

Conflations, possibilities, and foreclosures: Global citizenship education in a multicultural context

Karen Pashby

University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

This paper presents a critical framework applied to findings from a critical discourse analysis of curriculum and lesson plans in Alberta to examine the assumption that Canada is an ideal place for global citizenship education. The analysis draws on a framework that presents a critique of modernity to recognize a conflation within calls for new approaches to educating citizens for the twenty-first century. A main finding is that although the Alberta curriculum reflects important potential for promoting a critical approach, a conflation of different versions of liberalism often results in a false sense of multiple perspectives and a foreclosure of potential. The paper argues for a critical approach to global citizenship education that engages with the tensions inherent to issues of diversity rather than stepping over or reducing them to theoretically and conceptually vague ideas of universalism and consensus.

Keywords: citizenship education; multicultural/diversity education; critical theory; socio-political conditions; global education; global citizenship

Travel writer and essayist Pico Iyer (2004) wrote that Canada is the “spiritual home [...] of the very notion of an extended, emancipatory global citizenship... .Pierre Trudeau’s inclusive immigration policies [have] given Canadians a sense of connection to both their homes and the world” (Iyer, 2004, p. 62).¹ A corresponding narrative is Canada as a multicultural mosaic where differences are valued, recognized, and cherished. 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. [...] to be indifferent to our obligations as citizens of the world is seen as ‘unCanadian’” (p. 358). Given that schools are a main site for the cultivation of citizens, it could follow that a multicultural demographic and celebratory approaches to diversity in Canadian schools make them an ideal place for global citizenship education (GCE).

Multiple identities and global citizenship are in fact linked by the ministry of education in Alberta. Alberta Education’s (AE) resource document *The Heart of the Matter: Character and Citizenship Education in Alberta Schools* (2005b) describes “national consciousness or identity” as a key element of citizenship. This includes (1) Sense of identity as a national citizen; (2) Awareness of multiple identities, such as regional, cultural, ethnic, religious, class, gender; and (3) Sense of global or world citizenship (AE, 2005b, p. 6). Yet, Kymlicka (2003b) has also argued that it is problematic to assume that respecting diversity in a global or cosmopolitan view leads to respecting diversity in local contexts. Thus, there are possible tensions inherent in the assumption that Canada’s multicultural context makes it an ideal place for GCE, and these require examination. This paper presents a theoretical framework to foreground the critical potential of GCE in

*Email: pashby@ualberta.ca

multicultural contexts. It applies the framework to some key findings from a larger PhD dissertation project (Pashby, 2013) that sought to identify the tensions inherent to each field – multicultural education and GCE – and the possibilities and challenges inherent to their perceived relationship. The study was guided by three interrelated questions: (1) to what extent are the fields of multicultural and GCE related and/or conflated, (2) what tensions and complexities within and between the fields are possibly over-stepped when they are assumed to be mutually reinforcing, and (3) what are the possibilities and foreclosures for critical approaches to GCE in a multicultural context?

First, the paper considers the parallels in the histories of multicultural and global education in Canada and the treatment of their relationship in educational studies literature. Next, a theoretical framework promotes an unpacking and interrogation of modernist assumptions underpinning calls for new approaches to schooling for the twenty-first century citizen (Andreotti, 2010b, 2010c) out of which GCE has emerged as a response and multicultural education is implicated. A comparison of the work of two key scholars in each field – Joshee (2009) on multicultural education and Richardson (2008) on GCE – contributes to the wider framework by recognizing multiple ideologies frame central discourses within each field and by pointing to the corresponding possibilities and barriers to critical work around complexity, difference, and citizenship. This framework is applied to key findings from a critical discourse analysis of the Alberta Social Studies Curriculum – particularly the grade 10 globalization course – and lesson plans available online. Finally, the discussion draws together the previous sections by suggesting some key possibilities and foreclosures in conceptualizing GCE in a multicultural context and considers implications in regards to current curriculum reforms. A key argument is that tensions must be foregrounded as a key dynamic of learning about others and as tied to systemic understandings of inequities in order to enable the critical potential of GCE in multicultural contexts.

Multicultural and global education in Canada: parallel histories and critiques

Multiculturalism in Canada is based on an expansion of liberalism to include certain collective rights to access the societal culture of the nation without having to face discrimination based on ethnicity (Kymlicka, 1998). The policy is predated by a history of struggles to include the rights of cultural minorities as well as on-going systemic racism (James, 2008). Kymlicka (2005) referred to the “three silos” of cultural diversity in Canada: (1) Aboriginal peoples (First Nations, Métis, and Inuit); (2) the “two founding nations” – Francophone rights within a British-dominated Canada; and (3) the “ethnic/immigrant” group² (p. 1). He notes they are three vertical silos as each is defined using specific principles and is disconnected from the others in terms of legislation and administration of cultural accommodations although the first two focus on struggles for autonomy (Kymlicka, 2005, p. 1).³ While multiculturalism is largely associated with the third group, the adoption of official policy occurred within a context of increased politicization around bi-lingual rights and a heightened and organized politicized movement of First Nations groups. In the 1960s sociologist John Porter (1965) used the term vertical mosaic to refer to the hierarchical relationships that exist between Canada’s cultural groups; more recently, Jiwani (2006) described it as “racially based internal hierarchies of power and privilege” (pp. 10–11; see also Bannerji, 2000).

Multicultural education has a long history in Canada and has included a wide range of theories, policies, and instructional practices that reject assimilation and promote cultural diversity (Ghosh, 2002; Joshee, 2007). Critiques from postcolonialism (Willinsky, 1998),

feminism (Arnot & Dillabough, 2004), and critical race theory (Dei, 2007; Gillborn & Youdell, 2009; James, 2008) point out the significant extent to which a superficial celebratory approach to multiculturalism reifies a dominant culture and lacks a critique of power relations and embedded hierarchies. Furthermore, implicated in these critiques is a recent concern about a neoliberal shift in multicultural education which Mitchell (2003) identified as “a subtle but intensifying move away from person-centered education for all, or the creation of the tolerant, ‘multicultural self’, towards a more individuated, mobile and highly tracked, skills-based education...” (p. 387; see also Sleeter, 2014).

Global education also has a long history in Canada (Evans, Ingram, MacDonald, & Weber, 2009) that is to a large extent parallel to that of multicultural education⁴. Since the turn of the twenty-first-century, in Canada and other English-speaking democratic countries (particularly the UK, USA, Australia and New Zealand), GCE merged global education and citizenship education, adding a stronger emphasis on action and political participation to extant approaches to global education (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005). In scholarly literature, GCE includes a broad range from more liberalist and humanistic frameworks (e.g., Noddings, 2004; Nussbaum, 2002) to more critical and social-transformation oriented frameworks (e.g., Andreotti, 2006; Lapayese, 2003; Shultz, 2007). Similar to the critical work on multicultural education, critical work on GCE points out the limits of a liberal humanist approach and the complicity of some GCE approaches with neoliberalism through a focus on self-management and developing a human capital skill set (Marshall, 2009; Tarc, 2012). GCE can reinforce a limited view of global citizen subjectivity in terms of gender, culture, language, religion, and race (Burns, 2008; Eidoo et al., 2011; McIntosh, 2004). A critical approach to GCE engages with ideas of complicity, particularly in persisting colonial systems of power, and aims to empower individuals to think differently and to reflect critically on the legacies of their own cultures and contexts to imagine different futures (e.g., Andreotti, 2006, 2010b, 2010c; Pashby, 2012; Pike, 2008).

