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Abstract

The International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme (IB MYP) is a curriculum framework for students aged 11 – 16 that ‘aims to develop active young learners who are internationally-minded’. It is popular in international schools around the world and is currently used in 1,356 schools in 108 countries, more than half of which describe themselves as international schools. The ‘global’ is ever present in MYP policy and curriculum documents, and discourses around global citizenship feature strongly, yet only one IB publication directly addresses global citizenship education.

This study explores global citizenship education in MYP policy and curriculum documents. It provides critical reflection on concepts of global citizenship evident in the programme’s main framework policy document for the MYP, an IB position paper on global citizenship, and two case study unit plans. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is used to examine language structures around global citizenship, investigating configurations of global citizenship constituted within Western, neoliberal-oriented concepts associated with globalisation.

Four key findings emerged from the analysis: first, that ‘international education’ may be understood as a platitude for private education; second, the programme has evolved into a curriculum framework that can be used in any kind of school setting globally in which the school can afford to pay the IB’s fees. Third, the programme blends the language of progressive education with the language of neoliberal globalisation in its promotion of global citizenship education. Finally, the study concludes that the IB, by subtly fusing the language of Western-oriented neoliberalism with that of global citizenship, orientates its focus towards growth in numbers of schools using the programme, attracting ever-greater numbers of customers and expanding its influence.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction to the Study

1.1 Introduction to the chapter
In this chapter I present the focus and aims of the study and set out the contents of the introductory chapter. The focus of the study is to explore the International Baccalaureate (IB) Middle Years Programme (MYP) curriculum framework through a critical discourse analysis (CDA) in relation to global citizenship. I introduce the study aims, the problem the study seeks to address and the background to the study. Research questions are then detailed, along with their justification, along with a discussion of the significance of the study as well as justification for the research. Next, the design of the study is briefly addressed, with an introduction to critical discourse analysis and researcher positionality. I then relate the policy context of the study before concluding.

1.2 Introduction to the study
The heart of this dissertation is a critical discourse analysis of policy and curriculum documents published by the IB. The IB is an organisation that provides curriculum frameworks for international schools, and one such curriculum framework is the MYP for students aged 11 – 16. As a provider of curricula for international schools, there is – and has always been – a significant thread of policy and curriculum content pertaining to global citizenship, global engagement and ‘international-mindedness’ (ibo.org) in IB publications. Definitions for each of these terms are contested, and claims around these terms have evolved as the organisation has grown over the last 45 years, with more schools than ever before currently choosing to use IB curricula, including the MYP. With this growth, the IB is expanding its educational influence globally, making it timely, therefore, to examine the discourse around global citizenship, global engagement and international-mindedness both in IB policy and curriculum documents and in the wider critical literature around the organisation.

1.3 Aims of the research study
The aims of this study are to:
1. analyse discourses and concepts of global citizenship evident in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents.

2. examine what version of global citizenship education is promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents.

3. explore the implications for social justice of IB MYP global citizenship education policy and curriculum discourses.

These aims create a focus for the research through which the purpose of the study becomes clear and the analytical intentions at the centre of the experience can be seen in summary form. The aims help to provide a platform for the analysis of the selected documents, detail the concepts the research will attempt to address and offer an outline of the parameters of the study.

1.4 The problem the research seeks to address
This study seeks to address tensions embedded in the goals of the IB MYP curriculum framework. According to published IB literature, IB curricula are vehicles for the establishment, development, support for and acceptance of cultural and economic parity in a global context. Its mission statement concludes with the claim that IB ‘programmes encourage students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right’ (IB, 2014h). This claim is filtered through policy documents as a statement of intent, and it is found in subject guides and curriculum planning tools in the form of contexts for learning. Contexts for learning are described as ‘authentic world settings, events and circumstances’ (IB, 2014, pg. 18). This is followed by the claim that ‘students at the MYP age range learn best when their learning experiences have context and are connected to their lives and to the world’ (pg. 18). There is no explanation as to what qualifies as an authentic setting, nor any suggestion as to how connections to students’ lives and ‘the world’ might be facilitated. But the claim is maintained and summarized with the assertion that:
in a world of increasing interconnection and complexity, learning in contexts provides students with opportunities to explore multiple dimensions of meaningful challenges facing young people in the world today, encouraging them to develop creative solutions and understanding (pg. 18).

The overall tone of this section of the document is idealistic rather than pragmatic, but it offers evidence of the philosophical underpinnings of the MYP as a curriculum for global citizens in international education settings. While the use of such language as ‘active, compassionate, and lifelong learners’ can appear to favour a version of global citizenship that has social equality at its core, these documents also contain distinctly marketised language around concepts of global citizenship, global engagement and international-mindedness with the claim that ‘global competence calls for deep, engaged learning. To prosper in the world, students must not only be able to understand globalisation, but to be able both to reflect critically on its promise and peril’ (IB, 2014, pg. 18). The IB publication ‘Towards a Continuum of International Education’ (2008) maintains that ‘effective learning for life in the 21st century recognizes that:

- the knowledge base is increasing rapidly, requiring learners to process and evaluate knowledge, not just acquire it
- the world is changing rapidly, requiring learners to anticipate the unknown and adapt to change, not just respond to it
- employment prospects increasingly require an ability to transfer skills and learning’ (pg. 13)

In other words, IB MYP policy and curriculum documents appear to suggest compatibility between deep, engaged learning and neoliberal globalisation. As these claims are made without evidence, this study aims to investigate how and why they have been incorporated into the MYP discourse.

The IB was founded in 1968 with the formulation of the pre-university Diploma Programme for students aged 16 to 19, ending with examinations designed to assess students for university suitability. Dissonant combinations of
concepts such as those mentioned above are not new to the International Baccalaureate Organisation (IBO), as it was originally named. Early in its existence, the IBO used the following allegorical description to explain the thinking behind their budding education programme:

One of the ‘new men’ [sic] of the late twentieth century is the employee of an international organisation or corporation to whom the world is home, and to whom his native country has ceased to have the dominant magnetic pull - at least until his retirement - of earlier eras. In a working life of forty years he may live in four or five countries; in the ten or fifteen years while his children are at school, two or three. Their education...is one of his major concerns. He will not work where they cannot study on a well-defined plan, and the appeal of boarding school in a distant country is growing less every year, in spite of increasingly easy communications (IBO, 1970, pg. 1).

From its earliest inception, the organisation began with the intention of serving a globally mobile elite, and this pragmatic rationale was soon reflected in IB policy with what Cambridge (2010) describes as a blend of progressive education and ‘currency for university entrance’ (pg. 205). This early synthesis between the two appears to have become entrenched in IB policy and curriculum document development, attempting to offer possibilities for consistent programmes of international education directed from a central policy source.

Indeed, an initial review of published IB documents and the critical literature around the IB reveals that while the language of IB publications is distinctly international, the organisation itself is distinctly centralised and focused on the Global North, with its foundation offices in Geneva and Cardiff, and its global centres in Bethesda (USA), The Hague and Singapore. The ideas promoted through the IB’s centrally developed publications need to be open to adaptation to dramatically diverse local educational contexts around the world (Bunnell, 2011a). Furthermore, whereas the intentions of the various IB programmes can be said to endorse or even encourage human cultural diversity, the reality is that it is only a small minority of economically secure students can engage in IB educational experiences. One of the ideas guiding this study is that an IB-educated elite might benefit politically, socially or economically from learning discourses of
international-mindedness and the celebration of human cultural diversity whilst maintaining their privileged position in the status quo of social reproduction and hierarchy.

These accusations were recognised early on by the IB, whose Bulletin Number 10 from 1974 expressed concern that the Diploma programme could be accused of ‘catering for privileged students’ (pg. 15). The same document develops a response to its own concern by explaining that any perceived elitism ‘was not of a social character but based on a selection to meet the real needs of the contemporary world’ (IBO, 1974, pg. 17). In other words, whilst accepting that international schools with IB curricula are open to the charge of being elitist, any concerns in this regard do not fall within the range of responsibilities of the IB, since they are more to do with criteria schools used to select students for IB schools than deliberate elitism.

This seems a specious argument when student selection for IB schools, even back in 1974, was based on which students’ families could afford to send them to a fee paying international school. The claim that this practice ‘was not of a social character’ is unclear and is not explained in the document, nor addressed in later policy documents. The claim is, perhaps, deliberately vague, when in my own experience as a teacher in three different IB international schools in two different countries, selection is based primarily on an ability to pay and secondarily on academic suitability. This means that the perceived elitism discussed in the Bulletin Number 10 from 1974 was, in contrast to the claims of the document, almost entirely of a ‘social’ character, given that the ability to pay school fees elevates those who can above those who can’t.

The enquiry at the centre of this study, therefore, stems from a combination of personal experience and curiosity. Personal experience suggests that the policy message of the IB to ‘promote intercultural understanding and respect, not as an alternative to a sense of cultural and national identity, but as an essential part of life in the 21st century’ (ibo.org) can be taken at face value and is often evidenced in teaching and learning situations. Research literature critiquing
the IB suggests that the IB’s:

values are primarily driven by principles governed by policies set out by
the United Nations and other such agencies, whilst its aspirations
represent the organisation’s business growth strategy, which is driven by
a capitalist market model. The outcome is an educational model for a global
neo-liberal elite (House, 2015, pg. 16).

This study aims to examine these apparent contradictions at an important
time in history for both the IB and for international education in general. Increases
in the numbers of people living and working outside their country of origin are
leading to increased demands for international education (Bunnell, 2011a, pg.
168), which could be significant for this study in that any findings or insights might
be said to apply to an increasing population of an increasingly internationally
mobile demographic. The recent growth in uptake of IB programmes reflects these
increases in overseas employment, as more families seek schooling and a
curriculum for their child that is at once international and transferable from one
IB school to another, regardless of geographical location.

1.5 Background to the study

The term ‘curriculum framework’ is used by the IB for their Primary and Middle
Years programmes, and it differs from a prescribed and mandatory curriculum –
as used in the IB Diploma\(^1\) – in that in the former cases individual teachers or
teams of teachers have considerable discretion to develop curriculum content
within the structure provided by a specific curriculum framework. Having
achieved significant expansion of the Diploma programme by the late 80s, the IB
grew to offer three additional programmes as part of its intention to ‘develop
inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and
more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect’ (ibo.org).
These include the Primary Years Programme (PYP – for students aged 3-11); the

---

\(^1\) The IB Diploma is a two-year pre-university programme for students aged 16 – 19.
Middle Years Programme (MYP - for children aged 11-16); and the Career-Related Certificate (IBCP), which came into being in 2014.

The rationale behind the creation of the IB is complex, stemming from a combination of practical need and Cold War socio-political tensions. In the sense of practical need, the Diploma programme in particular was intended for the children of transient diplomats and the English speaking heads of growing multinational corporations whose corporate responsibilities took them overseas for years at a time. In the sense of political need, Peterson (1972) described the IB Diploma as an ‘educational Nansen passport’ ²(pg. 19), serving Western-oriented educational ideals in opposition to those of the communist East. Given that the first Nansen passports were created to serve Russian refugees fleeing Bolshevism, the description is fitting. Thus there have always been both economic and ideological drivers behind the curriculum, and as the West has become increasingly influenced by neoliberal agendas, I wish to investigate if the IB and its programmes have become increasingly neoliberalised to meet the changing demands of paying customers.

1.6 Research Questions and Justification

Research questions form a crucial part of the study, providing a focus for exploration and ‘framing the research, which entails making sense of what you are doing and what it means’ (Wellington et al., 2005, pg. 56). It is to this end that the following questions have been developed:

1. What discourses and concepts of global citizenship are evident in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?

2. What version of global citizenship education is promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?

² Nansen passports were developed by the League of Nations in 1922 for refugees and stateless persons who required travel documents but did not qualify for them from any national authority. They were the precursor to the United Nations’ current certificate of identity.
3. What are the implications for social justice of IB MYP global citizenship education policy and curriculum descriptions?

1. What discourses and concepts of global citizenship are evident in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?

Research question 1 has been developed to facilitate investigation into the problem the research seeks to address, namely the apparent contradiction between the language of global citizenship education, global engagement and international-mindedness and that of free market economics used in IB MYP publications. Question 1 is the question most central to this study in that it aims to allow for the fulfilment of the study’s main aims. The focus on documentary evidence allows for a concentrated critical analysis of the language used by the IB in its perceptions of itself as an organisation, its perceptions of global citizenship, its perceptions of international education and its historical journey from inception to current situation.

2. What version of global citizenship education is promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?

Research question 2 aims to stimulate an exploration of the IB’s promotion of global citizenship education. This research question facilitates a critical discourse analysis of the documents selected for this study (see Chapter 4). It aims to explore MYP documents for evidence of global citizenship education terminology and to examine ways in which global citizenship education is promoted as part of the MYP.

3. What are the implications for social justice of IB MYP global citizenship education policy and curriculum descriptions?

Research question 3 involves the analysis of IB MYP policy and curriculum documents for their implications around global social equality. This will test if IB claims and perceptions around global citizenship education, global engagement
and international-mindedness translate to attempts to critically engage with and address issues around global social equality.

### 1.7 Justification for the study

International schools first came into being after the First World War and grew in number – and therefore influence – in the years following World War Two. In 1968 the IB was formed in Geneva, Switzerland, expanding steadily to leave the organisation currently as arguably the most prestigious and successful of its kind, experiencing a 20% growth year on year from 1990 to 2010 (IB, 2010b). This expansion has coincided with:

- advances in science, technology and engineering that have led to greater comfort, increased ease of transportation and communication, and a growth in leisure for the privileged in the developed world and for some of those in the less developed world (Hayden, 2006, pg. 5).

Just as these advances have influenced other areas of human interaction, so they have influenced international education – most noticeably by increasing the demand for schooling - but also by changing the nature of curriculum offerings in international schools to reflect perceptions of the growing importance of information and communications technology, a global perspective and global awareness of issues and opportunities on an international scale.

Within this corpus, Hill (2006) describes the effects of neoliberalism in education as the:

- effective elimination of much comprehensive (all-intake, all-ability), public secondary schooling. Commercialization and marketization have led to school-based budgetary control, a ‘market’ in new types of state schooling, and the effective ‘selling off’ of state schools to rich and/or religious individuals or groups via the Academies scheme (pg. 2).

Hirtt (2004) suggests that the core neoliberal influence on education is the attempt to ‘adapt education to the needs of business and at the same time reduce state expenditure on education’ (pg. 446).
This study aims to investigate evidence of neoliberal influences in IB MYP curriculum and policy documents and whether this has led to the promotion of neoliberalism in IB MYP international schools. I aim to explore whether the IB has participated – knowingly or unknowingly – in the social injustice alluded to in the above quote from Mary Hayden. If, as Hayden claims, current technological advances have favoured a privileged minority, are international schools catering for that minority and do IB international schools, in particular, offer a curriculum framework, a reputation and a prestige that channels existing privilege into increased privilege for an internationally itinerant global elite? If so, and if evidence for this trend can be found through this study, then perhaps it can help to inform the discourse around neoliberalism in international education.

1.8 Significance of the study

These issues are particularly significant at this point in history. The IB remains prone to the accusation that it is simply serving to support the existing privilege of ‘an elite group of candidates’ (Bunnell, 2011a, pg. 168-169). International schools can themselves be thought of as a challenge to traditional ideas of education in that they often facilitate a ‘detachment of education from its local and national roots and the transformation of its historical purpose in consolidating national identity and citizenship’ (Bates, 2011, pg. 13). If that national identity is indeed being replaced with an international model, then what does that model look like and how are organisations like the IB conceptualizing students within international education?

The IB’s strategic plan for 2011 – 2014, as envisaged in the November 2011 publication ‘Impact Through Leadership in International Education: Our Vision and Strategic Goals 2011-2015’, has as one of the stated objectives for this period the intention to ‘work with and involve as many people as possible in our work’ (IB, 2010b, p. 2). This cryptic statement is, perhaps, evidence of the IB’s intentions to expand their business. As of June 2016, nearly half the schools currently using the IB MYP curriculum framework globally are state-financed schools in Canada.
and the United States (Bunnell, 2016). This recent expansion into the state school sector in some of the world’s strongest economies means that the MYP is growing in influence; historically located in fee-paying private schools in some of the world’s weaker economies, the MYP is now becoming embedded in countries with strong economies whose expenditure on education is enough to pay for the MYP in the state sector. Analysis of the results of this changing influence is one of the recommendations for further study emerging from this research and will be discussed later. But these changes in influence mean that this analysis of global citizenship and global citizenship education as promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents is timely.

1.9 Study Design

Methodology

This study will consist of a critical discourse analysis of a selection of policy and curriculum documents and case study unit plans of the IB MYP. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) deals with the ‘struggle and transformation in power relations and the role of language therein’ (Fairclough, 1992, pg. 2). It operates under the assumption that different areas of society use different types of language, and that analysis of this context-specific language can both broaden understanding of societal situations and serve to inform and change them. In the context of social justice, with which this study is concerned, CDA should address ‘the discourse dimensions of power abuse and the injustice and inequality that result from it’ (van Dijk, 1993, pg. 252). But it should also seek to offer analysis that has the power to transform the aspects of society it examines.

Fraser's (2000) three dimensions of social justice will provide the theoretical framework for analysis of any social justice issues emerging from the CDA. The first of these dimensions, redistribution, deals with barriers to participation in social life that stem from economic inequality. Recognition, Fraser's second analytical dimension, focuses on cultural barriers to equal
participation in social interactions, including barriers stemming from race, gender, sexuality, religion or nationality. Fraser’s third analytical dimension, *representation*, allows for analysis of equitable participation in the political sphere of society. Combined, these three analytical dimensions are used to explore ‘parity of participation’, which Fraser argues is necessary for conditions that could support social justice.

### 1.10 Researcher Positionality

Clearly and consistently stating one’s positionality during research ‘is designed to reveal forgotten choices, expose hidden alternatives, lay bare epistemological limits and empower voices which had been subjugated by objective discourse’ (Lynch, 2000, pg. 36). I carry my own epistemological and ontological assumptions into the research design and experience. My preconceptions, interpretations and the choices I make influence the shape and conduct of the research. In reflecting in this way upon my positionality, I am recognising that my own involvement is integral to the research, and ‘that knowledge and understanding are contextually and historically grounded, as well as linguistically constituted’ (Mauthner and Doucet, 2003, pg 3).

This study has been stimulated in large measure by my own teaching experiences in IB international schools, which encompasses eight years in three schools in Romania and Qatar, during which I taught four IB subjects (Theory of Knowledge, Language B, Language and Literature, and Humanities) from 2005 to 2013. This professional experience exposed me to MYP curricula frameworks, planning materials and planning protocols through which I developed and taught MYP units to students aged 11 – 16. During these experiences, I noticed an undercurrent of perceptions of student global citizenship emanating initially from IB curriculum documents supported by school websites and other publications, and occasionally in teaching and learning situations. I sometimes contributed to this uncritical promotion of global citizenship without ever understanding the term, how students might understand the term, how the schools understood the term and – in particular – how the IB explained it.
These personal uncertainties arising from my teaching experiences led me to investigate the IB’s position on global citizenship, which influenced this study’s research questions and the choice of research method. I thought a critical discourse analysis approach would allow for a detailed analysis of IB documents pertaining to global citizenship. These points, and a more detailed rationale for the selection of documents and the methodological approach, will be discussed in the Methodology chapter.

1.11 Chapter conclusion

A literature review follows this introductory chapter, with discussions around the main themes arising from a critical review of the literature on the topics presented in this introduction. The literature review will include discussion of key issues and debates and will critically review literature focusing on the IB’s curriculum frameworks and their relation to the problem the study seeks to address. Chapter 3 will address methodology, including researcher positionality and limitations of methodology. Chapter 4 will focus on the critical discourse analysis of relevant IB documents. It will include a section on social justice issues emerging from the CDA, which will be analysed through Fraser’s (2000) three dimensional analytical framework. Chapter 5 will offer a discussion of the study’s overall findings, particularly in relation to the research questions and address any findings in relation to existing literature. Chapter 6 will serve as the study’s final conclusion, addressing each of the research questions in turn, making any recommendations in relation to policy, practice or further research, and reflecting on limitations of the study as well as the wider personal experience of conducting research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction
This study is located in the field of international education, with particular emphasis on global citizenship and global citizenship education. This chapter explores the role of a literature review before addressing the aims of the study through analysis of relevant critical literature in the context of the study’s three research questions.

A literature review is considered by many scholars as crucial to locating any research study in the context of existing work around similar research discourses. The purpose of the literature review is to identify key issues and debates in the field and to allow for critical reflection that can provide insights into the research study. This can strengthen the research study by providing an ‘inquiry trail’ (Wellington et al., 2005, pg. 73) that connects the research to wider discourses. Ridley (2008) describes the literature review of any study as ‘part of the thesis where there is extensive reference to related research and theory in your field’ (pg. 2), and where the selection and exclusion of texts helps to clarify the purpose and direction of the research study.

With these considerations in mind, the literature review for this study has been organised into nine sections, from 2.1 to 2.9, each of which will make regular reference to the study’s three research questions:

1. What discourses and concepts of global citizenship are evident in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?
2. What version of global citizenship education is promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?
3. What are the implications for social justice of IB MYP global citizenship education policy and curriculum descriptions?

Using these research questions as a basis for organising the chapter, Section 2.2 examines the concept of global citizenship through critical discussion of literature
relating to citizenship, modern citizenship, progressive citizenship, globalisation, neoliberalism, the knowledge based economy, neoliberal global citizenship and the IB’s self-generated concept of international-mindedness.

Section 2.3 looks at global citizenship education; I refer to Vanessa Andreotti’s (2006a) framework for examining ‘soft’ and ‘critical’ citizenship education and look at the material dimension of citizenship education, the cultural dimension, and the contrast between forms of global citizenship education. Section 2.4 looks at international education because the IB MYP is used predominantly in international schools. In Section 2.5 I critically review the IB literature, its place in the contested space of international education and its own evolution as an international education provider. This will be followed in Section 2.6 with an analysis of neoliberalism, particularly as it might be influencing international education. Section 2.7 aims to explore neoliberalism more specifically in the context of the IB, and Section 2.8 looks at Fraser’s (2000) theoretical framework for social justice. The chapter will end with a conclusion in which the key issues and debates emerging from the literature review will be discussed.

2.2 Global citizenship

Global citizenship is a contested concept with a history going back to the 18\textsuperscript{th} Century philosophies of Emmanuel Kant. Kant’s ideas were revived following World War 1 and – in particular - World War 2, with the establishment of the United Nations and the beginning of the Cold War. Davies (2006) argues that political, academic and media perceptions of global citizenship became prominent in the literature around international relations after the First World War, with increases in global education which tended to emphasise international awareness to students whose families lived away from their country of origin for years at a time (p. 6). She suggests that global citizenship began to be woven into the vocabulary of international education in response to shifts in political language towards human rights and the shared responsibilities of humanity. These shifts resulted from the formation of the League of Nations in 1920, which aimed to prevent, through arbitration, further armed conflicts and to improve the rights of
citizens in its member states.

Kant (1991) is perhaps most influential in philosophical discussions around global citizenship, asserting that ‘a violation of rights in one part of the world is felt everywhere’ (pg.107-108). In an expansion on his 1795 idea of ‘universal hospitality’ (pg. 105), Kant broadens the idea of social contracts pertaining to nation states by extending these rights and responsibilities to a vision of a global society. Isin and Wood (1999) suggest that this concept of a global society, both in principal and in practice, is governed by shared international agreements, similar to United Nations declarations, the World Bank's statement on making stateless individuals global citizens, and the European Union's Fundamental Rights Charter. However, this understanding of global society represents much more an ideal of global citizenship than a legal or political framework, and as such is located more in the realm of philosophical aspiration than legal reality. It is therefore useful to look at the idea of citizenship in and of itself in order to more appropriately locate any relationships between citizenship and global citizenship.

2.2.1 Citizenship

Held (1999) defines citizenship as a set of rights and obligations to which the citizen body is subject and which spell out and protect citizen rights, whether local or global. He suggests that citizenship is concerned with processes of social and political participation in society (or societies) which simultaneously reflect and challenge societal norms and tie the citizen population to each other, both in groups and as individuals, in some shared sense of community. For Held, both within groups and as individuals, ideas of citizenship can be influenced by factors such as country of origin, parentage, geographical location of birth or of residence, or – in terms of legal framework – as defined by rights and responsibilities within a specific political entity, such as a nation state.
Delanty (2000) and Dower (2003), also write of citizenship in these broader terms, as a sense of identity within an evolving social and political situation in which the citizen might drive change or seek to expand their citizenship rights and responsibilities. However, the practicalities of these enhancements of global citizenship are left unstated, ostensibly, in Delanty, as a result of the fluidity of the political situation in which any definition of global citizenship might exist; in Dower (2003) they are attached in theory to United Nations declarations, which are themselves intangible outside the agreement of particular nation states to respect the values inherent in the declarations. Even so, Archibugi (2003) pursues this largely philosophical vision of citizenship, asking ‘why shouldn’t’:

the process of democracy - which has already overcome a thousand obstacles within individual states - assert itself beyond national borders, when every other aspect of human life today, from economy to culture, from sport to social life, has a global dimension? (pg.10).

However, Szerszynski and Urry (2002) take a more critical view of what they call 'banal globalism' (pg. 467), in which information and communications technology, mass media and popular culture host platitudes of global citizenship that are intangible and that do not translate to any action around citizenship. This is significant for this study in that the research questions have been formulated to support the critical analysis of IB policy and curriculum documents relating to perceptions and claims around global citizenship education. Indeed, it was my concerns around the IB’s possible use of ‘banal globalism’ in its publications that originally prompted this research study.

The turn of the 21st Century has seen scholars wrestle with the nature, or structure, of global citizenship, with Heater (2002) proposing a framework of four essential elements including an infinity with a global human community, a common cause (such as opposition to climate change), acceptance of United Nations declarations around human rights and international law, and – perhaps
least tangible of all – a desire for positive change on a world scale. Dower (2003) suggests a three contingent organization of global citizenship values; first as a normative assertion in that it makes demands and raises questions about human behavior and human morality; second, as an existential declaration of the state of the contemporary world; and thirdly as an aspirational basis for the development of future legal and institutional frameworks that make global citizenship a binding agreement as well as a state of mind, with global citizens accepting ‘certain kinds of engagement as an ’active’ global citizen in exercising responsibility or asserting universal rights’ (pg.13-14). Typographies of this type are useful as frames of reference for analysis of global citizenship, but the work of both Heater and Dower has been superseded by more recent research, including that of Vanessa Andreotti (2006a), and will be discussed in Section 2.3.

Walker (2006) argues that global citizenship can be developed through existing transnational organisations such as the United Nations, and that ‘sharing our humanity has become a matter of life and death (pg. 80).’ Whilst the language of this statement may seem dramatic, Walker’s intentions are to highlight the benefits of international cooperation that can lead to peaceful conflict resolution and the sharing of resources, where ‘the very best response is the creation of global institutions like the United Nations and sister organizations, which, although imperfect, represent a formidable, tangible expression of our desire to share our humanity’ (pg. 80). Likewise, Stromquist (2002) seemingly accepts the assertion without question that there exists a collective will, as well as an inherent ability among people in societies around the world to become global citizens, concentrating instead on models for enacting this desire. Beginning with existing transnational organisations, Stromquist argues that a gradual reordering of social, political and economic structures to bring them under supranational authority could create the conditions for global citizenship.

There is, however, opposition regarding the idea of global citizenship,
firstly from those who consider it too abstract and unworkable (Parekh, 2003; Smith, 1991), and then from those who see aspirations around global citizenship as an attempt to undermine the citizenship of people’s immediate social and political communities both within and without the nation state (Hobsbawm, 1996). Parekh (2003) describes the notion of a world state as ‘remote, bureaucratic, oppressive and culturally bland’ (pg. 1067). It would be preferable, Parekh argues, for people to contribute to the global community by first being active, responsible citizens within their own nation state. And Smith (1991) writes that a ‘global culture answers no living needs and conjures no memories; it strikes no chord among the vast masses of peoples divided in their habitual communities’ (pg. 24).

Consideration of the concept of global citizenship is also cited as an indulgence that only the wealthy and privileged of the world can afford. Davies and Reid (2005) explain that when ‘one is barely scraping a subsistence level of income, daily fear of malnutrition and disease, imagining oneself as a world citizen is an unaffordable luxury, even in the unlikely event that the concept is known or comprehensible’ (pg. 163). Zolo (1997) is similarly critical in highlighting the cultural and economic relativity of global citizenship, pointing out the disparities between countries with strong economies, which are largely in the Global North, and those with weaker economies, that are largely in the Global South. This could open proponents of global citizenship to accusations of cultural colonialism, with national and/or ethnic identities being replaced by a strongly Western-oriented version of global citizenship. Hobsbawm (1996) summarises these concerns when he writes that ‘the concept of a single, exclusive and unchanging ethnic, or cultural or other identity is a dangerous piece of brainwashing’ (pg. 1067).

Discussions around the concept of global citizenship are far from over, with no firm definition, little agreement on how, and if so, how global citizenship should be developed, and little agreement on whether global citizenship would be either
possible or even beneficial. The research questions guiding this study aim to provide a platform from which to identify and critically explore how the IB’s version of global citizenship might be identified and critically discussed in this context. If, as has been suggested, this IB version of global citizenship has sometimes amounted to little more than an ‘international outlook’ (Barnes, 1998), I intend to identify and discuss any implications the IB’s version of global citizenship might have for the IB as an organization, for schools and teachers using IB curriculum programmes, and for the students and wider school communities relying on the IB MYP for their education needs. If graduates of the MYP go on to take up leadership roles in nation states, these implications could reach much deeper into society, stretching beyond secondary education and into socio-political and economic arenas.

This is why it has been important to critically review the literature around citizenship and global citizenship, and to identify and discuss the types of citizenship descriptions that may be evident in the policy and curriculum documents selected for this study. By contextualizing discussions around citizenship and explaining how they are relevant to this research experience, I aim to locate the research in the existing discourse and present the different perceptions of citizenship from which the IB may have formulated their own ideas on the topic. To this end, the following sections of this chapter, from 2.2.2 to 2.2.7, offer an outline of the citizenship typography identified in the wider literature on citizenship.

### 2.2.2 Modern citizenship

Modern citizenship prioritises the rights of citizens to participate in political and economic activities of the state. These values are closely connected to democratic traditions (Gilbert, 1992), in which the rights, responsibilities and individual liberty of the citizen are paramount (Abowitz and Harnish, 2006). National identity is also stressed as a facet of modern citizenship (Miller, 2000), which reflects the importance of the nation-state in Western political traditions (Lawson,
2001). It seems incongruous, perhaps, that a version of citizenship so focused on liberty and national identity logically disenfranchises individuals considered non-citizens. This ‘membership’ style of citizenship (ibid) elevates the status of the active citizen who participates in political activities and thus maintains the social status quo of the nation-state.

However, the prominence given to the active citizen in modern citizenship implies a consensus of understanding and agreement on citizenship definitions (Biesta, 1995), which can suppress diverse voices within the citizen body. Both Arnot (1997) and Faulks (2000) suggest limitations to this logic, which makes assumptions around a shared common identity among citizens and a commitment to a shared notion of the nation-state. Biesta (2009) suggests that such assumptions of modern citizenship can lead to social injustice against the non-citizen, or the citizen with diversities of opinion, and describes consensus of citizenship definitions as divisive in a contemporary social context in which diversity is the norm. These criticisms also apply to another element of modern citizenship, that of cosmopolitan citizenship, in which common human values are assumed (Osler and Starkey, 2005) and that these assumptions lead to descriptions of citizen rights and responsibilities that ignore the value systems of many indigenous cultures and traditional rural societies whilst promoting urban notions of the civic common good (Tully, 2008).

Proponents of cosmopolitan citizenship such as Held et al., (1999) and Banks (2008) continue to fall back on the Enlightenment principles of citizenship as expounded by Immanuel Kant during the late 18th Century. These principles emphasise the importance of democracy and universal human rights and are imposed upon humanity in general. But Popkewitz (2008) sees these values as emanating from the socio-political West, and Jazeel (2011) warns that such a genesis risks assuming all of humanity as a Western-oriented homogenous grouping within a totalising discourse. Not only does this cosmopolitan approach attempt to eradicate difference, but as Wood (2008) suggests, it also ignores the practical realities behind the development of human rights conceptualisations and the creation of democratic structures and practices. These creations are, Wood
insists, negotiated ideas that materialise from agreement and disagreement, compromise and concession. They are also products of particular eras and geographical locations (ibid), subject to the assumptions and beliefs in which their development takes place. This leaves notions of modern and cosmopolitan citizenship open to criticism around social justice issues, and these criticisms will be addressed in the next section.

