign language education as cultural politics*. London, England: Multilingual Matters, 2002.Ibrahim, Tasneem. 2005. "Global citizenship education: Mainstreaming the curriculum?." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 35, (2): 177–194.

Isin, Engin F., and Patricia K. Wood. 1999. *Citizenship and identity*. London, England: Sage.

Kachur, Jerrold. 2008. "Human Rights Imperialism: Third Way Education as the New Cultural Imperialism." In *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship,* 177–192. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 2005. "Differing concepts of citizenship: Schools and communities as sites of civic development." *Educating citizens for global awareness*, 69−80. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Mannion, Greg, Gert Biesta, Mark Priestley, and Hamish Ross. 2011. "The global dimension in education and education for global citizenship: Genealogy and critique." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 9 (3−4): 443−456.

Martin, Fran. 2013. "Same old story: the problem of object-based thinking as a basis for teaching distant places." *Education 3-13* 41 (4): 410−424.

Marshall, Harriet. 2011. "Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: Theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 9 (3−4): 411−426.

Marshall, Thomas Humphrey. 1950. "Citizenship and social class and other essays." Cambridge, England: University Press.

McIntosh, Peggy. 2005. "Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship." *Educating citizens for global awareness*, 22−39. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Mignolo, Walter. 2000. "The many faces of cosmo-polis: Border thinking and critical cosmopolitanism." *Public Culture* 12 (3): 721−748.

———.2011. "Geopolitics of sensing and knowing: on (de) coloniality, border thinking and epistemic disobedience." *Postcolonial studies* 14 (3): 273–283.

Niens, Ulrike, and Jacqueline Reilly. 2012. "Education for global citizenship in a divided society? Young people's views and experiences." *Comparative Education* 48,(1): 103–118.

Noddings, Nel, 2005. (Ed.). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. Teachers College Press, 2005.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2002. "Education for citizenship in an era of global connection." *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 21, (4–5): 289-303.

Osborne, Ken. 2008. "Education and Schooling: A Relationship That Can Never Be Taken For Granted." *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* 107 (1): 21–41.

Osler, Audrey, and Hugh Starkey. 2003. "Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences." *Educational review* 55, (3): 243–254.

Pashby, Karen. 2008. "Demands on and of citizenship and schooling: "Belonging" and "diversity" in the global imperative." *Brock Education Journal* 17 (1): 1–21.

———. 2011."Cultivating global citizens: Planting new seeds or pruning the perennials? Looking for the citizen-subject in global citizenship education theory." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 9 (3–4): 427–442.

———. 2013. *Related and Conflated: A Theoretical and Discursive Framing of Multiculturalism and Global Citizenship Education in the Canadian Context*. PhD dissertation, OISE/University of Toronto. http://hdl.handle.net/1807/35921.

Pike, Graham. 2008a. "Citizenship education in global context." *Brock Education* 17 (1): 38–49.

———. 2008b. "Reconstructing the legend: Educating for global citizenship In *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship,* 223–237. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Richardson, George H. 2002. *The death of the good Canadian: Teachers, national identities, and the social studies curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Pub Incorporated.

———. 2008. "Conflicting imaginaries: Global citizenship education in Canada as a site of contestation." *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishing.

Rizvi, Fazal. 2009. "Towards cosmopolitan learning." *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education* 30 (3): 253–268.

SACSC (The Society for Safe and Caring Schools & Communities). n.d.a. "*Grade 10 Social Studies, English Language Arts: Unit one: Global issues awareness: Lesson one: Issues, what issues*?" [Lesson plan]. Last accessed November 11, 2012. http://sacsc.ca/senior-high-lesson-plans-social-studies/.

———. n.d.b. "Grade 10 Social Studies, English Language Arts: Unit one: Global issues awareness: Lesson three: A lived experience [Lesson plan]". Last accessed November 11, 2012. http://sacsc.ca/senior-high-lesson-plans-social-studies/.

Said, Edward W. 1994. *Culture and imperialism*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Scott, David, and Helen Lawson. 2002. *Citizenship education and the curriculum*, 1–6. Westport, CT: Ablex.

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

Soysal, Yasemin Nuhoğlu. 2011. "Reply to Will Kymlicka:'Multicultural citizenship within multination states'." *Ethnicities* 11 (3): 8–312.

Steinberg, Marc W. 1999. "The Talk and Back Talk of Collective Action: A Dialogic Analysis of Repertoires of Discourse among Nineteenth-Century English Cotton Spinners." *American Journal of Sociology* 105 (3): 736–780.

Strand, Torill. 2010a."Introduction: cosmopolitanism in the making." *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 29 (2): 103–109.

———. 2010b. "The making of a new cosmopolitanism." *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 29 (2): 229–242.

Talbert, Tony L. 2005. "Freedom or French Fries: Packaged Democracy for World Consumption." In *Democracy at the Crossroads: International Perspectives on Critical Global Citizenship Education*, 31–54. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Tikly, Leon. 2004. "Education and the new imperialism." *Comparative education* 40 (2): 173-198.

Tully, James. 2008. "Two meanings of global citizenship: Modern and diverse." In *Global citizenship education: Philosophy, theory and pedagogy*, 15–39. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

White, Cameron. 2005. "Critical democratic education for social efficacy." *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education*, 77–104. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Willinsky, John. 1998. *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2012. "What was Multiculturalism?." *Precarious International Multicultural Education: Hegemony, Dissent and Rising Alternatives*, (pp. 15–39). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-6091-894-0.

Wrigley, Terry, Bob Lingard, and Pat Thomson. 2012. "Pedagogies of transformation: Keeping hope alive in troubled times." *Critical Studies in Education* 53 (1): 95–108.

---

[i] I have argued elsewhere that the scholarly writing on GCE is itself limited in that it is largely written from within that same geo-political context of English-speaking liberal democracies of the "Global North" (Pashby 2011).