In Canada’s multicultural context, contestations over national identity have evolved overtime. Educational policies and programs have reflected these contestations while also producing visions of Canada and its role in the world (Joshee, 2004; Kennelly & Llewellyn, 2011). As Richardson (2008) asserted, “the ideological orientation, content and purpose of global citizenship education has changed with the times and Canada’s evolving image of itself” (p. 53). Thus, despite the popular idea that a multicultural context makes Canada the “spiritual home of global citizenship” (Iyer, 2004, p. 62), underlying both multiculturalism and GCE are multiple and potentially contradictory aims, conflicting popular views, and theoretical contestations that raise significant tensions for citizenship education. These tensions emerge in particular ways in a context such as Alberta where popular and official discourses of multiculturalism exist alongside explicit attention to global citizenship in curriculum documents.

Significant to this context, it is challenging to find any research literature directly studying the relationship between the fields, particularly in the Canadian context (Pashby, 2013). This corresponds with a lack of explicit theoretical grounding of the assumed positive relationship between the fields of multicultural and global education in scholarly research, and GCE represents a further conflation. In the US context, Myers (2006) found the term GCE is used infrequently, but “when the term appears, it is often used with similar meanings to those ascribed to global education or multicultural education (e.g., Banks, 2004; Noddings, 2004) and rarely defined and given a coherent theoretical foundation” (Myers, 2006, p. 370). And while Myers’ work focused on the US context, Merryfield (1996) reported on how teacher educators in both Canada and the US bridge multiculturalism and global education by working together on common goals to “prepare teachers

for diversity, equity, and interconnectedness in the local community, the nation, the world” (p. 11). Her report suggests learning about global inequities enables learning about local inequities (Merryfield, 1996, p. 19). Teacher education institutions in Merryfield’s (1996) report were selected because their programs, classes, projects and research were grounded on theories of multicultural and global education⁵; however, there is neither elaboration on those theoretical frameworks nor on how the theories conceptualize bringing the fields together.⁶

A main premise of GCE literature is a dialogical relationship between respecting and valuing diversity in the local context and engaging with intercultural understandings of a global community (Basile, 2005). In much of the work on GCE, citizenship identity is assumed to expand in a linear manner from local to regional to national to global and learning about global issues will naturally inspire action against local injustices (Mitchell & Parker, 2008). For example, in Banks’s view, similar to that of Merryfield (1996), a global education approach grounded in diversity and intercultural awareness promotes positive, transformative interaction in a multicultural setting. To probe unexamined tensions in this view of GCE, a dynamic, interactive, and complex understanding of identity construction does not disallow for contradictory sentiments between national and global citizenship identities (Pashby, 2011, 2013; Taylor, 2012). As Banks (2004) acknowledges, “cultural, national, and global identifications and attachments are complex, interactive, and contextual” (p. 7). Furthermore, “citizenship education within any social and political context is likely to have complex and contradictory consequences that educators and decision makers are not always able to envision or predict” (Banks 2004, p. 11). These tensions must be at the forefront in order to evoke critical spaces that can respond to the complex contexts of twenty-first century classrooms.

New Education for the Twenty-First Century Citizen?: Post-as-After Versus Post-as-Interrogating Modernity

A premise of this research is that the concepts of multiculturalism and GCE are discursive fields producing and resisting dominant views about the role of schooling and of citizenship education for the twenty-first century (Andreotti, 2010b; Steinberg, 1999). This section contributes a theoretical mapping of the wider context as a way of updating and adding depth to understanding the fields and their relationship. Later the framework is applied to analyze curriculum and lesson plan documents.

As Mitchell and Parker (2008) point out, rather than fixing and normalizing ideas of citizenship in educational research,

we should interrogate why these particular scales and affinities have become the subject of so much interest, how they may be bound up with global economic and political formations, and how they are produced through discursive material processes operating in a mutually constitutive manner. (p. 779)

Andreotti’s (2010b, 2010c) work distinguishing between a post-as-after modernity and a post-as-interrogating modernity approach offers a theoretical framework to do such a mapping.

My use of Andreotti’s framework is intended to examine temporal and philosophical assumptions underlying calls for global citizenship in a context of multiculturalism. The notion of educating for citizenship is very much tied to the broader project of modernity (Zufiaurre, 2007). There are temporal aspects of modernity tied to a sense of telos,

development, and progress over time. There are also ontological and epistemological bases of modernity coming from Enlightenment thinking centered on Cartesian rationality. These are applied in systems of civic governance including modern democracy and the Westphalian nation-state of which education is a central institution (Mitchell, 2003). As a way to deepen the theoretical work and pedagogy relating to GCE, Andreotti (2010b, 2010c) engages with widely expressed calls for improvements to extant modern versions of teaching and learning in response to the intensification of contemporary processes of globalization. These processes include a shift from an industrial to knowledge-based society (Todd, 2008) wherein knowledge, learning, reality, and identities are understood to be fluid, negotiable, and provisional (Andreotti & Souza, 2008b; Gilbert, 2007). These changing social conditions represent a temporal shift into what can be referred to as an era of post-modernity (Hargreaves, 1999).

At the same time, there is a shift in social science research from positivism towards discourse study, representing a philosophical shift that can also be referred to as post-modern. I use the term postmodernity to recognize that these two aspects are inevitably linked. There are new social conditions and complexities emerging at the same time as identifying and analyzing discourses is a common and central preoccupation across the humanities and social sciences (Fairclough, 2003, p. 123). This “discursive turn” has given rise to the ‘post’ traditions including post-modernism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism which have then given rise to more such as post-feminism, post-positivism, etc. (Andreotti, 2010c, pp. 233, 235). They offer new frameworks to understand and analyze the extent to which responses to these apparently new conditions repeat inherited, modern ontologies and epistemologies (see Tikly, 2004).

Importantly, Andreotti (2010c) does not propose that “educators should adopt any of these lenses” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 233, italics in original). Rather, she contributes the framework towards increasing “the levels of intellectual engagement and autonomy in the profession” (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 233). Her argument is: “if we are serious about engaging with globalization or the social crisis we are embedded in, we need more lenses available to make better-informed choices of what to do in the complex and diverse settings in which we work” (p. 233). By applying the framework to help unpack the assumptions underlying a natural and positive relationship between multicultural and GCE, this paper attempts to take up her call.

Andreotti (2010c) distinguishes between approaches to GCE based on how they relate to modernity: post-as-after and post-as-interrogating modernity. Thus, she identifies an underlying distinction within current calls for new approaches in the shift from twentieth century modernity to twenty-first century post-modernity; this analytical tool can be applied to help recognize the extent to which the fields of multicultural education and GCE are related and conflated. In one version, teaching and learning in the twenty-first century is an extension of modernity and the post of post-modernity is understood as after. It responds to a change in the societal organizations defining modern development, but it does not interrogate the main teleological assumptions of progress through rationality and Cartesian subjectivity. This view focuses on progressing a country’s economic advantage. Educators are led to adopt those subjectivities, pedagogies, and epistemologies that are compliant with the shifts and uncertainties of current economies (Andreotti, 2010c). Main discourses include education for the “new global world order” and the need for “world excellence” in education (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 240; see also Parker, 2011). Multiculturalism is highlighted in terms of human capital, and the ability to work with people of different cultures creates an effective and competitive workforce.

The post-as-after modernity approach evokes a social justice discourse by calling for the inclusion of those who are marginalized within the capitalist market system (Andreotti, 2010c). In this view of inclusion, education can provide tools for participation in old and new markets (see also Marshall, 2009). Progress is just and linear, and the assumption is all marginalized individuals and/or communities desire the same ideals (Mignolo, 2000). While apparently responding to new trends, Andreotti (2010b, 2010c) argues, the post-as-after modernity idea of twenty-first century learning and teaching is a universalist metanarrative based on twentieth-century teleological foundations with no substantive interrogation of or change to the epistemological and ontological bases of modernity. The emphasis is on including everyone in the status quo without attention to the potential resultant disruptions and tensions regarding who gets to include whom and into whose desired future.