2.2.3a Progressive citizenship

The concerns around the potential for social injustice in modern and cosmopolitan citizenship are echoed in the discourse around progressive citizenship. Nagda et al. (2003) see the prerequisites of modern citizenship as biased towards those citizens in positions of privilege, either through gender, education, ethnicity or socio-economic status. Moellendorf (2002) focuses on the institutions through which social and political interactions are mediated, citing ‘social justice concerns’ (pg. 1) as being of central importance to the progressive citizenship agenda. Where modern citizenship assumes that practices of citizenship occur within a notional, fixed social frame of reference, proponents of progressive citizenship see the context for citizenship as continually changing (Abowitz and Harnish, 2006), requiring the expansion of citizenship rights and responsibilities to meet the changing needs of evolving social and political contexts.

Pateman (1989) uses gender inequality in citizenship discourses to illustrate these changing contexts, suggesting that citizenship definitions in education are often male oriented. Similarly, Arnot (1997) claims that citizenship in a modern context remains an essentially male narrative, with women’s rights and gender equality relegated beneath the pre-eminence of citizenship as an aspect of democracy. These differences in perceptions of citizenship demonstrate that citizenship lacks a single, unified definition and is a contested, evolving abstraction. It can be used both to liberate and to oppress within national or state contexts, and it is far from neutral when addressing issues around gender, race, class or social status. Nor is citizenship restricted to national or territorial boundaries; it is concerned with the expansion of citizen rights and responsibilities to people whose socio-economic background, race, gender or
sexuality might traditionally marginalize them from mainstream perceptions of citizenship.

One important marginalizing citizenship discourse critiqued in progressive citizenship literature is that of postcolonial citizenship, where agents from within the former dominant colonial powers maintain their influence over the citizens of other nations by creating a version of global citizenship that reflects the values of the traditional colonial powers. Radcliffe (2005) describes this post-colonial legacy as ‘a specific spatial imagination and materialist representation or discursive framework’ (pg. 296) that influences Western-oriented perceptions of non-Western citizenship traditions. Jazeel (2012) writes that ‘post-colonialism encompasses a diverse set of imperial projects, design and power-laden exchanges’ (pg. 4) that sustains inequality in relationships between Western-oriented and non-Western-oriented cultures (see 2.3). A post-colonial version of global citizenship education could be an uncomfortable experience for some students studying the IB MYP because it might highlight their position of privilege, in global terms, and encourage a sense of self-categorisation of Western-oriented and non-Western-oriented global citizens. It might be especially difficult for students from a non-Western-oriented background, who may start to consider their education as culturally self-defeating, with an emphasis on Western-oriented values that might not match those of their home culture.

This is particularly interesting for this study in that students studying in the IB MYP are predominantly privileged in the traditional socio-economic sense, but may feel disenfranchised as a result of their race, gender or sexuality – particularly as these students are often foreign nationals living within a host culture. Students from a Western-oriented background living in a host culture with different cultural traditions, or those from non-Western backgrounds living in Western-oriented host cultures, may feel marginalized as a result of dominant attitudes towards race, gender or sexuality. For example, a student from the U.K., Australia, or the United States who lives in Saudi Arabia might feel unsettled by restrictions on women related to driving in public, voting in elections or wearing
their own clothing choices. A student from Qatar living in Canada or New Zealand might feel unsettled by public displays of affection or indifference towards daily religious practices. For these students, the idea of progressive global citizenship might be particularly appealing as it extends notions of citizenship to the realm of the personal as well as the societal.

2.2.3b Poststructural global citizenship

These ideas around progressive global citizenship encourage analysis of the relationship between citizenship and governmentality, which can be accommodated through an examination of poststructural global citizenship. In this discourse, governmentality consists of ways ‘to create governable subjects through various techniques developed to control, normalise and shape people’s conduct’ (Fimyar, 2008, p. 5). In the context of this study, with its focus on global citizenship education in an international education context, these controls and influences include students’ psychological self-awareness as global citizens, with varying degrees of understanding of what this means. The progressive global citizen will continually reassess their understanding of the terms they use to describe themselves, whereas poststructural global citizenship requires the deconstruction of all aspects of terminology, agency, knowledge and the ways in which we view and understand other people.

The extent to which this takes place in a school context may depend upon the specific teaching and learning situation, specific units of inquiry and specific teachers and learners. It may therefore be worth examining citizenship in a global context, beginning with the concept of globalisation and exploring relationships between globalisation, neoliberalism and the knowledge-based global economy.

2.2.4 Globalisation

Globalisation, global citizenship and global citizenship education have a shared discursive history, interacting as concepts that help to define the current era. The literature around global citizenship, for example, is interspersed with discussions
around globalisation and its influence on the global citizenship discourse. Brodie (2004) describes globalisation as multi-directional, in terms of interactions between nation states, and multi-leveled, through information and communications technology as well as improvements in the speed and efficiency of transportation - both of goods and of people. Characterized in this way (ibid), by changes in perceptions of transnational spaces, the increased volume and frequency of the global citizenship debate, and the partial dissolution of traditional barriers between nation states and individuals within those nation states, globalisation can influence global citizenship education by supporting perceptions that encourage learners to think of themselves as global citizens in a primarily economic context. In other words, the characterization of global citizenship is influenced by a specific version of globalisation that concentrates on processes around the global economy.

Critics of globalisation describe the phenomenon as a tool for promulgating a particular world view. Abdi and Schultz (2007), for example, highlight the ways in which free market economics has become a dominant ideology, gradually replacing the concept of the democratic citizen with the citizen contributor to economic growth. Sahlberg (2006) asserts that the increased economic competition engendered by globalisation - both between countries and within countries - has resulted in economic growth becoming the benchmark for national wellbeing, and Brodie (2004) asserts that social problems that were traditionally addressed domestically have become more complex as traditional national boundaries have become less clearly defined and more porous. These critics of globalisation describe it as a vehicle for ultra-capitalist neoliberalism in the ways described above, with preeminence given to economic developments including large-scale deregulation of transnational business, the removal of trade barriers and the privatization of public sector institutions and processes.

For the purposes of this study, I have adopted this critical reading of
globalisation because the CDA at the heart of the research aims to test whether the IB might be contributing to these perceptions, either directly or indirectly, through curriculum and policy documents that are designed to drive teaching and learning. The research aims to assess any response to globalisation that might be evident in MYP policies and practices, looking to identify any connections with wider contextual interactions around globalisation and education. Lapayese (2003) details the broader educational response to developments around globalisation, identifying a shift in the educational discourse that expands and complicates the concept of citizenship as a notion given to multiple, evolving types of activity that are both domestic and transnational, both in group settings and for individuals. The absence of a shared definition or understanding of global citizenship exacerbates these complications, making the educational response patchy and uncertain, and leading to the current trend of education being geared towards the development of a citizen population whose primary responsibility is to the global market (ibid).

Both globalisation and neoliberalism (see Section 2.2.5) have influenced global citizenship education in particular by helping to promote specific versions of global citizenship that are embedded in free market values. This trend might prevail in international education, where an international school’s identity and self-promotion are often situated in global, free market language. Apple (2000) explores the connections between globalisation and neoliberalism in some detail, emphasizing the role of education in promoting knowledge and skills that will turn today’s students into tomorrow’s workers, essentially making them a form of human capital to serve an increasingly interconnected global economy. In this model, Apple (ibid) sees education for global citizenship as helping to create a citizen population who behave in ways primarily designed to offer them an economic advantage over other citizens. If this is the case, and if educational organisations (such as the IB) encourage specific competencies around second language development and geopolitical global awareness, Apple is suggesting that these models are being developed to promote aptitudes that will help students to compete economically in a global market. This is an important social justice
consideration for this research study and is discussed in more detail in Part 3 of Chapter 4 of this dissertation.

Globalisation and neoliberalism have influenced education more generally through a reconfiguration of education’s core purpose. Rizvi and Lingard (2010) demonstrate relationships between the global and the nation state, describing globalisation as a process which has ‘reconfigured the state and its authority in developing public policies’ (pg. x). This, by extension, results in local and national education policies becoming ‘linked to globalised educational policy discourses’ (pg. x). While they are clear that ‘globalisation does not have a single uniform meaning’ (pg. 3), Rizvi and Lingard explain some of the ways in which globalisation impacts education policy formation. They use the example of the ‘PISA’ system of assessment created by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to compare progress measures in educational achievement between different countries. This system, Rizvi and Lingard suggest, is founded on the neoliberal principal that students are potential contributors to the global economy; it is a system which does not allow for local or national perceptions of a good education, but which uses the same measure of success for everyone, regardless of different cultural interpretations of what education should look like. As such, it shows some countries as educationally less successful than others, putting pressure on those deemed less successful to change their educational policies and practices to meet the OECD’s standardized neoliberal version of educational success.

This study aims to investigate if, and if so, how neoliberal discourses of education might have influenced discourses of global citizenship education in the IB MYP. Rizvi and Lingard (2010) illuminate the tensions around education and globalisation, but also claim that ‘it might be possible to resist its negative effects

3 International schools are not subject to PISA, but almost half of schools currently using the MYP are state funded, meaning they will be included in the PISA system.
and forge a different, more just and democratic globalisation that implies a broader conception of education’s purposes’ (pg. 3). The research questions for this study aim to probe the documents selected for analysis for evidence of an IB globalisation discourse. More specifically, the study aims to explore what globalisation means for global citizenship and global citizenship education in the MYP. To that end the following section will attempt to address any relationship between globalisation and neoliberalism.

2.2.5 Neoliberalism

As indicated in the introductory chapter, neoliberalism is a phenomenon with a growing influence on education (Hill, 2006). Its origins as a free market economic philosophy date back to the 1920s (Peck, 2010), but it has developed as a concept to incorporate ideas around personal freedom, the reduced involvement of government in the economic affairs of the individual and the preeminence of economic competition in society (ibid). It has been linked by some academics to globalisation, with Peck and Tickell (2002) describing neoliberalism as the ‘ideological software for competitive globalisation, inspiring and imposing far reaching programmes of state restructuring and rescaling across a wide range of national and global contexts’ (pg. 380).

Some of this restructuring has involved the privatisation of previously state-owned industries and large scale market deregulation (Larner, 2000). These trends have been reflected in education through attempts to ‘adapt education to the needs of business and at the same time reduce state expenditure on education’ (Hirtt, 2004, pg. 446). As mentioned in the previous section of this chapter, however, it is the adoption of neoliberal ideas among influential wide-reaching organisations such as the OECD that has made neoliberalism a recognizable standard for measuring personal, social, political and economic success (Rizvi and Lingard, 2010). Whilst stemming from predominantly Western, right wing think tanks and corporate theorists, neoliberalism has been extended into the Global
South and former Soviet states through the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (Peck and Tickell, 2002). It is a philosophy grounded in the belief that ‘human wellbeing can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade’ (Harvey, 2005, pg. 2).

Critics of neoliberalism cite a focus on economic growth that takes little or no account of people’s wellbeing (Enslin and Tjiattas, 2008). Larner and Walters (2004) express the concern that neoliberalism amounts, in practice, to a reduction in citizenship rights and responsibilities, with the economy taking primacy over democracy. Rizvi (2004) extends this criticism, suggesting a correlation between the growth of global neoliberalism and the weakening of global democratic rights. This trend is illustrated most strikingly, according to Rizvi, in the realms of workers’ rights, healthcare and education, where privitisation has elevated the generation of profits above the health and wellbeing of people. The influence on education, and on international education – in which context this study takes place – will be discussed in sections 2.4 and 2.5 of this chapter. But first sections 2.2.6 and 2.2.7 will critically examine the literature around the knowledge based economy and the idea of neoliberal global citizenship.

2.2.6 Knowledge Based Economy

Both globalisation and neoliberalism, with which the previous two sections have been concerned, share a complex relationship with the global knowledge based economy, which can be characterized as an economic model in which the productivity of knowledge forms the basis for economic competition in a global market (Drucker, 1995). This post-industrial alternative to the traditional manufacturing basis for global economic competition has evolved in a complex relationship with advances in communications and information technology that have recently made knowledge ‘the most important determinant of growth in
living standards and new job creation’ (Harris, 2001, pg. 21).

This change in focus from natural resources and manufactured goods to intellectual capabilities has expanded the reach and capacity for individuals to access and contribute to knowledge based resources beyond traditional political or physical boundaries (Robertson, 2005). However, while proponents of the knowledge based economy claim that these developments offer new equal opportunities for economic competitiveness, it should be remembered that access to innovations in communications and information technology is far from equal in a global context. And, as discussed in section 2.2.1, this unequal distribution of technological innovations offers advantages within the knowledge based economy that appear to exacerbate existing global economic inequalities. This criticism is supported by Jessop (2008), who explains that while in principle the knowledge based economy might expand opportunities for economic participation, in practice knowledge is becoming ‘privately owned and thereby provides the basis for monopolistic rents’ (pg. 6) from countries in the Global North with strong traditional economies to nations in the Global South whose access to improved information and communications technology is expanding at a much slower rate.

In combination with globalisation and neoliberalism, as discussed in sections 2.2.4 and 2.2.5, the knowledge based economy appears to offer a new version of the economic inequalities already evident in the relationships between the Global North and Global South (Olssen and Peters, 2005), and may even contribute to a widening in the economic gap between the world's industrialised nations and the Global South. Further, the discourses around globalisation, neoliberalism and the knowledge based economy seem to be dominated by organisations and individuals who have the most to gain – politically as well as economically – from this evolving global order (Enslin and Tjiattas, 2008). The discourse emerging from some of these same individuals and organisations, which
include the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation (ibid), seem to promote a particular version of global citizenship in which globalisation, neoliberalism and the knowledge based economy feature strongly (Jessop, 2008). This synthesis of concepts that contribute to notions of the neoliberal global citizen will be discussed in the following section.

2.2.7 Neoliberal Global Citizenship

As discussed in section 2.2.5, neoliberalism is one of the leading contributing concepts to the discourses around global citizenship, and so it seems pertinent to examine the ways in which neoliberal global citizenship is addressed in the critical literature. Schultz (2007) recognizes that as the discourses around globalisation, neoliberalism and the knowledge based economy grow, they become more homogenized into a vision of neoliberal global citizenship that attempts to offer a universal paradigm of the 21st Century citizen. However, that paradigm is problematic in a variety of areas.

Firstly, the alleged universality of the neoliberal global citizen is strongly Eurocentric (Richardson, 2008a), or might better be described as Western-oriented (ibid). Its uncritical acceptance as a virtue of the Internet age is seen by some as a form of indoctrination (Noddings, 2010), usurping the rights and responsibilities of the nation state and perpetuating global inequalities by encouraging proponents of neoliberal global citizenship to think of themselves as superior to those without access to the same technologies and economic opportunities (ibid). Secondly, the idea of the neoliberal global citizen is strongly connected to globalisation, which – as discussed in section 2.2.4 – is a contested concept with a growing critical discourse. One version of the global citizen cannot, according to Peters et al. (2008), accurately represent the range of people affected by globalisation because the effects of this phenomenon differ depending upon the characteristics of the individual, as well as their socio-political, economic and cultural context.
Finally, neoliberal global citizenship is problematic in that it prioritises global free market capitalism over the wellbeing of the individual citizen. Giddens (2000) argues that offers of free trade economic interactions in no way guarantee that these interactions will be equitable. Enslin and Tjiattas (2008) argue that neoliberal global citizenship is focused primarily on each citizen gaining economic primacy over others, regardless of any negative consequences. The presumption of equal competitiveness (ibid) disregards the realities of inequality that come from unequal access to capital, technology, civil liberties and freedom of movement. The neoliberal global citizen is therefore one whose concept of citizenship is based on the drive for superiority over other citizens. In the context of this study, I set out to investigate the occurrence of these versions of global citizenship in the discourses around the IB MYP and/or in the documents selected for analysis in Chapter 4, the critical discourse analysis.

### 2.2.8 International-Mindedness in the IB

The IB’s self-instituted concept of international-mindedness features strongly in the two documents selected for analysis during this research study, detailed seven times in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011), and eight times in ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (IB, 2014). However, it is another IB publication, a research report entitled ‘Conceptualizing and assessing international-mindedness (IM): An exploratory study’ (Castro et al., 2013) in which the IB most conspicuously attempt to explain and describe the concept of international-mindedness. According to this document, international-mindedness (IM) is:

> an overarching concept, which is seen to be embedded across all the [IB] programmes. It has no curriculum of its own. It could be considered as an approach embodying the values of the IB philosophy, and the IB encourages schools and teachers to integrate an international-mindedness approach in all that they do.

(Castro et al., 2013, pg. 5)
Ways in which this concept is embedded in IB programmes is elaborated upon with the claim that ‘IM is manifested in the components of multilingualism, intercultural understanding and global engagement’ (ibid. pg. 5), each of which is provided with its own brief definition before we are told that ‘the research shows that the aspect of assessment of international-mindedness is underdeveloped in IB documents’ (pg. 6). As with the IB’s global citizenship discourse (see Part 2 of Chapter 4), the absence of assessment for IM perhaps suggests avoidance of critical engagement with the concept it is promoting. The aspirational tone of IM echoes similar inclinations around global citizenship education, as espoused in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011). However, this is where any connections between global citizenship and international mindedness seem to end.

The methodology used in the research of Castro et al. (2013) includes selection criteria for literature pertaining to ‘key concepts and recommendations in the field of international education and global citizenship education’ (pg. 12). The study found that across a variety of IB publications ‘there is some reference to intercultural understanding leading to global citizenship’ (ibid. pg. 9). However, the nature of that global citizenship is left unstated because ‘the different meanings and contexts for being a citizen in a globalized world challenge educators, researchers, teachers, students and policymakers’ (ibid. pg. 39). The authors of this study prefer to avoid meeting these challenges, mitigating any criticism of the fluid definitions and unstated contexts associated with IM with the explanation that ‘it needs to be remembered that the IB task is one of uniting as well as allowing for diverse contextual interpretations’ (Castro et al., pg. 57). IB

---

4 Multilingualism is contextualized as studying languages, including languages for learning purposes; Intercultural understanding is linked to language learning, with an emphasis on developing knowledge of other cultural groups; Global engagement is described in the documents as undertaking activities outside school, around local communities and/or in other foreign communities.
interpretations of global citizenship and global citizenship education appear to rely equally on this disclaimer, with diverse contexts facilitating both the removal of agency – and therefore responsibility – from the IB, and allowing for adaptations in specific school settings that might clash with other philosophical claims made in IB policy and curriculum documents. In attempting to understand ways in which various versions of global citizenship are evident in education, the following section attempts to address global citizenship education.

2.3 Global citizenship education

2.3.1 Introduction

Global citizenship education is the vehicle through which the various versions of global citizenship, as discussed above, can be promulgated. Like the literature around globalisation, the literature around citizenship, global citizenship and global citizenship education is always evolving, and as Klein (2004) has explained, the dynamics of ‘the global’ make any attempt to conceptualize international socio-political phenomena difficult. Shultz (2007) attempts to organise global citizens into three distinct categories. The first category, neoliberal global citizenship, is embraced by people who are either willing to conform to the dominant global capitalist system or who are unaware that their perceptions of global citizenship exhibit neoliberal leanings. This category has been addressed in some detail in the above section 2.2.7 of this chapter. People who gravitate towards Shultz’s second category, radical global citizenship, actively apply their perceptions of global citizenship to global social justice in an attempt to expose ideas of neoliberal global citizenship as unjust. These radical global citizens might become involved in activism against the free market global economic system, human rights or climate change. And Schultz’s third category of transformationist global citizenship is used to describe people for whom the purpose of global citizenship is to promote a shared humanist vision of citizenship in which equality is extended across all traditional social and political categories.
However, Schultz’s organizational focus on the individual overlooks the educational dimensions of global citizenship education that most specifically affect international education, in which this study is situated. Vanessa Andreotti’s *Soft versus critical global citizenship education* (2006), on the other hand, offers a rationale for critical global citizenship education, and has been preferred for this study as it provides an outline and discussion of global citizenship education that reflect the focus of the study’s research questions. Andreotti begins her article, for example, by explaining that the global economic system comprises issues around wealth distribution, labour inequalities and power structures with diverse cultural and economic histories and with uncertain futures. It is within this shifting paradigm that global citizenship education attempts to operate, and this study aims to investigate how the IB has organised its MYP to meet the challenges inherent in those uncertainties. This section of the literature review will therefore use Andreotti’s outline of global citizenship education to critically review the key themes and issues that arise in the literature around global citizenship education, beginning with the *material* and *cultural* dimensions of global citizenship education before moving on to the *critical* and *soft* dimensions of global citizenship education that can be found in the wider literature on the topic.

2.3.2 The material dimension of citizenship education

Andreotti identifies what she sees as the key component of her material dimension of global citizenship, explaining that ‘having the choice to traverse from the local to the global space is the determining factor for whether or not you can be a global citizen’ (2006a, pg. 3). This does not simply involve the movement of people from one place to another, but refers to access to technology that transcends physical space and supports global interactions that may be social, economic, or political (for example, through participation in online petitions around human rights or environmental sustainability). This ‘material’ ability to conceptualise one’s self as a global entity is a privilege of those in the Global North (ibid). In other words, global citizenship depends upon assumptions around common beliefs and values that favour Western traditions, and – for Andreotti - globalisation is the dominant discourse supporting these assertions.
In developing curricula for global citizenship education, Western values and morality form the basis from which individual and national progress is measured (ibid) through undefined humanistic generalisations rather than the political systems that create and sustain global inequalities. Andreotti argues that agents of the Global North intentionally or unintentionally assert their own versions of global citizenship which usurp local values and traditions in favour of a Western-oriented outlook. She cites ‘unexamined notions of a common humanity in global citizenship education’ (pg. 3) and asks:

Who is this global citizen? What should be the basis of this project? Whose interests are represented here? Is this an elitist project? Are we empowering the dominant group to remain in power? Are we doing enough to examine the local/global dimensions of our assumptions? (pg. 4).

These material dimensions of global citizenship education take the form of platitudes around globalisation and worldwide interconnectedness that assume an equal and willing exchange of ideas, good and services that masks unequal power and wealth relations between Global North and Global South, and which support Northern economic and political dominance over the Global South. Rather than use global citizenship education to critically examine the economic and political practices that create such inequalities, Andreotti argues that the umbrella term of globalisation encourages a focus on moral, charitable obligations to poorer world citizens rather than a critical reassessment of the causes of that poverty. For example, evidence for this is offered in the analysis of MYP unit plans in Part 3 of chapter 4. In using globalisation as the basis for global citizenship education, educators are knowingly or unknowingly perpetuating representations of the Global North as the patriarchal benefactor and the Global South as the helpless recipient of a superior social, political, cultural and economic paradigm. However, the cultural dimension of global citizenship education is more complex than this picture suggests.
2.3.3 The cultural dimension

Much of the complexity in the Global North and Global South relationship is grounded in the development of the relationship over time. The material dimension of global citizenship education asserts that the umbrella concept of globalisation serves as a smokescreen for Western-oriented dominance over the Global South; the cultural dimension of global citizenship education normalises the myth of Western-oriented global dominance but suggests some Global South complicity in this imbalance (Andreotti, 2006a). The role of colonialism in the creation of global economics in its current state is subsumed beneath discourses of globalisation and modernisation, and resultant free trade agreements operate, in practice, as nations in the Global South buying and borrowing (or adopting) Western economic practices that are loaded with pseudo-colonial ideological and cultural values and socio-political structures (ibid).

In ignoring or deliberately hiding current global economic imbalances that resulted from colonialism, or in situating these imbalances in history, actors on both sides of the Global North-Global South relationship facilitate ‘worlding of the West as world’ (Spivak, 1990, pg. 67). As discussed in the context of globalisation (section 2.2.4, above), this naturalising of the development of the Global North as the criteria by which progress is measured worldwide encourages those in the Global South to contribute to their own disadvantage by buying into the paradigm of a superior or preferable Western-oriented world view. Andreotti (2006b) describes this as:

sanctioned ignorance, which disguises the worlding of the world, places the responsibility for poverty upon the poor themselves and justifies the project of development of the Other as a ‘civilising mission’ (page 5).

This is important to this study as there are implications for global citizenship education as the potential vehicle for perpetuating this global paradigm. It suggests the capacity for global citizenship education to be ideologically-driven, disguised as education around globalisation but proliferating the idea that the Western-oriented world view is both universal and value-neutral (Spivak, 2004). For Andreotti (2006b), this trend in global citizenship education
is often characterised by the promotion of perceived equal access to economic competitiveness, or by a focus on charitable managerialism in which the ‘developed’ or industrialised world, as represented by the G7 nations (ibid), must attempt to save the Global South from its own economic mismanagement through non-governmental organisations or through some form of service to the less fortunate. These claims are made through Andreotti’s (2006a) framework of ‘critical’ and ‘soft’ citizenship education, an outline and analysis of which follows.

2.3.4 Critical and soft citizenship education

Andreotti’s (2006a) framework contrasts soft and critical citizenship education structures through a breakdown of the characteristics of both. Critical citizenship education is focused on inequality and social justice, characterised by exposing education built around power systems and economic structures that maintain unjust and unequal practices of exploitation that disempower former colonial client states and empower dominant Western nations and their ideologies (ibid). Critical global citizenship education challenges these imbalances, and is ‘an attempt to understand origins and implications’ (pg. 7) of trends in citizenship education that unveil hidden assumptions and make suggestions for the development of ethical relationships between the Global North and Global South.

Soft citizenship education is focused on poverty and helplessness, characterised by education around development in areas of culture, technology and resource management (Andreotti, 2006a). It relies on assumptions around common humanity, mutual interdependence, tolerance, equality and harmonious relations among nation states. Soft global citizenship education focuses on raising awareness of global issues and attempts to empower individuals to become self-aware, and therefore self-empowered, to adopt the version of global citizenship couched in the terms of neoliberal globalisation (ibid). Its grounds for action are humanitarian in principal, primarily located in discourses around tolerance and global equality.

It is clear from Andreotti’s (2006a) framework and discussion that she supports a critical approach to global citizenship education, which she
characterises as 'the analysis and critique of the relationships among perspectives, language, power, social groups and social practices by the learners' (pg. 7). It is a call to action for educators to facilitate global citizenship education that encourages students to analyse contexts, perspectives and power relations critically before deciding for themselves what manner of intervention might be most appropriate to a given set of circumstances. This is in contrast to 'soft' global citizenship education, in which students are provided with an outline of possible options and solutions to global issues without problematising the politics and ethics involved.

It is important to recognise differences in approaches to global citizenship education, and to match appropriate approaches to contexts. Educators need to be critically literate about global citizenship education in order to avoid unintentionally supporting systems they do not wish to support or promote during teaching and learning. Abdi and Shultz (2007, 2008) maintain that global citizenship education should have its basis in international justice, with links made between human rights agreements and global citizenship rights and responsibilities, and with the justification that global citizenship education should attempt to address global realities in a world of global information and communications technology, global finance and global threats to security. Dower (2003, 2008) attempts to identify and detail a philosophical framework underpinning global citizenship education. This largely normative approach aims to bind together the values and ethics stemming from transdisciplinarity into a perception and practice of citizenship that emphasizes inclusivity and equality. However, both Klein (2004) and Abdi (2006) recommend the development of precautionary measures to ensure that global citizenship education does not become so neutralized by compromise that citizen rights and responsibilities are weakened.

Implications for this study are considerable; if the purpose of global citizenship education is to develop specific values in students, who decides what these values should be, and how they are facilitated through curriculum? If the
purpose of global citizenship education is more around critiquing global inequalities, what are those specific issues and how are they framed in teaching and learning? Questions are raised around the purpose of education more widely, both as an instrument of social reproduction and/or as a device for developing specific notions of the educated person. Andreotti's (2006a) ‘soft’ and ‘critical’ notions of global citizenship education form a useful framework. But these notions of global citizenship education and the educated person are further complicated by the international context in which the analysis of curriculum documents takes place. The following section of this chapter will therefore explore the literature around international education, beginning with an introduction to the field and then focusing on the IB, first through its historical context in international education settings, and then through the critical literature which links the IB to a wider trend towards neoliberalism in international education.

2.4 International education
International education is a crucial contextualising element of this study, primarily because literature from the IB situates the organization within international education, but also because my research questions explore first, global citizenship, and then global citizenship education through the curriculum in many international schools globally. Bunnell (2006, 2008), Fox (1985), Hayden (2006, 2011), I. Hill (2007a) Saavedra (2014) and Tarc (2009) provide both context and critical commentary on the evolution of international education over time. Some early studies around international education emerge from comparative education studies, with Wilson (1994) tracing these studies and then discussing the relationship between ideas of comparative and international education. He calls the research relationship between comparative and international education a ‘hybrid offspring’ (pg. 450) with shared foundations in educational research history. Amove (2001) treats, as one research entity, comparative education as well as international education, and in the same year Tikly and Crossley address the debate around this topic head on, concluding in their article (2001) that any distinction between comparative and international
education in the research discourse results from the historical foundations of the two research areas rather than from any necessary division.

The term ‘international education’ can variously describe a range of educational practices and situations, often involving cultural interactions between institutions and individuals from different nation states. Fraser and Brickman (1968) are among the first to attempt to define international education in its own right, outside the earlier distinctions around international and comparative education. Their 1968 review of nineteenth century documents states that international education ‘connotes the various kinds of relationships - intellectual, cultural and education - among individuals and groups from two or more nations, (being) a dynamic concept (which) involves a movement across frontiers, whether by a person, book or ideal’ (pg. 17-18). Hayden and Thompson (1995a) address international education largely in the context of, or in terms of relationships between international education and international schools. As a baseline for their research, they use the definition of international education from Fraser and Brickman.

In 1960 Scanlon of Columbia University Teachers College in the United States wrote that:

international education is a term used to describe various kinds of education and cultural relations among nations. While it applied merely to formal education, the concept has now broadened to include governmental cultural relations programs, the promotion of mutual understanding among nations, educational assistance to underdeveloped regions, cross-cultural education, and international communications (1960, pg. 1).

Mungazi, to some extent addressing the implications in Scanlon’s definition, suggests that ‘the term International Education is employed to relate to a variety of cultural and educational activities intended to improve understanding and cooperation among nations so as to eliminate or reduce the prospects of conflict’ (1991, pg. 1). More recent reflections attempt to further this claim, with Fabian (2016) outlining the potential for international education to be ‘a source of aspiration and inspiration for students, for schools and the world’ (pg. 86). This
But in their original attempts to explore the implications of the practice they describe, Fraser and Brickman elaborate on their definition with the claim that:

International education refers to the various methods of international cooperation, understanding, and exchange. Thus, the exchange of teachers and students, aid to underdeveloped [sic] countries, and teaching about foreign educational systems fall within the scope of this term. On the negative side, international education also encompasses activities making for international misunderstanding, ill will, hatred, and even war (1968, pg. 1).

In these discussions, international education is contextualized within international relations, both broadening the respective definitions and emphasising the potential for international education to influence issues around society, politics, culture and social justice. The common theme between them is the interconnection between international education and international relations.

Another important connection, that between international education and international schools, is a recurring theme for Hayden (2006), in particular, and Hayden and Thompson (1995). They trace the development of international schools - whose purpose was to offer international education - to the period between World War 1 and World War 2. Schooling for overseas residents or citizens existing long before this and tended to be in the form of British schools, for example, in British colonies around the world, or Christian missionary schools in sub-Saharan Africa whose purpose was both to educate and proselytise (Hayden and Thomson, 1995). The former tended to serve the children of the ruling elite – both British and local – while the later tended to concentrate on children and adults within the native population. Schooling specifically for an international education grew as an idea and a way of operating in schools primarily in Europe during the 1960s. However, more recent research suggests a
This expansion occurred in order to meet the educational needs of families involved in diplomacy, business, journalism and other practices that took people from their countries of birth to live abroad for periods of years at a time (Hayden, 2006). It was also during this period of the 1960s that the concept of global citizenship began to emerge (Hanvey, 1975), with many of those transient families who were being served by international schools among the first to think of their own citizenship as an international phenomenon with cultural, moral and ethical implications. Nussbaum (1994) summarises the spirit of these implications when she describes global citizenship as a responsibility and an opportunity to ‘recognize humanity wherever it occurs, and give its fundamental ingredients, reason and moral capacity, our first allegiance and respect’ (pg. 156).