Andreotti (2010b, 2010c) identified a distinct, alternative vision of education that also responds to the new conditions of schooling the twenty-first century citizen. Unlike the post-as-after modernity approach, it sets out to disrupt and challenge the status quo rather than to extend the logic of modernity through twenty-first century iterations. Central to this vision is the importance of pluralizing knowledge; the current system is understood to be complicit in epistemic violence through the assertion of a dominant Western, scientific, and positivistic view (Andreotti, 2010c; Mignolo, 2000). This stance rejects one universalizing idea of humanity and sees it as coercive (Andreotti, 2010a). It critiques a post-as-after modernity approach as essentially a neoliberal order that is more complex than a twentieth century way of thinking but reproduces the ways of knowing, thinking, and relating that caused the marginalization of certain groups (see also Marshall, 2009).

In contrast, the post-as-interrogating view takes a more deeply critical approach to pluralising the possibilities of what can be envisioned for education through a critical engagement with the system from within (Andreotti, 2010b, p. 9). This is distinctly different version of learners than the fluid but self-interested individualism of post-as-after modernity. The post-as-interrogating modernity approach encourages the development of a reflexive ethic and healthy scepticism towards normative projects that are invested in achieving consensual universal goals through the elimination of conflict and disagreement. Applying this framework to the topic of this study raises some key implications for educating for global citizenship in a multicultural context. Rather than focusing on multiculturalism as simply good for business or as inclusion into the status quo, a post-as-interrogating modernity vision of GCE would recognize that dominant epistemological and ontological assumptions define social categories and citizen subjectivities (see also Pashby, 2011). Just who counts as a multicultural other and how, and who is a global citizen and how are questions that are embedded in wider systems of power.

Acknowledging the possibility that a post-as-interrogating approach to GCE is currently idealistic, Andreotti (2010b) contends that the approach neither excludes preparing students for the job market nor disallows normative versions of citizenship; GCE can prepare for existing versions of the world in addition to other possibilities. The post-as-after versus post-as-interrogating modernity framework helps to recognize tensions in the philosophical context defining the ways that multiculturalism and GCE are related and conflated. While the framework presents as a binary, it is better understood as an analytical and reflexive tool helping to acknowledge when inherited ontological and epistemological assumptions may not promote a complex and nuanced approach to engaging with systemic differences. Post-as-interrogating modernity promotes a deeper criticality that recognizes there are possibilities for imagining new ways of relating as twenty-first century citizens. Moreover, identifying post-as-after modernity approaches helps to make intelligible the risks of engaging in

what seem like new ways of educating but which may actually reinforce ontological and epistemological assumptions at the core of the very social inequities multicultural and GCE are meant to address.

Research on multicultural and global citizenship education in Canada:
distinguishing ideological connotations

Andreotti's (2010c) framework is consistent with research identifying key discourses that frame citizenship education; there is a dominance of the post-as-after modernity approach both found and critiqued in recent scholarship (Pashby, 2013). Research finds a central inherent tension between neoliberal (individualistic) and critical (systemic) logics (e.g., Knight-Abowitz & Harnish, 2006 in the USA; Marshall, 2009 in the UK). This wider dichotomy in citizenship education theory frames the way multiculturalism and GCE are conflated and assumed to be mutually reinforcing. The work of two scholars – Joshee (2009) on multiculturalism and Richardson (2008) on GCE – demonstrates how this occurs in the Canadian context.

Joshee's (2009) analysis of hundreds of recent and current policy and curriculum documents relating to multicultural education in Canada found a complex interplay of three main ideologies of citizenship and diversity. While there is evidence of neoconservatism at the federal level, in K-12 documents – which are produced at the provincial level – she identified four liberal social justice and four neoliberal discourses with the latter more strongly modifying the former and reflecting a post-as-after modernity approach. Together, the liberal social justice discourses intersect to encourage a nurturing, caring, and just society. The identity-based discourse asserts that cultural identities ought to be supported and developed. The discourse of recognition stresses that not only should individuals' identities be supported but also that diverse cultural identities are valuable to the wider community. The rights-based discourse sees cultural identity as a human right. The discourse of redistribution recognizes that goods and power are unequally distributed among social groups and that this must be addressed (Joshee, 2009). The redistribution discourse has significant potential to open discursive spaces for a post-as-interrogating modernity discourse. It goes beyond recognizing and celebrating diversity to engaging directly with power imbalances and deeper social justice issues around how power is distributed and how to build more equitable relations of power. Yet, it is least often emphasized (Pashby, Ingram, & Joshee, 2014).

Joshee (2009) identified four inter-related neoliberal discourses in Canadian multicultural education documents: the business case, equity of outcomes, equality as sameness, and social cohesion. Echoing a post-as-after modernity approach, the "business case" discourse values multiculturalism "to the extent that it is a resource for international business and provides a strategy for managing workplace diversity" (Joshee, 2009, p. 99). Equity of outcomes expresses that some individuals need help to achieve success in a system that is essentially fair. The equality as sameness discourse acknowledges there are many ways of being different and diverse; those who are not equal want to be treated the same as those in the norm. Finally, the social cohesion discourse promotes a neutral idea that seeing past difference and being nice to others is the key to a strong society and economic prosperity. Joshee (2009) recognized that any alternative view of diversity is easily dismissed within this discourse because any focus on difference poses a challenge to social cohesion. In this sense, it works against a critical engagement with diversity and reduces multiculturalism to getting along as individuals.

Joshee (2009) concluded that multicultural education policy work in Canada is an “on-going dialogue” wherein neoliberal (and at the federal level neoconservative) discourses get modified by liberal social justice discourses and “vice versa” (Joshee, 2009, p. 106). The post-as-after versus post-as-interrogating modernity framework can be applied to her findings to point out the significant extent to which liberal social justice discourses can be conflated with and framed by neoliberal discourses when they fail to challenge the premises of inclusion (see also Mitchell, 2001). If liberal social justice discourses fail to interrogate the assumption that everyone desires inclusion into the same project of modernity based on an assumed unanimity as to what that shared future will entail, they work in tandem with if not in support of business case, equality of outcomes, equity as sameness, and social cohesion. Thus, multicultural education discourse in Canada appears to be a firm reflection of the post-as-after modernity framework while there are some important possible critical spaces opened up, particularly through the redistribution discourse.

Richardson (2008) has done similar work unpacking conceptualizations of GCE in Canada. He identified two distinctly different global imaginaries inherent to contemporary understandings of GCE in scholarly work and curriculum: the ecological imaginary and the monopolar imaginary. First, the ecological imaginary is encapsulated by notions of relationships, interrelatedness, and the importance of physical and cultural diversity. Similar to the liberal social justice discourses of multiculturalism (Joshee, 2009), the ecological imaginary serves to develop in students a sense of connectedness, empathy and appreciation for diversity and differences. Indeed, focusing on a critical view of relations with others, an ecological imaginary probes universalism and interrogates how the idea that ‘we are all the same’ can, despite good intentions, erase differences. It thus questions the privileging of Western ways of knowing, “and posits as a civic ideal a kind of decontextualized liberal democratic state” (Richardson, 2008, p. 60). Yet, a competing imaginary threatens to foreclose the critical potential of the ecological imaginary.

Richardson (2008) found a monopolar imaginary based on individualism and neoliberal economic ideals emphasizes superficial differences, asserting that individuals have the same fundamental wants and needs (see also Shultz, 2007). Similar to the neoliberal discourses operating in multicultural education (Joshee, 2009), in the monopolar imaginary, GCE should develop in 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 (2009) concern about the way that a neoliberal context frames equity and diversity as individual development and social cohesion as interpersonal relations. Concerns about citizenship education in Canada presenting a depoliticized view of good citizenship as good behavior and getting along are well established (see, e.g., Osborne, 2000; Porter, 2012; Reid, Gill, & Sears, 2010).

Applying the post-as-after versus post-as-interrogating modernity framework (Andreotti, 2010b, 2010c) to the work of Joshee (2009) and Richardson (2008), allows for a recognition of two sources of conflation relevant to teasing apart the presumed mutually reinforcing relationship between multiculturalism and GCE. First, understandings of educating global citizens for the twenty-first century may unite around calls for new approaches to meet current realities, but there are (at least) two distinct views: one that moves from a basis in modernity and one that significantly interrogates and challenges the assumptions of modernity. Second, within a post-as-after vision of post-modernity, well-intended liberal social justice views of equity and diversity can sit side by side, conflate with, and become framed by a dominant neoliberal view that forecloses critical

spaces. In this sense, the post-as-after modernity versus post-as-interrogating modernity represents more of a continuum than a binary.

Liberal social justice discourses such as recognition, rights, and identity (Joshee, 2009) may recognize that the project of modernity requires serious and even systemic change, but they may ultimately fall back on modern solutions. A redistribution discourse (Joshee, 2009) may more strongly engage with an interrogation of modernity. Similarly, within an ecological imaginary of GCE (Richardson, 2008), ideas of environmental sustainability education may focus strongly on individual actions and reflect more of a post-as-after modernity approach while ideas of neocolonialism and the re-emergence of unequal relations of global power may engage more of a post-as-interrogating modernity approach. The critical potential of conceptualizing and practicing GCE in a multicultural context can be supported by approaches that “enable educators to engage with a level of complexity in the debate where different perspectives are contemplated”, and where students can “address the interface between mainstream and emergent thinking” (Andreotti & Souza 2008a, p. 7).

Multiculturalism and GCE in practice: critical discourse analysis of the Alberta social studies curriculum

In order to identify overlooked tensions inherent in the assumed positive relationship between multicultural and GCE, I used critical discourse analysis (CDA). I drew on the work of a range of researchers who emphasize a critical dimension (e.g., Fairclough, 2003; Luke, 1994, 2002; MacLure, 2003; van Dijk, 1993). Specifically, I used CDA to study educational texts and find insights into how ideas relating to multiculturalism and global citizenship are conventionalized and formed into taken-for-granted neutral assumptions (Santos, 2010). The educational texts selected were sources for understanding wider tensions and confusions operating in the discursive fields of multiculturalism and GCE. As Kennelly and Llewellyn (2011) 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” (p. 900, see also Bickmore, 2006).

In the research reported here, I considered the wider Social Studies program of study for kindergarten to grade 12. Social Studies is a compulsory core subject in Alberta, and at the end of grade 12 there is a required Social Studies diploma examination; the curriculum draws on subjects across the disciplines of Social Science. In the findings presented here, I draw specifically on the grade 10 course which focuses on globalization. Unit and lesson plans available for teachers of the grade 10 course provide exemplars of the key discourses framing hoped-for classroom practices. I conducted an internet search and found two main sources of publically available lesson plans. The Learn Alberta website is supported and administered by the Digital Design and Resource Authorization Branch of AE and posts a series of lessons in collaboration with the Critical Thinking Consortium. I reviewed twenty-five lessons from Grade 10. I chose to analyze more closely three that most related (implicitly or explicitly) to the relationship between multiculturalism and global citizenship⁷. I also studied lesson documents found 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. Of fourteen lessons posted, I looked closely at four⁸.

The main goal of the empirical study was to break down the use of language in the texts so as to identify what discourses accounted for confluences of the concepts and to

identify unexamined tensions between the fields of multicultural and GCE. The CDA consisted of three stages: a) finding evidence of the existing discourses identified in the wider literature (Joshee, 2009; Richardson, 2008), b) examining how those discourses were connected to expressions of the relationship between multiculturalism and GCE with a particular focus on tensions and contradictions, and c) conducting multiple readings to select examples. I focused on four key expressions of discourse (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006) as related to multiculturalism, GCE, and the relationship between them: (1) claims and evidence put forward, (2) choices of rhetoric (including vocabulary, slogans, style, etc.), (3) promotions of moral and political values, and (4) descriptions of the context from which the text is produced (Knight Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 655). I took particular note of any description of the national context of multiculturalism and of ideas of global citizenship as well as rationales for educating twenty-first century learners.

It is important to note the intention of this research was not to generalize on what is or is not going on in classrooms in Alberta. Rather, it considered an analysis of curriculum documents and endorsed lesson plans as a window into dominant discourses. The claims made in the analysis refer to a wider discursive context of popular and official iterations of multiculturalism, GCE, and their perceived relationships; however, a limitation is that the research did not attempt to examine teachers' and students' understanding of the concepts. Also, while the larger study (Pashby, 2013) provides a number of detailed examples, here I focus on some key quotations from the texts to illustrate how the concepts of multiculturalism and global citizenship are both related and conflated.

Alberta social studies curriculum. The program of studies for Social Studies in Alberta demonstrates both the opening up of critical possibilities, and the potential foreclosure of those possibilities. This is tied to a conflation of neoliberalism and liberal social justice discourses of equity and diversity in a post-as-after modernity approach that fails to engage significantly with tensions and conflicts. Foregrounding complexities provides opportunities to engage with diverse positions and experiences and invite critical dialogue around complexity, difference and uncertainty (Andreotti & Souza, 2008a). This could include questions of equity in regards to the redistribution of power and who is viewed as a citizen and how thereby connecting local and global issues regarding equitable distribution of power and agency. Notably, although evident in the wider character and citizenship education documents (Joshee, 2009; Pashby 2013), the business case for multiculturalism is not strongly emphasized in the program of studies or lesson plans. Liberal social justice discourses of identity, rights, and recognition are there, but these are often framed by neoliberal equality as sameness, equity of outcome, and social cohesion discourses. Importantly, despite a conflation of liberal social justice and neoliberal discourses of diversity, an ecological global imaginary, particularly when combined with the redistribution discourse provides an important critical space for interrogating systemic injustices.

In its stated learning goals, the program of study expresses Canadian pluralism as compatible with and extendable to the wider global community: (1) "understand the principles underlying a democratic society", (2) "demonstrate a critical understanding of individual and collective rights", (3) "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). There are important possibilities in the idea of having a critical

understanding of collective rights. As reflected in much of the scholarly literature, there is a positive vision of cultural diversity as an asset and the development of a sense of global citizenship through responsibility to others and respecting human rights. Yet, as part of a broader turn to neoliberal understandings of multicultural education (Joshee, 2009; Mitchell, 2001, 2003; Sears, 2009), the term pluralism replaces and can depoliticize multiculturalism by focusing on including more ‘differences’ into the political space previously set aside for minority rights relating to racism and discrimination based on ethnicity (Richardson, 2002)⁹. The curriculum document demonstrates the opportunities and foreclosures for a critical approach:

A key component of effective social organizations, communities and institutions is recognition of diversity of experiences and perspectives... 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)

There is evidence of the liberal social justice discourses of identity and recognition. The statement hints that some categories of identity are more significant (e.g., race, socioeconomic conditions and gender) but does not express the redistribution discourse; a trend consistent in the documents (Pashby, 2013). Rather than pointing to and challenging systemic categorizations, this treatment of identity categories prioritizes the variety of individual experiences.

The document expresses the idea, consistent with the neoliberal equality as sameness discourse, that everyone has difference and there are a variety of ways of experiencing identity of which race, socio-economic status, and gender are two. For example, the document defines “a pluralistic view” as “recogniz[ing] that citizenship and identity are shaped by multiple factors such as culture, language, environment, gender, ideology, religion, spirituality and philosophy” (AE, 2005a, p. 1). Here, gender is equivalent to philosophy, and the broader term culture is used rather than ethnicity or race; all differences are included thereby overstepping acknowledgement of conflicts and tensions around systemic differences and de-emphasizing the more systemically binding categories. Thus by reducing differences to a set of individual attributes, a wider neoliberal framing can de-politicize what might otherwise be spaces to evoke a more critical social justice discourse such as redistribution and to promote a post-as-interrogating modernity view that enables a critical and nuanced understanding of systemic inequities. Rather than recognizing the systemic ways certain sets of identity are othered in the Canadian context and engaging in the extent to which there is a virtual mosaic (Jiwani, 2006), the focus is social cohesion through getting along and including everyone.