This idea of mobile citizenship is represented in the literature under a variety of designations, from the IB’s current ‘global engagement’ (2014b) to the ‘world citizenship’ of Gellar (1996), the ‘world mindedness’ of Hayden and Thompson (1995a; 1995b), or the frequently used ‘global citizenship’ of Bartlett (1993) and Wong (1997). As with the various descriptions of international education, these aspirations around international citizenship are rarely clearly defined and often used without concrete definitions. But it is often around this discussion that ideas of values in international education are addressed. Bartlett (1992) is concerned with a perceived lack of values in international education, and Gellar (1996) expressly calls for values to become inherent in international education frameworks and practices. Both authors complain of the scarcity of values education in the programmes they discuss, and both highlight the opportunities this presents for values education to be formulated and incorporated into curricula.

Among the values featured within the debate, the concept of tolerance is usually of principal interest, with Fox (1985), Hayden and Thompson (1995c) and
Laurent-Brennan (1998) all beginning their values analysis here. Bartlett (1993; 1994) centres the debate around empathy, social responsibility and action. Fox (1985) and Gellar (1993) explore the potential for world peace emanating from international education, making the assumption that values education for students in international schools will lead to improvements in international relations. Hayden and Thompson (1995b) reflect this general theme, but focus on school structures and settings rather than curriculum, and Laurent-Brennan (1998) suggests that the teaching of tolerance will most likely lead to positive growth in other areas of values education, but without indicating how this might happen. For Skelton (2016) the ‘international is a dispositional rather than a locational adjective’ (pg. 71), and ‘the heart of any successful international dimension is a practiced sense of the other’ (pg. 76). However, one of the findings emerging from this study is that international school curricula, and in particular the IB MYP, can be interpreted to the convenience or the preconceptions of schools or teachers to suit their intentions, whatever those intentions may be.

Benhabib (2004) expands the discussion somewhat to imagine a global agreement on values that can be disseminated through international education. This reflects the earlier work of Hanvey (1975) who appears to present the world of international students as a collection of self-aware global citizens who could potentially address global issues on a global scale and come up with global solutions to global problems that are only going to increase in number and complexity as a result of globalization. This rather glossy image of international education repeats, to some extent, Fraser and Brickman’s 1968 vision of the potential for international education to influence international relations. What emerges in the literature is a deeper analysis of morality – or perhaps responsibility - around concepts of global citizenship.

Nussbaum (1994) proposes that living in international environments necessitates making efforts to strive to understand other people, their cultures and their idea of their place in the world. Archibugi (2008) extends this idea from individuals to institutions, involving those institutions already concerned with international relations and including international schools and other sources of
international education. For Bunnell (2016), however, the growth in numbers of international schools in recent years has led to an ideological divergence between traditional international schools and ‘commercial operators’ (pg. 219) whose primary goal is financial gain. He suggests that international schools are generally moving into a ‘post-ideal era’ (ibid. pg. 219) in which market forces will dictate operational practice, location and curriculum content above and in lieu of any ideological, educational drivers.

There remains uncertainty in the literature over what international education looks like and what its purpose should be. Gibbons (1994) recognized prior to the Internet age that knowledge production was changing, with interdisciplinary (or transdisciplinary) knowledge replacing traditional ‘homogenous modes of knowledge’ (pg. 516). Max-Neef (2005) describes this new transdisciplinarity as ‘accumulations of visions emerging from participating disciplines’ (pg. 6), with traditional categories of subject area synthesized into holistic understandings that require equally synthesized approaches to understanding. However, these descriptions necessarily fall short of defining international education, which is continually evolving and responding to wider trends in education, politics, culture and economics. The following section will therefore focus specifically on international education in the context of the IB.

2.5 International education and the IB

The most prominent feature of a critical literature review of the IB is the repeated theme of an enduring lack of available literature. Hayden and Thompson (1995b) confront this issue head-on, citing the difficulties in finding widely accepted definitions for international education as a key area of obstruction and attempting to alleviate the problem somewhat with their own research. Even as recently as 2009, Tarc (2009) expresses frustration at the dearth of literature on the IB whilst suggesting that this is beginning to change. Bartlett (1992) suggests that conceptual problems with definitions mean that it is not only international education that is difficult to define, but also international schools and even
international curricula. Hayden and Thompson (1996) develop this deconstruction further to point out the difficulties in assuming that international schooling and international education are one and the same. Gellar (1993) insists on the school setting as a qualifier for international education in his discussion of the potential for students at such schools to improve international relations. But when Bartlett (1992) attempts to locate international education within international schools, he observes that this is ‘a myth struggling to become a reality’ (pg. 48) because some schools describing themselves as international schools are little or no different to their state school counterparts.

Despite contestations, it is the IB that is usually used for discussions around curricula in international education, perhaps because the IB itself has continually branded itself as a ‘foundation offering highly respected programmes of international education’ (IB, 2016). Hayden and Thompson (1995a) note that the IB went from ‘a programme for international schools’ to ‘an international programme for schools’ (pg. 16), indicating an intention to expand their curriculum framework beyond the international school market. To that end, three of the four curriculum frameworks offered by the IB are inherently flexible, able to adapt and respond to multiple contexts. Barnes (1998) identifies this malleability as both a strength and a problem, with many different interpretations of IB programmes being practiced simultaneously and few commonalities in all but the final pre-university Diploma programme.

Poulet (1996) provides further analysis on this phenomenon, commenting on the fact that most schools using IB curricula in Canada and the United States are using government funding, whereas most schools outside those two countries using IB curricula are private. Fox (1985) suggests that the reason for this is that North American schools use IB curricula ‘for the gifted’ (pg. 68), and this theme is repeated in both Daniel and Cox (1992), and in Poelzer and Feldhusen (1997). It is in this discussion around the application of IB curricula that themes of perceived elitism emerge. Hayden and Thompson (1995b) offer suggestions that the demographic of parents living and working outside their country of origin directly relates to the demographic of children studying in international schools. Hayden
and Wong (1997) refer to the ‘professional mobility’ of this population (pg. 351), who are often senior managers of multinational companies who are sent around the world to fulfill their role.

Bruce (1987) describes this population as ‘influential, affluent and committed to education’ (pg. 707), and Bartlett (1992) writes of the diplomatic community being of key importance to IB international school enrollment. These commonly found references to the families of international school students acknowledges the differences found in comparison with mainstream school populations, with status and affluence often cited as prevalent. Discussion of the influence of these factors is curiously absent in much of the literature dating from before the 2000s, as is analysis of student and family demographic around ethnicity or gender. While Bruce (1987) writes of the diversity of IB international school populations, the characteristics of that diversity is undisclosed. Similarly, Hayden and Thompson (1996) describe international school student diversity as among their ‘universals of international education’ (pg. 19), with no attempt to define the nature of this particular ‘universal’.

Rather, the nationalities of IB international school students and their families becomes a focus, with Bruce (1987) singling out U.S. and British families as dominant among the populations placing their children in IB schooling outside their countries of origin. Fox (1985) argues that the IB is Eurocentric, whereas Hayden and Wong (1997) describe students at IB international schools as attempting to behave as ‘American as possible’ (pg. 357). Buckheit (1995) suggests that IB curricula are essentially part of a wider endeavor to support Western capitalist values, focusing on the language of instruction (English) as a feature of this intent. Bruce (1987) and Bartlett (1994) also cite English as the language of instruction in IB schools as an element of Western cultural imperialism, suggesting that linguistic dominance carries with it social, cultural and economic ramifications.

More recent research into the IB and international education provides a picture of an evolving organization with evolving curricula. Doherty (2010)
describes the IB as an ‘ironic marriage of neo-conservatism (re-asserting centralised power) and neo-liberalism (divesting power from the centre to the market)’ (pg. 6). This supports one of the key arguments of this thesis, which is that the IB are attempting to synthesise diverse socio-political developments into a single coherent concept. Wells (2011) describes ‘the International Baccalaureate (IB) as an organization aims to provide an education which complies with both the pragmatic and ethical aims of international education’ (pg. 175). And Gellar (2002) addresses these perspectives in the context of new understandings emerging among students at IB international schools that appear to transcend traditional perceptions of national identity.

Roberts (2009b) describes students at IB international schools displaying a high degree of cosmopolitanism, with cosmopolitanism being defined as a shared sense of global community as well as morality. Tarc (2009) suggests that this common idea of global community arises from developments in information and communications technology, most notably Internet-based platforms on which many students at IB international schools spend several hours a week. I. Hill (2007a) is unequivocal in citing feelings of ‘world citizenship’ among students as a fundamental element of the IB international school experience (pg. 28). Of course, as the former Deputy Director General of the IB, Hill might be seen as promoting this notion rather than offering empirical evidence for it, but it reflects an ideology Hill claims can be traced back to the foundation of the International Baccalaureate Organisation in the late 1960s.

Irrespective of the ideological drivers, the curricula of the IB’s ‘programmes of international education’ (ibo.org) come in for criticism for using concepts of world citizenship to weaken students’ national identities and to promote a specific Western oriented world view. Mitchell (2003) suggests that whilst overtly this drive for world citizenship education seems to support notions of tolerance, it also ‘aids in the exportation of liberalism, and hence capitalism, abroad’ (pg. 391). Others argue that the meeting of Western and non-Western ideologies might lead to the development of shared values of humanity, enabling a cross fertilisation of traditions that could be truly universal. Gellar (2002)
explores the potential nature of such a synthesis, identifying the IB’s Theory of Knowledge\textsuperscript{5} course in the Diploma programme as well as drama and the arts as fertile territory for establishing cross-cultural understandings.

Tarc (2013) welcomes the opportunities presented by cultural conflicts arising from Western and non-Western interactions in educational contexts. Perhaps following on from Gellar, Tarc examines the nature of the knowledge claims being taught in the IB’s Theory of Knowledge course and looks for opportunities for these to be balanced with other cultural traditions of engaging with knowledge. The very purpose of an international education, Tarc suggests, should be to cultivate a range of ‘epistemic virtues that press the learner to understand cultures as dynamic and relationally produced under specific historical tendencies, geospatial relations and geometries of power’ (ibid. pg. 104). Whether these possibilities could be extended to the MYP is something this study aims to explore.

2.6 Neoliberalism and international education

Discussions around global citizenship and cultural approaches to knowledge raise questions around what Western and non-Western values look like in an international education context. Bunnell (2011\textsuperscript{a}) succinctly summarises the prevailing discourse around these questions with his claim that a fundamental dilemma exists in international education between its role as a facilitator of universal human values and its role as a supplier of ‘branded services’ for a globally mobile neoliberal elite (pg. 168). This dilemma is evident in the language of the documents analysed in Chapter 4, which attempt to combine terminology from progressive and neoliberal education traditions. Indeed, findings emerging from this study suggest that MYP policy and curriculum documents have been developed specifically in order to merge the terminology of human universality and global capitalism. Bates (2011) identifies the potential for international education to disrupt the traditional purpose of schooling that seeks to confirm

\textsuperscript{5} Theory of Knowledge is not part of the MYP, which is the focus of this study.
perceptions of citizenship and nationality, and in the MYP, the IB have created a programme of education that seeks to satisfy the global citizenship aspirations of all its paying customers.

The literature around neoliberalism suggests that this ideology is both pervasive and insidious in multiple areas of social, economic and political life for many people in many geographical locations and many types of socio-economic situation (D. Hill, 2010). Its relationships with globalisation have been explored in section 2.2.4, but it is the potential relationships between neoliberalism, international education and the IB that most concerns this study. The following section will therefore examine the influence of neoliberalism on the IB in particular, and will look at both the critical literature around this topic as well as publications that have come from the IB or their sponsored researchers.

2.7 Neoliberalism and the IB

The influence of neoliberalism in education is particularly pertinent to international schooling because the circumstances of international schools means that they are not always subject to state or national standards. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated in IB international schools, which share common curricula frameworks that can be adapted to local situations, and which are primarily privately funded. Lai et al. (2014) found in their research on IB schools in Hong Kong that students of both Western and non-Western origin frequently subsumed their own nationality within a preferred sense of global citizenship. This tendency was not, however, prevalent among teaching staff, whose sense of nationality came from the nation states in which they grew up and was more significant to them than concepts of global citizenship. This suggests that IB curricula are influencing the citizenship perceptions of students studying in one of their programmes, helping to shape students’ paradigm of citizenship.

On the topic of paradigmatic circumstances in international schools using the MYP, Weenink (2008) considers the concept of global citizenship little more than a marketing strategy designed to convince parents to send their children to fee-paying international schools. And Fischman and Haas (2009) elaborate on this
theme with the suggestion that neoliberal narratives in international school promotional materials appeal primarily to aspirational parents who want their children to keep up with perceived global changes brought about by improvements in information and communications technologies. Personal experience of teaching in three international schools using the MYP leads me to empathise with these suggestions, and a brief review of the current websites of these schools indicates a persistence in emphasizing both global citizenship (in an undefined sense) and the availability of the very latest and most sophisticated information and communications technologies for student use.

Rizvi and Engel (2009) suggest that the relationship between international schools and universities in English-speaking industrialised nations has been encouraged by the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) as a way of entrenching global free market attitudes among the social and political ruling elite of the future. Suspitsyna (2012) elaborates on this point by claiming that across the higher education sector a ‘neoliberal discourse subverts the social functions of universities that are aimed at social justice and redefines individual agency in terms of economic rationality’ (pg. 53). If, as Apple suggests, these developments have been mirrored in international schools, then international education is becoming an important component of a global neoliberal agenda, contributing to the neoliberal narrative and supporting the emergence of a global neoliberal elite (2001). If this is the case, then this study might shed some light on neoliberal influences in the documents selected for analysis. And if connections between the expansion of the MYP and any global drift towards neoliberalism in education exist, then this shift may be identified in the CDA chapter of this study.

2.8 Theoretical framework/social justice
The theoretical framework for this study comes from Nancy Fraser’s ‘Rethinking Recognition’ (2000), Fraser’s ‘Social Justice in the age of identity politics (2003), and her ‘Reimagining political space in a globalising world’ (2008).

Fraser's view of social justice is based on what she calls ‘parity of participation’, with the principal that ‘justice requires social arrangements that permit all to participate as peers in social life’ (2008a, pg. 16). On this basis, Fraser argues, surmounting injustice involves ‘dismantling institutionalised obstacles that prevent people from participating on a par with others as full partners in social interaction’ (pg. 16). This is particularly significant in that the third research question of this study aims to critically examine two IB publications (Davy, 2011; IB, 2014) for any evidence of barriers to participation in the IB MYP.

The two other dimensions of Fraser’s model are ‘redistribution’ and ‘recognition’. Redistribution in the context of this study relates to the possibilities and practices of providing equal access to education for any who may benefit from it. It is, therefore, related to participation in that redistribution focuses on the potential outcomes of such equal access. Recognition is described by Fraser as ‘a question of social status’ and concentrates on issues of recognition injustice, and ‘the political constitution of society’ (2000, pg. 113). Fraser’s model is perhaps best appreciated as a synthesis of these three principles, from which her framework for social justice has been developed. Perhaps more pertinently for this study, Fraser (2007) suggests that globalisation is helping to place issues around framing social justice ‘squarely on the political agenda’ (pg. 23). This is, perhaps, an optimistic claim, but Fraser makes an important observation when she writes that ‘globalisation is changing the way we argue about justice’ (ibid, pg. 17).

Critics of Fraser, however, point to problems of consistency with her distinction between economics and redistribution politics, and cultural injustices and the politics of recognition. Resnick and Wolff (2005) highlight the abstract nature of Fraser’s conception of economic injustice, in which the notion of class enjoys no special status. This is problematic for Resnick and Wolff, who complain
that ‘many of those otherwise sympathetic to Marxism have a need instead to lose the specificity of exploitation and its social effects’ (2005, pg. 36). Swanson (2005) states that ‘Fraser’s framework falls short in subscribing to the analytical utility of only two categories and in remaining too abstract’ (pg. 90). There is more to be gained, Swanson suggests, from disaggregating the many forms of oppression covered by Fraser’s headings of ‘redistribution’ and ‘recognition’, particularly as tensions and possible compatibilities between different types of economic struggle could then be more appropriately highlighted.

However, Fraser’s ideas around social justice can help to form an appropriate theoretical framework for this study because, as Tikly and Barrett (2011) explain, Fraser’s version of misrepresentation is ‘related to globalisation and has increasing significance for education because of the increasing importance of global and regional agendas on influencing national policy including that related to education quality’ (pg. 7). Given that IB descriptions of global citizenship and access to the MYP are two of the central problems this study aims to address, a framework for social justice that works for education in a globalising context is an appropriate selection.

2.9 Conclusion

This literature review chapter has attempted to situate the study in the contexts in which the research has been developed. The first key issue to arise from this literature review is that critical literature around the IB is still a work in progress, and as Bunnell explains, ‘relatively little critical discourse has occurred, while most of the major authors are IB protagonists, and much of the more critical literature is contained within the ‘IB World” (2011a). Other issues that arose from reading the critical literature around global citizenship include the difficulties in defining terminology, the many different – and often contradictory - versions of global citizenship that have been rendered in the literature, and the potential for global citizenship to mask global inequalities, particularly under the umbrella term of globalisation.
Andreotti’s (2006a) framework of ‘soft’ and ‘critical’ citizenship education traditions provided a platform for critically analyzing global citizenship education that is focused on a Western-oriented worldview which promotes the values, cultures and economic practices of the Global North as superior to those of the Global South. This critical version of global citizenship education offers an unexamined assumption of global citizenship as being symmetrical among nation states, where social and political involvement as well as economic opportunities are equally available to people in all geographical and socio-economic situations. Hayden and Thompson’s ‘universals’ of international education (1996) provide an example of attempts to define this evolving concept, but as the authors themselves are keen to emphasise, international education has always been characterised by change, dealing as it does with the traversing of traditional frontiers, both physical and metaphorical. Other issues that arise from the literature around international education include the increasingly nebulous and uncertain relationship between international education and international schools, with private institutions – in particular – free to describe themselves as ‘international’ with few, if any, qualifying credentials.

There is a complex relationship between international education and the IB. The IB maintains on its most current website pages that it began its existence and continues to serve as an organization for positive social change. Hayden and Thompson (1995a) and Hayden and Wong (1997) identify the IB’s consistency of message highlighting intercultural understanding and global citizenship. Section 2.5 therefore analysed what those terms meant when the IB was formed and what they mean now with the organization at its most successful in terms of numbers of schools using their ‘international programmes for schools’ (Hayden and Thompson, 1995a, pg. 16). One key issue to arise from the literature on this is the tendency for schools using IB programmes to serve students from secure (indeed, privileged) socio-economic backgrounds. Some critical literature extended this idea to suggest that the IB deliberately offers curriculum offerings that support
Western capitalist values.

These suggestions are addressed in more detail in sections 2.6 and 2.7 of this chapter, which have focused on the critical literature around neoliberalism, its presence as an element of international education and its possible influence on the development and growth of the IB MYP. Issues arising from these sections include claims that the IB fosters neoliberal ideologies in its policy and curriculum documents as well as in its criteria for schools to become authorized to use its programmes. Apple (2001) suggests that international schools, and the IB in particular, concentrate on developing neoliberal values in privileged students who will one day dominate the global economic and political landscape, and Harvey (2005) imagines developments such as these contributing to a steady decrease in national and global social justice that has already begun, and for which international education should be held partly accountable.

Section 2.8 of this chapter outlined the theoretical framework for the study, which is based on Nancy Fraser’s (2000) work around social justice, and will be developed further during the critical discourse analysis in Chapter 4 of this study. In this literature review, the various sections of the chapter and their subdivisions have attempted to offer a context and an overview of existing critical literature to which the study aims to contribute, and to expose any issues and debates that have arisen from this phase of the research. The next chapter of this dissertation will focus on the methodology guiding the research experience, which uses a critical discourse analysis approach that might best allow for exploration of the study’s research questions.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

3.1 Introduction
In this chapter I present the methodological approach employed to respond to the study’s research questions. Research questions allow the researcher to specify the purpose of the research and to address the problem or problems identified in the research proposal. Different research approaches and methodologies use research questions in specific ways, and in the context of critical discourse analysis this involves ‘the dialectical relationships between semiosis (including language) and other elements of social practices’ (Fairclough, 2001, pg. 123). The research questions driving this study are:

1. What discourses and concepts of global citizenship are evident in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?

2. What version of global citizenship education is promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?

3. What are the implications for social justice of IB MYP global citizenship education policy and curriculum descriptions?

This chapter will outline the methodological framework of the study, which is based on Foucauldian discourse analysis, the critical discourse analysis (CDA) methodological position of Fairclough, and the Hyatt CDA frame (2013). This methodological approach aims to uncover any hidden meanings in the language around global citizenship in selected IB policy and curriculum documents. It also aims to discuss any implications for social justice. The selection of a CDA approach for Part 1 and Part 2 of the Analysis chapter is based on the general premise that social reality can be reached through socially constructing meaning, including knowledge of social reality that is constructed linguistically. Part 3 and Part 4 of the Analysis chapter examine how socially constructed meanings around global citizenship can have social justice implications.
The methodology chapter is organised into six sections after the introduction. Section 3.2 looks at Foucault’s Discourse Theory, discussing its key assertions and explaining how it is related to this research study. Section 3.3 deals with Critical Discourse Analysis (including criticisms and limitations of CDA), with a justification of the selection of CDA for this study and an explanation of the rationale and practice of CDA. Researcher positionality is discussed in Section 3.4, with reflections of how the study might be influenced by my own values, choices and preconceptions. Section 3.5 deals with the selection of documents for analysis. Section 3.6 addresses approaches to analysis and includes an outline and detailed breakdown of the Hyatt frame. Finally, in Section 3.7, there will be a conclusion in order to review this methodology chapter and to offer a plan for the chapters to follow.

3.2 Foucault’s discourse theory

Foucault’s discourse analysis is described by Gubrium & Holstein (2001) as ‘analytics, not theoretical frameworks in the traditional sense’, seemingly aiming to answer ‘how it is that individual experience comes to be understood in particular terms’ (pg. 495). Foucault’s discourse analysis is concerned with how language not only describes but shapes human experience, and Foucault (1971) conceptualises discourse as those things that can be said and those that can be thought of, as well as who can speak, and with what authority they can speak, and who is silent and why. In terms of knowledge, which is historically specific, discourse permits us to write, think and speak of social objects or social practices in a specific way. For Foucault, discourse involves groups of statements that persist both in speaking and in writing, that take on different arrangements at different times in history (Foucault, 1972).

To illustrate the concept of discourse in the context of this study, the IB produces policy and curriculum documents that consistently refer to discourses of globalisation, global engagement and international-mindedness. There is no single definition of these terms in IB policy and curriculum documents over time, and yet they persist as central to the IB’s curriculum offerings, regardless of changes in context. This is important in that the ambiguity of terminology allows
for multiple interpretations of message and meaning. Parents, teachers, students and school leaders are likely to have their expectations met around globalisation, global engagement and international-mindedness when reading IB documents, even if their preconceptions and understanding of these terms differ. The lack of clarity in terminology allows for various readings of these expressions, satisfying the reader without challenging their existing perceptions.

For Foucault, discourse reflects what exists in the social world, and is therefore fundamentally integral and descriptive of the world; what exists in the world is not just described in language but comes to mean what it is known as through its description. In other words, he sees ‘practices that systematically form the object (or subject) of which they speak… Discourses are about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and, in the practice of doing so, conceal their own invention’ (Foucault, 1972, pg. 49). So discourses aren’t simply reflective or descriptive of the entities they encompass, they also constitute meaning for those elements of reality through language, constructing people’s perceptions of areas of life and constructing our understanding of them during our recurring experiences of them.

Fairclough (1992) explains that we ‘cannot simply ‘apply’ Foucault’s work to discourse analysis’ (p. 38), and Gubrium and Holstein (2000, pg. 495) add that Foucauldian ‘analytics’ as outlined in his work on the archaeology of knowledge and the analysis of forms of knowledge (Foucault, 1970; 1972), as well as in his work on the genealogical analysis of the nature of power in society (1971; 1973; 1977; 1978) offers a starting point for inquiry about the ontological and epistemological assumptions inherent in discourse. Foucault (1972) holds that historically located discourses are different from each other and different from earlier versions of themselves. Therefore, Foucault’s idea of discontinuity (involving epistemological changes) suggests that discourses changing over time can be understood through ruptures leading to new versions of themselves. This is relevant to this study in that concepts of global citizenship, global citizenship education and international education have changed both within and outside of the IB discursive corpus.
Early Foucault

In his engagement with notions of subjectivity, Foucault’s work evolved over time and it is common for researchers to refer to ‘early’ Foucault and ‘late’ Foucault (see Danaher et al 2000; Olssen 2006; Besley & Peters, 2007). Heavily inspired by Nietzsche, early Foucault (1970; 1972) employed an archaeological and genealogical approach to discover how a subject is created by discourse, power practices and institutions in which agency can be found through the repeated interactions between power and resistance as opposed to subjective self-consciousness. Early Foucault, for example, outlined his thoughts on discourse with the following claim:

Expressing their thoughts in words of which they are not the masters [sic], enclosing them in verbal forms whose historical dimensions they are not aware of, men believe that their speech is their servant and do not realise that they are submitting to its demands ... Hence the need to work one’s way back from opinions, philosophies, and perhaps even from sciences, to the words that made them possible (Foucault, 1970, pg. 324).

Here Foucault suggests that people become subject to the language they use, whilst assuming language to be under their control. He calls this process ‘objectification’ and extends the idea with the claim that individuals are the products of deliberate discursive arrangements and the results of modern configurations of power which he calls ‘discipline’. In terms of institutions, such as schools, prisons and companies, discipline creates the conditions under which populations can be scrutinised, evaluated and manipulated with such a level of sophistication that power can be applied against each individual separately. Thus, the self in Foucault’s early writing is the product of a system of discourses where power relations are scripted through institutions and other societal forces rather than an independent, thinking, reflexive and self-aware subject.

Over a wider range of Foucault’s writings, such as those dealing with the mentally ill (Foucault 1965; 1973) or those dealing with prisoners (1977), various means of objectification of the subject are outlined. The first of these means (or
modes) are the dividing practices addressed above, wherein ‘the subject is objectified by a process of division either with himself or from others’ (Dreyfus & Rabinow (ed.), 1982, pg. 208). The second mode is scientific categorisation (Rabinow, 1984, pg. 8), which involves ‘the modes of inquiry which try to give themselves the status of sciences’. This is often achieved, according to Foucault, through ‘the objectivising of the productive subject, the subject who labours, in the analysis of wealth and of economics’ (Foucault, 1982, pg. 777). This practice of including some and excluding others, either in a temporal, social or spatial sense, characterises the modes of manipulation Foucault describes as dividing practices. The subject is engendered with both a social and personal identity through social objectification and categorisation, resulting in labelling.

Late Foucault

Conversely, Foucault’s later work (1978; 1980b; 1985; 1986) offers a version of the subject that is capable of constructing or negotiating their own identity through their own mechanisms, allowing the subject to thus shape their own thoughts, sense of self and bodily appearance. This later development in Foucault’s thinking was viewed by some researchers (Dews 1989; Abrams 2002; Burkitt 2002) as the return of the subject. It seemed to these researchers that Foucault had ceased to focus on the analysis of power and knowledge mechanisms that construct subjects. He had instead apparently turned his attention to the study of ethical self-constituted subjects, as seen in the following example:

Analyzing the experience of sexuality and the history of the experience of sexuality, I became more and more aware that there are, in all societies, other types of techniques, techniques that permit individuals to effect a certain number of operations on their own bodies, on their souls, on their thoughts, on their conduct, and in this manner…. to transform themselves (Foucault 1980 in Paras 2006, pg. 122).

Unlike in his earlier work, Foucault begins to write about individuals as independent entities of experience, able – as subjects - to take action in order to pursue specific goals. Consequently, autonomy emerges as the characteristic of the subject that is more complex than simply a component in the exercise of
power. Similarly, reflexivity appears as Foucault’s later work focuses on what he calls the ‘arts of living’, reflecting ways of life that evolved in the ancient world and that facilitated the determining of a person’s own life experience in conjunction with aesthetic aspirations. These practical and philosophical lifestyle choices could only exist with the deployment of the ‘pre-discursive subject’, wherein the subject paves the way for practices that construct an autonomous and reflexive self.

Foucault (1982) deconstructs subjects through what he calls ‘dividing practices’, with subjectivity itself being made manifest not just through naming the subject, but by describing what the subject is not. This is done by means of technologies of differentiation, with disciplinary technologies being described as ways in which individual bodies are acted upon in – to use the earlier example - schools, prisons and hospitals. But in his earlier work, Foucault considers subjects as classified, disciplined, evaluated and normalised by a process of naming and categorisation, leading to the subject being conferred with a specific labelling identity such as patient, prisoner, and student.

The concept of the individual subject as an independent agent is therefore treated to this deconstruction, with the various classifications used to arrange types of individuals into recognizable groups being condemned by Foucault as false. Thus the self, or the individual agent, is in Foucault’s earlier work dependent upon discourses in a historical and cultural context, dependent upon time and place, and subject to societal rules or practices that determine what can be thought about, enacted and described in language. So discourse for Foucault depends largely upon time and place, situation and context – which are ideas developed in the Hyatt frame of 2013 that will be used for this study. The context of the documents selected for this study include globalisation (see 2.2.4), neoliberalism (see 2.2.5), global citizenship education (see 2.3) and international education (see 2.4). It is in these contexts that the discourse around global citizenship has been developed in IB policy and curriculum documents.
3.3 Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an approach to the study of the discourses of individuals of socio-political significance and in social institutions. CDA emerged from a critical theory of language and draws on a poststructuralist discourse approach, which supports the deconstruction of knowledge assumptions. CDA relies upon assumptions around language as social practice; it holds that verbal and written texts result from the actions of speakers and writers who are socially situated. CDA is used for detailed analysis of verbal and written texts in a particular context, whilst connecting context both empirically and theoretically with the wider social configurations that the texts under analysis attempt to address. Examples of CDA can be found in academic or journalistic critiques of political speeches or policy documents. For example, Hatcher's accusation of the former government of Tony Blair centred on the claim that the administration had ‘established the production of ‘human capital’ for the competitiveness of the British economy as the master narrative of policy’ (Hatcher, 2008, pg. 665). The focus on narrative and policy is a language focus, but it is contextualised in much broader historic and socio-political terms.

CDA is concerned with uncovering hidden meanings or absent meanings in messages; Kress (1990) describes CDA as “making visible and apparent that which may previously have been invisible and seemingly natural ... to show the imbrications of linguistic-discursive practices with the wider socio-political structures of power and domination” (p 85). CDA attempts to uncover relationships of power and control as immersed in written and verbal language. Hence the dialectical relationship between language and society is always a feature of a CDA approach. Titscher et al (2000) view discourse analysis as both interpretative and explanatory (pg.146). In this model, critical analysis is systematic. It is a methodology showing relationships between texts and their wider social contexts, including power relations and related ideologies.

Wodak (1996) attempts to outline the key principles of CDA in a research context in the following arrangement:
• CDA is concerned with social problems. It is not concerned with language or language use *per se*, but with the linguistic character of social and cultural processes and practices. Accordingly, CDA is interdisciplinary.

• Power relations have to do with discourse and CDA looks at both power in discourse and power over discourse.

• Society and culture are dialectically related to discourse: society and culture are shaped by discourse and at the same time constitute discourse. Every single instance of language use reproduces and transforms society and culture including power relations.

• Language use may be ideological. To determine this, it is necessary to analyse texts to investigate their interpretation, reception and social effects.

• Discourses are historical and can only be understood in relation to their context. At the metatheoretical level this corresponds to the approach of Wittgenstein (1984), according to which the meaning of an utterance rests in its usage in a specific situation. Discourses are not embedded in a particular culture, ideology or history, but are also connected intertextually to other discourses.

• The connection between the text and society is not direct, but is manifest through some intermediary.

• Discourse is a form of social behaviour. CDA is understood as a social scientific discipline which makes its interests explicit and prefers to apply its discoveries to practical questions.