Appreciating the fact of multiple cultures and diverse individual identities is reflected in the Culture and Community strand of the social studies program of studies. Shared values are assumed to lead to each student expressing individualism and fitting into the status quo:

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)

The liberal social justice discourse of identity is strong in the idea that all students should feel that they belong. In addition, the emphasis on multiple perspectives builds to recognition and the inclusion of multiple visions of Canadian identity. There is an opportunity to connect to differently positioned perspectives and to adjust one's position (Andreotti & Souza, 2008a). The terms "issues" and "change" in this section are vague but potentially significant. "Issues" suggests that there may be tensions inherent to multiple perspectives on culture and community, and "change" may open up the idea of the need to challenge and transform the status quo. However, these are discursive possibilities and the critical potential is there but muted.

It is significant to compare the Culture and Community strand which is framed in a domestic or national version of pluralism with The Global Connections strand. A global framing appears to open a critical space for a post-as-interrogating modernity approach. Pushing from the more neutral description of Canadian pluralism in the Culture and Community strand, the Global Connections strand takes up conflicts and tensions:

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)

Here, an ecological imaginary of global citizenship is articulated through the attention to interdependence. The description of the Global Connections strand includes many concepts and choices of rhetoric that are not used in other sections where the focus of citizenship formation is the national or provincial context. For example, here, rather than a neutral equality as sameness discourse, the term multiple perspectives explicitly relates to a notion of criticality. The liberal social justice discourse of redistribution is at least hinted at through a more direct idea that "tensions" exist around economics and human rights. This is the first time the word conflict is used to describe the nature of individuals and communities. Elsewhere conflict is not connected to multiple identities and is something to be overcome.¹⁰

Therefore, 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 approaches to pluralism that are not framed in a national or provincial lens. The global lens offers a different way of knowing the world from the idea that Canadian citizenship naturally extends from an assets model of national diversity to global citizenship. The stronger iteration of human suffering across the globe could help to encourage self-critique, recognize historicity, and situate global issues in wider power relations reflected in multiculturalism in Canada.

Alberta lesson plans. The Grade 10 course is called "Perspectives on Globalization"¹¹. According to the course description, it "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, 2007, p. 12). This section reports on an analysis of lesson plans created for teachers and made available online for use with this course. The lesson plans provide insights into the ambiguities in the relationship between domestic and global cultural diversity and reflect the

wider confluences and unexamined tensions. Neoliberal discourses frame liberal social justice discourses (Joshee, 2009; Richardson, 2008) within a post-as-after modernity approach to educating the twenty-first century global citizen (Andreotti, 2010b, 2010c).

A SACSC Grade 10 unit on Global Issues reflects the Global Dimension in the program of studies. Students learn about six global issues identified by the Canadian International Development Agency. They are tied to the United Nations Millennium Development Goals: poverty, basic education, HIV/AIDS, children's rights and protection, gender equality, and environmental sustainability. The students research a "developing country" where "quality of life might be questionable with respect to the issues presented":

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)

Importantly, the global frame emphasizes struggles and hardships, recognizing that the human condition is marked by a lack of quality of life for many in the global community, a fact emphasized by the qualifier "undeveloped" countries and regions. There is also a strong underlying assumption that with "knowledge and understanding" of global issues in those parts of the world students in Canada will necessarily feel more responsible and be moved to "act" reflecting the work of Banks (2009) and Merryfield (1996). However, the assumption that students will act upon knowledge of an injustice is challenged by Tarc (2012) who points out that citizenship acting has become part of the neoliberal imaginary despite "critical attention to social justice" in GCE on the part of organizations such as Oxfam (p. 117, see also Sears & Hyslop-Marginson, 2007).

As this unit continues, a view of immigrants as resources for knowledge about global issues is introduced. An option for learning extension suggests "students...interview new Canadians who immigrated to Canada from an identified country [one of the developing countries researched in relation to the six global issues]" (SACSC, n.d.c). Interview questions "could include those specific to quality of life" (SACSC, n.d.c) and his or her experiences with the global issue(s) in question. The assumption is there is a "new Canadian" (racialized) from one of the specified "developing countries" (in the Global South) where quality of life is a problem. By asking about a personal experience, the student interviewer will gain awareness and learn about an issue. An underlying assumption is that the student is not from a developing country nor does she/he have experience with the global problem. The assumed student is not a Canadian who has personal experience with a global problem outside of Canada or in Canada. A related assumption is that Canada does not have global problems. This is an example of the conflation of multiculturalism and GCE within a well-intended approach to inclusion that may contradict the complex lived experience of students and fellow-citizens while reinforcing deficit views of local and global others.

Another possible extension activity suggests students write an essay following the interview by responding to the question "do we as Canadians take for granted our quality of life?" (SACSC, n.d.c.). The main activity has students researching a global problem somewhere in the so-called developing world and not in Canada; thus, it is a leading question. The discourse of re-distribution is evident in the idea of comparing quality of life; and this prompt could indicate an opening of a critical space. However, it appears more as a conflation of a liberal social justice focus on recognition, a hint at redistribution, and

a strong neoliberal equity of outcomes discourse (Joshee, 2009). This conflation, within a post-as-after modernity frame, results in an emphasis on the students' individual enlightenment through a recognition of having taken for granted Canadian quality of life rather than on the complexity of what the new Canadian may have to express about life in Canada or abroad. A very possible unintended consequence of this conflation is a twice othering of the immigrant as a local and global other.

While the SACSC interview activities challenge the assumed extension of Canadian multiculturalism to global citizenship, other lessons further challenge the positioning of a multicultural imaginary in conceptualizing global citizenship by studying the influence of global forces on minority groups in Canada. A unit available online through a collaboration between the ministry of education and a not-for-profit organization called the Critical Thinking Consortium called "Globalization and Cultural Identities" states its main goal: students will "prepare an effective set of questions to gather information about the impacts of globalization on the identities of various groups" (LA, 2008b). Students are to "investigate the impact of globalization on Canada's founding nations and cultural communities by decided whether globalization has, on balance, enhanced or weakened community identities" (LA, 2008b). Importantly, a distinction is made between "founding nations" (the British and the French) and "cultural communities" (a vague term referencing the third silo, presumably immigrants not of British or French descent).

The context of multiculturalism is explicit in the instructions:

Brainstorm possible examples in their own communities of [opportunities and challenges associated with globalization's impact on culture]; e.g., 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. (LA, 2008b)

Here, it is evident that multiple discourses sit side by side within a post-as-after modernity view. Liberal social justice discourses of recognition and identity are evident in the attention to marginalization based on language and culture. These discourses are neutrally positioned beside a global-travel discourse with a strong overall framing of personal enlightenment and development rather than a challenge to systemic inequities. In this unit, multiculturalism and global citizenship are related in the idea of global impacts on cultures, yet, confusingly, they are also distinguished. The fact that teachers must be careful to steer students away from naming domestic factors reflects an attempt to separate the domestic view of respecting differences from a global view of citizenship. On the one hand, Canada's multicultural demographic and official policies of multiculturalism are relevant to the study of the impact of globalization on minority cultural identities in Canada; on the other hand, global effects happen outside of Canada.

Further, students 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?" (LA, 2008b). These questions reflect a combination of the Culture and Community strand and the Global Connections strand of the Program of Studies (AE, 2005a). An ambiguity remains regarding which cultures have been more impacted by globalization. An option suggested to teachers reflects this ambiguity. Teachers can 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” (LA, 2008b). Reflecting the three silos (Kymlicka, 2005), the wealth of diverse identities suggests that Canada benefits from diversity. This assets view of diversity could open important spaces to discuss issues of recognition and identity, and the findings could challenge an assumption of modern progress through Canadian inclusion and recognize how groups are differently positioned. However, given the strong post-as-after modernity framing of the curriculum and the strong equality as sameness discourse of pluralism, it can also be read as another conflation of liberal social justice and neoliberal ideologies and as inherently about social cohesion. Distinctly missing is the redistribution discourse (Joshee, 2009).

Thus, the lesson plans reflect how multiculturalism and GCE are related through some wider concepts: a) global issues and immigrants’ experiences of those issues, b) the impact of globalization on cultures, and c) the challenges of and possibilities for cultural diversity as related to globalization. This study considered the limited amount of lesson plans available online, and it is possible that plenty of teachers are evoking the critical potential in the curriculum in their lessons. However, the lessons promoted by government and community organizations provide insights into dominant discourses and how wider philosophical and ideological conflations can foreclose critical potential in some key ways. Drawing on Joshee’s (2007) work on multiculturalism discourses and Richardson’s (2008) work on imaginaries of GCE, this conflation can be mapped onto Andreotti’s (2010b, 2010c) post-as-after versus post-as-interrogating modernity framework. It is the redistribution discourse that when combined with the global lens articulated in the Global Dimensions strand of the curriculum most strongly represents a space for promoting a post-as-interrogating modernity view of learning for twenty-first century realities. Yet, the redistribution discourse is rarely evident in a national or provincial framing of culture and community. The global connections section of the program of studies discourse is the strongest opportunity for opening up critical space for interrogating an assumption of progress through inclusion in to modernity and for imagining new ways of being and relating as global citizens. The findings thus demonstrate the limitations of the deeply rooted assumption that recognizing systemic injustices extends naturally and neutrally from national to global dimensions and that learning about global injustices necessarily enables an interrogating of justices in local contexts.

Discussion

A great deal of scholarly attention has been given to theoretical concerns around cultural diversity, globalization, and citizenship education (Abdi & Shultz, 2008; Banks, 2004; Openshaw & White, 2005; O’Sullivan & Pashby, 2008). Studies have demonstrated both teachers’ commitments to and discomforts with teaching global issues (Larsen & Faden, 2008; Olser & Starkey, 2003). Despite the range of theoretical and school-based inquiries, little attention has been paid to the deeper philosophical and ideological context in which these two fields relate and conflate. This paper seeks to contribute to updating the field in this regard by examining how GCE is conceptualized within a national Canadian and provincial Albertan context of multiculturalism and GCE. Specially, it considered three inter-related questions: (1) to what extent are the fields of multicultural and GCE related and/or conflated, (2) what tensions within and between the fields are possibly overstepped when they are assumed to be mutually reinforcing, and (3) what are the possibilities and foreclosures for critical approaches to GCE in a multicultural context?

The research finds that both multiculturalism and GCE are discursive fields (Steinberg, 1999) where distinct versions of liberalism are conflated. On the one hand, liberal social justice discourses of identity, rights, and recognition are strong in the documents. On the other hand, the redistribution discourse is less evident and is most strongly emphasized in a global rather than national frame. In this sense, evoking these discourses can either serve as a jumping off point for a more critical approach or can fall back into a neoliberal focus on individual development and skills. Also strongly evident in the documents are the neoliberal discourses of equality as sameness, equity of outcomes, and social cohesion. Critical discourses that represent a post-as-interrogating view of learning for twentieth-century realities are potentially foreclosed by the strong conflation of liberal social justice and neoliberal discourses. Thus discussions fall back on getting along and acknowledging all differences rather than pushing to engage with multiply positioned experiences of difference and diversity.

By mapping out some of the discourses and unexamined tensions in unit and lesson plans, this paper has recognized both the problematic and positive ways cultural pluralism is understood in the context of multiculturalism and in reference to global citizenship. The findings elucidate the broader ideological context in which a populist and political dominance of neo-liberalism is at odds with a call in scholarship for an interrogation of modernist views of progress and efficiency. The fact that liberal social justice discourses exist in the Alberta texts is significant; they represent spaces in which to mediate the wider neoliberal dominance (Joshee, 2009). This study found, similar to Knight Abowitz, and Harnish's (2006) mapping of citizenship discourses in American education documents, that when framed through a global lens, this flexibility is particularly evident. However, the lack of attention to the discourse of redistribution beyond an acknowledgment that Canadian quality of life can be taken for granted indicates that neoliberal discourses mediate those liberal social justice discourses and not vice versa. Both operate within a post-as-after modernity approach to teaching twenty-first century citizens. This approach may fail to significantly account for or challenge systemic inequities.

The Alberta lesson plans are significant in their recognition of complex views of globalization and use of a terminology of complexity and systems (e.g., marginalization, cultural protection). However, the overall assumption remains strongly modernist in the sense that students need to become more aware and then will be able to understand and progress the overall system; tensions are over-stepped. For example, an us-versus-them discourse is constructed through a conflation of multicultural and global citizenship when students are to interview immigrants from those countries where there are assumed to be global issues. Thus the curriculum and lesson plans represent an important move towards multiple perspectives and a critical view of globalization but remain framed by a normative view of culture and diversity as individual experiences. Mapping the way this functions in the Alberta context suggests stronger critical discourses are necessary, and critical GCE represents an important discursive space for promoting complexity, complicity, and historicity in multicultural contexts.

This study may offer some important insights given Alberta's current process towards curriculum redesign, a process that began in 2011 and is expected to end in 2016 (AE, 2014). The findings presented here could be useful as a source of critical reflection on the extent to which the current reform priorities open up or foreclose critical spaces and opportunities. For example, the three framing priorities are students as critical thinkers, ethical citizens, and entrepreneurial spirits (AE, 2011). To what extent is ethical citizenship compatible with entrepreneurial spirit, and to what extent does an ethical approach clash with aspects of entrepreneurship? To what extent will this approach conceptualize

critical thinking so as to meet the needs of ‘twenty-first century learners’ and be “designed in ways that acknowledge complexity, contingency (context-dependency), multiple and partial perspectives and unequal power relations”? (Andreotti, 2010c, p. 241).

This study has demonstrated that a focus on multicultural tensions and contestations of rights, recognition, and redistribution in the Canadian context can open up critical possibilities for understanding interconnections among global and local systems of inequities. It is also important to recognize and strategically interject when these discourses are being conflated with neoliberal discourses; in such a conflation neoliberal discourses mediate liberal social justice discourses so as to depoliticize and individualize what could be openings for critical discourses of citizenship. In a multicultural context GCE can open up dynamic and critical spaces for students to both understand and challenge systemic inequalities. For, as Taylor (2012) reminds us, “a global citizenship education of ‘bringing the world into our classrooms’ forgets that our classrooms are always already in this world” (p. 177; see also Dillabough & Kennelly, 2010). In this way, a multicultural context can open significant critical possibilities for making sense of today’s complexities and for imagining new ways of relating as citizens. Drawing on the critical potential of conceptualizing and practicing GCE in multicultural contexts, these new possibilities for imagining ourselves acting as global citizens can recognize the limitations of and can interrogate rather than operate within inherited ways of relating towards new ways of practicing GCE.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes


1. Pierre Trudeau was Prime Minister of Canada from 1968 to 1979 and from 1980 to 1984 as leader of the Liberal Party. In 1971 his government adopted a policy of multiculturalism, and in 1988, the government of Prime Minister Brian Mulroney – of the Progressive Conservative Party – passed The Multiculturalism Act of 1988. Multiculturalism policy encouraged full participation of all minorities and was implemented in all government agencies, departments, and corporations.
2. Kymlicka (2005) recognizes that this terminology is slightly problematic even though it is 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 descendants of the original immigrants.” (Kymlicka, 2005, n. 1, p. 27).
3. The Aboriginal peoples of Canada are legislated through the Royal Proclamation (1763) and the Indian Act (1876). French Canadians are legislated through Quebec Act (1774), British North America Act (1867), the Official Languages Act (1969), and sections 16-23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (CCRF). Ethnic immigrant groups are legislated through the Parliamentary Statement of Multiculturalism (1971), the Multiculturalism Act (1988), and Section 27 of the CCRF. (Kymlicka, 2005).
4. For a more detailed description of the parallel histories of multicultural education and global education in Canada, see Pashby (2013).
5. Merryfield (1996) points to James Banks, Paulo Friere, Robert Hanvey, Cameron McCarthy, Anna Ochoa, Christine Sleeter, and Carl Grant (p. 20).
6. In fact, similarly to more theoretical pieces (Cort es, 1983; Cole, 1984; Ukpokodu, 1999) the relationship is largely descriptive of the existence of a relationship between the two fields rather than on what possible tensions or conflicts there may be within or between them (see Pashby, 2013).