(pg. 17 – 20)

CDA, as outlined above, suits the purpose of this study in that education is a social and cultural practice with a strong linguistic character. Education is a form of social reproduction, communicating societal structures and expectations from one generation to the next. Education uses language as a vehicle, and this language can be political and ideological in nature, which should be uncovered with a CDA approach to analysis. The policy and curriculum discourses of the IB MYP occur in historical contexts that themselves exist in cultures and various forms of expression. They are given form through the intermediary of international schools, which are centres of social as well as educational behaviour. CDA focuses on the practical need for a discursive analysis of written and verbal texts in their historical, social and political contexts. This is important for this study in that the
evolution of language around global citizenship in IB policy and curriculum documents reflects changes. For example, the differences in terminology around the ‘global’ between the 2007 and 2014 versions of ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ might reflect the IB’s uncertainties around its own policy documents and curriculum framework structures.

Textual analysis using CDA involves more than linguistic form and content. Indeed, it is important to focus on the function that grammatical and syntactic elements serve when they are being used. Analysis of these elements can be looked at in two ways: first, discursive practice involves an examination of the production, consumption, interpretation, transformation, reproduction and distribution of texts; second, the analysis of socio-cultural practice examines broader societal movements to try to understand how discourse functions in various areas of society, including analysis of interactions between discourse and social structure. Fairclough’s approach, and particularly its evolution into the Hyatt frame, both emerges from and compliments Foucault’s theory and practice of discourse analysis. Fairclough’s approach provides opportunities for descriptive data analysis, where the Hyatt frame is more orientated towards micro analysis in macro contexts. Like Foucault’s analytics, the Hyatt frame looks at how systems of power and knowledge located in culture and history lead to the construction of subjects.

Criticism and limitations of CDA

However, CDA has its critics. Rogers et al. (2005) point to a perceived tendency with CDA to make assumptions that draw social and political conclusions from data where these would not occur with other research methodologies. They suggest that CDA is too often removed from wider social contexts, which can create imbalances between linguistic theory and social situations. The selection of the Hyatt frame for this study, allied with Foucauldian discourse theory, should ensure that these important contextual elements are ever present in the research. Widdowson (1995) is critical of the separation wrought by a CDA approach between text and discourse. He considers CDA vague and claims that texts can be
selected because of their suitability to the approach, rather than for their socio-political significance.

By clearly describing the analytical framework for this research project, it is hoped that Widdowson's criticism of CDA as vague is a charge that will not be levelled against this study, especially as the Hyatt frame offers an analytical framework that is clear and focused on specific linguistic features. Analysis of my own participation in the research experience and any contribution to the reproduction or distribution of power engendered by this study will be detailed in full. The educational contexts for the study will be detailed along with the wider historical, societal and cultural contexts in which the texts selected were produced. I will attempt to make any value judgments or preconceptions apparent through evidence and a thorough breakdown of my positionality as a researcher and my critical self-reflexivity throughout this study, beginning with the following analysis.

3.4 Researcher Positionality

Researcher positionality can be characterised as the ways in which the personal beliefs, character traits and the prior experiences of the researcher influence and shape any research planned and undertaken. A researcher's ontology, their race (or ethnic self-identity), their socio-economic status or class, their age, gender, nationality, vocation, epistemological beliefs and educational background or sexual orientation can all affect their approach to research, and these influences can impact research decisions and results at every phase in the research experience. The practice of researchers actively engaging in overt meta-analysis in which they state their positionality and show how it influences their actions as part of their research is known as reflexivity, and it is increasingly evident in qualitative research.
The idea of reflexivity was probably first formulated by the sociologist William Thomas (1923, 1928), who wrote that 'If men [sic] define situations as real, they are real in their consequences' (Thomas and Thomas, 1928, pg. 571). This principle was expanded upon by another sociologist, Robert K. Merton, who in 1948 first outlined the idea of social sciences inadvertently producing self-fulfilling prophecies. If the researcher anticipates that certain events that take place during the research process will produce certain results, the researcher may unconsciously shape their research to make that happen. This notion has been applied to economics and some of the 'hard' sciences, and has found popularity in the mainstream cultural consciousness of many Western societies.

More recently, in the last thirty years or so, the idea of reflexivity evolved as a counter-balance to any researcher unawareness of their own bias. Researchers began to contemplate the idea that they themselves were integral to the research they conducted, with ‘feminist, postmodern, post-structural, hermeneutic, interpretive and critical discourses recognising that knowledge and understanding are contextually and historically grounded, as well as linguistically constituted’ (Mauthner and Doucet, 2003, pg 3). It became increasingly common for researchers in the social sciences to make demands of themselves and other researchers around incorporating researcher identities into research processes and products. The prevailing philosophy was that ‘representation is always self-presentation; the Other’s presence is directly connected to the writer's self-presence in the text’ (Denzin, 1994, pg. 12), and that one’s positionality should be continually monitored throughout all areas of research. Indeed, ‘in terms of current practice, it could be argued that reflexivity, in its myriad forms, is now the defining feature of qualitative research' (Finlay, 2002, pg. 211).

In framing positionality in reference to this research study, further assumptions arise. My interests may be intellectual or pragmatic, there may be financial or institutional constraints governing the choice of research topic, and existing ontological and epistemological perceptions might ultimately dictate the
direction in which research will finally move. And finally there is the question of how positionality is carried out as part of a research experience. Stating one’s positionality ‘is designed to reveal forgotten choices, expose hidden alternatives, lay bare epistemological limits and empower voices which had been subjugated by objective discourse’ (Lynch, 2000, pg. 36). But this all depends on who performs the research and how they conduct their research processes ‘when we delineate what we intend to study, when we adopt a particular theoretical position, when we ask certain kinds of questions rather than others, and when we analyse and make sense of findings in one sense rather than another’ (Usher, 1998, pg 34).

There are, however, limitations to this practice. The first issue when considering the significance of positionality is that it assumes researcher positionality is an unchallenged certainty that is bound to influence a researcher’s selection of topic, aims, research question/s, methodology and methods. This locates studies within the context of the researcher or researchers, which could limit the scope of research projects and discourage researchers from taking calculated risks to gain new insights. Secondly, commentators such as Jenny Lunn and Michael Lynch are critical of its power over research decisions. With the need to qualify one’s every thought and action in light of one’s experiences and perspectives, ‘writings about positionality have come to be characterised by an almost paranoid hyper-reflexivity’ (Lunn, 2010, pg. 4). In this study, I will attempt to incorporate reflexivity as and when appropriate using a structured self-awareness of reflexive practice.

The first way of organising my reflexive practice will be to identify and present a breakdown of my own research context as the primary researcher in this study. Such a ‘self socio-analysis’ (Bourdieu, 2007) aims to expose how my positionality might contribute to the ways in which I conduct research and analyse findings. Through working in three international schools – in Qatar and Romania and one Japanese state secondary school respectively over a ten-year period, I became increasingly aware of tensions seemingly inherent in student and teacher perceptions of global citizenship. On one hand, the concept of global citizenship
was addressed - or at least discussed – by teaching colleagues in terms of social equality and opportunities for greater understanding and empathy across (and within) cultures. On the other hand, these discussions were sometimes tinged with the language of neoliberalism, in which globalisation and global citizenship were seen as opportunities for increased trade and new opportunities for students to exploit upon leaving school. I was regularly party to both genres of discussion, unwittingly communicating mixed messages to my students.

The tension between these competing scenarios of global citizenship were exacerbated, to my mind, by what I consider a lack of criticality among students, teachers and expatriate families in international school communities. Often ideas of social equality and global profiteering were two parts of the same conversation, as though one automatically engendered the other in some pseudo-utopia of wealth and social justice for all. However, there was no evidence for this reality; on the contrary, the international schools in which I worked primarily served the families of a wealthy Western elite along with a small and privileged pocket of families from the host nation in which the schools were located. In short, what seemed evident to me was a self-fulfilling cycle of self-delusion and language propaganda serving to persistently convince the elite expatriate community that they were at the vanguard of some great social and financial miracle proliferating around the world.

It was an uncritical perspective and one in which I was both situated and to which I contributed at that time. But my experiences of growing up in a working class community on a council estate in south Manchester and my subsequent travels to live and work away from home – both in other areas of the U.K. and abroad – provided me with a constant reminder of social inequalities that had abated little since I left school in 1985 to 40% unemployment and significant social deprivation. My position within the expatriate community many years later as a teacher in international schools insulated me from contemporary hardship, but the longer I spent as part of these communities, the more convinced I became that we were unintentionally or otherwise contributing to global social and economic inequality; it seemed to me that the curriculum I taught each day in
school was the main problem, mixing – as it did – the language of global citizenship, social equality and neoliberalism as though they were all part of the same phenomenon. This uncomfortable realisation is what led me to begin this study.

The space I occupied within these situations, and upon which I must constantly reflect critically during this study, means that I am subjectively connected to any and all aspects of the experiences I will attempt to address. I am acutely aware of the possibility that I might subconsciously gloss over my own involvement in any of the global inequalities I describe, or that I may be tempted to protect friends – or, indeed, friendships – by avoiding stipulating selectively chosen instances or examples that could effectively illustrate a particular situation. It will be crucial, therefore, not just to self-critically reflect on research processes but also to attempt to maintain personal and academic transparency throughout the study, and to protect identities, however uncomfortable or inconvenient this might be.

My positionality in this study also shaped the methodology and approach employed, as the language of selected policy and curriculum documents and the social justice implications of the hidden assumptions in these documents most aptly matched the concerns I felt that led me to formulate this research study. My teaching practice in the MYP exposed me to regular and persistent exposure to policy and curriculum terminology I found incongruous with my own beliefs about education; I was troubled by the idea that I might be unintentionally contributing to the dissemination of a neoliberal, Western-oriented worldview among my student population.

Another factor shaping my positionality and research choices is my training and experience as an English teacher. I have an M.A. in Creative Writing and I participated in writing workshops in Japan and the U.S.A. Aspects of these experiences were incorporated into my teaching practice, and over time my interest in language, its uses and significance intensified. My choice of CDA reflects this growing personal interest, as I have been drawn ever more deeply into the
interactions between language, society, power, politics and education. This positionality means that I have focused very directly on issues of language and terminology, access to the MYP and the social justice implications of findings emerging from the CDA.

3.5 Documents selected for analysis

The documents selected for analysis for this study have been chosen from among publications from the IB that set out the organisation’s vision and process for schools to use the IB MYP. The first is ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (IB, 2014) and it has been selected for analysis because it represents the key policy and curriculum framework document for the IB MYP. This document contains a brief history of the programme, its philosophical underpinnings, a breakdown of its organisation in a school setting and advice for teaching, learning and assessment. It is used by teachers - in conjunction with subject guides – to develop MYP units of study.

The second document selected for analysis is ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011), an IB ‘position paper’, which is defined by the IB as ‘part of a series of papers, written by IB practitioners and endorsed by the IB. Each paper addresses a topic or issue related to the IB’s philosophy or its educational practices’ (2011, pg. 2). This position paper has been selected for analysis because it outlines the IB’s philosophical position on global citizenship in their curriculum offerings. These two documents together contain much of the information needed for in depth responses to this study’s research questions.

3.6 Approach to analysis

This study will use the Hyatt frame of 2013 to access, describe and analyse IB policy and curriculum documents relating to global citizenship. This frame was developed specifically to address educational policy documents and has been organised into the following structure:
Contextualisation: temporal context, policy levers/driver, warrant

Deconstruction: modes of legitimation, intertextuality/interdiscursivity, evaluation/appraisal, presumption/implication, lexico-grammatical construction (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 43).

As the documents under consideration may vary in content for which these general headings may be appropriate, it is envisaged that each element might not be treated equally in terms of volume of analysis. Rather, different sections that lend themselves most favourably to a critical discourse analysis of the documents selected feature more prominently in the study. The various sections of the analytical frame can be outlined in the following manner:

Policy contextualisation

Temporal context

Temporal context refers to both the synchronic and diachronic contexts of a given document or discourse, looking equally across time and in the present moment. Hyatt (2013, pg. 46-57) organises temporal context along the following lines:

1. Immediate socio-political context, which deals with any current events influencing the discourse being studied.

2. Medium-term socio-political context, which deals with discourse elements that last beyond the immediate socio-political context.

3. Contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures, which focuses on key individuals either responsible for or concerned with the discourse under analysis, and the institutions with which these individuals have been involved.

4. Epoch, which addresses what is known or considered knowledge within a particular time period, and which draws on Foucault’s 1972 concept of ‘episteme’.

1. Immediate socio-political context

The immediate socio-political context of the IB’s claims around global citizenship can be found in the organisation’s most recent publications as well as from curriculum documents such as subject guides and unit plans. Other critical literature also provides context and commentary on how the landscape of politics, economics and cultural influences are presented in the texts selected.
2. **Medium-term socio-political context**

The ‘medium-term socio-political context’ (Hyatt, 2013) refers to contexts with duration beyond the immediate term, often beyond any specific text, but that are not lasting enough to be thought of as part of wider socio-political contexts or enduring aspects of culture. While linked to the socio-historic eras during which they were formed, these contexts might overlap with shorter and longer-term contexts, and so it is important to reflect on how and when they are presented as key acts in a given time frame.

3. **Contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures**

Next is ‘contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures’ (ibid), and in particular at current participants in decision making that most profoundly influence text development and dissemination. For this study, these individuals may operate within or around the IB organisation, but they may also come from other educational sources and from other economic or socio-political settings. When concentrations of power can be seen to affect the dynamic of an organisation, looking at contemporary socio-political individuals can ‘help to elucidate the relationship between individuals and institutions, addressing the interrelationship between agency and structure’ (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 48).

4. **Epoch**

Epoch is important in understanding what is thought of – and written of – as truth in a given context and time frame. Inspired by Foucault’s concept of *episteme* (1972), epoch is concerned with ways in which societies present themselves and how they legitimise their self-identities through discourse. Foucault describes these processes via ideas of deviancy and normality, where power is wielded through compulsion either directly or through hegemony. Fairclough (1989) sees epoch as the ways in which discourse is driven by consent rather than coercion, when dominant voices or dominant groups are accepted as the current norm or standard for the ideology they represent within a particular era.

*Policy drivers and levers*
Policy drivers are those stated objectives of a policy that can be found in policy documents, press releases, through legislation passed in parliament or through directives developed in organisations. Policy levers are mechanisms used to enact policy, through legal obligation or through organisational practices. Beginning with the qualifying statement that ‘there is no recipe for carrying out policy analysis in education’ (Rizvi and Linguard, 2010, pg. 45), it’s important to note that a policy analysis can be conducted in a variety of ways, as there is much more to any policy than the text to which it is assigned. Policies are infused with the values of the people who write them and they exist in broad contexts that range from the political to the social to the economic. Policies can be said to be multidimensional, and policy implementation can result in both intended and unintended consequences that can be difficult to predict. This applies equally to institutional policies, with which this study is primarily concerned.

**Warrant**

Warrant refers to the justification of policy, either through evidentiary authority, such as research data or other statistics, through accountability, such as academic performance results, or through political warrant, such as those policies presented as serving the public interest. For ease of analysis, the concept of warrant can be subdivided, as by Cochran-Smith and Fries (2001), to include the *evidentiary warrant*, the *accountability warrant*, and the *political warrant*. The *evidentiary warrant* is concerned with warrant justified with evidence, which is perhaps the most persuasive form of warrant in the current era. For Cochran-Smith and Fries (ibid), evidence is never an objective given; rather, it emerges from the choices and interpretations of researchers, whether it is qualitative or quantitative, and hence comes infused with the values of the researchers, as well as their subjective focuses.

The *accountability warrant* provides legitimation or authority through the measurement of outcomes. Standards or benchmarks are set, sometimes arbitrarily or to serve a hidden purpose, and authority comes from the demand for those standards to be improved. The *accountability warrant* can be bolstered by suggestions of threats as to what might happen if given benchmarks are not
met or improved upon. As such, this kind of warrant is common in education, both in the U.K. and overseas, and is often accompanied by political drivers and levers. This brings us to the *political warrant*, which is concerned with policy justification in the national interest or in the context of the public good. Like the *accountability warrant*, the *political warrant* suggests that opposition to such a policy stance is akin to desiring failure, but it is generally used in conjunction with undefined or contested platitudes such as ‘freedom’ or ‘public interest’.

**Deconstruction of policy**

*Modes of legitimation*

Legitimation is concerned with the means and the processes by which a policy is justified to its intended audience. As such, it shares a relationship with *warrant*, with legitimation carrying the main policy message and warrant providing informational support for that message. Fairclough (2003) divides legitimation into four areas, or modes: *authorisation, rationalisation, moral evaluation* and *mythopoesis*. *Authorisation* provides legitimation for an idea by drawing upon authority that isn’t usually challenged, such as tradition and custom, law and the authority vested in individuals, such as police officers and judges. *Rationalisation* seeks its authority from the perceived value or usefulness of an idea to its society, or to a section of society, and as such is related to the *political warrant*. Similarly, *moral evaluation* takes its authority from perceptions of what is good, but rather than ‘good’ in this sense meaning useful, *moral evaluation* rests on ideological discourses, where ‘good’ is a value judgment based on certain philosophical or conceptual principles.

*Mythopoesis* refers to discourses that offer time-honoured advice, warnings against certain actions or ideals and narratives such as cautionary tales that draw their authority from the perceived wisdom of old sayings and common idioms. In each case, *authorisation, rationalisation, moral evaluation* and *mythopoesis* can lay claims to authority that are specific, but they can equally rely on implicit meanings and assumptions. Fairclough (1989) emphasises processes of ‘naturalisation’ for these modes of legitimation, where language creates (or adds to) social pressures for people to accept conditions provoked by policy and
other discourses that might, in fact, be to their detriment. This is why implicit assumptions in modes of legitimations should be uncovered and critically evaluated.

*Intertextuality and interdiscursivity*

Interdiscursivity refers to the ways different discourses interact, often through relationships developed through social or political trends. Intertextuality occurs through the narrative of one discourse borrowing from the narrative of another. Interdiscursivity occurs when discourses interpenetrate one another, sometimes to more widely contextualise the text or to seek legitimation or support from other genres or text types. An example might involve a History educational text drawing upon information in a Science journal to add credence to its analysis. Or a journalistic text might use findings from an academic text to bolster the position of a given article. In these cases, the textual influence might not be obvious, but with intertextuality the borrowing of ideas is more obvious, usually explicitly stated through quotation or direct reference.

*Evaluation and appraisal*

The two areas of evaluation and appraisal applied in this study are *inscribed* evaluation and *evoked* evaluation, the former carrying a clear meaning from the use of evaluative language and the latter offering a superficial neutrality designed to elicit strong feelings or reactions. *Inscribed* evaluations of texts carry clear value judgments relating to the text or its author(s). These might include judgmental adjectives such as ‘poor’ or ‘superb’, where the attitude of the writer is clearly demonstrated. With *evoked* evaluation the attitude of the commentator towards a text or texts is not overtly demonstrated, but evaluations are constructed to provoke specific responses in the reader, through which the value judgments of the commentator are made manifest. Example of *evoked* evaluation might include seemingly neutral terms such as ‘historic’ or ‘reform’, which are passed off as universal but which are infused with value judgments.

*Presupposition and implication*
Presuppositions are language constructs that frontload content with values. Examples of presuppositions include questions beginning with ‘Isn’t it accurate to point out...’ or statements that begin with ‘Clearly....’ These language structures seek responses that have been implied before the question has been asked or the statement has been heard. They offer a presupposed version of truth whilst attempting to seem reasonable and common sense. As such, they are loaded with implications that might not be immediately obvious from the textual context. An example of a presupposition might include causal links between disparate events such as claims that the economy is healthy because fewer small businesses failed in one year compared to the previous year. Such presuppositions are common in both journalism and political speeches, but evidence of their use is widely dispersed across academic publications and educational policy documents.

**Lexico-grammatical construction**

The application of pronouns, changes between active and passive voice, tense selection and the omission of agency to produce universality are all lexico-grammatical constructions that influence ‘the representation of action or process as true, relevant or significant’ (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 56). These language structures aim to offer versions of reality not open to question; they can obscure the identities of groups or individuals and either add or remove attachments of responsibility from unnamed actors in a process. Choices of tense, for example, can elaborate on events and place them within a time frame, even if that time frame is never stipulated. Likewise, the passive voice can mask agency from actors in policy development, presenting policy development as a process where drivers and levers are absent. Lexico-grammatical constructions can thus represent actions or situations in deliberately uncertain or misleading terms, whilst seeming ostensibly neutral.

**3.7 Conclusion**

The methodological approach used for this research experience was based on Foucauldian discourse analysis theory synthesized with the Critical Discourse
Analysis (CDA) position of Fairclough (1992) that contributed to the formulation of the Hyatt frame (2013). Foucault’s (1972) assertion that discourses ‘do not identify objects, they constitute them’ (pg. 49) has been of particular help to this study, which has engaged with ways in which the IB has attempted to constitute its own versions of global citizenship and global citizenship education through descriptions of these contested concepts. Fairclough’s (1992) text-oriented approach to CDA has supported the document-centred focus of this study, and his assertion that we ‘cannot simply apply’ (pg. 38) Foucault’s theories to CDA encouraged me to develop a theoretical framework designed specifically for analysis of policy documents.

The framework chosen as most suitable to this purpose was the Hyatt frame (2013), which offered a thorough, linguistically focused way of analyzing specific aspects of language in the texts selected for study. Fundamentally in this study it has served to synthesise Fairclough’s method of descriptive data analysis with Foucault’s analytics by directing the research towards knowledge and power, and how these are located in history and culture. During documentary analysis, the Hyatt frame provided a list of options pertinent to CDA from which I was able draw to suit specific areas of the study. The frame is divided into two parts – *Contextualisation* and *Deconstruction* - each offering five dimensions of analysis specific to policy documents and other educational texts. Hyatt is clear in indicating that these dimensions should not be addressed in equal measure if this is not relevant to a given research experience; rather, the researcher is free to select from the ten dimensions of analysis detailed in the frame.

The flexibility to be selective with Hyatt’s (2013) analytical dimensions proved helpful in that there was widespread use of *lexico-grammatical construction*, for example, in the documents selected for analysis; however, there was no evidence of *intertextuality* or *interdiscursivity*, and so these dimensions did not feature in the CDA. Added to this, there were no aspects of the documents selected for analysis for which there was not a relevant analytical dimension
offered by the Hyatt frame. In other words, the Hyatt frame presented a range of analytical tools that were more than adequate for the textual elements of the research. Moreover, the sequence in which Hyatt's (2013) analytical dimensions are presented in the frame offered a way for me to organise the CDA at the heart of the study (Chapter 4). In flexibly following the sequence offered by the Hyatt frame and matching this to the linear order of the documents under review, the issues emerging from the CDA could be detailed in a logical pattern that complimented the organisation of the study.

One limitation to my CDA approach was that I found myself becoming absorbed in the philosophical ramifications of language in education, language in organisations and language in society. These wider considerations sometimes distracted me from focusing on responding to my research questions, and I was obliged to keep my research questions in bold text on each page of the analysis chapter in order to avoid this diversion. A second, related limitation to my CDA approach was that it generated as many questions about language and terminology as it answered. Many key terms were open to multiple interpretations, and it was difficult to keep my investigations within the bounded unit of the study. I address these limitations in the Discussion chapter. The chapter following this one demonstrates the application of the methodology described here to the documents selected for this approach. It is the chapter in which the core analysis of documents – and social justice issues emerging from that analysis – are revealed and discussed.
Chapter 4 - Analysis

Introduction

The first three parts of this chapter respond to the study’s first two research questions: (1. What discourses and concepts of global citizenship are evident in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents? 2. What version of global citizenship education is promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?) by focusing on analysis of two key documents and two case study MYP unit plans. The two key documents are: ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (IB, 2014), and ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011). The two unit plans are called ‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’ (appendix 2) and ‘The bottom billion’ (appendix 3). This chapter’s fourth part addresses research question 3: What are the implications for social justice of IB MYP global citizenship education policy and curriculum descriptions? This part examines issues of social justice emerging from the CDA, identifying any ways in which conceptualisations of global citizenship might be evident in MYP unit plans currently in use at schools using the programme.

Parts 1, 2 and 3 of this chapter are organised using the Hyatt frame (2013):

- Temporal Context, including immediate and medium-term socio-political context, contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures, and Epoch.
- Drivers, levers, and warrant
- Modes of legitimation, interdiscursivity and intertextuality, evaluation/appraisal, presupposition/implication, and lexicogrammatical construction.

The meaning of each of the technical terms above is explained in the methodology chapter of this dissertation, and in considering this structure, it is important to note Hyatt’s clarification (2013, pg. 5) that these analytical lenses for discourse analysis are neither ‘universal’ nor ‘all-encompassing’ in any case study. Where they are used in detail in this study, they will be preceded by a sub-heading
so that the focus of the section is clear to the reader. Where they are used in less
detail or under other headings, they will be italicized. These analytical tools will
not, however, be used in equal measure; rather, they will be applied when
appropriate to specific areas of text, depending upon the focus of the section and
the content of the text under consideration. The fourth dimension of the Hyatt
framework, for example, which includes ‘modes of legitimation, interdiscursivity
and intertextuality, evaluation/appraisal, presupposition/implication, and lexico-
grammatical construction’ (ibid) is integrated into the analysis at appropriate
points. As well as the explanation of these terms, the rationale for this
arrangement is discussed in more detail in the methodology chapter.

Part 1 - MYP: From Principles into Practice (IB, 2014)

Temporal Context
‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ was published in 2014 and resulted from a
major curriculum review called the ‘MYP Next Chapter’ (ibo.org). The 2014
document is a revision of the first version of ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’,
which was published in 2008 and ‘described a framework that consolidated the IB
community’s understanding of curriculum in the MYP, but did not radically change
it’ (Harrison, 2015, pg. 45 – 46). The redevelopment of the programme and its core
policy and curriculum document is significant to the first research question in this
study in that it exhibits considerable increases in uses of terminology around the
‘global’. In the 2008 version of the document, there are eleven mentions of ‘global’
or ‘globalisation’ in its 86 pages; in the 2014 version, there are one hundred and
seventeen uses of the same two terms in its 115 pages (without appendices).

Much of this change comes from the MYP’s change in ‘learning contexts’
from ‘Areas of Interaction’ to ‘Global Contexts’. ‘Learning contexts’ is the term used
by the IB to describe a set of headings which are designed to ‘help students
understand different languages and cultures’ (ibo.org). Learning contexts consist
of ‘global contexts’ developed by the IB. Global contexts in the MYP are organised
into the following six arrangements:
fairness and development  
identities and relationships  
orientation in time and space  
personal and cultural expression  
scientific and technical innovation  
globalisation and sustainability

Each MYP unit planner for any of the eight subject groups\(^6\) must include one selection from a choice of these six global contexts.

The MYP unit planner (appendix 1) is used by teachers or teaching teams in IB schools to create learning experiences organized around one MYP Key Concept. Each planner also requires the use of one or more Related Concept, plus a ‘statement of inquiry’, which aims to outline the unit focus, and one Global Context. The introduction of the Global Context element to MYP unit planning suggests that in the six years between the 2008 and 2014 versions of the document, the ‘global’ component of the MYP curriculum framework has taken on greater significance for the IB, whose five-fold increase in uses of the terms ‘global’ or ‘globalisation’ suggest a promotion of these concepts in the MYP. During that same period, the number of schools using the MYP globally went from 161 in 2008 to 1,108 in June 2014 (IB, 2014c).

These developments suggest a current temporal context in which students studying in the MYP are expected by the IB to engage with Key Concepts through their place in a global context. There are sixteen MYP Key Concepts\(^7\), and these have been loosely clustered in connection with specific disciplines. The four Key Concepts connected to Individuals and Societies (formerly Humanities), for example, are Systems, Global Interactions, and Time, Place and Space. Other Key

---

\(^6\) The eight subject groups of the MYP include Mathematics, Language Acquisition, Individuals and Societies, Sciences, Language and Literature, Design, Arts, and Physical and Health Education.

\(^7\) Aesthetics, Change, Communication, Communities, Connections, Creativity, Culture, Development, Form, Global Interactions, Identity, Logic, Perspective, Relationships, Time, Place and Space, and Systems.
Concepts can be used within that subject group, so the connections are recommended rather than mandated, but each unit plan’s ‘statement of inquiry’ must explicitly connect the unit’s Key Concept with one of five mandated Global Contexts.

The language of ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ falls short of using the term ‘global citizenship’, but the growth and scale of global terminology locates sections of the document in the global citizenship discourse. Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of the literature review address this claim in more detail, outlining the various versions of global citizenship and their application in educational contexts. The MYP is extending its influence over a growing number of students worldwide and those students are exposed to global learning contexts that are value-laden and greatly contested in the critical literature around this topic.

Immediate and medium-term socio-political context

Tarc (2007) describes the period of the IB’s history during which the MYP was developed (1990 – 2001) as the ‘ascendancy of neoliberal globalisation’ (pg. 45). But the IB’s own publications relating to the development of the MYP largely avoid contested political discourses such as globalisation, except for when it is referred to as a concept ‘open to different interpretations’ (IB, 2014, pg. 17). Writing when the MYP was still just an idea, former Director General of the IB, Gerard Renaud (1991), stated that ‘the mission of schools is to prepare young people – the decision makers of tomorrow – to live in a complex multicultural society undergoing a process of rapid change and opening up a new world’ (pg. 8). Harrison (2015) cites the efforts of ‘prominent thinkers whose work was more generally influencing the Anglo-American educational community in the early 21st century, including Wiggins and McTighe (1998)’ (pg. 46). Wiggins and McTighe gained acknowledgement in the IB though the publication of their 1998 book ‘Understanding by Design’, which is referenced with some frequency in a variety of IB publications issued by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, an American independent nonprofit organization which provides programmes, products and services primarily in the American and international education markets.
The IB’s publication ‘The History of the Middle Years Programme’ (2010) states that ‘the programme was devised to help students develop the knowledge, attitudes and skills they need to participate actively and responsibly in a changing and increasingly interrelated world’ (pg. 25). This focus, however, does not shield the MYP from the socio-political context in which it was developed and in which it currently operates. The MYP curriculum framework ‘retains its essentially favourable orientation toward the worldviews of its originators, which some will (not without cause) find to be overtly ‘western’ or even ‘colonialist” (Harrison, 2015, pg. 55). As mentioned earlier, this is perhaps most strongly suggested by the selection of the IB’s ‘working languages’ of English, French or Spanish, which reflects both the location of the organisation’s foundation (Geneva, Switzerland), the nationalities of its founders (Robert Leach: USA; Alec Peterson: Britain), and the languages associated with the nineteenth century’s leading colonial powers - Great Britain, France and Spain. In schools wishing to run the MYP in any other language, ‘the pedagogical leadership team must develop plans to ensure the consistent implementation and development of the programme’ (IB, 2014, pg. 30).

In contrast to this narrow cultural-linguistic focus, in ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014), the section Global contexts for education begins with the claim that ‘IB programmes aim to develop international-mindedness in a global context’ (pg. 11). The term ‘international’ is defined as a ‘perspective of the world’s constituent parts, nation states and their relationships with each other’. The term ‘global’ is defined as ‘the perspective of the planet as a whole’. These definitions are followed by the suggestion that:

sharp distinctions between the “local”, “national” and “global” are blurring in the face of emerging institutions and technologies that transcend modern nation states. New challenges that are not defined by traditional boundaries call for students to develop the agility and imagination they need for living productively in a complex world (pg. 11).
This is important because these terms are addressed much more briefly in the original, 2008 version of the same document, which reads: ‘given the variety and complexity of schools, and the elusive nature of the concept of international-mindedness itself, it would be naive to propose any simple definition and expect it to stand up to rigorous examination’ (2008, Pg. 7). In the context of this study's first research question, it could be argued that the IB's attempts to develop this definition in the 2014 document falls short of rigorous application.

Within this immediate socio-political context, the claim that ours is a 'highly interconnected and rapidly changing world' (2014, pg. 11), is the platform from which all other claims around international-mindedness follow, but – as explained below - the idea that we share a world that is 'highly interconnected' reveals a lack of criticality in the IB's development of their concept of international-mindedness. The term ‘interconnected’ (or a derivative) is used three other times in this document, first in the context of 'the relationships between, and the interconnectedness of, individuals and civilisations, from local and global perspectives' (pg. 18); second in ‘the interconnectedness of human made systems and communities (pg. 61); and third through ‘opportunities and tensions provided by world interconnectedness’ (pg. 61). Despite these extensions of the concept, none of these phrases attempt to define interconnectedness, making it difficult to interpret the term and further weakening the idea of international-mindedness it is meant to support. People and places can be interconnected in numerous ways, but none of these possibilities are presented except in very general terms and any possible connections implied by this term do not necessarily lead to international-mindedness.

Apple (2001) suggests that interconnectedness is just another way to describe globalisation, with all its inherent contestations (see 2.2.4). Even if we assume that interconnectedness includes connections made through information and communications technology, there is no evidence that our 'highly interconnected and rapidly changing world' (2014, pg. 11) applies equally to all
people in all situations. A United Nations report entitled ‘The State of Broadband’ states that ‘the Internet is currently only accessible to 35 per cent of people in developing countries [sic]’ (UNESCO, 2015, pg. 44). More significant still, in 48 of those countries designated by the U.N. as ‘Least Developed’ [sic], more than 90 per cent of the population is ‘without any kind of Internet connectivity’ (pg. 8). Of course, parts of the world can be interconnected in other ways, such as language, history, culture or trade. But the idea of being ‘highly interconnected’ suggests a focus on information and communications technology.

Similarly, the claim that we live in a ‘rapidly changing world’ is made without a frame of reference or an attempted definition. This does not mean that some changes in some parts of the world are not taking place rapidly; rather, it fails to identify what kinds of changes might be taking place rapidly, how and why those changes might be taking place, where these changes may be apparent, whether these changes are positive or negative, or for whom they may be significant in the context of equality and social justice. Taken together, these ideas of high connectivity and rapid change are empty of details, explanations or justifications to support them, and yet these are the claims that form the basis on which further unsubstantiated claims are made. These additional claims will be examined in a later section of this analysis, under the heading Epoch.

Contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures

The IB MYP has been significantly redeveloped twice in its twenty-year history, first in 2008 and again in 2013. Both at its inception, in 1997, and in these following redevelopments, multiple contributors and influences helped to develop the evolving programme. However, one individual stands out as most directly involved in shaping the programme into its current state. Monique Conn served as the first MYP Manager from January 1997 to 2002, when she became Head of Programme Division, with responsibility for all three IB programmes. During Conn’s tenure as MYP Manager she ‘facilitated the writing of each guide with
teachers, and all MYP documentation’ (IB, 2010, pg. 28), going on to become the Academic Director of the Aga Khan Foundation after leaving the IB in 2007.

Conn’s writing on the development of the MYP shows evidence of language and terminology similar to that which can be found in current MYP documents. This should not be surprising, given her involvement in the development of the programme, and it perhaps demonstrates the impact of socio-political individuals on prevailing messages and attitudes within organisations. In her article for the ‘International Handbook of Education for the Changing World of Work’ (2009), Conn begins with the judgment that ‘the success of the curriculum models developed by the International Baccalaureate Organisation (IBO), addressing the academic needs of students in the 3 – 19 age range, is now well known’ (pg. 735). What that success is, and to whom it is known, are not revealed; all actors and all agency in these claims are hidden by what Hyatt (2013) calls the lexicogrammatical construction (pg. 56) of the sentence. This involves the use of certain tenses, or – as in this case - the passive voice, which enables the writer to avoid specifying actors in the event or process described. It can also involve presupposition, as with Conn’s assertion that in the development of IB programmes:

international educators were motivated by an idealistic vision: they hoped that a shared academic experience emphasising critical thinking and an exposure to a variety of points of view would encourage intercultural understanding and acceptance of others (pg. 735).

This claim around the idealism of international educators lacks any reference to the role and responsibilities of a specific international educator or educators who shared this particular ideal and how that ideal was manifest in a shared hope for a particular academic experience for unspecified students. As Hyatt (2013) explains, such presupposition can help ‘to represent constructions as convincing realities’ (pg. 55). Conn’s claim also relies upon the mode of legitimisation Fairclough (2003) describes as authorisation, whereby the authority for a claim is only implied, not stipulated, with the authority in this case coming
from unnamed ‘international educators’. The claim that these educators support curriculum development that encourages ‘intercultural understanding and acceptance’ reflects the language of ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ – versions 2008 and 2013 – around ‘intercultural understanding and respect’. The parallels of the language between Conn’s article and the curriculum and policy documents of the IB suggests that her influence on the IB and on the development of the MYP is both considerable and lasting.

Epoch

Drawing on Foucault’s (1972) concept of ‘episteme’, and Fairclough’s (1989) interpretation of this term, Hyatt (2013) uses epoch to frame what passes for truth within a specific time period; for Foucault, epoch rests on contemporary ideas of what is normal and what is deviant; for Fairclough, epoch is influenced by the consensus of what is accepted as true during a given era. The epoch in which the MYP was developed is evident in the policy and curriculum documents selected for this study, with the terminology of globalisation and information and communications technology woven together with environmental and humanitarian language in an outline of MYP values and influences. In ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014), the IB has summarised these values into the terms ‘international-mindedness’, ‘intercultural understanding’ and ‘global engagement’ (pg. 11 - 12). In this document, international-mindedness ‘relies on the development of learning environments that value the world as the broadest context for learning’. Global engagement ‘represents a commitment to address humanity’s greatest challenges in the classroom and beyond’, and intercultural understanding ‘involves recognizing and reflecting on one’s own perspective, as well as the perspectives of others’ (pg. 12).

Whilst unique to the IB as terminology specific to their programmes, this language contains parallels with the wider literature around global citizenship, and around global citizenship education. So in responding to the first research question of what discourses and concepts of global citizenship are evident in IB
MYP policy and curriculum documents, the epoch in which the MYP is situated is reflective of the ideas and claims that count as truth or knowledge in the era of the discourse around global citizenship. While avoiding the terminology of global citizenship in 'MYP: From Principles into Practice', the concept of 'international-mindedness' is of central importance to the IB, being incorporated into the organisation's mission statement to 'develop internationally-minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world' (IB, 2014 pg. 1).

This statement demonstrates the global leadership aspirations the IB has for its students, which is why it may be important to attempt to understand the type of global leader the IB envisions in its policy and curriculum documents. Page 12 of this same document claims the programme offers a ‘philosophy, organization and curriculum that can create and sustain authentic global learning communities’. This claim reflects the epoch of global citizenship, drawing upon the power of consensus around this concept. However, it is arguable that consensus equates to authority, and it would be interesting to know what is meant by ‘authentic’. ‘Global learning communities’ puts ‘global’ into an MYP context, but the idea that global learning communities can be facilitated through the programme is a claim without evidence or explanation. In describing international-mindedness in this way, the IB have attempted to justify their aspirational idea with elaborations that are without foundation except in generalised intangibilities. They have also managed to avoid the direct terminology of global citizenship, although – as this section of the study aims to demonstrate - the parallels can be identified.

Like international-mindedness (see 2.2.8), 'intercultural understanding' aspires to the global citizenship value of ‘universal hospitality’ (Kant, 1991, pg. 105). According to 'MYP: From Principles into Practice' (2014), ‘to increase intercultural understanding, IB programmes foster learning how to appreciate critically many beliefs, values, experiences, forms of expression and ways of knowing' (pg. 12). The term ‘intercultural understanding’ can be found in the IB’s
mission statement. It can also be found in the United Nations resolution 61/269 of the 25 May 2007, which attempts to address interreligious issues. It is an aspirational term that is used five times in the 2014 version of 'MYP: From Principles into Practice'; in the 2008 version of the same document, 'intercultural understanding' is used once and 'intercultural awareness' is used five times, suggesting that between 2008 and 2014, 'awareness' was deliberately replaced with 'understanding'.

This reflects Fairclough's (1989) suggestion that epoch equates to dominant voices or dominant groups whose ideas become accepted as normal for the time period in which they are developed through a process of consent. The transformation from 'awareness' to 'understanding' occurs during the same time period in which the United Nations began using 'intercultural understanding'. The United Nations is an organisation that carries considerable authority, and so the IB's selection of a common term to describe a largely undefined concept suggests the *authorisation* mode of legitimation. Interestingly, in 'MYP: From Principles into Practice' (2014), the term 'intercultural understanding' is contextualised alongside 'multilingualism', with the claim that 'learning to communicate in a variety of ways in more than one language is fundamental to the development of intercultural understanding' (pg. 12). This suggests that intercultural understanding is the privilege of those people who can communicate in more than one language. It denies the same aspiration to those people whose mother tongue is their only means of communication, and it assumes that multilingualists both aspire to – and believe in – intercultural understanding as a facet of their value system.

In analysing the 2014 text in response to this study's first research question, 'global engagement' is perhaps the closest of the three IB terms to connect directly with global citizenship, but it stops short of the responsibilities around citizenship so prominent in the global citizenship literature. It is doubtful that this was oversight; rather, in avoiding the term 'citizenship' the IB is
distancing their organisation and their programmes from the obligations and restraints of citizenship values, whilst retaining – or attempting to retain – the perceived benefits of a global outlook. Archibugi (2003), for example, uses ‘the process of democracy’ (pg. 10) to describe global citizenship as where citizens seek to expand their rights and responsibilities beyond their local context. The IB’s ‘global engagement’ is described in ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) as ‘the use of global contexts in inquiry leading to principled action’ (pg. 12). But there is no suggestion of what kind of action might be taken, no summary of the principles leading to that action and no connection to action in the service component of the MYP.

The connections between the IB’s global engagement and aspects of global citizenship are developed further, with many of the same topics being named in general renderings of contested concepts. For example, MYP teachers and students are encouraged to engage with ‘local and global concerns, including the environment, development, conflicts, rights, and cooperation and governance’ (pg. 12). These wide ranging topics are organised into a single sentence, as though they are all part of the same issue. Such a lexi-co-grammatical construction allows the IB to avoid defining any of the topics included in the sentence, and it suggests relationships between issues that may or may not exist. Placing ‘local’ and ‘global’ concerns together, for example, assumes that the unstated ‘concerns’ are directly connected to each other and, perhaps, can be addressed in the same way. This is misleading, at best, and – at worst – is an attempt to bury particular and important local and global issues in an unspecified context. Similarly, placing ‘cooperation’ and ‘governance’ in the same lexi-co-grammatical space within a sentence creates a possible connection between these ideas that is fallacious. There are many different methods of governance and many different types of cooperation; any relationship between them is likely to be complex and should not, perhaps, be ignored or treated merely to generic platitudes.

In ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014), the term ‘global citizenship’ is conspicuous by its absence. The terms ‘international-mindedness’, ‘intercultural understanding’ and ‘global engagement’ have drawn heavily on the underlying
notions around global citizenship and global citizenship education, which are themselves contested ideas that attempt to explain evolving concepts. As such, these IB terms contribute to the *epoch* of their development without critically engaging with how these notions have been developed and how they might be interpreted. They are as much contested notions as any of the concepts on which they are based, and yet they are central to the message of the IB's key policy document for their MYP. The headings and italicized elements of the Hyatt frame (2013) used in this section of the analysis chapter have helped to draw out the ambiguities of these core IB terms.

Policy drivers

Hyatt (2013) describes policy drivers as those stated objectives of a policy that can be found in policy documents, press releases, through legislation passed in parliament or through directives developed in organisations. Beginning with the qualifying statement that 'there is no recipe for carrying out policy analysis in education' (Rizvi and Linguard, 2010, pg. 45), it seems likely that a policy analysis can be conducted in a variety of ways, as there is much more to any policy than the text to which it is assigned. Policies are infused with the values of the people who write them and they exist in broad contexts that range from the political to the social to the economic. The development of policy is often a government activity and education policies interact with other state policies from across the various government departments and ministries. As such, policy can be said to be multi-dimensional, and policy implementation can result in both intended and unintended consequences that can be difficult to predict. This applies equally to institutional policies, which this study seeks to address.

The drivers of MYP policy reflect the history and development of the IB itself. On the one hand, the MYP has been driven by an ideological desire to 'create a better and more peaceful world' (2014, pg. 1), and on the other hand by a desire to expand the reach and influence of the IB organisation. Evidence for this assertion can be found in contemporary literature published by the IB in which the rationale for the MYP is discussed. For example, Robert Harrison, current Head of Middle Years Programme Development, summarised the drivers of the
programme by describing the MYP as 'incremental and expansionary' (2015, pg. 45), and explaining that 'important drivers in the MYP’s review were the stated aims of developing a programme that fully reflected the IB’s principles of teaching and learning and one which more explicitly supported the IB continuum' (2015, pg. 46).

Policy levers

Policy levers are mechanisms used to enact policy, through legal obligation or through organisational practices. The focus on the continuum between IB programmes illustrates one of the IB's levers in expanding and facilitating the MYP. Candidate schools running both Diploma and MYP curricula are able to work with one curriculum organization, the IB, for their curriculum authorization and external moderation. They can use the IB brand on their school website and documentation, and 'if a school offers two IB programmes, the school is given a 10% discount on the lowest single programme fee' (ibo.org). But perhaps most important of all is that MYP students are exposed to IB assessment systems and assessment language for up to five years before continuing along the IB path of the pre-university Diploma programme. Collectively, these levers make the MYP an attractive financial proposition to schools, particularly when those schools are already using the IB Diploma programme.

These drivers and levers inculcate the values of the IB into the MYP, demonstrating the synthesis of the will to improve the world through education with a perpetual drive to increase the global spread of the IB organization. The levers the IB use to expand the use of the MYP include financial incentives for schools already using the much more prominent Diploma programme, as well as the badge of prestige – ‘IB World School’ - that schools can use to declare their embrace of the IB. Drivers in these processes of expansion are primarily ideological in nature, consisting of philosophical platitudes around intercultural understanding and respect, international-mindedness and social responsibility.
Part 2 – Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship (Davy, 2011)

As with Part 1, this section of the chapter has been organized to follow the structure the Hyatt frame (2013), which consists of the following elements:

- Temporal Context, including immediate and medium-term socio-political context, contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures, and Epoch.
- Drivers, levers, and warrant
- Modes of legitimation, interdiscursivity and intertextuality, evaluation/appraisal, presupposition/implication, and lexicogrammatical construction.

Again, these analytical lenses will not be applied with formulaic regularity. They will be used as needed, depending on any evidence of the elements detailed above emerging from the text. The first two dimensions of the Hyatt frame will be arranged as they have been presented above, but the third dimension will be integrated into the CDA as appropriate to their emergence. As with Part 1, elements from within the first two dimensions of the Hyatt frame will be preceded by an appropriate sub-heading.

It is surprising that the IB, as a self-proclaimed leader in international education, should avoid directly using the term ‘global citizenship’ in ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) and in its MYP subject guides, and yet the IB Position Paper entitled ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011) aims to set out the IB’s vision for global citizenship education. This apparent contradiction is difficult to explain, particularly as the position paper was published three years prior to the most recent version of ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014). Indeed, as the following analysis demonstrates, there appear to be few direct connections between the two documents. This represents a missed opportunity for the IB; using the position paper in support of the curriculum framework document might have helped MYP practitioners to understand the place of global citizenship in MYP planning, teaching and learning.
As it is, these two documents appear to have been written independently of each other, further exacerbating the difficulties associated with defining global citizenship education in an IB context.

The position paper ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011) relates to all IB programmes and was written by an IB practitioner, Dr. Irene Davy, who is Head of School at Sunnybrook primary school in Canada, and it has been endorsed by the IB as part of its series of position papers, with the explanation that ‘This paper is part of a series of papers, written by IB practitioners and endorsed by the IB. Each paper addresses a topic or issue related to the IB’s philosophy or its educational practices’ (pg. 2).

Temporal Context
The opening sentence of the first paragraph in the introduction to this position paper claims that ‘in the past two decades the success of the International Baccalaureate (IB) in international education has led to a significant dissemination of its ideals and philosophy’ (pg. 3). The two decades to which this claim refers, from 1991 to 2011, saw the number of schools using the MYP globally rise in the following pattern:

- from 0 in 1991 to 14 in 1994
- from 91 in 1998 to 221 in 2002
- from 378 in 2006 to 729 in 2011 (ibid)

The claim around increased dissemination of IB ideals and philosophy can therefore be borne out statistically using a year-on-year growth model. However, the nature of the IB’s ‘ideals and philosophy’ is left unstated, and while statistical evidence for increases in numbers of schools using the MYP can remain unchallenged, the claim that this equates to a ‘dissemination of its ideals and
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8 Carroll, J. 2012 - Academic honesty in the IB; Erickson, H.L. 2012 - Concept-based teaching and learning; Allan, M. 2011 - Thought, word and deed: The roles of cognition, language and culture in teaching and learning in IB World Schools; Hare, J. 2010 - Holistic education: An interpretation for teachers in the IB programmes; Marshman, R. 2010 - Concurrency of learning in the IB Diploma Programme and Middle Years Programme; Walker, G. 2010 - East is East and West is West.
philosophy' is unfounded. There is no explicit evidence to suggest that ideals and philosophy can be effectively disseminated simply by increasing the number of schools using a particular curriculum framework, nor can it be assumed that such an increase equates to ‘success of the IB in international education’. With no external assessment or moderation requirement for the MYP, the IB has no way of knowing how – or if – ideals and philosophy are being taught and learned. And, if evidence is implicit, it might have been helpful for the author to provide examples to guide the reader. With neither explicit evidence nor examples, this claim appears somewhat unsubstantiated.

Warrant

Evidence of warrant (see 3.6) pertaining to global citizenship education is apparent in the claims linking statistics and philosophical terminology in the position paper ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011). For example, the claim on page 3 of that document that growth in the numbers of schools using IB programmes equates to success in the dissemination of IB ideals and philosophy in international education assumes a causal relationship. This is an example of evidentiary warrant (Cochran-Smith and Fries, 2001), wherein quantitative data – in this case, the number of schools using the MYP – is used as evidence to provide authority to the causal relationship claim. Making links between a growth in school numbers and the dissemination of IB ideals and philosophy could be an attempt to supply circumstantial evidence for the success of the IB’s ideals and philosophy. However, links are implied with no evidence to support the claim of a correlation between growth and dissemination, and yet this claim is the basis for some other claims to follow, many of which, as will be seen in a later section, make similar – if not more unfounded – connections between the IB, the organisation’s ideals and philosophy, international education, and global citizenship education, beginning with the immediate and medium-term socio-political context of the position paper.

Medium-term socio-political context
After the two introductory paragraphs of the position paper ‘Learners Without Borders’ (2011), the heading ‘Globalisation and Education’ introduces the claim that ‘the world is changing, and there is evidence that we are entering a post-international environment’ (pg. 3). The nature of this ‘post-international environment’ is left undefined, and that the author has situated her discussion in the context of globalisation and education assumes a connection between the two and leaves the concept of globalisation and its links to education undefined and unexamined. This uncritical relational assumption is part of a trend in the discourse around international education and has been addressed in detail in section 2.2.4. It is used in this section of the position paper as a precursor to a sweeping statement about world affairs that is unsupported except for passing reference to a 2010 article written by George Walker, former Director General of the IB9 claiming that ‘we are increasingly living next to, working alongside, sharing our leisure with, choosing our partners from people with different cultural backgrounds’ (pg. 69). Not only does this statement take its authority from within the IB, it also claims ‘evidence that we are entering a post-international environment’ (pg. 3) without explaining the terminology on which the claim rests.

Evidence from outside the IB, however, is entirely lacking. Such *mode of legitimation* (Hyatt, 2013) is an example of *authorisation* (Fairclough, 2003), in which the support for a claim or idea comes from an unchallenged (and in this case internal) authority – specifically here the former Director General of the IB itself. The focus on the immediate socio-political context for the position paper ‘Learners without Borders’ (2011) is strengthened in the second paragraph under the ‘globalisation and education’ heading, with the imperative demand that ‘education for global citizenship must become the curriculum of the future’ (pg. 3). Again, there is no definition of education for global citizenship and, as evidence in support of this demand, we are told anecdotally that ‘an earthquake in Japan brings suffering to our own back yards; the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico reverberates for economies and resource use worldwide; revolution on the streets of Tripoli resounds around the globe’ (pg. 3). This is an example of the *political*
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warrant (Hyatt, 2013), which is used to support claims made in the interests of the public good or in the national interest. In this case, global citizenship education is being offered as a solution to disparate world events; first, an earthquake in Japan, then an oil spill in the United States and finally a civil war in Libya.

The binding of these three unrelated global events into one sentence of three clauses is a deliberate *lexico-grammatical construction* (Hyatt, 2013) designed to imply an increased relational worsening of a situation. Used to support the *political warrant* described above, this phrase attempts to connect global citizenship education with natural and human-made disasters. The version of global citizenship education that might negate the effects of natural and human-made disasters is not stipulated; similarly, the ways in which global citizenship education might prevent, lessen or avoid the occurrence of human-made or natural disasters is not suggested. Rather, this blanket claim uses imagined threats to personal and economic security in order to attempt to persuade the reader of its validity.

In the medium-term socio-political context of Davy’s position paper (2011), over the five years covering 2007 to 2011, there were fifteen earthquakes in Japan, and yet we are warned that ‘an earthquake in Japan brings suffering to our own back yards’ (pg. 3). The owners or occupiers of these ‘back yards’ remain a mystery. That the author is Canadian and based in Canada might suggest that she is referring to a North American context, but this is not made clear. The type of suffering occurring in these dislocated back yards isn’t indicated, and the manner in which one of fifteen earthquakes in east Asia brings suffering to people in presumably distant locations is not addressed. Likewise, the Libyan political crisis of 2011 is described as a ‘revolution on the streets of Tripoli’ which, in some undefined way, ‘resounds around the globe’ (pg. 3). The Deepwater Horizon oil spill of 2010 apparently ‘reverberates for economies and resource use worldwide’ (pg. 3), and yet no evidence is provided to support any ways in which resource use and economic activity ‘around the globe’ may have been effected by this oil spill in
the Gulf of Mexico. Unsubstantiated fear-mongering of this kind is typical of the political warrant, where – in this case – a variety of catastrophes is used as the basis for justification for the introduction of global citizenship education.

Contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures

This position paper, ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011), is the sole publication of the author, Dr. Irene Davy, School Principal and Director at a private IB primary school in Canada that charges $27,750.00 (Canadian) total first year fees for new students. She holds a PhD in Educational Psychology from the University of Vienna in Austria. Dr. Davy served as Chair for the IB’s Primary Years Programme Committee from 2002 – 2005; she has been a member of the International Baccalaureate Educator Network (IBEN) since 2002, and served on the Board of Governors for the IB from 2008 – 2012, during which time the position paper under scrutiny here was published. Dr. Davy’s credentials in terms of her involvement and understanding of the IB are self-evident; she served as a Workshop Leader, a school Site Visitor and a Conference Presenter for the IB for 15 years, and her involvement in such senior posts at the IB mean that she was well placed, at the time of writing her position paper, to represent the IB’s vision of global citizenship education.

In ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011), Dr. Davy makes reference to sixteen other works, which she uses to support her claims. Of these sixteen references, five are IB publications and four are publications from the ASCD (formerly the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), which is described on its website as ‘a global community dedicated to excellence in learning, teaching and leading’ (ascd.org). The relationship between the ASCD and the IB is complex, and perhaps worthy of further study in its own right. But an online search of the ASCD’s publications reveals ten pages (270 results) of publications that make direct reference to the IB. This suggests that the ASCD at the very least provides a platform for
publications regarding the IB, and so – to return to my original point – it would appear that Dr. Davy has taken nine of the sixteen sources for her position paper from within the IB’s sphere of influence.

It should come as no surprise, then, that this position paper reflects many of the uncorroborated claims around global citizenship identified in the other document selected for this study. ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) follows the patterns of self-referenced authority evident in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011), and this CDA reveals those patterns. Dr. Davy is perhaps contributing to a largely internal discourse that conveys the IB’s philosophy and criteria for educating children. In this sense, hers is a useful position paper for this study, and if it lacks criticality, this is probably because it was never meant to be critical of the IB’s position on global citizenship education but to communicate that position.

Under the heading ‘The global citizenship curriculum in practice’ (pg. 5), we are told that ‘the IB aims for teachers to be role models, developing international-mindedness and global citizenship in their students’. The idea of international-minded has been discussed in detail in Part 1 of this chapter, but this is the first time in either of the documents selected for analysis that international-mindedness and global citizenship have been explicitly connected. Despite this, there are no suggestions as to how international-mindedness and global citizenship might be modelled by teachers of MYP students, nor are there examples or explanations of any ‘global citizenship curriculum in practice’ (ibid). This perhaps exemplifies the IB’s tendency – in the two documents selected for analysis – to stipulate curriculum expectations without offering suggestions for making these expectations manifest.

Such a tendency can be analysed using the contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures element of the Hyatt frame, with the
emphasis being on *structures*. This analytical element can help to expose any ‘interrelation between agency and structure’ (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 48); in this case, the responsibility for global citizenship and international-mindedness qualities in students falls upon MYP teachers, but the document stipulating this responsibility is devoid of explanations, advice or support regarding how this expectation should be met. By placing the responsibility for this expectation on teachers, the IB can avoid being directly accountable for the many interpretations that are likely to emerge from this directive. Similarly, with schools given free rein on interpretations of international-mindedness and global citizenship, the IB organisation can distance itself from interpretations that may be controversial or even incongruous with other areas of the IB ethos.

Similarly, under the sub-heading ‘Pedagogy’, the author suggests that ‘the dramatic impact and pervasiveness of technology in our students’ lives should be reflected in our pedagogy’ (Davy, 2011, page 5), but the statement is loaded with assumptions. The first assumption is that technology is pervasive and dramatic of impact for all 54,795 students studying in the MYP as of 2016. Next, ‘our pedagogy’ assumes a collective agreement on pedagogy for all MYP teachers. Not only does such an agreement not exist, it is unlikely ever to exist while the pedagogy of the MYP is endemically undefined and open to interpretation. At the starting point of this section in the position paper ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011), we are told that ‘a pedagogy based on constructivist approaches is the bedrock of a global curriculum’ (pg. 5). But an assumed relationship is implied between global citizenship and a ‘global curriculum’. Given that these claims are meant to demonstrate ‘the global citizenship curriculum in practice’ (ibid), there is little of any substance here that could help a teacher to engage practically with global citizenship teaching and learning. Examined through the lens of *contemporary socio-political individuals, organisations and structures* (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 48), this particular curriculum structure fails in its most basic objective of defining and explaining curriculum intentions.
Drivers and levers

An attempt is made in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011) to use assessment as a lever for incorporating global citizenship into the MYP curriculum. The text states that ‘schools assess what they value and value what they assess’ (pg. 5). The values that schools assess, however, are undisclosed, even though – at this stage – the text is referring to all three IB programmes, not just the MYP. This seems like another missed opportunity to use this position paper to stipulate the specifics of IB policy, if indeed it is a missed opportunity rather than a deliberate ploy. As with the section on pedagogy, this section on assessment drifts across general platitudes that present a loose aspiration rather than a clear directive. The text continues along the same vein, with ‘making it explicit that we are assessing for international-mindedness and global citizenship will strengthen the curriculum’ (pg. 5). This is an example of levers in education, ‘the impact of which are meant to facilitate the implementation of policy’ (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 49). Whilst not, perhaps, the most powerful example of leverage, this is as far as this position paper is willing to go to serve as an instrument of policy. It makes demands around assessment for global citizenship without offering a framework for facilitating this imperative. Indeed, at the time of writing, all MYP assessment is internally assessed, although there is currently a pilot programme in place to introduce an ‘eAssessment’ at the end of the final year of the programme.

This fondness for headlines over substance is also evident in the next section of the text entitled ‘Global curriculum’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 6). According to this section of the document, ‘A pre-K to 12 curriculum for global engagement necessitates fresh approaches in identifying learning outcomes’ (pg. 6). No examples of fresh outcomes are detailed, there are no justifications for this claim for fresh approaches and – upon closer linguistic examination – the lexicogrammatical construction of the demand for fresh approaches to identifying learning outcomes is problematic. Firstly, ‘A pre-K to 12 curriculum for global engagement’ does not exist anywhere in the IB lexicon outside this position paper; it is not a tangible reality in any other area of IB curricula. Secondly, the claim that
global curriculum necessitates new approaches is an example of an ‘invalid causal link’ (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 55), which presupposes that if the first part of a claim is true, then it follows that the second part of the claim must also be true. Deconstructed in this way, the claim around global curriculum necessitating changes in approach to outcomes appears meaningless. It is a statement requiring action but it is based on a non-entity supported by a vacuous claim.

The next part of this section on ‘global curriculum’ has the sub-heading ‘Culture and perspective’, which interacts with Fraser’s issues of recognition (see Section 3.2) through its descriptions of culture in an IB setting. It is placed in this section of the chapter about drivers and levers because it explicitly states that ‘perspective and cultural understanding are underlying drivers of a curriculum’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 6). This is an interesting statement, seemingly offering a glimpse into the IB’s rationale for incorporating global citizenship into a school curriculum whilst avoiding a full commitment to this aspiration. ‘Perspective’ remains neutral, or at least undefined; we do not know what kind of perspective is meant or how – if at all – it interacts with ‘cultural understanding’. With such a lack of clarity over the terminology used, it is difficult to know how either perspective or cultural understanding might serve as drivers for a curriculum. The confusion is exacerbated by the use of the term ‘underlying’ in this statement. This makes an already vague notion even more opaque, as it suggests that the drivers for ‘global curriculum’ are somehow subsumed within a greater whole. The effect of this linguistic construction is two-fold: first, it disguises any curriculum drivers; second, it eliminates reference to any actor or agency responsible for the drivers. If, as Hyatt (2013) explains, drivers are ‘expressions of the intended aims or goals of a policy’ (pg. 48), this particular driver tells us almost nothing of how perspective and cultural understanding might influence an educational endeavour claiming to be a ‘global curriculum’.

Also in this section of ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011) is an example of an inscribed evaluation, where ‘an evaluation
is carried by a specific lexical item, overtly displaying the attitudinal judgment of the text producer’ (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 54). In this case, the author suggests that a curriculum should ‘reach beyond the delights of culture’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 6), imbuing the concept of culture with assumed positivity. This is then reinforced with evoked evaluation, which is a mechanism ‘through which evaluation is covertly constructed’ (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 55). Having gloried in the ‘delights’ of culture, the IB position paper warns of the ‘ambiguities, challenges and provocations of cultural difference’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 6). Whereas the author’s overt value judgments are transparent with the inscribed evaluation of culture per se, these judgments around cultural difference ‘do not denote the text producers’ attitude to the content overtly, but leave the value judgment to the reader’ (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 55). Within a single sentence – ‘Perspective and cultural understanding are underlying drivers of a curriculum that must reach beyond the delights of culture to probe the ambiguities, challenges and provocations of cultural difference’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 6) - the concept of culture is overtly celebrated and then immediately tempered with implied concerns. These evaluations are unsupported and unilaterally conveyed, as though immune to critical analysis. They are examined in greater details in Section 3.2, which deals with social justice issues around cultural recognition.

The next section of the position paper under consideration deals with ‘Concepts, skills, knowledge, attitudes’ (pg. 7). However, the first of these broad areas of discussion is immediately dispensed with because although ‘in a curriculum for global citizenship [concepts] will go beyond discipline-specific skills and knowledge, the nature of the content make a comprehensive discussion of these elements impossible’ (pg. 7). This is a peculiar use of inscribed evaluation, in which the views of the author are overtly expressed; we are presented with the educational imperative of ‘concepts’ in a position paper about education for global citizenship, but then told that such concepts are impossible to discuss. If this is a limitation of the paper – or, indeed, its author – this could be clearly stated and incorporated into the text. But to boldly claim that concepts around global citizenship are impossible to discuss suggests a deliberate circumnavigation of
this area of policy. Without a discussion of global citizenship concepts in curriculum contexts, the paper avoids participating in a contested academic space and abstains from attempting to define the version of global citizenship to which the IB subscribes.