7. The three lessons I focused on for the Alberta Learning lessons for the grade 10 course included “Globalization and Cultural Identities” (LA, 2008b), “Enhancing Cultural Identities” (LA, 2008a), and “The Future of Collective and Individual Rights” (LA, 2008c).
8. Contributed by Tracey Lyons, a Program Manager at SACSC, I looked at lessons for Unit One of the Grade 10 curriculum which was called Global Issues Awareness: Lesson One “Issues... What Issues?” (SACSC, n.d.a), Lesson Two “Tell Me About It” (SACSC, n.d.b.), Lesson Three “A Lived Experience” (SACSC, n.d.c), and Lesson Four “Preparing and Sharing” (SACSC, n.d.d.).
9. It is outside the purview of this paper to go into detail regarding the intentional favoring of the term pluralism over multiculturalism in the Alberta social studies program of study. In this paper, I continue to use the term multiculturalism to describe the wider discursive field as tied to Canadian policy and popular understandings of the multicultural mosaic as tied to educational practice as set out in the introduction. For more information about the history of a change language and emphasis, see Richardson (2002).
10. Elsewhere in the document 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).
11. There are different versions of the course (e.g. 10–1 “Perspectives on Globalization and 10–2 “Understanding Globalization”) 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.

Notes on contributor

Dr Karen Pashby holds a postdoctoral fellowship at the Centre for Global Citizenship Education at the University of Alberta. From 2013 to 2014, she was a postdoctoral researcher on the Ethical Internationalisation in Higher Education Project at the University of Oulu in Finland where she also represented the Chair of Global Education at multi-stakeholder meetings in Europe. She earned her PhD at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto in a combined program: Philosophy of Education and Comparative, International and Development Education. Previously, she served as a secondary school teacher in Canada and Brazil. She also was a coordinator and instructor in the Global Citizenship and Sustainable Development cohort of the initial teacher education program at OISE/UT.

ORCID

Karen Pashby  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9967-8262>

References

- AE (Alberta Education). (2005a). Social studies: Kindergarten to grade 12. Edmonton: The Crown in Right of Alberta.
- AE (Alberta Education). (2005b). The heart of the matter: Character and citizenship education in Alberta’s schools. Edmonton: The Crown in Right of Alberta.
- AE (Alberta Education). (2007). Social studies 10–1: Perspectives on globalization. Edmonton: The Crown in Right of Alberta.
- AE (Alberta Education). (2011). Framework for student learning: Competencies for engaged thinkers and ethical citizens with an entrepreneurial spirit. Retrieved from <http://education.alberta.ca/media/6581166/framework.pdf>
- AE (Alberta Education). (2014, March 12) Curriculum Design Timeline. Retrieved from <http://education.alberta.ca/media/8383057/curriculumredesigntimeline.pdf>
- Abdi, A., & Shultz, L. (2008). Educating for human rights and global citizenship (pp. 1–10). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft vs. critical global citizenship education. *Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review*, 3, 40–51.
- Andreotti, V. (2010a). Engaging the (geo)political economy of knowledge construction: Towards decoloniality and diversity in global citizenship education. Retrieved from [https://c5.ucalgary.ca/peacestudies/files/peacestudies/Engaging%20the%20\(gео\)political%20economy%20of%20knowledge%20construction.pdf](https://c5.ucalgary.ca/peacestudies/files/peacestudies/Engaging%20the%20(gео)political%20economy%20of%20knowledge%20construction.pdf)
- Andreotti, V. (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.
- Andreotti, V. (2010c). Postcolonial and post-critical global citizenship education. In G. Elliott, C. Fourali, & S. Issler (Eds.), *Education & social change* (pp. 233–245). London: Continuum.
- Andreotti, V., & De Souza, L.M. (2008a). Global learning in the ‘knowledge society’. *ZEP*, 9. Retrieved from http://www.waxmann.com/index.php?idDzeitschriftendetails&no_cacheD1&eIDDdownload&id_artikelDART100990&uidDfrei
- Andreotti, V., & Souza, M. (2008b). Learning to read the world through other eyes: An open access online study programme focusing on engagements with indigenous perspectives of global issues. Derby: Global Education.
- Arnot, M., & Dillabough, J. (2004). A magnified image of female citizenship in education: Illusions of democracy or liberal challenges to symbolic domination? In J. Demaine (Ed.), *Citizenship and political education today* (pp. 158–180). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Banks, J.A. (2004). Introduction: Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 3–15). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Banks, J.A. (2009). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 303–322). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). The paradox of diversity: The construction of a multicultural Canada and “women of color”. *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 23(5), 537–560.
- Basile, C. (2005). Jefferson County open school: Voices of global citizenship. In C. White & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education* (pp. 347–363). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Bickmore, K. (2006). Democratic social cohesion (assimilation)? Representations of social conflict in Canadian public school curriculum. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(2), 359–386.
- Burns. (2008). (Re)imagining the global, rethinking gender in education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 29(3), 343–357.
- Cole, D. (1984). Multicultural education and global education: A possible merger. *Theory into Practice*, 23(2), 151–154.
- Cortés, C. E. (1983). Multiethnic and global education: Partners for the eighties? *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(8), 568–571.
- Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalizing citizenship education? A critique of ‘global education’ and ‘citizenship education’. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(1), 66–89.
- Dei, G. S. (2007). *Racist beware: Uncovering racial politics in contemporary society*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Dillabough, J., & Kennelly, J. (2010). *Lost youth in the global city: Class, culture and the urban imaginary*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Eidoo, S., Ingram, L., MacDonald, A., Nabavi, M., Pashby, K., & Stille, S. (2011). Through the kaleidoscope: Intersections between theoretical perspectives and classroom implications in critical global citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 34(4), 59–84.
- Evans, M., Ingram, L. A., Macdonald, A., & Weber, N. (2009). Mapping the “global dimension” of citizenship education in Canada: The complex interplay of theory, practice and context. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 17–34.
- Ghosh, R. (2002). *Redefining multicultural education*. Toronto: Nelson Thomas Learning.
- Gilbert, J. (2007). Catching the knowledge wave: Redefining knowledge for the post-industrial age. *Education Canada*, 47(3), 1–8.
- Gillborn, D., & Youdell, D. (2009). Critical perspectives on race and schooling. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 173–185). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Florence, KY: Routledge