Under ‘Skills’ (ibid) the author appears to have taken the opposite approach, stating that ‘global citizenship requires a specific skill set’ (pg. 8) and then offering a discrete list. According to this section of the position paper, these skills ‘enable students to approach issues with the ability to research and learn about them, consider the perspectives of others, find solutions, and strive for consensus’ (pg. 8). This is another example of a seemingly incongruous lexicogrammatical construction, where four diverse skill sets are clustered together as though mutually complimentary. A generous reading of this claim around skills for global citizenship might allow the reader to find common ground among the first three – ‘to approach issues with the ability to research and learn about them, consider the perspectives of others, find solutions’ – but these are in no way automatically compatible with a desire to ‘strive for consensus’ (pg. 8). This is a particularly problematic piece of advice, with consensus given implied authority without critical analysis. It assumes that consensus is a positive quality, but history is filled with examples of consensus leading to conflict and inequality. It seems odd for a position paper on global citizenship to promote consensus without first qualifying the issues, qualities and perspectives on which consensus is built. Striving for consensus with no context appears to blur the issues on which consensus might be reached, and placing consensus alongside the other ‘skills’ detailed in this section of the position paper could well be an attempt to obviate the IB’s responsibility to detail their position on skills for global citizenship.
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10 Communication skills; issue analysis; ability to challenge injustice; problem solving; reasoned persuasion; cooperation and conflict resolution; critical thinking; technology skills; the ability to choose a means of responding.
The final section of ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011) is a call to action entitled ‘Future directions for IB educators’ (pg. 9). It is an attempt to summarise the drivers, levers, instruments, steering and trajectory (Hyatt, 2013, pg. 48-49) of the position paper and to outline the IB’s vision of global citizenship education. Perhaps predictably, any opportunities to clarify the aims and goals of the IB’s global citizenship education policy are not taken; rather, the reader is furnished with generalisations and drifts across different educational contexts that could apply to all or none of the claims made in the position paper. Beginning with ‘education for global citizenship is education for the future’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 9), this concluding section typifies the tone of the piece, making an unsubstantiated aspirational claim and then moving on to unrelated topics: ‘classrooms are busy’; ‘students have active lives with many distractions’; ‘including the curriculum elements for global citizenship can be challenging’; ‘educating for global citizenship is now a significant element in curriculum development in many jurisdictions’ (ibid, pg. 9).

There is no trace of irony when the claim that ‘the IB can provide leadership in international education’ is followed by the need for ‘strengthening the terminology used in describing and explaining the IB philosophy’ (pg. 9). Similarly, we are told that ‘strengthening the global elements of the curriculum is an ongoing process’, and ‘the more clearly the global elements of the IB curriculum are articulated, integrated and assessed, the easier the task will be for schools’ (pg. 9 – 10). In both instances, an aspiration is followed by a limitation preventing the aspiration from being made manifest, and yet it is precisely within the context of these aspirational claims that the author has the opportunity – and the responsibility – to elaborate on the processes and definitions that could help these aspirations to become teaching and learning realities. As a vision of the ‘future directions for IB educators’ (pg. 9), this concluding section of the position paper fails to refer to any of the previous sections of the text and offers guidance that is so open to interpretation as to be misleading. Rather than serve to outline the IB’s position on global citizenship education, the advice offered to IB educators offers
little guidance on future directions and even less on the form and practice of global citizenship education in any of the IB’s curriculum programmes.

Parts 1 and 2 of this chapter represent responses to the study’s research questions in direct reference to the two key IB documents selected for analysis. Part 3, below, will deepen the analysis conducted above by examining two sample MYP units from the IB’s Online Curriculum Centre (OCC). I will continue to use a CDA approach because the MYP unit planner (appendix 1) necessitates the incorporation of certain curriculum components that are taken from ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) and from the subject guides for each of the MYP’s eight subject groups. This means that many sections of MYP unit plans are populated from pre-prepared lists of concepts, contexts and assessment criteria generated by the IB. The approach to Part 3, therefore, will be to draw upon the previous sections of the chapter to demonstrate ways in which the findings emerging from those sections are reflected in current MYP unit plans that are being used by teachers in some international schools in a variety of global locations.
Part 3 – Analysis of case study MYP unit plans

The IB’s OCC was an online resource facility for teachers and school leaders in authorised IB schools using any of the IB’s curriculum programmes. The resource was closed in 2017, but it was open – and used – during this research study, to access sample MYP unit plans. In total there were 74 example unit plans on the OCC, covering all eight of the MYP’s subject groups, with nine of these located in the section for Individuals and Societies (formerly Humanities), from which the two units selected for analysis were taken. These two units are example 7, ‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’, and example 9, ‘The bottom billion’, which both came under the heading ‘Individuals and Societies Teacher Support Material’ on the OCC. The reasons for the selection of these two particular sample units out of a total of 74 is that they most closely reflect themes and debates emerging from responses to the study’s research questions during Parts 1 – 3 of this chapter and they incorporate ideas related to global citizenship in an international education context. I examined all 74 sample unit plans from across the eight MYP subject groups for suitability for this study, but most were from subject groups such as Design, Arts, Mathematics, Sciences, and Language Acquisition, which bore little direct relevance to the study’s research questions.

Importantly, whilst these two unit plans and their related teacher and student materials were made available by the IB for purposes of teacher support, they were not developed by the IB to serve as exemplars of MYP Individuals and Societies units. Indeed, MYP unit exemplars have never been made available since the programme was launched. Rather, these units are examples of teacher interpretations of the MYP curriculum framework used in current teaching practice and were provided by schools which use the MYP in a variety of international locations. The IB explains the purpose of these sample units with the following disclaimer:

This teacher support material is designed to accompany the MYP Individuals and societies guide (May 2014). It is intended to give practical help to support teachers’ understanding and implementation of the subject-group framework.
The teacher support material is divided into three sections.
- Written curriculum
- Taught curriculum
- Assessed curriculum

For further information on each of these sections, please refer to MYP: From principles into practice (May 2014).

Please note that the materials provided are examples only. They have been included to demonstrate how teacher planning and tasks, and student work may appear, and do not form part of a mandatory curriculum for schools. Teachers may wish to use these examples as a guide to support the design of appropriate units of work and assessment tasks.

Any examples of student work included in this teacher support material (TSM) are authentic and are presented in their original style, which may include spelling, grammatical and any other errors.

Thanks are due to the schools and students whose work has been used in this document, and to the experienced MYP practitioners who worked so carefully on the content.
- International School of Lausanne, Switzerland
- International School of Phnom Penh, Vietnam
- KIS Bangkok, Thailand
- Munich International School, Germany
- New International School of Thailand, Thailand
  (ibo.org)

I analyse the two case study units using the study's research questions:
1. What discourses and concepts of global citizenship are evident in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?
2. What version of global citizenship education is promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?
3. What are the implications for social justice of IB MYP global citizenship education policy and curriculum descriptions?

Analysis of the following MYP unit plans uses CDA to look at what conceptualisations of global citizenship are promoted or evident in sample MYP units. It examines if (and if so, how so) any or all of the global citizenship descriptions and references used in IB publications are applied during MYP unit planning. This is an appropriate way to track conceptualisations of global
citizenship education from the relevant IB policy documents and position papers through to working documents in schools currently using the MYP.

**Case study unit plan 1: ‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’**

As with all MYP unit plans, the top section draws mostly from a selection of content elements that have been developed and promoted by the IB for MYP unit planning. The use of the Key Concept, Related Concept, and Global Context is mandatory, and terms for each of these headings come from lists of required content. The top section of ‘Economic Development – the importance of industry?’ is organized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Subject Group and Discipline: Individuals and Societies</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Title: Economic Development – the importance of industry?</td>
<td>MYP Year: 4</td>
<td>Unit Duration: 16 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Concept: Global Interactions</td>
<td>Related Concepts: Globalisation, Interdependence, Resources</td>
<td>Global Context: Globalisation and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher-generated MYP Statement of Inquiry for this unit is: ‘In an increasing (sic) interconnected world, global interactions should rely on a sustainable relationship’.

Two versions of the same textbook\(^{11}\) are cited in the Resources section of the unit plan, but they are not referenced at any point in any other section of the
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document and there is no content to indicate that any aspect of either of these two textbooks has been used directly or indirectly in this unit plan. It’s not possible to know reasons for the inclusion of these textbooks in the Resources section, but one possible explanation is that these textbooks, or one of these textbooks, or perhaps even parts of either textbook, might have inspired some aspect of unit planning. However, this is merely speculation. Another possible reason for including these textbooks in the Resources section of the unit plan might be simply to have no blank spaces left in the unit planner.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of this unit plan in relation to this study's first two research questions is its thematic focus on the ‘global’. Globalisation, interdependence, interconnectivity and interactions in global contexts all feature in the Stage 1 section of the unit plan, which is under the heading: ‘establishing the purpose of the unit’. In support of its Related Concepts, the planner elaborates with ‘Interactions among nations lead to changes in levels of economic development’, which – written in the passive voice – avoids naming any of the interactions, nations, changes and types of economic development contained in the statement. The exploration of the unit’s Global Context makes similar attempts at passive voice neutrality that obscure any actors in the process: ‘The interconnectedness of communities and man-made [sic] systems provides both tensions and opportunities’. As Hyatt explains (2013), ‘The selection of voice or shifts between active and passive can be motivated by the desire to elide agency’ (pg. 56).

In using the passive voice in their core conceptual and contextual planning phase, the author or authors of this unit actively avoid naming agents or organisations that may come under consideration during teaching and learning. Under these circumstances, it is impossible to establish how students might come to understand the human element in the many global contexts present in the unit planner. Even with explicit mentions of ‘communities’, ‘nations’ and 'human-made systems’, specific actors in processes and interactions are disembodied, as though global interactions occur in some neutral, organic manner, regardless of the people making the decisions that lead to the interactions alluded to. Discounting
agency in these interactions negates the necessity for discussing particular roles and responsibilities in global interactions. This in turn obviates discussions around responsibilities relating to citizenship.

The relationship between this unit - ‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’ – and ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) is instructive in demonstrating ways in which global citizenship debates are bypassed in favour of terminology around the ‘global’ that is less politically contentious and therefore less open to challenge. ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’s’ (2014) 117 uses of terminology around the ‘global’ contrasts sharply with its zero uses of terminology around global citizenship. The latter text’s preferences for IB-generated terminology such as ‘international-minded’, ‘interconnectedness’ and ‘global interactions’ (see Part 1) are reflected in the unit plan ‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’, which is logical given that ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) sets out the planning requirements for MYP units across all eight MYP subject groups.

However, with the IB having set out its global citizenship vision in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011), these omissions from ‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’ and ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) stand out as deliberate. It’s almost as though the IB’s position on education for global citizenship has been intentionally confined to one position paper and circumvented or expunged from other available IB publications. One possible explanation for this is that the IB is unwilling to make firm policy commitments to any one version of global citizenship or global citizenship education; this would be in keeping with the organisation’s tendency to provide curriculum frameworks rather than curriculum content so that teachers in schools in diverse educational settings can reflect their specific setting in their teaching content or respond to local cultural needs. This tendency may have emerged from influences around progressive global citizenship (see 2.2.3), but another possible explanation is that the IB is deliberately blurring terminology between the global and global citizenship in order to propagate a narrative of globalisation as akin to global free market
The implications of this approach are discussed in more detail in Part 4 of this chapter, which deals with issues of global social justice.

**Case study unit plan 2: ‘The bottom billion – Development in Sub-Saharan Africa’**

This unit has been developed in the following manner using the required MYP format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher:</th>
<th>Subject Group and Discipline: Individuals and Societies</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Title:</strong> The bottom billion – Development in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>MYP Year: 5</td>
<td>Unit Duration: 15 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Concept:</strong> Change</td>
<td>Related Concepts: Patterns and Trends, Disparity and Equity, Poverty</td>
<td>Global Context: Fairness and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unit has been named after a book, which will be examined below, and its teacher-generated MYP Statement of Inquiry is ‘Development is multidimensional, complex and dynamic’. It is an appropriate unit for this research study in that it reflects one of the study’s key findings – the blending of the terminology around neoliberalism (see 2.2.5) and the ‘global’, as though the two are mutually compatible. ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) defines the ‘global’ as ‘the perspective of the planet as a whole’ (pg. 11).

The MYP Global Context for this unit, for example, is Fairness and Development, which suggests that fairness and development share a specific relationship. ‘Development’ in this MYP unit plan is used in reference to global aid and development practices between nation states or transnational agencies such as the U.N. However, Gronemeyer (1992) suggests that this binding of unrelated
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12 The Bottom Billion by Paul Collier, Professor of Economics at Oxford University.
ideas, in this case ‘fairness’ and ‘development’, is often a reinvention of traditional colonial policies (pg. 55). In combining the concepts of ‘fairness’ and ‘development’ into a single MYP Global Context, the IB are propagating the notion that development help happens in order to facilitate fairness.

The teacher(s) developing the unit ‘The bottom billion’ must make a conscious selection of one MYP Global Context from a choice of five possible MYP Global Contexts\textsuperscript{13}. They do not have the option of dividing, for example, ‘fairness’ from ‘development’, or ‘globalisation’ from ‘sustainability’. The MYP have already combined these disparate terms in order to form implied relationships between certain concepts, and placing them under the heading ‘Global Contexts’ creates the impression that issues around the ‘global’ are best addressed through these binary conceptual constructions. This illustrates one of the key findings of this study, which is that the IB, in their MYP curriculum framework documents, are attempting to promulgate a particular Western-oriented worldview. Evidence for this claim is presented (below) through analysis of the resources used in ‘The bottom billion’, which shows that the Global Context of Fairness and Development is based on an assumption that development in Sub-Saharan Africa results from aspirations of fairness by the Global North. But, as Gronemeyer explains, ‘only through help is the recipient raised to the level of humanity, which implies a view of the cultural and spiritual superiority of the giver’ (1992, pg. 57). It is a paradigm in which wealthy nations gain a sense of piety from the distribution of aid, which serves to keep the recipients of that aid subservient and helpless in the eyes of the donor.

This demonstrates how the structure of the MYP unit planner (appendix 1), with specific sections under specific headings requiring the selection of mandatory Key Concepts, Related Concepts and Global Contexts, provides the platform for MYP unit planning that carries IB assumptions around values into teaching in MYP schools. The IB requires that teachers develop the content for

\textsuperscript{13} MYP Global Contexts consist of: orientation in space and time; identities and relationships; personal and cultural expression; globalisation and sustainability; fairness and development; scientific and technical innovation.
MYP unit plans, but ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan helps to illustrate ways in which one or some MYP teachers are interpreting MYP curriculum framework materials in order to develop units of study for MYP students. The values in these units are not neutral; they are shaped by the prerequisites of MYP planning materials and other available materials. In ‘The bottom billion’, for example, teachers developing the unit have detailed the following list into the ‘Resources’ section of the unit plan:

- http://www.worldmapper.org/
- http://www.gapminder.org/
- Mapping Our World GIS (website)
- New Wider World Textbook
- The Shackled Continent
- The State of Africa
- The Bottom Billion
- Geldof in Africa DVD
- Library Books

These titles and websites suggest that the selections of resources made by the teacher(s) developing the unit complimented the choice of Fairness and Development as the MYP Global Context because seven of the ten named sources deal with either Africa or global development, or both. The first website is generated by the United Nations (UN) Development Programme, containing the U.N.’s version of development data from 1990 to 2015. As indicated in Part 1 of this chapter, U.N. language is frequently reflected in the IB’s terminology around intercultural understanding, and U.N. publications influence concepts associated with international education (see Section 2.2). The IB, in particular, appears to use U.N. terminology in its policy and curriculum framework documents presumably to increase their legitimacy. It seems logical, then, that MYP teachers might be drawn to U.N. resources to support unit planning. However, ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan takes an uncritical approach to the U.N.’s development programme website, seemingly accepting its statistics as the basis for claims made around the poverty of Africa and the justification for current Western-oriented development
policies and practices. The use of U.N. resources is critically examined below as part of the analysis of The New Wider World text book.

The second website listed on ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan belongs to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) of the United States, with a ‘World Fact Book’ containing the CIA’s guide to every UN-recognised country in the world, including an introduction and sections on:

- Geography
- People and Society
- Government
- Economy
- Energy
- Communications
- Transportation
- Military and Security
- Transnational Issues

As one of the vehicles for United States foreign and domestic policy, the CIA’s website is a repository for information that serves the interests of the United States government, and its ‘World Fact Book’ offers information on other countries around the world from the perspective of the United States government. For example, in its introduction to the United Kingdom, the ‘World Fact Book’ states:

The UK has been an active member of the EU since its accession in 1973, although it chose to remain outside the Economic and Monetary Union. However, motivated in part by frustration at a remote bureaucracy in Brussels and massive migration into the country, UK citizens on 23 June 2016 narrowly voted to leave the EU. The so-called “Brexit” (British exit) will take at least two years to carry out but could help trigger referenda in other EU countries where skepticism of EU membership benefits is strong.

The perspective and assumptions evident in this statement reveal how the ‘World Fact Book’ is prone to U.S. political and economic preconceptions, and to political, diplomatic and economic interactions between the U.S. and other nation states. This ‘World Fact Book’ therefore presents a particular U.S.-oriented view
of other countries, although there is no indication on ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan that these considerations have been addressed. This is one example of ways in which teachers planning MYP units can draw uncritically on Western-oriented resources that perpetuate a Western-oriented worldview. This worldview is disseminated during teaching and learning – either deliberately or passively – resulting in educational experiences for MYP students that encourage them to adopt Western-oriented perspectives. If this is what is meant by the claim that in an IB education ‘our students are empowered to make the choice to become global citizens’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 5), questions arise as to the type of global citizen the IB would have its students become.

The third and fourth websites listed on ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan are Worldmapper and Gapminder, online atlases which are linked to lessons 3, 4 and 8 of the plan. They are used primarily for their development indicators, and the fifth website on the list - Mapping Our World GIS - focuses on how students can use geographic information systems to present data. It is referenced in Lesson 10 of the Learning Process section, the lesson objective of which is to ‘describe and explain the role of the Millennium Development Goals in monitoring and encouraging development in Sub-Saharan Africa’. Presumably, these Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are those of the United Nations\(^\text{14}\), and focusing these goals is problematic for two reasons.

First is that ‘many poor countries, especially those in Africa, will miss the MDGs by a large margin’ because of ‘the overly-ambitious goals themselves and unrealistic expectations placed on aid’ (Clemens and Moss, 2005, pg. 1). Second, the MDGs promote a worldview in which Africa is the poor relation of Western-oriented industrialised nations (Hedlund-de Wit, 2014, pg. 4). The MDGs divide the world’s nation states into the ‘donor community’ and the ‘developing world’ [sic] (Clemens and Moss, 2005, pg. 3), with former consisting of the world’s

strongest economies and the latter focused almost exclusively in Sub-Saharan Africa. Using the MDGs in ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan helps to sustain the impression already made in the CIA’s ‘World Fact Book’ that Africa is the weak recipient of development aid from benevolent Western-oriented donors. If the goal of the IB is to ‘strengthen the elements of global citizenship throughout the IB curriculum’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 9), is the IB’s global citizen one who shares this Western-oriented perspective? This analysis suggests that students entering into schools using the MYP in the ways described here are likely to adopt this particular worldview.

The four hard copy texts selected for ‘The bottom billion’ also share a largely Western-oriented focus. The first hard copy text named in the Resources section is ‘The New Wider World’ (Waugh, 2003) geography textbook. Judging by the page numbers and tasks detailed in the Learning Process section of this unit plan, the teacher(s) developing the unit have used the second edition of this textbook, which provides a flavour of the way in which development is portrayed. On page 80, countries are divided into ‘more economically developed countries’ (MEDCs) and ‘less economically developed countries’ (LEDGs), as measured by ‘gross national product per capita’ (Waugh, pg. 80). These are followed by a ‘Human Development Index’ (HDI) (ibid. pg. 182), ranking countries from 1 to 162 by a combination of adult literacy rate, life expectancy, ‘Real Gross National Product per capita (ppp US$)’ and school enrolment rate.

Perhaps not surprisingly, given these indicators, the five highest ranking countries by HDI are Norway, Australia, Canada, USA, and Japan; the five lowest ranking countries are Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Burundi, Niger, and Sierra Leone – the lowest four located in the continent of Africa. Combined with the online resources discussed above, this textbook maintains a donor versus recipient theme in keeping with the overall trend of this MYP unit plan, which these rankings help to support. Even the questions students are asked to answer
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15 Specifically, pages 180 – 183 (World Development and Interdependence), page 197 (Questions relating to Pages 180 – 183), and pages 146 – 147 (The Pacific Rim).
regarding this section of the textbook (on page 197) reveal a distinct Western-oriented perspective on wealth, poverty and development. For example, question 1a asks students to ‘name three countries in the “richer North” and three in the “poorer South”. Question 1b asks students to ‘state how the five indicators on the map show that Africa is economically the least well-off’ (ibid. pg. 197). Questions 1c to 1e prompt students to create a table ‘to show differences between MEDCs and LEDCs’, which includes naming the three countries with the highest HDI and the three countries with the lowest HDI.

In reading and responding to the above named sections of ‘The New Wider World’ (Waugh, 2003), and unless directed towards a more critical stance by their teachers, students are likely to nurture a sense of Western global economic dominance and African poverty, which could feed into the overall message that rich Western-oriented nations must come to the salvation of poor African nations through development practices. ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011) states that ‘global citizenship requires a knowledge base and understanding of global issues together with critical thinking skills and pluralistic attitudes’ (pg. 3). But the evidence of ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan suggests a deliberate avoidance of plurality and criticality in forming knowledge and understanding of global issues around aid and development.

The second hard copy resource named in the Resources section of ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan goes even further in disregarding plurality. ‘The Shackled Continent’, by Robert Guest, Africa editor of ‘The Economist’ magazine, asserts that the adoption of global capitalist practices is the answer to perceived development problems in much of Africa. Guest begins by contextualizing the issues facing Africa in traditional capitalist terms, claiming ‘the route to prosperity is through thrift, hard work, and finding out what other people want in order to sell it to them’ (Guest, 2004, pg. 11). He attempts to legitimise this assertion by stating that ‘since the collapse of the Soviet Union, some things have improved… Almost all African countries have held multi-party elections, and many have attempted free market economic reforms’ (ibid. pg. 14). However, the clearest example of Guest’s neoliberal perspective comes from an example he uses from a
visit to a small farmstead in Malawi, which provokes him to write, 'I have never seen a more poignant illustration of why the world’s poor need capitalism' (ibid., pg. 83). In selecting this text as a component in the development of 'The bottom billion', the teacher(s) planning the unit are drawing from an openly capitalist, neoliberal resource, although it is unclear from the unit plan how this text will be used during teaching and learning.

The second hard copy text listed on 'The bottom billion' unit plan is 'The State of Africa' by Martin Meredith. Unlike the unit's other websites and text choices, 'The State of Africa' does not emphasise the economics of development; rather, it highlights Africa's political issues, focusing in particular on political leadership in various African countries since their independence from European colonial powers in the later part of the 20th Century. This vast post-colonial narrative is treated lightly in 'The bottom billion' unit plan, being referenced only once for Lesson 4 when students are instructed to 'read through relevant photocopied pages' of this book of 816 pages, and then 'highlight factors that hindered development in one colour and those that encouraged development in another'. This seems like a wasted opportunity to expand the study beyond the economic indicators of development and directly into the realm of politics. But as we are not told which of the pages from this book have been photocopied for students to read, it is difficult to identify their influence over the unit.

The hard copy text 'The Bottom Billion', from which the MYP unit plan takes its name, was written by Paul Collier, Professor of Economics at Oxford University and a former director of the World Bank. As with the previous text choices for this MYP unit, it's not possible to identify where, or to what extent, any or all of the information in this text has helped to shape unit development. But as with 'The Shackled Continent', 'The Bottom Billion' suggests that barriers to free market trade is one of the reasons for the continuing necessity for development aid for Africa from the world’s wealthier nations: 'It is stupid to provide aid with the objective of promoting development and then adopt trade policies that impede that objective' (Collier, 2007, pg. 160). Collier uses examples from other parts of the world to support this theme: 'Before globalization gave huge opportunities to
China and India, they were poorer than many of the [African] countries that have been caught in the traps. But China and India broke free in time to penetrate global markets’ (ibid. pg. 10). This market-oriented approach to complex socio-political situations is indicative of a neoliberal worldview (see Section 2.2.5), as advocated by Robert Guest, author of ‘The Shackled Continent’. It is more evidence of the way in which some teachers appear to be drawing upon Western, neoliberal-oriented resources during the planning of MYP units.

The next named resource on the list is ‘Geldof in Africa DVD’, which is directly referenced twice in ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan. This 2005 documentary DVD comprises six 30 minute episodes of a series in which Bob Geldof travels to Africa to share his reflections on the continent, its people, history and geography. Episode 1, The Luminous Continent, is used in Lesson 1 of ‘The bottom billion’; Episode 5, Four Horsemen, is used in Lesson 9. There are stark contrasts between these two episodes of the documentary series. The Luminous Continent is a panegyric to the continent of Africa, with Geldof attempting to discredit what he describes as images of ‘the dark continent as so often described by writers from the gloomy northern skies of Europe’ (2.46). Instead, he suggests, Africa should be thought of as ‘the luminous continent, drenched in sun’ (3.05). The Four Horsemen, by contrast, paints a far gloomier picture of Africa, in which Geldof complains that he has ‘seen the four horsemen of the apocalypse galloping across Ethiopia, and they are famine, debt, trade and AIDS’ (2.16).

In Lesson 1 of ‘The bottom billion’, students are expected to draw a spider diagram of words they associate with Africa before they then watch The Luminous Continent. According to the unit plan, this process will ‘highlight that students have a fairly negative image of Africa’ which the DVD episode should counteract. Then, in Lesson 9, when students watch Four Horsemen, they will ‘take notes on the impacts of conflict (LRA [Lord’s Resistance Army] in Uganda), plague (AIDS) and Aid (N. Kenya) and other factors hindering development’. It should be noted that the DVD used in this unit plan conveys the perceptions and personal opinions
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16 Episodes include: 'Cocoa Slaves and Goo', 'Apocalypse Still', 'The Luminous Continent', 'Perfect Zero', 'A Terrible Beauty' and 'Four Horsemen'.

of Bob Geldof and his production team; it is not an academic resource and does not claim to be. The selection of this DVD series, and in particular the two episodes used in ‘The bottom billion’, offers a personal narrative of one Western man with well-known development involvement in Africa. Most of all, the deliberate contrast between the messages behind Lesson 1 (The Luminous Continent) and Lesson 9 (Four Horsemen) does little to dispel the preconception that Africa could be some pristine paradise if it was not at the mercy of factors requiring ongoing aid and intervention from Western-oriented powers. The social justice implications of this prevailing message in ‘The bottom billion’ will be discussed in Part 4 of this chapter.

Having taught for eight years in three MYP schools in two different countries, I never encountered an MYP unit plan with a global citizenship focus and I have been unable to locate an MYP unit of this kind on any IB database. The MYP’s position on global citizenship education, and on global citizenship, as elucidated in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011), appears to have no bearing on MYP curriculum development, despite preceding ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) by three years. In responding to my research questions, therefore, I have adopted a tangential line to lever out and expose the kinds of political ideologies underpinning teaching resources offered by the IB for the MYP. This has been the most appropriate way to address this study’s research questions and to deepen the analysis prompted by those questions. In analysing ‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’ and ‘The bottom billion – Development in Sub-Saharan Africa’, I have demonstrated how global citizenship is isolated to one IB publication and how Western, neoliberal-oriented perspectives are disseminated in MYP planning materials. The next section of this chapter looks at social justice implications of the analysis conducted during Parts 1 – 3.
Part 4 – Social justice implications

In this part of the chapter I apply Nancy Fraser’s analytical framework of justice and injustice to the issues and debates generated by the CDA. I discussed the analytical framework and its limitations in Section 2.8. The framework comprises a three dimensional approach based on ‘parity of participation’ (Fraser, 2008, pg. 16). It focuses on redistribution, which examines justice issues through socio-economic contexts, recognition, which addresses issues of social status, and representation, which is concerned with issues of equality in political participation.

4.1 Redistribution

Fraser’s analytical dimension of redistribution highlights the most striking aspects of the IB MYP. First is its outwardly inclusive curriculum framework that concentrates on values of fairness and equality but that can only be accessed by a privileged student population. A significant proportion of this population come from an increasingly mobile, socio-economically secure global elite studying the MYP in international schools in predominantly non-English speaking countries; others live in countries that are among the most economically powerful in the world.

According to the ‘IB MYP Statistical Bulletin’ of June, 2016, there were 1,264 MYP schools in 86 countries. Three of these countries (USA, 618; Canada, 169; Australia, 45) accounted for 832 – or nearly 66% - of MYP schools. This means that more than half of MYP schools in 2016 were located in the world’s first, tenth and thirteenth strongest economies respectively. No sources of statistical data are referenced in this document, which can be found on the IB’s public website along with similar documents for the years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015.

The same statistical bulletin reveals that of the 54,735 students of 178 nationalities globally, citizens of the United States and Canada made up 37,672 – almost 69% - of students studying the MYP. Mexican nationals were in third place
with 1,849 – or just over 3% of the total student population. This begs the question of whom, specifically, has access to any global citizenship education offered in MYP programmes.

These figures from the 2016 Statistical Bulletin suggest a ‘distinct North American imbalance’ (Bunnell, 2011b, pg. 270) in schools choosing to use the MYP, but the reasons for this are complex and should perhaps be looked at in the wider context of schools choosing to use the MYP globally. Sperandio’s 2010 research study entitled ‘School Programme Selection: Why Schools Worldwide Choose the IB MYP’ looked at 306 schools that gained MYP authorisation between 1993 and 2007, citing ‘innovative programme features’, ‘a good fit with schools’ existing mission statements/philosophy’, and schools’ belief that the MYP would ‘increase the multicultural/international/global awareness of the school community’ (pg. 143) as among the top stated reasons for school programme selection. Global citizenship is not specifically referenced in this study, even though school mission and philosophy make up a high proportion of the reasons for schools selecting the MYP. It is, perhaps, alluded to in the point indicated above around increasing global awareness in the school community, made by 37% of respondents to Sperandio’s study. Other reasons given for school adoption of the MYP are detailed as follows:

1. Schools cited innovative program features—interdisciplinary/holistic approach, personal project, community service requirements, emphasis on creativity, areas of interaction—as attracting them to the program (54.4%).
2. Schools expressed a desire for a “seamless” curriculum using the MYP in tandem with the PYP (Primary Years Programme) and DP (Diploma Programme) to provide this (42.9%).
3. Schools noted that the program is a good fit with their existing mission statements/philosophy (38.5%).
4. Schools believed the program would increase multicultural/international/global awareness of the school community (36.9%).
5. The program was described as challenging students and requiring high academic standards (32.0%).
6. Schools believed the program would give them a distinct international image/focus and prestige (23.4%).
7. Schools stated that the MYP provides clear teacher guidelines and required professional development for teachers linked directly to the program (16.9%).
8. Schools wanted the links to other schools and an international organization that offering the program would produce (11.2%).
9. Schools wanted the external validation of internally assessed student work and teacher developed units that the IB organization would provide (10.7%).
10. Schools considered the program had the flexibility to allow for school choice of content knowledge and assessment methods (10.1%).
11. Schools wanted their students to obtain the MYP’s certificates of achievement with its international recognition (10.1%).
12. Schools wanted to adopt the program as it was distinct/different from local/national curriculum or systems of education (7.4%).

(Sperandio, 2010, pg. 143 – 144)

The attraction of increasing global awareness in the school community is contentious in a U.S. context as it has drawn criticism for denationalising American curriculum content that was traditionally aimed at the social reproduction of American citizenship ideals (Bunnell, 2011b, pg. 74). The MYP, in other words, has been accused in the United States of attempting to replace American ideals with international ideals (ibid). Resnik (2012) states that in ‘the United States and in western Canada, state schools have adopted the IB to create a “private school” aura to attract students from middle- and upper-class families and accommodate neoliberal parents’ (pg. 250), and yet coexisting research shows the IB in America in a positive light, with Taylor and Porath (2006) in particular illustrating American IB graduates’ satisfaction with – and high regard for – their IB schooling experience. Sperandio’s 2010 study cites ‘U.S. schools required to improve student academic outcomes’ (pg. 141) as particularly important to schools in the United States, with approximately 30% of MYP schools in the U.S. drawing funding from Title 1 federal funding streams that were created to support schools in low income school districts.

The IB divides the world into three regions, but the 832 MYP schools in
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17 Title 1 is government financial assistance to schools with a large proportion of children from low income families
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the United States and Canada far outnumber the combined total in countries across the Global South, with 74 MYP schools in Latin America, 29 in South East Asia and 13 in the whole of Africa (ibo.org). Even combined, these 116 MYP schools across the Global South are far fewer than the 185 MYP schools in less wealthy areas of the United States that receive Title 1 federal funding. And yet the IB's website maintains that:

The MYP is open to any student aged 11 – 16, at schools that have been authorised to implement the programme. The MYP is inclusive by design; students of all interests and academic abilities can benefit from their participation (ibo.org/programmes/middle-years-programme/).

This designed inclusivity does not extend to students at schools globally that cannot afford to use the MYP and, examined through the lens of Fraser's redistribution dimension of social justice, it would seem that the MYP is selective. Global citizenship education opportunities in the MYP, as ill-defined as they are, become confined to situations in which there is sufficient socio-economic privilege to support them, either being situated in nation-states with strong global economies or being located in pockets of privilege in nation-states of the Global South. In both cases, MYP perceptions of global citizenship education can only be accessed in schools with the financial means to expose their students to specific interpretations of this concept. With its focus on both inputs and outputs, Fraser's framing of redistribution shows the MYP as a programme requiring significant material resources, such as ongoing annual payments to the IB and funding for IB-accredited teacher training, in order to produce outputs that include exclusive academic credentials and students with world views, or dispositions, who are better equipped than their non-MYP peers to become successful in a globalising world. This aspiration is articulated in ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014), with the statement that the MYP’s focus is on ‘developing the skills and attitudes, the understanding of concepts and the knowledge needed to participate in an increasingly global society’ (pg. 3). However, this does not extend to socio-economic equity in a global context, and analysis of its American context demonstrates the limitations of its aspirations around global equality.
These limitations are also evident in pockets of privilege on the other side of the Global North-South divide, where ‘emerging middle classes of the South are already embracing international forms of education for instrumental reasons of advantage and distinction’ (Gardner-McTaggart, 2014, pg. 1). Browsing over the websites of international schools in the Global South that use the MYP ‘reveals a glossy world of advantage, replete with jostling visions, missions, curricula: the unique selling point’ (ibid, pg. 12). Redistribution in this context is a social justice imperative, where socio-economic advantage and disadvantage are more pronounced than in the Global North, and where students studying in international schools are ‘being subject to the coercive power of non-state forms of governmentality’ (Fraser, 2007, pg. 23).

Non-state forms of governmentality include international entities such as the U.N., OECD, and IMF. Other examples are international corporations or private institutions. In this case, governmentality comes from the IB, a transnational organisation with transnational priorities that might not always align with the national interest. Many nation states have education systems in which national curriculum requirements are a mandatory part of the curriculum, even for private schools. This helps these nation-states to enforce their own version of the national interest in their education systems, and Turkey, Japan and China are countries with just such requirements. However, other countries, including Bolivia, South Africa and Romania do not have a legally mandatory national curriculum. In MYP schools in these countries, the MYP could serve as the sole curriculum of students aged 11 – 16, with no obligation to reflect what the national government sees as the national interest. Located in this way in such relatively small pockets of privilege in the Global South, it is interesting to wonder about future MYP growth in this sector, and to examine ‘what role the IB may play in facilitating a concept of global citizenship in the rapidly expanding South’ (Gardner-McTaggart, 2014, pg. 5).

4.2 Recognition
Expanding on the points made in the previous section, Fraser's second dimension of recognition places a focus on cultural injustice, examining how differences in social status can disadvantage some social groups or individuals by imbuing them with a lower social esteem than other groups or individuals. This analytical dimension can help to highlight the tensions inherent in the IB's stated position on global citizenship education, which might be said to dilute or negate types of citizenship responsibilities among students and provide a self-identity that allows MYP students to disengage from difficult issues of social injustice in their homes of origin and in their home countries of residence. For example, staying briefly in the U.S. context of the previous section, the culture of U.S. students studying in the MYP can be influenced by the IB aspirations of global citizenship education, global engagement and international-mindedness.

In each case, the influence of those aspirations will depend upon their interpretation by the individual teachers – or teams of teachers in individual schools - who are responsible for developing curriculum content that can incorporate global citizenship, global engagement and international-mindedness in any area of the MYP curriculum in any way they see fit. These interpretations can affect students' school experience and contribute to processes that can promote the power of perceived global citizenship interests over national citizenship interests.

With so many MYP schools in the United States drawing on Title 1 funding, where members of the school community include many different nationalities and people from various countries of origin, it’s possible that global citizenship aspirations might trump aspirations towards American citizenship (Bunnell, 2011b, pg. 270). In offering citizens of nation states an alternative self-identity as a global citizen, the IB could be contributing to the development of an international social elite by promoting a hierarchical structure of cultural value in which self-proclaimed global citizens feel superior to other social groups in both their host country and/or their country of origin. Fraser's principle of participatory parity (2007) holds that social justice through recognition can only occur when any such hierarchical patterns ('institutionalised obstacles', pg. 17)
are removed and the order of social status offers opportunities for all social groups and individuals to enjoy equal social status, including those exposed and not exposed to the MYP in U.S. schools. Where nation state curriculum models provide a platform for the social reproduction of knowledge, skills and ideals considered by those developing them as being in the national interest, the MYP attempts to transcend these interests in favour of the global citizen who may repudiate any ‘closed and static notion of identities’ (Pashby, 2011, pg. 428).

Writing of the MYP, Tarc (2009) attempts to trace a historical shift in focus from the national citizen to the global citizen. In its Cold War historical context, early opposition to the MYP (known then as the ISAC\(^{19}\)) was the result of a desire on the part of nation state governments to use education as a tool for developing loyalty towards both the state and a neoliberal ideological political system as an anti-communist device (pg. 23). With the passing of the Cold War, this opposition faded and the language of globalisation began to influence the discourse around global citizenship education (see 2.2.4). Schultz (2007) asserts that with the growth of discourses around globalisation, neoliberalism and the knowledge based economy, these three contested concepts have become synthesised into a version of neoliberal global citizenship that tries to provide a specific paradigm of citizenship in the 21\(^{st}\) Century (see 2.2.7). Resnik (2012) takes this point even further, claiming that ‘the collapse of the Soviet Union allowed capitalism and neoliberalism to emerge as the sole alternative to coordinated economies and political systems’ (pg. 256).

The first three sections of this chapter appear to suggest that the MYP’s version of global citizenship mirrors Schultz’s 21\(^{st}\) Century global citizen paradigm. Language emerging from the two documents selected for critical analysis reflects the language of neoliberal global citizenship, and neoliberal global citizenship facilitates misrecognition by elevating neoliberal global citizenship ideals above those of traditional nation state citizenship as well other concepts of global citizenship such as Andreotti’s (2006a) notions of ‘soft’ and

\(^{19}\)International Schools Association Curriculum, piloted in 1988 by the International Schools Association (ISA) and adopted by the IB as the IB Middle Years Programme in 1994.
‘critical’ global citizenship as discussed in Section 2.3. Fraser's dimension of recognition holds that ‘cultural relations of class, gender, race and ethnicity are important influences on the quality of students' school experience, and imply obligations of social justice’ (Gilbert et al., 2011, pg. 5). In offering students a homogenous version of global citizenship education that reflects a neoliberal worldview, the MYP appears to be devaluing important cultural considerations and creating imbalanced criteria for what is culturally relevant to MYP students and their school communities. In eulogizing over global citizenship education without providing a clear framework for how it should be disseminated through teaching and learning, the MYP appears to be contributing to hierarchical patterns of misrecognition that elevate neoliberal worldviews above others.

4.3 Representation

Fraser’s third analytical dimension of representation concentrates on political injustice, highlighting systems that deprive some social groups or individuals of an equal share in political processes and therefore political power. This study’s analysis of global citizenship education in MYP policy and curriculum documents deconstructs texts in documents that favour a particular Western, neoliberal-oriented worldview. Combined with Fraser's previous two analytical frames of recognition and redistribution, ‘representation addresses the means by which participants can promote their access to equitable processes and outcomes’ (Gilbert et al., 2011, pg. 6).

The first consideration in looking at global citizenship education as it is alluded to in the selected documents is how political misrepresentation can be defined in this context. When ‘the concept of global citizenship education has, as yet, developed neither the political structures that typically ground citizenship in regularized and generally understood civic practices, nor has it, to date, provided a powerful emotive bond’ (Richardson 2008b, pg. 56), it is difficult to know against what and whom any misrepresentation might be taking place. One of the issues that emerged from Part 4.1 of this chapter, with its focus on redistribution, was that the MYP appears to be concentrated in school situations globally that are economically secure and have – by global economic standards - a largely
privileged student population. This applies both to countries with strong economies and to narrow, privileged sectors of society within countries with weaker economies. Section 4.2 of this chapter, with its focus on recognition, found that cultural injustice could be facilitated through the MYP by encouraging students to consider themselves to be culturally superior to others due to their adoption of global citizenship principles. Pashby (2015) views these elements of global citizenship education in the MYP as ‘ways of knowing, thinking and relating that cause the marginalisation of certain groups’ (pg. 350), thus contributing to global social justice issues around representation. The context for this claim is around a globalising world with the growing cultural, political and economic dominance of neoliberalism (see 2.2.5).

The two MYP unit plans examined in Parts 3.1 and 3.2 of this chapter serve as examples of some ways in which these issues of social justice can be evidenced in MYP teaching and learning materials. There appear to be both benefits and dangers in the IB’s tendency to use nebulous language in its policy and curriculum documents, and in its reluctance to make policy commitments to any specific variety of either global citizenship or global citizenship education. One possible benefit is that teachers are trusted to develop their own curriculum content that can be shaped to meet their students’ specific cultural needs in their specific situation. This liberty is hampered somewhat by the range of key terms provided by the IB, which promote a Western-oriented worldview (see Sections 3.1 and 3.2), but the MYP offers the potential for learning and teaching that is reflective of social justice aspirations.

A possible danger around planning MYP units, with the IB’s terminological prerequisites, is that any social justice aspirations are immersed in the language of neoliberalism, creating artificial combinations between concepts such as ‘Globalisation’ and ‘Sustainability’ (see Section 3.1) or ‘Fairness’ and ‘Development’ (see Section 3.2). These explicit terms could persuade students that
globalisation and sustainability share an inherent relationship, or that fairness and development go hand in hand. In many cases, as Gronemeyer (1992) has shown, these relationships are far more complex and far less equitable than the terminology of the MYP can support. The two unit plans suggest a Western worldview, where balanced perspectives respecting the traditions of non-Western cultures are either noticeable by their absence or else measured against Western, neoliberal-oriented values and criteria.

My analysis of the two case study unit plans in Part 3 of this chapter shows how the prevailing linguistic strands that start with IB policy and curriculum documents, such as ‘fairness and development’ or ‘globalisation and sustainability’, are disseminated in MYP unit plans and support a Western-oriented, neoliberal worldview. Drawing from personal experience, where less than half of the students I taught in international schools came from Western-oriented nation states, this raises the issue of whether or not the IB is either intentionally or inadvertently promoting a Western-oriented, neoliberal worldview as superior to the non-Western cultural norms of students and their families. Fraser’s (2000) three analytical dimensions have helped to reveal ways in which this cultural orientation in international education can operate as a form of cultural colonialism, with the dominant voices and language of the IB reflecting Western-oriented attitudes against which the educational experience of non-Western students is measured.

**Conclusion**

This chapter demonstrates ways in which critical discourse analysis reveals hidden assumptions and inconsistencies in the IB’s main policy and curriculum documents for the MYP. The analysis exposes the IB’s strategic action regarding the definition of terms which favour fluid descriptions of globalization and global citizenship education, even when those terms are integral to claims around core values and educational practices. The use of undefined and unsupported
terminology such as our ‘highly interconnected and rapidly changing world’ (IB, 2014, pg. 11) and a ‘post-international environment’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 3) are typical of these descriptions, exhibiting a preference for headlines over substantive content. The implications for social justice, for education and international education are considerable. Head of MYP Development Robert Harrison’s 2015 claim that ‘curriculum change in the MYP involves fixed ecologies, cherished architectural features, and organic processes that can be both fragile and robust’ (pg. 56) perhaps typifies the vague and imprecise language used to attempt to describe the programme. It is open to multiple versions of meaning and based on platitudes drawn from wider contextual claims around globalization and international education. As such, the MYP remains perhaps deliberately enigmatic, attempting to be all things to all people, failing to assert its position in the ‘global’ context in which it operates, and avoiding criticality with which students could analyse curriculum content.

This is unlikely to be an oversight, with the MYP being a curriculum framework model that is highly successful in terms of growth and dissemination. At best, the fluid approach to descriptions and explanations suggests a respect for the professionalism of teachers who develop MYP curriculum content; on the other hand, it may suggest a conscious attempt to avoid clarity so that issues arising from the language used in curriculum documents are open to wide interpretation and misinterpretation. By placing the responsibility for global citizenship education on teachers and teaching teams without offering a clear position, the MYP avoids accountability for individual interpretations and facilitates the growth of a neoliberal consensus in international education.

Regardless of their nationality or the location of their school, students’ sense of national/global identity is influenced by MYP discourses of specific
Western-oriented versions of global learning contexts, including neoliberal globalisation, as discussed in this chapter. In the discussion chapter to follow, the findings of this analysis chapter will be discussed in detail. Each of the research questions for this study will be addressed, and the critical issues described here will be expanded upon. The study's findings, aims and processes will be identified and explained with a view to bringing the various threads of the research into a cohesive whole.
Chapter 5 – Discussion

5.1 Introduction to the Chapter

This chapter has been organized into the following structure: Section 5.2 explores the global citizenship discourse in the IB, both explicit and implied, to examine ways this discourse may or may not influence the MYP curriculum framework. Section 5.3 focuses on relationships (including relationship omissions) between the IB’s global citizenship discourse and the MYP curriculum framework. In Section 5.4 I outline the social justice issues emerging from the study, both during the critical discourse analysis and as a result of applying Nancy Fraser’s (2007) three-dimensional analytical framework to any issues arising. The way in which this study is located in the wider research literature around global citizenship, global citizenship education, and international education form the focus for Section 5.5, and Section 5.6 offers a summary and conclusion of the topics discussed in the chapter.

5.2 An examination of the global citizenship discourse in the International Baccalaureate

Attempts to respond to my research questions were driven both by my eight year-long experience as an MYP teacher in three international schools, and by my continuing involvement in training other MYP teachers as an online workshop facilitator for the IB. Since 2005, when I first began teaching the MYP in an international school, I have struggled to understand fully the IB’s position on global citizenship in the MYP curriculum framework. During that time, policy and curriculum documents pertaining to the MYP and to global citizenship increased dramatically their use of terminology around the ‘global’, whilst avoiding – in all but one position paper - any direct incorporation of global citizenship definitions, descriptions or explanations. The findings from this research suggest that this tendency has led to uncertainties and inconsistencies in MYP policy and curriculum documents and in teacher-facilitated planning for MYP subject groups. That these developments have corresponded with an unprecedented rise in the number of schools globally using the MYP during the same period (since 2005)
suggests that the IB has been strategic in its avoidance of engagement with the wider global citizenship discourse in education generally, being driven by expansionist business considerations more than by clear and well defined curriculum content for global citizenship.

The fundamental concern emerging from this study is not just that the IB is being strategically fluid in its global citizenship descriptions in MYP curriculum framework documents, but that this strategy promotes, insidiously, the ideology of neoliberal global citizenship in MYP planning, teaching and learning. This is not to suggest that the IB is deliberately employing some sinister strategy for turning MYP teachers into conduits for neoliberalism, nor are they setting out to purposefully inculcate MYP students with neoliberal worldviews. Many practicing MYP teachers and students would find this idea counter-intuitive, if not offensive. The issue is that without clear global citizenship guidance in policy and curriculum documents, neoliberalism is becoming subtly embedded in MYP units of study, and is therefore being disseminated as a key component of an MYP education. Findings from this research study invite questions around whether the IB envisages MYP students as responsible global citizens with critical ideas of social justice, or if the successful MYP student is simply one who excels in a globalising economy.

Many of these issues reflect wider uncertainties around international educational and international schools, where there is little agreement on purpose and intentions (see 2.4). The evolution of international education is in itself a story of transient families moving across socio-political spaces, so it is perhaps understandable that such mobile cultural experiences have resulted in fluid perceptions of citizenship, global citizenship, and global citizenship education. It is in response to these situations that global educational organisations – including the IB – have attempted to develop definitions of their missions, intentions and curriculum frameworks. But in the case of the IB, descriptions designed to clarify
positions pertaining to these international education contexts appear to have worked to the opposite effect.

In publishing the position paper ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011), the IB attempted to establish a clear framework for global citizenship education. However, nothing of the global citizenship discourse from this publication appears in ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014), the core policy document for the MYP curriculum framework that was published three years later. The IB’s alternative terminology around citizenship in global contexts - ‘international-mindedness’, ‘intercultural understanding’ and ‘global engagement’ – appear in both documents, but with no direct links to global citizenship or global citizenship education (see 2.2.8). This leaves the IB’s global citizenship discourse incoherent and open to multiple interpretations, which will be discussed in the next section of this chapter. The two policy documents selected for analysis during this study represent a missed opportunity for the IB to provide clear and coherent guidance around global citizenship education in their MYP. This missed opportunity – whether deliberate or careless – renders the MYP susceptible to multiple influences, and to the influences of neoliberalism that dominate in policy and curriculum framework publications.

5.3 Gaps in the IB MYP curriculum framework

The findings emerging from this study suggest that indeterminate terminology in MYP curriculum planning guidance results in a dominant Western-oriented discourse in MYP policy and curriculum documents which is reflected in MYP unit plans. The most prevalent example of this tendency is in the many expressions of internationalism and globalism found in the MYP texts studied. The term ‘global’ features strongly, but the IB’s version of the ‘global’ is awash with neoliberal undercurrents. The introduction to ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014), for example, describes a curriculum framework that should, according to the IB, emphasise student preparation for participation in ‘an increasingly global society’
through ‘holistic learning, intercultural awareness and communication’ (pg. 3). These aspirations are connected to the knowledge-based economy through ‘promoting understanding of cultures and environments across global contexts through the transfer of knowledge’ (ibid. pg. 16). Using these global contexts, MYP students should explore concepts ‘open to different interpretations such as citizenship, identity and globalisation’ (pg. 17). However, the document makes clear that these interpretations are subject to the vagaries of the ‘global economy’ (pg. 17).

Sitting side by side with this particular worldview are multiple, persistent references to the personal qualities expected of an MYP student. Some, such as aspirations around ‘the pursuit of significant knowledge and understanding’ (2014, pg. 9) reflect unsupported assumptions – in this case, that certain kinds of knowledge and understanding are significant whilst others, presumably, are not. Most, however, borrow from earlier traditions, described in ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) as grounded in ‘progressive educational thinking’ (pg. 3). Under the heading ‘IB Learners’, the document describes such learners as ‘active, compassionate lifelong learners’ (ibid. pg. 9). Locating these students in IB programmes20 apparently ‘requires IB learners to strive to become inquirers, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, principled, open-minded, caring, risk-takers, balanced and reflective’ (pg. 9). These personal qualities make up the IB’s learner profile, a collection of personal attributes considered by the IB to be of paramount importance in learning. Still, gaps remain between the detailing of these attributes and the attributes associated with some versions of global citizenship (see Section 2.2).

With the Learner Profile, the IB has an opportunity to make connections in their MYP between some of their core philosophical values and their position on global citizenship and global citizenship education. The MYP has not evolved in a vacuum and has been subject to many of the influences evident in the wider

---

20 Primary Years Programme, Middle Years Programme, Diploma Programme
literature around international education. These influences have included those of the progressive education tradition as well as those of Western-oriented economics in a globalising economy, and the tensions inherent in these competing ideologies have been explored in the literature review for this study (see 2.2.3a). Given that international education has evolved in the same context and during the same time period as global neoliberalism, it is predictable that there would be a relationship between them. But the documents examined in the literature review for this study exhibit a consistent disconnect between two competing ideologies – progressive education and global neoliberalism – with the MYP currently looking like a neoliberal curriculum framework tucked inside a seemingly progressive curriculum package.

These gaps – between a neoliberal worldview and progressive education ideals and aspirations – are at the heart of this research study. The idea that all students globally can enjoy equal access to a curriculum experience that is simultaneously humanitarian and neoliberal in nature represents persistent uses of incongruous *lexico-grammatical constructions* that attempt to marry contrasting educational, philosophical, political and socio-economic ideals and practices. The result of these dissonant messages coming from IB policy and curriculum documents is MYP unit plans that attempt to link the two, and this study shows how these seemingly confused messages are being interpreted during the planning of units by MYP teachers.

### 5.4 Social justice issues emerging from the research

One of the principal social justice issues emerging from this study has been around what Fraser calls ‘parity of participation’ (2008a, pg. 16), which is a response to a type of injustice stemming from institutionalized social arrangements that prevent all people from equally accessing participation in social interactions, including education. With the possible exception of Ecuador, which has recently implemented the MYP into some of its state-funded schools, access to an MYP education remains confined to students in school settings or national economies
with the economic means to pay remuneration to the IB for administering and
authorising the use of the programme as well as teacher training costs and annual
programme fees. The IB’s claim that ‘the programme is designed to be inclusive;
the IB believes that all students can benefit from the programme’ (IB, 2014 pg. 3)
does not appear to extend to a student’s socio-economic situation when looked at
globally. The economic restrictions to access mean that any benefits offered by the
MYP are concentrated to student populations located either in nation states with
strong economies or within small, privileged communities across the Global
South. For Fraser (2000), this is an issue that can be addressed through
redistribution, which aims for equal access to participation in social activities (see
2.8).

Fraser’s (2000) second analytical dimension of recognition helped to reveal
two ways in which the MYP could be contributing to cultural injustice: first, by
imbuing MYP students with a sense of cultural superiority over others, and second
by encouraging students towards a preference for an MYP version of global
citizenship over the citizenship rights and responsibilities of their home or host
nation. These two issues around recognition are related - both to each other and
to the issues of redistribution described above. The MYP student’s elevated social
situation, either in the sense of their attendance at a private international school
setting or a publicly funded school in a strong global economy, may lead to an
elevated social status or sense of cultural superiority. This study has shown how
any sense of cultural eminence may be empowered or even facilitated through the
MYP’s interpretation of global citizenship. If MYP students are encouraged to feel
that they are neoliberal global citizens (see Section 5.2 of this chapter), they are
more likely to associate their sense of global citizenship with ongoing attempts to
gain a competitive edge over global ‘others’. In this scenario, the MYP is located
among those ‘institutionalised obstacles’ (Fraser, 2007, pg. 17) that prevent
people from experiencing equal social status.
Fraser's (2000) third analytical dimension of representation was used in this research study to explore ways in which the MYP's rendering of global citizenship might contribute to political injustice, first by perpetuating a neoliberal citizenship discourse and second by promoting a particular, Western-oriented worldview. Section 3.1 of the CDA in Chapter 4 of this study showed how MYP students appear to be located in educational contexts of relative wealth and privilege; it is not possible in a study of this size to extrapolate how many of those students are likely to go on to experience continued privilege through professional roles in government or business when they reach adulthood, but studies available from the IB website suggest a much higher enrollment in higher education for MYP students than for students studying in other curriculum frameworks (ibo.org). University enrollment does not automatically locate former MYP students in influential professional roles in government or business, but it does place those students in positions of privilege.

If, as this study's findings suggest, MYP students are concentrated in contexts of educational and socio-economic privilege, it is possible that a disproportionate number of former MYP students inhabit professional roles in which they have the power to shape and promulgate a political worldview that has been influenced by an MYP/IB education. Section 3.1 of the CDA in chapter 4 showed how a large proportion of MYP students come from financially secure backgrounds and study in educational contexts of socio-economic privilege. Fraser's (2000) analytical dimension of representation helps to reveal ways in which these trends can serve to concentrate political power into the hands of a privileged global minority, depriving global 'others' of equal participation in political processes and political influence (pg. 16).

5.5 Findings of this study in relation to existing literature

The findings emerging from this study aim to advance the existing research corpus around four contemporary historical, societal and cultural contexts:

a. international education
b. the IB
c. neoliberalism in education
d. global citizenship, and global citizenship education

\[ a. \textit{International Education} \]

Students studying the MYP do so in schools in a variety of locations globally, from state schools to private schools and self-described international schools. This study confirms the perspective of Hayden and Thompson (1995), for whom international education exists largely in the context of international schools, which traditionally served – and still serve – families from among a global privileged elite. However, the recent expansion of the MYP into a growing number of U.S. state-funded schools (see 4.1) challenges this assumption, exposing a trend in which the IB, as a global leading provider of international education, is seeing its MYP used as part of the education system of a nation state.

This MYP movement into state-funded schools in poorer U.S. school districts could be evidence of a wider U.S. trend towards privatisation of state schooling, where 'because education policies are intertwined with neoliberal urban economies, education is a key site of urban contestation' (Lipman, 2013, pg. 562). I do not claim here that the IB or MYP are responsible for this broader socio-economic situation. Rather, the pull of neoliberal urban economics means that 'take-overs by education management organizations, expansion of privately run charter schools, and mayoral control of school systems are the order of the day' (ibid, pg. 558). In this context, it's possible that the MYP has become attractive as an external education provider that can be used in low income state schools as part of the process of disconnecting public school curriculum from public school funding, thus beginning the process of privatisation.

On a recent visit to the U.S., whilst writing this discussion chapter, I saw a headline in my father-in-law’s newspaper, the 'Albuquerque Journal', that read
'Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) promotes (sic) 'private school education for free'' (abqjournal.com). The article, by staff writer Kim Burgess, was about Sandia High School, which my wife had attended as a teenager, and which had just started to offer the IB Diploma. In the article, Principal Harry D’Anza explained that ‘Our goal is to create a school within a school’ (ibid). Reading this article ‘at a time when disparagement of public services globally neatly propels the shift towards privatization’ (Winter, 2017, pg. 70), I was compelled to include it in this dissertation as evidence of U.S. schools’ and their funding bodies’ active fostering of curriculum programmes traditionally associated with international schools.

How this development may influence the IB, the MYP and U.S education systems over the coming years is of particular interest, and it forms one of the recommendations for further research in Chapter 6. Perhaps most interesting would be to examine whether the MYP is being taken up in the U.S. because it fits in with existing social, cultural, political and educational doctrines, or if its attraction to some U.S. schools and school districts is that it offers a quick and easy route to privatisation and high status.

b. The IB

One of the reasons for commencement of this study was to make a meaningful contribution to a corpus of literature on the IB which Tarc (2009) finds sparse and largely uncritical. The study’s findings confirm this observation, with critical literature outnumbered by IB-sponsored studies by some margin. However, this should not distract from the necessity for ongoing analysis of the IB, which this study has shown to be an evolving organisation with changing curriculum offerings that attempt to transcend traditional perceptions of the nation-state and national identity. This finding reflects the assertion of Bunnell (2011b) that IB programmes can come in for criticism for ‘undermining the national interest’ (pg. 169). However, evidence did not emerge to support Roberts’ (2009b) claim that this undermining of national values takes the form of the development of cosmopolitan values in IB schools. Indeed, this study showed that the values
promoted in MYP policy and curriculum documents did not correspond to cosmopolitanism, aside from one version of neoliberal cosmopolitanism, but to neoliberalism in education, as discussed in the next section.

c. Neoliberalism in Education

Findings emerging from this study suggest a Western-oriented, neoliberal undercurrent to MYP policy and curriculum documents, summarised by Bunnell (2011a) as located within a dilemma between aspirations of universal human values and a service for globally mobile elites (pg. 168). Indeed, this study’s findings largely agree with Bunnell’s interpretation, revealing aspects of both sides of the dilemma he describes in the documents analysed. Fairclough’s (2009) claim that the language of neoliberalism is being deliberately fused with that of globalization to make it seem both inevitable and more palatable to education providers is an astute observation borne out by this study. But there is no clear evidence in the documents selected for analysis for Apple’s (2001) assertion that the incorporation of neoliberalism into education is a deliberate strategy for disseminating capitalist values among the next generation of students who will go on to dominate the political and economic landscape of the future.

d. Global Citizenship and Global Citizenship Education

My findings demonstrate that the MYP’s aspirations around global citizenship and global citizenship education, as articulated in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011), are not demonstrably evident in other MYP curriculum documents or sample MYP unit plans. The IB has avoided using any of the versions of global citizenship detailed in Section 2.3, preferring to use the terms ‘international-mindedness’, ‘intercultural understanding’ and ‘global engagement’ in their place. This study has indicated that despite the use of these alternative terms, the broader terminology of the MYP is mostly inclined towards neoliberal versions of global citizenship, as outlined in Section 2.2.7, and global citizenship education, as outlined in Section 2.3, in order to expand their business
by appearing to be compatible with the discourses of both progressive education traditions and neoliberalism.

5.6 Conclusion

This discussion chapter has drawn together findings from the research study’s CDA and the social justice implications emerging from the application of Fraser’s (2000) three dimensions of analysis. It has reflected upon the methodology that draws on the traditions of CDA and social justice frameworks, concluding that the combination of these traditions has been effective in responding to the study’s research questions. In the concluding chapter, I reflect on the study’s findings, assess the implications and evaluate the research experience.
Chapter 6 – Conclusion

6.1 Introduction
This concluding chapter has been organised into eight sections. It draws together findings from the research relating to the study’s aims and research questions. Section 6.2 considers each of the study’s three research questions, the findings associated with each one and the conclusions reached in relation to the study’s original aims. Section 6.3 offers recommendations for policy and practice emerging from research findings, and Section 6.4 outlines the original contribution to knowledge offered by the study. In Section 6.5 I evaluate the contribution made by the theoretical framework, and in Section 6.6 I detail the strengths and limitations of the study. Section 6.7 makes recommendations for future research and Section 6.8 offers reflections upon my research journey.

6.2 Addressing the research questions
This research study has focused on analysis of the language of documents relating to the IB MYP. My aim was to investigate discourses and concepts of global citizenship, and global citizenship education, and to explore any implications for social justice. To that end, each of the study’s three research questions will be addressed in turn.

6.2.1 What discourses and concepts of global citizenship are evident in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?
This research question was pivotal to uncovering the undercurrent of the concept of global citizenship in the documents selected for analysis. Within these documents, the terminology of global citizenship has been used exclusively in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011). It has not been explicitly stated in any of the other MYP documents analysed, and yet it is alluded to in alternative terminology unique to the IB, such as ‘international-mindedness’, ‘global engagement’ and ‘intercultural awareness’. Findings emerging from this research question reveal how these alternative terms help to
carry the message of neoliberal global citizenship without ever specifically expressing this aspiration.

By examining the discourse around global citizenship in IB documents and comparing it to the wider global citizenship discourse, this research question helped to identify ways in which language is used to create relationships between seemingly unrelated concepts. Under the heading ‘Globalisation and Education’ (Davy, 2011), the IB states that ‘education for global citizenship must become the curriculum of the future’ (pg. 3). This attempt to synthesise globalization with education and the future is typical of the IB discourse around global citizenship, which uses widely used – but little understood – generalized terminology to communicate grand aspirations. It suggests that MYP policy and curriculum documents have been written specifically with the purpose of blending the terminology of globalisation, neoliberalism and universal human values. This research question revealed that concepts of global citizenship in IB policy and curriculum documents do little more than regurgitate globalization clichés in educational contexts.

6.2.2 What version of global citizenship education is promoted in IB MYP policy and curriculum documents?

This research question uncovered the IB’s stated intentions around global citizenship education. These are most explicitly expressed in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011), which states ‘Educating for global citizenship is now a significant element in curriculum development in many jurisdictions’ (pg. 9). One of these jurisdictions, according to this document, is international education:

The IB can provide leadership in international education by:
- strengthening the elements of global citizenship throughout the IB curriculum
- developing authentic assessment tools for international-mindedness and global citizenship
• opening perspectives for students and empowering them through technology
• strengthening the terminology used in describing and explaining the IB philosophy

Through this research question, these claims were unpicked for meaning via critical discourse analysis, resulting in the finding that global citizenship education is an aspiration largely confined to one IB position paper. Indeed, the last of the bullet points above appears almost ironic in that this research question has prompted research findings suggesting that terminology describing global citizenship education under the umbrella of IB philosophy is distinctly uncertain. This uncertainty has been exacerbated by the IB’s decision to omit any explicit terminology of global citizenship education from ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014), which is the core policy and curriculum document of the MYP.

The IB’s stance on global citizenship education is elucidated as ‘an approach to learning, not an addition to the curriculum’ (Davy, 2011, pg. 1). This research question has shown this to be a nebulous and unsubstantiated claim made in isolation from the wider global citizenship education discourse. Keeping global citizenship compartmentalised as an approach rather than a curriculum contribution serves as a marketing ploy, allowing schools to use any version of global citizenship in their MYP curriculum, on their websites and in their promotional materials, or to omit global citizenship entirely. With no assessment requirement for global citizenship in the MYP, with contrasting and conflicting global citizenship terminology, and with a separation of global citizenship into one specific document, the IB has waived any responsibility for global citizenship education in the schools it authorises and moderates.