- Hargreaves, A. (1999). Schooling in the new millennium: educational research for the postmodern age. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 20(3), 333–355.
- Iyer, P. (2004, November). Canada: Global citizen. *Canadian Geographic*. Retrieved from <http://www.canadiangeographic.ca/magazine/nd04/feature.asp>
- James, C. E. (2008). Re/presentation of race and racism in the multicultural discourse of Canada. In A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 97–112). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Jiwani, Y. (2006). *Discourses of denial: Mediations of race, gender, and violence*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Joshee, R. (2004). Citizenship and multicultural education in Canada: From assimilation to social cohesion. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 127–156). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Joshee, R. (2007). Opportunities for social justice work: The Ontario diversity policy web. *The Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations*, 18(1/2), 171–199.
- Joshee, R. (2009). Multicultural education policy in Canada: Competing ideologies, interconnected discourses. In J.A. Banks (Ed.), *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education* (pp. 96–108). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kennelly, J., & Llewellyn, K. R. (2011). Educating for active compliance: Discursive constructions in citizenship education. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6–7), 897–914.
- Knight Abowitz, K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 653–690.
- Kymlicka, W. (1998). *Finding our way: Rethinking ethnocultural relations in Canada*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2003a). Being Canadian. *Government and Opposition*, 38(3), 357–358.
- Kymlicka, W. (2003b). Multicultural states and intercultural citizens. *Theory and Research in Education*, 1(2), 147–169.
- Kymlicka, W. (2005, October). Ethnocultural diversity in liberal state: Making sense of the Canadian model(s). Paper presented at the Art of the State III: Diversity and Canada's Future, Montebello. Retrieved from <http://www.irpp.org/events/archive/aots3/kymlicka.pdf>
- LA (Learn Alberta). (2008a). Social studies: Grade 10: Critical challenge: Enhancing cultural identities: [Lesson plan]. Retrieved from http://www.learnalberta.ca/content/ssoc10/html/enhancingculturalidentities_cc.html
- LA (Learn Alberta). (2008b). Social studies: Grade 10: Critical challenge: Globalization and cultural Identities [Lesson Plan]. Retrieved from http://www.learnalberta.ca/content/ssoc10/html/globalizationandculturalidentities_cc.html
- LA (Learn Alberta). (2008c). Social studies: Grade 10: Critical challenge: The future of Collective Identities [Lesson plan]. Retrieved from http://www.learnalberta.ca/content/ssoc10/html/futureofcollectiveandindividualidentities_cc.html
- Lapayese, Y.V. (2003). Toward a critical global citizenship education. *Comparative Education Review*, 47(4), 493–501.
- Larsen, M., & Faden, L. (2008). Supporting the growth of global citizenship educators. In M. O'Sullivan & K. Pashby (Eds.), *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 91–104). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Luke, A. (1994). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Review of Research in Education*, 21(1), 3–48.
- Luke, A. (2002). Beyond science and ideology critique: Developments in critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22(96–110).
- Marshall, H. (2009). Educating the European citizen in the global age: Engaging with the postnational and identifying a research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(2), 247–267.
- MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in educational and social research*. Buckingham: Open University.
- McIntosh, P. (2004). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 22–39). New York, NY: Teachers College Press
- Mignolo, W. D. (2000). The many faces of cosmo-polis: Border thinking and critical cosmopolitanism. *Public Culture*, 12(3), 721–748.
- Mitchell, K. (2001). Education for democratic citizenship: Transnationalism, multiculturalism, and the limits of liberalism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(1), 58–78.
- Mitchell, K. (2003). Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: From the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28, 387–403.

- Merryfield, M. (1996). Making connections between multicultural and global education: Teacher educators and teacher education programs. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Mitchell, K., & Parker, W. (2008). I pledge allegiance to: Flexible citizenship and shifting scales of belonging. *Teachers College Record*, 110(4), 775–804.
- Myers, J. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the U.S. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(3), 370–394.
- Noddings, N. (2004). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, 289–303.
- Openshaw, R., & White, C. (2005). Democracy at the crossroads. In C. White & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education* (pp. 3–11). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Osborne, K. (2000). Public schooling and citizenship education in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 32(1), 8. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/docview/215638116>
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 243–254.
- O'Sullivan, M., & Pashby, K. (2008). Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives. *Brock Education*, 17, i–iv.
- Pashby, K. (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.
- Pashby, K. (2012). Questions for global citizenship education in the context of the 'new imperialism': For whom, by whom? In V. Andreotti & M. Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 9–26). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pashby, K. (2013). *Related and conflated: A theoretical and discursive framing of multiculturalism and global citizenship education in the Canadian context* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto, Toronto. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1807/35921>
- Pashby, K., Ingram, L., & Joshee, R. (2014). Discovering, recovering, and covering-up Canada: Tracing historical citizenship discourses in K–12 and adult immigrant citizenship education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 37(2), 458–483.
- Parker, W. (2011). "International education" in U.S. public schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3–4), 487–501.
- Pike, G. (2008). Reconstructing the legend: Educating for global citizenship. In A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 223–237). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Porter, A. (2012). Neo-conservatism, neo-liberalism and Canadian social policy: Challenges for feminism. *Canadian Women's Studies*, (29), 19–31.
- Porter, J. (1965). *The vertical mosaic: An analysis of social class and power in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Richardson, G. H. (2002). A border within: The western Canada protocol for social studies education and the politics of national identity construction. *Revista Mexicana de Estudios Canadienses*, 4, 31–46. Retrieved from <http://www.amec.com.mx/revista/004/07%20A%20Border%20Within.pdf>
- Richardson, G. (2008). Conflicting imaginaries: Global citizenship education in Canada as a site of contestation. In M. O'Sullivan & K. Pashby (Eds.), *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 53–70). Rotterdam: Sense.
- 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]. Retrieved from <http://sacsc.ca/senior-high-lesson-plans-social-studies/>
- SACSC (The Society for Safe and Caring Schools & Communities). (n.d.b). Grade 10 social studies, English language arts: Unit one: Global issues awareness: Lesson two: Tell me about it [Lesson plan]. Retrieved from <http://sacsc.ca/senior-high-lesson-plans-social-studies/>
- SACSC (The Society for Safe and Caring Schools & Communities). (n.d.c). Grade 10 social studies, English language arts: Unit one: Global issues awareness: Lesson three: A lived experience [Lesson plan]. Retrieved from <http://sacsc.ca/senior-high-lesson-plans-social-studies/>

- SACSC (The Society for Safe and Caring Schools & Communities). (n.d.d). Grade 10 social studies, English language arts: Unit one: Lesson four: Global issues awareness [Lesson plan]. Retrieved from <http://sacsc.ca/senior-high-lesson-plans-social-studies/>
- dos Santos, A. I. (2010). The Discourses of OERs: how flat is this world?. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 2008(1), Art-11.
- Sears, A. (2009). Guest editor's introduction. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 1–3.
- Sears, A., & Hyslop-Marginson, E. J. (2007). Crisis as a vehicle for educational reform: The case of citizenship education. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 41(1), 43–62.
- Reid, A., Gill, J., & Sears, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Globalization, the nation-state and the citizen: dilemmas and directions for civics and citizenship education*. London: Routledge.
- Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 53(3), 248–258.
- Sleeter, C. (2014). Multiculturalism and education for citizenship in a context of neoliberalism. *Intercultural Education*, 25(2), 85–94.
- Steinberg, M. W. (1999). The talk and back talk of collective action: A dialogic analysis of repertoires of discourse among nineteenth-century English cotton spinners. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 105(3), 736–780.
- Tarc, P. (2012). How does 'global citizenship education' construct its present? The crisis of international education. In V. Andreotti & M. Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 105–123). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Taylor, L. (2012). Beyond paternalism: Global education with preservice teachers as a practice of implication. In V. Andreotti & M. Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 177–199). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tikly, L. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative Education*, 40(2), 173–198.
- Todd, S. (2008). Facing humanity: The difficult task of cosmopolitan education. [Submitted to the PESGB (Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain)]. Retrieved from http://www.philosophy-of-education.org/conferences/pdfs/Sharon_Todd.pdf
- Ukpokodu, N. (1999). Multiculturalism vs. globalism. *Social Education*, 63(5), 298–300.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(1), 249–284.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Zufiaurre, B. (2007). Education and schooling: from modernity to postmodernity. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 15(2), 139–151.