6.2.3 What are the implications for social justice of IB MYP global citizenship education policy and curriculum descriptions?
The findings emerging from this research question demonstrated that the use of unsubstantiated global citizenship terminology created opportunities for undercurrents of Western-oriented neoliberalism in contemporary MYP teaching
and learning materials. These undercurrents may contribute to global social injustice in the ways described in Part 4 of Chapter 4. Through limiting global access to the MYP to school districts in wealthy economies and private schools, the IB is encouraging division of global social status between MYP students and non-MYP students. As of June 2016, more than 40% of MYP students globally were situated in state-funded schools in the U.S., the world’s largest economy (IB, 2016). My own recent experience in the U.S. of reading about the IB being offered as ‘private education for free’ (abqjournal.org) reflects Resnik’s (2012) assertion that in North America, ‘state schools have adopted the IB to create a “private school” aura to attract students from middle-and upper-class families and accommodate neoliberal parents’ (pg. 250). This merging of private and public could be part of a wider trend of privatisation of public assets in the U.S., as described in 5.5a.

The IB may also be contributing to global social injustice in the MYP by promoting Western-oriented values and attitudes as the criteria for success or failure in students’ educational experiences (Bunnell, 2011b). This research question prompted an examination of the MYP globalisation discourse, demonstrating ways in which globalisation is used to justify the promotion of Western-oriented traditions over others (see 2.2.4). For example, the OECD uses PISA measures of school achievement to compare educational success or failure between education systems in different countries globally (Rizvi and Lingard, 2010). These OECD measures and criteria do not reflect different local cultural perceptions of what is a good education. Rather, they used a standardised, Western, neoliberal-oriented version of educational success that favours a view of students as contributors to a global neoliberal economy (ibid, pg. 3).

6.3 Recommendations for policy and practice
As a result of this research experience, I will now make three recommendations, one of which pertains to IB policy development and two of which relate to MYP unit planning practices.
My first recommendation is for the IB to clarify its position on global citizenship within its core policy and curriculum document for the MYP. This could mean amalgamating ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (2011) with ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014) or incorporating key elements of the former into the latter in order to improve the rigour and critical quality of the document. Clear terminology, outlined in a glossary, could strengthen the document. Similarly, outlining the IB’s position on global citizenship in the context of wider global citizenship debates could provide opportunities for teachers to connect global citizenship teaching and learning experiences to the existing discourse. This could encourage students to critically examine the IB’s global citizenship position and understand the variety of alternative interpretations. In a curriculum framework that promotes ‘a stance of critical engagement with challenging ideas’ (IB, 2014, pg. 9), advancing criticality could be a welcome addition to ‘MYP: From Principles into Practice’ (2014).

The reason for this recommendation is that findings emerging from this research study suggest that MYP planning, teaching and learning around global citizenship is not taking place in the ways endorsed in ‘Learners without borders: A curriculum for global citizenship’ (Davy, 2011). Indeed, global citizenship as an aspirational concept appears to be entirely absent from the MYP in all but the above named document. Synthesis of the IB’s position paper on global citizenship with its core policy and curriculum framework document for the MYP could be the first step in incorporating global citizenship education into the MYP. The next step would be incorporating this policy position into MYP teacher training, which usually takes place through face-to-face MYP conferences, online workshops and in-house in schools using the programme. Through these types of training, classroom practices could emerge that encourage MYP students to become critically self-aware learners.

My second recommendation is for the ‘Global Contexts’ section of the MYP unit planner to be reconfigured so that each global context is listed separately and can be used independently or in a relationship with another global context chosen and justified by the teacher or teachers planning the unit. Currently, the ‘Global
Contexts' planning imperative consists of pairs of global contexts, such as 'Fairness and Development' and 'Globalisation and Sustainability', which have been addressed during this study. These combinations, which are a required component of any MYP unit, consist of assumed relationships, and these assumptions restrict teachers to binary explorations of important learning contexts that obscure the broader political and economic concepts within which they are situated.

Reconfiguring the 'Global Contexts' portion of the MYP unit planner could expand the options for teachers to develop MYP learning experiences that attempt to address each of the stated global contexts either independently or in any other configuration. It could also help to address the Western-oriented discourses in curriculum materials that have emerged from this study by removing assumed value-laden relationships. For example, in the two MYP unit plans examined during Part 3 of Chapter 4, 'Fairness and Development' (3.1) is used to support a unit contextualising sub-Saharan Africa as subservient to the economies of the Global North, whose development aid largesse was required to rescue this region from itself. ‘Globalisation and Sustainability’ (3.2) is used in a unit that characterises globalisation and industrialisation as positive forces for environmental sustainability. These opportunities to represent situations and events with a Western-oriented bias arise as a result of the arrangement of the MYP Global Contexts. Reconfiguring those contexts could discourage teachers from building Western-oriented bias into their MYP planning practices.

My final recommendation is for the IB to instigate an innovative curriculum development project to review the origin, purpose, and goals of global citizenship education in the MYP. I recommend that the IB introduce an action research project inviting MYP teachers to become trained as teacher-researchers, researching their own MYP teaching practices in teams. The reason for this recommendation is to support global citizenship education throughout the MYP, from the programme's policy documents to its planning materials and into teaching and learning.
6.4 Original contribution to knowledge

This research study offers a contemporary analysis of global citizenship aspirations in IB policy and curriculum documents at a time of unprecedented expansion of the MYP (Bunnell, 2011). I have uncovered Western-oriented neoliberal undercurrents running through MYP policy and curriculum development narratives that are likely to influence the worldview of almost 55,000 students of 178 nationalities currently studying the MYP in 86 countries globally (Bunnell, 2016). This study has shown that in most cases these students are located either in some of the strongest economies in the world or in pockets of privilege in countries with weaker economies.

The elite make up of MYP students means that there is an increased likelihood of MYP graduates occupying some of the most influential roles in the political and economic structures of their nation states, or the nation states in which they live (Tarc, 2013). This study finds that the philosophical and ontological influences students are exposed to during their time studying in the MYP could have significant effects on future social, economic and political developments in countries around the world (Rizvi and Lingard, 2010). It has exposed ways in which narratives of neoliberal global citizenship are hidden in some of the IB’s alternative policy and curriculum terminology around ‘global engagement’, ‘intercultural understanding’ and ‘international mindedness’. The artificial coupling of other concepts, such as ‘fairness and development’ or ‘globalisation and sustainability’ is helping to support false relationships that could colour the perspectives of future political, economic, social and educational decision makers.

I believe that the connections made in this study between the MYP and wider discourses around global citizenship, global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2006) and global social justice (Fraser, 2000) help to illuminate global educational trends towards neoliberal beliefs being promulgated under the smokescreen of globalisation. My aims were to analyse MYP descriptions and terminology pertaining to the development of the MYP citizen and to place these descriptions in a wider educational and socio-political context. The study has
demonstrated that the IB, at least in its MYP, is contributing to the neoliberal trend in education – and in international education – and to the manipulation of the ‘global’ as a vehicle for propagating mythopeosis linking globalisation to political and economic neoliberalism (Brown and Lauder, 2011). This study has revealed ways in which the IB has proactively connected the language of global social justice with the language of global neoliberalism.

Finally, this study has highlighted the uncertainties and inconsistencies endemic to the IB’s policy and curriculum descriptions of the MYP curriculum framework. These uncertainties and inconsistencies provide space for the dissemination of teachers’, schools’ or other educational organisations’ political or religious ideologies, and I believe that this particular focus is unique to the discourse around both the IB and the MYP. In failing to establish clear guidelines that reflect the organisation’s values, the IB has left the MYP open to multiple interpretations of its core curriculum content. Identifying and cataloguing the effects of these interpretations is one of the recommendations for further research emerging from this study.

6.5 Contribution of the theoretical framework

Fraser’s (2000) three analytical dimensions of analysis pertaining to social justice issues helped to develop the issues emerging from the CDA. These dimensions included redistribution, recognition, and representation; issues around equal access to the MYP were addressed using Fraser’s notion of ‘parity of participation’ (2008). The limitations of a CDA approach (see 3.7) required the incorporation of additional analytical elements around social justice issues emerging from the research, for which Fraser’s Rethinking Recognition (2000) was used. The reason for this synthesis between critical discourse analysis and Fraser’s framework for social justice is less an issue with the Hyatt frame (2013) and more a response to social justice issues emerging from the CDA process. These aspects of the study required a broader theoretical framework that could address the full range of issues that surfaced during examination of all the documents explored as well as the educational context in which the curriculum framework of the MYP is used.
Fraser’s analytical tools enabled me to tease out concerns embedded in the selected documents, supporting exploration of socio-economic injustice, cultural injustice around social status, and political injustice. In short, the theoretical framework allowed me to achieve my research aims. However, Fraser’s (2000) three analytical dimensions are presented as of equal value and equal importance, whereas the results of this study suggest that socio-economic issues (redistribution) impacted more profoundly on the educational context in which it takes place than either the cultural (recognition) or the political (representation).

Initially, I had considered using Tikly and Barrett’s theoretical approach as espoused in ‘Social justice, capabilities and the quality of education in low income countries’ (2011), which draws on the work of Nancy Fraser and Amyarta Sen. But after testing this approach in a trial analysis, I found it unsuitable for an MYP context, focused – as it is – on state-funded education in low income countries. There were limitations to Fraser’s (2008) approach, in that it assumes economic injustice is followed by cultural and then political injustice, which simplifies the complex and evolving relationships in the diverse global contents with which this study is concerned. But these drawbacks are outweighed by the benefits of being able to draw on a theoretical framework that enhanced and deepened the results of the CDA. If embarking upon another CDA dealing with global contexts, I would apply Fraser’s analytical tool kit again.

6.6 Strengths and limitations of the study

This section is divided into two sections that outline the strengths and limitations of the study respectively. It is followed by my recommendations for future research and a personal reflection on the research experience.

6.6.1 Strengths of the study

The main strengths of this study can be arranged into three related sections: the timing of the study; the emergence of hidden assumptions in the documents selected for analysis; the theoretical framework that synthesised CDA with Fraser’s (2000) three analytical dimensions of social justice.
First, the study has been completed at an interesting historical juncture for the MYP, with the last five years seeing a prominent shift involving adoption by many more state-funded schools in the United States. This study does not provide answers to questions pertaining to reasons for this shift, but it highlights the shift at a time of increasing political conservatism that is attempting to marry capitalist, neoliberal values with perceptions of a globalising world. It has not been possible within the scope and time frame of this study to assess any relationship between these political trends and the adoption of the MYP by state-funded schools in the United States, but it would be interesting to look further into this dynamic. Analysis of the growth of the MYP in state-funded schools in the United States as highlighted in this study is a suggestion for further research.

Second, the findings emerging from this study have challenged some pervasive assumptions in the language of IB MYP policy and curriculum development documents. The study has met its aims, which were to analyse policy and curriculum terminology used in unit planning in the MYP; it has laid bare conflicting concepts within the documents selected for analysis and explained how these conflicts present challenges for teachers, students, their families and – potentially – wider global society.

Third, the application of the theoretical framework has coincided with a period of political zeitgeist in which ‘facts’ and ‘alternative facts’ change places with alarming regularity. This is not a new phenomenon in politics, but the key difference in the current political arena is that descriptions such as ‘facts’ and ‘alternative facts’ are being employed, suggesting an increasing awareness of the ways in which truths are conveyed in language and statistics. A CDA approach facilitates analysis of terms and phrases that carry messages of political and socio-economic intent; in the case of this study, educational policy intent has come under scrutiny and produced the insights described above. Those insights, transposed into a global social justice context, enable people to distinguish between what is said (or written) and what is meant (or implied), and how the differences can impact social life in communities effected by socio-economic and political messages communicated in the language of policy. This is a strength
emerging from this study that could contribute to a growing text-based policy analysis approach both in education and beyond.

6.6.2 Limitations of the study

This study is primarily text-based, meaning that findings emerging from the study are located in documentation and interpretations of content; they are not located in teaching practices or participants’ perspectives and so the study is unable to highlight findings from MYP teaching and learning perspectives and situations. The study has also been restricted to one of the IB’s four programmes of education, which means that findings are limited to the MYP, whereas a broader study across all four programmes might be better able to find themes running through the IB organisation. This limitation reflects my IB teaching experience, most of which took place in an MYP context.

Another limitation to this study stems from the range of documents identified and analysed. Although my search for IB documents featuring narratives of global citizenship and global citizenship education has been thorough and ongoing, other uncovered documents could exist. Similarly, as my study did not take place in a school context, I am unable to report on MYP schools with policies and practices relating to global citizenship and global citizenship education. These schools may have helped to shed light on ways in which global citizenship and global citizenship education are incorporated into the MYP curriculum framework in specific school contexts.

6.7 Recommendations for future research

I offer two recommendations for future research based on this study’s findings. The first is an investigation into reasons for the current increase in numbers of state-funded schools in the United States accessing the IB MYP. While growth in the IB’s other global regions has been slow and steady for the MYP since 2012, in North America – and particularly in the United States – growth has been significant. Only a year after the IB adopted the MYP, Hayden and Thompson wrote that the IB went from offering programmes ‘for international schools’ to offering ‘international programmes for schools’ (1995a, pg. 16). Twenty-two years later,
this astute observation is unfolding at an impressive rate, with the MYP statistical bulletin of June 2016 showing that state-funded schools in the United States accounted for more than 40% of all schools using the MYP globally; ten years earlier, this figure stood at less than 5%. Reasons for the adoption of the MYP by state-funded schools in the USA could shed light on the growth of the MYP and the changes made to the structure of the curriculum framework between 2008 and 2014, when the programme underwent reorganisation.

Interviews with policy makers in U.S. school districts as well as with school Principles and IB Coordinators could shed light on some of the reasons for the rise in numbers of state-funded schools adopting the MYP. My instincts are that there are four main reasons why U.S. schools are increasingly adopting the MYP. The first is that schools already using the IB Diploma would like a curriculum framework with continuous articulation from one programme into the next. The MYP could meet this need, and the IB offers financial incentives for schools to adopt more than one IB programme. The second reason is that the MYP fits in with existing neoliberal socio-economic attitudes in the U.S. education system, where university structures have resulted in expectations for education to be organised and managed as business enterprises. The third is that the MYP could support coercive privatisation practices (see 5.5) in which U.S. state schools in areas of comparative socio-economic deprivation become privatised through management company intermediaries that use state funding to run state schools as business enterprises. The fourth is that the MYP could support gifted and talented programmes in these U.S. schools, leading to differentiation between students who are deemed capable or worthy of MYP engagement and those who are not, resulting in an elite and underclass under one school roof as divided by curriculum offerings.

My second suggestion is for research into the global citizenship narrative of the IB across all four of its programmes, to include the Diploma Creativity, Action, Service (CAS), the MYP Personal Project and the Primary Years Programme Student Exhibition. One of the limitations of this study has been that it is confined to the MYP, and there is scope for analysis across all four of the IB’s
programmes for the organisation’s narrative of global citizenship and global citizenship education. Given that some students study in IB programmes from the age of 5 to the age of 18, IB global citizenship narratives could be pervasive throughout a child’s education. Combined with the narrative exposed by this study of globalisation equating to Western-oriented neoliberalism, the IB graduate's idea of global citizenship could make them an unwitting contributor to global social injustice, or at best a proponent of the myth that free market economics can facilitate global equality. A study of the IB’s global citizenship message could help to confirm or deny this assertion, providing valuable insights into the organisation’s broader socio-economic and political intentions.

6.8 Research journey

In reflecting on entries in my research diary, it seemed at the start of the study both unlikely and inevitable that this research experience would result in profound personal and professional change. Having long since prided myself on my organisational abilities, I was compelled to reappraise my self-aggrandisement, realise that I needed to do much more in far greater detail in much less time, and to find a balance between family life, work life and study that would support all three relatively equally.

Change is the key word emerging from this research experience. The study has changed the way I think. It has continually challenged my preconceptions and encouraged me to increase the criticality of my thinking, adding extra layers of analytical instinct that were entirely absent before the start date of October 2012. As such, it is difficult to separate the personal from the academic because these changes have been equally pervasive across both. That said, there have been specific elements of change that are more apparent on the pages of this dissertation than in other areas of life.

I have learned that language, as applied to policy terminology, is often complex, nuanced, contradictory, sometimes well intentioned and subtly deliberately manipulative. Messages sent and received pass through intricate layers of intention and interpretation, often requiring clarification or revision.
Language does not evolve in a vacuum; it evolves in linguistic, cultural, historical and political contexts, constituting the object, concept or event it describes. This creates relationships between language and power, between social interactions and words, between terminology and the application of concepts. Looked at through the lens of education, language is at the complex juncture of teaching and learning, helping to define concepts and content that can become synonymous with knowledge that shapes the minds of students and teachers.

There are weighty implications to the ways in which language is used, and this study’s focus on social justice implications has shown me that teaching is of tremendous importance in society. It has shown that teachers have a great responsibility for ensuring that their students are able to critically reflect on the language that helps to shape their understanding of the world, their place and their role in it. Education providers at the policy and curriculum development level share in this responsibility, for it is only through their awareness of the political and ethical power of language that this criticality can be facilitated in teaching and learning situations. I started this study investigating the terminology of a curriculum framework I had been using for years, and I discovered that I had been using that terminology in an ad hoc and uncritical manner. I had, albeit innocently, been promulgating laziness and uncritical acceptance of meanings expressed in language. In this sense, I had been failing my students.

Participating in the EdD at the University of Sheffield began as another step on a professional progression, but it has been a life changing experience, echoing through the various realms and layers of life I inhabit in time and space. I no longer see study as a process with a beginning, middle and end; it is an evolving reality that cannot be confined to professional contexts. I am more determined, relentless and better organised than I ever thought possible. I am better able to withstand rejection, to accept criticism and to remain open to other perspectives. Most of all, I am better prepared to encourage these kinds of resilience and criticality in my students, and perhaps in my children as they grow older and move through the school system. They will know, through my encouragement, that they are indeed in a system, that there are other systems, and that they are free to analyse, accept,
reject and enquire into any aspects of those systems with which they feel uncomfortable or which they would like to challenge. This, perhaps, will be the most enduring outcome of my research experience; it will not end with me.
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Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Subject group and discipline</th>
<th>Unit title</th>
<th>MYP year</th>
<th>Unit duration (hrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Inquiry: Establishing the purpose of the unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key concept</th>
<th>Related concept(s)</th>
<th>Global context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Statement of inquiry

Inquiry questions

- Factual—
- Conceptual—
- Debatable—

Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Summative assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outline of summative assessment task(s) including assessment criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship between summative assessment task(s) and statement of inquiry:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approaches to learning (ATL)

Action: Teaching and learning through inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Learning process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning experiences and teaching strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources
Reflection: Considering the planning, process and impact of the inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to teaching the unit</th>
<th>During teaching</th>
<th>After teaching the unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 - ‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Subject group and discipline</th>
<th>Individuals and Societies Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Economic development – the importance of industry?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MYP year</td>
<td>Unit duration (hrs) 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inquiry: Establishing the purpose of the unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key concept</th>
<th>Related concept(s)</th>
<th>Global context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Interactions</td>
<td>Globalisation, Interdependence, Resources: Interactions among nations lead to changes in levels of economic development</td>
<td>Globalization and sustainability: The Interconnectedness of communities and human-made systems provides both tensions and opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of inquiry

In an increasing interconnected world, global interactions should rely on a sustainable relationship

Inquiry questions

**Factual** – What are the reasons for changes in employment structures?

**Conceptual** – How can places and people be interconnected?

**Debatable** – Can interdependence impact levels of sustainability?

Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative assessment</th>
<th>A: Knowing and understanding (i, ii) and D: Thinking critically (i, ii)</th>
<th>B: Investigating (i, ii, iii, iv) and C: Communicating (i, ii, iii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outline of summative assessment task(s) including assessment criteria:</td>
<td>Industrial Location Cocktail: Identify the geographical factors in choosing a location for hi-tech industry or a footloose. Categorise the importance of each factor, making explicit connections to an industry’s success. Explain the conflict may arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Impacts of MNCs: an in-depth investigation into one MNC, its locations, and the social, economic,</td>
<td>The Impacts of MNCs: Explaining the impacts of human decision-making socially, economically and environmentally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship between summative assessment task(s) and statement of inquiry: Industrial Location Cocktail: Understanding that human choices can be influenced by the physical environment, ensuring that they maximise their opportunities</td>
<td>Is globalisation good or bad?:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is globalisation good or bad?:
Is globalisation good or bad?: an extended piece of writing interpreting differing perspectives on globalisation, in order to synthesise this information, allowing a valid and well-supported argument to be formulated.

Exploring the opportunities and tensions that develop through the interconnectedness of the world.

### Approaches to learning (ATL)

- **Thinking:** Critical thinking – consider ideas from others perspectives and points of view
  - identify and define authentic problems and significant questions for investigation

- **Communication:** Literacy – read critically for comprehension
  - use and interpret a range of content-specific terminology
  - summarise and transform information
  - organise information logically

- **Self-management:** organisation – plan strategies to guide inquiry
  - plan assignments and set appropriate and manageable goals to achieve them (by a set deadline)

### Action: Teaching and learning through inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Learning process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is development? – recap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do employment structures vary between countries?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What determines the location of economic activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do MNCs affect development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How can economic activity affect the physical environment at a variety of scales?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning experiences and teaching strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do employment structures vary between countries?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- global variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- country employment structure comparison – using triangular graph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What determines the location of economic activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- research groups into 4 different types of industry – to be experts and teach the rest of the class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ranking and justification of different industry location factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- linking and explaining location factors for quaternary industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- industrial location cocktail – summative assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do MNCs affect development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- research into different specific MNCs (in different sectors of industry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can economic activity affect the physical environment at a variety of scales?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- note-taking on the socio-economic and environmental impacts of MNCs with specific examples from group posters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formative assessment
1. Class discussion and questioning
2. Discussion, questioning and justification
   - extended writing task, with scaffolding on how to compare/contrast
3. Presentations for misconceptions and clarifying information
   - class discussion and think-pair-share of ideas. Individual questioning to ensure understanding
   - individual meetings with teacher to check explanation of links and extend thinking
   - self and peer editing of recipes, checking with assessment criteria, with time built-in for improvement before handing in the cocktail

Differentiation

Resources

Textbooks
Teaching Resource

Reflection: Considering the planning, process and impact of the inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to teaching the unit</th>
<th>During teaching</th>
<th>After teaching the unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do we know?</td>
<td>Ensure to develop explicit forms of ATL skill development.</td>
<td>Revise connection between formative and summative assessment. Need to provide students with support for peer feedback as they felt lost into what to use as reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do we want to find out?</td>
<td>It would have been nice to exploit the “cocktail” metaphor a bit more. Something to consider for next year. Can we really speak of cocktails for economic development and industry success? Perhaps start with an engagement to activate schemata, what are some important ingredients?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we find out this information? Circles of Inference KWL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 – ‘The bottom billion’ unit plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Subject group and discipline</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The bottom billion - Development in Sub-Saharan-Africa</td>
<td>MYP year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 12 (MYP 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inquiry: Establishing the purpose of the unit**

**Key concept** | **Related concept(s)** | **Global context**
---|---|---
Change | Patterns and trends, disparity and equity, poverty | Fairness and development

**Statement of inquiry**

Development is multi-dimensional, complex and dynamic.

**Inquiry questions**

**Factual**— "What is ‘development’?"
How can we measure development?
What patterns of development can we observe globally? Were the millennium development goals (MDGS) achieved?

**Conceptual**— How does development affect people’s lives? What strategies can countries use to develop?

What are the major challenges facing countries when they develop?

**Debatable**— Trade, aid or governance? Which is the best way forward for development in Sub-Saharan Africa? Have countries that have integrated into the global economy developed the most successfully?

**Objectives**

**Criterion A: Knowledge and understanding**

ii. Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of subject-specific content (DEVELOPMENT ISSUES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA) and concepts (CHANGE, PATTERNS AND TRENDS AND POVERTY) through descriptions, explanations and examples.

**Criterion B: Investigating**

**Summative assessment**

Outline of summative assessment task(s) including assessment criteria:
You are to conduct your own independent investigation into an aspect of development in Sub-Saharan Africa for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). This will be presented as a report. You will have class time as

Relationship between summative assessment task(s) and statement of inquiry:
SOI: Development is multi-dimensional, complex and dynamic.
Assessment one gives students ownership of exploring the multi-dimensional, complex and dynamic nature of development by choosing their own research question.
Approaches to learning (ATL)

Communication
- Communication skills: Use appropriate forms of writing for different purposes and audiences

Research
- Information Literacy skills: collect, record and verify data
- Media Literacy skills: organize, evaluate, synthesize and use information from a variety of sources and media

Thinking
- Critical Thinking skills: gather and organize relevant information to formulate an argument

Self-management
- Organizational skills: Plan strategies and take action to achieve personal and academic goals

Specific skills:
- Formulating a research question
- Action planning for an investigation including goal setting
- Sourcing information from a variety of web sources with statistical analysis (tables and graphs)
- Evaluating sources of information (OPVL)
- Debate – accepting other people’s viewpoints
### Action: Teaching and learning through inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Learning process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Idea/Content</td>
<td><strong>Learning experiences and teaching strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The different perceptions of Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Lesson 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ A political map of Africa with key geographical information</td>
<td>Lesson objectives: Describe different perceptions of Sub-Saharan Africa and label a political map of Africa with key geographical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The development and indicators of development (individual and composite)</td>
<td>□ Top 10 least developed countries – Students list then check against HDI list - Focus in on LLEDCs (Least less economically developed countries) and Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The development of different countries in relation to indicators of development</td>
<td>□ Discuss why most LLEDCs are in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ A changing aspect of development in one or two Sub-Saharan African countries</td>
<td>□ Draw spider diagram of words they associate with Africa (This should highlight that students have a fairly negative image of Africa whereas Geldof will argue that it is not the ‘dark’ continent but the ‘luminous’ continent. Watch introduction to Geldof in Africa – the Luminous continent (30 mins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The Comparison and contrast the development pathways of different countries</td>
<td>□ Watch other movie links (on pwpt) that portray other false images and perceptions of Africa and discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The barriers to development for Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>□ Mapping Sub-Saharan Africa on outline map and Atlases–Lines of latitude, Countries and capitals, other major cities, Sahara, Tropical rain forests – Assignment 1 – focus on presentation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The role of the Millennium Development Goals in monitoring and encouraging development in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>HWK - Finish maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ The different strategies to encourage development in Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Lesson 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Concept of development and stereotypes. How we used to view development – first world etc</td>
<td>Lesson objectives: Define development and indicators of development (individual and composite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ students draw line on blank world map to divide world into 2 levels of development</td>
<td>□ Brandt world map –evaluate the benefits and drawbacks of this map. Promote or demote one country e.g. South Korea could be promoted to ‘rich north’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Categorising countries in terms of their level of development. (MEDC, NIC, etc) - Show Development pathway powerpoint: · note definitions and e.gs</td>
<td>□ Refer back to Brandt line - Discuss drawbacks of only using GDP to measure development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Use images on pwpt to identify other indicators of development – discuss merits of these social indicators</td>
<td>HWK - NWW page 180-183 – Q1 only page 197 and read geofile 528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ List the top 10 most developed countries worldwide according to the HDI. Reveal answer and discuss why these countries are developed</td>
<td>Lesson 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ List the top 10 most developed countries worldwide according to the HDI. Reveal answer and discuss why these countries are developed</td>
<td>Lesson objectives:Examine the development of different countries in relation to indicators of development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
countries are the most developed. How did they achieve such a high level of development?

- Review homework task - peer assessment
- Evaluate individual indicators against composite indicators
- Check the actual current Top 10 developed countries worldwide and discuss
- Watch Hans Rosling’s TED talk on development indicators using his Gapminder software: (posted on moodle)
- Show students the ‘how to use’ tutorial video (accessed through the button at the top of the default graph)
- Complete activities on gapminder worksheet

HWK - Final tasks on Gapminder worksheet

Lesson 4

Lesson objectives: Examine the development of different countries in relation to indicators of development

- Starter - Gapminder quiz - split class into teams of 3-5 students
- Brainstorm factors hindering development in Sub-Saharan Africa (Landlocked states, infrastructure, role of natural resources, climate, AIDS/HIV, trade, political stability, colonization, population, corruption, education, aid, foreign direct investment and MNC’s) Read through relevant photocopied pages from ‘The Shackled Continent’ and ‘The State of Africa’. Students highlight factors that hindered development in one colour and those that encouraged development in another.

- Present Assignment 1 UN report to compare development in at least one Sub-Saharan African country and on one MEDC. – Model simple gapminder graphs that focus on showing changing indicators over time and exemplar analysis of these graphs which include comparative figures.
- ATL skills focus - Drafting a research question and action planning

Lesson 5

Lesson objectives: Analyse a changing aspect of development in one or two Sub-Saharan African countries

- Working on assignment 1. ATL skills focus - Research and critical thinking (source analysis)

HWK - Complete research and source analysis

Lesson 6

Lesson objectives: Analyse a changing aspect of development in one or two Sub-Saharan African countries

- Working on assignment 1. ATL skills focus - Communicating in the style of a UN report

Lesson 7

Lesson objectives: Analyse a changing aspect of development in one or two Sub-Saharan African countries
Working on assignment 1. ATL skills focus

HWK - Complete report write up, self-assess and evaluate the process and results. Lesson 8

Lesson objectives: Compare and contrast the development pathways of different countries

Where in the world?

Show Gapminder graph comparing S Korea and Tanzania. Both were at a similar level of development in the 1800s but then S. Korea's development took off

PWPT - Rostow model of development

Discuss differences between S Korea and Tanzania and brainstorm possible reasons for their contrasting development pathways.

Read NWW pg 146-147 Pacific Rim development and NICs – discuss success of economic development in Japan and NICs. What were the main causes

Lesson 8

Lesson objectives: Recognize the barriers to development for Sub-Saharan Africa

Review the main barriers to development identified in lesson 4

Watch Bob Geldof DVD (Four horsemen of the Apocalypse) – 30 mins take notes on the impacts of conflict (LRA in Uganda), plague (AIDS) and Aid (N. Kenya) and other factors hindering development

Create an A3 mind map on factors hindering development in Sub-Saharan Africa

Lesson 9

Lesson objectives: Describe and explain the role of the Millennium Development Goals in monitoring and encouraging development in Sub-Saharan Africa

Linking images to the MDGs

Using the PWPT, MDG tracker website and latest UN MDG report describe and explain the MDGs

Group work - split class into 8 groups and assign each a goal to become an expert on. The task is to produce a three minute oral presentation with accompanying images to evaluate the progress made for that goal.

Group presentations and overall analysis of the goals.

Lesson 10

Lesson objectives: Evaluate different strategies to encourage development in Sub-Saharan Africa

Brainstorm solutions (trade, appropriate aid, micro finance, gender balance, Debt relief etc. – think back to South Korea case study)

Study Fair trade, trade, foreign direct investment (FDI), Economic Processing zones/Special economic zones, micro
finance, aid and sustainable development and appropriate technology through a jigsaw activity

- Watch a section of ‘The Chinese are coming’ on FDI - note benefits and drawbacks
- Share understanding in small groups. Decide which strategy they think is the most appropriate to help aid development in Sub-Saharan Africa

Lesson 12
Lesson objectives: Evaluate different strategies to encourage development in Sub-Saharan Africa

- Trade, aid or governance? Which is the best way forward for development in Sub-Saharan Africa? Debate on strategies to aid development in Sub-Saharan Africa. ATL skills focus - communicating
- Final assessment to produce a speech of no more than 3 minutes in response to the debate question. Allow time in class to discuss and draft

Hwk - Final assessment

Formative assessment

An action plan template is provided.
Peer review and feedback.
Comments on first draft of report.

Differentiation

This unit is mostly differentiated in terms of students’ interests. They are presented with different perspectives and options throughout the unit and are asked to make informed decisions to cater for their specific learning styles.

Resources

New Wider World Textbook
http://www.worldmapper.org/
http://www-gapminder.org/
Geldof in Africa DVD
The Shackled Continent
The State of Africa
The Bottom Billion
MDG task in Book 2 of Mapping our World GIS
Library books

Reflection: Considering the planning, process and impact of the inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to teaching the unit</th>
<th>During teaching</th>
<th>After teaching the unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

195
Possible IDU with Math Project
- Comparison of 2 health or social indicators from Sub-Saharan Africa (2 weeks) or may stick with IDU relating to global climate change

Do we change the final debate question as some weaker students struggled with classifying certain strategies? How can we give EAL and AC students more support and structure for the final assessment?